

in which there are clear heroes (people who favored and furthered freedom, tolerance, respect, and solidarity) and villains (people committed to constraint, pathologization, and exclusion and who caused or refused to see suffering). But the fact that Herzog makes no secret of her own political preferences does not make this a biased book; it is an engaged one. Herzog's reading of the interactions between psychoanalysis as a profession, the personal concerns and possible psychological motivations of theorists themselves, and broader political and cultural contexts is consistently nuanced, complex, and plausible.

In short, this is a scintillating and thought-provoking work of intellectual history, a rich, sophisticated, and exciting analysis of ideas in historical context. It is an important book and will be productive for Herzog's readers both for its empirical and for its theoretical contribution.

EDWARD ROSS DICKINSON
University of California Davis



Bad Girls: Young Women, Sex and Rebellion before the Sixties. By AMANDA H. LITTAUER. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015. Pp. 280. \$27.95 (paper); \$26.99 (ebook).

Who would not buy a book about girls in search of hot sex? Illustrated with colorful evidence about the American girls who decided to “do it,” girls who found sex too exciting not to pursue in the decades before the 1960s counterculture, *Bad Girls* does not disappoint. As Amanda Littauer writes in this lively, well-researched book, the “victory girls,” “B-girls,” lesbians, and ordinary teenagers of the 1940s and 1950s set the stage for the sexual revolution. *Bad Girls* is also an account of female sexual courage: if girls couldn't get what they wanted at home, they often hit the road, leaving school, parents, community, and sometimes a young husband behind.

The sexual revolution is often said to have begun with the marketing of oral contraceptives in 1960 and the widespread availability of all birth control by 1965. But Littauer asks us to rethink these assumptions, arguing that a “long sexual revolution” (3) was already under way before World War II. It accelerated during the war years, when “victory girls” put their bodies to work on behalf of the war effort—and sometimes got a few dollars and a dose of venereal disease in return. In the postwar years, “B-girls,” or “drink solicitors,” seduced men into buying watered-down and fake drinks, earning a percentage of each sale. B-girls sometimes came through with a little sex too, but they did not consider themselves prostitutes. By using their sexuality to make a sale, they “expanded the possibilities for women's sexual license” (53).

As historians like Alan Bérubé, Leisa Meyer, and Mary Louise Roberts have shown, World War II was a turning point for American sexuality: queer men and women swarmed to cities and military bases in record numbers. War also provided a template for normalizing heterosexual, white male violence. But as Littauer notes, the war put civilian girls in motion too, allowing them to break free of family and community to participate in creating a distinctive and public sexual youth culture. After the war, sexologist Alfred Kinsey entered the conversation that girls and women had already begun. Littauer argues that *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, published in October 1953, brought “a wider range of female voices into the postwar conversation about sexuality” (82). Some women participated in the study (importantly, as Littauer notes, Kinsey only sought out white informants), while other sexually active women wrote to Dr. Kinsey with frank questions.

How to balance girls’ desire for hot premarital sex with support for the institution of marriage? One cultural compromise was “going steady” and other forms of play marriage, which allowed young women to engage in heavy petting and intercourse within the tacit rules of monogamous engagement. With sexual talk, sexual experimentation skyrocketed—but so did pregnancy and VD. “Between 1940 and 1960,” Littauer informs us, “census data shows a 2.5-fold increase in single motherhood among white women and a threefold increase among all women of childbearing age” (113). If some of this intercourse was acquaintance rape, a term that Littauer introduces while acknowledging that many girls would not have recognized it as rape, it was also the logical endpoint of the heavy petting, digital penetration, and oral sex that girls welcomed.

Littauer reads her sources deeply to tease out three key themes in postwar sexuality studies: acquaintance rape and sexual force; African American girls’ embrace of their own sexuality; and the spread of sexual practices and sex knowledge—particularly oral sex—within teen culture. *Bad Girls* does not minimize the costs of female desire; unwanted pregnancies, hastily arranged and ill-advised marriages, and dangerous illegal abortions were common. Yet Littauer makes a persuasive argument for why women in search of sexual pleasure would risk “getting caught” to have it. Using sources that range from health and social work records to oral histories, memoirs, and popular culture, Littauer records both how girls understood their own sexual experiences and the price they sometimes paid for them. Cold War psychologists and social workers told a different story, often reframing those experiences as psychologically deviant.

Although lesbians make an appearance in other parts of the book, Littauer devotes her final chapter to them. Here she enters a competitive field: Meier, Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline Davis, Nan Alamilla Boyd, Lillian Faderman, Esther Newton, and numerous memoirists have already taught us a great deal about this subject. Yet there is more to know. *Bad Girls* situates the emergence of urban lesbian subcultures in the context

of these other, larger changes in heterosexuality and female mobility. Much of the literature on lesbianism focused on deviance and pseudo-Freudian speculations about neglectful parenting and psychological immaturity, and some lesbians agreed that they had turned to other women because of bad experiences with men. Yet they did not necessarily agree with experts that lesbian sex was immoral or unnatural. Anticipating the lesbian feminists of the 1970s, some argued that it was unmarried “heterosexual sex, not sex between women, that was immoral” (154).

“The generation of young women coming of age in the 1950s keenly understood the internal contradictions of postwar sexual culture,” Littauer writes, “and they felt that hypocrisy deeply and personally” (95). That feeling would build into a wave of rage and activism by the late 1960s, when feminism took sexual pleasure, sexual equality, marriage, birth control, sexual health, and the fight against rape as some of its core issues. This, I think, is the central importance of this book to our history of twentieth-century women: it is no accident that a generation of young women raised on frank conversations about the pleasure of heavy petting and oral sex might be newly open to lesbianism by the 1960s; or that women whose desire had opened the door to expanded possibilities for men to experience no-strings-attached intercourse soon understood that the sexual deck was not stacked in their favor. We knew that the sexual revolution of the 1960s did not come from nowhere, but in this lasting contribution to the history of women, sexuality, and girlhood, Littauer maps a “somewhere” where other historians are sure to follow.

CLAIRE POTTER
The New School



Sexual Myths of Modernity: Sadism, Masochism and Historical Teleology.
By ALISON MOORE. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2016. Pp. 277.
\$105.00 (cloth); \$99.00 (e-book).

In this groundbreaking and eminently readable study, Alison Moore addresses the ways in which certain nonnormative sexual modalities—here the fantasies and practices subsumed under the umbrella term “sadomasochism”—have been used to shore up a dominant mythic narrative of historical progress, precisely by being made to stand in for political degeneration or “barbarism.” In examining the alignment at various historical moments between sadism and political violence (Nazism in particular), Moore expertly demonstrates the workings of an ideological “attempt to bind sexual practices to a vision of historical teleology or social evolution” (1) throughout modernity and its afterlives.

The methodological toolkit chosen by Moore to explore the deployment of sexual myths in modernity is explained and ably justified in the introduc-