

and arguments about women entering the workforce, Løvdal Stephens makes clear that Dobson and his staff had to walk a tightrope between insisting on the naturalness of “traditional” families and acknowledging the changing social and economic realities that sent women to work and made men less economically essential to their families. This, alongside her important insights on race and sexuality, marks another important conclusion from Løvdal Stephens’s book: it makes clear that change and failure to adhere to a “traditional” family ideal were the norm and not the exception in the world Dobson built.

Michael J. McVicar
Florida State University
doi:10.1017/S0009640721000652

***The Limits of Tolerance: Enlightenment Values and Religious Fanaticism.* By Denis Lacorne. Translated by C. Jon Delogu and Robin Emlein. Religion, Culture, and Public Life. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019. xiii + 280 pp. \$35.00 hardcover.**

This is the English translation of a book originally published in France in 2016 and now endowed with a new introduction and an epilogue addressed to an American audience. The book is divided into two distinct and uneven sections, each of five chapters. The first five chapters survey the philosophy of tolerance in Locke, Bayle, and Voltaire and identify various regimes of tolerance in Colonial America, the Ottoman Empire, and the Venetian Republic. This part is mildly interesting but of limited relevance to the main argument, and all the early modern primary sources are cited from secondary works, which is the method of a journalist rather than a historian. The book gets to the heart of the matter in chapter 6, entitled “On Blasphemy,” which is devoted to the Salman Rushdie affair as well as to the crisis provoked by the caricatures of Muhammad that culminated in the terrorist attack on the journal *Charlie Hebdo*. The author sees in these contemporary controversies an anachronistic resurgence of the will to punish blasphemy, which he blames on Islam. In the second part of his work, chapters 6 to 10, the author is most interested in case studies that test the limits of tolerance and blur the distinction between free speech and hate speech. He is a very clever and attentive reader of current events, and he usefully contextualizes the examples he compiles from Western Europe and America. Chapters 7 through 9 survey the various exemptions granted or denied to religious minorities by Western judicial systems and the controversies that have arisen over the public display of religious symbols. Chapter 10 compares the limits of tolerance, in the sense of unrestricted freedom of speech and assembly, in the United States, France, and Germany. The epilogue revisits two incidents that hit the headlines after the French edition of the work came out: the Unite the Right riot on the campus of the University of Virginia and the rather tamer controversy over the use of so-called “burkinis” on the Côte d’Azur. Perhaps the author’s most prescient case study involves religious exemptions from vaccination, which he touches on briefly in chapter 7. In an era of pandemic, such cases may well define the new limit to tolerance (or the new confusion between tolerance and extinction). In fact, America is now experiencing a grave crisis caused by people who

refuse to accept any restrictions of their behavior in the name of public safety, and the same phenomenon seems to be manifesting itself in the right-wing demonstrations taking place in Germany and elsewhere. This sort of aggressive selfishness is not a form of religious dissidence that tests our tolerance but rather a blatant rejection of social cohesion. In effect, the subject matter of this book has been overtaken by events, and this is always the weakness of books on current events, which do not stay current. When the author proclaims in conclusion that “armed fanaticism remains the basic obstacle to tolerance and freedom of expression” (206), he is thinking of radical Islamists and I am thinking of white supremacist militias and Donald Trump. Religion is but one basis of identity and one source of identity politics, but there are even more primitive and more strident forms of identity that are now asserting themselves in defiance of democratic norms. In a way, there is something naïve and nostalgic about the author’s melodramatic anxieties. It’s like worrying about an earthquake in California while the whole state is burning down.

Eric MacPhail

Indiana University

doi:10.1017/S0009640721000664

Miss America’s God: Faith and Identity in America’s Oldest Pageant.
By Mandy McMichael. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2019. xii
+ 249 pp. \$34.95 cloth.

Scholars of Christianity and church history may be surprised to hear that in the last thirty years more scholars have published about beauty pageants than about prominent American evangelists Charles Finney or Billy Graham. This includes studies about how women represent moral virtue and about how pageants eroticize bodies in post-industrial capitalism; studies about broadcasting feminism and about advertising and modesty; studies about how pageants in Jamaica, Nigeria, or Mali expose the constitutive relationship between beauty ideals and gendered nationalist ideologies; studies about how Indian beauty pageants in Guatemala convey shifting social claims for cultural authenticity; studies about transgender inclusion in single-sex competition; and studies about pageants as political rituals. The study of pageants is not an obscure but omnipresent topic in the bibliographic record of the humanities and social science. The consensus in this record of research is that beauty pageants use women’s bodies to mobilize broader political and economic structures of power. For example, Magda Hinojosa and Jill Carle have argued American beauty queens can trade pageant titles for political roles. This is not unique to the United States (in Venezuela, Jamaica, and France, pageant winners also have won elected office), but is an export of the United States: every scholar of beauty pageants agrees single-sex beauty competitions have their origin in this particular settler colonial territory.

Mandy McMichael does not think much about these broad bibliographic insights. For her, the appropriate comparisons in an exploration of Miss America are not similar competitions in Mali or Nicaragua but *American’s Next Top Model* or *Dancing with the Stars* and the country that plotted the entertainment media preamble to whomever was last crowned (35). As McMichael explains it, circus impresario Phineas T. Barnum held