stamps, blind embossing, embossed printing, hot-foil stamping, offset lithography, and most recently xerographic, laser, and ink jet printing. Each is discussed in detail. This section of the study serves as a brief history of innovation in label printing as it relates to the book trade.

The accompanying compact disk contains two catalogues: the first is a descriptive list of 178 bookbinders’ signatures. Each ticket is fully described, along with its binding if it remains in situ. Bookcloth is described using Andrea Krupp’s *Bookcloth in England and America 1823–50* (2008); colours are identified using *Centroid Color Charts*; and marbled paper is identified using Richard Wolfe’s *Marbled Paper: Its History, Techniques, and Patterns* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990). Detailed descriptions include method of printing. Notes that present career dates, bindery addresses, and other pertinent information accompany most entries. The second catalogue describes 615 booksellers’ labels. It provides a full description of each label including method of printing. It also provides bibliographic information for the book that accompanies the label, when known, although it does not include a physical description of the book. Together these catalogues add nearly a thousand pages to the study, making this a very robust investigation.

An understandable weakness is the relatively small sampling of ninety-two bindings with tickets still in place. Although it is quite a large collection of Canadian tickets, the sample remains too small to draw definitive conclusions about particular binder’s tooling habits or their use of materials such as leather, bookcloth, and marbled paper. Combining the study of tickets with booksellers’ labels has allowed Garlock to focus not on the work of individual binders but on the use, artistry, and production of tickets and labels — kindred facets of the book trade. An expanded study of British or American tickets and labels along the same lines would be most welcome.

THOMAS E. KINSELLA
Stockton University


It seems as though *Teen Vogue* is always in the news these days. Since the 2016 US Presidential election, the magazine has become
an exemplar of accessible and critical sociopolitical analysis, cited frequently on social media in late 2016 in striking contrast to mainstream news media publications like the *New York Times Magazine*. *Teen Vogue*’s frank political coverage was deemed so radical that the periodical became glorified over its competitors. One popular tweet, posted on 4 February 2017 by Tom Jamieson (@jamiesont), for example, compared *Teen Vogue* to peer magazines *Elle* and *Marie Claire* through a reductive summary of the magazines’ respective foci:

This season’s must haves —  
ELLE: Heels  
MARIE CLAIRE: Tuxedo jacket  
TEEN VOGUE: A hatred of Nazis & a working knowledge of the constitution

But according to *Teen Vogue* digital editorial director Phillip Picardi (@pfpicardi), who replied via Twitter on 5 February 2017, both competitor magazines “have been writing about politics long before *Teen Vogue* was” and, more importantly, “writing about fashion or being interested in fashion does not preclude anyone from being concerned or informed about what’s going on in our country.” This seemingly inconceivable coexistence of popular culture and politics is at the heart of Elizabeth Groeneveld’s study of the power and possibilities for feminist magazines, *Making Feminist Media: Third Wave Magazines on the Cusp of the Digital Age*.

To be clear, *Teen Vogue* is not marketed as a feminist magazine, but its bold and unapologetic political writing participates in a small and under-acknowledged tradition of (proto-)feminist publishing in the mainstream magazine industry. In fact, Groeneveld’s *Making Feminist Media* suggests that it should not be surprising that mainstream teen magazines have become overtly politically charged. As Groeneveld explains in her introduction, “third-wave [feminist] magazines have helped create feminist popular cultures and have attempted to make what Lisa Jervis and Andi Zeisler describe in their inaugural editorial for *Bitch* magazine: girl-friendly spaces within a mass media landscape where few such spaces exist” (1). The frequency with which *Teen Vogue* appears in headlines suggests that there remains much work to be done before women and girls are seen as inherently political, and *Making Feminist Media* provides useful historical context for what one might cautiously term a watershed moment in popular culture.

Groeneveld’s *Making Feminist Media* could not have arrived at a more salient time. This in-depth exploration of “third-wave” feminist magazines situates five such magazines (*Bitch, BUST, HUES,
ROCKGIRL, and Venus Zine) in the context of North American feminist periodical history. These discussions include such suffrage magazines as The Woman’s Journal (1870–1931) and The Revolution (1868–1870), second wave/mainstream feminist magazine Ms., proto-feminist teen magazine Sassy, and post-wave magazines Shameless and the online-only Rookie, in addition to numerous others. The collective history of these periodicals, Groeneveld shows, reveals substantial intertextual relationships between the magazines’ respective readers, editors, and creators that explode reductive narratives of feminism as a series of internally consistent “waves” or of feminist periodicals as somehow untouched by the mainstream magazine industry or market. Groeneveld adeptly documents the complicated negotiations that each of these magazines has had to balance between politics, financial viability, and reader satisfaction. Using an historical-materialist lens, Groeneveld demonstrates the various benefits and drawbacks of for- and not-for-profit status, circulation, advertising, readership, reader engagement, and mission statements.

Making Feminist Media is organized in two parts with a total of six chapters. Although Part One is framed as historical and Part Two is framed as political, Making Feminist Media’s analysis of third-wave magazines (and feminist periodicals in general) demonstrates the limits of such distinctions and situates each chapter within the history of feminist political writing. Groeneveld chooses the evolution of Sassy magazine for the book’s point of departure in the first chapter, “‘Someone Else Actually Cares As Much As Me’: Sassy Magazine, Grrrl Zine Culture, and Feminist Magazines.” This chapter details the genealogy of third-wave feminist magazines as collectively influenced by the mainstream periodical Sassy, DIY and zine culture, and the riot grrrl movement of the 1990s. Groeneveld is careful to articulate this convergence of influences not as the origin of feminist periodicals but rather as the moment at which some feminisms and countercultures converged to enter a small corner of the mainstream. The fraught relationship these magazines would go on to have with the mainstream is outlined in the second chapter, “Serious and Material Business’: Third-Wave Magazines and the Marketplace in Historical Perspective.”

Throughout the text, each chapter focuses on a substantial issue of particular salience to one or two magazines but that influences all third- and post-wave periodicals to some degree. This format allows the highlighted periodicals in each chapter to serve as case studies that Groeneveld then contextualizes broadly in relation to
the other magazines under examination in the book. For example, while all feminist magazines are impacted by systemic racism, which presumes race to be a matter distinct from gender and sexuality (80), such racism particularly affected HUES, a periodical that deliberately addressed a multiracial readership. The chapter “HUES Magazine, the Politics of Alliance, and Critical Multiculturalism” demonstrates that the magazine industry’s systemic racism was far more detrimental to it than to periodicals presuming a white readership (87). Similarly, Making Feminist Media’s provocatively titled sixth chapter, “Dildo Debacle: Advertising Feminist Sexualities in Bitch Magazine,” examines in-depth a controversial sex-toy advertisement on the back cover of Bitch magazine. Groeneveld uses the ad and its many responses as a case study not for advertising in feminist magazines (advertising is the subject of the second chapter) but rather for the various approaches feminist magazines have taken to recognizing queer sexualities as elemental to feminism.

Situated within the fields of periodical studies, feminist periodical scholarship, feminist history, and scholarship on publics, Making Feminist Media is an ambitious and thoroughly researched archival study of contemporary feminist magazine production. If the book has a weakness, it is its reluctance to specify a firm position on the subject matter of several chapters. Throughout these chapters runs the vague and unsatisfying theme “feminist magazines have taken varying perspectives” (65) applied in various terms to advertising, covers, political endorsements, and features. Similarly, the notion that “it is not worthwhile to define success or failure [of feminist periodicals] solely in economic terms” (90) is rehashed throughout the book, but without a clearly articulated alternative for what success for these periodicals should look like. While it is unarguably necessary in archival research to identify the practices and realities of the texts under study, the chapters in which Groeneveld relies on vague reflection in place of analysis feel rather unsatisfying. By contrast, the fourth chapter takes a persuasive critical position on the BUST magazine’s 2006 fashion issue, arguing that the spread “offers a version of feminism in which gender — and more specifically the relationships between men and women — is the only consideration. […] Historical specificities and analyses that consider, for example, class and race subjectivities are effaced in a version of feminism that seems based on a notion of universal sisterhood that transcends time, locality, and difference” (109). In referring to BUST’s Angela Davis’s “look” as representative of
the issue’s troubling erasure of intersectional feminist concerns, Groeneveld quotes directly from Davis, who has herself addressed “the ways in which photographic images of herself from the 1970s have been mobilized in contemporary fashion magazines” (109). Chapter Six similarly asserts a clear position on the matter of the sex wars, particularly the homophobic exclusion of queer sexualities from mainstream feminism as articulated through BITCH magazine’s “dildo debacle” discussed above.

Ultimately, Making Feminist Media is a valuable intervention in the study of periodicals and the history of feminist print culture. Its numerous areas of focus encourage further study in mainstream periodicals targeted at girls and women, and its rich archival and historical detail implores further investigation into counterculture periodicals and their influences on mainstream media. Much like third-wave magazines have sought to make “girl-friendly spaces within a mass media landscape where few such spaces exist” (1), Groeneveld’s Making Feminist Media likewise opens the field of periodical scholarship to girl-friendly media where few such studies exist.

MARCELLE KOSMAN
University of Alberta


This carefully edited volume, published in 2015, brings forward for the first time the informative and lively diaries of a young Scottish doctor who spent four years in the Canadas during the years immediately after the 1837 Rebellions when the political struggle for responsible government was gaining strength despite well-organized and adamant Tory resistance.

This volume from the Champlain Society is certainly up to the Society’s editorial standards. The work of Sandra Alston and Cicely Blackstock is detailed and carefully couched, thus offering well-informed, explanatory support for William Ord Mackenzie’s five journals. Helpful footnotes provide military background, geographical information, and social context for the contemporary reader. Each of the five journals was sent home upon its completion to Carleton Place