

East Texas Historical Journal Vol. XLV, No. 2, Fall 2007

*White Metropolis: Race, Ethnicity, and Religion in Dallas, 1841-2001*, Michael Phillips, The University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX, 78713-7819) 2006. Contents. Illus. Notes. Biblio. Index. P. 267. \$19.95. Paperback. \$60. Hardcover.

As the writing of Texas history has grown increasingly sophisticated in recent years, relatively little of this new scholarship has been directed at the history of Texas cities. Michael Phillips addresses this shortcoming in *White Metropolis*, his study of Dallas from its founding to 2001. Phillips' focus is race, but not as it is usually conceptualized. This is not a history of African Americans in Dallas, or for that matter a study of Dallas race relations. Instead Phillips organizes his study around the concept of race in all of complexity. Influenced in part by Neil Foley's tri-racial study of black, Mexican American and poor white workers in Texas agriculture, Phillips broadens our usually narrow concept of race to include blacks, along with Mexican Americans, immigrants (especially those from southern and eastern Europe), the white working class, Jews, Catholics, and even women. These otherwise disparate groups share the fate of having been marginalized and oppressed—sometimes violently—by the white power elite that dominated Dallas' political and economic development and controlled its history and its image of itself.

Central to Phillip's analysis of Dallas history is the theory of "whiteness," which the author defines as much as an attitude as a complexion. "Whiteness rested on a steadfast belief in racial differences, support of capitalism, faith in rule by the wealthy, certitude that competition and inequity arose from nature, and rejection of an activist government that redistributed political or economic power." (12) It was more an economic and political ideology than a biological or anthropological construct. It was anti-socialist and anti-collectivist. Using "whiteness" Phillips presents Dallas history as the largely successful struggle of Dallas elites to establish and maintain their power over the vast majority of Dallas citizens through the use of racism and violence. Challenges occur and they are largely defeated; even the civil rights revolution did not radically alter power relationships.

Phillips concludes his history with the observation that Dallas escaped the violent urban riots and decay of cities like Detroit, not because it enjoyed a more dynamic leadership than those failed cities, "but because a self-induced paralysis left the structures of oppression soundly intact. Under the influence of whiteness, Dallas learned to forget the past, regret the present, and dread the future." (178)

*White Metropolis* will not please all of its readers. It is a highly ideological and sharply critical study of Dallas, and by implication, all of urban Texas and the urban South. Its focus is clearly on oppression and injustice, not success and accomplishment. It is thoroughly researched and documented, although hardly balanced in its approach or its tone. Like it or not, this book needs to be read by anyone interested in Texas history.

Cary D. Wintz  
Texas Southern University