

gathered three-score pieces of writing about the Lone Star State. Most are short stories or parts of novels; several are essays. Though the Texas mystique developed during the 19th century, Graham largely restricts himself to the 20th. This leaves enough of the old Texas—including Andy Adams on a waterless cattle drive, O. Henry on the politics of cowboy art, and Walter Prescott Webb on the Comanches—to satisfy traditionalists, but allows Graham to illustrate how the Texas experience diversified after the discovery of oil at Spindletop in 1901. The voices are as varied as the people of the state.

Graham's Texas is divided into four parts: the West, the South, the Border, and, reflecting the fact that Texas has become one of the most urbanized states, Town and City. Dorothy Scarborough writes of the wind on the West Texas plains, and how it blows away beauty and youth and dreams. Katherine Anne Porter looks east to find the memories that fill the region that was a salient of the Cotton Kingdom. C. C. White's memories of the same district come from the other side of the color line. Ray Gonzalez watches immigrants cross the Rio Grande at El Paso, defying authority as immigrants to Texas have done since the Comanches and Americans pushed into Spanish and Mexican Texas during the early 19th century. Robert Caro—no Texan but a New Yorker on an extended visa—writes about the Hill Country, where Lyndon Johnson grew up without electricity and vowed to ease the burden of women like those who reared him.

Larry L. King ponders the oft-noticed habit of Texans to become more Texan after leaving the state. "Texas remains in my mind's eye that place to which I shall eventually return to rake the dust for my formative tracks," he writes, "that place where one hopes to grow introspective and wise as well as old." Molly Ivins is less lyrical and more put out as she describes the varieties of Texas sexism: "They used to say that Texas was hell on women and horses—I don't know why they stopped."

Short stories and essays anthologize well; bits of novels are trickier. Mary Karr's piece from *The Liars' Club* (1995) is hilariously self-contained, but Billy Lee Brammer's *The Gay Place* (1961), the finest novel of Texas politics, is woven too tightly for clean excerpts. Brammer has to be included, and Graham does his best, but the ragged edges show. In this case, the

plea of all anthologists applies with special force: Go read the original.

Graham is a gentle guide to what he calls the "archeological site" of Texas literature. He suggests themes but otherwise lets visitors ramble. "Readers may make their own discoveries and connections, and they are welcome to whatever insights may arise." It's a rich plot, worth returning to again and again.

—H. W. BRANDS

GODARD:

A Portrait of the Artist at Seventy.

By Colin MacCabe. Farrar, Straus & Giroux. 432 pp. \$25

As a filmmaker, Jean-Luc Godard, éminence grise of the European avant-garde, presents stumbling blocks. More essayist than storyteller, he has always made films that subordinate narrative to ideas, or else discard narrative altogether. The ideas unfold unpredictably, through images and techniques that are, by turns, evocative, smart-alecky, and silly. To Godard, contradictory impressions represent not incoherence but fidelity to life's tumult. For a time, especially in the 1960s, every new Godard film was an event.

Born in 1930 to a prosperous family, Godard left his home in Nyon, Switzerland, at 16 to attend the Lycée Buffon in Paris. A lackadaisical student, he turned to petty thievery, got arrested, and was disowned by his parents. Godard soaked in Paris's rich cinema culture at Henri Langlois's revered Cinémathèque and the Ciné-Club du Quartier Latin, and got to know Eric Rohmer, Claude Chabrol, and



Jean-Luc Godard on the set in 1968

Current Books

François Truffaut. This movie-mad bunch became critics for the influential journal *Cahiers du cinéma* and then filmmakers of the French New Wave.

Along with retelling that story, Colin McCabe, a professor of English and film at the University of Pittsburgh, places Godard in another familiar tale: Scion of a cushy background finds Marx and rebels against the bourgeoisie. While films such as *Une femme mariée* (1964) and *Masculin féminin* (1966) probe the topic of consumerism with a relatively detached eye, *Week-end* (1967) depicts France as a decaying nation overrun by greed. As McCabe notes, *Week-end* is the work of “someone who has reached a point of total disgust and rejection of his own society.” The film closes with the words “End of Cinema.”

Godard’s next films, including *British Sounds* (1969) and *Vent d’est* (1970), sketch a nebulous Maoist ideology that dictates cultural revolution. They are, writes McCabe, “in some simple sense unwatchable—the premise of each is that the image is unable to provide the knowledge that it claims.” Through a partnership with the filmmaker Anne-Marie Miéville, Godard has subsequently returned to engaging the audience rather than hectoring it, but his politics haven’t changed.

McCabe illuminates the historical and theoretical contexts, but he doesn’t deeply analyze the films themselves. It’s a conscious choice, and probably a wise one. There’s no substitute for watching such masterworks as *Breathless* (1959) and *Contempt* (1963).

—CHRISTOPHER BYRD

RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY

FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES AND THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.

By Jo Renee Formicola, Mary C. Segers, and Paul Weber. Rowman & Littlefield. 214 pp. \$68, \$23.95 paper

As a matter of both substance and institutional allocation of power, the Bush administration’s faith-based initiative is sprawling. It raises profound issues of welfare policy and church-state relations. All three branches of the federal government play significant parts in the enterprise, as do the states. And the initiative tackles the politically charged task of distributing funds among faith-based entities, with African American churches and white Protestant evangelical groups in particular standing to gain.

In *Faith-Based Initiatives and the Bush Administration: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*, Jo Renee Formicola, Mary C. Segers, and Paul Weber, political scientists all, appraise this tangle of substantive and institutional concerns. The “Good” portion of their book neatly summarizes the initiative’s conservative intellectual underpinnings; the “Bad” chapter discusses the potential legal constraints; and the “Ugly” segment recounts the considerable political strife spawned by this effort, both within the executive branch and

between Congress and the White House. The book’s conclusion raises a multitude of questions but offers few answers.

Far more than most presidential policies, the faith-based initiative is shaped by constitutional doctrines. Three decades ago, judges probably would have invalidated major elements of the initiative. First Amendment rulings then barred government from funding “pervasively sectarian” institutions. But by the time George W. Bush took office in 2001, those sweeping restrictions had disappeared (though others remained). The following year, the Supreme Court ruled that government could, through tax-funded vouchers, purchase services with explicitly religious content—a result sharply inconsistent with the jurisprudential trend of the early 1970s.

Formicola, Segers, and Weber are least illuminating with respect to the deep conflict, within both the Supreme Court and the political culture, between neutralist and separationist visions of church-state relations. Neutralist approaches require government to treat religious and secular organizations evenhandedly. Separationist approaches, which hold religion to be constitutionally distinctive, would disable government from aiding an individual’s religious experience. Neutralists and separationists agree that the Bush initiative