

Pacific Historical Review

May 2007, Vol. 76

White Metropolis: Race, Ethnicity and Religion in Dallas, 1841-2001. By Michael Phillips. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.) 267 pp. \$60 cloth. \$19.95 paper.)

Michael Phillips examines race relations in Dallas from its founding to the present, an ambitious project for 178 pages of text. Unlike other explorations of the Dallas past that have touched on the relationship between blacks and whites, this book also includes an examination of how Mexican Americans, Catholics, and Jews fit into the racial landscape of the city. Indeed, the author's exploration of the evolution of white identity in Dallas is clearly influenced by a growing number of studies in whiteness, a field that Phillips feels compelled to defend in an afterward. The author contends that "whiteness proved an effective tool for controlling dissent" (p. 177), not only among minorities but from among the city's white laboring classes, since they too felt compelled to prove their whiteness by supporting elite notions of race and class hierarchy. The book starts with a prologue that strikes a familiar note to those familiar with Patricia Hill's book, *The Making of Modern Dallas* (1996). It decries the lack of serious scholarship about the city and suggests that this is a result of a conspiracy by the elite to promote the myth that Dallas prosperity came only from strong civic leadership and a spirit of consensus. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that since 1990 scholars have written at least eleven books and fifteen articles on Dallas.

The book's first chapter examines the mistreatment of slaves in antebellum Dallas, particularly in response to the burning of the county courthouse in 1860, which led to rumors of slave conspiracy. The book's central focus, however, is on what happened after the Civil War with the development of "a more fluid concept of race in which white status could be gained or lost based on acceptance of elite social norms." (p. 19). Equating whiteness with elite social norms appeared to be the best way of controlling the wage-earning classes that threatened the social order of Dallas. "Whiteness" was so important for success in Dallas for Jews, light-skinned Mexicans, and others, including poor whites of Eastern and Southern European descent, that elites believed that social order could be controlled with the carrot of whiteness. Dallas Congregational pastor Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, whose dispensationalist *Scofield Reference Bible* rejected political activism for an otherworldly focus, also helped control dissent in Dallas.

The emphasis on whiteness proved particularly useful for the city's elites during the tumultuous twentieth century. So did the eugenics movement and the Klan, which expanded the definition of non-whites. According to the Phillips, the lure of whiteness for some frustrated coalition building by those without power. Dallas elites, then, controlled dissent by their definition of whiteness, as well as by promoting a history that ignored the very real social tensions and diversity in Dallas history.

The book does a good job of documenting how Dallas reflected the racism and fear of diversity common to much of the twentieth century by discussing the various attacks on diversity within the city. It is also the first book on Dallas to try to tackle the role of religion as an influential element in the city's history. Still, the author fails to substantiate his claim that elites orchestrated the emphasis on whiteness as a divisive factor. Although the book provides some helpful insight about race in Dallas, it is in no way the final word.

ROBERT B. FAIRBANKS

The University of Texas at Arlington