

REVIEWS

The Professional Guinea Pig: Big Pharma and the Risky World of Human Subjects, by **Roberto Abadie**. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 184pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822348238.

STEFAN TIMMERMANS
University of California, Los Angeles
Stefan@soc.ucla.edu

The Professional Guinea Pig belongs to a social science growth area investigating the pharmaceutical industry in contemporary health care. This literature is united by a prevailing consensus that views the drug industry as the villain du jour in health policy. After focusing on unbridled professional power and the for-profit insurance industry, the critical social gaze is turned to Big Pharma. Consequently, most social scientists see it as their job to expose the scientific manipulation, the chase of profit margins, the dehumanization, the ethical transgressions, and the inequities that flow from drug industry involvement.

In engaging prose, Roberto Abadie delivers the expected social science message. Abadie conducted an eighteen-month ethnography of a group of healthy people who made a living as research subjects in Phase One clinical trials in Philadelphia. Most trial participants are African-American and Latino, but Abadie spent time with a group of young, non-Hispanic white anarchists who enrolled in clinical trials. He compares these trial participants with people enrolling in HIV trials. The book examines the motivations, reflections, and practices of professionalized clinical trial participation.

What does Abadie make from this data? He highlights the "commodification" (p. 15) of the trial subjects' bodies in a "slow torture economy" (p. 46). He pays attention to the "revolt" (p. 54) of the professional research subjects when they felt underpaid and threatened to walk out. Instead they received an \$800 bonus. He notes the "resistance of the weak" (p. 60), when "guinea pigs" (p. 21) smuggle in forbidden foods or engage in other acts of "sabotage" (p. 61). Abadie also examines the risk-management strategies of

the trial subjects: they weigh money against potential long-term effects but tend to believe that drugs wash out of their bodies in a couple of days. He then compares the professional trial participants to those involved in HIV trials and argues that the latter are motivated by deeper existential concerns but, of course, they also have a disease and participate in different kinds of trials. In a final empirical chapter, Abadie examines the professional trial subject's limited understanding of informed consent procedures, and argues that the drug industry deliberately uses the consent form to obfuscate the commodified relationship with research subjects.

Abadie's book has two glaring weaknesses. First, he brings much rhetorical bluster to his study but the interview quotes and observations do not bear out the core themes of "alienation" (p. 6) and "exploitation" (p. 154). The fascinating empirical puzzle of his study is that anarchists are willing to swallow their principles and vegan diet to take money from this most controversial industry. In the conclusion, Abadie pays attention to the paradox between anarchist politics and pragmatics, but throughout most of the book he tries to rationalize the anarchists' justifications for the blood money that sustains their lifestyle of leisure. Some of his friends even minimize the trial risk because they assume that strong government oversight protects them from harm! Abadie writes: "[these] views of governmental regulation are not totally at odds with their radical [anarchist] beliefs" (p. 143). Really? Rather than reconcile the dissonance between what anarchists do and belief in theoretical constructs of exploitation, the explanation seems more mundane. People end up in trial after trial by choice or circumstances because it is easy money. Compared to flipping burgers, cleaning toilets, or being homeless, testing pills is extremely attractive. The job stinks, but the money is good.

Abadie also wrote the wrong book. While he lived in the anarchist community, he never participated along with his research subjects in the trials. Abadie's information comes largely from casual conversations

and more formal interviews. He heard about the “revolt” months after the fact and draws much of his data and analytical insights from a “zine” published by a perceptive and reflexive professional trial subject. Basically, Abadie had a first-hand perspective on anarchists’ daily lives but never followed them to work. Still, he wrote a book about their job. He missed the actual interactions between clinical trial staff and research subjects: he never saw the deliberate acts of “resistance,” the drudgery of giving blood, or the boredom and games his roommates told him about. He did not experience the pleasure of the paycheck and the pain of the skin biopsy. Right under his nose was a fascinating book about a contemporary anarchist community in a neighborhood always on the verge of gentrification, but he wrote instead about what he knew only indirectly.

While Abadie’s intuitions and motivations may be correct, the end-result is an argument that lacks specificity, nuance, and irony. And that is too bad because the clinical trial industry deserves a critical examination based on high-quality social science research.

Constructing the International Economy, edited by **Rawi Abdelal**, **Mark Blyth**, and **Craig Parsons**. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010. 294pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780801475887.

JOHN BOLI
Emory University
jboli@emory.edu

Judging from this book, the constructivist challenge to conventional international relations (IR) research is making serious headway but remains, perhaps unnecessarily, on the defensive. The book’s chapters address, in the main, familiar and much-discussed issues in international political economy: the politics of agricultural trade (Mlada Bukovansky), IMF policy and operations (Jacqueline Best), liberalization of trade in services (Cornelia Woll), the “good governance” initiative of the World Bank (Catherine Weaver), and so on. Almost all of the authors are political scientists (one is a sociologist, two are political economists) but most of the chapters have a decidedly sociological

feel to them. This is not exactly accidental, for constructivism is the branch of IR research that most closely resembles sociological analysis. In particular, constructivism argues against the dominant rational-actor approaches in IR—realism, neo-realism, and neoliberal institutionalism—by shifting attention to the development and use of interpretative schema, processes of interest construction, the establishment of and struggles over norms, and other similarly cultural and signficatory issues that dominant approaches neglect or dismiss as inconsequential. The constructivists’ goal is to show that this neglect is problematic, and in that regard most of the chapters are largely successful: they reveal problems and inconsistencies in dominant approaches and offer correctives that are at least thought-provoking and, often, insightful improvements on rationalist theories.

In the introduction, Rawi Abdelal, Mark Blyth, and Craig Parsons outline four distinct “paths to constructivism,” the paths of meaning, cognition, uncertainty, and subjectivity. The path of meaning deals largely with issues of identity, the path of cognition addresses processes of information selection and interpretation, and the path of uncertainty concentrates on the impetus provided by unpredictability to the construction of institutions and norms. The path of subjectivity takes a more fully postmodern turn, emphasizing both the subjective meanings developed by actors in the context of the power relations that inhere in efforts to define the possible and the “thinkable,” and the legitimation effects of successful efforts in this direction. These four paths organize the book’s ten substantive chapters, between the bookends of the editors’ framing chapters. The chapters were less distinctly oriented to one or another path than this neat conceptual scheme suggests, though certainly the chapters in Part IV, the path of subjectivity, are more deeply concerned with issues of discourse, subjective interpretation, and performance than those in the other three parts.

The unnecessary defensiveness of the book appears in the opening pages of most of the chapters, where the authors engage in metatheoretical discussions of constructivism as an alternative to rationalist theories. While helpful in that they point out

weaknesses in rational-actor thinking, these discussions are overly concerned with justifying the “sense and sensibility” of the constructivist approach in the abstract. Norms matter; discourse has effects; material interests are socially constructed, not given in the nature of things; interests are less stable than rationalists assume. This form of argumentation, particularly when repeated (albeit in different terms and from different angles), becomes rather tiresome. The authors would have been better served if the editors had urged them to leave meta-theorizing aside (the editors’ opening and closing chapters provide enough metatheoretical framing for the book) and dive straight into their substantive analyses, letting their findings and interpretations speak for the usefulness and insight that constructivism provides.

On the other hand, the metatheorizing was quite useful in the chapter by Charlotte Epstein, which has the telling subtitle of “How to Study the ‘Social Construction of’ All the Way Down.” Epstein’s topic is the moratorium on whaling promulgated by the International Whaling Commission in 1982, but the chapter is mostly metatheoretical. Her discussions of such key concepts as “discourse” and “normalizing effects” (an interesting alternative approach to understanding norms), and her treatment of the “false dichotomy” between material and ideational factors, are unusually rich and thoughtful. They make the chapter a good place to start for the reader who knows little about constructivism’s epistemological foundation and how that foundation yields an alternative form of IR analysis.

The chapters are generally of high quality; the authors know their topics and cases and they draw clear contrasts between their analyses and those of rationalist theories. Three chapters struck me as particularly interesting. Jeffrey Chwieroth shows the impact of neoliberal or monetarist economics on social spending in Latin America: if a country’s finance minister or head of the central bank (or both) was trained at Chicago, Stanford, or Columbia, higher public debt burdens occasioned substantially greater reductions in social spending than if neither had received such training. Chwieroth demonstrates this effect in a multivariate analysis

of 14 countries for the period 1972–1997, while adding brief case studies of Chile (where the “Chicago Boys” were given notoriously free rein to manage the economy) and Peru. Cornelia Woll addresses business lobbying regarding the liberalization of trade in services for two sectors, the telecommunications industry (during negotiations regarding the General Agreement on Trade in Services) and the air transport industry. Woll explores the uncertainty that reigns when industries face a changing regulatory climate, companies search for information about how to anticipate the future, and the unexpected outcomes that may result, such as the support for liberalization eventually given by regional telecommunications companies and low-cost air carriers that, on the face of it, appeared to be especially threatened by rising competition. The third chapter that struck my fancy is Yoshiko Herrera’s study of the Urals Republic movement seeking economic-based sovereignty in the Russian region of Sverdlovsk (north of Kazakhstan and centered around Ekaterinburg) in the early 1990s. Herrera shows that the movement’s interpretation of Sverdlovsk as economically disadvantaged in larger Russia involved not a straightforward interpretation of unambiguous economic data (which was scarce and of dubious quality in this time of great economic upheaval) but a reflection of many factors, including historical experience, institutional context, and local conditions. Herrera concludes that, like Anderson’s notion of national societies as “imagined communities,” national economies are also imagined, and researchers would be well advised to study seriously the imagining process rather than take the “imagined economy” for granted.

This edited volume is one of the best collections of constructivist research that I have yet encountered. It is also relatively accessible to sociologists. I recommend it both for the light the chapters shed on their substantive issues and for the opportunity it provides for sociologists to learn about kindred souls in political science who, while still overly defensive, are making progress in redirecting international relations research toward a broader understanding of international political economy.

Dubai: Gilded Cage, by Syed Ali. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010. 240pp. \$20.00 paper. ISBN: 9780300152173.

HABIBUL HAQUE KHONDKER

Zayed University, UAE

Habibul.khondker@zu.ac.ae

Dubai: Gilded Cage is a delightful read on a subject which is sometimes fun, especially when it dwells on the night-life, the sinfulness of a city, an oasis in a desert of piety—yet not all of it is fun and play. As if to compensate, some sections of the book cast a gloom, while dealing with the precarious existence of migrant workers or involuntary prostitution. Narrated in a language of jargon-free lucidity with quotes of the interlocutors, it is a book for social scientists whose eyes are tired of reading tables and for business travelers and general readers who will read it for pleasure and more for knowledge about Dubai. And they will get both.

The airport bookish tone becomes serious as Syed Ali pursues the story of a city that has been transformed from a “trading port” to a “global city” over the past few decades. Dubai has been a poster boy of superlatives, with its largest shopping mall, and the tallest tower, the city has had its share of international media attention—both positive and negative. The economic melt-down—which was caused by a multiplicity of factors, not the least of which was the consequence of the financial crisis that began in the United States—dampened but did not extinguish the spirit of Dubai. The crisis was global and was tackled in the same global manner.

The rise of Dubai in the early days can be accounted for by the colonial phase of globalization, its geographical location and the connectivity it provided. Ali’s narratives highlight, correctly, Dubai’s growing prominence not only as a port linking various key regions of the world but due to the policies in India and Pakistan. While India and Pakistan maintained strict restrictions on the flow of gold, Dubai pursued a policy of *laissez-faire*, attracting merchants who bought gold legally in Dubai, then transported and sold to the gold hungry Indo-Pakistan subcontinent illicitly at a prime price.

Even before the gold rush, Dubai had a history of an open port in the nineteenth century

gaining prominence after the decline of a rival port in Iran in 1902 (Kazim 2010). Ali does not go that far in history but focuses on more recent developments of Dubai, tracing its rise from the mid-twentieth century. Ali’s discussion of the political economy of the rise of Dubai is insightful yet when it comes to causal priority, he tends to lean heavily on the public policies, especially in regard to residence and citizenship. Expatriates make up 90 percent of Dubai’s population who live in a state of “permanent impermanence” (p. ix). It is this precariousness of the migrants that propelled the author, himself a second-generation American, to write the book. The author compares house rents in Dubai with his own mortgage in Brooklyn, and mentions a white American roommate who never spoke to him. Such first person narratives make the book immensely readable and help the author to proceed beyond the political economy and public policy into the everyday life of Dubai society.

As the author expounds the migrant and employment policies, including affirmative action policies to hire more locals, he is forced to move beyond Dubai into the larger scope of the United Arab Emirates, the nation-state made up of seven emirates: Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Sharjah, Ajman, Ras al-Khaimah, Umm al-Quwain and Fujairah.

This poses a problem of unit of analysis. It is difficult to limit the discussion to the city while dwelling on public policies which are made at the federal level. However, the difficulty of the author lies in the arrangement of confederation and the relationships among the federal units. While discussing Sovereign Wealth Funds, he is forced to move into Abu Dhabi which is home to some of the larger SWFs (p. 50). This does not, however, handicap the author in his analysis of Dubai and its expatriate population who built the city. However, Dubai is a global city with a difference, it “is a transitional social space” (p. 10). For high-end expatriates, it is also a “springboard for migrating to the West” (p. 10). The author deals with the trade-off between political freedom and economic freedom, and Dubai offers plenty of the latter. This trade-off is not limited to the residents of Dubai, it is the fate of (and even, choice of) many in the rich countries of Southeast and East Asia. The logic of *laissez-faire* attracts

all sorts of people to Dubai, including gangsters and prostitutes.

The darker side of globalization is well illuminated in the book. Thanks to the rulers of Dubai who wanted to diversify (or were forced to because, unlike Abu Dhabi, oil revenue's contribution to the GDP of Dubai is miniscule) the city has become a major tourist attraction for nearly 7 million visitors (more than the total population of the country). The tourism industry in Dubai—not unlike other Asian tourist destinations—is built on “shopping and hedonism” (p. 43). The author dwells on the transition of culture which is “plastic” (p. 68) to culture befitting a global city—art galleries and international film festivals. But art thrives on freedom, which poses a challenge in Dubai with its censorship and more importantly, self-censorship. The latter is a feature of societies dominated by expatriates. The author goes on to discuss how Dubai and the UAE in general are emphasizing higher education, attracting scores of international universities to set up their branches. Dubai has about 40 such universities (p. 76).

Ali dwells at length on the working class, who in his words are “socially invisible, interchangeable and ultimately disposable” (p. 81). The impermanence and exploitation of the workers, their living conditions, in short their precarious existence make up an important part of the book. The construction workers, house maids, and camel jockeys (although the latter have now been replaced by remote controlled robots) are the faces of “factors of production” who keep the city going. He summarizes the litany of criticisms to which Dubai and UAE have been subjected over the years. But to be even-handed, Ali also records the shifts in policies with regard to migrant workers mainly in response to the criticisms of the Human Rights groups. While the author leans on secondary materials in his discussion of the plight of the workers, his discussion on the dilemma between freedom and development, the complexity of the issues of citizenship rights, the relationship between citizens and expatriates, the hedonistic life-style of the British expatriates is supported by the rich interviews that he conducts. The book ends with Weberian and,

to some extent, Marxist pessimism (though these names are unstated) which is the condition of “disenfranchised” humanity in a society of hyper-consumption and crass-materialism.

Reference

- Kazim, Aqil. 2010. “The Rise of Dubai: A Social History of the Commercial Cities in the Gulf.” Pp. 73–99 in *21st Century Globalization: Perspectives from the Gulf*, edited by Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Habibul Haque Khodker. Dubai, Abu Dhabi: Yazey University Press.

Orderly Fashion: A Sociology of Markets, by **Patrik Aspers**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010. 237pp. \$35.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780691141572.

JUAN PABLO PARDO-GUERRA
London School of Economics and Political Science
 J.P.Pardo-Guerra@lse.ac.uk

Fashion has been a topic of sociological inquiry for quite some time, having captured the attention of several central figures of the discipline. But as a social process, fashion evolves not only in content but also in form, with new patterns of production, distribution and consumption emerging over time and throughout space. As such, analyses such as those offered by Patrik Aspers in *Orderly Fashion* are welcome and timely contributions to the literature.

In *Orderly Fashion*, Aspers provides a thorough evaluation of a widespread facet of contemporary fashion, namely, the branded garment retail industry (comprised of such household names as Gap, Zara and H&M). Addressing the most accessible form of fashion in prevalence today, Aspers' book is designed as a two-fold contribution. At one level, the analysis of fashion is an opportunity to discuss the origins of order within and without markets, a topic Aspers deems relatively undertheorized yet central to the sociological endeavor. At a different level, his study is a site for developing, refining and introducing novel conceptual tools for

the analysis of markets, which are meant to identify some of the overarching patterns encountered in different forms of economic life. The possibility of dealing with these two levels of discussion is achieved through the remarkable empirical breadth of Aspers' study: his analysis goes into different elements of the circuits of design, production, circulation and articulation that underlie the fashion industry, from the meticulously calculated display windows of BGRs on Oxford Street, London, to the reactive factories in which garments are made overseas.

Aspers' argument hinges on approaching the issue of order by referring to the partial, rather than the global. Such partial orders, Aspers contends, are constructed on the relative entrenchment of actors' identities, their perceived status and the embedding market culture. Order is therefore a social construction that hinges on the stability of evaluations made by actors of each other's qualities, products and position. The logic of this construction, however, varies according to the type of market one deals with. Thus, in status markets—where the important evaluation is the status actors have accrued rather than the quality of the products—order results from the stability of identities. This is illustrated by the relationship between branded garment retailers and their customers. Conversely, in standard markets—those in which the relevant evaluations are made in terms of "quality"—order derives from the stability of standards. This is exemplified by Aspers' account of the production of branded garments, where actors predominantly make their decisions on the basis of price/quality signals. Effectively, Aspers argues that markets can be studied in terms of two pairs of ideal types: on the one hand, there are status and standard markets which are defined in terms of the forms evaluation that are relevant to actors; and, on the other hand, there are fixed role and switch role markets that are defined according to whether actors are buyers, sellers, or enact a combination of both.

Orderly Fashion is quite recommendable. However, I must make a handful of comments, most of which bear upon structural elements of the book. Of this handful, two

comments are directed to the theoretical instrumentalia deployed by Aspers. First, I am not entirely convinced that previous sociological literature completely failed to address the ontological level of order, as Aspers suggests. His account of entrenched identities, for instance, quite clearly resounds with the socio-cognitive models of order presented by several social theorists from the 1970s onwards, including such figures as Barry Barnes, a founder of the so-called Edinburgh School. In effect, Aspers' concern with explaining entrenched identities in phenomenological terms is entirely consistent with the rationale of Barnes' model of society as a stable self-referential system.

Second, *Orderly Fashion* was a missed opportunity to discuss the form and content of culture in markets. Specifically, Aspers invoked the idea of partial cultures in markets to explicate how certain stable social forms feed into the maintenance of partial orders. Aspers' definition of market culture, however, is as vague as other definitions that populate the literature on economic life. Moreover, his reference to cultures as a means of portraying order as a social construct seems slightly recursive: the existence of a culture, however partial, assumes a pre-existing form of order that is used to account for a broader type of order. "Order begets order" is not a compelling theory of order.

Aside from these theoretical points, my main concern is with the structure of the book, which could have benefited from better integration between the appendices, the main body and other scholarly writings. Given the challenge of balancing accessibility and depth of argument, this book could have had a better engagement with specific debates in economic sociology throughout the text—a very brief introduction to the relevant parts of economic sociology, for instance, was left to the appendix. Furthermore, some appendices fail to provide fine-grained information on the project. The description of Aspers' empirical research, for example, lacks basic transparency in the form of the locations and dates in which observations were made, as well as the description of the interviewees that were

used in the study. While these need not go into the main text, they could have gone into a thorough appendix. (There is also a rather generous sprinkling of 'conferes' throughout the argument, which might result in a reader spending more time comparing than actually reading.)

These are, nonetheless, minor comments. Aspers' book is a superb reference for those interested in the mechanics of mass fashion. The criticality of time in the industry, exemplified by the patterns of so-called "fast fashion" which require having factories close to the market, is particularly interesting, given that similar spatial patterns are crucial in today's financial markets. Aspers' descriptions of the global manufacturing system supporting retail fashion are equally appealing. Indeed, Aspers' accounts of the rich, multifaceted and spatially distributed forms of consumption and production of the branded garment industry are intellectually stimulating and narratively engrossing.

Conjuring Crisis: Racism and Civil Rights in a Southern Military City, by **George Baca**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 196 pp. \$25.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547527.

SARAH N. GATSON
Texas A&M University
gatson@tamu.edu

George Baca presents a political economic history of Fayetteville, North Carolina, as a rich ethnography of social dramas surrounding a democratic shift in local power, successfully rearticulated into a racial crisis. Baca provides a similarly intricate examination of the history of the town and state, seen through the lens of "racial fears," "public performances of racial enmity," "displays of power and anxiety," and "rituals of racial reform" (pp. 9–11; 21). He does an excellent job of tracing the ways in which political discourses are formulated, deployed, and adapted over time. How power is maintained, albeit in modified forms, is thus explicated in a detailed and convincing manner, discussing the perspectives and actions of Fayetteville's black and white political and business leaders, ordinary citizens, and

members of the military who live in and around the city.

Baca begins by discussing the historical, deeply political racial panics that are relevant to a nuanced understanding of a "crisis" that arose when two white city council members broke the assumed majority boundary and sided with their black colleagues in a pivotal 1997 meeting. Framed as an illegitimate and bordering on illegal power grab, a dispute over the police chief and city manager's handling of accusations of systemic racial discrimination in the police department blossomed into a crisis of conspiracy that undermined the status quo by giving the black community an "inordinate amount of power" (p. 40). Baca argues that the discourses deployed thereafter were available as part of a well-used local, regional, and indeed national repertoire.

Starting with the 1725 founding of large land grant plantations at the mouth of the Cape Fear River, Baca contextualizes contemporary Fayetteville's politics by grounding them in its history of the slave economy, retrenchment of antebellum control over black labor and bodies, and gradual racial reform in the Civil Rights era and beyond. Noting the existence of an immediately prior public racial crisis (white James Burmeister's racially-motivated murder of black Jackie Burden and Michael James) in which Fayetteville was represented as a stereotypical racially-backward military town, Baca contrasts the media frenzy over the trial with his direct experience of the interracial cooperation and condemnation of the murders in the actual town itself, in what he calls "performances of racial reconciliation" (p.6). He uses that contrast, along with the historical narrative of other salient racial crises, to argue that each iteration of racial crisis is an opportunity for "myths of racial redemption" to be deployed in order to shore up "the idea that the majority's best interest is represented by white culture. The ideal of whiteness conditions racial reforms in ways that demand black political leaders and activists must tailor their agendas to the majority's will." But, Baca cautions, "whiteness, much like crisis, cannot be taken at face value," and it is the boundaries around whiteness as much as the actual behavior and demands of blacks that are threatened and

need protection — even if such protection need be violent (p. 16).

Although Baca does a solid job of providing local and regional back story to the ongoing racial dramas in Fayetteville, some of his methodological and theoretical contributions could be stronger. A discussion of the history of using constitutional military force against blacks, as well as the ongoing risk of police brutality and the Prison Industrial Complex, would have been useful additions to the book. The epilogue focusing on the place of the military in social reform feels tacked on, and would have benefited from deeper grounding in military sociology. Baca's use of Gramsci, while entirely appropriate, is not a deep reading of Gramsci, and ignores the excellent work of Omi and Winant; both would have given Baca even more convincing theoretical language to discuss the situations he so richly observed. More than the confluence of interests, actions, positions, and ideologies, the Gramscian historic blocs described by Baca also involve a shift from a war of maneuver to a war of position. The discursive deployments made by, for example, the Fayetteville Committee of 100, to conjure up fear over the biracial alliances being made by the usurping Five city council members exemplify not only the tactics of a war of position (see e.g., p. 95), but specifically the sorts of rearticulations in the ongoing process of racial formations and racial projects, outlined by Omi and Winant. As good as the historical grounding is, Northern and national racial crises are largely ignored, and a better epilogue might have connected Baca's observations with the ongoing discourse of racial crisis as deployed during the 2008 national election and beyond. His argument would be stronger with a discussion and application of Burawoy's concept of the extended-case method, thus better situating his contexts within a dialogue between theory and the field (Burawoy 1991, 2000; see also Marcus 1998).

I would recommend this book as an urban ethnography, and to those teaching classes in politics, social movements, sociology of law, and race and ethnicity. If read in conjunction with such classics as *Black Resistance, White Law* and *Racial Formation in the United States*, as well as with contemporary political discourse in the United States, Baca's work makes a very powerful statement about the

care citizens have to take vis-à-vis the statements made by their political representatives regarding whose interests they serve. The social drama and public performance of white solidarity — more or less explicitly expressed — appear to be a constantly handy, deep political repertoire whose "periodic displays of racial fear [are] a key feature in North American race relations" (p.21).

References

- Berry, M. F. 1994 [1971]. *Black Resistance, White Law*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Burawoy, M. 1991. *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 2000. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Marcus, G. 1998. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Omi, M., and H. Winant. 1994 [1986]. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown in Baltimore: School Desegregation and the Limits of Liberalism, by **Howell S. Baum**. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010. 274pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780801476525.

CARL L. BANKSTON III
 Tulane University
 cbankst@tulane.edu

In *Brown in Baltimore*, Howell S. Baum presents a history of efforts to desegregate Baltimore schools and a theoretical explanation of why these efforts met with so little success. His command of the train of historical events is strong and deep. His grasp of theory, unfortunately, is weak.

Baum successfully shows us the troubled course of attempts to break down school segregation. The troubles were largely due to the "liberalism" of the Baltimore school board, he tells us. By this term, he means something more than a dedication to various strains of progressivism. He means the Lockean view of citizens as individuals possessing rights and of justice as a set of impartial procedures

for protecting those rights. Baum acknowledges that this broad sort of liberalism motivated initial assaults on de jure segregation, but that it was inadequate to conquer the de facto variety.

As a factual case study of school desegregation in a single city, Baum's book is excellent. He traces racial politics in Baltimore back to the city's beginnings and gives a fine account of the long black struggle for equality in the community and in the schools. I found his narrative of the crucial years in the early 1960s under Superintendent George Brain particularly intriguing. The story of the shift from open enrollments and free choice policies to federal intervention, accompanied by the steady movement of whites out of the city and its public schools, is a paradigmatic tale of desegregation around the country. Baltimore has a special significance though. Not only is it close to the nation's capital, it was also the home of Johns Hopkins Professor James S. Coleman, parent of a Baltimore public school student and perhaps the most influential of all social scientific researchers on the subject of school desegregation.

By the 1980s, desegregation in Baltimore, as in many other parts of the country, had essentially come to an end. There were few white students left in the city. A court victory of the Baltimore administration over the Office of Civil Rights had left the OCR with little negotiating power. The Federal Government, under President Reagan, had lost interest in pushing desegregation. In 1983, Baum tells us, black students made up 80 percent of the district. Twenty-one years later, this proportion had grown to 89 percent.

Clearly, if the goal of school desegregation had been to mix black and white students, it was a miserable failure in Baltimore, as in other locations around the United States. So, why did it fail? Baum's account clearly establishes that racial redistribution was not on the road to glorious success until the forces of reaction turned public agents away from enforcement of constructive policies. His answer does not directly deal with how school desegregation may have been at odds with the social and material interests of white families, with the economic processes that concentrated low-income black Americans in central urban areas, or even with the continuing significance of racial prejudice.

Instead, he finds the answer in the assumptions underlying the social philosophical orientation of the school board.

I have serious difficulties with this type of theorizing. Explaining complex social developments as consequences of general philosophical principles strikes me as sophomoric. It sounds like the type of answer we sometimes get in social problems classes in which every troubling aspect of American society is explained as the result of Americans being "too individualistic." This is hard to refute precisely because it is so vague and general.

In this account, the school board's liberalism (in the widest sense) led the members to embrace individualistic programs such as free choice, and these programs failed to achieve the desired end. This is counterfactual history, though, that maintains that if the authorities had some other orientation, they would have pursued some other line of action that would certainly would have had much better results. Baum claims, for example, that free choice policies encouraged white flight by creating uncertainty about school make-up through lack of central control. Uncertainty and the prospect of change may well have undermined white confidence in the schools of Baltimore, but this does not mean that forceful centralized direction of racial distributions by a more authoritarian school board would have soothed all anxieties and retained white enrollments. Would those who left, because they were afraid the schools might go in a direction they did not like, have stayed if the undesirable direction had been definite? It is possible, but Baum does not offer any evidence. He just assumes that all of desegregation's problems can be attributed to the free choice approach and that everything would have worked out well if there had been more command and control.

I was interested to see that Baum cited Christine Rossell's 1975 criticism of James Coleman's support for voluntary desegregation arrangements. Apparently, Baum has missed the later evolution of Rossell's thinking. With the benefit of hindsight and experience, Christine Rossell has more recently concluded that most of the progress in school desegregation actually occurred during the period of free choice and that later policies

rejecting such liberal means reversed this progress.

Would the schools of Baltimore today have ideal racial balances if only the school board had been guided by some other philosophical orientation, perhaps a communal authoritarianism that would have discarded principles of irreducible individual rights and procedural justice in favor of creating desired categorical outcomes? I doubt it.

For all of my skepticism about the author's historical explanation, I thought his history was extremely useful. Clearly written and engaging, *Brown in Baltimore* provides us with a detailed narrative of school desegregation in an important location. I would recommend it to anyone with an interest in this topic.

Socialism and Modernity, by Peter Beilharz. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2009. 225pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780816660865.

HARRY F. DAHMS
University of Tennessee
 hdahms@utk.edu

This collection provides an intriguing set of thirteen vignettes published between 1985 and 2004 (plus a highly illuminating and very helpful introductory chapter written specifically for this volume) that track the decline and transformation of socialism since the 1980s, and the shift in social theory from capitalism to modernity as the focal point of critique. The essays were written by Peter Beilharz, a sociologist who is both a social theorist and labor and social historian, and the author and editor of many books and dozens of articles who also was a cofounder and currently is a co-editor of the journal, *Thesis Eleven*. Topics include the origins of socialism, its relationship to Marxism and communism, the relevance (and forms) of socialism after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the variegated history of socialism in the twentieth century (including such traditions as Social Democracy and Fabianism), the history of the socialism in Australia, totalitarianism, postmodernity, intellectuals, utopia, and finally, socialism in America—both via

a comparison of the reception of Edward Bellamy (whose *Looking Backward*, published in 1888, “was the second-biggest-selling work of fiction in the United States in the nineteenth century” [p. 179]) and a discussion of American exceptionalism. In addition to Marx and Bellamy, the theorists of socialism Karl Kautsky, Eduard Bernstein, Antonio Gramsci and Lenin feature large in this book. Although the affinity of Beilharz's perspective with the critical theory of the Frankfurt School is undeniable in these chapters—both its early incarnation, as in Horheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse, and especially with more recent representatives like Habermas, Honneth, and their contemporaries—in this book, they play a rather marginal role, no doubt due to the fact that “socialism” has not played a central role in their writings (contrary to modernity, to be sure). Tellingly, the theorist whose number of mentions in this book are second only to Marx, namely Zygmunt Bauman, has been pursuing a theoretical agenda that shares many motifs with successive generations of Frankfurt School critical theorists.

Beilharz likes to allude to the “antipodean” location of his theorizing, relative to Europe and North America as two regions more commonly associated with the kind of discourse and concerns that inspire his thought and writing: the Australian social theorist addressing issues that are most closely associated with the northern hemisphere, including Russia. The antipodean origins of his theorizing represent both limitations and opportunities, and Beilharz has been highly aware of the former, and eager to seize upon the latter, from early on. In Chapter Two—“Socialism by the Back Door” (published in 1994)—the most personal chapter in the collection and a compelling alternative entry point to the other essays, Beilharz described the character of his own contributions as follows: “My own work seems to me to take a form like that of a patchwork quilt, a series of contiguous plates that all add up to something that covers the same kinds of concerns, across socialism and politics, but also opens out or connects up in ways I cannot always anticipate” (p. 21). One-and-a-half decades later, as his oeuvre has continued to expand at a steady and impressive rate, this assessment appears

to continue to hold true. The purpose of *Socialism and Modernity* is not to trace sustained efforts over the course of two decades to engage in systematic theorizing or theory building; rather, Beilharz's effort is directed at carefully observing historical shifts in the condition of socialism and the social, cultural and political issues that are its core domain, along with related and practical challenges, in different parts of the world. His objective is to assess the significance of those shifts for the future of democracy, liberalism, and social justice. In the process, Beilharz is persistently non-dogmatic and cognizant of difficulties to draw definite conclusions from perceived changes for the future of both modernity and socialism—what each have represented historically, and what they represent today.

For students of labor history and socialism in the United States, several essays included in the collection—"from the antipodes"—are interesting for at least two additional reasons. They tell the story of working class efforts to influence political decision-making processes and establishing lasting structures of representation and participation in Australia as another settler society—perhaps the society whose sociological foundations have more in common with those of the United States, and in more regards, than any other modern society, including Canada. Thus, the essays provide a highly valuable parallel history of sorts—despite the conspicuous differences between Australia and America, in many regards—supplying a concrete foil for assessing the deficits resulting from the relative absence in America of social conflicts and struggles that penetrated, permeated, and shaped the realm of politics as a set of institutions and processes, and related successes and failures, regarding the need to mediate between those who benefit most from the existing social structure, and those who carry it and make it work. In addition, the essays and the book as a whole present glimpses of what might have been, in America, and indications of the burden that results from "American exceptionalism" (whether it is being conceived affirmatively or critically) as the absence of a crucial dimension of the history of modernity that did (and continues to) shape politics, culture, and society in all other modern societies, if only as a buffer

against "capitalism," "globalization," "neoliberalism," or—hopefully—whatever we may call it ten or twenty years from now.

In sum, the relevance of Beilharz's exceedingly well-written and highly accessible essays—combinations of theoretically informed and oriented histories, analyses and commentaries that they are—is likely to continue to grow as time goes by. As we continue to move into the twenty-first century, seemingly getting further and further away from the struggles and concerns of the previous two centuries, we will forget and ignore related challenges at our peril, and how remembering and recognizing their motivations and objectives is essential to the possibility of making compatible the normative grounds we claim orient our actions and efforts, and material realities our societies represent—both as citizens, and especially as social scientists.

New Blood: Third-Wave Feminism and the Politics of Menstruation, by **Chris Bobel**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 238 pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547541.

DEBRA MERSKIN
 University of Oregon
 dmerskin@uoregon.edu

In some cultures it is taboo to talk about it, in others it is a shameful, dirty bodily function kept hidden. In America, menstruation is an experience that is, to say the least, left unspoken. Advertising for feminine hygiene products relies upon allusion, metaphor, and humor to sell items for cleaning, concealing, and caring for the menstruating body. There are, however, activists dedicated to shedding light on the political economy of menstruation and educating girls and women about the power of their periods.

In *New Blood: Third-Wave Feminism and the Politics of Menstruation*, Chris Bobel describes the subculture of women who believe that contemporary views about menstruation are not only unhealthy, and contribute to environmental degradation, but also contribute to the subjugation of women. This well-written, thoroughly researched book based on 65 in-depth personal interviews,

textual analysis, archival research, and four years of fieldwork is simultaneously about feminism and menstrual activism. It is a multi-method journey that guides the reader through social movement theory as articulated menstrual activism.

Contextualized in second and third wave feminist activism, menstrual activism (also known as radical menstruation, menstrual anarchy, or menarchy) encompasses everything from education campaigns designed to increase awareness of the environmental impact of feminine hygiene products (the FemCare industry), conferences dedicated to empowering women about their bodies through rituals and plays, to simply speaking openly about one's period, challenging the idea that it is something to be ashamed of or dirty. Regardless, the personal *is* political as *New Blood* traces the origins of the movement to the three-way interaction between the women's health movement, environmentalism, and consumer activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Menstrual activists challenge conventional thought about women's bodies and biological processes in ways that amplify the roles consumer capitalism and the health care industry play in supporting a hegemonic view of menstruation. For example, the \$17 billion global FemCare industry makes menstruation-related products that have a significant impact on the planetary and bodily environment.

Bobel comes to these conclusions through fieldwork (attending the 2001 Michigan Womyn's Music festival), by attending workshops, a rant, by listening to radical cheerleaders, poets, and facilitators who use humor to relax conference participants, and observing college student groups dedicated to menstrual activism. She gets to know a representative of the Montreal-based "radical wimmin's health project," Bloodsisters, whose goal is to stop women from "riding the old cotton pony" (p. 110). What is also revealed is who is excluded from discussions of menstrual activism by the activists. This includes menstruation as it relates to transgender individuals, women of color, and lesbians. The book notes a linguistic turn toward the term "menstruator" rather than solely identifying menstruation with women. Bobel is reflexive in terms of how her standpoint as

a white female might or might not have influenced her interactions with interviewees. Her conclusions about sexuality and menstruation are, however, based on conversations with very few individuals.

As a result of the research, Bobel identifies two distinct groups engaged in menstrual activism: (1) feminist spiritualists and (2) the second-wave menstrual activists. Both groups share a commitment to raising women's consciousness about the potential harms that can come to them individually and collectively by consenting to the concealment of menstruation and yielding to the tactics of the FemCare industry. Activist strategies between the groups vary considerably.

The feminist spiritualists take an individualistic approach and celebrate menstruation as an experience that unites women—a blessing rather than a curse. While Bobel carefully presents findings of the research and with great care discusses the group's goals, she takes issue with the tactics of this primarily white, heterosexual group, not in terms of the message but that the movement freely appropriates ceremonial artifacts and activities from Native American and South Asian traditions. Furthermore, while this branch advocates bodily literacy it does so by commodifying it, by selling celebratory related items such as DVDs, retreats, and pop culture items, creating another menstruation-related political economy. Bobel, who pulls no punches in her analysis, also questions whether newly menstruating girls who are pulled into these spiritualist events by mothers and concerned others, actually want to celebrate what they have been taught to fear and dread.

Radical menstrual activists, who draw on punk, third-wave feminism and environmentalism seek to disable the FemCare industry by shedding light on the political economy of menstruation and by educating women to other means of dealing with periods than by using mass-produced products that contribute to gender-based oppression and corporate colonization. What this branch of activism fails to do, however, is to acknowledge the work of second-wave feminist menstrual activists. By neglecting to include lessons of the past, the movement misses opportunities to learn from earlier efforts. When examining menstrual zines

and related websites, Bobel unpacks the class, race, and gendered aspects of this wing and argues that menstrual activism is the purview of primarily white, middle-class, and heterosexual women.

Drawing on Foucault and Lacquer, this book is a study of the distinctions between second- and third-wave feminism, the nature of social movements, and multi-methodological analysis of the health, environmental, and political economy of menstruating in American and activists who resist. It brings needed attention to that which goes largely unquestioned and unspoken and does so in clear, informative writing. To those interested in the politics of social activism, the menstrual movement and in unpacking the similarities and differences between second- and third-wave feminism, and a reconsideration of gender binary and questions about who menstruates, this book is a must-read.

Intimate Labors: Cultures, Technologies, and the Politics of Care, edited by **Eileen Boris** and **Rhacel Salazar Parreñas**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. 340pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804761932.

KARLA A. ERICKSON
Grinnell College
ericksok@grinnell.edu

In response to the rapid pace and scope of the commercialization of care, Eileen Boris and Rhacel Salazar Parreñas have collected and edited an exciting array of labor studies that focus on economic, emotional, sexual, and intimate modes of production. The collected studies look at a range of working environments from sex clubs in Ho Chi Minh City to households in Kolkata, and work products from manicures to trophy girlfriends, to consider the raced/gendered labor at the juncture between love and money.

Organized into three sections on technology, cultural relations, and political mobilization, *Intimate Labors* is impressive in the scope of work included. Alongside the more predictable work arenas of child care, domestic work, elder care, and sex work, chapters also examine arenas of work that are not always included in studies of

intimate work including medical markets for sperm and eggs, the work of partners of transmen who anchor masculine performances, and caring work in Indian bill collection centers. One of the highlights of this book is Laura Briggs' chapter, "Foreign and Domestic: Adoption, Immigration, and Privatization," that she describes as "a companion piece to David Harvey's [A] *Brief History of Neoliberalism*" by thinking through what neoliberalism looks like from inside families (p. 49). Briggs manages to give a human face to the abstract notion of global markets. She traces the global adoption market against the backdrop of neoliberal departures from state support and what she calls the "national security family" (p. 54), concluding that "We have understood neoliberalism to be about states and economies, but it is at least as true to say it is a story about families tied together by intimate labors" (p. 60).

Taken together, the volume reflects the sophistication and analytical clarity of recent studies of intimate work. Each chapter layers on a series of questions sparked by the interactions between workers and clients. For example, speaking about her elder ward for whom she has committed to offer care until his death, a home health worker named Norma Paredes says, "One only has one life, and I felt that he needed me, in order to live in the way that made him happy" (p. 126). Is this a form of intimacy? How does pay combine with spiritual and ethical motivations for Norma to offer care at a critical stage of life? In her chapter entitled "My Reward Is Not Money: Deep Alliances and End-of-Life Care among Mexicana Workers and Their Wards," María de la Luz Ibarra examines how personalism extracts additional effort from laborers while simultaneously fulfilling workers' desire to feel skilled, useful, and significant in the lives of their clients. Ibarra's study is one of several that asks readers to think through the coexistence of economic transactions with emotional intimacy.

What sets this collection apart from previous attempts to capture the rich, messy, complex dynamics of intimate labor is the simultaneous focus on the potential for collective action. Eileen Boris, Jennifer Klein, Premilla Nadasen, Miliann Kang, Ellen Reese, and Becki Ross trace the history of resistance,

contestation and collective action from domestic workers' efforts to improve their work in 1960s Atlanta to the concluding call from Dorothy Sue Cobble for more intimate unions that move beyond the factory paradigm to treat intimate workers as "prototypic rather than exceptional" (p. 280).

The intimate labor framework is incrementally developed, with several chapters contributing to the intended meaning and utility of intimate labor over other framing mechanisms including care work, reproductive work, and interactive service work. Intimate labors include those embodied and affective interactions that require close care of the body and the emotional needs of the service recipient in which the service "develops the capabilities of the recipient" (p. 3). Intimate labors include work that entails bodily or emotional closeness or personal familiarity from high-end nursing to low-end house-keeping. Viviana Zelizer's chapter takes the framework the furthest. Building on her previous scholarship, Zelizer makes a critical intervention by pointing to the limits of "carework" because much intimate labor noticeably lacks care and affection, particularly for the workers. Often intimate work is marked by indifference, disdain, and disregard, but it remains intimate in its tasks and demands.

The primary contribution of the intimate labor framework is that it helps to dismantle the binary view of either exploitation or agency, a view that assumes market-based interactions are inherently diminished in terms of authenticity by virtue of the economic logic. This assumption has for too long disregarded the ability of workers to make meaningful connections with their clients and has subsequently contributed to the failure to see homes as workplaces, contributing to the devaluation of intimate work by "truncat[ing] people's view of what counts as genuine work that deserves serious compensation" (p. 267). Across this well-researched, carefully communicated, compelling collection of studies, researchers demonstrate that intimate labors entail careful management of the self alongside friendship, affinity and something that looks like love.

This is a highly teachable volume that will be useful for advanced undergraduates and graduate students in Gender and Women's

Studies, American Studies, Sociology and courses on labor and globalization. For scholars of work, gender, race, and globalization, the collection offers an archive of the progress made in analyzing intimate labors, while also inviting future scholars to take up many of the provocative, crucial questions raised by the assembled studies.

Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science, edited by **Craig Calhoun**. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010. 320pp. \$40.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780231151122.

CHARLES CROTHERS
*Auckland University of Technology,
 New Zealand*
charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz

The fate of a leading sociologist's work is largely in the hands of textbook writers (who often provide un-nuanced and even misleading capsule treatments) together with small bands of commentators, and so it is refreshing when more extensive exegesis of a sociological theorist's work is developed and published in such a well-constructed volume.

This collection of twelve short and clearly-argued chapters arose from a small invited one-day conference immediately before the ASA Annual Meeting in New York City in 2007. The final products have been sharpened by discussion at the meeting, and it is good to see many appropriate cross-referrals among the chapters. The conference reconsidered Merton's legacy and attempted to link this up with contemporary theoretical issues. Authors, under the editorial chair of Calhoun, included some of Merton's students (Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Thomas Gieryn, Viviana Zelizer and Harriet Zuckerman), together with other notables with an interest in his work (Charles Camic, Ragnvald Kalleberg, Alejandro Portes, Robert Sampson, Alan Sica, Charles Tilly) and several younger scholars working in areas of particular importance to Merton's writings —Aaron Panofsky on Science and Peter Simonson on Rhetoric. All but Kalleberg are American, which perhaps emphasizes the American provenance of Merton's work at the cost of reducing

attention to its international importance. Similarly, they are also all sociologists except Simonson, which is again both a strength and limitation. The shared broad theme of the volume insists that Merton's intellectual legacy remains fecund and should continue to be part of the active considerations of sociologists, as opposed to locking Merton's work into a structural-functional frame imposed by so many commentaries.

Without specification, such a broadly entitled book remains rather enigmatic, although the subtitle "Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science" suggests that the reader will find an examination of Merton's well-known work in that area of sociology, together with explorations of his methodological work. Indeed so. The opening chapters explore the continuing relevance of Merton's conceptions of sociological innovation, his early pursuit of mechanism-type explanations and remake the renowned Columbia Tradition point that the basic/applied dimension can often be abjured in producing good sociological work. (Stephen Turner's conference essay on the Columbia approach to theory construction—which he criticized for being too formalized—has been published separately, together with commentaries in *Philosophy of Social Science*.) Both main essays on Merton's sociology of science attempt to resolve the competing Mertonian and post-Mertonian sociologies of science — one by suggesting a summative Mertonian-style paradigm whose main feature is to stress that the various elements required to understand science sociologically form not so much an array of oppositional tendencies as requiring both polarities to be simultaneously brought into play, and the other by providing analyses that show how various groupings interact with science *across* its boundaries. The latter approach is echoed in Kalleberg's call for extension of structural analyses of science to include boundary-spanning roles such as the "public intellectual." These essays are preceded by a crisp and competent overview of Merton's intellectual biography from the editor.

More excitingly, there is a very strong and distinctly emergent (that is in Mertonian terms "serendipitous") theme running through the remainder of the essays which posits Merton as a largely undiscovered cultural sociologist.

However, this broad point takes very different tangents among the various chapters. Thus, Epstein and Zelizer comment on Merton's cultural sociology and its ties to his structural sociology, the latter also showing how important Merton saw uncertainty is as a "driver" in social situations. Simonson focuses on Merton's interest in rhetoric, Zuckerman on his "Sociological Semantics," Kalleberg on the analytical potential of the concept of "Ethos," and Camic on Merton's *sociological* history of ideas, while Sica is more critical in exploring why Merton early and wilfully resiled from taking up the reflective and societal-level style of European sociology of knowledge (à la Mannheim).

How might this retrospectively emergent richness in Merton's work be best received in the discipline, given its (in Mertonian terms) "pre-discovery" status? Merton pioneered and opened up several areas of sociological study but his attempts in cultural sociology fell on somewhat fallow ground partly because he himself did not indicate its wider significance and so, as Camic in particular points out, it sat inertly and barely configured alongside his more widely known structural work. However, alerted through the perceptive reconstructive essays in this volume, cultural and other sociologists should no longer fail to consider adequately Merton's contributions in this and other areas.

It is not immediately obvious how these different angles of vision on Merton's cultural sociology can be reconciled, but once organized along his career trajectory the different versions fall neatly into place. His sociology of knowledge and work on ethos are essentially pre-WWII, complemented by the propaganda/rhetorical work emerging during WWII and immediately after, whereas his sociological semantics emerged from a flurry of writing in the late 1950s (and added to with later work) which was only partially consolidated towards the end of his intellectual career.

The opening sentences in Epstein's chapter deftly sum up the book (although making too strong a claim for his cultural sociology):

Far from being exclusively a functional social structuralist as he has been characterized by several generations of academic critics, Robert K. Merton was,

ultimately, a theorist of cultural sociology. Unfortunately, Merton is neglected today by serious analysts and theorists of cultural sociology. . . . Yet many of Merton's key concepts for the analysis of social life centered on the cultural domain, mated with structural variables (p. 79).

Is a volume of well-crafted essays drawing attention to Merton's rich legacy of interesting material enough to restore Merton's place among contemporary sociology's pantheon of key theorists? Merton did not effectively pull together the many strands of his sociological work to be able to infuse it with an animating impulse. It is possible that Sica's implicit point, echoing that of other critics, provides something of an answer to why Merton's sociology seems incomplete: had Merton heeded the Mannheimian call, would a more reflexive framing to his sociology have rendered it more redolent to contemporary sociological sensibilities?

Reviewers like to point to little slips to prove they have read the work. On page 21 the editor should have cited Camic's chapter as 12 (not 10) and on page 23 he incorrectly identifies Kalleberg as the author of Simonson's chapter on rhetoric. While the Jon Clark edited volume on Merton did indeed come out in his eightieth year, it is not really a festschrift except in the broadest sense.

The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation, by **Leo R. Chavez**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008. 265pp. \$21.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804759342.

ADALBERTO AGUIRRE, JR.
University of California, Riverside
 aguirre@citrus.ucr.edu

It is hardly surprising that the state which was chosen by the Minuteman Project in 2005 to launch its attack on Mexican immigrants five years later passed legislation (SB 1070) criminalizing undocumented Mexican immigrants within its boundaries. Leo Chavez argues that the Minuteman Project was the political expression of a public discourse pregnant with images regarding the binary

classification of citizen versus immigrant. The Minuteman Project may have been disingenuous in selecting Arizona, a state where a "disproportionate number of undocumented migrants crossed" (p. 135), as a platform for drawing the nation's attention to "the Latino Threat Narrative."

The Latino Threat is "part of a grand tradition of alarmist discourse about immigrants and their perceived negative impacts on society" (p. 3). The Latino Threat Narrative argues that Latinos are not like previous immigrant groups because they did not follow their path to becoming part of the nation. The narrative portrays Latinos as "unwilling or incapable of integrating, of becoming part of the national community" (p. 2). Instead, Latinos are portrayed as an invading force from south of the border intent on taking back land (the southwestern United States) they see as formerly theirs. Chavez uses the term "Latino" as an inclusive descriptor for a heterogeneous population that consists of different groups, each with a distinct historical background and level of integration into U.S. social and economic life. However, "Mexico, Mexican immigrants, and the U.S.-born of Mexican origin are the core foci of the Latino Threat Narrative, but the threat is often generalized to all Latin American immigrants and at times to all Latinos in the United States" (p. 22).

The Latino Threat is divided into two parts. Part One examines "a set of taken-for-granted assumptions" mainly about Mexican immigrants and their offspring. By taking an "admittedly empirical approach" in Part One, the author avoids an accusation, which often plagues narratives on immigration, that Chavez is essentializing the immigrant image in U.S. society. In Chapter One, "The Latino Threat Narrative," Chavez reviews and challenges the perception in popular discourse that Latinos are intent on reconquering the Southwest. An important feature in this chapter is the author's discussion of immigration reforms in the 1920s that resulted in the construction of "illegal aliens," a category that taints the discussion of Latinos and citizenship. In Chapter Two, "Cultural Contradictions of Citizenship and Belonging," the author analyzes survey data he collected in 2006 in Orange County, California to contradict the Latino Threat's argument that Mexicans are unable

or unwilling to integrate into U.S. society by choosing to remain linguistically and socially isolated. Chapter Three, "Latina Sexuality, Reproduction, and Fertility as Threats to the Nation" and Chapter Four, "Latina Fertility and Reproduction Reconsidered," look at reproduction and fertility as sites of political debate over the nation and citizenship. Chapter Three discusses the depiction of "hot" Latinas as sexual objects and "out-of-control" fertility as a tool with which Latinos seek to reconquer the Southwest. In Chapter Four, Chavez presents empirical findings from two research projects in Orange County, California to refute the perception that Latinas are "out-of-control" regarding their fertility. Interestingly, Chavez shows that Latinas average fewer children over time in the United States within the first generation, a trend that continues across the generations.

In Part Two, Chavez focuses on organ transplants for undocumented immigrants, the Minuteman presence on the U.S.-Mexico border, and immigrant marches. Chapter Five, "Organ Transplants and the Privileges of Citizenship," is an interesting discourse on the notion of "citizenship" and its incongruence with the undocumented immigrant body. In denying organ transplants to undocumented immigrants, the nation is excising disease from its body. Chapter Six examines the Minuteman Project's arrival in the Arizona desert in 2005. Chavez argues that the Minuteman Project used its activities in Arizona to create a media spectacle that quickly captured American public attention and the need to implement anti-immigration reforms. Chapter Seven, "The Immigrant Marches of 2006 and the Struggle for Inclusion," explores the cultural and political significance of the marches and demonstrations by immigrants in the spring of 2006. While the marches were primarily a response to the passage of HR 4437 that would have made felons of all undocumented immigrants in the country, Chavez argues that the marches were also an expression of the immigrants' claim to social and cultural citizenship. Interestingly, Chavez suggests that immigrants were expressing a form of "neoliberal citizenship" that focused on their role as citizen-subjects and economic contributors to society.

In the book's epilogue, Chavez states that he coined the term "Latino Threat Narrative" in order to "show that what might appear as random or idiosyncratic comments, characterizations, tirades, images, and other representations about Latinos, both immigrants and U.S.-born, are actually part of a more cohesive set of ideas" (p. 177). Chavez discusses how a model of linear assimilation may not fit the Latino experience because while Latinos are integrating into U.S. society, they themselves are not integrating as a homogeneous group. Chavez also lists policy recommendations that might alleviate the damage caused by the Latino Threat Narrative.

Finally, *The Latino Threat* is well organized and documented around timely themes in the immigration discourse that fuels public opinion in the United States. Chavez provides immigration scholars with a conceptual tool, the Latino Threat Narrative, for examining anti-immigrant and anti-Latino sentiments in the public discourse. His discussion of the biopolitics surrounding the undocumented immigrant body can be observed in the ongoing practice by medical hospitals in this country to medically repatriate undocumented immigrants if they are unable to pay the cost of medical treatment. His use of empirical data to challenge major precepts in the Latino Threat Narrative enhances the book's foundational value to the study of Latino ethnicity and immigration. Chavez is quite innovative in his use of magazine cover art and political cartoons to illustrate the construction of Latino social identity in the public discourse, an identity that serves as a vehicle for challenging their citizenship claims. In short, *The Latino Threat* is a significant contribution to the study of Latinos because it clearly illustrates the precarious position of *all* Latinos in U.S. society.

Workplace Flexibility: Realigning 20th-Century Jobs for a 21st-Century Workforce, edited by **Kathleen Christensen** and **Barbara Schneider**. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 2008. 408pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780801475856.

STEPHEN LIPPMANN

Miami University
lippmas@muohio.edu

In the closing decades of the twentieth century, the labor force underwent a series of dramatic changes. In 70 percent of two-parent families, both parents work for pay. In the vast majority of those dual-income families, parents' work hours total at least 80 hours per week. As a result of these changes, dual-income families are forced to divide the duties of three jobs (two in the labor force, one at home) among two people. Of course, the situation is typically more difficult in single-parent households. In addition, the aging of the labor force presents new challenges to working parents trying to manage caregiving responsibilities and their own health. As the nature of work changed and technology blurred the boundaries between work and home, growing employment insecurity has caused great unease among labor force participants. Kathleen Christensen and Barbara Schneider's central theme in *Workplace Flexibility* is that labor market institutions are not keeping pace with these dramatic changes that characterize work at the turn of the century. Employers still overwhelmingly structure jobs based on a set of outdated assumptions that are inflexible and unresponsive to the lives of many employees, and governments, while themselves significant innovators of new and more flexible employment policies, have been slow to encourage implementation in the private sector. As a result, workers trying to manage their jobs, their personal lives, and their care-giving responsibilities are finding the challenges increasingly insurmountable.

Workplace Flexibility focuses on these changes and challenges in four parts. The first examines the effect of long work hours on families. Not only do parents who work longer hours have less time to spend with their families and on other non-work activities, it appears that the quality of that time

suffers as well, with multi-tasking and isolation more common among families with longer parental work hours. Parts Two and Three examine the workplace/workforce fit in the United States, with a focus on individual, family, and organizational-level factors that affect it. Chapters in Part Two describe the ways in which individuals try to negotiate the mismatch between the timing and development of careers and family life, including a surprising amount of informal "career customization," whereby working parents cobble together a career over their life course through a series of job switching, employer switching, and temporary labor force exits as non-work responsibilities dictate. Part Three focuses on employer and government policies intended to alleviate work/life mismatch, and where these policies fall short. While "model employers" provide useful models of flexible employment policies to manage conflicts between work and life, chapters in this section demonstrate that their implementation is spotty across firms. The state of U.S. policies regarding work/family balance is brought into sharp relief in Part Four, which focuses on international examples of family-friendly work policies, and the contexts in which these policies exist.

The strengths of this volume are many, and all surround in some way the diversity it contains: of topics, of disciplinary approaches, of data, and of methodologies. The 32 contributing authors come from academic departments of sociology, anthropology, psychology, labor studies, women's studies, public administration, political science, economics, law, and from outside of the academy as well. This disciplinary breadth is refreshing, as it not only makes one aware of the work being done outside of their particular discipline, but also brings substantive insights to many important research questions, such as the chapter by Robert Hutchens and Patrick Nolen, which compares the utility of economic and sociological theories of establishment-level adoption of informal and formal work-hour reduction policies. The topics covered by the chapters include the tried-and-true: employers' use of family friendly policies, the strategies used by working parents to balance work and family life, and cross-national comparisons of

work/life policies and balance, to the more novel, including two analyses of multitasking at home and participation in the family meal, and a focus on what some employers are doing to improve work/family balance. Shira Offer and Schneider found in their chapter that although multi-tasking parents feel more productive, multi-tasking mothers in particular exhibit more feelings of stress, irritation, and guilt than others. In addition, less than 20 percent of families in the data analyzed by Ochs, et al. ate dinner in unison across a three-day period, with absent family members and divergent meal times more common than the idealized evening family meal. The chapter by Ellen Galinsky et al. described in detail the range of flexible employment practices offered by employers surveyed in the 2005 National Survey of Employers, and features select employers that effectively utilize certain flexible policies to the benefit of both themselves and their employees. In addition to these topical highlights, the volume contains a healthy mix of data sources and methodological approaches, from time diaries to national and cross-national data sets, to meta-analyses of existing literature.

Of course, the territory covered by the volume has been well-trodden over the past two decades, and the overarching themes in the book, including American exceptionalism in state interventions in work/family balance, and the incompatibility of work and family especially for working mothers, at times do not appear to be tremendously groundbreaking. Although many of the chapters offered solutions or descriptions of best practices, a reader may be left to wonder why the problem of work/family balance has continued or even, as demonstrated by some chapters, gotten worse over time. In addition, many of the practical suggestions offered by the contributors reflect the healthier economic times in which they were written. It is hard to imagine that during a time of high unemployment and worker insecurity that some solutions would be adopted readily. A final concern is that the individual chapters all reflect a bias towards middle-class two-parent families with parents employed in white-collar and professional occupations. This bias is unfortunate, because as demonstrated elsewhere,

work/family balance is much more difficult for those who are single parents, earning lower wages, working in shifts or irregular hours, or with other job and firm characteristics more common among lower-level service jobs. These are also the workers for whom realistic solutions to mismatch are arguably the least likely to be implemented. However, *Workplace Flexibility* does add new insights into the nature and extent of work/family incompatibility, the areas of life affected by it, and possibility of solving some of these problems. The introductory and concluding chapters by the editors clearly summarize the variety of arrangements that workplaces and families use to make things work. In addition, they offer a set of policy guidelines to help workers achieve balance, and employers retain quality workers that revolve around making a strong case to the business community why workplace flexibility is in its best interest. This is a practical and useful starting point, but given the current state of workers' rights and labor relations, one has to wonder how this case will be received.

More Perfect Unions: The American Search for Marital Bliss, by **Rebecca L. Davis**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. 317pp. \$29.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674047969.

CARRIE YODANIS
 University of British Columbia
 carrie.yodanis@ubc.ca

Rebecca L. Davis' *More Perfect Unions* is a history of marital counseling in America. She discusses the decades of advice books and magazines, programs, workshops, counseling sessions, and research studies aimed at promoting marriage and helping married couples improve and continue their marriages.

The book outlines how the ideal of marriage has changed through marriage counseling and how counseling has led to America's search for the perfect marriage. Davis writes, "Americans care deeply about marriage. . . Marriage counselors and their clients have shaped this uniquely American obsession, one counseling session and retreat

weekend at a time, instilling in American culture the hope that with enough effort and the right guidance, more perfect marital unions are within each couple's and the nation's reach" (pp. 9–10).

Counseling has taught couples how to communicate, build and maintain intimacy, and maintain individual identities and happiness within marriage. Yet much of the history of marriage counseling Davis describes seems to have focused on resisting change to the institution of marriage rather than encouraging change in marriage. Throughout history, marriage counseling fought many of the changes in marriage widely discussed today, including increasing intermarriage, egalitarian gender roles in marriage, and same sex marriage.

For example, tests of couple compatibility to predict and encourage marital success—the precursor to online dating and match making tests—were popular since the 1930s. The first computer-based match making service started in 1956. Tests of compatibility were often used, however, to promote marriage between individuals of the same religion, race, and ethnicity. Intermarriage was discouraged on the basis of lower marital happiness and stability. One leader in the emerging field of marital counseling, who had a connection to the eugenics movement, warned "mixed marriages do not turn out well" (p. 111).

Heterosexuality was promoted through marriage counseling. Many counselors saw benefits for marriages in an active heterosexual sex life between spouses, and some advocated birth control to facilitate in this process. Homosexuality, in contrast, was seen as needing "treatment" through counseling. Spouses' "heterosexual adjustment" was assessed and encouraged through "a culturally approved progression through courtship, marriage, pregnancy, and child rearing" (p. 53).

Traditional gender roles were also encouraged in counseling. Women were counseled to perform unpaid housework and to please, support, defer to, and not nag their husbands. Men were promoted as the breadwinners, with women's employment discouraged as a threat to marital happiness. Through marital advice books and columns, "women learned that marriage entailed a rejection

not only of wage-earning work but also of the emotional self-sufficiency it provided" (p. 93).

Efforts by the women's movement to change marriage were strong and made significant gains in a wide range of areas, including women's independence in and from marriage, laws against marital rape, access to birth control, and support for same sex relationships. Yet these successes were matched by simultaneous efforts within marriage counseling to reinforce traditional gender roles and marriage. The book, *The Total Woman*, published in 1975, for example, argued that, "It is only when a woman surrenders her life to her husband, reveres and worships him, and is willing serve him, that she becomes really beautiful to him" (p. 209).

Marriage and marital stability have also long been heralded within marriage counseling as a means to end social problems, including poverty and welfare dependence and teen pregnancy. At the same time, serious problems within marriage, including husbands' abuse and alcoholism, were historically ignored in counseling or blamed on women, who were encouraged in counseling to see their role in their husbands' behavior.

Many actors had a role in the development of marriage counseling and fought over control of the turf. Religious leaders strove to maintain and advance their role in couples' counseling as members of the psychology community acted to develop marital therapy into a profession. Social workers counseled families experiencing problems. Judges counseled marrying and divorcing couples while in court and states funded marriage counseling, long before the Bush administration funded efforts to promote marriage through the Healthy Marriage Initiative.

Sociologists also played a central role in this history. Sociologists and sociological studies are featured prominently, including the work of Burgess, Bernard, Waite and Wallerstein. It is interesting to see how the range of empirical studies and conclusions reached by sociologists fit within or challenged larger social and ideological trends of historical time periods.

Sociologists can learn from this history. Marriage as an institution, including the sexism, heterosexism, and racism embedded in marital practices, is hard and slow to change. And much of what we consider to be new

changes in marriage today, including government-backed marriage promotion and online matchmaking tests, actually have a long history in America. *More Perfect Unions* is a blissful read, of an at times frustrating but enlightening story.

Contesting Community: The Limits and Potential of Local Organizing, by **James DeFilippis**, **Robert Fisher**, and **Eric Shrage**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 210pp. \$25.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547565.

DAVID WAGNER
 University of Southern Maine
 wagner@usm.maine.edu

For those community activists and academics in sociology, social work, urban studies, and related fields who (like me!) are tired of the neo-communitarian rhetoric daily repeating “civil society,” “social capital,” “asset-building,” and “capacity building,” *Contesting Community* is a refreshing and important book which looks at the current state of community organizing in America, Canada, and the United Kingdom from a critical perspective.

First, James DeFilippis, Robert Fisher, and Eric Shrage are to be applauded for addressing community organizing: an important area of inquiry which has faded in recent years due to a combination of the field being virtually abandoned by some academic subject areas, and because of the conservative thrust in everything from funding sources to most of our current textbooks. Second, the authors make the profoundly important point that there is nothing inherently “left” or “right” about community organizing efforts. They have been with us throughout modern history and, dependent on the time and place, have been successfully used by different groups. They make the very important point that the most successful organizing in the United States in the last three decades has probably been done by the New Right and its local Christian affiliates, not by any group on the Left.

DeFilippis, Fisher, and Shrage skillfully provide an historical context in which they periodize the predominant eras of U.S.

history in which conflict-style community organizing predominated (1900-1920, 1930-1946, and 1960-1975) contrasting these with conservative periods in which collaborative and consensus models of community change dominated (the 1920s, late-1940s through the 1950s, and since the late-1970s). The historical approach as well as the key changes marked by the advance of neo-liberalism in the last decades help explain the more conservative domination of the vague “community change” or “community development” in the last decades. Although the communitarian literature has its left and right versions, essentially they agree on a focus on community development and internal community building, which fits well at a time when public resources have been privatized (and are often villainized), when outside intervention into poor and disenfranchised areas is more difficult to secure, and in which the ideology of self-help prevails over more re-distributory and ambitious strategies.

The book’s third and fourth chapters are to be particularly commended. In a cogent but admirably civil discussion, the authors show why neither dependence on community capacity nor the market can achieve substantial change particularly in poor and disenfranchised neighborhoods. Without re-building the public sector, which itself will take some consideration of conflict strategies, many community efforts will at best have only mild, ameliorative effects. They could even serve as a way to “blame the victim” when poor communities find local community development or capacity building fails to change things because great changes are out of the hands of one community.

The latter chapters of the book seek to contrast several examples of conflict-oriented groups with the communitarian model, which were not as clear as earlier chapters: the book makes no mention at all of the decline of geographic community in the Internet era. For most people I know, the locale they live in has become far less central in their lives than their Facebook friends. Clearly some new strategies and theories are needed for an age in which geographic propinquity means less (and where communities are so globalized as to become less and

less distinctive). There was also no mention made of the worldwide anti-globalization movement. Though obviously these efforts have had their fits and starts, they still are the major conflict organizations that can affect an increasing globalized world in a leftward direction. The three groups chosen (and they were all American rather than reflecting Canada or the United Kingdom) were at least in two of the cases, arguably less than successful in their missions—one a local housing group which they state has not stopped gentrification, and one a national group that has fallen on difficult times, not completely as a result of repression, but also their own weaknesses.

This disappointment aside, *Contesting Community* should be required reading for scholars and students interested in community work, community sociology and social change, and communitarianism as a theory.

The Sociology of Wilhelm Baldamus: Paradox and Inference, edited by **Mark Erickson** and **Charles Turner**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 134pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754678564.

RICHARD KILMINSTER
University of Leeds
r.c.j.kilminster@leeds.ac.uk

Wilhelm who? That would probably be an understandable reaction from many American sociologists glancing at the title of this book. Wilhelm “Gi” Baldamus (1908–1991) is better known this side of the pond where he has a loyal following of ex-students and colleagues. He was a German refugee from the Nazis who taught at the University of Birmingham, England from 1951 until his retirement in 1976. In the early 1950s, Baldamus gained a Rockefeller Foundation grant for a year at Cornell’s School of Industrial Relations, working with Maurice Stein and William Foote Whyte. He became Professor of Sociology at Birmingham in 1970. John Rex’s personal memoir of working with Baldamus in the early 1960s shows the man himself as serious and principled in matters of science but sometimes willful and stubborn. Long after his retirement Baldamus continued to speak and publish, particularly on

theoretical sociology and the sociology of science.

This is an unusual book, part posthumous *Festschrift*, part memorial volume and part introduction to the neglected work of an original, influential, but not widely known sociologist. It is, as far as I know, the only book about Baldamus in English. It contains much new information from the editors about his life, drawn from his personal papers and diaries. In addition, there are five chapters by ex-colleagues and students from the United Kingdom on various aspects of his work in industrial sociology and in theory, methodology and the sociology of knowledge and science, a full bibliography of Baldamus’ writings in German and English, as well as a newly translated article, “The Exoteric Paradox” and a previously unpublished piece on “Networks.” The editors each evaluate one of Baldamus’ best known works: Mark Erickson revisits *Efficiency and Effort* of 1961 and Charles Turner evaluates *The Structure of Sociological Inference* of 1976 as a neglected classic.

What comes over in these contributions is Baldamus’ staunch sociological realism. As John Eldridge explains in his contribution, Baldamus argued that manipulating even simple cross-classifications in research into industry was not simply an exercise in organizing the material logically and tidily. That can lead to new knowledge and suggest *real* processes at work in society, “behind people’s backs.” Baldamus also believed that sociology has a mission to understand social, political and economic realities empirically and in a long-term perspective, attentive to the dangers of conceptual vagueness, over-abstractness and obscurity. He also had a keen eye for the part played in the conceptual history of sociology by pleonasms, paradoxes and metaphors deriving from literary antecedents. Baldamus’ piece on “Networks” is a good example of this theme in his work: he explores several applications of the metaphor of “nets” in the sociology and philosophy of science. He also used this kind of analysis to good effect in a series of neglected articles on Habermas’ use of dyads and triads.

Born in Berlin, Baldamus studied economics, statistics, philosophy and sociology at the Universities of Berlin and Frankfurt, his

teachers including Werner Sombart, Hans Reichenbach, Hendrik de Man and Karl Mannheim. These influences drew him towards the empirical social sciences and inspired an abiding interest in the philosophy of science, which surfaced in his publications in the later years. As Peter Lassman in his contribution points out, Mannheim, in particular, was a significant intellectual influence, providing Baldamus with his central focus on the “non-cognitive” aspects of knowledge and scientific discovery. The Mannheim circle was also the main source of his intense commitment to sociology as a mission.

Like Norbert Elias, Hans Gerth and Adolphe Löwe, Baldamus was a participant in the “Other Frankfurt.” By this term I refer to the Sociology Department of the University of Frankfurt under Karl Mannheim in the years 1930 to 1933. As a postgraduate student, Baldamus attended Mannheim’s seminar and once shared with Hans Gerth a prize for the best essay submitted on the history of liberalism, set by Mannheim. This department is not to be confused with the subsequently better known neo-Marxist *Frankfurter Schule* associated with Horkheimer and Adorno. Even John Rex in his contribution makes this error. Both institutions shared the same building during those years but relations between them were distant and sometimes strained. To this day, in the second generation, the “silent hostility” (as Lassman puts it) between them can still be detected in the significant absence of even a mention of either Mannheim or Elias in Habermas’ encyclopaedic *The Theory of Communicative Action*.

Baldamus’ principled toughness was almost certainly shaped by the political conflicts between left and right in Weimar Germany as well as the traumatic experience of exile, which established his lifetime status as an outsider. He lived in Germany until 1937 when he fled to England to avoid harassment from the Gestapo because of his socialist views. Also his wife Lydia was Jewish, so by then things were getting more and more dangerous for both of them. His early years, struggling to assimilate himself into British society while working in a series of manual jobs and learning English, were not made any easier by a period of internment in 1940 with other German nationals, including Norbert Elias—with

whom he remained on friendly terms for many years—on the Isle of Man.

The newly translated piece, “The Exoteric Paradox” of 1979, crystallizes many of Baldamus’ characteristic themes and concerns in his later years, including the importance of precise sociological language, the dire consequences of over-abstraction, the central role of scientific communities and disciplines (“non-cognitive” aspects) in the development of knowledge and, for all its limits, the usefulness of content analysis in the sociology of science. In this piece he shows how specialist scientific concepts (esoteric knowledge) become ever more vague and ambiguous the more they are translated into terms comprehensible by the general public (exoteric knowledge).

Baldamus had derived the latter distinction from Ludwik Fleck’s *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, published in German in 1935. In the Anglophone world, Baldamus’ name is enduringly associated with drawing attention in several papers to the significance of Kuhn’s reliance in his famous *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* of 1962 on ideas from Fleck. In “The Exoteric Paradox” he shows through a content analysis how Kuhn took from Fleck only those “exoteric” concepts, such as “paradigm community” and “normal science” that he needed to make the history of science intelligible to the “exoteric demands of the sixties.” In so doing, Kuhn brushed under the carpet the interdependence of esoteric and exoteric circles. Baldamus adds that this was “the price that the philosophy of science community must pay in order to confront the growing competition from sociology” (p. 105).

Baldamus was not a stellar player on the international sociology stage and his ideas do not (yet) figure in the best-selling textbooks and reference works. But we learn from this book that nevertheless, luminaries such as Ralf Dahrendorf and John Rex regarded him as their intellectual superior. In the editors’ words, Baldamus was a “maverick,” a dogged and highly regarded outsider to the sociology mainstream, whose writings deserve to be more widely known. The editors are to be commended for retrieving and consolidating for future generations his distinctive and original contribution to the discipline.

Culture, Bodies and the Sociology of Health, edited by **Elizabeth Etorre**. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2010. 178pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754677567.

LISA JEAN MOORE
Purchase College, SUNY
Lisa-jean.moore@purchase.edu

The body: the fleshy, verdant, carnal, sensate, drippy, leaky, jiggly body. The body: composed of bones, blood, organs, hormones, and fluids. The body: made up of statuses, hopes, fears, and anxieties, has come to matter as never before within the field of sociology. The body may have long been an unspoken central concern within not only sociological subfields—medicine, sexuality, race, media—but within the discipline as a whole. However, the rise of interdisciplinary specializations such as science and technology studies, sociology of sport, disability studies, trauma studies, aging and the life course, and transgender studies has catapulted the body into our theories and mediations as a cultural construction, symbol, and conduit of social processes.

One of the freshest additions to the literature is Elizabeth Etorre's edited collection, *Culture, Bodies and the Sociology of Health*, featuring eight original essays from international transdisciplinary social scientists. The aim of this volume is to situate reflexively bodies within the sociology of health and illness through interrogating the production of "healthy" embodiment. Major themes of contemporary sociological studies of the body consider how bodies become social entities through membership in communities and how these bodies are valued according to their gender, social class, religion, race/ethnicity, and national status. Etorre's collection significantly expands the analytic power of sociology through these cutting-edge, empirically-based, and theoretically rich pieces that interrogate complex practices of medicalization, inscription practices of technoscience, and strategies of the resistance of human agents to biopolitical regimes.

Divided into three parts, the first three essays examine the body in relation to technoscience and how its applications have changed the contours of the flesh. Using

narrative extracts based on her ethnographic fieldwork of kidney transplantation in the Republic of Ireland, anthropologist Ciara Kierans interprets the material and symbolic loss of physiological sovereignty. Attaching her analytic lens to the organ, Kierans engages contemporary social theory to examine how organs travel through bodies, countries, imaginations, and affects. April Henning's exploration of elite athletes' practices of "doping" highlights their paradoxical experiences. These athletes must perform at superhuman levels while affirming the unadulterated "humanness" of the body; her work encourages anti-doping agencies, and the public, to consider this paradox in evaluating the practices of elite athletes. Self-regulation is the key theme in Carole Sutton's autoethnography of her running experiences and training to become a marathon runner. Her narrative and its analysis, trace the way the body and self are transformed through the consumption of running technologies and the social and political dimensions of the running club.

The second part includes essays that demonstrate how bodies through specific body projects are represented, constrained, and normalized through biopower. Rui Machado Gomes examines the new visual regime of contemporaneity—the moment we are living in—whereby biomedical techniques of representing the inner body proliferate and infiltrate popular media. Gomes' content and discourse analysis of Portuguese men's and women's lifestyle magazines reveal how new visual regimes create a new "technological arsenal" for managing the body's inside and outside in line with contemporary social norms. The core concept of medicalization is taken up in Peter Conrad and Ashley Rondini's essay, which examines the role of the Internet in promoting the transformation of social problems and human conditions into medical problems, such as anorexia. Analyzing pro-ana and wannabe websites as well as the strategies and practices of the "afflicted" provides fertile ground to dimensionalize medicalization and demedicalization. Social gerontology and feminism are analytic frames used by Jason Powell to explore the aging body. Employing biography as a method to excavate the subjective experiences of sentient aging people, Powell calls for

a methodological intervention toward a reflexive gerontology.

Essays that feature abject bodies, bodies that illustrate the intertwining of health and morality, round out the last part of the book. Difficult to disentangle, bodies that are medicalized through obesity and pregnancy are also scrutinized and surveilled in pursuit of the shifting socially normative body. Shirlene Badger's ethnographic research of children and families in a "genetics of obesity" study shows how the child's body becomes a "vector" of moral messages to the general population. Her analysis is a cogent explanation of how deploying a particular child's story, real or fictionalized, performs the cultural work of reasserting the predominance of medical science as the ultimate interlocutor and savior. Ettorre's essay focuses on the pregnant embodiment of drug-using women who are socially designated as doubly disgusting. Using the theoretical concept of the "scopic drive," the socio-cultural force that designates bodies as normal or deviant and makes bodies knowable and intelligible through increasingly invasive biomedical means, she uncovers how social forces operate to create hyper-visual means to lurk around women's outside social practices and peer inside women's bodies.

Adding significantly to sociology of the body and to interdisciplinary body/embodiment studies, Ettorre's collection demonstrates breadth and depth of sociological reflexivity, inspired empiricism, and theoretical dexterity.

When Couples Become Parents: The Creation of Gender in the Transition to Parenthood, by **Bonnie Fox**. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press, 2009. 334pp. \$35.00 paper. ISBN: 9780802091840.

MARYBETH J. MATTINGLY
University of New Hampshire
beth.mattingly@unh.edu

Becoming a parent is one of the most significant transitions most adults will experience. Individuals' and couples' lives are changed in ways that are often unforeseen and unpredictable. As heterosexual couples adjust to their new roles as mothers and fathers,

many renegotiate the division of household and market labor while they meet the intensive child care demands posed during the first year of their child's life. Individually and as a couple, there is often a radical transformation in outlook, meaning and priorities. However, the challenges and benefits of new parenthood are not equally distributed. Following the birth of a child, most couples become more gender traditional: men tend to work more following the birth of a child, and women less. Historically, women have been assigned the role of primary caregiver and in the early months, those mothers choosing to breastfeed are tied closely to their babies in a way that men are not. How couples adjust to having a new baby varies along several lines: their social class will influence the array of service options they can access, the stressors they face, and the expectations they have of themselves and their partners. The gender division of household work, and the extent to which the couple holds egalitarian ideals, will influence how they hope to divide parenting and may affect how they actually do so.

In *When Couples Become Parents*, Bonnie Fox tackles these issues by following couples from the birth of their first child through the first year of parenthood. She draws upon multiple in-depth interviews with couples in Toronto, Canada to explore the interplay of gender and class dynamics as couples begin their lives as parents. She opens with a chapter on childbirth, goes on to explore how couples are becoming parents, discusses homemaking, and describes the evolution of relationships through the transition to parenthood. The sample consists of 40 couples in which both partners were interviewed over the course of their first year of parenthood.

Fox's findings, though not surprising, offer insight about how couples manage, negotiate and implement their new roles. Throughout the book, Fox interlaces narratives and quotes that illustrate the important roles played by social class, the gender division of household labor before the transition to parenthood, relative bargaining power, socioeconomic status and the important role of access to social support. She does this while considering the perspectives of both men and women so that we gain an

important understanding of early fatherhood in men's lives.

Beginning with the labor and delivery process, Fox explores how women's childbirth experiences are shaped by their prior marital relationships, social support systems, and earnings relative to their husbands. She also explains how childbirth transforms women, and how this transformation affects their parenting as well as their husband's role and relationships within their families. Specifically, she discusses how women who feel their childbirth went well often experienced support and nurturing both from their partner and their medical team. Women who developed their own health challenges during the birthing process faced additional challenges in fulfilling their expectations of the maternal role. Fox spends substantial time detailing the nuances of childbirth and illustrating factors that influence women's outlook, including their sense of empowerment, control and agency. However, the early section of the book does not address how different childbirth and postpartum experiences influenced fathers' transition to parenthood.

In later chapters, we get a fuller understanding of the role of parenthood in men's lives and how it changes them. By including both mothers' and fathers' perspectives, Fox analyzes not only individual transformations, but how these are shaped by the couple's dynamics and the families' wider support network. For example, she describes several families where gender egalitarian parenting may be preferred by the mother, but is not possible due to the father's reluctance to engage in traditionally female responsibilities involved with infant care. This is particularly evident in some of the lower-income families, where the men feel unable to provide adequate financial support for the family and thus do not derive as strong a sense of masculinity from their role as worker and provider. Such men often prefer a more traditional gender division at home to support their masculine identities.

Fox's book offers important insights about the transition to parenthood, providing an important lens on the first year of parenthood and laying the groundwork for future research. Scholars of the family and of gender dynamics would surely be interested in further research that builds on Fox's work

and explores such important questions as: What happened in the couples' and children's lives subsequent to the first year of parenthood? Fox observed substantial changes during the babies' first year of life. It would be valuable for sociologists to explore whether these changes are permanent and whether gender and class influence how the transition to parenthood then shapes later parenting practices and couple dynamics. The field would also benefit from understanding what happens with subsequent births and whether and how the initial transition to parenthood affects later parenting decisions. Additionally, work that addresses a more racially/ethnically diverse sample, and work that addresses the transition to parenthood among same-sex couples would nicely complement this study.

Socialist Insecurity: Pensions and the Politics of Uneven Development in China, by **Mark W. Frazier**. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010. 210pp. \$35.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780801448225.

TERESA WRIGHT
California State University, Long Beach
twright@csulb.edu

Socialist Insecurity adeptly combines empirical detail and theoretical insight, single country and comparative analysis, and qualitative and quantitative methods. The book deepens our understanding of state-society relations in contemporary China, and social welfare developments around the globe.

Empirically, Mark Frazier tells a crucial part of China's economic reform story that heretofore has not been comprehensively studied and explained: how, when, and why China's pension system was reformed. Lest anyone question the topic's importance, Frazier reminds us that pensions are the "most expensive function of the Chinese government" (p. 2). Drawing on over forty interviews conducted with government officials, enterprise managers, and common citizens, Frazier recounts the tale of pension reform in a clear way, providing enough detail to satisfy China hands and policy wonks, yet not so much that a more general-interest reader will become lost or bored. The basic storyline

is this: in the mid-1990s, China's central leaders got serious about large-scale state-owned enterprise (SOE) reform, requiring that SOEs become profitable or face privatization. The result was mass layoffs and forced retirements, which triggered large-scale protests. Concurrently, the central government stipulated that enterprises (which up to this point had provided social welfare benefits through the work unit) could no longer pay pensions. Instead, new local social insurance agencies (SIAs) were charged with this task. Facing both this unfunded central mandate and the prospect of growing worker and pensioner unrest, local governments used their power to raise local revenue and to assert property rights over SOEs to force tens of millions of laid-off workers onto the pension rolls, and to fund these pensions with employer contributions. Thus, China simultaneously dismantled its old social welfare system and created an entirely new one.

Many of the consequences of pension reform have been negative. For one, because (a) current pension payments have been made from the contributions of current employees, and (b) the ratio of workers to pensioners is decreasing, China's new pension system faces a huge unfunded future debt. Further, the new power of local governments to collect social insurance fees has bred cases of extreme corruption. The most dramatic example is Shanghai, wherein urban authorities collected fees far and above what were necessary, then diverted the excess revenue into loans to various real estate and financial firms—all with virtually no outside knowledge or oversight. Finally, because of the vast local variation that has resulted from the lack of a single central policy that is uniformly implemented, and also because pension reform has continued to privilege holders of urban residence permits over migrant workers and rural residents, the post-reform increase in pension payments has only reproduced existing economic inequalities in China.

Yet on balance, Frazier emphasizes that pension reform has benefitted the Chinese public. Overall, state-provided pension payments have risen dramatically—even in, and often especially in, the most “corrupt” localities. Indeed, Shanghai's new pension system is the most generous and extensive in the

country, extending even to migrant workers and residents in surrounding counties. As demonstrated in the public opinion surveys and focus group findings detailed in Chapter Six, the urban populace appears satisfied with the new status quo.

A central focus of the book is the ways in which, and the reasons why, local governments have thwarted central government attempts to create and implement a uniform national pension system. Frazier posits an historical institutionalist explanation. Due to the property rights claims of urban governments over SOEs, the rights of urban governments to locally-raised revenue, and the fact that subnational government spending accounts for a staggering 75 percent of total government expenditures, both local government cadres and SOE managers preferred to retain local control and flexibility.

This leads us to the larger lessons of the book. To begin, Frazier argues that “rent-seeking,” “predatory,” and/or “corrupt” government actions do not always result in “the erosion of state capacity and governance capabilities” (p. 25); to the contrary, in Shanghai “public officials abus[ed] their legal authority to provide public goods” (p. 24). This insight also challenges the common finding that in China the central government is benevolent and well-intentioned, but local officials are abusive and self-serving. Moreover, Frazier finds that local authorities have been attentive to their residents in the case of pensions because, in the words of one local cadre, “we Chinese officials fear the public” (p. 27). In a somewhat twisted way, then, China's pension reforms are a case of public officials in an authoritarian state responding to the people's demands. This suggests that not only can authoritarian regimes adapt, but their actions can be positively influenced by public opinion and behavior. Even regimes that lack free, fair, and competitive national elections can exhibit the substance of democracy—the idea that the government does what the people want.

Throughout, *Socialist Insecurity* places China in a comparative perspective. Frazier explains that the Western and Japanese experience of industrialization, urbanization, and modernization as precursors to the welfare state does not apply. In China

and other later developers, not only have welfare policies been adopted far earlier than would be predicted by their level of “modernization,” but local governments often have been “vital agents in welfare politics” (p. 34). Frazier also argues that China is not really comparable to other post-socialist states; in pre-reform China the state’s social welfare commitments were much smaller and economic administration was far more decentralized, and in post-reform China the state did not democratize. Frazier asserts that the closest parallels to the Chinese case are other large, uneven developers, such as India, Indonesia, South Africa, and Brazil. In all of these cases, public pension provision was “an attractive solution to the political conflict over uneven growth” (p.18).

The book’s only quirk is Chapter Six, which contains an array of fascinating public opinion data, but is not clearly integrated into the overall argument. This relative triviality aside, the book is an exemplary piece of scholarship that sheds light on some of the biggest and most important political, economic, and social issues facing China—and the world—today. It is highly recommended to anyone interested in understanding where China has been and where it is going, and how its path compares with those trodden by countries across the globe.

Fatherhood: Evolution and Human Paternal Behavior, by **Peter B. Gray** and **Kermyt G. Anderson**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. 304pp. \$29.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674048690.

RICHARD A. SETTERSTEN, JR.
Oregon State University
richard.settersten@oregonstate.edu

Fatherhood is an often-fascinating foray into an evolutionary perspective on paternal behavior. It synthesizes existing research from the cultural and societal levels down to the hormonal. While the record of scientific evidence is not always strong or deep, the issues at hand are almost always provocative.

In *Fatherhood*, Peter Gray and Kermyt Anderson shine a bright spotlight directly

on male behavior. Whether you are a father, mother, or child, or care about the future welfare of societies, you have to understand what is going on with men today. And to do that, you have to understand male behavior across species, cultures, and historical time. That is a tall order, and it obviously cannot be handled in a single book. The authors do their best in sampling research and packing it in. But this book sings when the authors are focused on hunter-gatherer and subsistence cultures past and present, and when they are telling the big story of how paternal behavior has shifted in the course of six million years.

It is in these chapters that sociologists will find themselves most captivated because the material will not be as familiar. In Chapter One, “Our Founding Fathers,” the authors discuss a few classic evolutionary perspectives on paternal behavior (Bateman, Trivers, Darwin) and then lay out a sweeping history of paternal behavior from *Homo*, through *Homo erectus*, *Homo heidelbergensis*, and *Homo sapiens*. Their glimpses into early behavior reveal just how raw and brutal the behaviors of our earlier ancestors were. The punch line is that, until relatively recent times, knowing who your offspring were was a “probabilistic endeavor,” and this did not exactly prompt meaningful paternal behavior.

Paternal care was largely absent until babies were born helpless through an evolutionary process that delayed a large proportion of brain growth for the period *after* birth. A helpless baby meant that caregivers were necessary—with fathers included among a cadre of female caregivers. Long-term bonds with a partner were necessary but not sufficient, the authors say, to account for the eventual emergence of more significant paternal care. Fathers were more likely to stick around when babies became helpless, and they mate-guarded mothers to ensure sexual access. Because females largely chose males based on their ability to provide, the nutrient base for themselves and their young ultimately ensured their survival. Gray and Anderson note, however, that arguments that simply reduce male behavior to “showing off” or to “costly signaling” do not fit the story of greater paternal investment. If this were the case, fathers would

not care about their paternity status—which they do.

Chapter Nine “The Descent of Dad’s Sexuality” addresses cross-cultural beliefs about conception and more recent biomedical understandings of conception. The authors point to persistent taboos for females who are not supposed to have sex during pregnancy or in the postpartum period, and a double standard for men, who do not have the same proscriptions on their sexual behavior and have other outlets for meeting their sexual needs. A fascinating aside relates to our species’ unique tendency to have sex in private. “When is the last time you saw a couple having sex in the grocery store or at a party you hosted? When is the last time you saw pets, animals in a zoo, or animals you saw ‘in the wild’ having sex in plain view? Exactly” (p. 195).

Chapter Ten, “Babies on His Brain,” explores emerging research on the phenomenon of *couvade* (in French, “hatching” or “brooding”), a cluster of symptoms that have been observed in men in conjunction with their role as fathers. Some of these symptoms may be expressed as “sympathy” during a partner’s pregnancy and postpartum period (such as poor concentration, anxiety, fatigue, and disruption to sleep). These negative symptoms may have positive effects on paternal behavior, however, if they foster a man’s emotional commitment to a partner and child or signal to the community that he is undergoing behavioral and psychological adjustments and may need support.

Readers are also introduced to new frontiers in research on the human neuroendocrine system, which suggests that fatherhood may heighten sensory functions (smell, sight, sound, and touch), thereby linking the father’s physiology with his child via neural pathways. Fatherhood may also lower testosterone (at least for fathers in long-term relationships), increase vasopressin (for fathers of very young children), and increase prolactin (for fathers who play active roles in caring for their offspring).

In Chapter Eleven, “Health and the Human Father,” Gray and Anderson explore new evidence on how “reproductive success” has both positive and negative consequences for the morbidity and mortality of

men. The evidence suggests that the deleterious effects come early, when children are young (presumably because of the greater immediate press on the lives of parents when children are little), and more positive effects once children are older. It is clearly difficult, however, to separate the potential health effects of fatherhood from those of partnership or marriage, as the two are intimately enmeshed.

In the remaining chapters, sociologists will find much that is already familiar, whether Gray and Anderson are discussing marriage, fertility, paternity, stepfathering, work-family balance, or father involvement. Indeed, important sociological research is sprinkled throughout these chapters. And yet, because Gray and Anderson are rooted in an evolutionary perspective, even these topics will at times feel fresh to sociologists, who may be prompted to think in new ways about topics that are perhaps too comfortable.

The conclusion falls short in discussing important changes occurring with respect to fatherhood. It only briefly takes up issues related to “legislating fatherhood,” where the authors argue that laws to increase fathers’ involvement will be successful only if men “acknowledge paternity without dispute” (p. 250). They also point to the dangers of paternity tests, especially if children are separated from men after divorce or are from men who have been *social* fathers, even if they are not biological fathers. The authors also momentarily open some of the new ethical, legal, and social implications of technology to assist reproduction—whether sperm or egg donations, Viagra (which may extend older men’s reproduction), or ultrasound (which may strengthen the connection fathers feel toward children before they are born, or prompt selective abortion or sex selection). Unfortunately, the book ends abruptly on these points.

While the book is marketed as being written for a popular audience of parents and fathers—a kind of contemporary manual on fathering—it clearly is not. But it is a good, accessible, scholarly read, and it is consistently provocative as it wrestles with tough questions that are certain to forever occupy scientific inquiry into human existence.

Making Their Place: Feminism After Socialism in Eastern Germany, by **Katja M. Guenther**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. 247pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804770729.

BENITA ROTH

Binghamton University
broth@binghamton.edu

In *Making Their Place: Feminism After Socialism in Eastern Germany*, Katja M. Guenther explores how feminists and women's rights activists responded to the collapse of state socialism in the German Democratic Republic (the former East Germany, or GDR), and the incorporation of former GDR states into the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany, or the FRG). Guenther compares the post-1989 responses of activists in two cities in the former GDR, Rostock and Erfurt. Her analysis focuses on the influence of local history, politics and culture in establishing the possibilities for sustained and successful gender activism. Through this comparison, Guenther shows that grassroots responses to political change in the post-socialist era varied, and were conditioned by relationships of political scale; political fields ranged from the local and municipal, to the state and federal levels, and finally to regional and supranational alliances (i.e., the European Union).

The GDR was a repressive state, but political repression was coupled with a social safety net, the removal of which disproportionately affected women. Women in the GDR participated in the labor force in high numbers, had relatively easy access to abortion services, and were guaranteed some level of state support in terms of a social safety net. In contrast, gender policy in the FRG was based on a vision of stay-at-home mothers, and the lack of social safety support made labor force participation difficult for women; the FRG also limited abortion rights. Post-socialist migrations from East to West, and FRG politics that prioritized the needs of male workers in the post-socialist era of high unemployment pushed women from the former GDR back into untenable positions while depriving them of the means of making ends meet.

As Guenther found, "neosocialist" feminists in Rostock, who refused to repudiate the GDR in a wholesale fashion, made inroads

into municipal government and were thus able to funnel resources to help meet women's (and children's) needs. In Rostock, factors that favored feminist activism included the city's historical legacy of the Beguines (a "quasi-monastic order" of self-supporting women who lived and worked together from the 1300s to the 1600s), its having been a Hanseatic seaport with trading ties throughout the Baltic, the city's distance from the central GDR state (which led to relatively less repression), and the lack of conservative religious institutions. Rostock's neosocialist feminists also developed crucial network ties to feminists in social democratic Scandinavia, especially Sweden, and availed themselves of EU funds, and EU conceptual political frames, like gender mainstreaming.

In contrast, feminist post-socialist activism in Erfurt was conditioned by the city's traditionalism; by the strength of both Protestant and Catholic religious institutions, which helped to provide space for women to protest the GDR, but then limited the independence of women activists; by the central location of Erfurt in the historic German lands, and its "western" political identity; and by the more total rejection of the GDR's social and economic policies, as indicated by the strength of the Christian Democratic Union (or CDU) in local and state politics. Additionally, Erfurt's feminists were ideologically split; some, whom Guenther describes as "radical" feminists, identified with the "autonomous" feminist movement in the FRG, and others, whom Guenther describes as "conservative feminists," worked on women's issues under the aegis of the CDU. Erfurt's feminists thus faced a hostile political landscape, an historical/cultural context of traditionalism and divisions among themselves, and were largely unsuccessful in their attempts to institutionalize services and representation for women.

Guenther's methodological framing for her study is that of "place." Her innovation in this comparative work is her interpolation of the politics of place into considerations of the kinds of political factors we typically see as influencing activist outcomes. Also innovative is Guenther's consideration of the politics of place together with her analysis of different scales in the making of networks and alliances. She looks at how, for example, regional alliances beyond the national border of reunified

Germany were significant in forging a neosocialist identity for Rostock feminists, and how conversely, Erfurt feminists tended to reject transbordered ties in the form of EU funds and political directives (e.g., gender mainstreaming). Guenther's study therefore cautions us that national gender politics are not necessarily the most consequential for the success of feminists on the ground.

I enjoyed reading *Making Their Place*: it is an extremely well-written book, and I especially liked the short, more personal pieces about Guenther's interactions with her informants that are sandwiched among the chapters. She has a real ear for the ethnographic quote, and she also has the ability to convey the urban geography of her sites to the reader. The interspersed interludes with her informants add an emotional component to the book that is sometimes missing in the chapters, but the chapters themselves are nonetheless clear, complex and ultimately compelling as a set of nuanced organizational cases. On the whole, *Making Their Place* is a welcome contribution to the literature of activism, movements, and (feminist) political change. Those interested in feminist organizing will enjoy it and learn from it, as will anyone who wants to explore the dynamics of post-socialist Europe. Her book is a well-argued example of how to think about history, culture and local political contexts in tandem. As more and more studies of social movements rightly draw our attention to the global opportunities for and challenges to grassroots organizing, Guenther reminds us to consider questions of place along with questions of scale.

Ethnic Europe: Mobility, Identity, and Conflict in a Globalized World, edited by **Roland Hsu**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. 253pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804769471.

LARS MEIER

Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg
lmeier@ifs.tu-darmstadt.de

Ethnicity is a big issue in political and public debate in Europe. For the most part of the discussion, this subject can be characterized by three main features that dominate the

representation of ethnicity. First, ethnicity is considered a problematic issue that is testing societies. Second, ethnicity is used to create a seemingly homogeneous social group whose members are assumed to have similar attributes. Third, ethnicity is considered to cover other elements of social classification like class. Typically, ethnicity is seen as an element of the social groups which are part of the lower classes in the host country. In most cases, this relation is established without any reflection. These characteristics will be used to organize my review of Roland Hsu's edited work which highlights ethnic identities in Europe.

Even if *Ethnic Europe* wants to discuss critically whether the use of ethnic categories is a protection or a marginalization of identities (p. 3), it is confusing and misleading that its cover picture shows a fully veiled Muslim woman after a trial against a radical Islamic cell in Madrid. This cover picture together with the integration of the word "conflict" in the volume's subtitle suggests that this book gives a simplistic view of ethnicity that is based on Islamophobic clichés and puts its main focus on ethnicity as a solely problematic issue. But we should not judge a book by its cover. The contributions give a more careful and differentiated focus on ethnicity in Europe and are from perspectives that critically evaluate concepts of ethnicity (see especially the contribution by Salvador Cardus). As Roger Brubaker wrote in his fine article on differences between Western and Eastern Europe regarding ethnic groups and nationality, "ethnicity is a perspective on the world, not a thing in the world" (p. 49).

Also some articles do not merely consider ethnic identities as an issue of conflicts and challenges in societies. One of the most interesting features of the book is that some contributors are keen to present differences within seemingly homogeneous ethnic identities that are in fact "imagined communities" (Anderson 1983). This is illustrated by Carole Fink using the example of Jews in Europe. But the whole volume fully uncovers the relations and intertwining of ethnic identities with other social identities. Of course it is not fair to criticize what is not a topic of a book. But is it not artificial to separate ethnicity and discuss it as a solitary social issue?

Can, for example, a long-term unemployed former worker, an employee in a snack stall or a bank employee be charged by a similar ethnic background only?

The book's nine articles are clearly structured into three sections. In Part One, the category of ethnicity is critically discussed by Saskia Sassen, Roger Brubaker and Salvador Cardús. In Part Two, the dividing lines of ethnicity in Europe are evaluated by Alec Hargreaves in an interesting article about the dynamics of the ethnic discourse in France, while Pavle Levi works with films and comments by the filmmaker Želimir Žilnik to consider the life of undocumented migrants in the border regions. In Part Three, promising ties of ethnicity in Europe are considered by Basam Tibi, Kader Konuk, Leslie Adelson and Carole Fink. The chapters are written by well-known scholars having different professional backgrounds such as sociology, literature, political science, Francophone studies, history and film studies.

This edited volume, a follow-up of a conference that took place in the year 2007, wants to offer "new ways to see how thinking ethnically, even in sympathy with minority rights, may be creating a condition that constrains the European Union's grand promise of a European community" (p. 2). A short introduction helps to lead the reader through the contributions that are only loosely connected and suffer from missing cross-references between the different chapters. Without having a conclusion that binds together the arguments of the single chapters, the volume lacks an overall thesis that connects the chapters. It would be interesting to read more about new ways of how ethnicity is considered in the volume, as was promised at the beginning, and which could have been settled in an advanced theoretical model that builds on the diverse insights of the chapters. In the end, the reader is left with open questions that require a concluding chapter. For example, the relation between ethnic identities and religion bears potential for further discussion.

Reference

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York, NY: Verso.

Urban America Reconsidered: Alternatives for Governance and Policy, by David Imbroscio. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010. 223 pp. \$19.95 paper. ISBN: 9780801475658.

MICHAEL MCQUARRIE
University of California, Davis
 mmcquarrie@ucdavis.edu

David Imbroscio's new book makes use of his extensive knowledge of the fields of urban politics and community development and joins a bumper crop of reflective reassessments by left-leaning social scientists. Like many of these books, Imbroscio's does not offer new research or a new theoretical enterprise that gives a better framework for research and analysis. Rather, it aims to open the door to new possibilities for progressive politics by engaging in intellectual critique and offering up suggestive possibilities for new institutional arrangements. That said, the product of this reconsideration, an argument that alternative ownership arrangements and place-based development strategies can provide a basis for a more democratic and equitable urbanism, is not particularly original. More useful is that Imbroscio situates this goal on conceptual ground that he clears via a critique of current urban policy and theory.

Urban America Reconsidered is motivated by a desire to broaden the distribution of blame for urban ills beyond conservatives to liberals "who care deeply about the ends of justice and democracy in cities but are misguided as to means" (p. ix). To do so he proposes to bring "critical scholarship" back into the debate on policy. The result is a book that is part critique of liberalism and part a list of proposals for alternative institutional arrangements that will better secure the goals of justice and democracy. On this latter point, he emphasizes the potentially transformative role of "local economic alternative development strategies" (LEADS).

These two components of the book revolve around an argument about scale. Imbroscio is at pains to push back against a prevailing orthodoxy that privileges the scale of the metropolitan region as the appropriate one for institutional reconstruction, policy interventions, and even formal government. The underlying premise of this orthodoxy is that

central cities fail because they are isolated and that disconnecting people from dysfunctional places is a viable solution (what he calls the "dispersal consensus"), a premise that Imbroscio argues has very little data to support it. Imbroscio's book is at its best in its extensive critique of this habit of thought in policy and academic circles, a habit that he says is inherent to liberal thought.

Imbroscio argues that this "liberal expansionism" results in the abandonment of potentially superior place-oriented strategies of human, community, and economic development. Of course, such place-oriented policies were themselves once dominant but have since come to be considered failures in policy circles. Imbroscio convincingly argues that their relative failure is *not* because they are place-based, the central assumption that enables the jump to regional strategies, but because of other shortcomings: lack of funding, lack of authority, lack of effective management and leadership, and so on. He proposes that we focus more resources and effort on making place-based strategies work in order to achieve progressive goals.

Fully realizing these possibilities does not just require that we abandon liberal expansionism. The other axis of critique and reconstruction is the assumption that the state and the market describe the realm of institutional possibility, an assumption which persists in urban studies because of the beachhead it has established via urban regime theory. Urban regime theory, a theory that attempts to describe urban governance and politics, is a barrier to progressive reform because of its tacit assumption of the state-market dualism, according to Imbroscio. This assumption at the heart of the theory prevents the recognition of the third sector of locally-based nonprofit organizations, cooperatives, associations, and the institutional innovations that support them (LEADS), as a potential basis for urban economic development that is not controlled by a corporate elite.

Imbroscio argues that LEADS can provide the necessary resources for central city economic development while improving democratic accountability. This is because LEADS can restructure the relationship between state and market by building a third sector, they are focused on supporting place-based

communities, they are decentralized and local, they have a "commercial orientation" that enables economic development, and they have an "equity emphasis," all of which produces an independent electorate "where republican ideals and virtues can flourish" (p. 166). Imbroscio acknowledges that many impediments stand in the way of the realization of his vision for an alternative future urbanism, but "they perhaps are not insurmountable" (p. 173) because of their "structure-altering" potential when operating at scale. All that is needed is a social movement to advocate for them and an oppositional ideology, which should not be impossible to construct because of the natural constituency that already exists for the construction of an urban economic development system based on LEADS.

It is certainly not a bad thing that social scientists reflect on their knowledge in order to think about urban policy and explore the limits of the political and institutional realm of possibility. It is also certainly the case that Imbroscio's criticisms of liberal expansionism have much to recommend them. Nonetheless, questions abound. Is a reconstruction of urban regime theory really a necessary prerequisite for institutional experimentation? Wasn't community development policy that focused on place-based bootstrapping also "liberal"? In an era when urban policy is formulated in strategic business organizations and conservative think tanks, is liberalism really the problem? Can third-sector organizations generate the wealth necessary for cities to be economically autonomous from the suburbs and the federal government? Even if the institutional transformation occurs, is there any reason to think that a new third sector will manage to remain independent of the logics of state and market, based on the trajectory of urban civil society over the last 30 years? The answer to these questions may well favor Imbroscio's take on things. Unfortunately, because the reader is only armed with abstract bullet points and vague references to mostly disconnected actually-existing examples, evaluating these possibilities is largely left to the imagination. Nonetheless, urban policy is currently a vacuum that manages to suffocate any good idea. If Imbroscio's book manages to provide some air we will all be in his debt.

Everyday Life in Asia: Social Perspectives on the Senses, edited by **Devorah Kalekin-Fishman** and **Kelvin E.Y. Low**. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2010. 209pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754679943.

REGINA F. BENDIX

Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen
rbendix@gwdg.de

Qualitative work on the place and role of the senses in social and cultural experience has been on the rise for over two decades. This requires confronting a number of methodological and disciplinary challenges, as well as pushing for an understanding of the sensorium that goes beyond its physiological-neurological functioning. Sensing, in the broadest meaning of the term, facilitates alongside language the communicating and communing between individual body and cultural life. The specializations of the contributors of the present volume also illustrate that garnering “perspectives on the senses” is an inherently interdisciplinary enterprise; they are trained in an array of fields, ranging from sociology to anthropology and folklore studies, agricultural economics and architecture. Devorah Kalekin-Fishman and Kelvin E.Y. Low seek to situate the volume all the same in a sociological tradition and legitimize the focus on everyday life and the micro-level approach needed for generating relevant data in revisiting sociological classics by Durkheim, Weber and Simmel. Yet further segments of their introduction necessitate inclusion of the multidisciplinary background needed to both shed light on the cultural emplacement of the sensory and construct a framework for the diverse contributions gathered in the volume. Some arguments in this preparatory literature review strike one as oddly lacking in agency: language and environment are seen as determining forces in human experience, bypassing individuals’ capacity to shape, regulate and undermine those two regimes. The somewhat rocky opening chapter frames a selection of interesting case studies touching on, though by no means exclusively focused on, the social dimensions of sensory perception. The editors’ afterword strives to cull from the eight cases more general conclusions on the role of the sensory in social, spatial and translocal experience. For

someone interested in further systematizing a qualitative approach to sensory experience starting with this segment will be a good guide for reading the individual chapters; for someone reading the work more with a focus on everyday life in this very broadly conceived “Asia,” reading the work in a more random fashion will offer interesting glimpses at topics from heritage practices to architectural planning and massage.

Three chapters are grouped under the heading “Experiencing Space and Place.” Kalekin-Fishman explores what she terms “sonic configurations” in everyday life; she characterizes different facets of Israeli life in which auditory signals thicken experiential dimensions between ritual, religion and war. Somaphore is Steve Ferzacca’s coinage to capture, analogously to “metaphor,” the conceptual system of sense and society. Building on his work in Java, Ferzacca also — though only implicitly — theorizes how ethnographic data on other-cultural sensory experience can be generated. Heide Imai traces spatial experience through architectural transformations in a Tokyo neighborhood; there is a commendable applied focus to her piece, with recommendations to urban planners to consider individuals’ use of and history with an urban environment.

The second part is devoted to “Traditions and the Senses.” Co-editor Low draws on his work in Singapore to explore the role of the senses in shaping memory. In choosing the realm of the armed forces, he addresses an area rich in sensory practice from the acoustic to the tactile; ritual has, of course, often been considered in studies of nationalism, yet the dimension of the habitual sensory exposure customary in armed forced training and practice augments our understanding. By contrast, Mu Peng focused on a rural Chinese area in her closely observed and intelligently interpreted work with healing ritual and the sensory component involved as disciple learns from master. Body learning is clearly an essential aspect in the passing on of traditional knowledge — a component not really captured (and surely this is fortunate) in the politics of heritage preservation. The third and final part seeks to illuminate sensory experiences in their transcultural passage. Junko Iida’s piece focuses on Thai massage on its path to a globalized health and

relaxation practice. Noorman Abdullah documents the feelings of familiarity and comfort encoded in food smells and tastes in migratory contexts. The comparative work done with students all originating from Singapore is particularly illuminating, as is the overall contribution to foodways scholarship.

Many of the chapters could stand on their own, as almost each one of them begins with a general consideration of the new role of empirical work on sensory experience. The body of secondary literatures consulted is perhaps still somewhat predictable with the Toronto school, some historical classics and the works from the Berg readers on the senses figuring prominently. The book, overall, might be considered an example for integrating the sensory dimensions into more holistically conceived qualitative research and thus assisting in pulling this important aspect of human experience into overall methodological and theoretical considerations.

Social Relations and the Cuban Health Miracle, by **Elizabeth Kath**. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2010. 200pp. \$49.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781412814171.

P. SEAN BROTHERTON
Yale University
sean.brotherton@yale.edu

Social Relations and the Cuban Health Miracle is Elizabeth Kath's attempt to explain the seeming paradox of Cuba's health care system: How has a small developing country with scarce resources, experiencing a fiscal crisis, managed to achieve laudable health outcomes? To answer this question, Kath moves beyond a facile analysis of Cuba's vital health statistics to examine the institutional and personal dynamics that constitute Cuba's "health miracle." The author's main point is that "non-material factors," such as the collaborative relationships among a diverse group of actors, including health workers, the state and different institutions, have proven influential in helping Cuba achieve its national health goals. These factors are effective for health policy *implementation*, she notes. Nevertheless, as she further argues, the state-centered, top-down approach in the *design* of Cuba's

health policies provides no opportunities for popular participation or cooperation. This has led to some adverse consequences for quality of health care delivery in the country.

The general conclusions this study draws are not remarkable in and of themselves, as most of these observations have been well documented in the health policy literature. The original contribution of this book, however, is the alternative theoretical framing the author presents in Chapter Two to analyze the Cuban case study. Marshalling a somewhat overwrought review of the extant literature on social capital and state capacity in capitalist and neoliberal contexts, Kath postulates the feasibility of applying such conceptual tools for analyzing the socialist state. Problematically, the author's tentative language in explicating this theoretical intervention is compounded by the uncritical use of textbook definitions of state-society relations. By drawing on rigid dichotomies of capitalism/socialism, development/underdevelopment, or statist/decentralized state perspectives, this study leaves little space for musing how and in what distinctive ways the Cuban state blurs these distinctions.

The empirical chapters (Two-Four) in *Social Relations and the Cuban Health Miracle* seek to unpack the multiple threads that make up the author's overarching thesis. Analyzing a "slice" of Cuba's health sector, the country's Maternal-Infant Program (PAMI), Kath blends secondary literature, participant observation, and formal and semi-structured interview data, to examine health policy at the macro- and micro-levels. The brief first-hand ethnographic accounts presented are compelling and offer a unique view of health policy in practice. In spite of this, the over-reliance on other scholarly accounts to describe PAMI, without adequately presenting the rich, primary data produced by the Cuban Ministry of Health, at times results in a fragmented narrative of the state's specific institutional goals and objectives for this program. Moreover, the author's choice of PAMI as a "slice," or entry point, to reflect on the larger health sector, ironically, works both for and against the larger theoretical claims that are being made by this study.

As Kath suggests, echoing other scholars, the maternal and infant health care program in Cuba is organized in a top-down manner relying, almost exclusively, on a very paternalistic biomedical model (e.g., hospitalized childbirth, maternity homes, medical surveillance of expectant mothers, genetic screening for congenital abnormalities, etc.) and, in practice, offers very little room for popular participation of patients in health design. Confronted with a lack of autonomy in the "decision-making arrangements," evidenced in maternal and infant health care programs, Kath deduces, "The social relations of the Cuban health system can therefore be described as predominantly paternalistic" (p. 120). Without a doubt, such a conclusion is on point for characterizing PAMI. However, such a sweeping generalization of the health system as a whole is a questionable claim. How representative is PAMI of Cuba's overall approach to primary health care?

Historically, Cuba's maternal and infant health care programs have been priority sectors for development in Cuba's "health miracle." The country's infant mortality rate and other vital health statistics have long constituted forms of symbolic capital to bolster the revolutionary government's achievements, as well as garner accolades by international governing bodies such as the World Health Organization, which use health statistics as a means to rank and classify the effectiveness of health care systems of the world. In this context, the very choice of PAMI, one of the most highly regulated programs of the primary health sector, can be seen to pre-determine the author's conclusions: that state elites dictate health policy through a vertical structure which severely curtails patient autonomy, divesting them of a voice in the medical decision-making process, is not entirely unexpected. An important (and unanswered) question remains: How do other "slices" of Cuba's health sector fit within this model? For example, would health education and prevention programs or programs for the elderly reveal another perspective on popular participation in Cuban health design? These are equally important and fruitful lines of methodological and epistemological inquiry that are left unexamined.

In the remaining chapters of the book, Kath shifts focus from PAMI to provisionally examine how individual Cubans navigate the formal and informal health care sectors. The author argues that, while the state has successfully built up an expansive institutional capacity, increasingly, "social capital is being lost through . . ." informal channels in the health sector (p. 172). One solution to this apparent problem, Kath argues, would be for the Cuban state to bolster its "civil society" through more active participation in health policy design, and formalized feedback mechanisms to evaluate and improve health care delivery for the future. On an abstract level these are seemingly sound recommendations, however, very little concrete data is presented to address how this may take shape in the socialist island-nation. For instance, what constitutes civil society in Cuba? Is this the same as the civil society found in countries with different sociopolitical arrangements? Since the earliest stage of establishing primary health care in the revolutionary context, the health care sector has been in a continual process of restructuring. Most of the key changes in the development of the country's primary health care sector have focused on patient needs and more efficient delivery of health care. This suggests a more dynamic and responsive health care sector than is depicted in the "top-down" model described by Kath as representative of Cuba's health sector.

Despite some of the analytical lapses and lofty theoretical claims, *Social Relations and the Cuban Health Miracle* offers an insightful examination of Cuba's maternal and infant health care program. This book will serve as a contribution to the literature on international development, public health studies, international political economy, and medical sociology.

Race, Gender, and the Labor Market: Inequalities at Work, by **Robert L. Kaufman**. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010. 277pp. \$62.50 cloth. ISBN: 9781588267108.

IVY KEN

George Washington University
ivyken@gwu.edu

Well-established books that rely on popular data sets get replaced by books that analyze new waves of these data in slightly modified ways. This inch-by-inch approach is comprehensive, if laborious and uninspiring, but it has produced some important individual facts-as-we-know-them. We know that workers' human capital attributes do not explain as much about their job placement as you would think if you just listened to folks talking over corned beef sandwiches at the local café, for instance. We know that there is something "woman-y" about jobs that women fill, like nurse and laundry press operator, as much as we suspect that jobs which require a lot of authority are often taken by white workers. When people articulate hunches like these, the discipline of sociology has an army of Organizations, Occupations, and Work (OOW) specialists who can enact their seriously honed regression skills to analyze this country's well-counted formal paid labor force and find out whether hunches correspond with realities.

Within this well-established enterprise, Robert L. Kaufman's new book accomplishes what we might expect. It does not use new data, unfortunately, but it does analyze 1990 Census Bureau data on the workforce in a comprehensive way. The author includes all the variables to which the giants like Barbara Reskin, Patricia Roos, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, and Leslie McCall have given decades of attention, and he also examines interesting economic sociological priorities such as the profitability of the industries in which workers work. Rather than indices of dissimilarity he uses the much better log-linear odds ratios to document how many times more likely it is for a white woman rather than a black woman to be employed in a particular occupation. And he depicts his major findings beautifully with well-conceptualized visual figures.

From all this we find out that gender segregated jobs that are stereotyped as "white

typed" come with wages three times as high as those that are "black typed," these referring to job conditions that include heavy physical labor, poor working conditions, menial tasks, and lack of authority. Kaufman cleverly focuses on four specific occupations to illustrate his findings, and confirms scholarship on labor queues that would predict black men's overrepresentation among garbage collectors, for instance, because this occupation has a relatively high level of unemployment and is therefore less appealing to the race/gender group (i.e., white men) that is ranked higher in the labor queue. A job like nursing, on the other hand, that is growing in demand and has low unemployment will require employers to hire a more racially diverse workforce, even while the job's position in hospitals—an industry with high profitability and oligopolistic characteristics—will exacerbate the gender segregating tendencies that come with the job's requirement for nurturing.

Because of its exhaustive approach and clear explication of the major approaches in the field, Kaufman's book will likely motivate specific studies of black and white women and men's positions in the labor market for years, and in that sense the book is quite relevant. Unfortunately, that says more about the state of OOW scholarship than about the vision or contribution of this particular book. Some labor market dynamics are easy to count, and for that reason we, as a field, feel justified when we dissect the minutiae of things like the effects of white- or male-typed skills on earnings ratios in unprofitable industries. If the path between findings like these and action-takers and policy-makers was smoothly paved and brightly lit with lots of good roadside food stops, it would make sense to keep generating them. Yet I fear the only action these findings will spur is more clicks on the keyboard with STATA maximized on the screen.

This is not a screed against quantitative research or even an argument against research for research's sake. Rather, it is the written articulation of a sigh, which indicates disappointment over what satisfies us in this field. When I need a detailed answer to a very specific question about black women, black men, white women, or white men in the U.S. labor market in 1990, I will consult this

book first. But the title of the book tells me I will find something about “race, gender, and the labor market,” and upon finishing the book I know little more about that broad topic than I did when I opened its cover. The only theory the author engages is a list of justifications for the variables he includes, and the only policy recommendations he makes are exhausted in two pages. A scholar capable of the extraordinarily detailed, systematic, and integrated analyses that Kaufman presents in this book should be able to rely on a reward structure within our discipline and an academy-industry-union-policy network that puts his talents to better use.

A Faith of Our Own: Second-Generation Spirituality in Korean American Churches, by **Sharon Kim**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 200pp. \$23.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547275.

KELLY H. CHONG
University of Kansas
 kchong@ku.edu

Sharon Kim has written a clear, well-organized, and accessible book on an important emerging phenomenon among second generation Korean American churches. Past studies of immigrant religions, especially of earlier European immigrant religions, have posited a generational attenuation of immigrant religiosity among the second generation, as the children of immigrants follow an assimilationist path and stray from, if not outright reject, the immigrant churches and religiosity of their parents. Recent studies of post-1965 immigrant religions have considerably revised this view by depicting a more complex picture of second-generation religiosity, focusing on the consequences of continued racialization of non-white groups, such as Asian Americans. In particular, these recent studies have offered insights into the ways in which the second generation does not necessarily reject ethnic churches outright nor follow a straight-line assimilationist path of “Anglo-conformity” but appropriates ethnic religions for their own purposes.

Kim has put her finger on the pulse of one of the most important recent developments in non-white immigrant religiosity: the

development of independent second-generation Korean American congregations and the crafting of a distinct second generation spirituality, which she refers to as the formation of “hybrid third spaces.” She accomplishes this through a first-hand investigation of 22 independent second generation Korean American Protestant churches in Los Angeles, 6 of which are “monoethnic” churches (over 80 percent Korean) and 16 are pan-Asian churches. Her most interesting contribution is the comparison between “monoethnic” churches and the “pan-Asian” churches regarding how these congregations are formulating and envisioning their organizations and their spirituality; she further reveals that 6 out of the 16 pan-Asian churches are in fact in a “transitional stage” en route to becoming “multiracial” congregations that see themselves as embracing all races. In Chapter Seven, she makes an explicit comparison between monoethnic, pan-Asian, and multiracial churches. (In LA, prior to 1992, there were 3 independent churches; since 1992, they have increased to 56).

After a brief introduction in which Kim engages theoretically with issues of race, ethnicity, and immigrant religions, and outlines her method and data, Chapter Two describes the major reasons why these second-generation Korean American Christians have decided to create independent churches of their own. The most important of these reasons is the generational tension within Korean immigrant churches, in which the complaints among the second generation of the disrespectful attitudes of the parent generation toward the second generation (“second class citizenship”), the first generation’s “dysfunctional” and “watered down” spirituality (pp. 27, 29), church schisms, and the authoritarian ways of the first generation leaders are rife. The second generation also feels restricted by the home-bound religiosity of the first generation, and therefore, their unwillingness/inability to reach out to the larger community.

In the next chapter, Kim delves into the reasons these second generation members are choosing to strike out on their own, and she sees as key the importance of race and the racialization of non-whites in America that prevents complete acceptance within white churches and in the society at large.

But she contends that while her observations are more in line with researchers who similarly view race as important, these churches are not merely “refuges” or “reactions to racial marginalization,” nor “co-ethnic cliques.” Rather she wants to offer “nuances and complexities” that shape the rapid growth of these churches, and sees these second-generation churches as a “creative resolution to the constraints and opportunities tied to the multiple identities of their members” (p. 52).

She argues that despite the high level of acculturation, these second generation members, however, do form their churches because they feel a need for comfort, community, and belonging, but with the goal of transforming Korean churches into an “empowering” institution that will foster ethnic healing and pride. Importantly, contrary to some scholars who say that many second generation Christians are embracing a larger evangelical identity at the expense of ethnic identity, she sees her informants as trying to marry both their ethnicity and Christian identity into a kind of “hybrid” spirituality and theology, and that they are not necessarily rejecting their parents’ religious ways but trying to elicit the best of both “Koreanized” Christianity and American evangelicalism. The second generation members also see themselves as “globalized” Christians, reaching out to all Christians more so than their inward-looking parents: “In their quest to invent an independent second-generation spirituality, the leaders of these new churches aim to adopt what they perceive to be essential beliefs, symbols, and practices from Korean Protestantism and various expressions of American evangelicalism, and to anchor them in their newly formed organization” (p. 83).

I find her most interesting chapter to be her last substantive chapter, Chapter Six, where she compares the three types of congregations, the “monoethnic,” “pan-Asian,” and those poised to become “multiracial.” This chapter, unfortunately, also reveals one of the weaknesses of Kim’s study—her dearth of material on the non-Asian congregants who attend these predominantly Korean churches (she reports that even the “multiracial” churches are over 80 percent Asian Americans), that might provide a more robust explanation for why some of these

churches are facing challenges in becoming truly multiracial. The few perspectives she relates from non-Asian members are mostly from African American members, and we hear almost nothing from European-ethnic members. We do not hear much from other Asian-ethnic members, either. The reality is that for most of these congregations, the culture that permeates the church is predominantly Korean, as is their leadership, and this is why they have been unable to successfully attract significant numbers of non-Asians. If so, what is the attraction of current non-Asian members to these churches, who exactly are these members, what are the precise racial demographics of these members? Kim does not provide answers to these questions. Exploring this critical dimension could have provided better clues to the challenges faced by these churches in reaching out to non-Asians.

Throughout the book, the voices of the pastors and church leaders seem to dominate; and although these are central to the study, one yearns for more voices of lay members, both Korean and non-Korean, which can better describe the internal racial/cultural dynamics of these churches. The book is also short on evidence of participant observation, more of which could have given the book a greater sense of depth and complexity; the evidence provided is derived mostly from interview material. These shortcomings aside, I believe this book to be sensibly organized, economically presented, and it makes an important contribution to the emerging literature on second generation ethnic religions in America.

Fair Trade and Social Justice: Global Ethnographies, edited by **Sarah Lyon** and **Mark Moberg**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2010. 307 pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780814796214.

ZSUZSA GILLE

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
gille@illinois.edu

This excellent collection of essays fills a gap in the social science literature on alternative consumption practices that have rapidly expanded in the Global North in the last

two decades and that range from sustainable consumption through shopping locally to buying “fair trade” products. Western European activists and scholars tend to extol the virtues of these practices, arguing that they demonstrate a real political alternative that can be scaled up and thus be truly transformative. Even though North American scholars have been somewhat less enthusiastic, critical and theoretically informed studies of Alternative Trade Organizations (ATOs) and various certificate schemes have remained few and far between. This is the first volume that systematically gathers empirical evidence on the social justice impacts of fair trade from multiple contexts with the goal of comparison, some generalization, and theoretical conceptualization.

The authors are all anthropologists, but the empirical material is not limited to fieldwork data gained from single sites; in fact, most of the contributors engage with multiple sites or relate their local findings to macro- and global-level events, institutions, or change processes. They also do not avoid statistical data (such as price fluctuations of the commodities investigated: tea, coffee, banana, and crafts) market concentration, or even small surveys of participants in various fair trade schemes. This indeed represents “best practice” in the tradition of the extended case method and global ethnography.

Together the essays document the following ways in which fair trade falls short of its stated goal of delivering social justice: (1) women are left out of fair trade opportunities or from fair trade governance (Sarah Lyon and Catherine Dolan), (2) other local social inequalities increase because often only the better off or those with formal land titles can participate in fair trade (Sarah Besky and Mark Moberg), (3) governance structures required for fair trade certification may displace other already-existing and democratically elected and functioning decision-making bodies (Catherine Dolan), (4) production and decision-making requirements reflect Northern consumers’ tastes, ethical norms (such as what constitutes child labor), and technological assumptions rather than catering to the social needs, or taking into consideration the knowledge, of producers (Mark Moberg, Julia Smith, Patrick

Wilson, Catherine Dolan, and Kathy M’Closkey), in one case producing disciplinary effects that leave farmers nostalgic for colonial rule, (5) the costs associated with certification, especially when environmental standards are also part of the scheme, often exceed the price premiums guaranteed to fair trade products, either because high quality conventional products fetch a higher price than those guaranteed by fair trade certificates, because there is not enough demand for fair trade products which then get mixed up with conventional lower-priced ones, or because fair trade prices do not keep pace with inflation or with the price increases for conventional goods (Julia Smith, Catherine Dolan, Mark Moberg, Sarah Besky, Catherine Ziegler, and Molly Doane), (6) fair trade “contractors” exclude entire groups, tribes, or villages if they do not conform to Northern concepts of indigeneity and authenticity, threatening them not only with homogenization but also with economic disenfranchisement and cultural extinction (Patrick Wilson and Kathy M’Closkey), (7) social premiums—a percentage of fair trade price—that accrue to the community are spent on projects that either are unsustainable in the long run, or do not reflect local priorities (Mark Moberg and Catherine Dolan).

While this may seem a damning list, several authors also document advances made in increasing economic and political opportunities, and the overall message of the book is not to do away with fair trade but rather to demonstrate that in theoretical terms fair trade cannot help but produce these unintended consequences. The reasons for this reside in fair trade’s intimate relationship with neoliberalism. In fact, the sustained and theoretically sophisticated attention to this relationship—a rare feature in anthologies—is the greatest virtue of this volume.

Mainstream approaches and early social science studies of fair trade claimed that fair trade represented an alternative to neoliberal policies that idolized free trade as the universal panacea for a range of social and economic problems. This claim, if it was supported by empirical data, was usually based on anecdotal evidence or on studying the perspective of Northern retailers, NGOs and consumers. In contrast, the first two sections of *Fair Trade and Social Justice*—entitled

"Global Markets and Local Realities" and "Negotiating Difference and Identity in Fair Trade Markets"—focus entirely on producers, farmers or craftspeople in the Global South; and even the third section of the book, which gathers consumer-oriented studies, provides a comparison of what fair trade means to participants with what it means to producers.

In contrast to the view of fair trade as an alternative to free or conventional trade, the anthology advances the view that, first, fair trade probably would not have appeared on the scene when it did—in the 1990s, in its current nonstatist form—without neoliberalism, because with the elimination of farmer subsidies and import and export duties, as demanded by the WTO and the World Bank, participation in ATOs seemed for many the only way to receive a guaranteed, though not always high, price, and thus to hold onto their lands and livelihoods. Second, fair trade also came to replace services and funds for social development that, prior to the implementation of neoliberal policies, had been provided by the state, in effect legitimating the reduced role for government. Third, fair trade endorses market-based solutions to social inequalities and environmental problems that were caused by the free market to begin with. Fourth, fair trade, just like neoliberalism, promotes voluntary standards as opposed to regulation enforced universally by governments. Overall, fair trade has become a brand and a marketing tool that "fairwashes" (Jane Henrici) corporations whose practices are otherwise socially suspect.

This book not only advances our understanding of fair trade but also of neoliberalism, flexible accumulation and globalization, and it engages with issues of great concern to sociologists—such as labor, ethics, development, ethnic and gender inequalities, and justice—in nuanced and innovative ways. It will be a great resource for graduate and undergraduate courses.

Self, Identity, and Social Institutions, by **Neil J. MacKinnon** and **David R. Heise**. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 266pp. \$85.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780230621794.

LAUREN LANGMAN
Loyola University Chicago
llang944@aol.com

When sociology emerged from the writings of Comte, Marx, and Spencer and arrived in the academy, we also saw the birth of social psychology, especially with James and Cooley and then Mead. But concerns with the self/subject have generally taken a backseat to macrosocial concerns with class, power, structure, culture and/or institutions. Postmodern theories have attenuated (deconstructed, if not obliterated) the very notions of subjectivity. Neil MacKinnon and David Heise seek to develop a comprehensive theory of an agenic subject based on their earlier work, especially affect control theory and the relevant research in their field. They seek "to rejuvenate self and identity theory, expanded to consider social institutions" (p. 219). At the same time, they address some larger sociological questions. This book covers a great deal of material, presented in a very concise style that presupposes the reader is familiar with these traditions and current research. It cannot be summarized easily without losing a great deal of its complexity and nuance.

Given my own concerns with identity and emotions, I was eager to learn what MacKinnon and Heise had to offer. At the same time, influenced by Weber and Freud, I am often skeptical of theories of self, identity and emotion based on pencil and paper questionnaires of undergraduate students. Such work often tends to be taxonomic, static and divorced from the lifeworlds most people inhabit. But I was pleasantly surprised and indeed very favorably impressed by the magnitude and sophistication of their work, especially their attempts to tie their social psychology of selfhood to some wider theoretical traditions and issues. Moreover, while not embracing a postmodernist perspective, they squarely address some of the issues raised concerning the fragmentation or at least the pluralization of selfhood and the extent of its agency.

They begin with Mead's notion of the "social self" that emerges via interaction through gestures, signs and language that ultimately allow learning rules, roles and "taking the role of other." But they claim, and rightfully so, that Mead's focus on the linguistic (cognitive) paid very little attention either to emotions or the many possible identities that result from the pluralization of the institutional settings of our life worlds. Nor did Mead say much about the particular institutions in which selfhood is articulated. Yet they consider themselves close to Mead as they reviewed and evaluated some of the symbolic interactionist traditions. Along the way they found valuable insights if not antecedents in the work of McCall and Simmons or Wiley.

For MacKinnon and Heise, selfhood tends to be at the individual level, while identities are more microsocial—expressed in interactions—even if imagined or anticipated. Social roles are located in macrosocial institutions. Moreover, given indebtedness to Berger and Luckmann's "moderate" constructionism, identities are linguistic objectifications—they are socially constructed, self-externalizing activities that emerge from individual or collective activity that then constitute a social reality. They then argue that people express agency in creating selves and identities, selecting which to embrace and how to present their selves through certain identities. Their fundamental thesis claims that self, or should we say a particular self among many, is created, selected and actualized through a myriad of identities that are largely articulated within specific institutions that express and maintain self-sentiments. *People confirm themselves cognitively and affectively in creating, selecting and enacting identities in particular social institutional contexts.* The sentiments unify and stabilize the self. But this is not a functionalist argument based on "over-socialized" selfhood. Quite often, the identity one expresses is more demanded by the situation than "freely" chosen. People may feel "inauthentic" in certain contexts and may then seek other situations where the articulations of "alleviating" identities confirm self-sentiments—or perhaps other kinds of "inauthentic" identities. A student may flunk his social psych exam, but star as

electric guitarist in his/her garage band. Given the many institutions in which we participate every day, it may seem as if self and its identities are fragmented, but at the same time "the self category itself acquires unity and pragmatic meaningfulness as one among the many socially constructed categories an individual applies, maintains, and extends in everyday life" (p. 4).

They claim that people employ a "cultural theory of people," that is, language includes "stocks of identities" with implicit logical relationships: teacher-student, doctor-patient. These range from specifics to greater generality—if ultimately, a human being. Such identities, as "stocks of knowledge" acquired through socialization, facilitate social life by specifying the kinds of identities that might be salient in relating to a doctor or a dean, a student or a spouse/partner. Moreover, we have some vague ideas of how to relate to that person and/or anticipate future interactions that might come through either mobility, career or simply aging. To ascertain their lexicon of identities, the authors employed WordNet, a computer-based dictionary and thesaurus that taxonomically links nouns through semantic relationships. They further employed a linguistic analysis to indicate how various identities clustered within various institutions since as noted, these are the contexts where identities are articulated. They similarly developed affective lexicons based on Osgood's notions of Evaluation, Potency and Activity based on questionnaire data in order to measure self sentiments—primarily self-worth, self-sufficiency and self-initiative.

As noted, a short review hardly does justice to a work of this caliber. It is of course easy to criticize their empirical methods from the use of WordNet or student questionnaires, but those issues are not unique to their work. Given space limits, there are some criticisms that I would make. They address the issues of power, specifically Foucault and Bourdieu. While they defend a more robust notion of self and agency, they do not address the extent to which their discipline disciplines their own researchers by establishing certain "acceptable" academic parameters and conceptions of self that are "always already" there. For example, some psychologists like Sampson have argued

that the concept of self and the “appropriate” concerns of academic social psychology have been constructed in order to secure grant funding. Such “constructions” ignore marginal identities such as racial minorities, political radicals or queers. Similarly, to what extent do selves and identities that may perhaps be quite creative, nevertheless work in institutions that serve hegemonic functions? Meanwhile, some folks seek to change institutions, if not society, given their own networks and identities. The authors often cite Castells who claims that while most people support modern “network” society, *some resist and embrace traditional identities based on nation or religion. Meanwhile others reject the status quo and seek to fashion new, “project identities” that would transform society.* Moreover, given the importance of interaction in the socialization of the self and its articulation within institutional identities, there are very few discussions of actual interaction. The authors tell us little about transformative identities with political impacts that are created through negotiation in groups. Finally, while much to their credit they integrate emotions into their theory, they say very little about specific emotions besides the EPA scales. Scholars such as Hochschild, Scheff and Stearns have provided us with many insights about emotions and subjectivity. Thus, for scholars concerned with self and/or identity in relationship to issues such as work, race, class or gender, politics, power and mobilization, their approach might be a bit limited.

MacKinnon and Heise provide a new synthesis that has updated classical insights by considering emotions, cybernetics, semiotics (meanings) and have addressed postmodern critiques of subjectivity. Further, they address broader theoretical issues and questions raised by such people as Bourdieu or Parsons that will sensitize micro social researchers to macro social factors and impact subsequent research. Given their theoretical framework and the canons of research that they rely on, they have written a very important, indeed a foundational book that will be mandatory reading for social psychological research and theorizing about self and identity.

Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-Immigrant Times, by **Douglas S. Massey and Magaly Sánchez**. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010. 305pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780871545794.

FRANK D. BEAN

University of California, Irvine
fbean@uci.edu

For both theoretical and public policy reasons, immigrant group incorporation has become the focus of contemporary immigration research. In regard to theory, the neo-institutionalist revival of assimilation theory (Alba and Nee 2003) has hypothesized that, as a result of sheer (and mutual) exposure to one another, immigrants and majority natives gradually become more similar, especially when institutional factors are in place to enhance assimilation processes. In regard to policy, countries with advanced post-industrial economics have undergone profound demographic changes over the past four decades that have made it increasingly difficult for them to function without the unskilled (and often skilled) labor that immigrants provide. Because most newcomer workers are non-European and often poor, destination countries often worry they will confront challenges to social solidarity from greater ethnoracial and social class diversity. This catapults the issue of immigrant integration to the top of their domestic public policy agendas.

The task confronting research on immigrant group incorporation, then, is how to deal with the different realities reflected in these two domains. What sorts of incorporation theoretical perspectives resolve the contradictions involved in applying assimilation theory to groups defined in terms of absolutist racial categories? Assimilation theory, while apparently useful for analyzing the U.S. incorporation successes of European and many other groups, has failed to account for the experience of African Americans, whose incorporation remains conspicuously incomplete. Sharp and powerfully enforced racial and other divides (at least as exemplified by the U.S. black-white divide) have thrown up barriers so unyielding and static that assimilation processes scarcely seem to

apply. But the experiences of many of the new U.S. immigrant groups seem neither like those of U.S. blacks nor exactly similar to those of the earlier immigrants from Europe. As a result, alternative theoretical perspectives that point to structural factors that generate disadvantage while conceptualizing such barriers in ways that better allow for the possibility of change appear more adequate for understanding the incorporation dynamics of the new immigrants. This has led theories of incorporation recently to emphasize the nature and strength of boundaries—how they are negotiated both socially and more formally through policy changes—as factors that not only shape immigrant group integration but that also better account for incorporation dynamics.

Brokered Boundaries constitutes a major contribution to this kind of incorporation study. The book is superb and path-breaking: the first chapter contains one of the best reviews on theoretical perspectives about immigrant incorporation. It describes and critiques the major ideas in assimilation and alternative incorporation frameworks, showing how the predictions of various perspectives are connected to the structure of opportunities in American society. And, as already noted, the book conceptualizes immigrant integration explicitly as a process that involves the definition of boundaries. This means that what happens to immigrants depends both on how the members of the receiving society see certain immigrants and on how immigrants from certain places see themselves. The book examines the latter (i.e., the question of identity construction with respect to defining oneself as an American or as a minority Latino) in detail through in-depth interviews conducted in 2003 with 159 members of Latin American immigrant groups (either Caribbean, South American, Central American or Mexican in origin) living in the Philadelphia-New York corridor of the United States. Three-fifths of the respondents were male, over two-thirds were first-generation (the rest 1.5 generation), more than one-third were from Mexico, and nearly half were unauthorized. Except for Mexicans (only one in 12 of whom reported African origins) the members of the groups identified themselves as having substantial

African origin roots (ranging from 30 percent for South Americans to over 90 percent for Caribbeans). Since all groups rather homogeneously reported Indigenous (90 percent or more) or European (80 percent or more) origins (respondents were allowed to report more than one kind of origin), having African origins was the critical difference among the four region-of-origin groups.

The book's overarching purpose is to examine the extent to which recent Latino immigrants embrace a "Latin American" or "American" identity, especially as a result of having lived in the country after 9/11 when security concerns tended to harden native attitudes toward immigrants. A specific goal is to ascertain the degree to which Latino ethnicity among these immigrants is reactive (i.e., develops in a way that is appreciably shaped by defensive responses to harsh and hostile treatment experienced in the United States). Substantial evidence in the book shows that this is indeed the case. The longer immigrants are here and the more they say they have experienced discrimination, the more likely they are to reject calling themselves "American." The implications for immigrant incorporation are clear. If natives stereotype immigrants and make them feel unwelcome, immigrant identities are likely to develop along adversarial lines. In short, if the United States seeks immigrant labor but socially excludes the immigrants providing it, then the country risks negative self-fulfilling prophecies. Drawing on the views of the Latin American immigrants themselves, Massey and Sánchez provide rich and compelling examples of how hostile native reactions to today's immigrants are self-defeating.

The findings from their research also point to the need for further investigation into the roles that race versus membership play in affecting identity and immigrant incorporation. In addition to rejecting an American identity on account of having experienced discrimination, Massey and Sánchez's respondents were also more likely to embrace an American identity if they were from Mexico, as well as more likely to do so the more they came to the country for economic opportunity, reported Indigenous roots, and were "green-card" holders (although the latter tendency was not statistically significant, probably because the

samples sizes were so small). Because they did not see themselves as having African roots, and in a context that still maintains a black/nonblack divide if not a black/white one, Mexicans with unauthorized status may be more likely to experience rejection and develop separate identities for reasons having as much to do with lack of legal status (i.e., with marginal membership) and social class (i.e., with being poor) as with race per se. This book argues compellingly that many of today's immigrants substantially determine their own identities. When Mexican immigrants are able to change their status from unauthorized to legal, their inter-generational mobility improves (Bean et al. 2011). Such changes in migration status may also affect identity formation. Parsing the differences in the relative influence on identity formation of ethnoracial status, membership and class across immigrant groups constitutes an important challenge for future research. I recommend this work with great enthusiasm.

References

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bean, Frank D., Mark A. Leach, Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, and John Hipp. 2011 (forthcoming). "The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons Across U.S. Immigrant Groups in How Parent's Status Affects Their Offspring." *International Migration Review* 45(4).

Preserving Ethnicity Through Religion in America: Korean Protestants and Indian Hindus Across Generations, by **Pyong Gap Min**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2010. 265pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780814795866.

RUSSELL JEUNG
San Francisco State University
Rjeung@sfsu.edu

How does religion relate to the maintenance and transmission of ethnicity? Pyong Gap Min's *Preserving Ethnicity Through Religion in America: Korean Protestants and Indian Hindus*

Across Generations is remarkable in its theoretical insights on this very relationship between American religion and ethnicity. It is methodologically well conceived, and its rich details make it one of the strongest sociological contributions to the study of American immigrant religion.

Min sets out to explore how religion is used by immigrants to preserve ethnicity and particularly, how different theologies impact ethnic and religious transmission to the next generation. To gather his findings, he uses six main data sets. To contrast Korean and Indian immigrants, he surveyed 564 individuals, interviewed 115 first-generation respondents, and engaged in ethnographic work at the Ganesh Temple and Shin Kwang Church of New York. Then, to examine the transmission of religion and ethnicity to the 1.5/second-generation, he surveyed 202 Korean Americans, surveyed 35 Korean English congregations, and interviewed 121 respondents of the 1.5/second-generation.

These large sample sizes enable him to compare ethno-religious groups with each other and across generations. Significantly, Min does not only look at congregational practices as independent variables, but also devotes equal attention to domestic religious practices, which are main components of many Asian religions. For dependent variables, he operationalized three dimensions of ethnicity: (1) cultural practices (childrearing); (2) social relations (friendship and dating patterns); and (3) group self-identification. This mixed-method approach worked very well in systematically addressing the multi-dimensional complexity of both religion and ethnicity.

The first half of the book examines two main findings about the different manners by which Korean Protestantism and Indian Hinduism help immigrants preserve their ethnicity. For Korean Protestants, religious participation facilitates the maintenance of co-ethnic social relations. In his ethnography of the Shin Kwang Church, Min describes the multitude of church activities that promote friendships and family-like ties. This church even takes its elderly on "filial tours," which are paid for and organized by the younger members. Such activities to the countryside not only build networks, but also transmit Confucian relational practices of Korean culture.

In contrast, Indian Hindus do not attend the temple as frequently, but the temples do serve symbolic and functional roles to preserve the immigrants' ethnicity. Min's participant observation of the Hindu Temple Society of North America reveals that even the design of the building marks a difference between Indian Hindus and other Americans. Its lavish, "authentic" design—eight architects were commissioned from southern India—reminds immigrants that they are in "Little India." As one of New York City's architectural sites of religious significance, groups of visitors often make tours to the Ganesh Temple. It also observes eight major Hindu holidays each year with various Indian concerts and plays. On the other hand, the Shin Kwang Church has no such Korean symbolic elements or celebration of Korean national holidays.

Importantly, Min finds that Indian Hindu domestic religious practices are more crucial for the preservation of ethnicity than is temple attendance. He shows that daily prayers at family shrines, *pūja* ritual ceremonies, and regular dietary practices reinforce immigrants' Indian heritage. Because these Hindu practices are intimately fused to Indian culture, the immigrants' children identify their Indian identity with Hinduism. However, Korean Protestant domestic religious practices have less effect on the transmission of cultural practices because of the disassociation between evangelical Protestantism and Korean culture.

The second half of the book examines how the 1.5/second-generations adhere to their parents' religion and how this identification shapes their ethnicity. Along with this emphasis on where religion is practiced and how religion is culturally fused to ethnicity, Min writes that the theological content of the two religions influences the transmission of ethnicity. He utilizes the concept of "dogmatic authority" to distinguish how Korean Protestantism and Indian Hinduism relate to ethnicity. Because Korean evangelicalism tends to be more universalistic and authoritarian, it encourages a Christian identity over an ethnic one and does not support ethnic cultural activities in its practice. Indian Hinduism, though, is more theologically liberal, and thus religious and ethnic identities can be complementary.

This contrast in dogmatic authority shapes the primary identities of the 1.5/second-generation, their childrearing values, and their social relations. Influenced by the strong evangelical orientation of universal brotherhood, the younger generation of Koreans is more likely than others to identify primarily as Christian. Subsequently, the 1.5/second-generation Korean Americans are likely to emphasize religion more in their childrearing practices, and have friends who are also Korean Protestants. While the younger generation of Korean Protestants identifies more with religious identities, the younger generation of Indian Hindus affiliates with their ethnicity. This identification, though, does not affect their childrearing beliefs or friendship patterns.

Min concludes that even though Korean Protestants are more religious and meet together as co-ethnics, Indian Hindus are more successful in transmitting their ethnicity. This is because any adherence to Hinduism—whether its spiritual orientation, cultural practices, or philosophical values—serves to reinforce Indianness. On the contrary, affiliation with evangelical Christianity—even in a Korean American context—serves to reinforce a Christian identity that prevails over an ethnic one.

On the basis of these multiple findings, scholarly rigor and systematic approach, I highly recommend *Preserving Ethnicity Through Religion in America*. Like any intriguing research, it raises even more questions than it answers. The differentiation between the spiritual, cultural, and philosophical aspects of Indian Hinduism is very useful and Min should have explored these same facets of Korean Protestantism. Other researchers would do well to follow his methodological and theoretical approaches to unpack these very complicated relationships.

Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity, by **Torin Monahan**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 211pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547657.

SIMONE BROWNE

University of Texas at Austin
sbrowne@austin.utexas.edu

Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity is organized into two parts, each a frame from which to examine insecurity and its attendant practices, ideologies and anxieties. If homeland security is the rationality of our time, one way to approach it is through a critical examination of the form of subjectivity that this very rationality brings into being, the "insecurity subject." The book's first part, "Security Cultures," does just that by taking up the social construction of identity theft, the relationship between public perceptions of terrorism and the television series *24*, the business of national security, and the Christian fundamentalist fiction series *Left Behind*. As Torin Monahan explains, rather than understanding post-9/11 security regimes as a departure from those of the past, security has simply intensified, giving way to suspension of law, preemptive action as the means of managing perceived threats, and privatization of the business of security that sees the citizenry enlisted to secure the home and the homeland. Monahan rightly notes, "the 'war on terror' is more ontological than geographical" (p.18). Meaning here that not only is the insecurity subject made to think and act through missives and alerts from the National Terrorism Advisory System (NTAS), but that the war on terror must be understood as a pedagogical project where the citizenry is instructed through rituals and through popular discourse to be perpetually fearful and at the same time perpetually prepared. Monahan suggests, "the insecurity subject is afraid but can effectively sublimate these fears by engaging in preparedness activities" (p.23). Think FEMA's directive to ready a disaster supply kit that should include duct tape, scissors and pre-measured and cut plastic sheeting in case of chemical attack. Hence the insecurity subject comes to understand herself as vulnerable and is tasked with securing her own

security. Here the use of the feminine personal pronoun is deliberate, as Monahan posits that this subject is in a way feminized, either "charged with compensating for the state's neglect of social needs" or "deemed as requiring paternalistic monitoring and intervention" (p.113).

Key to this book is an interrogation of the cultural practices through which insecurities are cultivated, and a questioning of the kinds of insecurities that get privileged over others and why. In this way, Monahan tells us something about the series of anxieties around difference, class, gender, and racialization in the making of what he terms "marginalizing surveillance." Through a discussion of the role of surveillance in boundary reproduction based on the author's own ethnographic encounters in a gated community, a public housing site and a transportation control center, the second part of the book, "Surveillance Infrastructures," closely examines how surveillance systems can create and maintain social inequalities and spatial hierarchies, as well as how such outcomes are presently being challenged by the likes of the Institute for Applied Autonomy, for example.

Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity is a complex text, grounded in a rich theoretical engagement with neoliberalism and the ways in which it structures the insecurities of our present conditions, both the everyday (i.e., homelessness, policing the poor and the undocumented) and the extraordinary (torture in extra-legal black sites and the stockpiling of avian flu vaccine). From this perspective, that "the neoliberal state heightens its security apparatuses while dismantling its social programs" (p.26), Monahan then provides the necessary analytic tools to understand this operation of power. For example, in Chapter Four "Vulnerable Identities" he names identity theft as both myth and socially constructed moral panic, and argues that as the insecurity subject is counseled to consume in order to ward off fraud (purchase antivirus software and paper shredders), responsibility for data protection shifts from the state to the citizenry and blame is then focused on the victim of identity theft for not taking the necessary precautions. Underlying this narrative of moral panic are homeland security concerns around illegal immigration, as

undocumented workers are deemed identity theft criminals and are subject to increasingly punitive measures. Special attention is paid in this chapter to the trope of the “meth head” in the discourse and economic context surrounding identity theft, where Monahan makes important links between condemned rural spaces, postindustrialization, and transformations in capital accumulation and social policy that see both the flexible worker and the methamphetamine user as multitasking, able to “work long hours on tedious projects” and technologically savvy (p.59).

I gave a copy of *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity* to a student with a keen interest in the field of Surveillance Studies. Later, when we met to discuss the book and the student offered me his take on some of the arguments made, he began his statements with “she argues that” or “and then she says.” I stopped the student and asked him why he used the feminine personal pronoun. He told me that compared to most of the texts in the field that he had come across so far, this one provided a sustained gender analysis throughout. For example: in Monahan’s reading of 24, Agent Jack Bauer embodied a frontier mentality acting within an Agambenian logic of the state of exception; and in Chapter Eight “Masculine Technologies” where Monahan considers certain technologies put to use in welfare, health care and transportation regimes, he stresses that these technologies do not exist outside of the gendered social conditions within which they are researched, developed and put into practice. Relatedly, Monahan’s notion of “discrimination by abstraction” is particularly instructive for thinking about when “bodies become data” and how “social inequalities and experiences tend to drop out of the equation” (p.116). I relay the story of my student here to say that with this book, Monahan takes seriously the significance of gender and inequalities in the study of surveillance. *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity* offers not only a timely intervention into the fields of communication and information technologies, critical security studies, and gender studies, but also demonstrates that a progressive politics can be found in a sociology of surveillance.

Who Cares? Public Ambivalence and Government Activism from the New Deal to the Second Gilded Age, by **Katherine S. Newman** and **Elisabeth S. Jacobs**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 219pp. \$26.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780691135632.

STEPHEN PIMPARE
New York University
stephenpimpare@yahoo.com

It is fitting that Katherine Newman and Elisabeth Jacobs included Richard Nixon along with FDR and LBJ in their brief study of presidents who fought for expansive social policy despite what was, at best, an ambivalent public. Had Nixon’s Family Assistance Plan (FAP) been enacted—especially given the propensity for public programs to grow over time (e.g., Social Security)—that guaranteed income program might have utterly transformed the American welfare policy landscape. But it was not to be. Drawing upon letters to the presidents, public opinion data (including a fresh look at some 400 New Deal-era polls that have been adjusted by Adam Berinsky to overcome flaws), and an array of secondary sources, they set out to determine what such data “can tell us about the limits and contours of American attitudes toward government intervention on behalf of the poor” (p. 7). What they confirm is the enduring sameness of mass opinion: as far as social scientists can measure such things, they have found again and again that the public supports aid to those they deem the worthy poor, especially if it is tied to work, and just as predictably oppose relief to those they identify as unworthy. It is a pattern older than the republic itself. The central claim in *Who Cares?* is that “the public [has] exhibited far more mixed and contentious attitudes about activist government than the politicians they returned to office” (p.7). Thus, this is in some ways a story about bold leadership.

Among its virtues, the book offers a reminder of how much opposition FDR faced, even during the worst of the Depression, from so many quarters, and of how compromised his initiatives were as a result; it is especially useful given that efforts to explain Obama-era policymaking too often turn to New Deal comparisons without an

appreciation of that actual history. So too, they argue, did the programs of the War on Poverty push against public opinion and, in a different manner, the welfare retrenchments of the 1980s and 1990s.

But what motivates presidents here is a desire to do what is good and right, and they are described as “politically courageous” for pursuing policies presumably at odds with public sentiment. While the authors know the historical truth is more complicated, that context is too little addressed. It is, for example, the mass movement pressures Roosevelt faced that explain his push for emergency aid; as they note, FDR famously opposed cash relief as “a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit” (p. 28). When he fatefully sought to balance the federal budget in the late 1930s it was not because “he misread public opinion” (p. 156) and realized that he had pushed the activist state too far, but that he was returning to what his policy preferences were before the crisis forced him to alter course. Similarly, Johnson sought to use the cash and jobs distributed by the War on Poverty, at least in part, to quiet unrest and to expand his electoral base, while Nixon regularly attempted, as Clinton would later, to co-opt Democratic plans and programs in hopes of wooing new voters to the Republican Party. There are pressures, desires, and incentives from places other than “the public” that constrain, motivate, and enable Presidential action.

The ultimate source of mass opinion might be more fully problematized here as well. Opinion tends to parrot elite views when elites are united, and is divided when elites are divided: in either case, opinion is typically shallow, ill-informed, and changeable, as we know. As a result, what apparent ambivalence (or conflicting preferences) in measured opinion might mean is a complicated question, because polled opinions cannot be taken as expressions of considered belief. I do not mean to overstate this critique: Newman and Jacobs point to this thinness of opinion, to be sure, but it seems too lightly passed over given how central it is to their inquiry and the logic of their argument. Indeed, their own evidence might be read to suggest that there may be less to these ambivalent views than meets the eye: did public opposition to Medicare increase during the battle over its enactment because

the public opposed the program, because the American Medical Association and others launched a broadside against it, or because they were turned off by the contentious nature of the political process itself which spilled over into their feeling about the policy?

These are meant to be modest complaints. *Who Cares?* is an ambitious effort to do nothing less than challenge some widely held assumptions of American welfare state history, and it offers an important collection of historical evidence to show that what public opinion scholars say of the present—that politicians track polls not to respond to the public’s desires but to better craft their language to sell their agenda—may have been as true in the past. Just as important, by demonstrating the striking sameness to public opinion about government interventions on behalf of poor Americans over the course of our history, they render suspect explanations for policy change that depend upon the political system responding to public wishes: if opinion does fluctuate, it is more likely to be a product of policy and economic change rather than a cause of it.

Locked Up, Locked Out: Young Men in the Juvenile Justice System, by **Anne M. Nurse**. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2010. 208pp. \$27.95 paper. ISBN: 9780826517128.

ROBERT C. HAUHART
Saint Martin’s University
RHauhart@stmartin.edu

This book reports on the author’s interview study of forty male youth who were first time admissions to the Ohio juvenile correctional system in 2002. The youth sample was drawn from those entering the Ohio system at two facilities—Oak Hill, a maximum security facility housing about 200 juveniles and Perry Point, a medium security facility with about 500 male residents. At the time, Ohio operated eleven juvenile institutions in its Division of Youth Services (DYS) holding about 2,000 youth.

Anne M. Nurse was interested in studying her youthful population from the time they gathered their first impressions of the system through the time of their release. DYS

provided Nurse with lists of all first time admissions assigned to either Oak Hill or Perry Point. Since Ohio required parental permission for research involving subjects under eighteen years of age, Nurse's task in selecting her sample was complicated by reaching and persuading the parents of respondents under eighteen. She received permission from 20 percent of the parents of this group, and 100 percent of these youth then agreed to participate. Nurse also contacted juveniles who had reached eighteen years of age prior to entering the system. Ultimately, this latter group constituted 50 percent of the sample. All of the juveniles selected from this group also agreed to participate.

Nurse's research design involved interviewing each subject three times. In the first round of interviews, Nurse focused on explaining the longitudinal nature of her study, distancing and distinguishing herself from DYS staff such as social workers and psychologists, and emphasizing the voluntary nature of each youth's participation and the lack of direct benefit involved. The second round of interviews was conducted nine months after the first group. Since all subjects were first time admissions to the juvenile system, many of their sentences were short. Consequently, twenty-nine of forty of her subjects had been released on parole by the second round. Nurse conducted these interviews typically at a restaurant of the youth's choice where she bought him lunch. Thirty-five of the original sample of forty juveniles agreed to participate. The third round of interviews was similar in structure to the second and scheduled for nine months later. Thirty-four of the original sample of forty participated in the third round, an 85 percent rate.

The author's findings support many of the social structural and cultural features reported by previous studies of juvenile institutions and prisons more generally. Thus, Nurse finds that the rehabilitative ideology continues to permeate the official goals of the Ohio juvenile system. However, she also finds that—like most correctional systems—the institutions are overcrowded, DYS is limited by tight budgets, the schools are understaffed, and the teachers underpaid. Consequently, she describes finding classrooms filled with either mild anarchy

or untutored students staring off into the distance. Interviews with her sample youth confirm these impressions. Substance abuse treatment programs, while sometimes available in the institutions, did not involve follow-up services upon release. Moreover, the one Ohio DYS facility that was entirely dedicated to providing a therapeutic substance abuse treatment community was closed as the author's book went to press in 2010.

With respect to the culture that permeated the Ohio facilities she studied, Nurse found that the male youth institutions were dominated by fear of staff violence, macho inmate performances intended to demonstrate the potential for violence, misogyny and homophobia. With respect to staff violence, the author notes that while her study was not primarily directed at examining this feature of institutional life—and she did not directly ask about the topic—her interview subjects frequently raised the issue. Thus, she found a heightened awareness that staff violence was a real possibility and that this fear lingered in the background atmosphere of the institutions. Perhaps correspondingly, residents concurred that demonstrations of violence or a reputation for violence were the primary means of gaining and maintaining status in the system. Thus, youth who had been in the institutions before or had been placed there because of a seriously violent offense were treated with respect by the other residents. With respect to displays of violence, Nurse also notes that young, small, immature, and/or gay youth are routinely the victims of harassment and violence. Such displays reinforce reputations and maintain the homophobic element of prison masculinity. Finally, boastful talk about heterosexual conquest and denigration of women both reinforce the negative attitude toward homosexuality and support the ascendancy of power, domination and violence as positively valued status attributes.

The core of Nurse's study, however, is the contribution it makes to understanding the complex relations residents maintain with the outside world and issues they face when coming home. The author carefully examines the importance of visitation, phone calls, and letters to inmates and notes the bureaucratic barriers—like expensive collect

call contracts—that affect these relations. The author also examines the trajectory of family and friend relations (families begin hopeful and end up disillusioned; outside friends begin as active respondents and then contacts precipitously decline once a resident reaches a permanent institutional placement) and the vicissitudes residents experience in these relations. Similarly, the experiences of release and parole are primarily ones of disappointment and trial. Nurse notes, for example, that Ohio DYS does not have an appreciable release planning program. Consequently, residents often do not understand the nature of their indeterminate sentences, likewise do not understand parole, receive no help in finding a place to live if they have none, and do not receive help in finding a job. The result is that under-prepared, under-educated youth are released back into the environment from which they came with almost no prospect of finding any job other than fast food or low-skill manual labor (jobs uniformly found through connections).

Nurse has written a careful, nuanced volume that examines the fate of Ohio's male juvenile population in clear-eyed terms. Unfortunately, she concludes the volume with a policy discussion that is naïve and unpersuasive. With respect to the institutions, she rather artlessly suggests that Ohio needs to improve its programs by raising teacher salaries, providing more training, and creating more resources at a time when states have no funds to do so and even less political will. Nurse also offers prescriptive advice for various staff (“...parole officers and juvenile correctional personnel should...”) and even recommends dismantlement of the existing institutions and adoption of the Missouri “cottage style” system—another budgetary non-starter. The juveniles she studied deserve better treatment and readers deserve better political analysis.

The Crisis of Capitalist Democracy, by **Richard A. Posner**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. 402pp. \$25.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674055742.

MICHAEL SCHWARTZ

Stony Brook University

mschwartz@ms.cc.sunysb.edu

My considerable disappointment with Richard Posner's *The Crisis of Capitalist Democracy* derives from its considerable virtues, which create an expectation of something much better. The book's value lies in much insightful micro-analysis of many specific events and consequences during and after the financial crisis of 2008. Posner harnesses his impressive experience and detailed knowledge of financial processes to describe what did happen and what might happen in the next few years. These virtues probably make the book a worthwhile read for the possibly many readers who are interested in understanding the nits and grits of both the current crisis of “Capitalist Democracy,” and the prognosis for various specific measures proposed, enacted, and implemented in answer to it.

The book's failure lies in the absence of either a convincing macro-analysis of the underlying systemic dynamics that conditioned the genetic or consequent events Posner analyzes—the processes that will therefore determine the future trajectory of “Capitalist Democracy.” Especially early on, the micro analyses are engaging and even arresting. Chapter Two consists of analyses of the series of mainly government actions that might have prevented the 2008 crash, or at least ameliorated the causal chain, and the alternative process that might have been. In one beautiful little argument (p. 82f), Posner explains why “the government's flooding of the banks with cash” (p. 83) did not loosen lending to the critical small business sector. In Chapter Three, he describes, replete with analytic details, the downward spiral, moment by moment. Included here is an entirely plausible explanation for the 2009 paradox, in which worker productivity and unemployment both increased. In Chapter Four, he analyzes the various Obama administration measures aimed at reversing

the process, giving each a “letter grade” in terms of its effectiveness in achieving its published aims and its underlying goals. The discussion of the stimulus package is among the best I have seen in sorting the various elements into those with truly stimulative impacts, and those with negligible or even negative effects.

But as these issue-by-issue discussions come and go, they do not develop into an arc of analysis—or even cumulate into a sense of what was important and what was unimportant. As the book proceeds, it reads more and more like a series of short and often very insightful essays about specific moments, policies, or proposals, without tying them together into a coherent analysis of “the crisis in capitalist democracy.” Chapter Five is, for me, the most salient example of this lack of coherence: it consists of a point-by-point analysis of the June 2009 Treasury Department proposals for a new regulatory apparatus; proposals that were eventually eviscerated in the congressional enactment process. Posner works his way through each policy recommendation—treating those that were never seriously considered with equal weight as those eventually enacted. While each little analysis has merit and even insight, the chapter as a whole reads like a series of exercises in micro-analysis, without a larger theme or significance.

This chapter especially makes one feel that the book is a compendium of policy-commentaries packaged together under thematic chapters, but without the larger analysis promised by the book’s title, and the principal rationale for gathering them together. The outline of a larger analysis never emerges, though certain themes can be sucked out of the text by dint of repetition and/or the weight he places on them at various moments.

Unfortunately these larger themes are undeveloped and ultimately, I think, flawed by Posner’s refusal to engage in real structural analysis. This refusal is illustrated by Posner’s repeated and persuasive contention that the regulatory apparatus in place, even after the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act in 1998, had the legal authority to prevent the crisis or at least ameliorate it. But, in addressing the critical structural question as to why the legal authority was never utilized, he

simply asserts with studied disinterest that the failure was “due to lack of foresight and knowledge” (p. 342). This is not an analysis, but rather an easily refuted offhand comment. What Posner needs is a real analysis of the political economic structures that prevented the application of existing regulations to the runaway speculation. This leads to the origins of these analytic failures: that Posner wants to find a self-contained analysis within the logic of classical micro-economics. His determination to utilize market logic as the core of his argument in every instance forces him to avoid the logic of even macro-economics, let alone political-economy.

This is perhaps best exemplified in Chapter Eleven, entitled “Reform You Can Believe In.” The chapter consists of ten proposals, beginning with those that Posner feels are most easily enacted (the first is “Establish an executive commission to study the causes of the crisis and suggest reforms”) and ending with most complex (the tenth is “Reorganize the regulatory structure”). In each instance, he discusses the economic practicality of concrete proposals and then evaluates their political chances, which is the only part of the book where political analysis is considered appropriate. In evaluating his ninth proposal, “Return to the Glass-Steagall Act,” (p. 353f) he offers several interesting pages of analysis about how the revived regulatory apparatus might work through market processes to protect against future bubbles and to channel investment into productive rather speculative investment. But, in analyzing its chances, he mentions that it “would be fiercely opposed” because it would entail the “break-up of such giants as Citigroup and Bank of America.” End of discussion.

In some sense, this summarizes my disappointment in the book. If the dynamics of “democratic capitalism” insures that the reinstationalization of Glass-Steagall would be “fiercely opposed,” then there is certain to be a political-economic component in all of the reforms “You Can Believe In”; and there must have been a political-economic component to the failure of legally authorized regulators to forestall or prevent the 2008 crisis; and there must be a political-economic component to all of the key dynamics that Posner wishes to understand.

In the end, *The Crisis of Capitalist Democracy* does not provide us with any overarching argument about the dynamics that underlay the 2008 crisis and/or the dynamics that will determine the future trajectory of the U.S. economy. His unwillingness to include any kind of macro/structural/political economy insures that he will dwell at the micro level, evaluating the details of government policy and corporate behavior without ever addressing the larger and far more relevant issues.

If you are looking for a detailed analysis of the micro-economic impact of many recent and current government policies and financial practices, this is a fine book. If you are looking for an analysis of the “crisis of capitalist democracy,” you need to look elsewhere.

The Matthew Effect: How Advantage Begets Further Advantage, by **Daniel Rigney**. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010. 165pp. \$24.50 cloth. ISBN: 9780231149488.

JOSEPH A. SOARES
Wake Forest University
soaresja@wfu.edu

At its best, this book on the “Matthew effect” is a pleasant reminder of how Robert K. Merton brilliantly contributed to our field theories of the middle range, in search of sociological mechanisms responsible for producing predictable outcomes. Indeed, the accompanying press release claims that the author “is the first to evaluate Merton’s theory of cumulative advantage extensively, considering both the conditions that uphold [it] . . . and the circumstances that cause it to fail.”

In conversationally clear but repetitive prose this book provides a general introduction and four topic chapters which attempt to summarize the literature relevant to the Matthew effect in science and technology, the economy, politics and public policy, and in education and culture. Daniel Rigney wraps up with a conclusion on implications and offers an appendix on new trends in economic inequality.

The introductory first chapter is most worth reading. He sketches an intellectual history of the concept that takes us through

Merton’s ideas on unintended consequences, opportunity structures, and social mechanisms. And he illustrates what the Matthew effect means with readily accessible examples drawn from the game of Monopoly as well as compound interest rates and debt. In Chapter Two, we learn that the Matthew effect is not as strong in science as supposed (p. 27ff), given the meritocratic and performances-based criteria of assessment in that field; yet early advantage continues to benefit men with what Margaret Rossiter calls the Matilda effect (p. 29). Chapter Three on the economy is a little thin. The author wanders from economics to include a discussion of media polls in politics (p. 45); and there is a long and out-of-place discussion of Myrdal (pp. 46–52). Chapter Four on politics is imbalanced, with four pages on incumbency, bandwagons, corruption and gerrymandering, and sixteen pages on racial and ethnic inequalities, health care and taxation. Chapter Five on education and culture is just ten pages long, and four of those are a gloss on Bourdieu. The large literature on how educational and cultural practices differentially impact blacks, women, and low-SES youths is hardly referenced. His citations include Kozol and Trow, but not DiMaggio or Lareau.

Perhaps Rigney is the first to write a book on the subject, and undergraduates may learn something from assigning a chapter, but I would advise against putting this on a graduate theory syllabus. At times, the book has a dated feel to it. As mentioned, it dwells at length on the “striking similarities” between “Merton’s Matthew effect and Myrdal’s circular causation” (p. 48). Among authors cited, only Merton has more entries in the index than Myrdal. Given the way the Matthew effect is supposed to work, one can understand how the analyses and the prose may become repetitive. There are more “feedback loops” in this text than in most breakfast bowls.

What is sorely missing, and was promised in the press release, is a nuanced discussion of the conditions when the Matthew effect works and when it does not. Rigney seems to see the effect as a probabilistic generalization that mostly holds true, except for when it does not. The idea that there may be systematic reasons for the effect’s failure falls

outside the text. I had hoped to read an analysis similar to Boris Groysberg's *Chasing Stars: The Myth of Talent and the Portability of Performance* (Princeton 2010). Groysberg looks at Wall Street firms and their attempts to identify and recruit rising-star financial analysts. Here we have a situation where bankers who perform brilliantly in financial markets are expensively recruited by rival firms who seem to subscribe to the potency of a Matthew effect. The recruiting firm is betting that stars will shine even more brightly in a new office than an old one. But most of the time they do not. Groysberg shows us that when financial stars change firms they become flare-outs—except when they take their entire team with them. The Matthew effect in investment banking worked best when stars stayed put or took along team players. One wonders if something similar is true of academics.

The Civic Foundations of Fascism in Europe: Italy, Spain, and Romania, 1870–1945, by **Dylan Riley**. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010. 258pp. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780801894275.

GIAN LUCA PODESTÀ
University of Parma, Italy
gianluca.podesta@unibocconi.it

Although it could be objected that his research compares political movements and countries that would appear to have little in common, this rather paradoxical book by Dylan Riley is both brilliant and courageous. His thesis rethinks the theory formulated on the basis of Alexis de Tocqueville's thoughts on nineteenth century United States, that there is a close link between the development of civil society, understood as the spreading of voluntary associations, and liberal democracy. While the French aristocrat insisted that civil society guarantees a country's liberty, by counterbalancing State power, other scholars writing on mass society (in particular Arendt, Lederer and Kornhauser) have used his thoughts to show that totalitarianism indeed owes its success to the absence or weakness of a vast network of movements and civil organizations mitigating State power. Of course Riley is aware that experts disagree on the

concept of fascism and on the nature of fascist regimes (or regimes that call themselves fascist), and of the possibility that this concept may be stretched to include very different situations. However, in the author's opinion, in order to compare and produce a reasonable interpretation in history and sociology, it is at least necessary to grasp the common essence of fascist regimes: Riley defines them as authoritarian democracies, which, though abolishing parliament, elections and civil rights, draw their legitimacy from widespread mass consensus and from the right, real or perceived as such, to ideally represent the nation and to interpret the authentic will of the people, who therefore abandon their political rights in the hands of the fascist élites, or rather in those of the charismatic leader, who guides that community of destiny representing the essential core of fascist ideology.

As Riley recalls, from the end of the nineteenth century until the First World War, voluntary associations multiplied all over Europe, especially among the rural population. But the development of civil society did not produce an effective liberal democracy in either Italy, Spain or Romania. The author, combining an original synthesis of Alexis de Tocqueville's liberal thought with the theory of cultural hegemony formulated by the Italian communist intellectual Antonio Gramsci in his *Quaderni dal Carcere* (Prison Notebooks), clearly explains that the spreading of societies, many of which (as in Italy, the Catholic and socialist ones) were opposed to the traditional ruling élites, generated a void of political representation into which fascism was able to insinuate itself, in order to achieve success. In Italy, after the fascists' conquest of power, the associations, which during the civil war had been violently repressed and whose adherents had been persecuted, were directly controlled by the Fascist National Party, which inserted them among its own social organizations, and used them as instruments of mobilization among the masses, with the aim of creating consensus for the regime. Riley claims that the fascist movements in the three countries are differentiated by the diverse trajectories followed by civil society in each one of them. According to the author, the rapid development and social mobilization of

various organizations in the absence of inter-class hegemony, paradoxically accelerated the birth of fascism, contradicting the idea that a vast mobilization of civil society must necessarily lead towards the development of a mature liberal democracy.

If the author's objective to demonstrate that the development of civil society does not necessarily counteract the advent of a fascist regime is fully achieved, what are the possible limitations and the less convincing aspects of his research? First we could point out that Tocqueville's thoughts on the relationship between civil society and the form of the State were always formulated with France in mind, and particularly the Ancien Régime's crisis and the Revolution. The French aristocrat's opinion, fed by France's history from 1789 to 1856, and laid down in *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, was that the absolute monarchy, by destroying the intermediate institutions and cancelling local liberties, had paved the way for the centralizing and authoritarian governments of the two Bonapartes. That is why Tocqueville was so sensitive to the role played by civil society in Anglo-Saxon countries as a counterbalance to State power. However, by applying Tocqueville's paradigm to very different countries, a kind of inevitable determinism could issue, although this does not seem to be Riley's case.

It is nevertheless risky to compare three countries that are very different from one another, as regards both their history and their social and economic development. In the same way, it seems today inappropriate to qualify Francisco Franco's regime as fascist, considering that the Falange played a definitely marginal role after José Antonio de Rivera's execution (a charismatic figure rather underestimated by the author). General Franco was certainly conservative and pro-clerical, similar in that to many other caudillos found in the history of Spain and Latin America, but not a fascist. In Spain there was no mass mobilization and nothing resembling the fascist totalitarian regimes' policies. Moreover, the sources used by the author are discontinuous and not all homogeneous, as in the case of Italian fascism: he never quotes from Benito Mussolini's *Opera Omnia* (Collected Works), an indispensable source for any scholar researching fascism.

The statistical data are sometimes fragmentary and their origin is not always clearly explained, nor the criteria used for their elaboration. The first part, especially that concerning Italy, is certainly the best organized and most interesting.

In fact, the most evident limits of Riley's albeit well-constructed research, are a product of the inevitable generalizations of his sociological approach, which cannot sufficiently explain the genesis of fascism, and must necessarily be integrated with more in-depth historical analysis. For example, no reference is made to the First World War, a crucial event without which the fascist regimes in Italy and Germany would never have emerged. The personal qualities and charisma of the individual fascist leaders are underestimated: putting Franco on the same level with a fine politician and charismatic leader such as Mussolini, and with a legendary figure such as Codreanu, who never even ruled his own country, would seem a little inappropriate. Nor are the major differences between the various political movements very well delineated, such as the question of anti-Semitism, which was at the core of the Iron Guard's ideology, but did not feature in Italian fascism until 1938. There is no mention of France, where, as Zeev Sternhell has shown, fascism was indeed strong and vital, and by 1934 it had almost overthrown the republican government. However, except for these remarks which would be interesting to discuss with the author, Riley's book highlights beyond any reasonable doubt the modern nature of fascist ideology, as well as its capacity to present itself to the masses in times of crisis as a plausible and more efficient alternative to liberal democracy.

Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu, edited by Karen Robson and Chris Sanders. Toronto, CAN: Springer, 2009. 227pp. \$189.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781402094491.

GAD YAIR

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
msyairg@huji.ac.il

Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu aims to provide examples and strategies for bridging social theory and methodology. Indeed, this is a timely project. As Karen Robson and Chris Sanders say at the outset, "The discourses of theory and methods are often rather disparate, with little communication between the two. There are 'theorists' and there are 'methodologists'" (p. 1). The editors decided to bridge the chasm while providing students with working problems to guide them when moving between theories and methods. In order to realize this worthy objective, the editors chose Pierre Bourdieu as a thematic axis of the book. They did so with good reason.

Pierre Bourdieu often grappled with methodological tools in order to make his theoretical premises fit; in doing so, he even applied innovative structural methods (e.g., correspondence analysis) to match his unique structural theory. Furthermore, Bourdieu often criticized regression techniques—which are great tools for some theoretical and practical problems—and he did so from a theoretical point of view (looking for similarities across people rather than separating them). In that sense, Bourdieu has provided a common framework for the fifteen chapters that follow the introduction. The 22 authors focused their chapters on the central theoretical concepts that Bourdieu advanced—Field, Social Topography, Cultural Capital, Reproduction and Habitus. In Bourdieu's work, indeed, these are interrelated ideas that necessitate a matching and coherent methodological toolkit, most often revolving around correspondence analysis and clustering techniques.

This coherent framework provided a valid setting for the varied empirical problems that the chapters tackled. Reading the book provides a good assessment for the state of the art in terms of the applicability of Bourdieu's theory across countries and empirical

settings. The chapters provide examples from France, Norway, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, Greece and Cyprus, Hungary and the United States. This selection provides a credible coverage, though the editors did not justify it theoretically (as would have been desired in a systematic comparative framework). The authors focus on different settings starting from the field of power, the stratification of lifestyles, and on to the conversion of capitals and the inter-generational transmission of cultural capital; other chapters focus on the influence of cultural capital on labor market outcomes, time use, and on the selectivity to elite frameworks; while the concluding chapters study the structure of stratification and social classes and their effects on cultural consumption. All the chapters tackle Bourdieu's major concepts mentioned above, and all provide unique methodological designs to assess their applicability in their respective settings. The chapters introduce unique datasets, and some even provide new measurement strategies that might be important for furthering the study of stratification and cultural capital across settings.

The overriding results—appreciated through the broad span of the studies—suggest that Bourdieu's theory is not applicable across settings; the aristocratic social structure that he persistently critiqued is, indeed, uniquely French. In that sense, the bridging examples between theory and methods that the editors collated—which are commendable in their own right—also provide some theoretical and empirical generalizations that are worthy of the reader's effort.

Other aspects of this collection, however, are less worthy. Few of the chapters would have been publishable in respected scientific journals. Most are very thin on theory, and only a few provide innovative conceptual tools. Most reviewers would have found the individual chapters wanting, and the editors did not verify that their agenda for the project was met at an acceptable level. The editors' introduction focuses on the popularity of Bourdieu rather than on their main agenda—namely the theory-methods nexus—and they do not tell the interested reader about prior books in that vein. Furthermore, the editors failed to ensure that grammar was checked and that proofs were error-free. The

publisher—Springer—was probably occupied with other projects, leaving this one without the guiding hand of a professional. The sloppiness of grammar and proofreading is consistent across the chapters (admittedly not in all of them). By that standard, the book is immature.

While these shortcomings might limit the popularity of the book (and the book's price will not offset this disadvantage), nevertheless, the editors' agenda is commendable and choosing Bourdieu was indeed productive. However, the editors should have sought more theoretical exegeses on this topic along the lines that Bourdieu himself would have taken. For example, Bourdieu would have argued that Anglo-Saxon methods focus on person-separation methods and issues, looking at reliability and using regression models, all in an attempt to predict individual behaviors. French methods, he would have argued, look for commonalities within groups while differentiating between them. This is why his class-based methodology focused on homology rather than on differences. Such expositions of the cultural bases of the theory-methods nexus would not only capitalize on Bourdieu's work, but it would actually go beyond it, showing its relevance across contexts and its relative merit within specific settings. *Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu* leaves the reader with a sense that there is more to be desired.

Multicultiphobia, by **Phil Ryan**. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press, 2010. 279 pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9781442610682.

LLOYD WONG
 University of Calgary
 lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

On the fifth of February, 2011, British Prime Minister David Cameron publicly criticized his own country's multiculturalism policy in a speech at a security conference in Munich. His criticism was reported in North America in popular media venues like Fox News TV and the New York Times. Not surprisingly, Fox News not only reported this event but editorialized their strong agreement. The Calgary Herald, a very conservative

newspaper in Canada, also editorialized on February twelfth that it was time for Canada to change the tune on official multiculturalism while also citing Prime Minister Cameron.

Thus Phil Ryan's book *Multicultiphobia* is an extremely timely book as multiculturalism continues to be assailed in Europe (such as the Netherlands, Italy, Germany and France) and highly criticized in the United States, Australia, and Canada. Increasingly, the attack on multiculturalism has come from politicians in these countries such as Prime Minister David Cameron, President Nicolas Sarkozy, and Chancellor Angela Merkel. *Multicultiphobia* is a well written and clearly organized book that critically examines the anti-multiculturalism position and discourse in Canada. Ryan basically argues, as a central thesis, that the critique of multiculturalism in Canada is not particularly well-reasoned nor is it precise. Rather, he suggests, the critique basically demonstrates a fear and anxiety of an ill-defined and vague phenomenon called "multiculturalism." Hence the title of the book in which he shortens the word multiculturalism to the stem "multiculti" and adds the suffix "phobia." Phil Ryan's choice of ophidiophobia (fear of snakes), as an example to illustrate in his introductory chapter that phobias are not necessarily irrational nor can be easily dismissed, is an interesting one given the demonization of snakes in many cultures. One wonders why Ryan did not select a more neutral example like agoraphobia or xenophobia.

The central thesis in *Multicultiphobia*, as mentioned above, is clear and significant. Readers will find a very cogent and systematic argument accompanied by strong evidence showing how the critique of multiculturalism in Canada is basically flawed. However, readers expecting a full defense of multiculturalism will be disappointed as Phil Ryan is true to his word: in the introduction he states that his work will not claim that multiculturalism is a wonderful thing and that there is nothing to fear from it. While he has some reservations about multiculturalism he is generally positive about the "multicultural temperament" in Canada and provides an analysis which is in the

spirit of reflective equilibrium (pp. 154–56). The methodologies utilized include policy analysis and also content and discourse analysis of older 1990s selected works which Ryan calls the “classics” that represent a corpus critical of multiculturalism in Canada, and selected print media articles in 1995 and 2006. These methodologies provide solid data to support his thesis. Overall the book includes an introduction, a division into four parts including twelve chapters, and ends with a personal conclusion. The introduction clarifies what multiculturalism is, and means, in Canada including multiculturalism as public philosophy (ideology and attribute), as sociological reality on the ground (social condition and practice), and as public government policy. The latter conceptualizes multiculturalism as a form of corporate pluralism. Ultimately near the end of the introduction, Ryan concedes that essentially there is ambiguity of the term “multiculturalism” in Canada and states that what is really important is what we want multiculturalism to mean and to make for us in the future (p. 18).

Part One examines the major critiques of multiculturalism in the 1990s in Canada. The first chapter provides a synopsis of the classics of multiculphobia and includes works of sociologist Reginald Bibby, novelist Neil Bissoondath, journalist Richard Gwyn, and historian Jack Granatstein. In Chapter Two Ryan thoroughly critiques the classics and challenges the claim that there is no debate on multiculturalism because of political correctness. Especially insightful in this chapter are Ryan’s meticulous and well-made counterpoints to the arguments made in the classics and particularly to historian Granatstein. Unfortunately, the section in this chapter on the evolution of multicultural policy in Canada woefully misses the important and perceptive analysis of sociologists Augie Fleras, Jean Elliott and Jean Kunz in the early 2000s. The final two chapters in Part One, Chapters Three and Four, zero in on the debates on multiculturalism in the parliament of Canada in 1994–95 and print media coverage of multiculturalism in selected sources in 1995.

Part Two examines multiculturalism in the post 9/11 era where Ryan argues that the 1990s classics continue to shape anti-

multiculturalism discourse today. Chapter Five briefly shows how some critics of multiculturalism simultaneously intersect it with immigration and issues of public securitization. Chapters Six and Seven in Part Two are a decade fast-forward parallel of Chapters Three and Four in Part One. Ryan shows how, in terms of public government policy, there is an ambiguous triumph of multiculturalism in 2005–6, as a conservative government in Canada embraces it for politically expedient purposes, while the anti-multiculturalism discourse prevails over pro-multiculturalism in selected print media in 2006 and continues unabated. For Chapters Four and Seven the content and discourse analysis is systematic and detailed and includes articles from *Le Devoir*, *Globe and Mail*, *Alberta Report*, *Vancouver Sun*, *Calgary Sun*, and *National Post* newspapers.

Part Three, entitled “What Do We Need To Talk About?” is the philosophical and sociological mainstay for the book where readers will find Ryan’s appraisal of multiculturalism vis-à-vis relativism and societal needs and the evidence for ethnic minorities and immigrants’ identification and integration to Canada. He ends Part Three with a challenge to the critics of multiculturalism. Essentially Part Three continues his critique of the classics and provides evidenced-based research on multiculturalism, the welfare state and social cohesion. Interestingly, Ryan notes that some research suggests residential concentration, as a result of multiculturalism, may actually ease the process of integration for ethnic minorities which, on first impression, seems counter-intuitive. Also in this section he comes up with an instructive metaphor of a muscle to explain identification and integration under multiculturalism. Nevertheless, Ryan’s analysis here is measured. For example in Chapter Ten, entitled “How Are We Doing?” he answers “I am not sure we really know” (p. 181).

Part Four of the book has only two brief chapters. Chapter Twelve provides an update of multiculphobic discourse in 2009 to show that it is unlikely to cease in the near future. More interestingly, for those readers more interested in policy analysis, lineage and evolution, there is a perceptive sub-section entitled “The Kenney Factor.”

Again, the timeliness of this book in Canada must be noted. At the time of the writing of this review, in early March 2011, Jason Kenney, the current Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism is embroiled in a national political controversy over allegations that he has recently misused the resources of the federal government to raise funds from immigrant and ethnic communities for his party to fight a looming election. The evidence from this issue supports Ryan's tentative hypothesis that the Conservative Party of Canada has ambiguously adopted multiculturalism for political expedience and the courting of ethnic votes. What is revealing in Ryan's analysis of the Kenney Factor is the detailing of the influence of the anti-multiculturalism arguments on Jason Kenney since he entered federal politics in 1999. The final chapter, entitled "A Personal Conclusion," shows that this is not your typical academic and discipline bound book. In this chapter Ryan provides some personal thoughts and then some prescriptions of what multiculturalism might and should look like in the future.

This book provides superb reading material for students, both undergraduate and graduate, and scholars interested in Canadian multiculturalism. It complements and adds to the existing academic literature on multiculturalism discourses in Canada such as the many articles in found in two relatively recent special issues of the journal *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, one entitled "Multicultural Futures? Challenges and Solutions" (2006: 38, no. 3) and the other entitled "Multiculturalism Discourses in Canada" (2008: 40, no. 1). On another level, *Multiculturalism* is written relatively free of academic discipline-based jargon and therefore is accessible to wider audiences interested in either the general and current debates about multiculturalism in Canada or the specific lineage of anti-multiculturalism discourse in Canada since the 1990s.

Aspects of Violence: A Critical Theory, by **Willem Schinkel**. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 254pp. \$85.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780230577190.

CURTIS JACKSON-JACOBS

Champaign, IL

jjacobsc@hotmail.com

Willem Schinkel's *Aspects of Violence: A Critical Theory* presents a phenomenological perspective on violence. To be clear from the start, this is not a "phenomenology" of violence in the same sense as Jack Katz's (1988). Though its firmest philosophical roots begin with Husserl's phenomenology, *Aspects of Violence* does not quite fit into what Randall Collins (1994) described as the phenomenological, "micro-interactionist tradition" in sociology, as exemplified by Garfinkel and—more pertinently—by Katz and by Collins himself. Garfinkel, Katz, and (to a lesser degree) Collins trace their lineage through one of Husserl's most influential students, Alfred Schutz, who developed the idea of "social phenomenology" – the study of social objects as they are experienced, felt, and understood in their being and doing.

Schinkel follows the path of another of Husserl's famously influential students, Martin Heidegger, for whom phenomenology referred to the ultimate "essence of things" – independent of their social meanings. Thus, Schinkel critiques Collins (2008) for studying the situations in which violence arises, and Katz for studying the *meaning and experience* of actually doing violence instead of studying violence "itself." These things, he argues, lie beyond violence itself, beyond its essence.

The problem Schinkel himself tackles is ontological: an explication of the essence of violence, its fundamental and universal being, stripped of the actors' experiences, independent of human definitions and meanings of violence. Here the text is at its most forbidding, relying heavily on Heidegger's concept of *Dasein*—usually translated along the lines of "being-ness." Thus denuded, some sociologists may wonder, what is there left to say about violence?

Violence, Schinkel claims, is traditionally defined in purely negative terms. However,

it must also always have a positive, constructive component. Here he foreshadows an important point: Violence accomplishes productive ends, rather than enacting purely destructive impulses, as sociologists often presume. In doing violence, one “reduces” an object (whether human, inanimate, or symbolic). One negates some “aspects” (in Wittgenstein’s sense) of its being. Any act toward any object requires that one recognize and attend to some aspects of being, while ignoring, or reducing, others. Thus, all action (or inaction) is violence. Schinkel asserts that “violence is an aspect of all (human) being and (inter)acting” (p. 50). Indeed, his definition appears to extend beyond the reduction of humans, past living creatures, even past physical objects in the world—it includes what is often called “symbolic violence” against mental entities.

If this definition sounds unreasonably broad, it may be because it is. However, it would be unwise to dismiss this version of violence too quickly. For Schinkel (and anyone else outlining “the ontology of ____”), the purpose is to begin by highlighting what is absolutely universal. Once established, then variations on the universals may be noted, and more substantive theories may be built upon this foundation. Consider a more familiar example of ontology-as-social theory: In Herbert Blumer’s symbolic interactionism, there is no human act that does not involve interpretation and a definition of the situation. The job of the empirical researcher is to investigate variations on interpretations and definitions in order to provide an adequate description of any phenomenon.

Sociologists are likely to find most value in the chapter titled “The Will to Violence” (originally a *Theoretical Criminology* article, and the book’s apparent inspiration). Here Schinkel makes a strong case against many of the prevailing causal explanations of violence in social science, institutional contexts, and contemporary culture. Like others before him (e.g., Collins and Katz), Schinkel rightly points out that it is a mistake to assume that the important causes exist only in the distant past, as is common within quantitative research on “background factors.” Rather, he argues, the social scientist must acknowledge that at least part of the

causality — more in some cases than in others—exists *within* the violence itself. And it is here that social scientists may be able to make the connection between Schinkel’s unusual approach to violence and more traditional approaches. Following the logic of Hume’s and Mill’s view of causation, there is a more or less continuous sequence of reasons-for-being across moments and acts, culminating in the present. Thus, there are an indefinite number of *whys* for violence. Importantly, which *why* one asks (and which ones one does not ask) are fateful acts in shaping the images of violence presented to the reader.

Schinkel emphasizes one *why* in particular, pointing to a premise too often overlooked in all manner of discourse on violence. To one degree or another, violence is intrinsically rewarding as it is performed. A major contribution of the volume is to introduce the concept of *autotelic violence*: violence as an end in itself, for its own sake. It is neither a micro- nor macro-sociology specific concept, and it should be taken seriously by all sociologists of violence, though the micro version has received the most attention: Lonnie Athens argued that a “successful performance” is a necessary condition for becoming a violent actor; Katz detailed a series of violent actions done, at least in part, for their intrinsic, aesthetic rewards; and, Collins (2008: 274–5) writes of “fighting as action and fun,” in which “members fought for the sake of fighting rather than...winning.” Schinkel makes a deeper point, more or less explicitly, at different points: Any means of conflict (any action) is necessarily chosen from an indefinite range of alternatives, and the appeal of any choice is worthy of investigation.

Naturally, there is considerably more complexity to Schinkel’s argument. By his definition, I have done it considerable violence in reducing those aspects. While it does not appear to be aimed at an audience of students or practical criminologists, it will be of great interest to those concerned with the philosophy of violence—an indistinct genre best exemplified by Hannah Arendt, drawing on a *mélange* of philosophical influences, such as Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and Nietzsche). Schinkel provides original and important contributions and critiques that deserve

attention, at least within the philosophically- and interactionally-oriented domains of violence research.

References

- Collins, Randall. 1994. *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2008. *Violence: A Micro-Sociological Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Katz, Jack. 1988. *Seductions of Crime*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Plenitude: The New Economics of True Wealth, by **Juliet B. Schor**. New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2010. 258pp. \$25.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781594202544.

RACHEL SCHURMAN
 University of Wisconsin, Madison
 schurman@umn.edu

Juliet Schor is extraordinarily good at identifying new social and economic trends and addressing them in out-of-the-box ways. In *Plenitude: The New Economics of True Wealth*, Schor explores the economic and ecological future of the planet, offering a prescient analysis of where the planet is headed if the world remains on its “business as usual” (BAU) course and a hopeful appraisal of the kind of world we *could* create if we were to change our relationship to “the market” and make ecologically conscious decisions about how we inhabit the earth. Her book is a clarion call to abandon our self-destructive consumption practices and to create a new economy that values, nurtures and produces a very different sort of wealth. That new wealth — plenitude — involves living lives that are richer in time and social relationships and less dependent on the formal market economy and the continual acquisition (and disposal) of material goods.

Schor’s notion of plenitude is based on four basic principles: *a new allocation of time*, in which people spend less time working for money and have more time to do other things; *self-provisioning*, that is, making, growing and doing things for oneself; *true materialism*, or an environmentally-aware approach to consumption; and a restoration of our social ties, which have been

attenuated by the domination of the cash nexus. Together, these principles can be summed up as: “work and spend less, create and connect more.” As one can intuit, and as Schor readily admits, this book is aimed at a specific audience: the “haves” of the world, whose high levels of material consumption account for the bulk of the world’s resource use. At the top of this list are U.S. citizens.

Plenitude has numerous strengths to recommend it, and will be of use in courses on consumption, political economy, and the sociology of the environment. Unlike most economists, Schor writes in a highly accessible manner and is a master at expressing economic ideas, concepts, and theories in a way non-economists can understand. She also does an excellent job of explaining how economists *think* and the assumptions that undergird their analyses. In Chapter Three, for example, Schor not only dissects the logic of mainstream economics and its perspective on resource scarcity (“don’t worry, be happy!”) but also critically evaluates the thinking of ecological economists, arguing that even this more forward-looking group makes faulty assumptions about how improvements in energy efficiency and “internalizing externalities” can solve problems of environmental deterioration. Based on evidence from the United States and Britain, Schor points to the “rebound effect,” which leads people to consume more when energy costs fall thanks to greater energy efficiency. She concludes that the only real solution is to reduce economic growth. This courageous message flies in the face of contemporary thinking and marks her as a true visionary.

Another strength of Schor’s book lies in her analysis of consumer capitalism. Her discussions of capitalism as a perpetual growth machine and her identification of the “materiality paradox” both stand as critical correctives to the view that capitalist societies are on the road to becoming green and sustainable. (The “materiality paradox” refers to the fact that as goods become more valued by “comfortable” consumers for their symbolic meanings rather than their use values, people are driven to consume more rather than less of them.) Indeed, reading Chapter Two, “From Consumer Boom to Ecological Bust,” will leave natural worriers sleepless.

Yet, in a conscious attempt to motivate her readers not to become despondent but to imagine and enact an alternative economy, Chapter Four presents a multitude of ideas about how people could live, and *are already living*, differently. Schor reveals how more people are becoming do-it-yourselfers with their extra time (due to job loss or a purposeful withdrawal from the market economy), sharing their know-how, and finding ways to consume creatively, by trading or sharing goods, growing and preparing their own food, employing home-based manufacturing technologies. The point is we need to change how we think about what "the good life" means and how we define wealth. Reading about these alternatives does not allow one to wallow in a doomsday mentality, although Schor should have acknowledged the countercultural movement roots of many of these downshifters and their explicit critiques of capitalism and modernity. By depoliticizing these movements and their ideas, Schor offers a purposefully sanitized (but more palatable to the mainstream) view of who these pioneers are and how we can save ourselves from capitalism.

In bringing together a sensitivity to human subjectivity and the importance of symbolic meanings with a political-economic perspective (e.g., in the "materiality paradox"), Schor presents an important contribution to the sociology of consumption literature. To date, most of this literature is characterized by one type of myopia or another. The camp that emphasizes the importance of subjectivity and agency for understanding people's consumption practices is theoretically sophisticated with regards to branding and identity-making, yet tends to lack an analysis of capitalist dynamics as well as a critical politics. The political economy literature has the opposite blind spot: while it focuses on changes in capitalism and the growth of a global consumer economy (replete with implications for workers, the environment, and local communities), it tends to ignore how ordinary people have become willing agents of hyper-consumption. Schor draws our attention to both phenomena, even though her book is thin (from a sociologist's perspective) on theorizing the formation of consumer consciousness, be it mainstream or alternative. Indeed, *Plenitude's* strength is not that it theorizes

consumer subjectivity in a new way (as she has done in *The Overspent American*), but in its recognition of how symbolic consumption in the context of falling consumer prices has created a profoundly unsustainable global political economy.

In my view, Schor's book represents an invitation and an invocation. It invites us to explore various aspects of consumption in theoretically rich ways and to ask interesting sociological questions that her work raises but does not try to answer. It invokes us to confront the social, environmental and spiritual destructiveness of our current economic system before it is too late.

Reference

Schor, Juliet B. 1999. *The Overspent American: Why We Want What We Don't Need*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.

Fighting for the Future of Food: Activists Versus Agribusiness in the Struggle Over Biotechnology, by **Rachel Schurman** and **William A. Munro**. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. 262pp. \$22.50 paper. ISBN: 9780816647620.

LAWRENCE BUSCH
Michigan State University
Lbusch@msu.edu

Early in my own career, I started to study issues surrounding agricultural biotechnologies. At the time I thought that this would be a project of three to five years duration. But now, 30 years later, the debates continue. Rachel Schurman and William Munro have done an extraordinary job of chronicling the complex turns of events, as well as the dramatically different settings in which debates over GMOs have taken place in Europe, the United States, and Africa. Moreover, they have provided a fascinating and detailed account of why activists largely succeeded in Europe, where mad cow and foot-and-mouth disease put food issues at the center of everyday politics, while they were far less successful in the United States, where no such crises occurred. In contrast to both these cases, African governments, made fragile by decades of structural

adjustment and often dependent on European markets for agricultural exports, have been hesitant to adopt GM crops for fear of making a bad situation even worse. In short, the authors show that the successes and failures of the activists and agribusinesses were the result of (1) their enthusiasm for their cause, (2) their varying ability to organize support and to resonate with diverse publics, (3) the widely divergent situations in which they found themselves, and (4) exogenous events over which they had little or no control.

Yet, this said, and despite attempts by the authors to treat both activists and agribusinesses fairly, the volume suffers to some degree from a lack of symmetry. In addition to mobilizing supporters, activist organizations—despite allegations to the contrary—are necessarily concerned with their bottom lines. They must constantly raise funds to keep their organizations afloat. Indeed, many observers have noted how fear of losing members and funding makes it difficult for activists to compromise. Similarly, at least some of the agribusinesses discussed in this volume, especially Monsanto, have taken on the job of “saving the world.” Indeed, the authors cite an “August 2008 editorial in the pro-biotechnology journal *Nature Biotechnology* [noting that] the claim that transgenic technologies offer the most promising means of healing, feeding, and fueling the world is ‘an outrageous act of faith bordering on the religious’” (p. 182). In short, while large corporations and activist organizations are different, especially with respect to their means of funding, the differences between them are far less than might be thought at first glance.

The authors also borrow the term “lifeworld” from the phenomenology of Schutz and Husserl to describe the different taken-for-granted worlds in which activists and agribusinesses find themselves. They note that “[t]he significance of a lifeworld for understanding social action is that it generates, and naturalizes, certain broad visions of the world, as well as interpretations of specific phenomena. These, in turn, predispose people to particular types of behavior” (p. xvii). But phenomenologists have been quick to add that the “natural attitude” can always be overcome by a “philosophical attitude.” In other words, lifeworlds are not fixed and unalterable. Even those who share a given lifeworld may

disagree on strategy and tactics to achieve a given end. Hence, over the years I have attended many biotechnology conferences where executives in other “life science” companies privately groused that they found Monsanto’s approach to be clumsy and wrong-headed. And, most anti-biotech activists were appalled by the acts of arson committed by members of the Earth Liberation Front.

Finally, although the entire GMO debate was and remains intimately linked to science—to genetics and genomics, but also to conventional plant breeding and agroecology—it is unfortunate that the volume says little about the science. STS scholars have been arguing for many years that science is politics by other means. As the authors point out, there were and are scientists on all sides of the GMO debate. The claims they made have been a central part of the messages of both supporters and detractors of the new technologies. The Environmental Protection Agency hearings after the Starlink fiasco are a case in point: scientists on the committee argued that the data provided by Aventis simply failed to answer the key regulatory questions. In a different vein, the authors note the rapacious attack on John Losey, a young biologist who innocently published an article in *Nature* (“Transgenic pollen harms monarch larvae,” *Nature* 399: 214, 1999) noting that Bt maize killed monarch butterflies. But it was one case among many. For example, George Monbiot, writing in *The Guardian* (May 14, 2002, p. 15), provided evidence that the harsh criticism of the work of microbial ecologist Ignacio Chapela was the result of a disinformation campaign orchestrated by a public relations firm—what might be called “unsound science”—including some apparently fictitious biotech supporters, and likely instigated by Monsanto. More recently, a group of entomologists wrote an open letter to the USDA complaining of their inability to conduct environmental research on GMOs. In short, if the activists occasionally made overblown claims about the risks of biotechnologies, supporters of the new technologies have made at least as many overblown positive claims and have worked hard to keep doubting scientists at arm’s length.

In sum, this volume provides an excellent account of many of the complex twists and

turns of the GMO debates in the United States, Europe, and Africa over the last thirty years. But the story it tells needs to be supplemented by inquiries into the corporate activism present at Monsanto and elsewhere, as well as a fine-grained analysis of the twists and turns of the science involved.

Challenging Neoliberalism in Latin America, by **Eduardo Silva**. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 318pp. \$27.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521705721.

SARAH BABB
Boston College
Sarah.babb@bc.edu

A scant decade ago, Latin America seemed to have arrived at the end of history. Across the continent, state interventions in national economies had been dismantled—trade barriers lifted, public enterprises privatized, regulations and subsidies removed. Social groups that had once succeeded in insulating themselves from market forces, such as labor unions, were too weakened by the mighty tides of economic globalization to resist. This move to a liberal economic arrangement coincided with a widespread transition from authoritarian political arrangements to formally democratic ones. Free-market democracy seemed to have arrived to stay.

And then suddenly history came roaring back to life. In country after country, movements rose up in popular protest and used democratic means to overthrow neoliberal governments and bring to power leaders, such as Venezuela's Hugo Chávez and Bolivia's Evo Morales, who implemented ambitious programs of reform. Liberal democracy, Eduardo Silva suggests, is not nearly as democratic as its neoliberal proponents make it out to be. Democratically elected governments can exclude subaltern groups, renege on their promises for reform, and repress popular mobilization through such means as imposing martial law. But liberal democracy also may, under some circumstances, provide popular groups with the tools to carry out campaigns of resistance and reform. In this respect, *Challenging Neoliberalism in Latin America* seems to echo the observations of T.H. Marshall, who explored the ways in

which civil and then political citizenship paved the way for social citizenship and the social democratic welfare state.

However, the central message of this book is not about democracy, but rather about markets. Silva argues that Latin America's reformist tide is best interpreted as a Polanyian reaction to commodification—a demand by subaltern groups and their allies for protection from corrosive market forces. Polanyi paid scant attention to the conditions under which reactions to "market society" could triumph, but Silva is interested precisely in why they appear in some cases but not in others. To this end, he compares four countries that rode the crest of anti-neoliberal popular mobilization (Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela) with two that appeared to buck the trend (Chile and Peru).

There are five key points in Silva's comparative and historical argument. First, movements against market society appeared in countries where states were utterly failing to respond to the demands of subaltern groups—a condition Silva argues that was present in all his cases but Chile (which at the time was engaged in a program of social democratic reform in the wake of the end of the Pinochet dictatorship). Second, anti-neoliberal coalitions flourished where liberal democracy afforded "associational space," a condition that was absent in Peru under the authoritarian Fujimori regime. Third, the power of these coalitions was enhanced where economies were dogged by crises and intractable problems of unemployment and marginalization. Organized industrial labor, though diminished, successfully allied with new types of social movement groups—such as neighborhood associations, public sector unions, and indigenous organizations—to deploy new tactics, such as disrupting transportation through roadblocks. Fourth, movements succeeded where they were able to build cross-class coalitions for reform, and failed where armed conflict prevented such coalitions from forming—most obviously in Peru, but also periodically in Venezuela, which was plagued by the persistent threat of military coups after 1992. Fifth and finally, anti-neoliberal movements were successful where they were able to frame their demands in ways that brought

diverse interests groups together under a common purpose.

This book is among the first scholarly monographs to tackle the monumental task of deciphering the underlying meaning of Latin America's dramatic turn to the left at the beginning of the twenty-first century. There will undoubtedly be other books and alternative interpretations. For sociologists, however, Silva's book may be the most useful of the lot. Silva is one of a number of political scientists who are leavening their work with theories from sociology and anthropology, which gives his book interdisciplinary appeal. Some sociological readers may thirst for denser and more explicit connections to literatures in historical sociology, social movements, and social theory, but the connections are clearly there to be made. Another winning feature is Silva's unabashedly normative stance. He is clearly a critic of neoliberalism, and although the details of the six historical narratives may be difficult for some readers to comprehend, the central thrust of the moral argument—that unfettered markets are socially harmful and generate resistance—will come through loud and clear. Consequently, this book may be useful in undergraduate classes. Even those who are unconvinced by Silva's analysis will find much to discuss here.

Refiguring Mass Communication: A History, by Peter Simonson. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010. 261pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780252077050.

MARIAN ADOLF

Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen
 marian.adolf@zeppelin-university.de

Peter Simonson describes his study as a "kind of contextually focused, communicative history of ideas about mass communication" (p. 7). Crossing disciplinary boundaries and structured along five biographical sketches, Simonson delves into the rich cultural, political and scientific history of mass communication. His treatment goes to show that, as is often the case with such large, historical concepts, it is the respective phenomenological focus, the particular methodological approach and the inevitable, inherent

normative framing that shape one's research. As such, the study offers a much-valued insight into the cultural sensibility of seemingly straightforward (scientific) terms and might be read as a biography of mass communication itself. The author retroactively applies the concept to various modern and pre-modern occurrences and observations—in an act of immense enlargement of the term itself. By doing so, Simonson wants his five essays to contribute to a "third way of communication study" (p. 7), between social scientific and critical culturalist approaches.

The first essay focuses on David Sarnoff, who was the public face of the Radio Corporation of America (RCA) in the early days of American broadcasting. Simonson tells the story of how "mass communication" was coined as a new, original term amidst the fight over the airwaves and rhetorical efforts to create a new public institution on the basis of personal, political and corporate interest (p. 12f). Selling radio as a powerful one-way means of propaganda to those so inclined and as a democratic all-to-all medium to others, Simonson hints towards the crucial rhetorical underpinnings of the then, new mass communication technology.

This is where the author starts a journey to a much broader understanding of mass communication. Having divided its various semantic dimensions into his own tempo-spatial matrix, his definitional work results in "five species" of mass communication (pp. 24–25). Especially for the communication scholar this is an eyebrow-raiser, but the reader who chooses to stay on board is in for a highly informative ride.

Simonson ventures back in time to look for alternative meanings of mass communication. He happens upon the Catholic religious service—Mass—and thus to one of its early theorists, the first Christian theologian, Paul of Tarsus. Paul's version of mass communication laid a theological foundation for the Christian faith and managed to unite a dispersed, inhomogeneous following of what was to become a world religion. Here, the Body of Christ serves as "the medium of the masses [...] a medium through which the mass of believers were put in communication with one another, across lines, in collective religious affirmation grounded in the sharing of the bread" (p. 51).

We are then taken to rural Long Island, the birthplace of Walt Whitman, "poet of the crowd" (p. 59), the flâneur of young New York whom Simonson sees embodying his own kind of mass communication. Whitman's journalistic work and artistic oeuvre—most importantly *Leaves of Grass*—are discussed as a polytheistic, democratic and libertarian vision of someone who loved "the crowd"—hoi polloi that others feared and distrusted. Simonson relates the life and times of Whitman, sympathetically casting him as a hands-on, working-class person with an artistic sensibility, a healthy love of God and his fellow man, and a commoner-gone-poet who observes the urban world around him with a quasi-sociological gaze.

Next in line is Charles H. Cooley who is, according to Simonson, not only the first scholar to develop a social theory of communication, but also the most neglected theorist of this tradition. Again, Simonson delivers a compact and sympathetic biographical account that helps the reader understand where Cooley "writes from" and how he came to put forward his own notion of communication as the Great Life, "a kind of mass communication writ large, a communicative totality of cultural and moral striving that encompassed and was born through the individual and the collective efforts of humanity past, present, and future" (p. 116). Cooley's is a progressive if frail faith in a greater order and the totality (the mass) of people, that makes up the backdrop of all human activity, sometimes revealing itself, if we can summon up the sensibility to behold it.

The great Robert K. Merton is up next. Apart from being one of the pioneers of the familiar understanding of mass communication—especially in his collaborations with Lazarsfeld—Merton's unpublished work also hints at other, "nonparadigmatic species" of mass communication (p. 154). Among Simonson's examples is a study of letters calling for Dwight Eisenhower to run for president in 1948, an instance of mass communication as communication **from** the masses; and another manuscript resulting from a study in urban sociology that focuses on the communion of black and white women at the laundry facilities in housing projects.

The book ends with an ethnographic and personal piece on the county fair that Simonson reads as another instance of mass communication, as a rural ekklesia, a "ritual of democratic mass communication" (p. 165), a place where communication is once again embodied and immediate in all its many-faceted manifestations while still pointing beyond mere presence to a unity of a democratic people.

Simonson develops his argument by expanding existing concepts, enlarging the understanding of theory and providing a distinctive methodical setting (pp. 24–28, 181f). First, in order to work with his sample of protagonists of such mass communication, he needs also to expand the idea of the theorist/theory "to include all manners of reflective interpretation-cum-representation of communicative phenomena" (p. 183). Second, representing the various strands of mass communication developed in opposition to the dominant understanding, Simonson chooses individual representatives, who play "multiple historiographical roles—as thread ends, agents, representative figures, models and conversationalists, among others" (p. 25). As such they provide entry points to particular, historically and socially situated and representative discourses of their time and social setting. Third, these individuals are then observed as to their media of invention, which means any typical practice through which they interfere with or take part in discourse: "bodies, workplaces, oral performances, modes of physical movement, reading, conversational relationships, and technologies of literacy, among other enabling-and-constricting media" (p. 185).

This book is a very interesting—sometimes rather unusual—approach to the questions of social and communication theory. Unorthodox in approach and method, it provides a rich picture of mass communication across the ages, across people and subject(ivities), communicative modes and conceptualizations of a medium. Simonson manages to stir the routinized gaze of the theorist of communication. Hardly a chapter goes by in which the author does not manage to evoke wrinkles on the reader's forehead, contradiction or silent nods. If for no other reason, this book is recommendable to those interested in rich biographical sketches of some of the

most fascinating proponents of early social science.

Seeking Spatial Justice, by **Edward W. Soja**. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. 256pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780816666683.

J.S. ONÉSIMO SANDOVAL
 Saint Louis University
 jsandov3@slu.edu

As I read *Seeking Spatial Justice*, I was reminded of a famous quote from Karl Marx, "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it." Edward Soja reminds the reader that spatial justice is not only a philosophical concept to be debated in classrooms, city halls, and state houses, but also is an outcome that should be pursued actively to change the contradictions in quality-of-life outcomes for individuals who live in different geographies of the city.

Soja builds his theory on the basic premise of urban struggles for contested space. To study these urban struggles, he argues that social scientists need to move away from the traditional academic analytical lenses (i.e., history and sociology). He encourages social scientists to adopt a spatial consciousness that will make them aware of the social hierarchy of the city that is spatially organized. Soja argues that social scientists need to step back and critically challenge the way they have been trained to study the city. If we are to understand the nature of the city, we must make ourselves aware of the outcomes of spatial injustice and the processes that augment an economic, political, and social environment, which are used to maintain the unjust geographies of the city.

Soja suggests that one method to achieve a spatial consciousness is to have an ontological reorganization. Our understanding of the city is fundamentally biased toward the social and historical narratives of how humans experience happiness and misery in the city. Soja argues that this bias toward the social and historical dimensions of knowledge downplays an equally important dimension of our knowledge, which is space. According to Soja, "we are spatial beings from birth," and through

our life, we are embedded in social and economic processes, where we actively participate in creating, shaping, and transforming the spaces we use. We are shaped by our geographies that surround us and we are continuously shaping the geographies around us. According to Soja, recognizing this third dimension of knowledge will provide new avenues of describing spatial justice, but more importantly this knowledge will empower people to change unjust geographies.

Soja's concept of spatial justice is as difficult to define as is beauty. Refusing to give a "cookbook definition" of spatial justice, he leaves us to use our social and historical imaginations, especially for those individuals who have not developed a spatial consciousness, to ponder the principal characteristics of spatial justice. My impression is that there are four characteristics associated with Soja's spatial justice concept.

The first characteristic of spatial justice is spatial consciousness. How we imagine the city and the geographies that make up the city depends, in large part, on our ontological understanding of human life in the city. Space in the city is not neutral. Where you live has a tremendous impact on your values, norms, and life expectancy. We are social actors engaged in writing a collective history of justification of how geographies of exclusion and geographies of privilege were created.

The second characteristic of spatial justice is the ability to change geographies. Soja is correct to say that we are spatial beings, however the geographies we use and shape may be a direct function of the weighted influence of racial discrimination, sexism, and xenophobia. As the U.S. Census releases the 2010 numbers for each state, lobbyists, politicians, and community activists are getting ready to fight for space. Literally overnight, millions of Americans will have to adapt to the new political spaces of representation based on the new geography of political power. How these new political boundaries are drawn will empower groups of individuals and disenfranchise other groups of individuals. Gerrymandering is one example presented by Soja of how changing geographies have meaningful and life-altering impacts.

The third characteristic of spatial justice is participatory democracy. In an effort to

defend or justify his theory, Soja introduces several case studies that illustrate how important participatory democracy is to spatial justice. Spatial inequalities do not change by themselves. People need to fight for the contested spaces. He also suggests that the image of the neutral and objective armchair scholar who writes about the city needs to change. Scholars need to be in the forefront of the seeking spatial justice movement and use their research capacity to create more opportunities for participatory democracy in their research (i.e., action research). Scholars need to marshal social and economic resources to support progressive movements to change geographies that produce destructive quality-of-life outcomes.

The fourth characteristic of spatial justice is sustainability. Soja makes clear that seeking spatial justice must be viewed with a holistic long-term goal to unite the different forces of participatory democracy if they want to change the social production of unjust geographies. Soja argues that the success of any spatial justice movement will depend on its ability to create coalitions with different movements across different geographic scales.

With the rapid urbanization of the populations across the world, *Seeking Spatial Justice* is a timely book that reminds us that space matters. Some of us who live in privileged spaces have the luxury to debate the ideas of spatial justice. However, for the great many of people who live in the unjust geographies of the city, spatial justice is a matter of life and death.

Culture and the Middle Classes, by **Simon Stewart**. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2010. 193pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754675334.

HSIN-HUANG MICHAEL HSIAO
Academia Sinica, Taiwan
 michael@gate.sinica.edu.tw

A careful search of recently published books on Western middle classes reveals two different themes and related tones. One is the historical discovery of the emergence of the middle class in Europe and America from the late eighteenth century, and the other is the current depiction of today's middle

classes in the West. The historical search is charged by optimism and assurance when exploring the birth and growth of the first generation of such a new class, while the current portrayal is colored by pessimism and skepticism as witness to the falling and decline of this class after more than 200 years of its existence.

The purpose of this new book by Simon Stewart is a rather moderate one. Though Stewart does intend to look for the historical origins as well as to sketch the current situations of the English middle classes, he is more keen to characterize the middle classes in different distinguishable types in terms of culture and taste. Also, the author dismisses Beck's decline-of-class argument and Gunn and Bell's middle class-in-decline narrative by asserting that the middle class could still be able to retain the distinction and dominance over other lower classes and maintain their class position as a prestigious and favorably positioned social group. The middle classes, as repeatedly argued by the author, do not constitute a cohesive and homogeneous middle class; instead, they are forming diverse and dominant social groups able to deploy, store, and defend large volumes of various forms of capital, keeping their strong position vis-à-vis others.

In the first three chapters, the author cited abundant and sometimes excessively detailed related research literature to portray the historic rise and its relevant institutional context, salient cultural features, and lifestyles of the middle classes in Britain since their heyday in the 1870s to the early 1990s. Many readers will find the synthesized materials a useful and instructive aid toward familiarity with current theorizing on the middle class.

Following Raymond Williams' definition of culture as "a whole way of life" and Pierre Bourdieu's notion of "taste," in Chapters Four and Five, the author then proceeds to present the findings of his primary research of middle-class "cultural practices and taste" in Horsham, West Sussex in the heart of the English home-counties. In fact, the materials and analysis in those two chapters are the centerpiece of the whole book, which is really focused on the characterization of middle-class culture in today's British class structure. The cultural profiling of his 100 respondents,

who were an audience of theatregoers, is interesting and not difficult to appreciate. The "silver disposition" is the term used in the two chapters by the author to describe the Horsham middle-class cultural practice and taste for plays, concerts, music, books, and food. They are middle-aged, affluent, and still preoccupied with that which is established and conventional. Their taste for culture does not exactly qualify as highbrow, nor can it be classified as only middlebrow. Rather their cultural practices are a mixture of the classics and the popular or light—the avant-garde is not their cup of tea.

The cultural practices of the middle-class Englishmen under analysis swing between highbrow and middlebrow, yet the Horsham residents are anxious and fearful about the eventual loss of countryside due to vast urban developments. From the description provided by the author, Horsham middle-class cultural life is not novelty or excitement seeking; they are "more likely to participate in cultural practices that are embedded in the legitimate and a sense of institutionalized prestige that has accrued over time" (p. 135). Finally, by practicing certain cultural activities, they are conscious about distinguishing themselves from those pursuing popular culture such as watching television and eating fast food.

Protest is also a cultural practice of the middle-class tradition of radicalism, as previously illustrated by Gunn and Bell. In this book, the author coins another term of "new middle class passions" to champion and protect country life, including hunting for sport as a collective expression of their "defensive formation." In Chapter Six, the final chapter, such middle-class protests in which defensive formations are articulated and enacted by them are viewed by the author as another means of distinguishing their prestigious position from those beneath them. The rural is presented by the protest movement as a seat of virtue, a source of middle-class moral construct. An English middle-class valuation indeed.

Having carefully read the whole book, a serious reviewer would have the impression that it is a collection of six separate essays rather than a coherent book with six integrated chapters. As already pointed out earlier, this book heavily cited much existing

literature to substantiate the author's claims on English middle-class cultural practices. As a consequence, the original empirical data and their analysis tends to be too light and sometimes falls short of sophistication and articulation. Nevertheless, from a comparative perspective, this book does present a useful insight into the growing analysis of middle-class culture in the non-Western context, such as Asia.

Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change, edited by **Julia Sudbury** and **Margo Okazawa-Rey**. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2009. 237pp. \$32.95 paper. ISBN: 9781594516092.

DAYO F. GORE

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
dfgore@wost.umass.edu

As I sit down to write this review, major protests are intensifying at the University of Puerto Rico, where students and faculty continue to resist increasing fees and shrinking programs in the face of threats and police violence. Although garnering little attention in the U.S. media cycle, these protests stand as a stark reminder that in the current climate, universities do not provide a safe escape from, but are deeply enmeshed in and shaped by, broader political and economic currents. The provocative and engaging anthology *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change*, edited by Julia Sudbury and Margo Okazawa-Rey, uses this framing of the university as deeply imbricated with local and global politics as a starting point to examine the possibilities and complications of doing activist scholarship.

In the introduction, Sudbury and Okazawa-Rey situate their collection within a political context that has seen North American universities emerge as crucial sites of inclusion and diversity with the development of women and gender and ethnic studies departments, as well as sites of social inequality complicit with state violence and a neoliberal agenda of privatization and global capital. The tensions, questions, risks, and rewards that arise for activist scholars seeking to negotiate such seemingly

contradictory tendencies are addressed in their collection of eleven essays that are divided into four parts: Revealing Complicities, Generating Insurgencies; Emancipatory Methodologies; Teaching as Radical Praxis; and Living with Contradictions. These essays center the voice of mostly tenured or tenure-track academics who have long been committed to “the production of knowledge and pedagogical practices through active engagement with, and in the service of progressive social movements” (p. 3).

Part I starts with a bang as Julia Sudbury’s opening chapter “Challenging Penal Dependency” and Andy Smith’s essay “Native Studies and Critical Pedagogy,” set the tone for the entire collection. Sudbury reveals “the social relations of knowledge production” that make academia a contradictory site for prison abolitionist work and uncovers the complicity between the university and the prison. Andy Smith provides a trenchant critique of native studies scholarship that emphasizes a politics of representation both in terms of native bodies and epistemologies. Arguing that such scholarship and politics often bring diversity into the academy, while leaving intact colonizing structures of the academic industrial complex (referred to in the collection as the educational industrial complex or EIC), both essays present a sharp analysis of the limitations of the academy as an activist space—such as institutional efforts to co-opt scholarship and the experiences of people of color to support research agendas and a narrow model of multiculturalism—while mapping potential strategies for resisting these institutional forces and engendering radical transformation. This emerges as a key framing in many of the chapters, where the authors detail limitations but still convey their energetic investment and belief in the transformative power of community activism and critical analysis.

The essays in Part II illustrate how such activism and analysis can produce real victories and critical insights. In particular, Mieko Yoshihama’s chapter on the success of an action research project in addressing domestic violence in Japan during the 1990s demonstrates that the right circumstances and connections can produce profound changes in social practices and government policies. In Chapter Five, “Solidarity Work in

Transnational Feminisms,” Linda Carty and Monisha Das Gupta outline the struggles involved in making such circumstances and connections possible. They explore the tensions around resources and solidarity that plague many North-South transnational feminist conferences and organizing efforts. The authors detail these pitfalls to argue for a transnational feminist politics more attuned to class politics in the North and “the transnational dimensions of activism in seemingly localized spaces” (p. 101).

The remainder of the collection builds on many of the critical insights and tensions outlined in the early chapters by examining how activist scholarship is translated and tested within the classroom as well as everyday academic life. In Part III, “The Power and Limits of Teaching Transnational Politics and Histories,” is evocatively discussed in Piya Chatterjee’s “Transforming Pedagogies,” as the author struggles to develop a transnational pedagogical model as a South Asian scholar teaching in a racially diverse U.S. university and a research-activist organizing with women workers in a tea plantation classroom in North Bengal, India. Another essay in Part III by Glenn Omatsu outlines his efforts as a longtime union organizer and grassroots activist to use anticolonial pedagogical methods to politicize an increasingly popular pedagogical model aimed at connecting the classroom with local communities.

In Part IV, the collection comes full circle as the final two chapters recount the editors’ personal experiences negotiating and coming to terms with the contradictions that emerge for them as activist scholars of color with shifting positions of privilege and marginalization within the academy and broader communities. Michael Hames-García writes on the “Three Dilemmas of a Queer Activist-Scholar of Color” and Margo Okazawa-Rey discusses her “Solidarity with Palestinian Women” as a Japanese African American feminist.

Although some of the chapters in the book are stronger than others, *Activist Scholarship* is a readable and informative collection that blends theory, organizing experiences, and personal narratives. It also sustains common themes, including the relationship between the global and the local, challenging an emphasis in colleges and universities of

working on communities not with communities, and theorizing activism that draws connections and builds solidarity across boundaries of difference, across a broad range of scholarship and activism. In the end the collection fulfills its goal of providing a detailed discussion that makes activist scholarship “visible” as a “viable mode of intellectual inquiry and pedagogical praxis” (p. 3). Indeed, the theoretical clarity and mixture of personal experiences and scholarly research makes the collection ideal for courses in feminist and queer theory, women and gender studies, and the study of social movements.

Globalization and Families: Accelerated Systemic Social Change, by **Bahira Sherif Trask**. New York, NY: Springer, 2010. 220pp. \$129.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780387882840.

GILI S. DRORI
 Stanford University
 drori@stanford.edu

The universality of “family” conceals the many forms which families take (nuclear and extended, monogamous or polygamous), the many social roles assigned to this social institution (procreation, economic production, socialization), and the many meanings poured into it (emotional comfort, tribal bonding, repression and social control). Bahira Sherif Trask’s book, in considering the family within the context of globalization, nicely addresses the multiple facets of this ubiquitous social institution. And she adds the analytic prism of gender to analyze thoughtfully and thoroughly the relationship between globalization and families.

Not to flatten complexity and conflate concepts, Trask layers the discussions of globalization, families, and gender. Seeing the theoretical and empirical intricacy of each of these notions, Trask takes care with the reification of social categories: universal concepts, from family to childhood to work, are scrutinized as hegemonic constructs which often constrain agency and voice. Indeed, the book begins with Part I, devoting this first third of the book to definitions and theories of globalization (Chapter One), families (Chapter Two), and gender (Chapter Three).

Part II examines in detail the linkages between globalization and particular topics from the list of issues that are core to the sub-discipline of sociology of the family. Each of the chapters follows a similar “funnel” logic: it starts with a review of globalization and the particular topic, then proceeds to offer a gendered perspective on globalization and the topic, then delves into analysis of implications of the globalization topic link for families. For example, Chapter Four is devoted to the issue of migration, reviewing current patterns of global migration, the impact of such migration patterns on social arrangements, the gendered nature of global migration, and the role of families in global migration and the impact of global migration on families. In a similar fashion, Chapter Five concerns matters of work, starting with a general review of “work” and of global labor trends, then proceeds to review the feminization of the labor force, and concludes with an analysis of work/life (im)balance and intra-household uneven attention to care work. Subsequent chapters, analyzing childhood (Chapter Six) and aging (Chapter Seven), follow a similar rhetorical-cum-analytic style. In each such chapter, Trask analyzes economic, political and cultural dimensions: economic analyses refer to remittances and labor force structure, political analyses refer to regulation and the public space, and cultural analyses to attitudes and identity. These chapters are rich with tales from different countries and world regions, with ample data offered in review of cross-national and historical patterns.

To broaden the scope even further, Part III adds a consideration of mechanisms and trajectories of globalization and families. In the three chapters included in this part, Trask considers the role of the state, policy, and social action. Here, she delves into the concomitant effects of twentieth century globalization—itsself entangled with capitalism, growing inequalities, and decolonialism—on the welfare state and, mediated by a complex array of global governance, on women and families. Here Trask completes the framing of her book: she concludes with insights about the role of the modern state, itself challenged by globalization, for families, women and social inequality, therefore

reaching back to her opening arguments, drawing from Bourdieu's work, that domestic life and private life are not insulated from their wider social sphere. In this way, Trask's analytic tone throughout this book joins a chorus of sociological work that combines scholarship with public agenda.

Throughout these discussions and analyses, Trask's primary considerations are of gender, power and inequality, with notions of hierarchy, conflict, exclusion, and boundaries dominating her discussions. The main arguments are that "both globalization and families are each distinctly politicized phenomena" and that "a gendered analysis of globalization reveals that this phenomenon has implications for the construction of femininities and masculinities on a global level and that the process of globalization is itself a gendered one" (pp. vii and viii, respectively). Note her use of the plural form for most terms, befitting her commitment to problematize hegemonic or static social constructs. The book's goal is, however, a humble one: to link the otherwise separate discourses and scholarships of globalization and of families. Trask convincingly argues for such a link and for the importance of a holistic approach to both bodies of work.

Despite the obvious import of this work to any academic discussion of globalization, Trask's work here is, in most respects, traditionally sociological. She is emphasizing core matters for the sub-discipline of sociology of the family by highlighting the issues of life course, childhood and aging, inequality and gender. Yet, in intersecting families with globalization, Trask wrestles with the nature of contemporary and global social change. While much-needed attention is given to matters of rights and the market, this book nevertheless does not engage with other issues that are core to the traditional sociology of the family. For example, there is no consideration of family rituals, either formal (marriage, custody) or informal (life course celebrations, kinship rituals); similarly, sex and reproduction are considered only in a short and underdeveloped manner. Most importantly, the treatment of male roles (as men, fathers, and husbands) and of masculinity, while promised equal weight, is unfulfilling and suggestive. Otherwise, this is a thorough and organized

book, which engages discussions of family and gender with the scholarship and research on the most profound and powerful of social processes, namely globalization.

Theorizing Identities and Social Action, edited by **Margaret Wetherell**. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 269pp. \$100.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780230580886.

Identity in the 21st Century, edited by **Margaret Wetherell**. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 261pp. \$95.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780230580879.

JOHN P. HEWITT
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
hewitt@soc.umass.edu

Identity is a challenging topic. Theorizing about identity, and even occasionally studying it *in vivo*, has preoccupied American sociologists and social psychologists, particularly those identifying as symbolic interactionists. Real or imagined changes in the nature and stability of identity across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been for decades a staple of American sociology, history, and social criticism. Notwithstanding the thrall in which it has held many scholars, identity can be an elusive topic. Studying identity in action — which is to say, seeing the connections between what people do and how they locate themselves and are in turn located by others — is difficult. Interviews and surveys can get people's identities "formulated, sprawling on a pin," Prufrock-like, but when they are "pinned and wriggling on the wall" and doused in the theoretical preservative *du jour*, they are quickly drained of color and life. To examine how people constructed and located themselves generations ago, we must study their fossil remains in advice manuals, biographies, and letters — useful, but subject to multiple layers of inference. And there is yet another problem: Unlike Humpty Dumpty, who assured Alice that his words meant just what he chose them to mean, a multitude of cacophonous disciplinary voices vie to define identity, whose meaning must be reiterated constantly and is always challenged. 'Tis brillig, indeed.

Each of the two volumes under review contains twelve chapters reporting on a set of research projects funded by the British Economic and Social Research Council. These projects grappled seriously and often successfully with the challenges of studying that complex, fluid, often constrained and sometimes unpredictable "coincidence of placements and announcements" (to invoke Gregory Stone's classic definition) that constitutes identity. Margaret Wetherell's *Theorizing Identities and Social Action* deploys diverse theories and methods to "...examine the ways in which individuals are assembled, defined and positioned and how identities authorise, anticipate, and guide social action" (p.1). The research settings in which theoretical issues are explored range across the transition to motherhood, teaching, participatory theater, the resolution of neighbor disputes, citizen action in London, the definition of civic space in Belfast, and identity and language in Wales, to name a few. Researchers employed interviews, experimental theater, conversation analysis, case studies, focus groups, and other approaches. They drew theoretical inspiration from a variety of traditions, with predictably heavy input from several of the usual suspects, including Pierre Bordieu, Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Stuart Hall, and (for the conversation analysis contingent) Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff. Wetherell's *Identity in the 21st Century* focuses on the perennial question of change in the sources and means of constructing identities, examining "...how people locate themselves now, how they make sense of their biographies and trajectories, and tell their stories" (p. 1). Researchers examined social class, ethnicity, and popular culture in a variety of settings, including a national social survey, a Welsh town that had lost its industrial base, school choices in a middle-class community, a young men's prison, young people's drinking practices, and reality television. Observation rather than theory is the main focus in this volume, but Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens find themselves frequently invoked, and several of the chapters grapple with their theories of individualization in contemporary life.

The news about these volumes is both good and not so good. American sociologists

interested in identity will learn a great deal about how their peers in the United Kingdom think about identity, a fair amount about how identity is constructed, performed, transformed, and managed across the pond, and not a little about contemporary British society itself. They will learn more in some chapters than in others: the four studies reported in Part I, "Class and Community" of the *21st Century* volume are particularly informative, in part because they make a serious effort to hold the Beck and Giddens individualization theories up to the light of evidence. And most engaging in the *Theorizing Identities* volume were the two studies that focus on Northern Ireland — intergroup contact in one, the definition of public space in the other. Wetherell's introductions to each of the volumes were helpful in drawing these disparate research topics, theories, and methods together and clarifying their connections. And kudos to the project as a whole for making the identity-action linkage central to analysis. Identity is an important concept precisely because it is intimately connected to what people do.

On the other hand, the books occasionally irritate. Although Erving Goffman merits a few citations, for the most part the authors seem almost blithely unaware of the contributions of symbolic interactionists in the United States to the study of identity. This is less of a problem for American readers, who will recognize the gaps and omissions, than for contributors to these volumes, who would have benefitted from that literature. There are more things in the study of identity, dear researchers, than are dreamt of in Judith Butler's philosophy and encapsulated in the term "performativity." The studies that employed conversation analysis were not persuasive of their value. Apart from demonstrating that identity can, indeed, be observed in the twists and turns of everyday conversation, it is unclear what is gained by that level of analysis. And in a few instances theoretical perspectives distracted and obscured rather than focused and clarified, especially when authors felt bound to lay down theoretical markers before getting to the point. The best of the contributions avoid that occupational hazard of graduate students. And finally (and perhaps related to the previous complaint), a number of the

contributions seem to have been intent on shattering the myth that British scholars know how to write with clarity and grace. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, American students of identity will find these books interesting and informative, but not indispensable.

Asian Cross-Border Marriage Migration: Demographic Patterns and Social Issues, edited by **Wen-Shan Yang** and **Melody Chia-Wen Lu**. Amsterdam, NE: Amsterdam University Press, 2010. 257pp. \$49.50 cloth. ISBN: 9789089640543.

FELICITY SCHAEFFER-GRABIEL
University of California, Santa Cruz
 fsg@ucsc.edu

The recent anthology, *Asian Cross-Border Marriage Migration*, tackles a broad comparative study of marriage migration across Southeast and East Asian countries. Since most recent studies on cross-border marriage migration rely on qualitative accounts of actors on the ground, this collection of essays edited by Wen-Shan Yang and Melody Chia-Wen Lu provides the demographic patterns of cross-border movements. Marriage migration has grown rapidly since the 1990s, when mostly women, but also male migrants, moved to Thailand, Japan, and South Korea from China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, and even Pakistan. Many of the authors situate these marriage migrations within the context of gendered labor migration, a trend that brings people into intimate contact. At the same time, several authors carefully distinguish cross-border marriages from labor migration as a strategy for long-term residency or eventual citizenship in the host country.

As a whole, the articles successfully avoid reproducing popular scrutiny of foreign marriages as part of the trafficking trade, especially pertinent since some Asian states respond positively, and even financially support cross-national marriages as part of their solution to declining fertility rates and gender imbalances in particular regions, leading to a shortage of eligible wives and reproductive labor (p. 17). That said, several articles construct their arguments against the state's

anxious monitoring of cross-border marriages, especially those that cross racial or cultural divides (except for American or European marriage migrants). In fact, the preoccupation of state governance, while not addressed head-on, is evident in the very sources used by several authors whose research into fertility, marriage, and divorce rates is possible only because specific states collect detailed records of the intimate lives of their citizens or those who marry their citizens. This methodological conundrum is not formally analyzed in the book, except that the authors draw upon state data to argue against the popular perception that cross-border marriage migrants are more fertile (Chapter Five), use more social resources, or result in higher divorce rates than local marriages (Chapter Six).

The deconstruction and re-purposing of state data provides the book with a strong methodological grounding and thesis: state scrutiny of these marriages proves misguided. Some authors use this official data to reverse the logic of state scrutiny, and to suggest ways states can better support these marriages: by lifting immigration restrictions, loosening strict guidelines for language use and cultural assimilation, and channeling more funds toward language acquisition and spouses' cultural transitions during the first year or so. Given the book's methodological bridging of qualitative and quantitative data, this strongly-researched and organized book presents a balanced perspective on marriages across uneven economic and sometimes racial divides that honors the agential contours of individual desires while also accounting for the structural constraints that confine how individuals make decisions. Given the emphasis on demography, the editors position the "hard data" more prominently and with more authority over the qualitative section titled "Social Issues" at the end of the book. This proves to be a false separation, as the quantitative data relies on qualitative data to put the numbers into a human framework. The essays on "Social Issues" bridge ethnography and/or interviews with demographic accounts in order to bolster the scope and quality of each methodological claim—there should have been more discussion of these productive methodological tensions.

While some anthologies lack a cohesive focus, this book is striking in its editorial vision, including the careful way each chapter builds on and expands the scope and argument of the others. For example, Chapter Three relies on the Japanese census to compare Japanese foreign marriage divorce rates and then contextualizes these data within the global context of feminized labor migration and immigration restrictions against low-skilled immigrants. High divorce rates for spouses from the Philippines, Thailand, and China, and then lower rates for those from Korea, Brazil and Peru provide some clues to explain why migrants marry Japanese citizens. Many Japanese of Brazilian and Peruvian descent are permitted to work long-term in Japan, while other groups face more restrictions and thus are dependent on marriage for longer-term labor and residency. In Chapter Four, we see a very different response by the Taiwanese state anxious to boost its population's fertility. In 2005, the Ministry of Interior (MOI) set up a "Foreign Spouse Care and Counseling Fund" to pay for medical care, community services, legal aid, and counseling services for the swelling number of mainland Chinese and "foreign" (mostly Vietnamese) brides. At the same time, the state's preoccupation with "foreign" brides comes through in popular media, and in the state's careful documentation of the birth rates and living conditions of these migrants. Aware of the popular and state stance that assumes foreign brides reproduce at a faster rate than others, the authors use sociological data on race and fertility rates with African Americans in the United States to show this has not proven to be true in the United States or in Taiwan.

The book displays many vexing interpretations of these marriages. Chapter topics span a range of understudied aspects of cross-national marriages, including: interviews with migrants about their level of acculturation into Taiwan (Chapter Nine); an inquiry into the consequence of state immigration restrictions and childbirth statistics in relation to divorce rates (Chapter Six); and the importance of religion in raising Muslim children for Pakistani immigrant men who marry women from Japan (Chapter Ten). The book also shifts the focus from market-brokered marriages to marriages

brokered by friend and family networks. A few chapters broach the issue of how these scattered migration trends create social networks, but clearly there is a need for more research in this area.

The last section of the book addresses the question: what makes a marriage successful? This critical inquiry orients the book to seek alternative solutions for how states can facilitate, rather than curtail, these marriages. For poor women who marry up, women are satisfied if their husbands treat them well, if they fulfill their role as dutiful daughters who remit money to family members left behind, and if they have autonomy over their bodies, such as the choice of when they want to have sex with their husbands. Some chapters also suggest that those states with more restrictive immigration policies may find higher incidences of marriage procured for a visa, residency card, or citizenship than out of the desire for a long-term marriage. Thus, grounded accounts underscoring what women are accustomed to and what they hope for in a foreign marriage help to shed light on the uneven duration and fulfillment of cross-border marriages.

Society Without God: What the Least Religious Nations Can Tell Us about Contentment, by **Phil Zuckerman**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2008. 227pp. \$40.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780814797143.

DARREN E. SHERKAT
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Sherkat@siu.edu

Religion and spirituality have been touted by pundits and scholars as universal solutions to questions about meaning and purpose in human life. Much contemporary scholarship argues that without the meaning and purpose provided by religion, people will be discontented with the materiality and transitory nature of life. In *Society Without God*, Phil Zuckerman adeptly shatters this myth by focusing on the existential awareness and mental well-being of secular people in two of the least religious nations of the world, Denmark and Sweden. For Swedes and Danes, religion is viewed with skepticism, and while many still claim

a nominal cultural identification with Christianity, very few adhere to the beliefs of that tradition. Despite their lack of religiosity, Scandinavians are quite happy and content, even in the face of tragedy and death.

Zuckerman conducted nearly 150 in-depth interviews, mostly with secular people from various walks of life in a year-long research project in Scandinavia. Zuckerman's ethnographic skills are keen, and his subjects speak in their own voices about topics like the meaning and purpose of life, and how their secular worldview provides solace in the face of death and disability. It is a powerful work, and Zuckerman did not shy away from hard questions as he probed how secular people cope with the death of loved ones, chronic illness, and impending death.

While Zuckerman's analyses of secular meaning-making in Scandinavia are important and enlightening, the implied comparisons to the United States are often hyperbolic, and frequently deviate from the key thesis of the book. This work tells us mostly about the secular majority in Scandinavia, and comparisons to the United States cannot be investigated with these ethnographic data. Indeed, it seems quite likely that Zuckerman's findings about meaning and contentment among Scandinavians would also ring true for the 20 percent of Americans who reject religious beliefs and identifications. The tangential comparative discussions are made more annoying by the fact that Zuckerman does not adequately situate his investigation in the literature on religion and well-being. Zuckerman does not directly address the claims made by scholars who seem to prescribe religion for health and well-being, and this prevents him from being able to demonstrate how and why religion has no bearing for positive functioning among secular people in Scandinavia (or in the United States, for that matter). Instead, Zuckerman appeals to macro-level indicators of social dysfunction in the United States and social harmony in Scandinavia, which is far afield from the crux of a study on individual-level contentment with life.

Researchers in the United States have typically found that most of the positive influences of religion are produced by social support generated in religious organizations. Zuckerman could have focused on how the secular social institutions facilitate community and

connections in Scandinavia. Zuckerman brings these into play in a few places, but they tend to appear wistfully in the interview data. In the United States, we lack truly "social" capital—and instead have collective capital tied mostly to specific religious groups—which exclude non-members from their benefits. In Scandinavia, it seems as if alternative social institutions provide genuine social capital, inclusive of sectarian commitment.

Another shortcoming in *Society Without God* is the unsystematic presentation of quantitative data on religiosity across nations. Zuckerman quotes many statistics, but almost never references data sources or seriously engages the implications of the quantitative distribution of religious identifications, participation, and beliefs. This further undermines the credibility of his macro-comparative statements, since the book lacks a concrete foundation for making the comparisons. Sweden and Denmark are not societies without gods. Not only do large fractions of the population maintain nominal religious identifications, sizeable pluralities are genuinely committed to religious beliefs and organizations. Zuckerman acknowledges this continued presence of the committed religious, and he even provides interviews with some true believers—but this is done mostly to identify them as aberrations. Further, with the growth of the free churches over the last several decades along with immigration from more religious nations, it is likely that committed religious people make up about the same proportion of the Scandinavian populations as secular people do in the United States.

Despite these drawbacks, *Society Without God* is a well-written and engaging book, and should attract a varied audience. Undergraduates will be able to read it with ease. The ethnographic quality and synthesis justifies attention from methodologists, as Zuckerman did a fabulous job of structuring the presentation of volumes of data in a succinct yet thorough manner. Sociologists of religion will find this a high priority book on secularism. *Society Without God* will also be popular with an educated public seeking to understand secularism and the moral culture of Scandinavia, and by reflection their difference from the United States.