sometimes in products—like butter—that do not require certification in non-industrial forms. I wish Lytton had spent more time on this aspect of his story. He notes that the proliferation of additives presented challenges to rabbinic supervisors whose jobs came to require expertise in food science. Yet we hear surprisingly little about these changes or about questions they raise about what counts as food in the first place, at a time when paint chemicals and petroleum-derived additives were becoming regular ingredients in processed foods.

Industrialization also resulted in longer and more complicated supply chains, which meant that agencies had to be able to trust each other. For the most part, Lytton argues, interdependence led to mutual oversight and cooperation, and his data suggests that any recent cases of mislabeling or adulteration have been rare and accidental. This data comes almost entirely from the certifying agencies themselves, however. Lytton treats his sources with skepticism, but I wonder how his story might have been complicated had he spent more time with sources from outside the industry.

The kosher certification model cannot be neatly imposed on America’s massively complex industrial food system, but its successes are worth considering. Under the right conditions, Lytton argues, private certification can be reliable, especially in tandem with government oversight. His argument is compelling given the profound problems with current governmental regulation of American food production. According to Lytton, the history of kosher certification shows that the conflicts of interest that inevitably arise when one private company pays another to certify some aspect of its production can be managed with the right social context and market conditions, especially when vigilant consumers help to keep tabs on certifying agencies. Indeed, since food industry insiders now routinely head government regulatory bodies, this point could be well applied to public regulation, too. Lytton’s thought-provoking book will be useful to anyone interested in the complicated question of regulating the food supply, whether in the past or in the present.

Helen Zoe Veit
Michigan State University


In *Sharing the Prize*, Gavin Wright adds an overlooked perspective to the
scholarship of the freedom struggle. Historians of the movement have paid close attention to its politics, its religious sensibility, and its leaders as well as its “local people.” But some scholars have argued that the movement had minimal economic impact. Wright challenges this view. He explores how the Jim Crow economy shaped the movement from its inception and then argues that its success helped open up the southern economy to a period of prosperity. This short review will be able to touch on just a few critical findings in this important book.

While white working-class fears of the movement were always evident, Wright points out that white southern business leaders also supported segregation. Their eyes were on their bottom line as they argued that an integrated consumer base would be smaller and less profitable, as white customers would be frightened off. Wright thus challenges the view of the Jim Crow businessman as a moderating force between the protestors and the die-hard segregationists. The Jim Crow economy was still profitable enough for southern business leaders to go to great lengths to resist desegregation. It was only when business leaders determined that the protests over public accommodations (lunch counter sit-ins, for example) were not going to stop that they began to consider desegregation seriously. Wright adds as another crucial factor in the business community’s reconsideration the critical role the federal government played enforcing the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Once it was clear that all lunch counters would indeed have to desegregate, to continue this example, individual storeowners did so in fairly short, pain-free order.

Wright then demonstrates how the fears of many of these same business leaders about desegregation were greatly exaggerated. The main thrust of his argument relies on showing how many critical economic indicators of the southern economy turned sharply upward once the landmark civil rights legislation began to be enforced. This data challenges the common perceptions that the movement either had no positive economic impact over all, or that the economic victories it produced came at the expense of white working-class southerners. Both black and white southerners on the whole, Wright demonstrates, prospered for a solid two decades after the mid-1960s. Cries of white southern victimhood did not arise until the 1990s when the southern industrial economy began to struggle, hurting both black and white wage earners.

From one of our finest economic historians, Sharing the Prize is a complex, rewarding achievement. Wright brings both nuance and sharp detail to the dif-
ficult task of writing economic history. This book will go instantly into the canon of civil rights scholarship.

Charles J. Holden
St. Mary’s College of Maryland


The desire for food security is highly motivational, and generally everyone agrees that more is better. But the emergence of genetically modified (GM) organisms in agriculture has divided eaters into increasingly distant dining rooms: technophiles who see GM as another scientific improvement in agriculture and biophiles who argue that a line has been crossed and a balance upset. Growing Resistance is the latest Canadian book to engage this debate, and it will certainly engage historians interested in how Prairie farmers responded to GM crops such as Roundup Ready wheat, canola, and Triffid flax.

Indeed, the book centers on a historical problem. Following the federal government’s permissive attitude to GM and what it calls “plants with novel traits,” the biotech sector quickly developed and approved several GM organisms (36). Beginning in the late 1990s, herbicide-tolerant varieties of canola and flax appeared and experienced strong uptake with farmers. But when Monsanto announced the development of Roundup Ready wheat—a variety that would tolerate the widely used herbicide Roundup—several producer, industry, and health groups rallied to stop it, and in 2004 the company stopped developing the variety. Eaton sets out to explain why the same farmers who adopted GM canola would reject GM wheat, and, more generally, how producer-led resistance complicates the literature on consumer anti-GM movements.

Eaton eventually argues that the very different responses to GM wheat and oilseeds stemmed from the history of the plants themselves. GM canola found purchase because canola was relatively new and already highly transformed, and GM wheat caused protest because of the cereal’s centrality in Western diets and its history in Prairie agriculture. The distinction is explained in “The Difference Between Bread and Oil,” a chapter that promises in its subtitle to put “People-Plant Relationships in Historical Context.” Here, Eaton follows a growing literature on companion species, arguing that we shape our plants