

Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews

<http://csx.sagepub.com/>

Katrina's Imprint: Race and Vulnerability in America

Lynn Weber

Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews 2011 40: 762

DOI: 10.1177/0094306111425016aaa

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://csx.sagepub.com/content/40/6/762>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



American Sociological Association

Additional services and information for *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://csx.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://csx.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Nov 1, 2011

[What is This?](#)

REVIEWS

Gender Inequalities, Households and the Production of Well-Being in Modern Europe, edited by **Tindara Addabbo, Marie-Pierre Arrizabalaga, Cristina Borderías** and **Alastair Owens**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 318pp. \$124.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754679684.

CLAUDIA GEIST
University of Utah
Claudia.geist@soc.utah.edu

Gender inequality remains both a pressing social issue and a fruitful area of social science research. This edited volume seeks to examine gender inequality and the production of well-being in Europe from an interdisciplinary perspective that is perhaps more feminist economics than sociology. The chapters draw on historical and contemporary European examples and offer a somewhat different take (both theoretically and methodologically) on what is usually found in American sociology journals.

This book takes a broader view on gender inequalities and the production of well-being, with the "capability approach" serving as the theoretical connection between the chapters. The chapters reemphasize that social reproduction is more complex than the production of goods. The various authors also call for and (in the empirical chapters) take into account the socio-political and economic context.

An entire chapter is dedicated to the introduction of the capability approach (Chapter Two). But the description of the theory remains lacking amidst numerous references that point the reader towards clarification elsewhere. The authors posit that well-being is an important outcome, and that the production of well-being itself needs to be included in the study of gender inequality (Chapter One), while also demanding that women are not just another vulnerable group (Chapter Four). Chapter Three further challenges conventional notions about the evolution of the "modern family" in the wake of the industrialization process, and argues

that the fragility of families is not a novel concept. These theoretical chapters call for a more multidimensional assessment of gender inequality, and remind readers of the importance of the concept and production of well-being.

The topics covered in the two empirical parts of the book are very diverse in terms of subject, methodology, and historical time period. The first empirical section "Gender Care and Work" is held together by the challenge to the idea of women as passive victims and in need of assistance. Chapter Five demonstrates widows' relative economic independence in urban Sweden and Finland from 1890 to 1910, and Chapter Six shows the centrality of female relatives in caring for extended family members in times of crisis. Chapter Seven reaffirms the idea that intergenerational support is not one-sided, and those often thought of as needing care due to older age are also givers of care and other forms of support. The findings from the chapters emphasize the importance of non-monetary transfers outside the market system. The theme of caregiving is readdressed in later chapters which illustrate how home caregiving in Belgium is situated between the public/market divide (Chapter Nine) and the problems of combining market work with caregiving, especially for those in the "sandwich generation" (Chapter Ten). In a seeming departure from studies in the capability approach tradition, Chapter Eight is a more typical time-use study that examines the gender asymmetry in unpaid labor in Italy. The results are not novel as women are found to do more unpaid work, especially in couples with children.

The second empirical part of the book focuses on the intra-household allocation of resources. Three of the five chapters in this section center primarily on the nineteenth century, examining consumption patterns in Spain (Chapter 11), gender differences in children's schooling in Switzerland (Chapter 12), and the differences in the treatment of and opportunities for celibate men and women in the Pyrenees (Chapter 13). These chapters illustrate gender differences, but not in

every case can the available data explicitly illustrate the different treatment of men and women in the same family. The final two chapters of the volume focus on income, assessed household income in Italy in Chapter 14 and men's and women's post-separation income in Denmark, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom in Chapter 15.

The volume fits with the literature on the social context of gender and gender inequality, broadly defined. Many of the chapters address women's social position and struggles more so than addressing gender inequality explicitly. The book is very well-intentioned but sometimes falls short of its self-stated goals.

The volume does not clarify how some aspects of the capability approach can be conceptualized empirically, and it is difficult to take away a clear idea of how to incorporate well-being and the production of well-being into the study of gender inequality. Chapter Four calls for not treating women as a unified vulnerable group, but the diversity of women's experiences is reflected in the other chapters in only a minor way. The historical examples provide a rich picture of women's social position in various European countries, but insights from the chapters are not always easily connected to women's realities in contemporary Europe. The theoretical stance of the book may challenge how to assess inequality, but it does not challenge traditional notions of families and gender; women are almost exclusively seen as mothers, family is mostly conceptualized as centered on married or cohabiting heterosexual parents, discussions about the struggles and resilience of single mothers notwithstanding.

The book makes a strong theoretical argument for broadening the scope when assessing gender inequality. This book is not able to provide a complete overview of gender inequality and the production of well-being in contemporary Europe—but probably no single volume can do so. Readers do however get a brief introduction to the capability approach with a specific focus on gender inequality; and the European case studies, especially those rich in historical detail, make the volume or individual chapters relevant for comparative scholars and potentially useful reading material for advanced undergraduate or graduate classes.

The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State, by **Lee Ann Banaszak**. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 247pp. \$26.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521132862.

CYNTHIA FUCHS EPSTEIN
 Graduate Center, CUNY
 cepstein@gc.cuny.edu

This book is a wonderful antidote to the widely disseminated and accepted platitudes these days that second wave feminists did not work on behalf of working-class women or women of color and that they did little to transform society. Lee Ann Banaszak, a political scientist, has done a masterful job of searching the archives, and interviewing a sample of the second wave feminists who worked within the federal bureaucracy—a place not generally viewed as likely to harbor radical idealists. Far from seeing them as “merely” working to make things better for middle-class white women, Banaszak shows how they did, in fact, work to shake up the system in an attempt to produce workplace equality for all women, to give them rights over their bodies, to win them access to good employment, and to change cultural views of women.

“Intersectionality”—which has been advanced as a recent vision—was indeed part of the agenda (without the label, of course) of feminists inside government who collaborated with activists outside government to achieve gender equity in the workplace at all levels. As Banaszak learned and reported in this solid, well researched account of the early days of the second wave women's movement, feminists within government and those outside collaborated extensively in efforts to improve the position of women workers in America.

Of course, the historical job is not complete nor could it be. The feminist work of the period was conducted face-to-face in living rooms and offices after hours, in exchanges over the telephone, without a paper trail or email chronicling the events of the day. My own files harbor (and I should find a better home for them) purple-inked “ditto” machine copies of the testimony I gave before the EEOC in their 1968 hearings to establish guidelines for the implementation of Title

VII of the Civil Rights Act. These hearings focused on sex segregated employment want-ads in newspapers and the impact of sex stereotyping in closing opportunities to women workers. Spurred by women working within the EEOC who were frustrated by the commission's inattention to the "sex" clause in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Betty Friedan, the first President of the National Organization for Women (NOW) and the author of *The Feminine Mystique*, arranged for my testimony. I suspect there are many such personal archives hidden away. Further, though I was a witness to some of the events chronicled in this book, I really did not know the extent of the activities of feminists within the government who reached out to women's movement activists to change an organizational climate in which women's issues—those affecting all women, not just middle-class women—were subordinated to issues of interest to men.

Thus Banaszak's book shows how government workers, working from within to forge a feminist agenda, were a "subversive force." Although a number of them were lawyers, they came from varied backgrounds. Prominent among the individuals whose work Banaszak describes was Aileen Hernandez, an African American (married to an Hispanic man) who worked in the EEOC at the time the Civil Rights Act was passed, but who quit her job in frustration at the agency's initial internal resistance to be concerned with sex-based injustice. Hernandez went on to become a founding member of the National Organization for Women and was its second President. While not many women of color were working in government at the time (prejudice was as powerful there as in the private sector), there were African American and Hispanic women holding posts in the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor who were strong supporters of the issues raised by the woman's movement, such as passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

Banaszak reveals how women government workers saw themselves as subverting status quo policies and they were devoted to changing the social structure. One of the pivotal cases was that of *Weeks v. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company* (1973) where government lawyers worked behind the

scenes after hours to prepare briefs for the case, knowing the litigation could fundamentally restructure state institutions, alter the nature of women's rights, and change the mission of the EEOC. As a direct consequence, the EEOC went after the behemoth AT&T, The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, the largest employer in the United States outside of the federal government—charging it with systematic discrimination against women and minorities. Banaszak writes that EEOC's argument was molded to present a "really revolutionary view of sex discrimination. . . the whole sociology and psychology of sexual stereotypes as it was inculcated into the Bell System structure." AT&T's settlement with the EEOC became the largest award in a discrimination suit to date; 13,000 women received back pay awards and more than twice as many were given raises. It also opened up tracks to advancement. With this momentum, in 1973 a transformed EEOC investigated General Electric, General Motors, Ford, and Sears and Roebuck and filed charges of discrimination against these employers. Note that the jobs concerned were mainly "working-class" jobs!

Far from supporting the status quo, "insider feminists" also participated in the litigation of the first cases to invalidate state "protective legislation" which impeded women from getting many higher paying jobs and supervisory roles.

What is perhaps surprising in Banaszak's account is the self-image these women had of themselves. They were not merely working within the system but became agitators when necessary. Mary Eastwood's story is a case in point. A lawyer for the Department of Justice, and one of the founding members of NOW, she was forbidden to participate in demonstrations by her supervisor when her picture appeared in *The Washington Post* (December 14, 1967). Not deterred, she bought a wig and continued to protest in public demonstrations against policies that discriminated against women and blacks.

The government feminists Banaszak describes continued to work on basic issues of gender equality in spheres of government outside their own agencies, often partnering with feminists in NOW and other organizations that had sprung up in the 1960s and

1970s addressing inequality. Finding that Title VII exempted educational institutions, feminists within government along with those in WEAL (The Women's Equity Action League) were instrumental in the Congress passing Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 extending equity requirements to women in colleges and universities.

Most activities of this period occurred under the Johnson administration and even under Nixon, although Nixon famously vetoed the Child Care bill passed by the Congress. Ronald Reagan and other Republican presidents were to slow the pace of feminist work in later years. But Banaszak also points to the work of feminists in the newly formed Office of Women in Development which carried programs for women's rights and development beyond the U.S. borders, focusing on the special needs of women in the USAID program which had ignored women's issues until then.

It is wonderful that this account has been told by a superb researcher and clear writer. I recommend the book for women's studies courses and programs as well as for those interested in public policy and social movements.

Social Movements and the Transformation of American Health Care, edited by **Jane C. Banaszak-Holl, Sandra R. Levitsky, and Mayer N. Zald**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010. 383pp. \$29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780195388305.

AARON PANOFSKY
University of California, Los Angeles
 apanofsky@ucla.edu

Among the many distinctive features of the American healthcare system is the proliferation of social movement activity, and the simultaneous absence of that activity at a scale or ambition capable of pursuing fundamental transformation. Another feature is the institutional complexity, decentralization, and hybridity of the system. Their intersection is the focus of *Social Movements and the Transformation of American Health Care*. First presented at a 2007 conference at the University of Michigan, the papers address

a surprising gap between social movement scholarship and analysis of health institutions. The volume capitalizes on a moment when social movement theory is flowering, adding institutional to state-centered analyses and engaging the complexity in the definition and composition of social movements.

After an introduction, the book's seventeen chapters are separated into four sections: state regulation and financing as targets of movements, movements' restructuring of institutional fields, professions and organizations, and movements' struggles for cultural legitimacy. Though these sections each cover important themes, and are explained helpfully with short introductions by the editors, they are ultimately somewhat arbitrary. With the same chapters, other groupings would have made sense, and some chapters could justifiably be presented in other sections.

There are several interesting cross-cutting themes that are not made explicit. The first is a traditional concern in social movement theory pertaining to the conditions of successful and failed mobilizations. As Constance Nathanson and Beatrix Hoffman show in their chapters, the fragmented structure of political opportunity in the United States is stacked heavily against the emergence of a broad-based health social movement for the poor or mobilization for universal insurance. Such mobilization is somewhat more possible on the state level with political coalitions according to Holly Jarman and Scott Greer. And Martin Kitchener presents a sophisticated political opportunity analysis that shows how resource-poor actors can exploit contradictory cultural logics in healthcare fields.

Numerous chapters demonstrate that a crucial ingredient for success is organizational hybridity. Sabrina McCormick shows that "climate-induced illness movements" are dependent on boundary organizations that have scientific and activist members. Scott Frickel explores "shadow mobilizations" whereby scientists and medical professionals help activists professionalize movements but conceal their involvement to preserve public legitimacy. A chapter by Jill Quadagno and Brandon McKelvey discusses the consumer directed healthcare movement which promotes policy change

through a hybrid of elite political activists, consumers, and organizations. Steven Epstein's chapter on policy reform of clinical research shows how hybridity can have multiple organizational and cultural dimensions. The ubiquity of hybridity in these chapters calls into question whether the traditionally understood movement of non-professional, activist, outsider actors is even a relevant category in the health field today.

A related second theme is what might be termed the "social movement-ization" of action in this domain. The chapters by Frickel, Epstein, Quadagno and McKelvey as well as Michael Goldstein's on alternative medicine in medical education and Renee Anspach's on conservatives' efforts to take over bioethics, all show how professionals and elite groups resort to social movement organization, tactics, and rhetoric to achieve their aims. A different version of this is in two other chapters. Mark Wolfson and Maria Parries show how the National Institutes of Health have increasingly funded research that encourages movement partnerships. And Paul Bate and Glenn Robert report on a U.K. National Health Service "experiment" seeking to help activist reformers by educating them about social movement theory. As these chapters demonstrate, the social movement form and public participation more broadly are being mobilized by a wide array of actors as they become important sources of political authority. Matthew Archibald's chapter shows how self-help movements draw on different institutions for legitimacy, but it also hints at the reverse—those institutions gain legitimacy by engaging movements.

A third theme is how the particular disease-based cultural logic of medicine organizes institutional and movement action. David Snow and Roberta Lessor's chapter on framing hazards demonstrates the discursive demands and pitfalls that this cultural structure puts on aspiring disease movements. There are discussions in several chapters, most notably Verta Taylor and Lisa Leitz's, about shared embodiment as a spur to collective action and the struggle to achieve legitimacy through disease recognition. These have been major concerns of scholars in science and technology studies who will find much of interest in this volume.

As the introduction and conclusion make clear, this collection has both substantive and analytic ambitions. Ultimately it is most successful at the latter aim. Some chapters, like those by Phil Brown and colleagues, Snow and Lessor, and Kitchener, explicitly provide portable toolkits, but nearly every chapter offers something scholars are likely to find useful in other contexts. However, the fact that the chapters overwhelmingly employ qualitative and case-study methods will mean a bit more work for researchers who use other methodologies.

The volume is less successful at its other aim: broadly characterizing the transformations that social movements have brought to the health field. The chapters tend to take the movements themselves as a starting point, focusing on the changes they intend to make. This neglects transformations further afield. It would have been fruitful if some had taken the healthcare system as the starting point and looked at movements as a factor in their transformation or stabilization over time. For example, have movements narrowed or broadened the distribution of resources in the health field, and have they reduced or increased health inequalities in the population? Have movements decreased or increased the power of corporate interests? Has the ubiquitous mobilization around disease categories crowded out mobilization for public health or universal insurance?

Providing answers to questions like these would be an exciting next step for social movements research. It could begin a fruitful dialog with health policy analysis which is too often focused on individual level actions and government policy, missing the importance of collective action. This is a compelling and innovative collection that opens an analytically fruitful and politically important door for sociological research.

Swinging in America: Love, Sex, and Marriage in the 21st Century, by **Curtis R. Bergstrand** and **Jennifer Blevins Sinski**. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010. 203pp. \$44.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780313379666.

KASSIA R. WOSICK
New Mexico State University
kassiaw@nmsu.edu

At first glance, *Swinging in America* promises an empirical glimpse into the lives of couples who practice sexual nonmonogamy. The book delivers, however, in effectively problematizing the traditional marriage narrative as “monocentric”—a social reality in which monogamy is sacred, essentialized, and institutionalized. Authors Curtis Bergstrand and Jennifer Sinski are quick to situate themselves vis-à-vis their scholarly efforts on “the lifestyle,” clarifying that their scientific approach to swinging is not informed by personal experience. The book’s twelve chapters then unfold as two distinct parts: Part I, “Swinging in America: The New Monogamy?” and Part II, “The Rise and Decline of Monocentrism.” The main thrust of *Swinging in America* involves understanding swinging as a lifestyle while predicting its future in terms of diversifying institutional forms of marriage and family living (p. 174). The book concludes with a practical chapter on assessing whether nonmonogamy is a viable option for the reader.

In the first five chapters of the book, Bergstrand and Sinski define swinging, identify swinger demographics, and illuminate the nuances of what is commonly referred to as “the lifestyle.” The book employs a clear, accessible tone that mostly continues throughout the remaining chapters. Alternative sexual lifestyles are notoriously difficult to study, mostly due to fear of exposure. Further, research on nonmonogamy has typically involved educated, predominantly white samples. Bergstrand and Sinski’s demographics are similar in this vein, although one strength is the “size and breadth of swingers sampled” (p. 46). Data are primarily drawn from the authors’ online survey of 1,100 swingers in 1999 and 2000 who responded to questions measuring their behavior, attitudes, and values. The authors

also included several questions from the General Social Survey (GSS) in order to compare swingers’ characteristics to a national norm.

Bergstrand and Sinski assert that swingers are “very similar to the majority of the general public” in terms of education, social responsibility, and psychological well-being, although they differ in terms of religion, political ideology, and prejudice toward marginalized groups based on GSS data comparison (p. 29). This sort of “just like you and me” tone pervades, which seems to humanize a population often perceived as pathological and licentious. Part I relies heavily on personal narrative data extracted from the authors’ online survey, which illuminate a range of swingers’ perceptions and experiences with the lifestyle. However, the respondent narratives could have benefited from a more detailed analysis and been better integrated with the authors’ overall arguments.

Bergstrand and Sinski effectively reference what little research has been conducted over the past forty years on nonmonogamy, distinguishing between three different types of monogamy (sexual, emotional, practical) as well as a range of alternatives to monogamy (swinging, polygamy, polyamory). While the authors locate swinging “under the umbrella heading of Alternative Lifestyles” (p. 4), they occasionally interchange it with other forms of nonmonogamy. Since there is a somewhat surface discussion of nonmonogamous relationship varieties, to the novice this book may not adequately articulate the obvious and more importantly subtle differences within and between such intimacies.

The authors conclude Part I by exposing the effects of swinging on the individual as well as its impact on committed relationships, namely marrieds who have entered into, are currently practicing, or have decided to quit the lifestyle. Respondent narratives work well in illuminating the nuances within the swinging community, highlighting gender differences as well as the complexities of nonmonogamy. The authors do, however, gloss over several important aspects of alternatives to monogamy, namely managing social stigma, reconciling jealousy, rule violations, and ensuring commitment between partners.

The remainder of the book (Part II) focuses on the rise and decline of monocentrism, relying on in-depth discussions of religious, economic, legal, therapeutic, and lastly heretical narratives to illustrate the monogamous nuclear family unit as a normative construct. Since there is little published on the social construction of monogamy, this section does well in conveying the institutional ramifications of both normative and alternative relationship constructs. However, these six chapters seem to diverge abruptly from the first part of the book in style and content. They are also packed with a string of theoretical references, relational models, and popular culture references that sometimes convolute the main points of the book.

Sociologists will appreciate references to Weber, Marx, Durkheim, and several symbolic interactionists (like Simmel, Berger, Luckmann) as the authors hone their theoretical approach to marriage and the romantic love ideal. In the chapter on sexuality and monocentrism, Bergstrand and Sinski draw on both feminist and queer theory to suggest how swinging (and other forms of nonmonogamy) may be a step in the right direction for women and sexual minorities to construct new sexual narratives that subvert monocentrism. Though, apart from a few paragraphs on bisexuality and gay men, the book is surprisingly heteronormative in content and analysis.

In the final chapter, Bergstrand and Sinski attempt a nonmonocentric narrative of love, sex, and marriage through referencing legal developments (Supreme Court decisions legislating morality) and psychological theories (Loevinger's developmental theory of personality integration). Their remarks seem less cohesive and more subjective than in the book's previous chapters. Additionally, Bergstrand and Sinski state in the conclusion that they have attempted to portray swinging in a rather positive light. While this book is a refreshing change to the often sex negative, mononormative approach that researchers take when examining alternative intimate sexual and/or romantic relationships, the reader is left with a hurried collection of final thoughts that seem to not convey what the authors originally suggested: that swinging is the new monogamy, and there has been a substantial decline in

monocentrism. Such claims are reminiscent of books on open marriage and alternative lifestyles published in the 1970s, again in the 1990s, and now in the 2000s. Perhaps more valid is their suggestion that "nonmonogamous models of marriage such as swinging and polyamory not only will but should increase as socially acceptable and legally sanctioned alternatives to the traditional Judeo-Christian monogamous marital form" (p. 174).

This book would fit nicely in both undergraduate and graduate courses on sexualities, families, and even seminars on social psychology. The authors' thorough incorporation of previous literature and recent research make *Swinging in America* useful for comprehending monocentrism and investigating swinging. It could also serve as a starting point for the contemporary couple interested in entering "the lifestyle."

Offenders on Offending: Learning About Crime from Criminals, edited by **Wim Bernasco**. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing, 2010. 322pp. \$44.95 paper. ISBN: 9781843927761.

JEFFERY T. ULMER
Pennsylvania State University
 jtu100@psu.edu

One typically finds in the pages of criminology journals studies of juvenile and young adult offending using self-report survey data, macro level studies of official crime rate, arrest, or victimization statistics, or studies of recidivism using correctional and court records, all applying advanced statistical methods. However, there has been a strong qualitative component to criminology since the days of the early Chicago School, and the pioneering work of Edwin Sutherland. This qualitative body of work has typically (though not exclusively) appeared in book form. *Offenders on Offending* continues this tradition, and argues eloquently for the benefits that qualitative methods continue to offer criminology. Indeed, the main focus of *Offenders on Offending* is methodological, and the book presents a lucid coverage of the uses, settings, promises, and pitfalls of collecting and analyzing qualitative data from criminal offenders themselves. The

book is the outcome of a 2008 workshop at the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement. Collectively, the chapters in *Offenders on Offending* are a testament to the value of qualitative methods in understanding the effects of criminal offenders' opportunities, norms, and life circumstances by seeing them from the actor's point of view. The strength of such qualitative data, especially when it is collected over a substantial period of time, is that it enables us to understand processes rather than just static outcomes of social processes. The book also prominently features international criminologists and their work, which is a welcome addition to the U.S.-dominated criminology literature.

The book begins with an overview chapter by editor Wim Bernasco, a Dutch criminologist. The overview is a helpful roadmap and summary of the book's structure and key features, and each subsequent chapter starts with a helpful abstract. These features make the book very reader-friendly, and more useful as a resource. The book is divided into five parts: "Setting the Stage," "Prison Settings," "Field Settings," "Social Categories of Offenders and Researchers," and "Learning About the Act." Each of the chapters revolves around five central issues (p. 6): (1) "Where, when, and how can we obtain information from offenders on offending?," (2) "What can we learn from offenders that cannot be accessed from other sources?," (3) "How can offenders be motivated to participate in research?," (4) "How can offenders be motivated and helped to provide valid accounts of their offending?," and (5) "How can the information that offenders provide be checked and validated?"

The 16 chapters distributed across these sections are too rich and detailed to summarize here, so I will mention just a few general comments, and note some of my reactions to a few of the chapters. The first part, "Setting the Stage," starts with a chapter by Henk Elffers that discusses threats to validity connected to interviewing offenders about their crime (misinformation, misunderstanding, and misleading), and prescriptions for dealing with it. Elffers' chapter displays a realist rather than a social constructionist perspective in that it focuses on eliciting "what really happened" from offenders, rather than

taking the offender's interpretations, perceptions, and definitions of situations as data in and of themselves. An interesting debate is also set up regarding the usefulness of collecting data from apprehended and incarcerated offenders. In Chapter Three, Scott Jacques and Richard Wright critique existing qualitative methodological writings in criminology as being atheoretical, and apply Black's pure sociology of law to argue that as more law is applied to offenders, the greater their probability of being sampled for research, the less they are remunerated for their participation, and the quality of data from them decreases. They then present several alternatives to deal with this problem, and call for research to test their propositions about and thus assess the validity of data from offenders selected from criminal justice institutional contexts. One interesting side issue here is that, like Donald Black, Jacques and Wright's application of pure sociology intentionally eschews the theorizing of offender subjectivity, such as motivations and emotions. However, such subjectivity is of great interest to most criminologists and criminological theories (which traffic in concepts such as learning, definitions, motivations, self-control, attachments, strain, rational choice, and emotions). For such people, a pure sociology of criminal offending would result in a truncated criminology indeed.

By contrast, in Part Two, "Prison Settings," Heith Copes and Andy Hochstetler present a spirited and (to this reviewer) convincing defense of the value of collecting data from incarcerated offenders. Carlo Morselli and Pierre Tremblay provide support for the notion that data collected from incarcerated offenders can be demonstrated to have validity and theoretical value, as exemplified by their research on criminal achievement and earnings from incarcerated Canadian offenders. Fiona Brookman rounds out this debate by providing a thorough overview of challenges presented by prisoner research, as well as ways to handle such challenges and how they might be triangulated with other sources of data.

In Part Three, "Field Settings," three chapters by anthropologists (Marie Rosenkrantz Lindegaard, Frank van Gemert, and Ric Curtis) make pleas for ethnography in naturalistic settings, as well as triangulation with

multiple methods. Part Four, "Social Categories of Offenders and Researchers," presents treatments of how offenders' and researchers' gender, class, and race/ethnicity shape the research process. Jody Miller discusses how offender and researcher gender interact to influence the quality of data collected (though she, unlike Elffers earlier, takes a social constructionist stance and embraces the notion that offender and researcher standpoints inevitably affect, indeed produce, data) and argues for interview research to be conducted by research teams diverse in gender and race/ethnicity, when possible. Sheldon Zhang demonstrates the access he had as a researcher of Chinese descent when studying Chinese human smuggling networks. Neal Shover and Ben Hunter argue for the usefulness of offender autobiographies for understanding offenders' narrative apologetics for their criminal involvement. This chapter, which argues that offender autobiographies are valuable precisely because they are not objective, unvarnished "truth," but rather contain offenders' (often self-serving) vocabularies of motive, is an interesting contrast to both realist perspectives and pure sociology.

Finally, the last part of the book focuses sharply on how to study criminal acts and situations themselves, and contains contributions from Claire Nee, Lucia Summers, Shane Johnson, George Rengert, Veronika Polišenská, Birgit Zetinigg, and Matthias Gaderer. These sections of the book range across topics such as using ethnographic data to construct computer simulations of burglaries, using mapping to explore offenders' spatial cognitions, and triangulating bank robbers' accounts of robberies with eyewitness testimony of bank workers.

Overall, *Offenders on Offending* provides a solid and helpful resource on the considerable benefits and equally significant difficulties in conducting qualitative research in criminology. As mentioned, a side benefit of the volume is its window into international, especially European criminological work. I would recommend this lucid compilation of qualitative methodological pieces for graduate methods classes in criminology and sociology programs, and as a resource for scholars.

Harem Histories: Envisioning Places and Living Spaces, edited by Marilyn Booth. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 416 pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822348696.

LEILA J. RUPP

University of California, Santa Barbara
lrupp@femst.ucsb.edu

Rarely have I encountered an edited collection as coherent and focused as *Harem Histories*. Originating in part from a conference at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the book brings together scholars from a range of disciplines and interdisciplinary perspectives to rethink the harem as both an important institution for organizing gender and an imagined place whose representations reveal a great deal about the complex relationship between the West and the Middle East. Sources include historical documents, prescriptive literature, legal codes, domestic architecture, paintings, photographs, poetry, and novels; theoretical inspiration comes from Foucault and Habermas, among others.

Ranging in time from the early days of Islam to the twentieth century, and in space from Tunisia through Egypt, Iraq, and Syria to Turkey, the volume presents historical, literary, art historical, and architectural scholarship on, in the words of Marilyn Booth's introduction, "the harem as social institution, architectural framework, and representational figure both in Muslim-majority societies and in Euro/American imaginations" (p. 4). The emphasis throughout is on the complex role of segregated gendered space in shaping identities and understandings, in that way reaching beyond the historical particulars to address "how gender matters in the ways that human beings make, use, and represent the spaces in which we live out our lives—and think about the lives and spaces of others" (p. 18).

The very word "harem," of course, evokes for many the Western perceptions of indolent and sultry wives, concubines, and slaves imprisoned by and at the mercy of a powerful and lascivious husband/lover/master. The articles in this collection spend a lot of time on the definitions and roots of the word "harem"—this is the only repetition, reading the volume as a whole, albeit necessary for

the articles to stand alone. The collection debunks the Western notion, while also exploring the forces behind such representations by both visitors and insiders, but does so much more. We see the harem as an institutional practice that has changed over time and varies from place to place. The opening articles, for example, show how the stories of the lives of the first generation of prominent Muslim women changed in significant ways over time, erasing their public roles, and reveal that in the first five centuries of Islam, Arabic texts did not represent the harem as a social space occupied by women. Later on, Leslie Pierce traces changes in Ottoman imperial law with regard to sexual crimes to analyze what that reveals about the harem. Other authors contrast imperial with more ordinary household harems in monogamous families and reveal the changing architecture and artistic representations of the harem.

Yaseen Noorani, drawing from Habermas, takes on directly what is perhaps the most important theme that emerges from the volume: the troubling of the notion that the harem was "private" while public space belonged to men. In a number of articles, we see women engaging in public and political activities: influencing public affairs from within the caliphal harem of Baghdad in the Islamic fourth/CE tenth century; socializing in the interests of business, politics, and diplomacy in the seaside bathing houses of precolonial Tunisia; and writing and hosting literary salons. Continuing the critique of public and private as separable gendered spaces, such scholarship gives concrete examples of the ways that public influence and power can emanate from private domestic spaces. Illustrating the complexity, Irvin Cemil Schick argues that the harem, as a socially constructed space often more imagined than real, functioned as a "technology of gender" where Muslims learned how to be women and men but also served as a site of resistance.

Another central theme of the collection is the equally complex relationship between "West" and "East." Booth opens her introduction with two vignettes that illustrate that theme. Demetra Vaka Brown, born in the Ottoman Empire but living in the United States, returned to her home country in the

early twentieth century and wrote about harem life in Turkey. "I had lived so long in a civilized country that I had forgotten how much more civilized, in some respects, uncivilized Turkey is," she wrote (p. 2). The pseudonymous Zeyneb Hanoum, around the same time, penned the story of her visit to Britain's Parliament, commenting in her book to an English friend, "But, my dear, why have you never told me that the Ladies' Gallery is a harem?" (p. 2). The theme of who is observing and influencing whom runs throughout a number of articles. Orit Bashkin, for example, analyzes the popular Arabic historical novels of Jurji Zaydan, who appropriated Orientalist concepts of the harem for his own political purposes. In this way, Bashkin argues, we can see "the impossibility of regarding East and West as separate entities" (p. 311).

In all these ways, then, *Harem Histories* offers concrete historical examples of the ways that gendered space is constructed and imagined, public and private overlap and merge, and cultural interaction has complex dynamics and consequences. Although perhaps of most interest to historians and other scholars of the Middle East, these are issues of more general concern to sociologists as well.

Rich Democracies, Poor People: How Politics Explain Poverty, by **David Brady**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009. 268pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780195385915.

ROBERT S. JANSEN
University of Michigan
 rsjansen@umich.edu

David Brady's *Rich Democracies, Poor People* delivers a stunning blow to prevailing myths and social-scientific theories of poverty and its determinants. Its principle contribution is to demonstrate that poverty is first and foremost a *political* problem. The provocative implication is that poverty amelioration is a matter of political choice.

Whereas poverty scholarship has traditionally zeroed in on variation at the individual and group levels within a single national context, Brady's research operates at a macro-analytic level—enabling him to address the

critical question of why some affluent Western democracies evidence higher levels of poverty than others. Arguing that a narrow focus on the characteristics of poor people or groups diverts our attention from more macro-level causes (pp. 17-19)—and noting that an exclusive focus on the U.S. “. . . samples on the dependent variable by selecting a case at the extreme end of the distribution” (p. 173)—Brady finds that poverty is most powerfully explained by variation in welfare state generosity (conditioned by leftist collective actors and “latent coalitions for egalitarianism”). Working with an impressive cross-national data set on eighteen Western democracies, Brady establishes this conclusion through a series of clearly-articulated statistical tests that pit dominant poverty theories against his own “institutionalized power relations theory.” Underpinning this ambitious exercise is a subtle and convincing rethinking of poverty *measurement* that itself represents a tremendous contribution to poverty scholarship (Chapter Two).

Most pointedly, this book stands as a critical rebuttal to liberal economic theories of poverty. Identifying as fundamental to these theories the principles of “harmonious progress, free market capitalism, human capital and worker productivity, and supply and demand” (p. 123), Brady submits liberal economics to empirical test (Chapter Six). First, while he finds a negative association between economic growth and poverty, this relationship is shown to be relatively weak. Second, the hypothesis that “government intervention into the free market (especially through welfare programs) should produce more poverty” is roundly rejected. Indeed, it is the book’s core finding that welfare programs *reduce* poverty. Third, labor productivity and its underlying human capital requirements are found to have *no* significant effects on poverty intensity. Finally, while the analysis supports the “supply and demand” hypothesis that unemployment predicts poverty, the effect is not as large as that of welfare generosity. While Brady relies on his own *relative* poverty measures in conducting these analyses, he also demonstrates that none of the relationships are statistically significant when the *absolute* measures preferred by liberal economics are substituted.

As if providing this powerful critique of liberal economic theories were not enough, Brady also makes significant contributions to more sociological theories of poverty, anti-poverty politics, and the welfare state. Testing sociology’s dominant social-structural theories against those of liberal economics, he finds the former to be more successful at predicting cross-national variation—although not as powerful as his own theory (Chapter Seven). With regard to anti-poverty politics, he demonstrates—*contra* some social movements theories—that formal, institutionalized politics have a greater impact on poverty outcomes than the “dissensus” politics of protest and strikes (Chapter Five). And while building heavily on welfare state theories, Brady presents findings that call into question these theories’ assumptions regarding the independent effects of welfare regime type (Chapter Four). These and other contributions provide a firm foundation for new research going forward.

The most challenging critique that this work is likely to receive from liberal economists, policy makers, and citizens will be a charge of circularity. It might be claimed that Brady’s central finding—that more welfare state generosity reduces poverty—hinges on his reconceptualization of poverty to measure levels *after* taxation and the receipt of cash transfers and in-kind benefits from the state. A satisfying response to this critique hinges on the answer to the question of whether Brady’s poverty measure is *supportable on its own terms*.

The measure is well-founded, but the author could have gone further in making this case. Brady’s primary justification for his “post-fisc” measure is theoretical: since the state is always involved in all aspects of the market—“by setting rules on how goods and services are bought and sold, by setting standards for labor and production, by defining who and what has property rights, by funding the infrastructure on which markets unfold, and by backing the currencies and credit that make exchange possible” (pp. 38-9)—it would be “disingenuous to simulate what income would be ‘before the state’” (p. 38). This argument resonates with recent theoretical work in economic sociology and should be acceptable to most

sociologists. But a broader audience might be more convinced by the truth captured by Brady (but on which he does not elaborate) when he notes that “People live in a posttax and posttransfer world” (p. 40, my emphasis). The average person’s daily lived experience of security and well-being (or the lack thereof) is not based on an abstract assessment of his or her (never-experienced) “pre-fisc” economic status, but rather on a sense of the resources enjoyed in contextualized social existence—which includes the debits and credits accrued through interactions with various social institutions, including the state. This meaningful experiential reality, along with its theoretical corollary, provides a solid footing for Brady’s definition—and so for his explanatory argument.

A second, more minor critique might derive from either a social conflict or elite politics perspective. Because Brady situates his theory in a broad Marxist tradition (see pp. 169-73), it is somewhat surprising that—while attending to “latent coalitions for egalitarianism” (pp. 10 and 102-5) and “failure[s] to institutionalize equality” (p. 6)—he devotes little attention to the possible importance of coalitions *against* egalitarianism that in some cases might have been *successful* at institutionalizing *inequality*. Whether such coalitions or institutions exist (or matter) is an empirical question; but it is one worth asking.

These comments aside, *Rich Democracies, Poor People* is a carefully-conceived, adroitly-executed, and eminently-accessible piece of scholarship that will shape the fields of poverty studies and political sociology for years to come. It will be a valuable tool for undergraduate teaching, helping students to see through popular misconceptions about how poverty works. At the same time, the book should be required reading for policy makers and the general voting public—as they consider the political choices that play a key role in shaping national poverty outcomes.

Identity Theory, by **Peter J. Burke** and **Jan E. Stets**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009. 256pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780195388282.

DEBRA KAUFMAN
 Northeastern University
 dkaufman@neu.edu

The authors of this compendium of social psychological theory, which describes identity theory, its origins, the research which supports it and in part its future direction, suggest that one of the main reasons for writing this book is to give scholars within sociology and across the social sciences a clear and organized statement on identity theory. No book, they claim, currently exists that does just that. They wish to make identity theory more accessible to those within the academy as well as to those outside of it. To do so, the authors have undertaken the rather formidable task of pulling together, in one volume, the work that they and their rather extensive research teams have been doing over the past several decades. In doing so, the text covers materials from chapters and journal articles published earlier. Such goals have both their strengths and weaknesses.

The strengths are that it brings together in one volume the cumulative testing and building of a highly ambitious, systematically rigorous research program in sociological social psychology from a positivist tradition. The authors show how the survey and/or laboratory research reported in the book support and/or extend identity theory. In so doing they show that theory is not the byproduct of one theorist alone, but rather the result of cumulative testing of systematic agendas of research. The benefits of a book begun some fifteen years prior to its publication are that the ideas reflect the richly developed and cumulatively thoughtful approach of two, productive, well-regarded and respected researchers and their colleagues.

While the book explores the historical roots of identity theory, not only in symbolic interaction, but also in cybernetics, the central mission of the book is an explication of Peter Burke and Jan Stets’ use of perceptual control theory in the making and development of their model of identity verification, most

especially in explanations for stress and self-esteem. However, the pulling together of so much empirical work and the theoretical strands which feed each project, from among at least twenty-seven different co-authors and from so many different publication outlets, leads, at times, to a sometimes confusing narrative. Perhaps most distracting is when the authors interrupt their own discussion by suggesting the work and/or ideas they are currently explicating will be better and/or more fully explored in a coming chapter or chapters. The reader is then left to move back and forth between chapters often losing the continuity of the arguments and/or materials being presented in any one chapter. And finally, in trying to reach what publishers often call the "intelligent lay reader," as well as colleagues, the authors have variously simplified their arguments and/or resorted to repetition rather than explanation of their ideas.

The downside of publishing a book wedded to the cumulative testing of research designed to test, refine, and build upon a specific theoretical orientation (drawn from the psychological literature on self-verification and the sociological literature on identity verification) is that it leaves the challenges and/or revisions which have emerged over the past decades to that theoretical tradition relatively unexplored or unincorporated into the research testing and rethinking of the theory. In particular, a feminist critique of gender scholarship, particularly in the area of role theory, seems neglected in the building and rebuilding of the identity theory presented. While a review of that literature is unwarranted here, the most common themes of a feminist critique have been that role theory within a positivist tradition does not capture the dynamic, complex character of gender or the making and re-making of normative standards (and the inequities) in social practice itself. The most critical dimensions of the critique are that there is no essential or unitary self, but rather one in interaction with the political, historical context within which it is situated. And while the authors do provide a more nuanced definition of interaction as taking place among identities rather than among persons, and centering on the meanings of the behavior rather than the behavior itself, surveys or

laboratory experiments (upon which much of their research is based) present methodological challenges to capture adequately these important distinctions or to simulate the context in which such meaning-making occurs. Similarly, queer theorists might challenge the use of bipolar scales of masculinity and femininity as adequate gauges for those who identify themselves as genderless.

In the last chapter, the authors combine their views for future research with what they present as some unaddressed problems in identity theory. They offer a series of hypotheses with regard to five theoretically under-theorized areas: resources, the multiple bases of identities, (role, group, and person), multiple identities, emotions, and identity change. In so doing, they indirectly address questions about the dynamic nature of role theory and some of the issues seen as theoretically troubling by other theorists. They ask: how do identities simultaneously emerge in one situation? How are the meanings of multiple identities managed when they conflict? What resources (personal, interpersonal, structural) lead to greater identity verification? The authors make clear that there is a need for longitudinal data to test changes over the life cycle and over social time. Although they provide thirty-five new hypotheses ripe for the testing, more narrative on the ways in which identity theory (the meaning and measure of identities) has come under criticism and the ways in which they have incorporated and/or rejected such criticisms into their own model, would have improved the discussion. Despite this, any book addressing the complex relationships among self, identity, social interaction, and social structure presents a serious challenge to its authors and to its readers. This book is one of the first to pick up this challenge. It encourages not only more systematic research, but also a continuing discussion among theorists and practitioners about the meaning and measure of identity theory.

Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Ableness, by **Fiona Kumari Campbell**. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 231pp. \$90.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780230579286.

CAROLINE GRAY
Yale University
cgray@aya.yale.edu

Disability studies has solidified itself as a vibrant interdisciplinary field with the potential to transform and challenge not just how we think about disability but also to reframe the basic assumptions we make about what it means to be human beings. Rather than viewing disability as something inherently bad or problematic, disability studies aims to recast disability as a difference that should be valued. Despite its overwhelming potential, in the social sciences at least, disability studies still has not gained the attention it is rightly due. However, developments in the field of sociology, such as the recent formation of the Disability and Society section for the American Sociological Association suggest that this is changing.

Fiona Campbell's recent book titled *Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Ableness* offers a welcome addition to social scientific literature on disability. In particular, *Contours of Ableism* may be viewed as part of a growing literature in disability studies that emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between disability and ability or ableism, as Campbell refers to it. This literature positions disability in a broader discursive and normative framework where all bodies are subjected to normalizing scrutiny and regulation. Campbell's contribution to this literature is a sophisticated, nuanced elaboration of the specific characteristics of what she dubs the "ableist project." This book will be of interest to sociologists of disability as well as those interested in identity politics, the sociology of the body and medicine, and culture and theory. This book is decidedly NOT an introduction to disability studies. Rather, it would be most useful, and indeed, most comprehensible, to those already acquainted with the subject matter.

Campbell sets the stage in the first chapter for unpacking the ableist project, writing,

"The challenge (in disability studies) is to reverse, to invert this traditional approach, to shift our gaze and concentrate on what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism" (p. 4). In each of the following chapters, Campbell provides a topical area or empirical site for elaborating the powerful role that ableism plays in social life. For the most part, each of the chapters is organized around how the binary dynamic of ableism and dis-ableism operates in a variety of contexts with priority given to major social institutions like law, education, medicine, and science and technology, though there are a few exceptions to this. For example, in Chapter Two, Campbell offers what in sociological terms might be thought of as a more "micro" discussion. Here she explores the notion of internalized ableism and likens the concept of disability to race and describes the similarities between internalized ableism and internalized racism. Chapter Three takes the reader back to her emphasis on social institutions, focusing here on the interplay between disability and the law. Campbell points out that despite the rigidness of "legal formations," they also allow room for the possibility of redefining disability in ways that are more positive. In Chapter Four she introduces the idea of "distechnologies," which she describes as technologies aimed at correcting the disabled and so-called "inferior" body. She argues that these technologies "rein in anomaly" and "purge, restrain, realign, and normalize ableist comportment," providing technological justification for the normatively able body. Her following chapter on the cochlear implant debate and its relationship to deafness similarly describes how this technology could be thought of as a "distechnology" in so far as it attempts to, in the words she used in the preceding chapter, "purge and normalize" deafness. Chapter Six explores what Campbell refers to as "restorative surgeries" and how these have been "tricked" by the rhetoric of ableism. Interwoven throughout these chapters is Campbell's basic argument that the logic of ableism provides a justification for these bodily interventions.

Convincingly demonstrating how ableism's power extends well beyond those bodies we deem as disabled, in Chapter Eight

Campbell addresses gender, specifically how biomedicalism and ableism coalesce to devalue the female body. This is one of her most convincing chapters because it effectively demonstrates both the insidiousness and breadth of the discourse of ableism. Chapter Seven appears somewhat out of place in the context of the other chapters. Here she addresses the disabled body and its role in teaching. While Campbell's argument, namely that the disabled body affords a privileged status in teaching, is provocative and worthy of consideration, it seemed to detract from her larger emphasis on ableism and its production.

Campbell draws on an impressive variety of scholars from a range of disciplinary fields in order to articulate carefully her points. The book is chock full of theoretical concepts and original ideas that are sure to prove useful to scholars in their own work. However, the theoretical richness of the text could also be viewed as a source of weakness. Namely, though not absent, Campbell's use of empirical data (and particularly, empirical data whose method of collection is clearly laid out) is rather limited. While understandable given her disciplinary base (philosophy), this may put off sociologists who are more compelled by empirical data. The heavy use of theory and the lack of empirical data relates to one of the main criticisms I have of Campbell's book. Though no doubt filled with many innovative and brilliant insights, Campbell's book makes use of dense, turgid prose that made getting through parts of the text difficult. Because of this, I will echo my earlier point, that this is not by any means an introductory text.

Despite these criticisms, *Contours of Ableism* nevertheless offers a compelling and complex extension of one of the most groundbreaking and innovative observations that disability studies offers, that we are all enmeshed in a larger system of ableism. Her analysis is subtle and the book full of conceptual nuggets that will be drawn upon for years to come by scholars interested in elucidating the complex relationship between disability and ableism.

Decentering Biotechnology: Assemblages Built and Assemblages Masked, by **Michael S. Carolan**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 188pp. \$89.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781409410058.

DAVID SCHLEIFER
Columbia University
ds3029@columbia.edu

Although not indicated by its title, *Decentering Biotechnology: Assemblages Built and Assemblages Masked* is essentially about the patenting of agricultural biotechnology. There is an irony in criticizing a book about intellectual property for its lack of novelty, but *Decentering Biotechnology* is mostly a synthesis of existing research rather than an original empirical or theoretical contribution. Michael Carolan sets out to show how laws, legal decisions, and trade agreements protect certain types of biotechnological artifacts. He attempts to argue that those legal protections are in fact what makes biotech artifacts hold together as things that can be commercialized, infringing upon, profited from, and that exacerbate the uneven accumulation of capital. However, *Decentering Biotechnology* is hampered by a fundamental flaw that undermines this objective. Rather than showing how laws make biotechnology possible, Carolan is bent on showing that laws and legal decisions concerning biotechnology patents are illogical. I agree with his basic claim that singling out DNA from genes, genes from organisms, and organisms from environments involves the creation of conceptual boundaries that simplify biological complexities. But by describing those boundaries as false, and dismissing the resulting biotechnology patents as "legal fictions" (p. 3), Carolan engages in a type of deconstructionist reasoning that many scholars in the sociology of science and the related field of Science and Technology Studies (STS) have thankfully abandoned.

Nearly a generation ago, Bennett Berger argued against this tendency in the sociology of knowledge to superciliously unmask the ideas of those whom we study (Berger 1981). But Carolan writes, "For biotechnology patents to be issued, the courts must persist in their mistaking the abstract for the concrete by continuing to (falsely) see the gene as

a discrete, self evident object" (p. 48). Pointing out logical fallacies may work in a legal brief, but in sociology this "emperor has no clothes" type of reasoning leads to a dead end. It tells us only that a certain state of affairs should not persist because it does not make sense. But a good sociological analysis would instead trace the conditions under which various people, organizations, and technologies have participated in creating, maintaining, and adapting a particular state of affairs. Although Carolan claims some allegiance with the Actor-Network Theory (ANT) approach in STS, Bruno Latour, one of the scholars most closely associated with ANT, has written pointedly against deconstructionist analyses which imply that phenomena are somehow less than real because they are "socially constructed" (Latour 1993; Latour 2005). Instead, ANT scholars have argued for the past 30 years that natural objects are made real by precisely the kinds of mechanisms, including social and legal mechanisms, which Carolan denounces.

There is some interest in reading Carolan's summary of the gradual process by which American courts came to recognize corporations as legal subjects that could claim ownership of inventions. In the early nineteenth century, courts generally held that employees owned their inventions. Even the owners of enslaved African Americans were not granted ownership of their slaves' inventions. By the late nineteenth century, employees still owned the rights to their inventions, but employers gained the right to license those inventions. Only starting in the early twentieth century were patents assigned to employers rather than employees (pp. 20–23). Carolan notes that this assignment of patents to corporations may reflect the multiplicity of people who collaborate in inventing complex technologies. This historical context is significant because it shows that the patent laws that apply (or, as Carolan might put it, misapply) to biotechnology emerged from case law and regulation concerned with other, earlier industries and were not designed specifically to enrich agricultural biotechnology companies. Indeed, Carolan's discussion of the 1930 Plant Patent Act and 1970 Plant Variety Protection Act shows that questions over intellectual property related to seeds

and other agricultural products predate the development of recombinant DNA and of the industry now called biotech.

The final chapter of *Decentering Biotechnology* marshals a variety of secondary sources to suggest that patents are not necessarily good for business or for innovation. They are expensive, often filed defensively, and may be so thickly stacked that some firms avoid innovating in order to avoid getting sued. Some empirical investigation into the ways in which patenting fails to work for businesses would have been informative. Nonetheless it is refreshing, if shocking in the context of the rest of this book, to hear Carolan imply that neither innovation nor business are necessarily bad things. He hypothesizes some alternative mechanisms that would ostensibly push innovation forward and pull technologies toward commercialization in what he calls a post-patent world. The pushes he suggests are open-source relationships and the pulls include prizes from government or venture philanthropists. One wonders who is going to bother commercializing technologies for which they do not own the patent, but Carolan suggests that generic drug manufacturers already operate along similar lines. Again, some empirical research into how current examples of unpatented innovation actually operate would have given us some basis for understanding the implications of these approaches.

In that *Decentering Biotechnology* touches on so many aspects of agricultural biotechnology, it may be of interest to those previously unfamiliar with this rich area of research in sociology. But given its lack of new empirical material, the book does not substantially move the sociology of science forward. And by deconstructing rather than explaining, *Decentering Biotechnology* contemptuously represents biotechnology patent law as a series of perversions rather than giving us genuine insight into this historically specific and socially contingent phenomenon.

References

- Berger, Bennett M. 1981. *The Survival of a Counter-culture: Ideological Work and Everyday Life among Rural Communards*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 ———. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Scripting Addiction: The Politics of Therapeutic Talk and American Sobriety, by E. Summerson Carr. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011. 323pp. \$27.95 paper. ISBN: 9780691144504.

CHRISTOPHER R. FREED
 University of South Alabama
 cfreed@usouthal.edu

Scripting Addiction: The Politics of Therapeutic Talk and American Sobriety, by E. Summerson Carr, explores the subtle but seldom insignificant dynamics of American therapeutic discourse—talk that many lay observers might otherwise characterize as unremarkable. The title of the book hints that the research is mainly about addiction and recovery. The exigencies of Carr's master's training in social work, and later her doctoral studies in anthropology and social work, led to her choosing a drug treatment program to frame her more central analysis of language, or "how institutions recruit people into roles and expect them to speak accordingly" (p. 221). Hardly a limitation, Carr's findings about the politics of words, and how talk originates from culture, almost certainly generalize to therapeutic speech across the helping professions.

Scripting Addiction is an ethnography about "Fresh Beginnings," an outpatient drug treatment program for homeless, mostly African American women located in the urban Midwest. Drawing from a rich blend of interviews, participant observation, and institutional documents such as meeting minutes, treatment protocols, and email messages collected for three-and-a-half years, Carr unpacks the "semiotic work" (p. 3)—the skillful use of language to achieve various aims—of Fresh Beginnings therapists, clients, program administrators, and case managers.

To open the book, Carr revisits Clinton-era welfare reform and the language of dependency it engendered. Fresh Beginnings staff

who spoke this language constructed an archetype of "the client" that served both institutional and professional ends. Specifically, therapists, administrators, and case managers attributed flaws in organization and implementation of the Fresh Beginnings program to "the drug-induced psychodynamics of the unstructured client" (p. 35). Additionally, Carr discovers that denial, a key component of the widely popular medical model of addiction, was "a central strategy in the broader project of bringing the addict back in line with authority, reality, and Truth" (p. 89). In fact, Fresh Beginnings therapists cautioned their clients that "a drug addicted way of speaking" (p. 127), not a drug relapse, resulted in poor treatment outcomes. Only when addicted clients articulated the decidedly American language of "inner reference" (p. 125)—words of honesty, openness, and willingness that therapists socialized their clients to use—could therapists acknowledge treatment progress. To cite one of Carr's clearest examples, "convinced of the pervasiveness of childhood sexual abuse among women drug users, Fresh Beginnings therapists often assumed that the client who did not disclose a personal history of childhood trauma had simply not undertaken a proper or thorough inventory" (p. 114). Therefore, "as one former client attested: 'You got to be abused there, or they start thinkin' there be somethin' wrong with you'" (p. 115).

Carr suggests that Fresh Beginnings therapists, however ideological they might seem, acted out of their commitment to help clients recover and in response to wider curative, policy, and cultural trends such as those concerning empowerment. Consider too, then, the carefully crafted "wordsmithing" (p. 169) of Fresh Beginnings board members who expected clients to "speak like an addict" (p. 189) in order to preserve the financial stability and institutional authority of the Fresh Beginnings program. But clients at Fresh Beginnings were not powerless. They recognized how their own words "traveled" (p. 52) by way of intake interviews and clinical assessments through the social service system, and how their words in turn affected their acquisition of vital resources. To that end, Chapter Six of *Scripting Addiction*, arguably the analytic highpoint of the book that

Carr effectively links to the preceding chapters, examines how Fresh Beginnings clients protected their personal interests of recovery and wellness against different staff agendas and broader treatment and cultural doctrine by “flipping the script”—that is, by using the language of inner reference to “perform” (p. 191) the role of “client in recovery” that they learned from Fresh Beginnings therapists, institutional policies, and more experienced program participants. In as much as “flipping the script” was a “political act” (p. 196), Fresh Beginnings clients, if practiced, could exercise considerable agency. “By contributing to and influencing the flow of discourse about urinalysis, AA, and other collective concerns, script flippers engaged in the ongoing policy work of debating and legitimating, stabilizing and destabilizing, and naturalizing and denaturalizing program practices” (p. 216).

Scripting Addiction fulfills Carr’s wish to decipher the cultural and institutional factors that necessitate “flipping the script” in the first place, in no small measure due to a vocabulary that Carr herself crafts. Consider, for instance, *distillation* (p. 126), or how language, as a cultural construct, is polished and redistributed; *anticipatory interpellation* (p. 153), or the appeal by some Fresh Beginnings clients that the institutional authorities who label them an “addict” also openly acknowledge them accordingly; *policies of personhood* (p. 25) that generate categories of people; and *metalinguistic labor* (p. 125), or the conscientious formation of a fixed therapeutic language. Although some of the more theoretical discussions that Carr incorporates throughout *Scripting Addiction* might occasionally sidetrack from her otherwise lucid analysis, sociologists and other scholars and students from across the social science disciplines, as well as social workers and drug treatment professionals, will appreciate the depth with which Carr covers an exhaustive range of literature relevant to their field, including forty pages of chapter notes that merit as much attention as the book’s main text. Overall, *Scripting Addiction* is a careful and intelligent ethnographic study about the “social lives” (p. 170) of words, the “semiotic entanglements” (p. 2) that words can cause, and how traditionally underserved and seemingly powerless client

populations navigate American therapeutic speech.

Communication Power, by **Manuel Castells**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009. 571pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780199567041.

LAURA GRINDSTAFF
University of California, Davis
 lagrindstaff@ucdavis.edu

Communication Power is a provocative analysis of how power is constituted in a network society. Readers familiar with Manuel Castells will recognize key themes from the trilogy *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, reframed and synthesized as a theory of power, and supported by a wide if somewhat disparate range of empirical research. Castells approaches his subject from above and below: he examines both power (domination) and counterpower (resistance), and he blends meta-theorization with attention to specificity and detail. The two levels do not always align; nevertheless, the book is an impressive, interdisciplinary narrative about the politics of contemporary communication that confirms his status as one of the world’s leading media scholars.

Castells’ central thesis is that communication power lies at the heart of the structure and dynamics of society because communication has the ability to shape the human mind. Although power is more than communication and vice versa, “the communication process decisively mediates the way in which power relationships are constructed and challenged in every domain of social practice” (p. 4). Drawing on concepts and literature in political science, sociology, psychology, and communication, Castells advances this thesis by focusing primarily on processes of asserting and contesting political power.

The first three of the book’s five chapters, along with the conclusion, lay the theoretical groundwork while the middle chapters provide elaboration via a series of case studies, some of them researched by Castells and his collaborators specifically for the book. Chapter One recasts the concept of the network society as a theory of power informed

by Weber, Habermas, Poulantzas (to whom the book is dedicated), Mann, and other notable social theorists. Castells identifies four dimensions of power: networking power, network power, networked power, and network-making power. Network-making power is paramount: it is exercised by “programmers,” who “program/reprogram the network(s) in terms of the goals assigned to the network,” and “switchers,” who “connect and ensure the cooperation of different networks by sharing common goals and combining resources while fending off competition from other networks by setting up strategic cooperation” (p. 45). Chapter Two provides an overview of the emergence and growth of global communication in the digital age, focusing especially on mass media and what he calls “mass self-communication” (blogs, v-logs, wikis, interactive video games, tweets, texts, etc.), made possible by the cluster of new technologies that support user-generated content. According to Castells, mass self-communication increases the autonomy of users vis-à-vis corporations, as users become both the senders and the receivers of messages. Thus networks of communication built around corporate and political interests coexist and interact with networks of communication built around users’ creative interests, although not on equal terms. This chapter stands well on its own, helpfully guiding the reader through a complex landscape spanning not only the rise of digital media but also the organization of global media corporations, the advertising industry, the politics of (de)regulation, and the communicative practices of the “creative audience.”

Chapter Three looks to the “affective intelligence” research in neuroscience on the one hand, and the agenda-setting and framing research in communications and rhetoric on the other hand, in order to bridge individual cognitive processes with socio-cultural communication processes. Yet Castells is only partially successful in this aim. The second half of the chapter explores the “misinformation campaign” directed at the American public by the Bush administration to justify the second Iraq War. The facts of the case are well-presented, but their connection to neuroscience is not. Castells claims that “power is constructed, as all reality, in the

neural networks of our brain” (p. 145). Missing is a meso-level analysis that would better explain the posited link between brain functioning and the deliberate deception of ordinary citizens by political elites. Neuroscience suggests that people everywhere—including, presumably, political elites themselves—are predisposed to believe what they want to believe, and that innate emotions like fear and enthusiasm disproportionately shape political behavior. How, then, can one explain the historical and cultural specificity of political malfeasance or, more importantly, the role of social inequalities—particularly along lines of race, class, and gender—in determining who gets to set agendas and frame public discourse in the first place? One can accept framing as a mode of thought (as George Lakoff asks us to do) and agree that some frames have greater cultural resonance than others (as Robert Entman shows), without recourse to individual-level theories that risk positioning abuses of power—and the failure to challenge such abuses—as likely outcomes of neural hardwiring.

That being said, the following empirical chapters are interesting and provocative (they are also largely divorced from references to neuroscience, making Chapter Three somewhat anomalous). Taking political communication as the favored form of power in the network society, Castells argues that media politics are increasingly scandal politics because networked power today is exercised largely through the construction of the politician as image rather than as representative of issues or even parties. Using four case studies—the downfall of Felipe Gonzalez and his Socialist Party in Spain, the practice of embedding U.S. military personnel in the media during the Iraq war, the prevalence of self-censorship among journalists in Russia as a byproduct of state control, and government efforts to control the Internet in China—he addresses such themes as propaganda, spin, infotainment, and the negative impact of scandal politics on political legitimacy.

The final case studies paint a more optimistic picture, as they document different ways in which people mobilize in an attempt to “re-program” communication networks to challenge established power using the new

opportunities afforded by mass self-communication. Castells calls such mobilizations "insurgent politics," and he presents four examples: the environmental movement, movements against corporate globalization, the flash mob protests in Madrid prompted by the 2004 terrorist bombings of the city's commuter trains, and the 2008 Obama presidential primary campaign in the United States. These cases do raise some issues: they are less clearly linked to Castells' overall theory of networks, they tend to overplay the transformational capabilities of mass self-communication (social movements have, after all, managed to do without it for many decades), and they speak only unevenly to the concept of insurgent politics (some formerly disenfranchised and/or disaffected voters might have been brought into the political fold by the Obama campaign, but the majority of Obama supporters were white and middle-class). Nevertheless, the empirical material adds necessary depth and contour to what would otherwise be abstract propositions. The concluding chapter, too, employs this interplay of the general and the specific to good effect, using the example of business tycoon Rupert Murdoch (who is simultaneously meta-programmer and master switcher) to reinforce Castells' theory of power as comprised of "networks of actors exercising power in their respective areas of influence through the networks that they construct around their interests" (p. 430).

Communication Power is a dense, wide-ranging book. It is not flawless and reading it takes work. But there can be no doubt that controlling, deploying, and challenging networks of communication are increasingly central to the global dynamics of power in the new millennium.

The Age of Obama: The Changing Place of Minorities in British and American Society, by **Tom Clark, Robert D. Putman, and Edward Fieldhouse**. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2010. 162pp. \$19.95 paper. ISBN: 9780719082788.

ENID LOGAN
University of Minnesota
 elogan@umn.edu

The first thing that must be said about this book is that the title is misleading. *The Age of Obama* is not an assessment of ethnic and race relations in Britain and the United States in light of Barack Obama's election to the White House. The authors do not devote any real space to analyzing the racial discourses that surrounded his historic election, or the implications of Obama's presidency for race relations in the future. That said, what have the authors of *The Age of Obama* actually done in this volume?

The stated goal of the book is to study the impact of what they call the "diversity revolution." This revolution, they claim, has unfolded over the last half century, as immigrants from the less-prosperous parts of the world have been drawn to the richer nations. The key questions they ask include, How has diversity impacted community life and social cohesion in Britain and the United States? Have whites responded mostly with tolerance or with fear? To what extent have minorities been incorporated into higher-wage jobs and integrated neighborhoods, and to what extent do they remain economically and spatially marginalized? And lastly, what roles have political discourse and the media played in shaping popular understandings of diversity?

The book is the product of a five-year collaboration between Harvard and Manchester universities, coauthored by Tom Clark (a British journalist), Robert Putnam (professor of public policy at Harvard), and Edward Fieldhouse (professor of political science at the University of Manchester). The authors employ a large quantitative database comprised primarily of several million census records in exploring their subject matter. We are promised an account that is thought-provoking, "innovative," and informative,

with broad appeal to both academic and non-academic audiences. In presenting their findings, the authors make extensive use of a comparative framework, designed to highlight important points of commonality and difference between British and American societies.

After laying out their aims and methods in Chapter One, the authors consider the histories of race and migration in the United States and the United Kingdom in Chapter Two. America is far more diverse than Britain, they write, as it has long been the "world's biggest draw for immigrants," (p. 14). The authors discuss the evolution of ideas about immigration and race, by examining changing racial categories in the census, and asking where each nation has drawn its most significant colorlines. Echoing George Yancey's *Who Is White?* (2003), they argue that in the United States, the black/non-black line has been the most important, while in the United Kingdom, the white/non-white divide has been more salient. Concerns about immigration, race, religion, and assimilation, they write, have varied over time in each nation, corresponding to demographic trends and political discourse.

Chapter Three discusses residential segregation and neighborhood integration. Among their core observations is that many new immigrant groups in the United States have assimilated more successfully than have African Americans (a fact that would be readily apparent to many readers). The authors write that in Britain, however, the results are mixed, with immigrants from the Caribbean being the most assimilated, Bangladeshis the least, and those from India somewhere in between. Chapter Four discusses minorities and employment, finding overall, a large gap in employment between whites and non-whites on both sides of the Atlantic (again a fairly unsurprising fact). Chapter Five explores the impact of diversity on community life. The authors write that in some situations, increasing integration encourages a sense of social cohesion among inhabitants, while in others it has the opposite effect, depending upon factors such as neighborhood poverty, education, and the rate of population turnover.

Chapter Six explores the impact of the media and political discourse upon perceptions of diversity. Politicians and the media

often stir up anxiety about immigration, they write, but the extent to which they are able to do so is dependent upon the number of immigrants in a given area. In Chapter Seven, the authors ask why minorities in the United States, including Barack Obama, have been much more successful in achieving political office than those in the United Kingdom. The American example, they claim, may be explained by the greater cohesiveness of the black community, higher rates of residential segregation, and a "tide of tolerance" among American youth. In Chapter Eight, the authors conclude the book with the argument that there is more tolerance in each society than there was in the past, but minorities still face numerous hurdles toward full incorporation.

There are a number of interesting questions posed in the book, and a deftly employed comparative method could have been a valuable analytical tool. Overall, however, the book is not particularly successful in accomplishing its aims, being neither especially clear, innovative or informative. A primary shortcoming of the text lies in the organization of the analysis and discussion. In numerous sections of the book, the authors alternate comparisons between nations from one page to the next, and in some parts from paragraph to paragraph. (Chapter Two especially suffers from this problem.) The result is a greatly oversimplified rendering of British and American social realities, which glosses over important differences between the two societies. The authors also occasionally conflate concepts such as race, ethnicity, and religion, and in the end, the method confuses more than it clarifies.

Elsewhere, ironically, the text suffers from the opposite problem. Rather than being too general, it is excessively detailed. In Chapters Three through Five, we are presented with numerous charts and tables explicating what seem to be fairly minor points in tremendous detail. A chart on page 35, for example, compares the "assimilation ID scores" of blacks and Poles in two Chicago neighborhoods between 1930 and 2000. On page 41, another chart compares the segregation index of Pakistanis in Bradford, England with that of African Americans in Miami in the 1990s. These seemingly random, unordered comparisons hinder the establishment

of a clear overall argument. A more useful method of comparison would have entailed devoting much larger sections of the text (perhaps entire chapters) to discussing social trends in one nation before moving on to the next. George Frederickson's seminal *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History* (1981), comes to mind.

The success of Frederickson's book (and others like it) also reminds us that some of the issues these authors discuss would have been better explored through qualitative means. Understanding the true meanings of diversity in different societies requires an understanding of how specific social categories were created, when they were created, and why. Much more substantial analysis of newspaper sources, political speeches, archival data, and other qualitative texts would have been helpful in this regard. The incorporation of such material would have allowed the authors to highlight and contextualize crucial differences in the meaning of several of their major concepts; demonstrating, for example, how being "black" or "mixed race" in the United States is qualitatively different from being "black" in Britain, or in South Africa, or in France, or in the Dominican Republic.

Is the chief problem of the book that it attempts to appeal to both academic and non-academic audiences? Perhaps. As written, it is likely to be unsatisfying, or frustrating to an academic reader, and too dense for a general audience. Given the presentation of the findings—which are alternately greatly oversimplified or far too detailed—it is difficult to understand any other than the most basic arguments of the book. There are not enough clear, compelling, or original "take-away" points to make the work truly noteworthy. The book should have been published as a series of narrowly focused articles, aiming to appeal only to a subset of academics studying issues such as diversity, social cohesion, and stratification.

Another Kind of Public Education: Race, Schools, the Media, and Democratic Possibilities, by **Patricia Hill Collins**. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2009. 236pp. \$21.00 paper. ISBN: 9780807000250.

AMANDA E. LEWIS
Emory University
alewi22@emory.edu

In her latest book, *Another Kind of Public Education: Race, Schools, the Media, and Democratic Possibilities*, Patricia Hill Collins begins the book's afterword with a quote from Zora Neale Hurston's essay "Crazy for This Democracy"—"They tell me this democracy form of government is a wonderful thing. . . and this talk and praise-giving has got me in the notion to try some of the stuff" (Hurston as quoted by Collins, p. 175). Like Hurston's essay, Collins' book draws attention to both the deep potential and the vast, persistent limitations in how American democracy has operated historically—what she describes as "the space between democracy's promise and practices" (p. 176). Yet, Collins demonstrates a capacity for being not only deeply critical about the realities of racism in our current context and its dampening effects on democracy but also for being hopeful, if not optimistic, about democracy's promise. She writes, "[we need an] ethos of hope coupled with action strategies to move it forward" (p. 34).

This book is an example of the best kind of public scholarship—work that brings together a number of sociological insights acquired in Collins' career of teaching and of thinking and writing about racial inequality and social justice. The book asks how we might capitalize on the democratic possibilities we have before us today in a way that also addresses the "challenges of our time" (p. xv). In a manner that perhaps few other scholars could pull off so well, *Another Kind of Public Education* seamlessly weaves together theory, anecdote, analysis of historical trends, and cultural texts to call for both thinking and acting differently in the world.

Collins' central concern is the role of education in producing citizens and in empowering a disenfranchised public. While beginning with her own experience of being

personally silenced in Philadelphia's public schools and serving as a witness to the disenfranchisement of many other children and youth, she nevertheless asserts the importance of education for creating engaged and critical citizens and calls for recommitting to vibrant public schools. She asserts that education is a key social institution for "putting teeth into democratic possibilities" (p. 11).

One major force preventing the realization of the educational and democratic possibilities she calls for is racism as a system of power. In Chapter Two, Collins adds to the important work by Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, Joe Feagin, Michael Omi and Howard Winant, and others, offering the domains-of-power framework for understanding how racism, and specifically colorblind racism, works today. She argues that racism as a system of power operates on four domains: structural (institutional structures), disciplinary (organizational practices), cultural (ideas and ideology) and interpersonal (everyday race relations). The domains-of-power framework, she suggests, serves to (a) encourage us to look beyond racism exclusively as operating at the interpersonal level, (b) pay attention to how racism simultaneously works within each domain and across all four, (c) think about the distinct analytic questions generated by each domain, and (d) push us to think about how each domain contains tools of oppression and of resistance. In many ways this framework is not new—it resonates with the work of a number of scholars, including Collins' own. It is a quite useful heuristic, however, for thinking about the multifaceted and multileveled way that race works today. Its emphasis on giving attention to specificity within and continuity across all four levels, along with the push to think about how racism is both reproduced and challenged in each domain, is particularly helpful.

Building on her call for strategies of action, in Chapter Three, Collins then tackles how we might resist colorblind racism as a system of power. Again, she focuses specifically on education here, and provides concrete examples of what resistance looks like along each dimension. For instance, in the structural domain Collins argues for creating safe learning spaces where children can express

themselves freely. Drawing examples from her own teaching and others', she describes concretely what such spaces look and feel like—how to, for example, make a classroom with no windows and black walls come alive, how such teaching prepares students for a different kind of engagement with the world. In the disciplinary domain Collins argues for making the hidden curricula explicit. She gives examples of classroom exercises she has used to get students to ask important questions: what are the rules? who do they serve? what are the narratives? whose truths do they tell?

Chapter Four expands on these ideas, particularly how to resist racism in the cultural domain. Here Collins explores African American youths' relationship to media and consumerism. Drawing on the example of the widespread marketing of Nelly's Pimp Juice and the lessons it offers to black youth about race, gender, and power, she demonstrates the role of the media in often narrowly "educating" youth about their place in the world and examines in depth how youth might be encouraged to become more critical consumers. Here she focuses on the potential of youth not merely as consumers of ideas but as cultural creators and thus, potentially, as catalysts for change.

Collins ends by reiterating both her commitment to the ideal of democracy and to doing it better. Here she advocates for "visionary pragmatism," which consists of "choosing to commit to principles that can be used to guide human action" (p. 178). While acknowledging the tension between what is and what we might imagine to be possible, she explicitly argues for avoiding the passivity generated by cynicism.

Another Kind of Public Education is, in fact, another important book from a scholar whose work has long provided theoretically rich analyses of the intersections of race, gender, and sexuality. With its substantial dose of both critical analyses of today's realities and of hope about the future, it is a quite useful text for use in a range of undergraduate courses (e.g., introduction to sociology, social problems, sociology of children and youth, race and ethnic relations, as well as courses in education, and media studies). Collins here offers a way not only of thinking carefully about social inequalities but also of

addressing them. It would be hard for any student to walk away from this book and ask the oft expressed end of semester sentiment, "but what do we do?" The book clearly has much to recommend in it. I walked away from it with only one real regret: that Collins did not give more of a nod to some of the related scholarship in education that similarly engages questions of how schools might educate a critical citizenry and assist African American youths' development of critical literacy skills and action strategies (e.g., the work of scholars such as Henry Giroux, Michael Apple, Lisa Delpit, Shawn Ginwright, Joel Spring, Maisha Winn, Valerie Kinloch, Sabina Vaught, Adrienne Dixon, David Stovall, Jeff Duncan-Andrade, etc.). If Collins' many followers found their way to this related literature it could only expand and widen this important conversation about how to change educational practices to enrich democracy.

Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class, by **Jefferson Cowie**. New York, NY: New Press, 2010. 464pp. \$27.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781565848757.

RYAN MOORE

Florida Atlantic University
Rmoore43@fau.edu

With the benefit of hindsight, the 1970s have come to be seen as a pivotal time in the transformation of American society. In two recently published and highly acclaimed works, Judith Stein has examined the restructuring of American political economy as a decade when capital "traded factories for finance," while Daniel T. Rodgers has placed the 1970s at the inception of an intellectual shift to "an age of fracture" cutting across a wide range of social thought. In Jefferson Cowie's *Stayin' Alive*, the 1970s were "the last days of the working class" because the social compact that had brought unprecedented affluence to American workers since World War II was demolished to clear a path for more cutthroat forms of neoliberal capitalism. Cowie also presents a superb class analysis of the music, movies, and popular culture of the 1970s, and thus *Stayin' Alive* stands among the most innovative books to have

developed from the intersection of cultural studies and labor history, exemplified by the scholarship of Stanley Aronowitz, Elizabeth Cohen, Robin D.G. Kelley, and George Lipsitz.

The early 1970s was a time of great promise for the American labor movement, particularly as younger workers had been influenced by the counterculture and the movements for peace and racial justice. Cowie discusses a series of strikes and upsurges of the rank and file led by younger, more anti-authoritarian workers, like the Lordstown autoworkers strike of 1972 that was called an "industrial Woodstock." The movements for racial and sexual equality presented an especially significant opportunity to connect identity politics with social class, and Cowie identifies several moments when these possibilities could be glimpsed in the insurgencies of farm workers, textile workers, and office workers. However, these political alliances based on the interrelations of class, race, and gender would not endure. As chronicled in the second chapter, their failure was encapsulated in the McGovern campaign of 1972, which never received the full support of organized labor, with many union leaders taking umbrage at the delegation's racial and sexual diversity and countercultural spirit. Meanwhile, Richard Nixon had been courting white working-class voters by emphasizing cultural values in place of economic interests, employing the "new southern strategy" to attract George Wallace supporters along with those besieged by anti-war protests and social deviance. Nixon further exploited working-class populism by representing himself in opposition to the stereotypical image of Northeastern liberal elites, as the champion of hard-working taxpayers who are victimized by a coalition of parasitic underclasses and privileged know-it-alls.

A key strength of *Stayin' Alive* is Cowie's discussion of how popular music and Hollywood films did not simply reflect the social changes of the 1970s but became objects of struggle in their own right. Country music, for example, moved to the center of political struggle as forces from both the Left and the Right sought to be aligned with the authenticity conferred by the white working class. Countercultural musicians including Bob

Dylan, the Byrds, and the Grateful Dead had begun recording country-themed albums in the late 1960s, and the hybrid of "country rock" was a key component of the record industry's expansion during the 1970s. Just as some New Left radicals had been trying to infiltrate factories and proletarian neighborhoods, musicians like Jackson Browne and The Band romanticized the historical struggles of working-class America in song. Nonetheless, these progressive, countercultural sentiments did not stick as signifiers of working-class authenticity, which would be more effectively pulled in the rightward direction of nationalism and patriarchy. Cowie begins his fourth chapter with the story of Merle Haggard's performance at the White House for Pat Nixon's birthday in 1973, a somewhat awkward cultural collision between the administration and an ex-felon turned country star, but one where Haggard performed his reactionary anti-hippie anthem "Okie from Muskogee" to the great enthusiasm of the Republican elite. In turn, if some progressives did symbolically align themselves with white working-class culture, many others on the Left have accepted these reactionary images of intolerant hardhats and ignorant Joe Six-packs, whose ideological development is traced by Cowie from the anti-hippie killing spree in the 1970 film *Joe* to the definitive symbol of working-class bigotry in the character of Archie Bunker.

Scholars of public policy often remark that the Nixon Administration now looks surprisingly liberal, as new legislation and federal agencies like the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) were created for the protection of workers, consumers, and the environment. In the later years of the 1970s, however, labor would be knocked into a defensive position with the beginning of a protracted campaign to undo the economic democracy established during the New Deal and after World War II. This reversal of fortunes in the class struggle is covered in the fifth and sixth chapters in great, if sometimes tedious, detail. Cowie is at his best in the seventh chapter, which returns to the analysis of music and popular culture. Here we find Bruce Springsteen singing about racing in the rustbelt's de-industrializing streets at the same time that

emerging punk bands like the Ramones and Devo were personifying delinquency and social decline from the blue-collar environs of Queens and Akron. Meanwhile, on screen we see a disgruntled cabdriver scowling at the signs of social decay surrounding him in Times Square, an Italian-American boxer who miraculously arises from the mean streets of Philadelphia to stand toe-to-toe with the cocky African American champion, and a disco dancer who flees the confines of his ethnic neighborhood in Brooklyn's Bay Ridge for the glamorous Saturday nights of Manhattan. In the last of these, whose signature soundtrack gives Cowie's book its title, the lead character's escape was a prophetic microcosm of the direction that American society would take as factories closed, finance capitalism grew, and working-class urban neighborhoods were remade into post-industrial playgrounds of commercial leisure.

The Origins of American Criminology: Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 16, edited by **Francis T. Cullen, Cheryl Lero Jonson, Andrew J. Myer, and Freda Adler**. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2011. 433pp. \$69.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781412814676.

JOHN F. GALLIHER
 University of Missouri, Columbia
 galliherj@missouri.edu

According to the introduction written by the editors, an effort was made to divide up the contributions into schools of thought, then to see how later theories build upon the earlier ones, and to present the core ideas of each tradition to emphasize simplicity that will ultimately lead toward a sociology of criminology. These are all commendable goals. This edited collection on criminological theory includes excellent previously published chapters as well as highly variable original selections. The best essays are typically found at the beginning of the book and include entries about some early prominent criminologists such as Clifford Shaw, Henry McKay, Edwin Sutherland, Robert Merton, Thorsten Sellin, Marvin Wolfgang, Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck, Freda Adler, Richard

Quinney, Walter Reckless, Simon Dinitz, and Travis Hirschi. As the book progresses the selections generally move to consideration of more recent scholars and scholarship. For this reason a revealing work by Ronald Akers on his contributions to Social Learning Theory appears near the end of the collection. The initial chapters include an outstanding reprinted paper dealing with Shaw and McKay on the ecological patterns of social disorganization, crime, and delinquency in Chicago written in the 1970s by Jon Snodgrass followed by an equally outstanding essay by Colin Goff and Gilbert Geis on Edwin Sutherland and the origins of his Differential Association Theory. The original chapters include background information about the scholars in question. In general this material is well done and informative. And the editors are to be commended for including a selection on Richard Quinney, who is a sociologist on the margins of criminology. That's the good news.

On the other hand, the editors should have written a conclusion to bring forth the similarities among these chapters rather than letting them stand alone as is presently the case. The collection ends abruptly with a short essay about an Advances in Criminological Theory Editorial Board member and Duke psychology/psychiatry professor Terrie Moffitt. Thus the editors violate their own rule of thumb expressed in the introduction where they said it was important to search for the central features of all theoretical contributions in the interest of simplicity. Also, the editors did their friends no service by asking them to write these essays for such a strangely produced collection. Some prominent criminologists such as William Chambliss, Alfred Lindesmith, Albert Cohen, Karl Schuessler and Austin Turk are largely ignored in this collection. This being the case Indiana University, where Edwin Sutherland completed his theory and his career, is given short shrift compared to other universities emphasized in this collection. The University of California at Berkeley also seems curiously missing. Thus David Matza, Jerome Skolnick and Troy Duster are not placed in context nor is there any consideration given to the distinguished Berkeley School of Criminology unceremoniously closed in the 1960s by then Governor Ronald

Reagan. Labeling theory and Howard Becker are also missing in action and this omission alone leaves a gaping hole in the book. In place of these figures the editors at times included selections from or about those whose inclusion strains credulity.

Here and there the book begs for analysis that is not forthcoming. One of the essays on Robert Merton notes that he was reluctant to give interviews dealing with his background. This essay later notes that as a youth he changed his name from Meyer Schkolnick and Merton noted that American actor Tony Curtis had done the same. For some time I have felt that something in this story is missing and just does not add up¹. Would Merton change his first and last names merely because actors were doing this? Of course, prior to WWII anti-semitism was a virulent force in academia as it was throughout American society. It seems likely that it was in this context that Merton anglicized his name. Just prior to WWII Merton told a Jewish undergraduate who was experiencing gross discrimination in applying for financial support from graduate schools that if he desired to have a career in academia he should change his name. Decades later Merton probably did not want to call attention to his caving in to this pressure by altering his names. This provides one example of the lack of depth found in even the best of the essays. Another illustration of this lack of thorough analysis is found in an overly brief discussion of the aborted collaboration of Thorsten Sellin and Sutherland. An offering near the front of the book on "Communities of Crime Revisited" seems out of place, being found just after Sutherland and just before essays on Merton. At a minimum, a thorough editing of this collection would have been warranted. If the collection is intended for use in the classroom then this editing is especially necessary to avoid giving the wrong impression about the nature

¹*Editor's Note:* Merton explained the origin of his assumed name in the Charles Homer Haskins Lecture at the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies in Philadelphia (April 1994), republished in Robert K. Merton, *On Social Structure and Science*, edited and introduced by Piotr Sztompka (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996); see pp. 347-48.

of the field of criminology. If on the other hand the book is intended only for professionals in the field, then readers will surely see for themselves the glaring omissions in this book.

Violence Against Women: Myths, Facts, Controversies, by **Walter S. DeKeseredy**. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press, 2011. 178pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9781442603998.

DONILEEN R. LOSEKE
 University of South Florida
 dloseke@usf.edu

Walter S. DeKeseredy begins this short book by alerting readers of his biases: The book has a “decidedly sociological orientation,” and “gives room to research, theories and policies that are often ignored or poorly treated by the mainstream media, politicians, and the general public.” This makes sense given the book’s purpose which is to “play a role in the ongoing struggle to end much of the pain and suffering experienced by thousands of Canadian women on a daily basis” (p. xi).

What follows are six chapters, each organized around particular questions about violence against women. Chapter One begins with the definitional question, “What is Violence Against Women?” Distinguishing between definitions that are narrow (concern limited to physical violence) and broad (defining violence as including all forms of “male power abuse”), the chapter ends by simultaneously emphasizing the importance of emotional abuse while limiting the book primarily to discussions of physical and sexual assault. Chapter Two, “It Often Hurts to be a Woman in Canada,” begins with an assortment of statistics and vignettes demonstrating and illustrating violence, and then continues into theories of causes of violence, specifically those conceptualizing violence as the consequences of men feeling unable to live up to perceived gender expectations and to hegemonic masculinity.

Chapter Three, “But Women Do It Too!,” contains the well-known criticisms of the Conflict Tactics Scale, the research measure most associated with findings that “women

are as violent as men.” This chapter covers the political implications of findings of “sexual symmetry” (ignoring violence against women) as well as discussions of problems from media over-dramatizations of women’s violence. Chapter Four, “Who Would Do Such a Thing?” in covering theories of cause, starts with limitations of psychological explanations, and then moves to “three powerful sociological determinants” (p. 74), which are pornography, male peer support, and patriarchal attitudes and beliefs.

Chapter Five, “Why Can’t Abused Women Leave Home?” in turning to that most common question about women victims, begins with a list of positive social changes helping women (such as mandatory arrest policies and increases in the number of shelters) before moving to discussions of women’s fears, consequences of emotional abuse, the plight of rural women, economic factors trapping women, and the absence of community support. Chapter Six, “Consequences of Violence Against Women,” contains the multiple physical, psychological and economic consequences of violence as well as the effects of violence against women on children. Finally, Chapter Seven, “What Can We Do: Policy Options,” begins with questions about the roles and limits of legal interventions and moves to the need to eliminate pornography. From there it turns to what “well-meaning men,” as well as to what “feminist men” might do to help. It concludes with the need for economic form, the role of government, and the need to change media.

After reading this book, I have with no doubt that DeKeseredy believes deeply in the need for fundamental social change in order to reduce the immense problem of violence against women. It also is clear that he has a long-term involvement in this social change project—the reference list contains more than 30 published articles written over the last 20 years in which he is the sole or first author; he is the second or third author on countless other publications. Unfortunately, these exemplary political commitments and academic credentials do not combine to produce a book that is either an impassioned call for political action or a forceful intellectual argument. It seems stuck between attempts to appeal to hearts and attempts to appeal to minds: The calls to political action are

repeatedly interrupted by citations to academic research; discussions of research often seem to be gratuitous support for political action; there is little in the way of organization or logical development of ideas and arguments within chapters or between chapters. The author clearly has the desire and abilities to write in ways that will inspire social change as well as in ways that will bring academic understandings to complex political topics. But it is uncertain that appeals to hearts and to minds can be effectively accomplished simultaneously.

The New Economy and the Modern South, by **Michael Dennis**. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009. 346pp. \$75.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780813032917.

PAUL LUEBKE
 UNC Greensboro
 paull@ncleg.net

Despite its contemporary-sounding title, this book primarily examines Virginia politics during the 1990s in the context of a changing global economy. Michael Dennis' discussion of what he calls the New Economy—the downsizing of white collar jobs due to technology and the flow of good-paying blue-collar jobs overseas—uses multiple Virginia magazine and newspaper citations to analyze a worker-unfriendly political economy.

Focusing on Republican George Allen's four years as governor between 1994 and 1998, Dennis explains how Allen's strong alliance with corporate interests sought to reduce the size of state government programs. Allen welcomed all multi-national corporations to Virginia, highlighting a minimum of state-level regulation, reduced taxes, relatively low wages, and weak labor unions.

Dennis clearly embraces economic populism and wishes for a New Deal-like interracial progressive coalition. However, in viewing Virginia politics from the left, Dennis unnecessarily overlooks the different ideological roots of conservative Republican governors like Allen (1994-98) and Jim Gilmore (1998-2002) on the one hand, and those of Democratic governors Douglas Wilder (1990-94) and Mark Warner (2002-06) on the other. Dennis expresses such frustration

with Wilder's unwillingness to stand strongly for organized labor and his endorsement of business-friendly slogans intended to lure multi-national corporations to Virginia that a reader could easily believe that Virginia Republicans and Democrats were indistinguishable in the 1990s.

In fact, Virginia's Democratic governors in recent decades have resembled Democratic governors in other Southern states, most notably Bill Clinton in Arkansas and Jim Hunt in North Carolina. Both Clinton and Hunt are centrist Democrats, who, in their commitment to public education, some environmental protection, and the concerns of African Americans and pro-choice women, stood in contrast to their conservative Republican rivals. Dennis criticizes President Clinton for championing NAFTA, a centrist political stance, but he overlooks the fact that most congressional Democrats opposed that legislation.

Some of Dennis' chapters add very little to the existing literature. "Downsized Business and the Insecure Worker," and "Office Workers and the Era of Uncertainty in Virginia" (Chapters Two and Three) are a repetition of material that, except for the inclusion of Virginia examples, is fully familiar to any well-informed reader. In several chapters, Dennis' chapter titles promise much more than they deliver. For example, the fourth chapter, "Southern Labor in the Era of Market Dominance," primarily chronicles one union drive: the United Food and Commercial Workers Union's failed effort in the early 1990s to organize grocery store employees in the Norfolk-Newport News area of southeastern Virginia.

The targeted food store chain, Be-Lo, maintained that the UFCW was unnecessarily interfering with the employer-employee relationship (a standard anti-union argument), but also that its stores, if unionized, could not compete against a major nonunion chain like Food Lion. Thus, if Be-Lo workers chose a union, they would sooner or later force Be-Lo stores to close. UFCW organizers thought they would prevail, but employer scare tactics carried the day in the March 1991 election; workers at thirty Be-Lo stores voted 377 to 220 against union representation. The chapter's overall message is straightforward: despite the occasional successful labor

campaign, few Virginia workplaces are organized, because of an institutional corporate structure that dominates public opinion. The corporate culture convinces most workers that voting for a union is not worth the risk.

Toward the end of his book, Dennis devotes a chapter to a discussion of a grassroots left-leaning organization, the Virginia Organizing Project. The chapter is curious for two reasons. First, the VOP activism took place in 2000 and 2001, while the remainder of the book is about the 1990s. Second, VOP's political action did not address state-level policies, but instead focused on, for example, a successful campaign to enact a living wage ordinance in Arlington, a Washington DC suburb. Apparently, VOP lobbied neither sympathetic Democratic members of the legislature nor other Democrats for a leftward shift in state government priorities. The VOP chapter comes across as an appendage, disconnected from the big business and big government interactions that are at the heart of the remainder of the book.

While Dennis' book is a helpful compendium of facts about Virginia's economy and politics in the 1990s, it suffers from excessive length. More importantly, the long lag time between the completion of the manuscript (the narrative ends on 9-11-01) and its 2009 publication date should have obligated Dennis to write an afterword. This afterword would have analyzed the successful four-year tenure (2002-06) of Governor Mark Warner. Warner "sold" Virginians on the virtues of a centrist state government. His accomplishments paved the way for an extraordinary event: Barack Obama's 2008 victory in Virginia, the first Democratic presidential winner there since Lyndon Johnson in 1964. An afterword would have placed Dennis' study in a present-day context.

The Supportive State: Families, Government, and America's Political Ideals, by **Maxine Eichner**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010. 198pp. \$49.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780195343212.

JOYA MISRA

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
misra@soc.umass.edu

In *The Supportive State*, legal scholar Maxine Eichner considers what role the state should play vis-à-vis American families. Her goal is to revise contemporary liberal theory, primarily as represented by John Rawls, to devise a new "supportive state" model. Rather than rejecting liberal theory's premises around individualism, Eichner seeks to integrate care, dependency, and family into liberal theory. Seeking to build upon the strengths of a liberal perspective in valuing freedom and justice, Eichner also argues that within an overwhelmingly liberal political tradition, such an approach is more likely to be implemented than those suggested by the left. However, her book also builds on and responds to a range of feminist theorists, including Martha Nussbaum, Susan Moller Okin, Martha Fineman, Eva Kittay, and Joan Tronto.

Eichner begins by critiquing Rawls and laying out her own "supportive state" model. Her major critique of Rawls rests on his not recognizing the inevitability of dependency across the life course. For Eichner, autonomy cannot be assumed, but must be achieved: "Without caretaking and adequate development of their capabilities, individuals could not become the (largely) autonomous citizens whose choices are worthy of respect" (p. 49). Thus, she argues that the state has a responsibility to support caretaking and human development. Eichner also critiques Rawls for his belief in a strong public/private demarcation, maintaining that law and policy are inextricably linked to family forms. Finally, Eichner contributes to discussions on democracy, arguing that healthy families create the engaged citizenry necessary for liberal democracies to flourish.

Eichner's theoretical intervention is clearest when she reasons against a "residual" model of the state, where the state steps in

only when the family fails in its responsibilities, and for a joint model, where families and the state work in conjunction with one another, recognizing that “institutions structured directly and indirectly by the state profoundly affect families’ ability to care for their members” (p. 60). This “supportive state” model is meant to respect citizens’ autonomy, while fostering families’ capabilities. Eichner also contends that family privacy should be an important good supported by the state, yet alongside other important goods such as children’s welfare, human development, and civic virtues.

The central chapters of the book focus on what the “supportive state” model might suggest about the state’s roles in both vertical relationships (such as caregivers for children or the elderly) and horizontal relationships (such as marriage). In thinking about vertical relationships, Eichner critiques both the residual model of the state, and models that consider children to be “public goods,” emphasizing instead the state’s responsibility to support “the dignity of its citizens” (p. 78). For horizontal relationships, Eichner argues against those who make the case for traditional (heterosexual) marriage and those who argue against marriage. Here, she argues that the state should recognize relationships between adults, and should privilege these relationships because of the importance of caretaking to society. She notes, “Given that a primary reason for the state to privilege adult intimate relationships is caretaking. . . the state has valid reasons to support all the following horizontal relationships involving caretaking: two elderly sisters who live together and take care of one another, a nonmonogamous homosexual couple, a commune of five adults who live together with their children, and a heterosexual married couple” (p. 105). By thinking through both vertical and horizontal relationships, Eichner applies her model to a wide range of contemporary issues, including foster care, welfare reform, gay marriage, teen abortion, work-family reconciliation, and other issues.

Although some of Eichner’s arguments are engaging, others seem muddled. For example, she rejects the notion that the state should support childrearing because it provides a public good, yet the public good of

providing care for another adult seems less problematic for her. Eichner also makes arguments about the importance of both marriage and multi-parent families that seem less convincing to me as a sociologist, and perhaps at odds with the principle of autonomy that is so central to liberal theory. In addition, Eichner draws examples from other wealthy countries in order to suggest alternate models of state support for families, without analyzing the normative political theory underlying those models. At times, her argument seems to follow from the outcomes she wishes to support, rather than being derived from her theoretical model.

Eichner’s audience is not necessarily sociologists, but more likely other legal theorists, and broader audiences. She makes a number of references to arguments made by conservatives (most notably, Rick Santorum), and appears to be deeply engaged in responding to attacks from the right against state support for families. In doing so, Eichner makes a strong, and persuasive argument for why and how states and families should work together—for the good of individuals, families, and a healthy polity.

Gender Dynamics and Post-Conflict Reconstruction, edited by **Christine Eifler** and **Ruth Seifert**. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2009. 298pp. \$67.95 paper. ISBN: 9783631560587.

JENNIFER F. KLOT
Social Science Research Council
 klot@ssrc.org

Christine Eifler and Ruth Seifert’s edited collection, *Gender Dynamics and Post-Conflict Reconstruction* is a significant contribution to a small but growing field of research and practice. Grounded in feminist peacebuilding and critical-security literature, it is among the few to offer empirical assessments of the prevailing “gender orthodoxy” as practiced by international peacebuilding institutions in post-conflict situations. With support from the Gunda Werner Institute for Feminism and Gender Democracy in the Heinrich Böll Foundation in Germany, this volume has its origins in a unique model of research training and collaboration

among faculty, doctoral fellows, and researchers from conflict regions in Europe and the Middle East. With an emphasis on post-conflict reconstruction, the analyses are rooted in an understanding of how different expressions of violence and social crises shape gender identities and relations before, during, and after conflicts take place.

This collection is unyielding in its interrogation of the assumptions on which international gender and security policies are based. Eleven case studies provide a rarified window into the perspective of “local actors” and women’s movements regarding the relevance and adequacy of the gender policies advanced by international and regional peace operations. In exploring the factors shaping their impacts, both intended and unintended, two recurring themes emerge: (1) the disconnected, often competing and sometimes conflicting interests, priorities and strategies that distinguish “international” and “local” gender and security agendas; and (2) the circumstances under which international peacebuilding strategies in general—and the implementation of gender policies in particular—further marginalize women’s peacebuilding efforts, and reinforce and/or create new forms of inequality.

In each of the chapters, the emphasis within international gender policies on electoral, judicial, and legislative reforms is contrasted with the wider-ranging and more nuanced priorities among local women’s movements, in relation to security, housing, employment, water and political accountability. In the case of Afghanistan, Susanne Schmeidl attributes these disconnects to “the inadequate knowledge and analysis of . . . past and current gender dynamics by international actors. . . (p. 73). In Bosnia, Anne Jenichen concludes that international gender equality initiatives are unresponsive to local feminist values and risk legitimizing and creating new, exclusionary structures of power among a selected urban elite. She considers their potential to advance the position of ordinary Bosnian women, “illusory.” Similarly, in Kyrgyzstan, Meghan Simpson attributes the “class blindness of international feminist organs” to the creation and intensification of social cleavages between feminists, civic activists, and the rural poor (p. 144).

In the case of Kosovo, Lynne Alice associates the bureaucratic constraints imposed

by international institutions with the limited ability of local women’s groups in Kosovo to assert their own priorities and to regain or recreate their own authority within the national reconstruction agenda. Even in the case of policies and programs advanced by the United Nations Development Fund for Women, Alice points to a narrowing of space within which local women’s groups can “develop alternative discourses, strategies and accountabilities (p. 53).”

According to Vjollca Krasniqi, “the gender constructions that international organizations import into post-war areas. . . do not necessarily live up to” (p. 165) the official political policies and, at worst, they may reinforce or create new forms of inequality. In Kosovo, she points to a “remarkable contradiction between the political modernisation discourse of the ‘International Community’” (p. 17) and the actual practice which ignored and/or marginalized Kosovar women’s voices and reinforced patriarchal power relations and traditional gender roles (p. 156). Through an analysis of “UN propaganda posters” and local nationalist political advertising, Krasniqi shows how gender has been used by both the “International Community” and Kosovar Albanian nationalists as a tool to reinforce traditional gender roles and to “ensure UN’s imposition of Western policies and norms and as a mechanism for local politicians not only to get a share of state power but also to consolidate their domination of the private sphere” (p. 155).

Remzije Istrefi and Ariana Qosaj-Mustafa associate even graver consequences for women in post-conflict Kosovo with a much more explicit collusion between the international and local: they posit that sex trafficking would not have flourished without the demand of international civilian peacekeepers and soldiers. They document the systematic failures by both the United Nations Mission in Kosovo and Kosovar authorities to investigate and prosecute cases, provide victim protection and assistance, enforce disciplinary action, and address procedural obstacles. As the first UN mission to establish an Office for Gender Equality, these well-documented transgressions illustrate the contradictions—noted in almost every study—between official gender policies and gendered practices of

international personnel which, according to Istrefi and Qosaj-Mustafa, "call into doubt the moral and political claims that are advanced by the hegemonic human rights discourse and offered to post-conflict regions" (p. 131).

Throughout the collection, there persists a fuzzy distinction between the role of the international feminist movement and of international organizations in advancing gender equality in post-conflict reconstruction. While the call for "closer scrutiny of international (feminist) organizations and their objectives and agendas" is certainly warranted, greater scrutiny and distinction should also be given to the agendas of the "International Community" as reflected in UN, multilateral, and regional peace operations. The latter are, themselves, influential sites of power and negotiation in which gender identities are reconstructed, reconfigured and redefined, both discursively and materially. And although the international women's movement played a significant role in shaping the gender and security policies advanced by these international organizations, and especially the Security Council's first Resolution (no. 1325) on women and peace and security, the resulting gender policies and their implementation failures are more likely to reflect the agendas, processes and structures of the international organizations than of the international feminist movement. Greater clarity about international peacebuilding structures and processes may identify new opportunities for transnational feminist solidarity to increase international accountability to local priorities.

The Causal Power of Social Structures: Emergence, Structure and Agency, by **Dave Elder-Vass**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 221pp. \$85.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780521194457.

ALEXANDER RILEY
Bucknell University
atriley@bucknell.edu

Though many critical realists, including the author of this book, are unsympathetic to the quasi-religious direction taken in recent years by the movement's central figure Roy

Bhaskar, the disdain for pluralism in social science theory found in some of the school's work can seem almost evangelical. We are told that the existing social sciences are "sadly absent" the "firm ontological foundation" required to enable them to attain "the status of 'well-developed science'" (p. 70), and only critical realism can provide this foundation. In this highly ambitious book, Dave Elder-Vass presents his offering on the definition of structures and agency in just this bold register: "we can *only* make sense of social structure by reinstating th[e] sense of structure-as-whole and identifying the social entities that can possess causal powers" (p. 82, emphasis added).

The book's central goal is to remove abstraction from the concept of "social structure." If social structures exist, they must be located in the world, and specifically in empirically existing groups (which he calls "norm circles" [p. 122]) who exercise causal power over individuals through their support of normative beliefs (p. 125). The definition of normative compulsion is largely indebted to Durkheim, but Elder-Vass wants to avoid pointing to the mystification "society" as the source of that power. He distinguishes a number of different varieties of norm circles (proximal, imagined, actual), always insisting that we must be talking about identifiable groups of actually existing people (p. 128). The effort is commendable, but it is not self-evident that all norm circles can be so defined; what of those who adhere to the norm of protecting the weak at least in part because of what they learned reading comic books and watching Westerns as a child?

Of course, defining "structure" requires also an effort to clarify what we mean by "agency." When Elder-Vass uses this latter term, he means no more or less than "the networks of neurons that make up a large part of our brains" (p. 90). Accepting this does not "commit us to any form of biological reductionism" (p. 92), though paired with the causal force of structure it would seem to point toward a determinist theory of human action. A potential problem emerges when Elder-Vass moves from the networks of neurons to talk about "the most important" of our "emergent causal powers" as "our generic power to act, including *our power to act communicatively*" (p. 89, emphasis added). How

do we communicate? Through symbols, signs, discourse, and language, none of which receives any significant attention in the book. Elder-Vass seeks to allay criticisms here by promising a book on culture, but this hardly seems sufficient. If the very core of human agency resides in culture, must not we have a theory of culture *before* we can have a theory of agency?

Much of the discussion of agency involves a critique of the Bourdieuan *habitus*. Following in Archer's steps, Elder-Vass attacks Bourdieu for the sin of "conflationism"—he sees agency and structure as mutually constitutive. Elder-Vass tells us that the Bourdieuan notion of habits as "structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures" is "a clear ontological error in that it fails to distinguish between a thing and its causal consequences" (p. 106, 107). This "error," however, arguably constitutes part of Bourdieu's effort to deal with an essential facet of social structure that this book omits entirely (and Elder-Vass admits as much [p. 204]): *power*. The habit ingrained by the systematic experiences arising from a particular position in structure is the effect of power, and to move it, as Elder-Vass would, into the category of "properties of human beings" and out of structure is to make that fact rather easier to miss. It is perhaps correct that, in this move, Bourdieu is "denying the real distinction between external and internal forces" (p. 106), but he does so precisely because he recognizes that social science is involved in a game with high *moral* stakes. But Elder-Vass is clear that the "emancipatory" aspect of critical realism as formulated initially by Bhaskar is not of central interest to him (p. 11). It would seem then that this branch of critical realism has taken the same evolutionary path from its origins that scientific Marxism did in relation to the revolutionary social theory of Marx himself, embracing a certain debatable notion of science at the expense of the emancipatory project.

In the book's penultimate chapter, we find a telling practical example of the limits of the theory of structure elaborated therein. Elder-Vass examines an interaction in an electronics shop between an employee and a customer buying a television set. The customer is

male and the employee female; the reader is assured that "most of the issues would be the same whatever the genders of the participants" (p. 170). There follow four pages of description of the interaction in the terms of the theory of structure presented in the book: description of the parties' likely understandings of the rules of such commercial interactions, and speculation on the various norm circles and organizations in which the hypothetical saleswoman is involved and how they will affect her behavior. But there is not a word about how the structural reality of *gender* relations will affect the interaction; how do the employee's physical attractiveness and demeanor as evaluated within the operating cultural system of female beauty (is she too assertive for a woman? too flirtatious? not flirtatious enough?) affect the interaction? What about the customer's beliefs concerning the relationship of gender and knowledge about technology?

This approach to structure and agency will likely appeal to readers already convinced of the basic tenets of the work of Archer and the early Bhaskar. The real test of the argument will be how effectively it can speak to those who are not already on board the critical realist train. The limitations of the theory with respect to culture and power, coupled with the book's dry, repetitive writing style, give some cause for skepticism on that question.

Second-Wave Neoliberalism: Gender, Race, and Health Sector Reform in Peru, by **Christina Ewig**. University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2010. 255pp. \$67.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780271037127.

TANJA RENER
 University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
 tanja.rener@guest.arnes.si

Second-Wave Neoliberalism speaks of the market-oriented restructuring of state social policies in Peru, particularly of health policy, and its impact on gender, class and race. By examining the local and global factors, the author tries to answer why feminists, previously actively involved in both, globally on the same or similar issues, and locally, arguing against the first-wave neoliberal dramatic cuts in state social services, failed to

intervene in the second-wave policy reforms in Peru. These reforms started in the mid-1990s by applying and deepening neoliberal tenets of privatization, decentralization and market competition already present in Fujimori's first-wave "structural adjustments" of policies in 1990. Christina Ewig takes a long-term historical view of the politics of reforms (from the late nineteenth century to the 1980s), heeding how policy legacies, by which she means the variety of interests, previous policy learning effects, and public expectations based on past policy decisions, impacted, in a gendered manner, the contemporary politics of health reforms.

Ewig utilizes multiple research methods to measure and analyze the impact of these reforms on gender equity. The book is based on fifteen months of initial research in Peru, followed by four follow-up trips which contributed to exceptionally rich empirical data. Methodology is crucial to this study, as the author states in the methodological appendix at the end of the book. Indeed, it is a rare opportunity for a reader to observe, step-by-step, how a combination of top-down analysis of policy formation with bottom-up, qualitative and quantitative analysis of policy implementation, works hand-in-hand to produce a careful scrutiny of the topic in focus.

Of the first four chapters of the book, the first one contains clear and honest theoretical and conceptual outlines in the best feminist epistemic tradition of "here I stand." They all are dedicated to an historical and political contextualization of Peru's social and, particularly, health policies. Ewig presents the genesis and policy legacies of public health programs and social security health care, both strongly class-specific, the first mother-child oriented and serving mostly the poor, and the second essentially male privilege of organized workers and middle classes. In analyzing the politics of neoliberal reform and in trying to answer the question of why Peru's policy makers accepted and applied particular foreign models and not others, Ewig highlights the role of competing transnational epistemic communities, that is, transnational networks of policy experts with a set of shared principles and their strength to put into effect one of the possible paradigms, the neoliberal one or the rights one. Chapter

Four informs the reader about the six major health reforms and the impact of policy legacies in gendering the nature of each of them, explaining why gender equity and gender mainstreaming were not incorporated. What follows is an accurate bottom-up based evaluation of—in some cases dramatically different—effects of reforms on different groups of people dependent on their social position structured by gender, race, class and geographical location. Particular attention is placed on the reformed family planning program, the only one out of six health policy reforms that is based on the rights paradigm and that has in practice—ironically, as the author says—continued to produce a series of human-rights violations. In the last chapter, Ewig speaks of public and private health insurance schemes and evaluates them according to their abilities to redistribute and recognize. Unexpectedly, the implications of these two reforms for gender equity cannot be read directly from their different and divergent market/state origin since they converge in more than one way: each is deficient in attending to women's health needs throughout their life course, each overlooks women's basic health needs in attempts to achieve greater "system efficiency," and each has succumbed to conservative traditions which tend to limit women's health needs to reproductive health care and to limit access to this reduced notion, too. Ewig summarizes her major findings in conclusion, adding more question marks than full-stops in regard to the future health policy agenda in the Americas. The only drawback to the book is that it is dense given the range of information provided and repetitive in stressing the importance of an intersectional approach.

Indeed, throughout the book Ewig's analysis works intersectionally to show how reforms have different effects on distinct subgroups of people due to intersecting structures of social organization of gender, class, race and—in the case of Peru—also location, since most of the extreme poor are concentrated in rural areas. Up to now, intersectionality has largely been an epistemic and theoretical orientation. Ewig's book demonstrates brilliantly how a consistent theoretical orientation combined with an extremely accurate empirical field research produces a powerful

result, which, I presume, will be referred to in a number of future studies in at least three fields: social (health) policies, gender equity, and intersectionality. Well, let's add a fourth one: it could be used well in social science methods classes as an example of an efficient and comprehensive methodological approach.

Who Can Stop the Drums?: Urban Social Movements in Chávez's Venezuela, by **Sujatha Fernandes**. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 319pp. \$23.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822346777.

LYNN HORTON
Chapman University
horton@chapman.edu

Who Can Stop the Drums? offers a cogent analysis of contemporary social movements that have emerged from low-income neighborhoods of Caracas to contest structures and discourses of racial/ethnic and class exclusion. In contrast to state-centric and structuralist analyses of the populist regime of Hugo Chávez, Sujatha Fernandes employs interviews with community activists and participant observation to explore the grassroots activism of Venezuela's marginalized urban poor under Chavismo.

Fernandes builds on earlier theoretical works on cultural politics, "attempts by social movements to challenge and redefine the dominant cultural order," to emphasize the spaces of everyday life as important terrains of struggle (p. 19). She focuses on cultural and community organizations distinguished by "their basis in the networks of everyday life, their location in the space of the barrio rather than the party office or union hall, and their attempts to establish independent linkages with the state" (p. 18).

This book's vibrant portraits of barrio life place at the forefront the agency of the urban poor. It refutes representations of Venezuela's popular sectors as easily manipulated, depoliticized individuals and highlights the role of social movements in shaping the nation's political processes. Specifically, Fernandes documents how residents engage in everyday resistance, shape new cultural and racial/ethnic identities, contest dominant negative

stereotypes, practice collective deliberations, and participate in broader political activism and coalition building.

This book locates barrio-based cultural and political activism in the broader context of deepening globalization and the implementation of neoliberal reforms. Fernandes explores how these economic measures—notably privatizations and a weakening of social welfare programs—have led to increased poverty, unemployment, and marginalization. Poor black and indigenous Venezuelans and women have been particularly impacted, and such neoliberal reforms have served as a negative incentive for grassroots mobilization.

The author explores neoliberalism not simply as a set of economic policies, but also as a modern form of power that encompasses rationalities centered on efficiency, individualism, and competition. Urban activists resist neoliberal pressures to shrink public spaces and commodify their cultural production. In contrast to such utilitarian logic, barrio groups are embedded in and value local histories and understand culture "as a way of being linked to their everyday lives and religious cosmologies" (p. 139).

Who Can Stop the Drums? addresses another key area of theoretical debate in the study of Latin American social movements, the relationships between movements and the state. Fernandes characterizes the Chávez government as part of a post-neoliberal order of "hybrid state formation that has mounted certain challenges to the neoliberal paradigm but which remains subject to the internal and external constraints of global capital" (p. 22). With its policies of redistribution of oil income, the Chávez government has offered material resources to community organizations, as well as access to new spaces of participation and opportunities to engage in discourse for the country's black and mestizo majority. In response, many urban groups have applied for state support. In the best cases, Fernandes contends, a mutual empowerment of state and society may occur. In other instances, however, tensions emerged, when urban movements came up against the instrumental rationalities of state agencies and government efforts at top-down populist political incorporation.

Fernandes takes pains not to overgeneralize about Venezuela's urban social movements, emphasizing their complexity and diversity. Some have been more successful than others in negotiating and maintaining their autonomy and resisting state efforts at imposing hierarchies, centralized control, political co-optation, and corruption more generally. While it appears that previous movement histories and leadership quality were factors at play, a more in-depth discussion of why some groups have been more effective under Chavismo would further strengthen this book's theoretical contribution. Likewise, while Fernandes presents vignettes of how individuals negotiate and contest class, racial/ethnic, and gender hierarchies in everyday life, the ways such inequalities impact barrio-based movements internally is less well-explored.

Overall, *Who Can Stop the Drums?* is an excellent, well-written, and engaging work of activist scholarship. It provides not only rich empirical data, but also theoretical insights on some of the key issues confronted by contemporary Latin American social activists. This book is highly recommended for scholars and activists with an interest in social movements and Latin America.

Blowout in the Gulf: The BP Oil Spill Disaster and the Future of Energy in America, by **William R. Freudenberg** and **Robert Gramling**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011. 254pp. \$18.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780262015837.

JOHN URRY
Lancaster University
j.urry@lancaster.ac.uk

This book is a significant contribution to the emerging sociology of energy. It has been written by (the late) William R. Freudenberg and Robert Gramling and details the causes and implications of the BP blowout in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010. It draws upon an impressive range of previous work and expert writings by the two authors. The result is a book that is clear, interesting, and authoritative—a great legacy to the memory of the first author.

Overall these two sociologists of the environment nicely mix analysis and empirical detail. The book will take its place in the small but emerging analyses of “normal accidents” that happen in rather exceptional environments. It is a good example of “public sociology” and should engender a wide readership for the detailed dissection of this corporate and environmental disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, the world's worst oil disaster.

But it is also not just an analysis of a specific disaster but of the kinds of “limits to growth” that the twentieth century imposed upon this new blighted century. The first of two legacies of the twentieth century was an increasing scale of greenhouse gas emissions, which seem to be changing temperatures around the world, an eventuality that most scientists had presumed impossible but for which there is now much significant supportive evidence, despite the claims of climate skeptics so influential in U.S. think tanks and on the blogosphere.

And the second legacy involved the rapid depletion of oil or black gold that had made the previous century, the American century, ever since oil first gushed out of the ground at Spindletop, Texas in 1901. At one time the United States produced more than one-half of the petroleum in the world. But U.S. peak oil production occurred in 1970. Although the Carter Presidency did partially reduce oil consumption, this was only a temporary blip. Freudenberg and Gramling document how the American way of life involves an increasingly desperate search for oil, for what the authors term the search for “weapons of mass consumption.” This search includes the Middle East, countries with often declining supplies and/or hostile governments, environmentally catastrophic sites as in Alberta, and deepwater locations in the Gulf, Alaska, and elsewhere.

And there will be many future spills of this sort as consumers expect the cars, the air conditioners, the planes, the plastics, the fertilizers, and so on, to continue to flow even though the global peaking of oil seems to have occurred in 2006, according to the Chief Economist of the International Energy Authority. Peak oil has also occurred in China—China, the United States, and the European Union are thus all on the resource warpath for even modest “oil dregs” that

might be accessed. The authors thus elaborate how "we are forced to be in such forbidding locations," such as the Gulf which is a place of increasingly destructive hurricanes. These are made worse by changing climates stemming from GHG emissions that in part result from burning all of that oil during the last century. This book also describes well the excessively generous tax breaks provided to the oil extraction industry in the United States, which make reversing oil dependence so difficult.

The Deepwater Horizon was a vast semi-submersible oil rig floating on the surface and it exploded on April 22nd, 2010, 40 years to the day after the first Earth Day in 1970, and the same year as American peak oil! It was drilling for oil off the coast of Louisiana, the place where the offshore oil industry was invented. There had been significant drive towards the much more aggressive leasing of offshore lands when Reagan replaced Carter in 1980. Three-quarters of the 3,500 offshore production facilities in the Gulf are located off the Louisiana coast.

The rig was drilling in water one mile deep, with the "oil reservoir" being another two-and-a-half miles below the seabed. Such reservoirs contain not only rock but also water, oil, and gas. The gas produces the danger of a blowout. The cement for the blowout preventer had been put in place by Halliburton, part of the system of fragmented authority that BP had engineered. The rig was owned by Transocean and had set previous records for offshore drilling but, being registered in the Marshall Islands, was subject to less regulation and lower staffing levels.

Freudenberg and Gramling describe the "atrophy of vigilance" that characterizes managers and workers working over time within such locations. And BP was notorious for its draconian cost saving and safety shortcuts. It was referred to as the "renegade refiner" although the Gulf had seen an astonishing 12,087 oil-related incidents in the previous 5 years! The authors also document the connections between local judges and the oil industry and the hopeless system of regulation especially after 1980. This was truly a disaster waiting to happen and one cannot imagine what kind of similar disaster will occur once BP, Transocean, Halliburton, and their friends get to drilling for oil in the Arctic

once changing climates have raised temperatures sufficiently for more of the ice to have melted at least for periods of the year.

The problem about oil which this important book documents is that there is no plan B to substitute for this astonishingly productive resource created over millions of years during the era of the dinosaurs. As the authors note, humans seem to have so adapted to a world of plentiful oil that they cannot re-adapt as that oil begins to dwindle away, and certainly away from the super-giant oil fields that characterized the last century. Humans are thus rather like the dinosaurs, brilliantly adapted to their oil-rich niche, but hopeless at adjusting to a new environment. This book is part at least of a very urgent and necessary wake-up call even to imagine that there could be a plan B.

At the Heart of Work and Family: Engaging the Ideas of Arlie Hochschild, edited by **Anita Iltz Garey** and **Karen V. Hansen**. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011. 278pp. \$27.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813549569.

MILIANN KANG

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

Being compared to a spider in most cases would constitute faint praise. The editors of *At the Heart of Work and Family: Engaging the Ideas of Arlie Hochschild*, however, invoke the visionary spider, Charlotte of *Charlotte's Web* fame, to dramatize the impressive web of ideas that Arlie Russell Hochschild has spun. In E.B. White's beloved children's story, Charlotte saves the life of Wilbur, a pig doomed for slaughter, by spinning the words "some pig" over his stall. While the farmer sees it as a sign that they possess "no ordinary pig," his wife more cogently observes that they have "no ordinary spider." Anita Garey and Karen Hansen use this tale as an analogue to Hochschild's uncanny ability to see the invisible work behind much of the labor involved in the intricately connected spheres of work and family.

This volume attests to Hochschild's spidery kinship with Charlotte, not only as "some thinker" but also as "some teacher," or in the words of Barbara Ehrenreich in the

foreword, someone who has been "extraordinarily successful at recruiting colleagues and co-conspirators" (p. xi). This collection of articles by many of her former students and collaborators is a fitting and loving tribute to the life work of one of the most original, influential and passionate contributors to the discipline of sociology, and much more broadly to the study of emotions, work, family and human relationships in the global economy.

Ehrenreich sums up Hochschild's contributions as "put(ting) the *people* back in sociology," and this volume builds on Hochschild's project of illuminating the human feelings, and complex negotiations of these feelings, which undergird all social institutions. *At the Heart of Work and Family* both showcases the richness of Hochschild's original concepts and demonstrates how current scholars have elaborated and extended their reach. For some scholars, this means using Hochschild's concepts to examine questions similar to those which she addressed, but in more contemporary contexts, such as Patricia Berhau, Annette Lareau, and Julie Press' chapter which takes Hochschild's analysis of the unequal gendered division of labor in the "second shift" and the "family myths" which support it, and applies it to the "activity management" labor necessitated by today's high standards of children's involvement in sports, music and other enrichment activities. Other chapters extend Hochschild's ideas into areas which she charted but did not herself explore in depth. For example, Kimberly DaCosta applies Hochschild's concept of "the commodity frontier" to examine the commercialization of interracial intimacy as a branding tool for companies, and Pei-Chia Lan takes the framework of "global care chains" to theorize "filial care chains" that link Taiwan and Hong Kong immigrant families in global networks of subcontracted care for elders.

The book has twenty-one chapters divided into five parts: (1) Family Time Binds; (2) Work/Family Feeling Rules for Managing the Heart; (3) Emotional Geography of Invisible Work; (4) Commodifying Intimate Life; and (5) Global Care Chains. The editors helpfully chart the overlapping themes in these sections by also including a "guide to topics" which lists the chapters under different

substantive areas, such as marriage, commodification, gender, race/ethnicity, globalization and carework and emotion work. In addition to the lively foreword by Ehrenreich, it includes an insightful introduction by the editors, and a moving afterword by Hochschild.

The first chapter reprints an early foundational essay by Hochschild, "Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers," chronicling her own personal journey through the academy while documenting a larger pattern of "autodiscrimination" in which women "cool themselves out" in response to the emotional wear of accommodating male career models. On first reading, I questioned the choice of this rather dated essay (first published in 1975), but then found it both prescient and depressing, as many of her experiences still ring all too familiar to academic women today. The book provides an excellent and comprehensive overview of Hochschild's ideas while also presenting an impressive array of new scholarship and would be an engaging text for undergraduate and graduate courses on the sociology of emotions, work, family, and globalization.

It is understandable and appropriate that the essays in *At the Heart* are overwhelmingly appreciative of Hochschild's work, but I found myself hoping for a more critical engagement with her ideas and the debates surrounding them. For example, several chapters cite Viviana Zelizer's work but they do not address her critique that Hochschild and others erroneously disparage emotion management as violating a supposed authenticity of feelings in private relations (2007: 17). Zelizer suggests that Hochschild falls at times into a "hostile worlds" approach, condemning the market for encroaching on private life, rather than exploring how economics and intimacy are inextricably intertwined. This is an important debate that the authors of these essays could have considered in provocative ways.

Further, Hochschild's concept of "emotional labor" has grown legs in business circles, at times justifying practices aimed at increasing productivity and profits in ways which Hochschild and other scholars would find objectionable. Hochschild's success in reaching beyond the academy has without a doubt furthered the mission of public sociology, yet how has the public interpreted and

misinterpreted her work? My own research, while greatly indebted to Hochschild, asks for greater attention to embodied and racialized processes in exchanges of emotional labor between women in face-to-face service interactions (Kang 2010).

Another area which is undertheorized in Hochschild's own work and in this collection concerns the ways in which emotions can be harnessed for social change, or not. A vibrant body of work has linked the sociology of emotions with the study of social movements (see Goodwin, Jasper and Pollenta 2001), and an essay addressing how emotions have impacted collective mobilization in the arenas of work and family would have been a welcome addition.

In sum, *At the Heart of Work and Family* is "some volume." Just as Charlotte hatches a swarm of spider children who take on unexplored worlds, Hochschild has launched a formidable generation of scholars, and this collection represents some of the best of their work.

References

- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and Francesca Polletta, editors. 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kang, Miliann. 2010. *The Managed Hand: Race, Gender and the Body in Beauty Service Work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana. 2007. *The Purchase of Intimacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Acting in Anaesthesia: Ethnographic Encounters with Patients, Practitioners and Medical Technologies, by **Dawn Goodwin**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 187pp. \$82.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780521882064.

ROBERT ZUSSMAN
 University of Massachusetts, Amherst
 Zussman@soc.umass.edu

Acting in Anaesthesia sets out to explain how action becomes intelligible in the complex encounters among medical practitioners (primarily anesthesiologists, nurses, and

technicians), medical devices, and unconscious patients during surgery. *Acting* succeeds admirably in achieving what it sets out to do. However, is what it sets out to do entirely worth doing, at least from the point of view of an erstwhile medical sociologist?

Acting is based on observations of anesthetic practice during operations in an English hospital, roughly once a week over the course of a year, supplemented by in-depth interviews. The empirical core of the book consists of what are, in effect, detailed textual analyses of several incidents during operations. Dawn Goodwin, herself a former anesthetic and recovery room nurse, has an impeccable grasp of anesthetic procedures, a rare and valuable resource for someone also in possession of finely tuned sociological sensibilities, and without which it would have been impossible to produce a book of anywhere near equal interest.

Goodwin begins from a critique of evidence-based medicine for its failure to recognize how knowledge is embedded in personal and local routines, how it is embedded and situated in practice. Very generally, Goodwin sets out to move from a model of individual action to a model of action in which clinicians act in concert with each other and even with unconscious patients, to a model where decisions are "fluid, relational, and collaborative" (p. 25).

Goodwin is at her best showing how anesthesiologists' knowledge is tacit, how anesthesiologists have to deal with "incoherent bodies" generating often contradictory signs. The decision-making process or, perhaps better, the sense-making process anesthesiologists go through, is much more complex than even a sophisticated algorithm could capture. Anesthesiologists do not simply act: they must first produce, conceptually, coherent bodies that then allow them to act. Goodwin is equally strong showing how there is an "ecology of knowledge" on teams consisting of physicians, nurses, and technicians with different training but who nonetheless go through a joint learning process that produces an identity that crosses disciplines. Similarly, she shows how a predictable spatial organization of the operating room contributes to the achievement of a polished work performance.

So far, so good. On some other points, I am less sure.

First, Goodwin makes some arguments that seem thoroughly questionable. Most importantly, she attempts to rescue some notion of agency for the unconscious patients who are treated by anesthetists. "My intention," she writes, "is to demonstrate how an entity [the cyborg-like combination of patient and medical device] that lacks consciousness and intentionality may still provide a dynamic contribution to the shaping of events" (p. 39). While it is surely true that anesthetists have to take the patient into account, in the sense of checking on oxygenation or heart rate, this hardly amounts to any meaningful sense of "agency." To suggest that it does seems to be a rhetorical device more than an analysis.

Second, Goodwin frames the analysis of her book as an extended response to the rise of evidence-based medicine and the corresponding efforts to impose formal and external decision-making algorithms on practitioners. While she is right that actual decision-making involves both local and tacit knowledge, this seems largely beside the point of the argument with evidence-based medicine. The proponents of evidence-based medicine do not claim that they are recreating the clinical decision-making process—if they were, there would be no point in the massive efforts at data collection and analysis they have made. Rather, their point is precisely that using evidence-based medicine is not only different from regular clinical practice, but superior to it. And this claim Goodwin addresses not at all.

Third, I am not sure what to do even with Goodwin's strong arguments. For example, she analyzes with great care a finely observed disagreement between an operating department practitioner (a technician) and an anesthetist, which is resolved by the anesthetist privileging the concerns of an anesthetist-in-training over the long-term technician. While Goodwin acknowledges explicitly enough that this is an instance of "stratified legitimacy," the conflict itself goes curiously under analyzed: What does it say about the character of professional dominance at this moment in time in England? Does gender enter in? (The anesthetist and technician are both men; the anesthetist-in-training is, to

judge by the name Goodwin assigns her, an Indian woman.) What consequences does it have for the kind of knowledge that is, in fact, deployed in making decisions with what systematic consequences, whether for patient health or patients' rights or anything else? This is not simply a matter of Goodwin ignoring conflict, although she does tend to gloss over it in favor of an emphasis on sense-making as a joint and consensual enterprise. Rather, it is also an apparent indifference to the longstanding, multiple agendas of medical sociology about professional organization, about patients' rights, about the effects of social organization on health outcomes, and about how gender and ethnicity shape the delivery and reception of health care.

Perhaps, though, I am being unfair. *Acting* is published as part of a series of roughly thirty books on "Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives." *Acting*, in this sense, probably belongs more firmly in the camp of science and technology studies than of medical sociology. And the standards there—not in the sense of whether it is good or bad but of what constitutes an important intellectual problem—may well be different. Yet even if that is the case, *Acting*, carefully observed and written, is an opportunity missed.

The Temp Economy: From Kelly Girls to Permatemps in Postwar America, by **Erin Hatton**. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2011. 212pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9781439900819.

PATRICIA YANCEY MARTIN
Florida State University
pmartin@fsu.edu

Erin Hatton's thesis is that temporary or "temp" work has flourished in the United States and globally since the 1940s, contributing to a cultural understanding of "workers as liabilities." During and after the depression, a "workers as assets" model was predominant. Labor unions were at their peak of popularity and power, having organized over one-third of the U. S. labor force and secured, via the "Treaty of Detroit," cost-of-living adjustments and pensions for workers.

By the end of the twentieth century, however, the worker as liability model prevailed. Instead of viewing full-time permanent workers as essential resources, they were depicted as liabilities. Hatton says the temp industry helped change cultural understandings of workers in regards to temporary work and generally. The rationale for a worker as liability model was that profits could be increased by ridding an organization of full-time, permanent employees. Temporary workers are cheaper, easier to dispose of, easier to manage. The temp agency, not the organization where work is done, does the hiring, firing, payroll work, assigning, compensating, and so on. Many corporations (and government agencies) bought into this model, then and today (including General Electric, Microsoft, Motorola, Bank of America, Xerox, Nike, Georgia Pacific, Bank of America, and Apple, among many others) and its effects on the U.S. job structure are extensive.

How did the temp industry accomplish this remarkable feat? Its influence can, in part, be laid at the feet of structural changes in the U.S. labor market, including globalization. Yet Hatton argues that aggressive promotional activities of temp industry leaders were also influential. Once it became clear that the economy could not always be counted on to expand, they sold the notion of temp labor as the route to higher profits. The oil crisis and economic slump of the 1970s were rich terrain for the temp work philosophy.

Beginning in the 1940s in the Midwest, the temp industry focused in the 1950s and 1960s on "white, middle class women" as "extra workers" who "wanted to work part-time," escape "housewifeitis," make a little extra money, and work outside the home in a job that did not take priority over the duties of housewife and mother. Focusing on women avoided the ire of labor unions because, at the time, unions often excluded women. Some scholars say the temp industry has "feminized" the very notion of work because the jobs and work conditions it promotes are those that have routinely been offered to women.

Things changed in the 1970s with the oil crisis and slowdown in the U.S. economy: restructuring of industrial work, globalization, out-sourcing. When temp leaders

wanted to attract men and expand beyond clerical work, they invented a concept of the semipermanent or "permatemp" worker who would stay as long as an employer wanted (months or years), not just days or weeks. The 1980s Reagan era rejected nearly all protections of full-time permanent workers that had been enacted earlier, making way for temp workers in nearly every kind of job. For example, they allowed organizations to fire fulltime workers and replace them with temps. In the 1990s, under Clinton, some protections were re-instituted and the temp industry's U.S. expansion slowed but, nevertheless, continued.

Besides selling the idea that temp workers are cheaper and can be hired and terminated at a moment's notice, the temp industry began offering training and management/supervision services. It encouraged companies to turn over entire departments so every worker was a temp agency employee who could be supervised by a temp supervisor. These conditions, according to Hatton, "triangulated" the worker-employer relationship by driving a wedge between employer and worker. When work and place are divided, Hatton says, no one takes responsibility and workers lose. Recent court rulings have labeled the organization for which work is done a co-employer with the temp agency, making it jointly responsible for workers' safety, work conditions, and assignments.

Innovations of the temp industry can become a model for a new "worker as asset" model, Hatton alleges, if four policy changes are made: re-link work and place; decouple social welfare programs from the workplace; make temping and other low-wage jobs decent, family-supporting work; and take temps out of the anti-labor movement and let them into the labor movement (p. 145). While these solutions are idealistic, they nevertheless challenge readers to reflect on the meaning and organization of work in today's world.

Hatton's data sources cover the period from 1946 to 2000 and include: industry publications (e.g., six books by Elmer Winter, who founded Manpower, and 200 documents produced by the associations that were founded to promote temp work); popular media (primarily 550 articles in 18 magazines from 1946 to 2000); business

publications (including 820 articles in 48 business and trade journals published between 1946 and 2000); advertisements (400 classified ads in *The New York Times*, *Chicago Tribune*, and *Los Angeles Times*, 1946–2000); court cases (250 state and federal cases); and government documents (legislation, cases, reports, and congressional hearings).

This book is a must-read for students of organizations, occupations, and work; labor markets and unions; sex and gender; and economic sociology. It is compellingly argued and documented. Furthermore, it engenders concern and reflection in all who view work as activity that not only puts bread on the table but offers opportunities for workers to obtain meaning, fulfillment, and respect.

Patriotic Professionalism in Urban China: Fostering Talent, by **Lisa M. Hoffman**. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2010. 206 pp. \$25.95 paper. ISBN: 9781439900352.

MICHAEL TIMBERLAKE
 University of Utah
 timber@soc.utah.edu

Over the past thirty years, China has become increasingly woven into the capitalist world economy, and this is especially evident in the coastal cities which “opened” under Deng Xiaoping’s de facto leadership beginning in the late 1970s. In recent years Shanghai and Beijing have risen to a second rung of “world cities,” joining Western cities such as Frankfurt and Chicago, just below the most central cities in the global urban hierarchy. Other Chinese cities have become more globally integrated as well, and they include Dalian, the port city east of Beijing that is the setting for Lisa Hoffman’s ethnography-based study of professional labor formation in China’s globalizing cities. Based on field work over ten years—beginning in 1993—the author followed the emergence of “talent markets” for new college graduates, in an evolving system of skill-to-job matching that replaced the assignment system which had governed college career placements prior to the economic reforms. Hoffman provides an engaging and persuasive analysis of the processes that are

producing a new kind of “subject of government,” the “patriotic professional” who is neither a dedicated worker for the state’s glory nor a rational, neoliberal, professional careerist; he and she—the young Chinese professional—are, somehow, both.

A key argument throughout the book, and its chief theoretical conclusion, is based on a “governmentality approach” that looks for (and finds) the ways that new systems of governance, specifically the imposition of neoliberal frameworks which in the Chinese case (if not all cases) are powerful in molding career trajectories and aspirations of professionals. In spite of the ideology that “the market” renders labor allocation processes to a kind of natural, rational state, Hoffman shows how new processes of governing that emerged with the market transition actively produced the new Chinese professional. Hoffman describes the Maoist system of job allocation that matched college graduates with particular jobs in particular careers and discusses how this was problematized as an impediment to the new, reformed Chinese economy. The national government fashioned a labor market for professionals that is embodied, in part, in “talent markets” that operate in cities, providing an arena for college graduates to meet employers. For ten years Hoffman followed one such talent market in Dalian from its inception in 1993, when it consisted of a few rooms, to its manifestation as a “large hall next to the library” on a university campus in that city. She attended job fairs, interviewed employers, graduating students and somewhat older professionals (up to age 40), and university administrators, and she conducted small surveys.

The book is organized into seven chapters, with the first providing background on the research setting and subject, describing the growth of college enrollments in China in general and Dalian in particular, a discussion of the ethnographic methods, and an overview of the research question and basic assumptions. The second chapter, “Refiguring Dalian,” describes the city’s emergence as an aspiring global city from a unique past that included its role in Japan’s imperial project and its increasing global interconnectedness today. Here she paints an interesting picture of reterritorialization of the city

through global city place-making activities. Local urban governments, as well as national policies, contribute to the governmentality processes that bear on and shape the professional China, producing a labor subject who is a hybrid of neoliberalism and state-centrism. Along the way we are reminded of the continued importance of the hukou (resident permit) in restricting the mobility of labor—even professional laborers. This point is threaded throughout the book and we learn at one point that some employers are reluctant to hire workers who do not have household registration in the places where the firms operate.

The third chapter describes in more detail the old assignment system, contrasting it with the new system, which Hoffmann argues hinges on “guidance, choice, and autonomy as new technologies of the self” (p. 61). Here she details her observations on how professionals are guided into careers and how employers define desirable “talents” and other employee traits—traits which for some jobs may include gender and height. She describes the processes taking place at job fairs, and we learn that there is a good deal of disappointment as expectations that young professionals have are frequently not realized in their search for a job. In the fourth chapter, Hoffman joins the neoliberal, “choosing” subject with the worker committed to contribute to China’s “development.” The choosing subject also learns to be self-enterprising and self-cultivating. Finding that young professionals’ career choices are often made “... in relation to national progress” (p. 90), “... embedded in patriotic professionalism is an unexpected combination of neoliberalism and socialism” (p. 84). Living up to one’s talent capacity is good for the country as well as one’s career. Hoffman provides a few examples of individuals having to do some ideological gymnastics to justify their employment in foreign firms.

In Chapters Five and Six, the author discusses the ways in which job matching is encumbered with more than just the cultivation of talent via formal education and training. Talent can be more or less useful for a firm to the extent it is embodied in an individual with other qualities as well, including particular sorts of family background and

gender specificity. For some employers, a “cultured” family background is more important than for others. Some firms are more interested in the profitability of an employee’s cultural capital. And gender plays a role in how labor subjects form themselves, the relative employability of men and women for particular sorts of jobs, and gendered household employment strategies. Chapter Seven concludes the book.

I enjoyed reading this book on a flight to Beijing, where I spent time lecturing about “world cities” and learned about global city formation processes in China. (I am drafting this brief review on my return to the United States from Shanghai, twenty days later.) The book is engaging, well written, and provocative. It will be of great interest to scholars and students interested in labor transformation in the new China, and it contributes to a more nuanced understanding of post-socialist transitional economies. For me, the book provided a wonderful way to become grounded in processes at the social and human end of global city formation. I learned much from reading it. It will be interesting to see a few years from now whether Hoffman’s professional patriots were a transitional phase of labor formation in China. Young people with whom I spoke at several universities were quite disillusioned about government at all levels in China, citing what they regard as extensive corruption and lack of attention to social needs. In one group of about fifteen recent social science graduates, one woman said that when she first graduated, she identified her career aspirations with national development. But, she said that government is not doing anything for people any more. “Now I just watch out for myself.” Several nodded in affirmation of her position. But others disagreed, expressing a position similar to many of Hoffman’s young professionals.

Collectivistic Religions: Religion, Choice, and Identity in Late Modernity, by **Slavica Jakelić**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2010. 210pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754678830.

SUSAN A. FARRELL

Kingsborough Community College, CUNY
sfarrell@kbcc.cuny.edu

In her scholarly and socio-historical research, Slavica Jakelić develops the idea of *collectivistic religions* in a way which illuminates the field of the sociology of religion. She delineates the history of several religious movements within established religious traditions and some religious traditions which stand on their own, to illustrate religious change and identity in late modernity. Jakelić's work adds to and deepens our understanding of why, against all the early sociologists of religion's predictions, religion is not only still with us but continues to grow and bring in new members to traditional as well as new religious organizations.

Building on careful socio-historical analyses of several countries and the religious denominations in these countries, Jakelić demonstrates that in many cases of increasing religious belief, these are tied to increased national identities rather than rational choice. Religious identity is less a matter of choosing a social status for people in the countries she discusses and more an assigned status along with ethnic identity. One is born a Catholic, an Orthodox Christian, a Jew, or a Muslim. In some cases, these nationalistically-tied beliefs lay dormant during times of political repression such as in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia only to arise again with new fervor after social upheavals. Focusing primarily on eastern European denominations and ethnic identity, Jakelić uses this history to show that people in these areas developed collectivist traditions that not only did not wither and disappear with modernity but became "constitutive, often *the* [emphasis in the original] element of people's collective memory," making it possible for social change to occur (p. 2). What Jakelić wants us to see is that a socio-historical analysis of these collectivist religions shows that

"there is no radical break between tradition and modernity," rather these traditions can be "retrieved and re-engaged in the context of late pluralism" otherwise known as post-modernity (p. 196).

Careful not to paint with too broad a brush, Jakelić rightly acknowledges that context is crucial in understanding how various religious traditions survived and became ever more alive and continue to grow in a variety of different circumstances. She states that in the case of Catholicism (contrary to the institution's own assertions), it "developed in very specific historical contexts—such as Poland, Ireland, or Croatia—domesticating themselves most clearly with regard to the existence of a religious Other" (p. 2). In Serbia, Orthodox Christianity developed as a national identity. While reading this book, I asked a Croatian American colleague what she thought of this thesis and she agreed with Jakelić. For Croatians, their Catholicism was one and the same with their ethnic identity and this understanding predated Communism and Vatican II. The struggle against the imposed unification under Marshall Tito was always fed by each of these peoples' religious traditions as well as by their ethnic identities. Religion was not only not irrelevant in the modern world but actually a strength which propelled them into a postmodern identity after the social upheavals of war and disaggregation from Yugoslavia.

Jakelić uses these examples from eastern Europe to create an extraordinary synthesis of sociological theories about religion, modernity, and postmodernity. She pushes the reader to be open to socio-historical developments which included religious movements and not to give in to foregone conclusions about social change that are predicated on out-dated theories of secularization in modernity. Using her research, she raises questions about the dominant theoretical frameworks used to explain religion and religious beliefs which have long been used and remain in many sociology of religion textbooks and introductory texts. Jakelić asserts that rather than dismissing religion as anachronistic or irrelevant in a modern society, referencing Anthony Giddens, she states that "the late modern social world does not erase the importance of tradition

. . . tradition may be and is defended—by becoming fundamentalist in orientation or by being fortified from the vantage point of reflexivity, through active engagement with tradition” (p. 196).

In this age of rising fundamentalism in a variety of traditions in many countries including the United States, this book has important insights for researchers, teachers, and students of religion. Further, Jakelić maintains that collectivist religions are examples of “multiple modernities” and “will not become secularized” as these various new countries continue to develop but “may gain new appeal” in “the context of religious pluralism” and may also “provide a counterpoint to the (liberal) politics of secularism” (pp. 197-198). They can be resources for “modernity’s capacity for continual self-correction” as we all struggle with the tensions in modernity and postmodernity and a politics of pluralism. I highly recommend this book to anyone involved in research on and the study of religion in our contemporary world.

Adopted Territory: Transnational Korean Adoptees and the Politics of Belonging, by **Eleana J. Kim**. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 320pp. \$23.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822346951.

SARA DOROW
University of Alberta
sdorow@ualberta.ca

To scholars in the field of transnational adoption studies, Eleana J. Kim is a familiar and respected name. *Adopted Territory* will, I hope, not only solidify her important place in this growing field of scholarship but also in studies of transnationalism, the politics of memory, and collective identity formation. An exquisite ethnography, it is about the creation of a counterpublic—a term Kim adapts from Michael Warner—that is at once broadly political and deeply intimate.

The counterpublic in question is the movement of Korean adoptees that has formed over the last fifteen years or so. While these adoptees’ individual and collective stories are distinctive, they are inseparable from,

and partly made intelligible through, a set of historical trajectories that include Cold War diplomacy, the valuation of “multicultural capital,” and economic and technological globalization. But more than this, they invite us to consider the contemporary politics of identity and social change as an active re-working of national and familial citizenship.

Kim’s telling of this living history is groundbreaking in at least two important ways. First, this is the first comprehensive analysis of the contemporary social and political movement of those who were and are part of the largest and longest-lasting transnational adoption project of the twentieth century. Their movement is a hybrid of formal and informal networks among Korean adoptees in their 20s, 30s, 40s, and 50s, namely, those sent to families in (mostly) the United States and Europe following the Korean War right through to the height of intercountry Korean adoption in the 1980s (more than 60,000 in that decade alone). The “adopted territory” they now construct through their conferences, social media connections, public art, and political campaigns spans from Sweden to Seoul to San Francisco.

A second major contribution of the book is Kim’s understanding of the histories written onto the individual and collective biographies of the adoptees she tracks and interviews. Her deft and thorough ethnographic fieldwork with people in and around the adoptee network, conducted mostly in the United States and South Korea, is supplemented by strategic historical and documentary research with materials such as the presidential archive of Syngman Rhee, U.S. news coverage of 1950s “war orphans,” and Korean media responses to adoptee gatherings and “motherland tours.”

Adopted Territory is presented in two parts. In Part I, Kim traces the history of the particular people and moments, both in structural and everyday terms, that have made and continue to make transnational Korean adoptee networks. In this way, her history of Korean adoption does not so much provide a backdrop as it sets up key ideologies and institutions that “return” in the more recent practices of the counterpublic. These include the racialized discourses of “Christian Americanism,” imbricated here with

Korean Christian impetuses for charitable outreach, and the development of professional social work in both the United States and Korea.

Adoptees' active engagement with the politics of these histories is a key theme of Part I, and as Kim herself clearly outlines, there are four aspects of adoptee practice that become especially salient: exclusion from dominant categories of race, family, and nation; the ability to capitalize on online networking; the significance of face-to-face meetings for constructing representations of and for themselves; and recognition as part of the Korean diaspora (p. 85). These themes constitute the somewhat amorphous but felt presence of an "adoptee culture." Although the majority of the more than 150,000 Korean adoptees worldwide is not directly involved in the transnational movement of gatherings and interactions Kim traces, it is the movement to actively construct that adoptee culture—the question of "how do we make us?" (p. 162)—that matters. Kim attends to the tensions of collective formation politically and the negotiation of norms of being and belonging. She considers, for example, how Nancy Fraser's distinction between the politics of recognition and the politics of redistribution play out in the making of the counterpublic.

"Adopted territory" refers in part to the re-territorialization of claims to identity, a key component of which is the practice and community of adoptees in South Korea. A growing number of adoptees have returned to their country of birth to visit, live, and work. They have created organizations and events that support adoptee efforts to search for birth families, challenge Korean audiences to include them in the imaginary of the nation, and respond to the problem of continued intercountry adoption in Korean modernity. And they have done so both with and against domestic policies and imaginaries, struggling (and sometimes splitting) over the strategic and ideological directions their interest should take. Part II of the book examines these politics, considering where and how adoptees "fit" or not in Korea's state project of globalization, or *segyehwa*, and exploring their relationship to burgeoning domestic forms of voluntarism and civil society.

Kim carefully unpacks how Korean adoptees are treated as objects upon which to exercise national and political interests, but also how they are agents of re-imagining citizenship and addressing the structural conditions of adoption. Key to her analysis is their strategic engagement with the relationship between private and public. Kim foregrounds the importance of this interplay to the counterpublics of adoption, over and against its usual treatment as a story of intimate kinship and individual psycho-social formation. Here Kim deploys Agamben to argue that the figure of the orphan serves as bare life, thereby stripping political possibility. At the same time, she suggests how political possibility might be found in adoptees' fictive kinship and collective psycho-social formation.

The many strengths of *Adopted Territory* are solidified by Kim's lucid and stylishly crafted prose. One is propelled through the book by a beautiful balance of detailed empirical accounts and judicious use of cultural theory, such as when adoptees' many frustrating encounters with taxi drivers in Seoul and Pusan are examined as a problem of "passing" and lead to a consideration of the "inside outsider."

In short, Kim's work is an altogether new treatment of a number of themes known to transnational adoption scholars, defamiliarizing territory we thought we knew. At the same time, it will familiarize scholars from a number of other fields with the importance of adoptees' stories and histories to transnational counterpublics.

Making Failure Pay: For-Profit Tutoring, High-Stakes Testing, and Public Schools, by **Jill P. Koyama**. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 179pp. \$22.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226451749.

PATRICIA BURCH
University of Southern California
 pburch@usc.edu

For over forty years, the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) has been a cornerstone of Federal education policy. Every seven years, the law is reauthorized. The 2002 reauthorization, under President

George W. Bush, introduced testing and accountability provisions as well as sanctions for schools and districts not making test score targets. *Making Failure Pay* examines an important relatively unexamined provision of the law—mandated after-school tutoring, referred to under NCLB as Supplemental Educational Services (SES).

Jill Koyama's *Making Failure Pay* is intricately structured as ethnography, through vignettes or episodes that trace the linkages between the New York City School District, public schools across five of the city boroughs, city government, and a composite company with the pseudonym United Education. It is based on three years of ethnographic research, conducted from June 2005 to October 2008. One chapter of *Making Failure Pay* is structured around a series of meetings of United Education executives in which the reader is invited into a dialogue intended to show how failure is connected to the idea of market share. Here the conversation flows horizontally across employees working for the same organization. However, the book also is a study of how policy is constructed vertically—how the decisions and actions of a parent company work their way down the assembly line and into the lives of students. The structural complexity of the work suits the topic. As I argued in *Hidden Markets* (Burch 2009), one company's involvement in public education frequently belies a more complex set of financial and business arrangements. Education companies frequently sell different products under different brand names. In this way, the company can increase market share without attracting public attention.

From the perspective of most of its critics, the problem with Supplemental Educational Services is that it loads inexperienced outsiders with the problematic task of raising students' test scores. Koyama traces this problem in the book. However, notably, Koyama goes beyond this first level of analysis. Through probing ethnography, she examines the causes behind the basic issues. For example, in Chapter Five, she considers the irony of a law (NCLB) that requires schools to have highly qualified teachers while NOT requiring its tutors to be highly qualified. As Koyama points out, this aspect of the law has financial benefits

for companies operating in the sector. Namely, the companies can hire part-time workers at low wages. There is a flipside. The design of the law allows companies to hire part-time workers. However, companies also struggle to maintain a stable workforce and have high training costs. Families bear the burden of the costs. Students eligible for after-school tutoring deserve the most experienced teachers, with demonstrated records of effectiveness. Low wages and seasonal work are not likely to attract this workforce.

The book also shows an instinctive sympathy for the malleable nature of policy. The people who deliver services interpret the meaning of policy. In this manner, as Michael Lipsky (1980) taught us, policy is made at the street level. In making everyday decisions about policy (who to serve, how to serve) public service employees shape how programs are delivered and their impact. *Making Failure Pay* applies these ideas to the Supplemental Educational Services (SES) provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Under these provisions, children who do not make adequate yearly progress in school for two years or more are eligible for free after-school tutoring paid for by the district. From this lens, SES enters stage left on the school improvement scene and presents an otherwise unassembled group of players with a particular policy problem—in this instance the problem of school failure.

According to the author, the book's central aim is to illustrate how various individuals and groups involved in the implementation of SES developed interventions around the idea of failure and implemented the law's requirements. For example, in response to the law, designated state and district officials must calculate which schools are failing according to a formula designed by another set of people. Tutoring companies have to decide how and when they will share information with parents about the program. In designing these materials, tutoring companies take their cue from policy. The problem is one of school failure and the solution is after-school tutoring. In these and other ways the book deftly explores how policy both changes and is changed by those who implement it.

Chapters Four through Six demonstrate how school staff, policy makers and the tutoring industry managers react to NCLB. In their reactions they reify the idea of failure. SES with an emphasis on remediation creates a buzz around the idea of school failure. People and their resources are moved in a particular direction—toward test and drill, ancillary programming, and money making. This is energy wasted. If the problem was defined differently, according to Koyama, we might have a policy design and flurry of activity that built on students' success as opposed to reinforcing failure.

Making Failure Pay offers a valuable examination of how the failures in education stem in part from policy designs. It should be read by anyone who cares about the future of public education, where money flows, and how Federal education money is spent.

References

- Burch, Patricia. 2009. *Hidden Markets: The New Education Privatization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

The Plural Actor, by **Bernard Lahire**. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2011. 271pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780745646855.

STEVEN HITLIN
University of Iowa
 steven-hitlin@uiowa.edu

This erudite book (translated into English by David Fernbach) has a sound thesis, though the ten years since it was originally published in French might have served to edify Bernard Lahire's justifiable argument against an uncritical acceptance of Bourdieu's popular notion of habitus. The book attempts to steer a course between two approaches to understanding social action that he feels are simplifications: (a) belief that social actors *only* behave in response to situational exigencies, or (b) *only* assuming that actors are shaped by early life socialization experiences. Lahire admonishes sociologists for creating an

"undiscussed (sic) postulate" by taking a position on this "power of the situation" versus "unreflective socialized habitus" debate *before* examining their subject of inquiry.

Lahire develops a program of sociology that is "designed simply as a reminder that the social exists as much within actors as outside them" (p. xiii). Lahire feels sociologists make too many "sweeping generalizations" about the nature of practice, action, and habitus based on studies focused on a single dimension of social life. He usefully balances between an overly rigid notion of the internalized habitus and an over-reliance on the power of situations to shape behavior. He rightly points out that too little sociological research follows the same actors across time and space yet makes strong claims about the essential nature of social practices. The middle managers we interview, the clients we study at the domestic abuse center, and the vendors on the sidewalk are multifaceted social actors who also act outside of the arena in which sociologists study them. We do not know enough as a discipline, Lahire argues persuasively, about the relationship and determinants of different "logics of action" within the social actor across situations and audiences. He advocates for a sociology focusing on multiple types of actors and logics: "the point is to develop a sociology of effective logics of action and of the plurality of forms of relationship to action" (p. 160).

Lahire is especially strong when discussing the overreliance on a vague notion of habitus as an internalized disposition which shapes social action. Certainly much of social life occurs habitually and beyond reflection, but Lahire does a service by focusing on how much of social life is reflected upon and consciously shaped, though he takes pains to distance this view from narrowly understood rational action. He draws on the analogy of the athlete involved in the flow of the game; she does not have time to reflect and must rely on some internalized practices, some version of a developed habitus. But life is not always the regular season, Lahire points out, and the athlete has spent a great deal of time in training by self-reflectively shaping these aspects of the habitus that flow effortlessly during the game. We are both conscious and automatic beings, and

in this Lahire presages recent developments in the sociology of culture.

Lahire explicitly intends to eschew an exhaustive survey of the discipline, and refreshingly adds that his own work is subject to the critiques he levels at others. In aiming so much of his impressive rhetorical artillery at Bourdieu's theory of practice and its later developments, Lahire is convincing, thorough, engaging, and a bit overstated. In the American context, where Bourdieu is a notable figure but whose shadow reaches only so far, this book reads a tad anachronistically. One finds themselves nodding their head in accord with a series of arguments that they already agree with about the importance of reflection in addition to the habitus, which makes for an edifying experience if not a broadening one. Social science, at least as represented in the top American journals, is becoming increasingly sensitive to issues of time, situation, and the multifaceted actor. Lahire seems unhappy with the state of interdisciplinary inquiry at the time he originally wrote this book and calls for more careful treatment and employment of psychological concepts. I am genuinely curious how he would evaluate current sociological research programs utilizing a variety of tools and perspectives that draw on nuanced understandings of networks, genetics, the brain, habits, and multifaceted social actors. This book suggests he has the vision and scope to be a useful critic of and guide for the discipline.

It will, however, likely find a narrower audience. If you think Bourdieu's explication of the concept of "habitus" is perfection incarnate, you should probably read this book. Or, if you find yourself irrationally angered by Bourdieu's treatment of this concept and its appropriation by a generation of French cultural sociologists, you will find an array of arguments that will help you to voice that anger. If you are an acolyte or co-author of Bourdieu's, you might profitably read this book but it will not be an especially self-affirming experience. If you are none of these things, it still serves as a sophisticated treatment of some often unremarked-upon postulates underlying a variety of sociological fields (e.g., life course studies, new approaches in cultural sociology, social structure and personality, symbolic interaction

understood broadly, pragmatism) that Lahire does not engage, yet would be quite consonant with his overall worldview. But it may not tell you much that you did not already know. The preface to this edition is quite excellent, explains the argument well, and is itself worth reading. The rest of the book is most useful if you are one of those aforementioned souls who want to soothe (or augment) an inchoate anger regarding the overly singular development of the concept of habitus in sociology.

Expatriate Identities in Postcolonial Organizations: Working Whiteness, by **Pauline Leonard**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 163pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754673651.

DANIEL PS GOH
National University of Singapore
socgohd@nus.edu.sg

For the keen student of postcolonial criticism, the study of dominant white identities in non-Western contexts is an intriguing frontier that promises theoretical insights. With this book, Pauline Leonard aims to open up ethnographic research on international labor migration to focus on privileged white expatriates. This is an appropriate move, as the literature is skewed to the understanding of the marginalized, which does not tell us how global power is being produced in the everyday interstices of multinational corporations and local elite institutions. Leonard emphasizes the cultural, organizational and locational contexts and contingencies of expatriate identity-making as a panacea to the homogeneous picture of mobile, highflying transnational elites painted in globalization theory. Her thesis is that whiteness *still* matters, but it is fracturing and becoming more diverse in its expression in a postcolonial world that is shifting its center of gravity to Asia.

Unfortunately, this metaphorically and physically thin book fails on methodological, empirical and theoretical grounds. I had my first doubt when Leonard, early on when citing Derrida, states that her project is deconstructive and theoretically poststructuralist. This is just after Leonard argues that "contexts of work and organization are critical

in the formation of identities, lives and relations" and that expatriate practices "are critical to the construction of the white cosmopolitan subject as normative" (p. 16), which is reminiscent of the good old sociology of work and culture.

Indeed, as the empirical analyses unfold late in the book, expatriates are treated as authors who negotiate dominant racial discourses and organizational structures and cultures to create narratives of meaning to sustain their identity in alien contexts and justify their privileged lifestyles. There is hardly any decentering of white subjectivity. Showing the social construction of identities is not the same as deconstructing discourses to lay bare whiteness as an empty signifier. Instead, the book suggests how diversified meanings of white identity are compatible with the enactment of transnational institutional power and perhaps even constitutive of that power. The explication of this down-to-earth relationship between symbolic representations, meanings and power would have yielded more interesting results.

It does not help that the reader is treated to a long theoretical exegesis in the first half of the book before we get to any empirically grounded discussion. The first inkling of a real social context is when Leonard introduces her research "with" (p. 50) white British expatriates in Hong Kong, for three pages, before returning to the literature review. For a study that sees context as all important, the contextualization of the study disappoints. Students of Hong Kong would be familiar with Leonard's stereotypical description of Hong Kong as a hybrid post-colonial landscape that is "a vibrant mix of old and new symbols, with British/imperial style dwarfed by postmodern global high-rise" (p. 52). For Leonard, British white masculine identities are similarly supplemented and hybridized by white feminine and local Chinese and Hong Kong identities. This is not different from the city-state's views of itself as the West's gateway to China, and vice versa, that underpins its representations in advertisements seeking to attract global tourists and capital to the city. Crucially missing from Leonard's otherwise comprehensive literature review are critical works by important Hong Kong scholars such as Ackbar Abbas and Tai-Lok Lui.

Tellingly, local identities all but disappear from the empirical analysis. They only appear as shadows haunting the expatriates seeking to readapt to the changing environment since the 1997 British handover of the city to the Chinese. Now that former subordinates and inferiors are colleagues and superiors, Leonard shows that Jim the corporate executive, Harry the club manager, and Rob the police superintendent have to adjust their former "pre-scripted and automatic" (p. 85) colonial machismo. Yet because Leonard does not take an ethnographic approach despite her claims, to studying the organizational setting, where one would observe actual interactions, but depends wholly upon interview narratives, the reader is unable to see the dialectical construction of identities. The Hong Kong Chinese appear in the quoted interviews as ghosts representing the racial anxieties that the defanged white expatriate struggles to manage—and just that, merely ghosts. This calls for a different mode of analysis, but Leonard uses the narratives to reflect actual experiences, sentiments and identities.

Furthermore, the unstable grounding of white masculinity is hardly unique to the postcolonial context, as demonstrated by a burgeoning body of work on colonial masculinities. Leonard overemphasizes postcolonial fragmentation without understanding the complexities of colonial culture in the first place—colonial discourse was not simply hardwired racism and sexism. Also conspicuously missing in the book is the seminal work of R. W. Connell, whose nuanced historical take on hegemonic masculinities would have been useful.

The most refreshing analysis in the book has to do with female expatriates. Here, Leonard tells us a very different story compared to the tired, anxious males. The women experience contradictory racial, class and gender forces, while some are able to exploit in order to distance themselves from the dominant expatriate discourse that expects the women to take care of white domesticity. However, this contrast between male and female expatriates betrays the limits of the fragmentation and diversification of postcolonial whiteness and begs for an explanation.

There is one more problem with the book. Leonard draws considerably on the

empirical materials of fellow scholars, especially Brenda Yeoh and Lars Meier, who work on expatriate identities in Singapore, also an ex-British colony with a majority Chinese population. As a sister global city competing against Hong Kong for a cut of Western investment in the booming Asian market, but with a more complex history of engagement with postcoloniality as a multiracial nation-state, a comparison of expatriate identities in the two cities makes sense. Frustratingly for a work that aims to decenter whiteness, Leonard uses the material to show a universal whiteness diversifying to adapt to the new world order. Context and history do not seem to matter and, ironically, the ever-intrepid white expatriate takes flight again to enjoy the fruits of a diverse world.

Cambodian Refugees in Ontario: Resettlement, Religion, and Identity, by **Janet McLellan**. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press, 2009. 263pp. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780802099624.

SUSAN NEEDHAM
California State University, Dominguez Hills
 sneedham@csudh.edu

In this book Janet McLellan examines the challenges and achievements of Cambodian refugees who resettled in Ontario, Canada in the 1980s and 1990s. Based on thirteen years of ethnographic fieldwork, McLellan introduces two aspects of resettlement which have been of most concern to Cambodians in Ontario: the circumstances of resettlement in Canada, in particular the lack of recognition by the government for their special needs, and the importance of religion, both Buddhist and Christian, as part of their identity in this new societal context.

The story of Cambodian adjustment in resettlement is complex. McLellan identifies three areas which have had significant consequences for Cambodian adaptation and identity formation in Canada. These are pre-migration trauma suffered by the first generation, the development of transnational ties with the home country, and inter-generational differences which affect experiences of trauma and understandings of ethnic and religious identity. McLellan

discusses all of the foregoing in relation to age, gender, ethnicity, class, and the political differences which Cambodians brought with them from the homeland. She identifies the many intersecting and often contradictory generational experiences, social practices, identities, and meanings which are relevant to this study. In this way the book provides a rich source of comparative data for those working with Cambodian and other refugee communities in other parts of the world, and makes a significant contribution to scholarly knowledge. As McLellan notes in the preface, many studies have been published about Cambodian resettlement in the United States; this is one of the few conducted in Canada.

As noted above, McLellan makes use of data collected over a thirteen-year period which include early findings on Cambodian adaptation and integration published by the author in 1995, fieldwork conducted in Cambodia in 2002 on transnational connections between the home country and Canada, and fieldwork from 2002 to 2005 focusing on intra-community dynamics and challenges to leadership. One of the strengths of the book is the extensive use of transcripts from hundreds of interviews and workshops conducted by McLellan. The liberal use of quotes not only allows Cambodians to speak for themselves about their challenges, aspirations, disappointments and adjustments to resettlement in Canada but also contributes to the comparative usefulness of the book.

Cambodian refugees in Ontario are part of a worldwide diaspora that began with the fall of Cambodia to the Khmer Rouge in 1975. However, few people were able to escape during this time and it was not until the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia in 1979 that many of thousands of Cambodians began fleeing the country into Thailand. Until this point, few Cambodian immigrants had been admitted to Canada. But between 1980 and 1992, under pressure from church leaders and private sponsorship organizations, the Canadian government accepted close to 27,000 Cambodians from the Thai camps. Most of these "designated class" refugees settled in southern Ontario. McLellan provides an invaluable overview of the resettlement process in Canada, describing government policy and goals, federal and private

sponsorship programs, and resettlement services. Additionally, she provides an assessment of those services from the point of view of both service providers and Cambodians. Because Cambodian refugees resettled not only in Canada and the United States, but also in Australia and France, and because the policy context of the host society has a significant impact on the structures and outcomes of resettlement, this information on Canadian policy, goals, and programs, can be used by other researchers (again for comparative purposes) to better understand what conditions of resettlement are unique to the receiving society and which aspects are associated with pre-migration culture and experiences.

As mentioned earlier, McLellan identifies and deals with complex intra-group social and personal characteristics, such as socio-economic status and gender, ethnic, and political differences, and notes the special challenges faced by each of these sub-groups. A chapter on these distinctions, group divisions, and challenges to community leadership provides a foundation for subsequent chapters focusing on the role of Buddhist practices, the effects of conversion to Christianity, and the challenges confronted by a new generation born and raised in Canada. While all are thought provoking, the chapter dedicated to youth is particularly informative. McLellan discusses many areas identified by the youth themselves as sources of both frustration and pride. Among these is how youth balance the realities of being both Cambodian and Canadian. This leads into the final chapter on how transnational connections with the homeland are affecting Cambodian adaptation and identity in Canada.

To bring order to the wealth of interview and ethnographic data presented in this book, McLellan uses the concept of social capital. If there is anything missing from this book it is a critical analysis of this or other immigration theories mentioned throughout the book. Such an analysis would be welcome, especially in light of several intriguing divergences between theory and reported behavior. For example, McLellan reports that youth are acquiring the social capital that allows them to interact successfully within networks of the wider society and because of this they have gained access to

resources that would benefit the community. However, Cambodian cultural values specifically associated with age and experience, coupled with a mistrust of outside programs on the part of elders, prevent youth from being able to integrate these resources into the community. Circumstances such as these are worth further critical examination, particularly with regard to how well they can or cannot be explained by the social capital model.

As an ethnographic treatment, *Cambodian Refugees in Ontario* is quite satisfying. This book is well written, clearly organized, and provides rich qualitative data that furthers our understanding of how Cambodians and other refugee groups have adapted over time in different parts of the world.

American Criminal Justice Policy: An Evaluation Approach to Increasing Accountability and Effectiveness, by **Daniel P. Mears**. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 321pp. \$34.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521746236.

NOELLE E. FEARN
Saint Louis University
nfearn@slu.edu

Expensive criminal justice policies tend to be quickly developed, implemented, and funded (over and over again) in response to controversial arguments and "facts" about the nature of crime and offenders. These policies, moreover, are rarely appropriately evaluated before being put into place; and, even though many of the criminal justice policies are extremely costly, they are seldom evaluated and revised once they have been implemented. Daniel Mears' book, *American Criminal Justice Policy*, represents a critical step forward in clarifying the need for and promises of using an evaluation approach to frame discussions surrounding U.S. criminal justice policy.

Mears sets out three overarching goals for his text: (1) to offer an evaluation research framework to enhance criminal justice policy, (2) to illustrate that accurate, reliable, and evidence-based foundations do not underpin many, if not most, of today's criminal justice policies, and (3) to argue that an evaluation research framework can and should be

a more integral component of developing, implementing, and maintaining U.S. criminal justice policy. These goals are quite competently met throughout the text. Mears takes the reader through a convincing and well-researched set of arguments (with clear examples from the "real world") regarding the astonishing lack of foundation upon which many of our most well-known criminal justice policies rely. Further, Mears presents an unusually well-organized and empirically sound approach for understanding and improving a wide range of criminal justice policies in the United States. Overall, Mears persuasively argues that utilizing an evaluation approach to more fully understand and assess U.S. criminal justice policy will likely result in increasing the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of the criminal justice system and its policies and practices.

Without the use of cumbersome and complex methodological jargon, Mears explains the basics of the "evaluation hierarchy"—the five types of interconnected evaluation questions/studies—making this text particularly well-suited for either graduate or undergraduate courses as well as readers with little or no interest or training in advanced methodology/statistics. Indeed, when issues surrounding the more technical merits or topics of evaluation research arise, instead of bogging down the reader with potentially confusing intricacies, Mears deftly points the reader to additional resources on these particular issues. This style as well as the informal presentation of the material enhances the impact of Mears' arguments and the ability of the reader to grasp fully the importance of an evaluation approach to examining criminal justice policy.

Regarding the more specific issues addressed in the text, after the introduction and a chapter highlighting today's "irrational criminal justice policies," Mears presents the reader with an overview of evaluation research and the evaluation hierarchy (Chapter Three). This chapter succinctly reviews the history of evaluation research, defines evaluation research, and discusses how evaluation research improves accountability and the effectiveness of evidence-based policy. This chapter also (briefly) contrasts performance monitoring and evaluation research

(a thread taken up further and later on in the text) and presents the numerous benefits of utilizing evaluation research.

The next five chapters each tackle a separate (but again interconnected) level or kind of evaluation research. Chapter Four discusses and describes needs evaluations, Chapter Five presents theory evaluations, Chapter Six deals with implementation evaluations, Chapter Seven discusses both outcome and impact evaluations (along with the differences between the two), and Chapter Eight presents material on cost-efficiency evaluations. Mears sets up these chapters with a nice illustration of the evaluation hierarchy (Chapter Two, p. 10, Figure 2.1).

In the chapters depicting the five levels of the evaluation hierarchy, Mears skillfully links each chapter and topic to the next and demonstrates how these levels build upon one another. Each of the topical chapters begins with discussions of what the particular level of evaluation under examination is (e.g., needs, theory, etc.) and why the specific type of evaluation is important. These are especially helpful sections that set the stage for the case studies that are presented next in each chapter. The case study examples, two of which are presented and dissected in *each* of the five topical chapters, are far and away the most exceptional and persuasive components of the text. Mears examines, in detail, many of the most well-known and hot button criminal justice policies in place today in these case studies. He clearly links today's policies to the evaluation type/level under study and illustrates how and why certain policies may not be needed (Chapter Four: mass incarceration and sex crime laws), how and why particular policies may not have clear theoretical backing (Chapter Five: supermax prisons and faith-based reentry programs), how and why some policies may not have been appropriately implemented (Chapter Six: juvenile transfer and domestic violence mandatory arrest laws), how and why specific policies may not result in the intended outcome or have the intended impact (Chapter Seven: drug courts and gun laws), and, finally, how and why certain policies may not be cost efficient (Chapter Eight: community policing and private prisons). Each of these five chapters is then wrapped up with

a critical assessment of how the examined policies meet (or, mostly, fail to meet) the expectations and criteria associated with the particular evaluation types along with a brief conclusion and questions for discussion. It should be noted for instructors who may consider adopting this text, the discussion questions presented at the end of each chapter appear to be exceptional teaching tools for classes on criminal justice policy.

Although the material in the topical chapters illustrates clearly the limitations and inadequacies of current U.S. criminal justice policy, the concluding chapter (Chapter Nine) provides a confident hopefulness for the future. Mears does not just discuss, in general, the promise of using evaluation research but also helpfully provides a number of specific and practical strategies for fully integrating an evaluation research framework into the development and practice of criminal justice policy (Chapter Nine, p. 241, Table 9.2) and describes in detail how to go about putting these strategies into practice. Overall, the text is quite informative and useful for anyone interested in U.S. criminal justice policy.

Playing on the Edge: Sadomasochism, Risk, and Intimacy, by **Staci Newmahr**. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011. 228pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780253222855.

CHRISTINE WILLIAMS
University of Texas at Austin
cwilliams@austin.utexas.edu

Playing on the Edge is a very difficult book to read. The first challenge is deciding where to read it. I read most of it on an airplane, which I do not recommend. I spent the whole time trying to hide the cover from my seat mates. Normally I am an ambassador for sociology—I am that person who strikes up conversations with strangers—but not this time. The book's cover features a woman lying on a wooden plank with bright red striations on her back. (It literally arrived in the mail in a brown paper wrapper.) I did not want to talk about it on the airplane. But the book was not any easier to read once I got home. It sat on my shelf for a few weeks before I mustered the energy to pick

it up again. At least on the plane I was a captive audience. Plus there was the benefit of the nearby barf bag.

Maybe I am a hopeless prude. That is not how I think of myself, although one is not the best judge of oneself in these matters. But it takes a special person to read dispassionately about nailing a scrotum to a board, caning a naked woman who is hanging upside down by her ankles, and forcing a razor blade into a woman's mouth. I hated reading about these things. The author sure as hell better make it worth it to put me through all that.

That task fell to Staci Newmahr. Not only did she have to convince me, she had to convince her dissertation committee, as well as her editor and her future colleagues. Did I mention that this is a book of participant observation? Each chapter starts with a vignette describing the author's experience of being whipped, flogged, hit, strangled, and cut (she curiously drew the line at spanking). Forget boxing rings in Chicago or street gangs in Los Angeles. This is one tough sociologist.

So was it worth it? This is what I learned from the study of sadomasochism in Caeden, the pseudonymous community of heterosexual tops and bottoms who "play" together at clubs and private parties, where they perform elaborate scenes of power and powerlessness that take them to the edge of life and death. First, the author uses her case to develop a new theory of edgework. Edgework refers to voluntary risk-taking in the quest for extreme experiences. Newmahr argues that because most research on the topic explores it from men's perspectives, the theory of edgework is deeply lodged in a man-against-nature narrative. Using her case study of Caeden, Newmahr refines this concept to identify what is universal in its experience, to wit, "shared transcendence of existential boundaries" (p. 160) through physical, psychological, and importantly, emotional risk-taking. With this new definition, women's experiences are made more visible, making possible a new feminist perspective on edgework.

Second, the case of the Caeden sadomasochists is used to explore and to rethink the meaning of intimacy. Newmahr rejects the popular view that intimacy is characterized

by love, sex, or tenderness, preferring instead Simmel's definition, which focuses on self-disclosure and the elimination of limits or boundaries. Intimacy for Newmahr means "access to emotional and physical experiences of others that we consider inaccessible to most people" (p. 171). She develops this perspective out of the feelings of "connection" and "energy" that result from SM play, arguing that access "does not cease to be intimate simply because it is unwanted, unpleasant, or violent" (p. 177). Intimacy, when defined as violation, is not necessarily a good thing. In her view, murderers, thieves, and rapists are all seeking intimacy in their heinous acts.

Finally, and most controversially to me, the book offers a feminist defense of sadomasochism. Newmahr rejects the views of radical feminists Susan Brownmiller, Andrea Dworkin, and Catharine MacKinnon, who see only patriarchy when violence is alloyed with eroticism. At Caeden, women bottoms find strength and refuse victimization as they are pummeled by the men tops. Newmahr contends that by voluntarily submitting to expertly and carefully delivered beatings, women "confront and withstand and symbolically survive male violence" (p. 183), even if few would articulate their experiences in this way. While she admits that the gender division of roles seems sexist—somehow worse in spanking than in flogging—she finds that the recreational SM experience is both "misogynistic and feminist" (p. 168).

I can reluctantly accept this claim, that SM is simultaneously "misogynistic and feminist" for some people in some contexts. But I am unsure where this takes me. I want to understand this ambivalence, not revel in it. Perhaps if the book had engaged with a wider range of feminist and queer theories, it might have moved toward this better understanding. Instead, I am left with a deeply disturbing and not altogether convincing defense of sadomasochism.

Working the Night Shift: Women in India's Call Center Industry, by **Reena Patel**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010. 191pp. \$21.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804769143.

ROBIN LEIDNER
 University of Pennsylvania
 rleidner@sas.upenn.edu

Reena Patel's *Working the Night Shift: Women in India's Call Center Industry* examines some of the consequences of the export of service jobs from the United States to the other side of the world. Because India has a large English-speaking population and lower labor costs than the United States, much call center work previously done in the United States, primarily by women, is now being handled by Indian workers. Patel, a geographer, centers her analysis on one particular feature of the work that disrupts the usual rules about gender and urban space: since customers are on American schedules, in India these are night shift jobs. Indian women's mobility has typically been sharply constrained by the norm that respectable women should be at home after dark. Does their employment on the night shift signal greater autonomy? Do the relatively high wages call centers provide increase women workers' status and independence? Patel argues that while these jobs provide higher earnings than most women could earn elsewhere, greater independence and power do not necessarily follow.

Patel's primary research site was Mumbai, but in order to get a better sense of women workers' experiences of night-time mobility, she also gathered information in Bangalore and Ahmedabad, more conservative cities. Patel interviewed 72 employees, plus 24 other informants, such as managers and members of workers' families. She also conducted focus groups and spent time hanging out in places frequented by call center workers. Moreover, she gained access to two call centers in the outskirts of Mumbai, both Indian-owned companies providing services to North American businesses. She had opportunities—closely supervised—to observe call center workers on the job and, at one site, to listen in on some calls, though her use of the term "participant observation"

does not seem to be justified. She interviewed workers at both sites, but in one of them she did so in the presence of a company executive. While Patel is clear about the limitations placed on her observations, she does not explain the make-up of her group of interviewees. We do not know how many were employed by the two workplaces she observed or how many interviews were conducted in the presence of a company executive, how many respondents came from each of the three cities, or what range of recruitment techniques she used to find them.

Working the Night Shift focuses closely on the ramifications of these jobs on women's lives, particularly on the degree to which they experience autonomy outside of work. Patel found "mobility-morality narratives"—talk that links women's movement, especially at night, to their own and their family's reputation—to be pervasive. The assumption that women out at night are immoral shaped her respondents' experiences, prompting opposition from their families, gossip from neighbors, and even inquiries from the police. The economic mobility made possible by relatively high-paying jobs carried the risk of a decline in status for these women and their families. And the risk of physical harm was a major issue for workers, their families, and their employers, especially because of the tremendous publicity surrounding the 2005 rape and murder of a Hewlett-Packard employee by a man posing as a company transport worker. Patel does not take the emphasis on safety at face value, however, writing, "Although concern for women traversing the urban nightscape was generally presented in the framework of protection and concern for women's safety, it became apparent that the underlying concern for women going out at night came from the 'What will people think?' narrative" (p. 60). Mobile phones provided reassurance to families concerned about women's mobility, but Patel notes that they form part of "strict regimes of surveillance" that limit women's autonomy. By and large, she reports, women limited their own movement in order to maintain respectability.

Patel's interviews revealed variation in how call center work fit into women's lives.

Economic mobility was their major motive, but many women saw the work as temporary, either a stopgap or a stepping stone to a better career, further education, or marriage. While their jobs, particularly their earnings, did enhance some women's sense of independence and their capacity to make their own decisions, Patel did not find that household relations, including the gendered division of labor and respect, were necessarily transformed by the women's employment. Patel documents considerable diversity in women's aspirations and experiences as they take advantage of new employment opportunities while negotiating the ongoing force of restrictive norms.

Working the Night Shift argues compellingly that the potential challenge to the social order presented by women's night-time employment in call centers has been limited by the ongoing strength of the cultural restriction of their spatial movement. Readers hoping to learn about the work itself will be disappointed. We are told that workers receive training in disguising their Indian identity but not in how they respond to that requirement or to callers' expressions of hostility to them as foreigners; we learn that the Indian public regards the call center work as low-skilled, but not about the workers' scope of decision-making or how closely they are monitored; Patel mentions the "social camaraderie associated with the call center environment" (p. 133), but provides no description of it. The book's subtitle, *Women in India's Call Center Industry*, signals another important limitation of the study. Although all but nine of the workers Patel interviewed were women, she reports that more than half of India's call center workers are men. Indeed, she points out that this "masculinization" of pink-collar work as it moves abroad and shifts to night time provides an intriguing opening for enriching the literature on work and gender, which contains many analyses of jobs feminizing over time, but her research design does not allow her to elaborate on the causes and consequences of occupational masculinization.

The contribution of this book lies in its close examination of the significance of women's movement to and from jobs organized according to the imperatives of U.S. companies. It provides a useful corrective to overly

simplicistic views of the impact of women's employment or, more generally, of the "modernizing" effects of globalization.

The Commodification of Academic Research: Science and the Modern University, edited by **Hans Radder**. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010. 350pp. \$50.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780822943969.

HENRY ETZKOWITZ
Stanford University
henryetz@stanford.edu

Philosopher Hans Radder and his colleagues turn the Mertonian norms of science on their head and into a set of aspirational values in this edited volume. Finding that Robert K. Merton's sociological analyses, inferred from scientists' practice and beliefs in the modern era, no longer hold with respect to commercialization of research, they re-label them as a set of broad values with corollary specific norms that are then expected to be operationalized as enforceable codes of conduct.

Merton published his normative structure of science in 1942, responding to Nazi and Soviet political deformations of science: Nazi racialist theories, German universities' removal of Jewish professors from their positions, and Lysenko's makeover of Russian genetics with Stalin's support. The authors in *The Commodification of Academic Research* are responding to what they believe is a contemporary economic deformation of science: individual scientist's and universities' increasingly widespread involvement in realizing the economic potential of their research, through patenting and technology transfer, as well as other mechanisms that link science to business in ways that may adversely affect the internal course and direction of science, as well as introduce an entrepreneurial ethos to the university. On the one hand, they wish to preserve the university as a non-capitalistic sphere of society. On the other hand, they are sympathetic to the university serving the public interest, variously conceived, and even contributing to technology transfer if it can be managed in a way that does not impinge upon academic autonomy.

Critics of Merton's norms have previously noted the discrepancy among the norm of universalism and the unequal gender relations of science and a higher rate of fraud than might be expected in a successful self-regulating system. In addition, the authors of this volume note the rising tide of academic patenting and licensing that would appear to question the Mertonian norm of "communism" in which property rights in scientific discoveries are expected to be limited to reputational rewards and those benefits that flow through this narrow channel.

Merton held that social norms are historically variable since they were derived from accepted and encouraged behavior that could change over time. A norm of entrepreneurial science is emerging, obligating investigators to determine and realize the economic implications of their discoveries. Sociologist Daniel Lee Kleinman comes closest to this conclusion in finding that academic culture is transforming itself to achieve economic development objectives, a goal that he opposes but recognizes is underway. Should he be surprised that the University of Wisconsin, where he teaches, is moving in this direction since as a "land grant" school, a primary purpose has been to assist agriculture, the major industry of its founding era?

A frequent assumption made by critics is that there is a conflict between internal (university) values and external (economic) values. It is held that academic activity must occur in a setting which is decoupled from the economic sphere of efficiency and profit-making. Once that barrier is crossed, they fear, it becomes extremely difficult to stop the corruption of values that they believe is entailed by the intersection of universities and the market. This fear is based on the false assumption that knowledge as "univalent" is incapable of encompassing more than one attribute at a time. However, new knowledge increasingly appears in "polyvalent" forms, patentable and publishable, with theoretical, practical, and interdisciplinary implications forming a common center of gravity.

An entrepreneurial ethos may be broader than business activities, crosscutting a variety of institutional spheres. The academic scientist and the business entrepreneur would appear to be distinctly different social types, yet there is a certain commonality to their

tasks. The businessperson must make a rational calculation of risks in starting a new enterprise; the scientist must persuade potential funding sources in order to conduct research. Academic science is entrepreneurial in its inner dynamic in countries where an academic job does not come with funds to support research. The necessity to raise research funds is the initial impetus to faculty entrepreneurship and is the underlying driving force of entrepreneurial science, even before commercial possibilities appear in research findings.

There is a strong analogy between some of the initial fears of critics of recombinant DNA research and the fears of these critics of entrepreneurial scientists and entrepreneurial universities. In both cases, the fear is that the breaching of a barrier, whether natural or moral, will lead to catastrophic results: the risk of catastrophe is too great to take a chance on breaching this barrier. In the case of the university, it is traditionally expected to be a relatively weak institutional sphere compared to industry and government. However, in an increasingly knowledge-based society, the university moves up in the institutional order from a secondary supporting institution in industrial society to a primary institution, more capable of protecting its interests.

Indeed, some firms view the university as a potential competitor that might adversely affect their interest in self-preservation, and argue that the university should confine itself to traditional roles. Perhaps the strongest argument for keeping companies from overly influencing the research agenda of the university is to preserve the university's entrepreneurial role as a seedbed of new industries and firms that may well supersede existing industries and firms.

Cultures of Servitude: Modernity, Domesticity, and Class in India, by **Raka Ray** and **Seemin Qayum**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009. 255pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804760720.

SARAH LAMB
Brandeis University
lamb@brandeis.edu

Relations of domination and inequality characterizing domestic servitude are not limited to the home but mirror and constitute inequalities at large, argue Raka Ray and Seemin Qayum in their brilliant analysis of domestic life and servitude in contemporary Kolkata, India. *Cultures of Servitude* offers a rich and penetrating ethnographic account of the intimate relations between employers and employees in Kolkata's middle- and upper-class households, using the ethnography to examine how class relations are constituted in the everyday life of the home, while illuminating sweeping social changes occurring across India and offering a concluding comparison with cultures of servitude in New York City.

Sociologist Ray and historical anthropologist Qayum engaged in extended research trips over a period of five years (2000 to 2005), combining participant observation in multiple Kolkata households with 52 oral histories from employers and 44 from servants in Kolkata and New York, and a survey of 500 Kolkata households. In Kolkata, *all* households that can afford to do so, even in the lower-middle class, have at least one part-time domestic worker, and Ray and Qayum reveal how entirely normal and inevitable are the unequal social relations by which the lower classes naturally serve the middle and upper classes.

The book develops the concept of cultures of servitude—the interconnected realms of consciousness and practice that arise from labor relations in the home, and that constitute and mirror broader social relations of extreme inequality. The culture of servitude in Kolkata, argue Ray and Qayum, is one in which “domination/subordination, dependency and inequality are normalized and permeate both the public and domestic spheres” (p. 172). The ethnography explores

how this culture of servitude in Kolkata is characterized by three premises: first, servants are essential to the well-run and appropriate middle-class household; second, servants are “part of the family” and bound to it by ties of affection, loyalty and dependence; and third, servants constitute a subordinate class with distinctive lifestyles, desires, bodily natures, and practices.

Ray and Qayum explore further how notions of domestic servitude in India are central to the self-conscious evolution of Indian notions of modernity. Keeping servants is not viewed in contemporary India as antithetical to a capitalist modernity. Those of the employer classes do debate, however, how best to manage servants and households, distinguishing two key types of management practices: the (more or less) feudal and the (more or less) modern. The “feudal” system is characterized by large, rambling extended-family households and long-term family retainers bound to families by life-long ties of dependence, affection, and loyalty extending often across generations. The “modern” system is associated with the increasingly prevalent small, urban flat, and a significant majority of Kolkata’s servants are now contractual part-time workers who serve several different apartment-based households. Many employers lament nostalgically how “they don’t love us anymore,” while many servants prefer the independence of part-time work easing the condition of extreme unfreedom in everyday life entailed by a feudal past. At the same time, some servants conjure up images of an ideal feudal family in which employers more readily accepted responsibility for the full well-being of the servant. In these ways, Ray and Qayum use domestic servitude as a lens to examine how members of both social classes ambivalently understand what they perceive to be inexorable processes of social change occurring across their nation.

Cultures of servitude are not placeless or timeless, of course, but fundamentally shaped by particular historical configurations of structural economic, spatial, gendered, and often race/caste relations. In New York City, for instance—where the authors also conducted ethnographic research, particularly among Indian immigrant households—servants are not currently considered

essential or indispensable to the well-kept middle-class home, and immigrants from India as well as other employers express a desire for impersonal, contractual, “modern” relations with domestic workers. Nonetheless, Ray and Qayum argue that domestic workers in New York City, as in Kolkata, grapple with the challenges of class distinction and relations of domination and dependency, and that “both cultures of servitude . . . eerily echo one another” (p. 186).

For anyone who has spent time in Indian middle-class homes, the intimate everyday relations and bodily practices exposed (the politics of sitting, access to leisure and television, ideologies of dirt and difference, etc.—daily operations of distinction rooted in extreme inequality) are absolutely familiar and convincing, although ordinarily unarticulated and unrecognized. This is the single most powerful dimension of the book: the elaborate bringing to light—in a highly sensitive way fair to the perspectives of both employers and employees, men and women, older and younger generations—of the kinds of everyday practices and ideologies that constitute and naturalize class in and beyond the home.

At once absolutely engrossing and theoretically sharp, *Cultures of Servitude* is one of the most rewarding ethnographies to appear in some years. Its accessibility and relevance will make the book extremely valuable reading in both undergraduate and graduate courses, on topics pertaining to systems of inequality, the intricate workings of class, visions of modernity, care work and the family, labor, South Asian studies, and ethnographic research methods and writing in sociology and anthropology. For any scholar interested in contemporary South Asia especially, the book is a must-read.

American Israelis: Migration, Transnationalism, and Diasporic Identity, by **Uzi Rebhun** and **Lilach Lev Ari**. Boston, MA: Brill, 2010. 176pp. \$131.00 cloth. ISBN: 9789004183889.

SHULAMIT REINHARZ

Brandeis University
reinharz@brandeis.edu

Immigration policy is one of the hottest political potatoes in the United States today, pitting, as it does, the rights of U.S. laborers to protect their jobs (whether or not there is an immigrant threat to their jobs is debatable) versus the desirability of sustaining the U.S. self-definition as a country that takes in "your tired, your poor, your huddled masses," a country in which we were all once immigrants. The legal status of people who arrive in the United States without permission (or without permission to stay) and the legal status of employers who engage these workers fuels another debate. What is to be done?

American Israelis: Migration, Transnationalism, and Diasporic Identity does not address these "immigration debates" but rather attempts to describe one particular immigrant group, Israelis. One should not criticize a book for what it does not do, yet I think a major opportunity was lost in not placing Israelis in the larger context of immigration controversies. Doing so might have made clear that the current debate is not about immigration, as much as it is about socio-economic class. In fact, the words "visa" and "illegal" do not appear in the index.

Unlike the poor, uneducated people entering the United States surreptitiously through its southern border, most Israelis who move to the United States are educated members of the middle class (or upper-middle class, p. 140) who arrive in conventional ways with conventional documents. In fact, the Israelis who come to the United States are *quite similar to the Americans already here*: "In 1980, roughly six of every ten Israelis who had been in the United States for five years or more were employed. . . This employment rate remained fairly stable over the next two decades. . . It closely resembles the employment rate among Americans at large and

approximates that of American Jews" (p. 73, citations removed).

Although the contentious debates are not engaged, Uzi Rebhun and Lilach Lev Ari do mention an emotional concern specific to Israeli immigration to the United States. As is well known, Zionist ideology and inhospitable conditions in their home countries propelled Jews from all over the world to come to Palestine and create the State of Israel. For this reason, *leaving* Israel to live elsewhere constitutes abandonment of the core principle of Israeli society. An analogy might be an American citizen's choice to immigrate to the U.S.S.R. during the Cold War.

Then there is the question of the creeping demographic imbalance between Jews and Arabs (based on birth rates) that could erode in the Jewish nature of the State of Israel, an imbalance that is abetted by Jewish immigration to other countries. The authors soften these particular arguments by stating that immigration by Israelis is "not exceptional by Western standards and, despite temporary fluctuations, has been declining over time" (p. xv). "Israel's out-migration rate is not high, especially given its large number of in-migrants. Israel has rather strong retention powers and offers its inhabitants opportunities and a quality of life that are not vastly different from those in the United States. . ." (p. 144). If Israelis immigrate at the same rate as other Westerners, then Zionist commitment to Israel is not stronger than the more general attachment that people have to their place of birth or residence. To this, the authors say, "on the basis of indirect evidence backed by prior studies, we have reached the conclusion that many of these well-educated people, after furthering their already-strong educational attainments in the United States, ultimately return to Israel" (p. 144). Strangely, the authors gave no concrete evidence of this.

Uzi Rebhun and Lilach Lev Ari stress that their research is "a scientific study based on analysis of comprehensive and up-to-date information about the emigration of Israelis to the United States. . ." (p. xvi). They emphasize that they did not initiate or gather their own data, but rather used existing census data. They describe their "painstaking insistence on using only accepted and common research methods [which] assures the

objectivity of this study and cleanses it of the authors' ideological or emotional involvement in its object" (p. xvii). The data are the three most recent United States censuses of 1980, 1990 and 2000, and other population surveys.

Although the authors make every attempt to be objective, the actual description of how they identified Israeli Americans in the census required many assumptions. Measuring the Jewish community in the United States has been extremely difficult in part because there is so much variation in the ways people identify themselves. For various reasons, methodological problems begin with the very designation of some people as Israeli. Given the reliance on this form of data, the authors focus their analysis on changes within the Israeli immigrant community over time, and comparisons of subgroups within the population. In their concluding chapter they discuss how immigrants of the twenty-first century are different from those of the twentieth—in general. It would have been extremely interesting to design the study to make comparisons among groups from various countries of origin, so as to understand the special features of Israeli Americans. One comparison (without documentation) stands out: "Among the recent American immigrants... the American Israelis are unique because their new place of settlement has a large and well established Jewish community with a ramified organizational and institutional infrastructure that no other ethnic group can match" (p. 138). Moreover, the American Jews associated with the new arrivals are making regular trips to Israel. This book concludes with policy suggestions for Israel, most of which relate to keeping track of Israelis who do not live in Israel and finding ways to lure them to return.

The Infanticide Controversy: Primatology and the Art of Field Science, by **Amanda Rees**. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009. 288pp. \$40.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780226707112.

TRUDY R. TURNER

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
trudy@uwm.edu

To the modern sensibility, infanticide is abhorrent. And yet, it occurs throughout the animal kingdom and has occurred at various times in human society. The extent to which infanticide occurs in animals has been increasingly documented over the past forty years by animal behaviorists. Why does infanticide occur? Amanda Rees in *The Infanticide Controversy: Primatology and the Art of Field Science* examines the way primatologists have understood the causes of infanticide. She details the history of the controversy about infanticide and suggests that the controversy is best understood within the framework of the way in which primatologists conduct their field research.

One of the tenets of most scientific experiments is that an experiment is reproducible. However, observation in the field is dependent on time and place and cannot be repeated. How valid then is the observation? Rees terms this dilemma the "fieldworker's regress." Primatology provides an excellent example of fieldworker's regress. Researchers often go alone to remote locations to study groups of animals. They observe small slices of the lives of these animals and even if they return or if someone else returns to the same location, things will be different. Some animals will have migrated, others will have died and others will have been born. How representative then are the observations of these individual researchers? Do they reflect the reality of a species that may be widely distributed over a diversity of environments or are these observations idiosyncratic? And if they are idiosyncratic, what can we really say about behavior and its causes?

Using fieldworker's regress as a paradigm, Rees looks at the way infanticide has been studied by primatologists. Primatologists have argued that there are two main

explanations for infanticide. One is that it is an aberrant behavior that results from overcrowding or stress, and the second is that it is the result of sociobiological processes and sexual selection. Rees does an excellent job of elucidating these two explanations and setting them within an historical context. She tracks primatology from its beginnings in the early twentieth century, paying particular attention to the development of the theory behind the practice of field observation. She highlights the founders of the discipline and their requirements for objective field research and then discusses the ways in which this has changed since the founding of the discipline.

What makes the infanticide controversy so interesting and what Rees spends most of the book discussing is that in the late 1970s the infanticide controversy in primatology seemed to have been settled, only to experience a resurgence in the 1990s. The resurgence was based on a reevaluation of the fieldwork that led to the acceptance of the sociobiological hypothesis in the 1970s. Beginning in the 1970s, sociobiology became the dominant paradigm for field research in animal behavior. In this paradigm, infanticide was a way for a new male entering a group to make a genetic contribution to subsequent generations since it allowed a female to begin cycling more quickly than normal. This explanation gained currency because infanticide during male takeovers was observed in numerous animal species. In the 1990s however, the explanation was challenged in the primatological literature. Robert Sussman, a primatologist at Washington University in St. Louis reexamined the fieldwork originally done by Sarah Hrdy on langurs in India that formed the basis for the sociobiological interpretation of infanticide. The original fieldwork was dissected as were other incidences of infanticide reported in the primate literature, and these were found not to be as compelling as originally thought.

Rees raises questions that are extremely important for any discipline that is based on field observation. What trust can we put in field observations? What is evidence? Can observation in one location be generalized to a species in general? This question remains at the heart of primatology or any discipline that is field based.

Primatology, perhaps more than most fields, is not new to reflection and self-examination. Before the 1970s practitioners were primarily male, after, primarily female. At the same time that this gender difference was occurring, there was a change from regarding non-human primate males as the core of the social group to seeing females as the core of the group. As a result of this much has been written about the relationship between subject and observer in the field situation and the lens through which an observer views a subject. In Rees' terms this would be another example of fieldworker's regress, although Rees pays little attention to gender differences in her study. While recognizing that primatology in the United States is really a part of anthropology, Rees also does not discuss the fieldworker's regress in anthropology. A discussion of these two examples would have given more depth to this current volume.

There are two other points that would have been useful to discuss in this volume. Although Rees gives a good history of primatology in the United States, she neglects some of the other influences on the primatologists. E.O. Wilson and Stephen Gould were both at Harvard when Hrdy was writing and this undoubtedly had an influence on thought about the tempo of evolution. The 1970s were an exciting time to be studying evolution—there were multiple new interpretations, and these are not discussed here.

This book is based in large part on interviews with twenty primatologists. It would have been useful if readers had been given a justification for how individuals were chosen for these interviews. There were many practitioners on both sides of the debate who could have been included.

The Rees book is part of a body of work on what could be called reflexive primatology. Even though it was somewhat repetitive, I found the book interesting and informative. I would recommend it for a methods class on primatology, anthropology or other field-based disciplines. Rees does a real service to the discipline by making us aware of the fieldworker's regress. It is imperative that practitioners continue to be aware of this and try to move from idiosyncratic interpretations and bias toward their own study population as representative of a species. It

is only through this that progress on understanding the causes of behavior can be achieved.

Union-Free America: Workers and Antiunion Culture, by **Lawrence Richards**. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008. 245pp. \$25.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780252077562.

STEVE LOPEZ

Ohio State University

lopez.137@sociology.osu.edu

A lot of labor scholarship rightly emphasizes the tremendous pressure employers put on their workers during unionization campaigns, and the failure of American labor law to protect workers from employer abuse. But as Lawrence Richards points out in *Union-Free America: Workers and Anti-Union Culture*, there is more to the story than employer intimidation. In many campaigns where one group of workers is organizing a union, other workers enthusiastically participate in “union-free and proud” rallies and demonstrations against unionization. While it may be true that many workers are reluctant to join unions because they are powerless and fearful, it is also true that plenty of workers are defiantly anti-union. The argument of Richards’ book is that the crisis of the American labor movement cannot be put down entirely to employer opposition and the weakness of American labor law—an important additional obstacle is the existence of a broad-based anti-union culture whose negative portrayals of unions are accepted by millions of working-class Americans. This argument calls attention to a very real and important aspect of American workers’ consciousness and ideology that receives far too little attention in labor sociology.

Part I of the book traces the evolution of American anti-unionism during the last century. Richards shows how, in the first three decades of the twentieth century, unions were successfully portrayed (and understood by the middle class) as “alien and subversive” (p. 15) organizations, representing an un-American idea that foreigners and radicals brought with them from Europe. But by the 1930s, immigration had been cut off and

immigrants had been largely “Americanized”; blue-collar workers were now seen as ordinary Americans rather than as foreigners. And in the context of the Great Depression, workers were viewed much more sympathetically. This enabled the labor movement to achieve a new legitimacy as “champions of the underdog” (p. 35). But, Richards argues, this legitimacy was very tenuous. After the war, as unions raised blue collar workers’ living standards and took part in an institutionalized system of collective bargaining, their underdog image was undercut. Business launched a postwar public relations offensive against unions, emphasizing images of unions as too powerful, self-serving, undemocratic, and run by overpaid, arrogant (and perhaps even racketeering) leaders. In the postwar period, unions became, in the public imagination, “just another special interest” (p. 69).

Part II consists of case studies of a 1980 campaign by the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU) to organize workers at a North Carolina textile mill owned by Frank Ix and Sons; an attempt by District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale, Distributive and Processing Workers Union (RWDWU) to organize the clerical workers at New York University between 1969 and 1971; and the running battle between the National Educational Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) during the 1970s and 1980s. The first two campaigns are deployed to show how the existence of a broadly-shared anti-union culture forced unions to organize not only against employers but against the negative views of unions that workers already held. The conflict between the NEA (originally a professional association) and the AFT (a trade union from its inception) shows how negative associations of blue-collar unionism complicated white-collar unionism even in its most successful instance.

This is fascinating stuff, but two criticisms seem in order. First, while it is indeed important to call attention to workers’ anti-unionism as an obstacle to union organizing, it is also important not to overstate the case or lose sight of the larger picture. In places, Richards does both, as when he concludes that “Ix’s campaign against the ACTWU was successful because its message to

employees was geared to reinforcing an image of organized labor that most of them already held" (p. 123). This overstates the case because every employer anti-union campaign plays on these same images—but unions nevertheless do win two-thirds of the elections supervised by the NLRB. It also loses sight of the bigger picture: while the American culture of anti-unionism certainly is an important obstacle for unions, it is not, as Seymour Martin Lipsett (2004) showed, the most important one. In Canada, after all, where unions still represent 30 percent of the work force, the public is actually more negative about unions. The main reason that so few Americans are union members today is not that Americans are more anti-union than Canadians but that the process of organizing a union is so much more difficult in the United States.

A more serious issue is the author's misreading of the significance, for the subsequent trajectory of the American labor movement, of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Amendments to the Wagner Act of 1935. Richards argues that "it was not so much the actual provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act that would work to eviscerate unions, but the fact that this Act withdrew the government's sanction to one part of labor's legitimizing myth. . . . The Taft-Hartley Act. . . sanctioned the idea that unions. . . were no longer 'the underdogs'" (p. 40). But as much historical scholarship—especially that of Nelson Lichtenstein (2003)—has shown, Taft-Hartley hurt the American labor movement in much more direct ways. Except for the public sector, Taft-Hartley effectively closed the door to organizing new industries and geographic regions. As a result, U.S. unions were never able to build a single national labor relations system or to extend it to new sectors as the old ones declined. Moreover, Taft-Hartley made it illegal for American unions to support one another in politicized struggles on behalf of the working class as a whole, and forced unions to concentrate their bargaining efforts more narrowly, on the wages and benefits of their own members. Richards refers numerous times in his analysis to the way that unions in the postwar era "seemed" to act as narrow special interests rather than on behalf of the public interest; what his analysis does not appreciate sufficiently is the

extent to which the Taft-Hartley Act was responsible for that.

Still, this is a highly-readable and informative history of the shifting cultural image of unions during the last century, and its central point—that today unions must organize not only against capital but against popular negative images of organized labor—is hard to argue with.

References

- Lichtenstein, Nelson. 2003. *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lipsett, Seymour Martin and Noah Meltz, with Rachel Gomez and Ivan Katchanovski. 2004. *The Paradox of American Unionism: Why Americans Like Unions More than Canadians Do, but Join Much Less*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Transgressive Bodies: Representations in Film and Popular Culture, by **Niall Richardson**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 237pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754676225.

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

A cabinet of curiosities, the Renaissance collection of indefinably strange and wonderful objects, is an apt metaphor for the subject matter of *Transgressive Bodies*. Clearly, as we peer into the cabinet and consider the contours of the objects on display, we are attempting to categorize items that challenge the very nature of the categories. In this modern day, we have put extreme body-builders, fat people, transsexuals and people with disabilities into hyper-mediated cabinets of curiosities (e.g., television sets, computers, movie screens) for oogling and commentary. Niall Richardson, a media studies scholar, uses cutting edge interdisciplinary analyses to investigate the transgressive dimensions of these types of bodies. Through the lenses of trans studies, sports studies, fat studies, disability studies, queer theory, and body studies, he performs insightful and strikingly close readings of

popular films and videos. Even while attending to the most complex theories and atypical situations, this is an extremely lucid book—a great testament to Richardson's clear and relatable writing style.

Divided into four sections, each with an introductory precis and two chapters, one of the book's strengths is that any chapter or section could stand alone in a self-contained argument. As Richardson argues in each chapter, both the actual, materially, fleshy body and the culturally produced representational body are formed through discursive activities of temporally specific cultural regimes. However, sometimes it is difficult to see the connections between the sections of the book. While all these bodies are produced through such regimes, what is the connection between bodies that are fat, disabled, transgender and built? Richardson hints at these connections, but more direct comparisons would have led to greater theoretical heft.

In order to understand how non-normative bodies are deeply fascinating to spectators, Richardson uses the status of "freak" to useful effect. He demonstrates that spectators put themselves in the position of authenticating (à la Walter Benjamin) the freaks, which serves only to undergird the presumed dominance of the "normals." Interestingly, Richardson examines the proliferation of freaks in the popular imaginary explaining this as partially related to increased explicit cultural articulations of sexuality. In so doing, Richardson employs queer theory. This connection is a deeply rich one that can lead to further theorizing: How might the freak and the queer overlap or interact? What are the differences between the freak and the queer? Can the categories be mutually exclusive? Do they automatically imply one another?

Another contribution of the book is the demonstration of how bodies, transgressive or normative, are both the basis for personal identification ("I am a bodybuilder") and the material for sexual fetishization ("I am a chubby chaser"). Richardson illustrates through his deconstructive treatment of films and television programs how bodies that transgress are simultaneously deeply troubling to social order and seductively intoxicating to erotic desires. His analysis of sexual

fetishization and the ways that sexual fetishes are identified is well argued and brings to light some of the seemingly arbitrary ways we sexually identify as beings. However, I would quibble with his claim that "heterosexual culture seems to be more reluctant in identifying in terms of physical fetishism (p. 102)." Many ostensibly heterosexual men have identified as breast or ass men, and age is certainly a physical attribute that leads to fetishized monikers—a cougar, a trophy wife, jailbait, or the cradle robber. But I am deeply moved by Richardson's examination of the limitations of sexual identifiers based on gender and sexual orientation.

One of the omissions of this book, which unfortunately is a sign of the clunkiness of print publishing and not the author's fault, is the lack of visual imagery to go along with the text. I suspect that Richardson would have loved to have a multi-media platform to present his arguments and enable his readers/viewers the opportunity to see his interpretations as the representations unfold. I suggest readers visit many of the websites that he has listed and perform image searches in order to see his subjects.

Overall, this book offers quite an impressive treatment of social class and how transgression is deeply intertwined with pre-existing layers of stratification. In particular, Richardson expresses how transgressive bodies differ in their reception and social integration based on class and, to a lesser extent, race signifiers. The film *TransAmerica*, through Richardson's analysis, then becomes not just an inspiring tale of a transgender woman's journey but an opportunity to examine the role of middle-class white femininity that eludes all female identified bodies.

This well-written and timely book is perfect for classroom use especially when used with accompanying videos, films or magazines. I can already imagine the engaged conversations that many of Richardson's interpretations could inspire: conversations about stratification, embodiment, physicalism, sexual identification, body image, gender, class, race...the very core of the sociological enterprise.

The Changing Landscape of Work and Family in the American Middle Class: Reports from the Field, edited by **Elizabeth Rudd** and **Lara Descartes**. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008. 330pp. \$38.95 paper. ISBN: 9780739117408.

ANNETTE LAREAU, assisted by April Yee
 University of Pennsylvania
 alareau@sas.upenn.edu
 apriljee@gse.upenn.edu

One of the pleasures of recent decades has been the publication of more studies that draw on participant-observation and in-depth interviews to study family life. These studies complement the useful, but often more narrowly conceived demographic studies in sociology of the family. This edited collection, which grew out of a conference at the Center for the Ethnography of Everyday Life at the University of Michigan, seeks to enrich our understanding of "how shifting ideologies and social realities of middle-class families look and feel to ordinary Americans" (p. 2). Reflecting the focus of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation which funded the center, the book is interdisciplinary in nature and concerns middle-class families, particularly in terms of work-family conflicts.

The editors Elizabeth Rudd and Lara Descartes offer a short overview which includes a definition of ethnography, a review of recent research on the family, the dominance of the "standard North American family" (SNAF, in Dorothy Smith's phrase), and important economic developments that have affected the middle class. Part I investigates work-family tensions. It includes chapters on African American parents in a small, economically depressed city who seek a "good job" that will allow them to support their families, as well as white families living in "rurburbia," (i.e., housing developments in rural areas) where mothers vigilantly protect their children from the "outside world" and fathers commute long distances to work. Part II focuses on "The (Not So) Standard North American Family." This section has eight chapters on various ways that the SNAF ideal is understood, perpetuated, and challenged by families and the media.

The book closes with a brief afterword by Kathryn Dudley on the question of "What is a family?" which offers a reflection on the cultural ideal of family life and the changing conditions under which families are trying to realize this ideal.

As in the best ethnographies, some of the chapters provide the texture and rituals of daily life. For example, Elizabeth Rudd and Lawrence Root show the carefully-timed handoff of children literally at the factory gate. Alesia Montgomery reveals the merged leisure and work spaces in the home of high-tech workers who toil around the clock to meet deadlines in the 24/7 global economy.

Most of the contributions are centered on work-family relations, broadly conceived. Some chapters draw only on interviews; they lack the richness of participant observation. The editors have worked hard to show variations in family life beyond the standard North American family. Diana Pash reveals how gay fathers demonstrate their shared family values to straight parents in their communities. Erin Winkler has insightful interviews from African American mothers showing how they seek to "arm" their children for racial insults that lie in their future. Carolyn Chen argues that Taiwanese immigrant parents in the United States embrace evangelical Christianity as a way to transmit their cultural values to their children.

Some of the chapters seem to be focused on cultural ideals of family life, as in the chapter by Eugenia Deerman discussing magazine articles on the pledges to abstain from sex until marriage. In a related vein, Todd Goodsell examines expectant fathers' beliefs about what it means to be a "good" dad, while Riché Jeneen Daniel Barnes investigates African American stay-at-home mothers' efforts to balance their roles as wives, moms, daughters, and female role models in their community. Brian Hoey examines corporate refugees who seek to reclaim their selves and improve their quality of life by abandoning urban centers for small towns.

Still, the book feels a bit betwixt and between: the work-family focus means that the collection is not as comprehensive a sociology of the family collection as either Barbara J. Risman's collection of quite brief papers in *Families as They Really Are* (W. W. Norton, 2010), nor the long-standing Arlene

Skolnick and Philip Skolnick *Family in Transition* (Allyn & Bacon, 2009). But the collection also does not take up many aspects of work-family conflict. Not all of the chapters in *The Changing Landscape of Work and Family in the American Middle Class* have the "feel" of traditional research reports. In some instances it would have been helpful to have more methodological details about the studies and more richness and texture in the descriptions. The collection is useful, however, in offering qualitative studies on selected aspects of work-family tensions and conflicts. The worry that mothers and fathers feel, the tight time schedules, and the problems of farm families, for example, are illuminated. Some of the chapters could be used in lower-level undergraduate courses, including introduction to sociology.

The book specifically includes the concept of middle class in the title. Despite the inclusion of the term, the book seems to be more focused on the concept of the standard North American family and a variety of families who have been spared the challenges of poverty. The conceptual role of social class, and the potential impact on family life, is not really the goal of this book. This is certainly reasonable: there are many aspects of family that can be fruitfully illuminated. Still, the book would have been stronger had each author defined what he or she meant by social class. Nor do we see the book as contributing systematically to the evidence on family *change*. The studies are not longitudinal or comparative-historical.

The strength of the book is in the vivid details sprinkled throughout. For example, in a chapter about ultrasounds, Sallie Han writes about her anthropological study: "Josie had told me excitedly that she has some 'cute' pictures to show me. However when she handed me the thin, curling slips of paper, what I saw were black-and-white blurs that bore no resemblance to a baby" (p. 250). This chapter is helpful in showing the "meaning-making" that expectant mothers create through technology as they embrace a sense of themselves as "Mommy," carefully protecting the blurry images in their wallets. In another chapter about the decline of rural life in North Dakota, Tom Fricke writes: "When farmers drive the section line roads and highways of West River, their eyes drink

up the landscape the way most people read a newspaper. Nothing is more revealing of a person's character than the neat lines of a well-tilled field, the missed crop rows where a seeder was plugged, or the pockets of discoloration caused by weeds missed in the spraying" (p. 34). Fricke highlights the importance of hard work in the development of moral identities. This book seeks to fill the holes in our knowledge of the rituals of daily life.

Seattle and the Roots of Urban Sustainability: Inventing Ecotopia, by **Jeffrey Craig Sanders**. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010. 288pp. \$30.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780822943952.

LARS D. CHRISTIANSEN
Augsburg College
christil@augsbu.edu

Environmental history is a field worthy of sociological attention. Such work provides histories and case studies that help advance theory, complicate narratives, and challenge received wisdom. For the uninitiated, Jeffrey Sanders offers an excellent example that serves as an important contribution. Sanders aims to show how contemporary ideas and practices of urban sustainability were expressed and engaged decades earlier, and in the process helps to answer how and why Seattle and its immediate region developed during the latter half of the twentieth century. This beautifully written and brilliantly organized work will serve sociologists who study social movements, cities and communities, environmentalism, and political sociology. Supported with evidence from archives, interviews, and field research, Sanders analyzes Seattle's history and environmentalist movements in the post-WWII era. For those already familiar with environmental history, this book is a perfect companion to Matthew Klingle's *Emerald City*, another fine work in this tradition on Seattle, though with different emphases.

Sanders opens by noting how surprised Seattleites were by the conflict that characterized the protests against the World Trade Organization in late 1999. The self-image of a "chill" Seattle, a city that had seemingly married progressive policies with global

industry, was challenged by images of Seattle police firing tear gas and rubber bullets at protesters, some of whom were engaging in non-violent direct action. Sanders claims that the anti-global capital movement was an expression of "post-1990s sustainability movements" that suggested "new connections" and "overlapping concerns for the environment, economy, and equity" (pp. 2–3). To many observers these were new developments. However, Sanders shows that events decades before provided early expressions of inter-connected sustainability issues and framings. These are the roots, the "deeper sense of the past that provides important foreshadowing" of urban sustainability that Sanders seeks to trace. The purpose of his study is to "argue that between the 1960s and 1980s, cities provided an important crucible for contemporary environmentalism. . . (and) to pull to the surface (the) partially submerged history of popular environmentalism, which derived strength from the urban social, political, and cultural contests in the era of postwar metropolitanization" (pp. 6–7).

Sanders identifies two myths common to standard histories and narratives about environmentalist movements. First that they are white middle-class movements focused on wilderness and natural environments, not associated with other groups nor urban environments. Second, that the movements of the 1960s were disassociated with the burgeoning environmentalism of that time. Indeed, these standard interpretations have been, arguably, reified today as urban sustainability initiatives appear to be racialized and class-biased. Sanders recovers the roots of urban environmentalism as linked directly to Black Freedom, Red Power, and feminist movements. Perhaps this could help undo the separation of interests that seems to characterize today's urban politics.

The events that make up the body of Sanders' book reveal that "sustainability" was contested within communities of activists, and between activists and elites. The book is full of actors and organizations expressing different ideas about where Seattle's neighborhoods, the city, the region, and humanity itself should be going. Specifically, Pike Place Market neighborhood, the Central District neighborhood, Fort Lawton, and the Fremont

neighborhood were sites of conflict between local residents, organizers, and supporters against developers and city power brokers; academics from the University of Washington also play significant roles in several of these events. Throughout these chapters one encounters conflicts over food production and distribution systems, arguments over urban aesthetics, battles against (what we now call) environmental racism, different visions for the use of open space, and apocalyptic "bioregional utopians" seeking systems-wide solutions.

While much of the book's analytical focus is on neighborhoods, one chapter shifts to the home. In the mid-1970s some environmentalists believed that by educating homeowners on eco-conscious living, they would better understand the relation between individual consumption and city/regional systems. However, the domesticity of sustainability led to unintended privatization in two senses: first, the emphasis was on commercial solutions to public problems; and second, it encouraged a retreat from the street and public sphere. Here Sanders offers a fascinating analysis of the meanings of backyard gardens.

The epilogue ties these earlier events to contemporary times via a major conflict over a downtown development in the 1990s. That event shows how city elites drew upon ideas that had been formed by countercultural environmentalists (among others) two decades prior; yet elites' plans were resisted by residents who were seeking to preserve the associations they had built over many years.

On this point, urban planners and developers often assume that remaking neighborhoods and cities will create communities instantly, or at least in short order. However, communities with authentic human associations, and the generalized trust necessary for positive social relations, cannot be created instantly. Community formation requires favorable structures/infrastructures, to be sure, but it also requires a stability and continuity of relations over time, which is to say, decades. This insight can be gleaned from accounts in each of the book's chapters. This is an issue of particular relevance for urban and community sociologists, who will find much to ponder in Sanders' book.

Sociologists familiar with advances in social movement theory over the past two decades will find confirmations of cross-movement influence and “spillover.” Sanders shows that movement-to-movement influences were concurrent (i.e., collaborations and shared issue-framing) and longitudinal (i.e., the successes of earlier movements, particularly Black Freedom), providing important foundations for subsequent movements. The events of each chapter are also useful tests of various theories of social movements, as elites, government at all levels, organizers, and tactics ranging from moderate to militant are at play here.

If I were to suggest any change, it would be the title. The current title is misleading because it implies that the roots of urban sustainability *in general* are in Seattle. A better title would be *The Roots of Seattle's Urban Sustainability*, and indeed that is more consistent with one of the major implications of the book: Seattle's story, while idiosyncratic in many respects, is part of a larger pattern of post-War urban development, very likely containing similar battles and stories in other cities waiting to be unearthed.

Just One of the Guys?: Transgender Men and the Persistence of Gender Inequality, by **Kristen Schilt**. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 216pp. \$22.50 paper. ISBN: 9780226738079.

PETER HENNEN
Ohio State University, Newark
hennen.6@osu.edu

Scholarly work on transgender issues often exhibits one of two unfortunate tendencies. In the first the living, breathing transgender subject is launched into a purely abstract universe and promptly disappears as great theoretical claims achieve their orbit. Such exalted approaches often succeed at the expense of the ordinary but eminently sociological details of everyday transgender life. In the second case, authors unwittingly exoticize transgenders via a hostile or defensive tone, one that often serves merely to isolate traditionally gendered readers from the subject. Happily, in *Just One of the Guys?*, author Kristen Schilt artfully avoids both of these

difficulties. She has produced a fresh, inventive, exciting, theoretically informed and occasionally exasperating book about the everyday work lives of transgender men. Of far greater consequence, she firmly establishes a new vantage point from which to consider decades of research on the persistence of workplace inequality.

Based on 54 in-depth interviews, five years of ethnographic field work, 61 surveys, and a content analysis of 50 years of newspaper articles, Schilt's book is as meticulously crafted as it is groundbreaking. The good news is that transmen (female-to-male transgenders) are often cheerfully accepted by their co-workers, including their conventionally gendered (or *cisgender*) male co-workers. The bad news is that this acceptance keys off of an interactive process that reproduces gender inequality as part of a deeply ingrained cultural logic of gender difference and deference.

Contextualizing her project presents Schilt with formidable challenges, as the frames, politics, identities, and vocabulary informing both popular and activist understandings of transgender have shifted dramatically over the past five decades. She does an admirable job of guiding readers through this history before introducing her empirical data, and makes two general observations about the contemporary scene; first, transgender cultural frames continue to be contested; and second, despite this there has been a marked resurgence of frames linking transgender with biological essentialism. Indeed, several of Schilt's research subjects offer accounts of themselves along these same essentialist lines.

This is, intriguingly, antagonistic to the critique of the “natural differences” paradigm that Schilt undertakes. This perspective was perhaps most notoriously voiced by recent Harvard president Lawrence Summers when he opined that perhaps the differential success of men and women in math and science was due to different biologically-determined capacities in the sexes. Schilt counters this argument by documenting the way that gendered interactive processes in the workplace, and not biology, maintain the status quo. The original contribution she makes is in examining these processes from the perspective of transmen, who learn the

gendered workplace rituals having experienced life on both sides of the gender binary. Schilt begins her explanation of this process with a chapter outlining the achievement of social maleness, followed by another more specifically focused on the experiences of transmen at work. She then explores a fascinating and empirically fruitful fork in the road, as not all transmen are out to their co-workers, and some can easily pass as cisgender men. Consequently she devotes her two subsequent chapters to how the workplace responds to what she calls "stealth" and "open" transmen. We get a wealth of sparkling and sometimes humorous data from the transmen involved, including their experience of what Schilt terms "gender culture shock." Examples include their first ambivalent experiences with male privilege, their heightened appreciation of the often mundane ways that gender difference gets produced in the workplace, and, in the case of open transmen, being adopted as "gender apprentices" by cisgender men who guide them through the peculiar rituals of masculinity. Despite these abundant riches, I found myself wanting to hear more from co-workers in these chapters (Schilt conducted 14 co-worker interviews), to compare their perspective in these areas, and in the case of those working with open transmen, to learn how they made sense of their gender-crossing colleagues. This data might have proved especially helpful in the less hospitable situations where Schilt observed racialized effects, or where transmen were marginalized, neutralized, or policed.

In the book's penultimate chapter, Schilt presents a masterful synthesis that shows how gender inequality functions in the workplace, following a cultural logic that interprets transmen's experience as a readily understandable move "up" to a more valued social position, which Schilt implies goes a long way toward explaining the lack of resistance from cisgender men. Then, in a brilliant comparison, she documents the dark side of this same logic by examining the experiences of transwomen. Here the gender transition is widely interpreted as a step "down" the ladder of social valuation, and as such it elicits far more confusion, fear, and hostility.

The concluding chapter includes some thoughtful if sobering speculations on the

prospects for meaningful change. Given the robust fidelity to interpreting biological sex differences in rigidly binary and intrinsically gendered terms, Schilt sees little hope of achieving real equality. We are in love with the binary, and one term seems fated to defer to the other in a world where gender is endlessly rehearsed. At work and play, over and over again we practice a rigged game, designed to believe its own machinations are entirely natural.

Schilt adopts a refreshingly even, non-defensive tone throughout the book. This will prove inviting to readers who might be unfamiliar with, or unduly influenced by the often sensationalized media coverage of trans issues. However, there are times when this virtue limits the analysis. Schilt is clearly not interested in implicating her subjects in any complicity with gender binarism, as some critics have charged that transgender men and women reinforce, rather than challenge binary conceptions of gender. This is a controversy that Schilt seems too eager to relegate to a less enlightened past. As a counter to this critique, she makes the marvelously laconic comment that she is not interested in establishing a rubric that "can create good genderqueers and bad transsexuals" (p. 174). Still, I could not help wondering at times how and to what extent this position might have been related to methodological concerns with subject rapport. I also found myself wondering if a more critical view of her subjects might have further enriched this already rich volume.

But in fairness, it would be astonishing if a book that makes groundbreaking contributions to both transgender and workplace studies didn't raise a few hackles. This is a delightfully original piece of work, and Schilt's book will make an excellent addition to gender, sexuality, queer studies, work, and stratification courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Professions in Civil Society and the State: Invariant Foundations and Consequences, by **David Sciulli**. Leiden, NLD: Brill, 2009. 488pp. \$159.00 cloth. ISBN: 9789004178311.

TRACEY L. ADAMS
 University of Western Ontario
 tladams@uwo.ca

The sociology of professions has long suffered from theoretical ambiguity. Indeed, at this time, there is no generally accepted definition of "profession." The accepted wisdom is that "profession" is a social construction and therefore variable across time and place. David Sciulli rejects this relativism, and in his book, seeks to advance the field theoretically by identifying *invariant* characteristics, foundations, and consequences of professions, while highlighting their significance in civil society. Through his endeavours he takes the field in a markedly different direction.

Sciulli's book begins with a review of the literature on professions since the 1930s, with a focus on the United States and Europe. He pays special attention to Talcott Parsons' contributions on the subject, and soundly criticizes all contributors to the field since Parsons' time—whom he labels "revisionists"—for making false assumptions and taking the course of study off-track. For instance, research has linked profession creation with industrialization, urbanization, the rise of the middle class, and the modern state. Sciulli asserts all of these assumptions are false, and have prevented sociologists from viewing professional development accurately. Parsons' focus on the role of professions in contributing to social order provides a more useful path forward; however, his work is also flawed, for his explanations were "substantive normative" and cultural, rather than structural and "procedural normative." Sciulli argues that by taking a structural approach, one can identify the invariant characteristics and consequences of professions.

Before detailing his theory, Sciulli presents two case studies. These cases—one historical and prior to industrialization, and one modern—shed new light on professional characteristics, he claims. Neither of these cases is recognizable as a profession in the

traditional sense. The first is the case of the *Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture* in Paris in the seventeenth century, a school that provided systematic and advanced training to produce painters and sculptors. The second is the case of corporate governance through the courts in the state of Delaware. Although most scholars see professions as a particular kind of occupation, Sciulli does not. For him, "professions" are institutions and activities in society that serve an intermediary, governance role and thereby contribute to social order.

In the lengthy final section of his book, Sciulli presents his theoretical argument in detail by building on these two examples and others. In brief, (his full argument is elaborated across almost 300 pages of text), professionals, "their associations, and their instructional facilities ... provide expert occupational services within structured situations on the basis of an independent socio-cultural authority" (p. 181). In these structured situations, professionals are in positions of power where they exercise "discretionary judgement and impersonal trust" over those in positions of dependence and vulnerability (p. 407). Their position accords them responsibilities "for client and patron well-being," as well as responsibilities to the "institutional design of the larger social order" (p. 407). Professions also "establish an independent socio-cultural authority" in a particular field (p. 181). In addition to these invariant qualities, professions also demonstrate the following characteristics according to Sciulli: they have both an epistemological and didactic or moral orientation that appears to reflect "truth" as understood in a given social context; they have a collegial form of organization which institutionalizes "procedural normative integrity" (p. 408); they privilege merit; and they "support structurally ... democratic, commercially competitive societies" (p. 182).

As noted, Sciulli holds that a variety of institutions can possess these characteristics and operate within structured situations to maintain social order—such as the Delaware courts do when they regulate corporations. Moreover, it is made clear, workers who do not operate in "structured situations" cannot be professional; thus the line demarcating professions from non-professions can even

cut through occupations. For instance, physicians who do not operate in structured situations—those who conduct periodic check-ups for instance—do not exercise power, and hence are not professional, according to Sciulli (p. 430, n. 20).

In his attempt to break the profession-occupation link that has predominated in social research, Sciulli's work is inherently controversial. His insistence on providing a general theory that cuts across place and time, and his dismissal of contextual factors shaping professional development as "extraneous details," are anathemas to many scholars in the field. Further, there is much that remains unexplained. Sciulli has created a model for identifying what professions are, and what their social role is, but it is not clear how social groups come to occupy that position, or why some such positions are occupied by practitioners of a specific occupation, while others are held by other social institutions; neither is it clear how these positions can change over time. Understanding how professions emerge and change necessitates a concern with social-historical events. Problematically, Sciulli has elaborated a theory, but he uses empirical examples sparsely. The usefulness of this theory for research on professions remains to be demonstrated empirically elsewhere.

Through his book, Sciulli aims to disentangle the study of professions from the study of occupations and social inequality, and draw it into political sociology. His work has implications, then, for both fields, and hence both political sociologists and scholars of professions may find this book of interest. However, the book is not particularly accessible or engaging. It is long, repetitive, abstract, and difficult to read. Sciulli's virulent attacks on current scholars in the profession's field will likely alienate many, as could the fact that what Sciulli means by profession (experts operating in structured situations) and what others mean by professions (expert workers practising occupations that have a different social and often regulatory status and hence more power than others) appear quite different. This could lead many to dismiss Sciulli's work out of hand. Yet, there is merit to his arguments. Research on professions has suffered from a theoretical malaise, and investigation of professions' and

professionals' roles in social governance and regulation is a worthwhile direction in the study of professions (albeit one that other scholars have arrived at by adopting a more Foucauldian perspective—this work is largely ignored by Sciulli). The extent to which Sciulli's theoretical arguments are empirically useful remains to be proven; nevertheless, the controversies generated by this book could help to reinvigorate this field of study.

Gender Inequalities in the 21st Century: New Barriers and Continuing Constraints, edited by **Jacqueline Scott, Rosemary Crompton, and Clare Lyonette**. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2010. 297 pp. \$130.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781848444386.

LOUISE MARIE ROTH
University of Arizona
 lroth@arizona.edu

My undergraduate course in gender was sorely in need of some updated pieces, so I picked up this book with the hope that it would be a useful addition to the syllabus. I immediately discovered that the writing style and complexity of theoretical engagement were too advanced for undergraduates or, at least, for the types of undergraduates that I usually teach. But this collection would make a useful addition to a graduate course because it offers recent evidence and highlights theoretical debates in the contemporary field of gender and work. Most scholars of gender and work will find something of value in this collection.

Substantively, the articles focus on recent trends and policy regimes, primarily in the United Kingdom and Western Europe. While the focus is decidedly Western, it is refreshing for anyone who reads too much U.S.-centric material. The book combines policy-related cross-national comparisons with attention to how work-family issues and class divisions lead to particular configurations of gender inequality in different developed countries.

The first of five parts examines changes in families and the labor market, beginning with a chapter on gender differences in transitions to adulthood for two cohorts. Using a life course perspective, this chapter illuminates diversity and change across cohorts,

especially for women. The second chapter offers a comparison of two theories of class reproduction across generations, and its theoretical development and use of interview data makes it the most engaging chapter in Part I. The third chapter examines ethnic differences in women's economic activity in the United Kingdom, finding that barriers to obtaining qualifications are the major driver of lower labor force participation among Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi women.

Part II compares gender inequality in occupational structures cross-nationally. Its first chapter evaluates the effects of different policy regimes (neo-liberal versus coordinated market economies), as well as the influence of national culture on gender inequality in four nations. It finds that interactions between culture and policy produce unique configurations of gender inequality in employment in each country. The next chapter analyzes characteristics of part-time work across Western European nations, finding that part-time work is not universally low paying and of poor quality. The third chapter in Part II is one of the book's best. It compares two cohorts of women in feminizing male-dominated occupations in the United Kingdom and France, and analyzes how different policy regimes influence women's work-life strategies, job satisfaction, and feminist orientations in the two countries. Interestingly, policy differences encouraged "sameness" feminism in the earlier cohort in Britain and the later cohort in France, and "difference" feminism in the later cohort in Britain and the earlier cohort in France.

Part III analyzes the challenges of integrating family and work. Its first chapter uses longitudinal and time-diary data to analyze the gender division of domestic labor, finding that women do more routine domestic labor across the life course, and that this labor is responsive to relative potential earnings within couples. Men are more likely to share in care-work and non-routine domestic labor after important life transitions than in routine domestic labor. The next chapter examines gender and class differences in strategies for managing work-family balance, finding that higher income women tend to use their class advantage to maintain full-time employment and to purchase childcare. Lower income two-parent families, on the other hand, may

prefer a homemaker arrangement but rely on women's earnings to make ends meet, and depend on no- or low-cost childcare, such as care from extended family. This chapter presents a good mixed-method analysis, offers an interesting read, and provides an important critique of universalizing arguments about women's preferences for paid versus family work. The final chapter in this section analyzes gender differences in perceptions of quality of life across the life course, tying them to caregiving responsibilities at different life stages.

Part IV aims to understand inequalities within and between households. Its first chapter uses mixed methods to examine responsibility for money-management and control over financial decisions within heterosexual couples. It finds that quantitative data alone obscure the meaning of financial control and that patterns of gender differences in financial management and control differ by class. Its other chapter examines the effects of women's labor force participation on earnings inequalities across households in Norway, finding that married women's earnings have contributed to a narrowing of the income gap across couple households since 1983. The authors conclude that there would have been a bigger "U-turn" in economic well-being without women's work. However, the analysis excludes a significant source of rising income inequality across households: single-parent households.

The final part of the book addresses complexities and conflicts between capitalism and feminism and between different variants of feminism. Its first chapter analyzes the conflict between the successful policy of promoting breastfeeding in Norway and policy efforts to increase father-involvement by extending the share of parental leave taken by fathers. This chapter paints a compelling picture of the conflict between "sameness" and "difference" feminisms in Scandinavian policy regimes. The final chapter was a challenging read, focusing on femininity as a commodity that drives consumer spending, and therefore the necessity of selling products that produce femininity to stimulate consumer capitalism. The writing in this chapter was relatively obscure, making it one of my least favorite.

As with most substantively-driven collections, methodology and data quality vary across chapters. Several analyses use the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), and some combine multiple data sources. However, some chapters used descriptive and relatively unsophisticated strategies to analyze quantitative data. Most chapters have a strong theoretical frame, and provide a valuable update and supplement to classic readings on gender and work.

Like all edited volumes, the chapters in the book vary in their quality and readability, and, like all readers, I appreciated some chapters more than others. From that perspective, I found the chapter comparing British and French women of different cohorts in feminizing occupations and the chapter analyzing breastfeeding promotion and parental leave policy in Norway to be the most compelling. Both offered interesting theoretical contributions, using methods and data that fit the research question.

Violence Expressed: An Anthropological Approach, edited by **Maria Six-Hohenbalken** and **Nerina Weiss**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 251 pp. \$114.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754678847.

ROBERT GAROT

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
rgarot@jjay.cuny.edu

The editors of *Violence Expressed* have presented an elegant volume focusing on the means by which violence is normalized, voiced and muted by perpetrators, victims, bystanders and researchers. In a remarkably coherent and complementary collection, the contributions all wrestle with the contention by leading researchers Appadurai (1996) and Das (2007) that language is limited in grappling with the horrors of violence. In three sections, on normalization and aesthetics, discursive strategies and muted language, and memory and aftermath, a mixture of experienced and younger scholars from Israel, Norway, Austria, the Netherlands, the United States, France and Germany present results from research among a wide variety of international sites and historic archives. Focusing on "silences, rumors, literary

narration, represented in muted bodies, in rituals or role models," many of the researchers present a *haptic* approach of "research through the senses" (p. 1).

Following an excellent and informative introduction, Linda Green commences the section on normalization and aesthetics with anthropology's *cri de coeur*, showing how the imposition of "ultra-normalized" Western civilizing practices has inflicted structural violence upon the Yup'ik of Alaska, resulting in a tuberculosis epidemic. The imposition of a market economy, sedentary lifestyle and inadequate shelter contributed to the crisis, and medical responses only exacerbated it. Eyal Ben-Ari also focuses on normalization, as he analyzes the aesthetics of two public military events in an ostensibly peaceful nation. First, the Hamamatsu Air Show presents a linear, scripted aerial dance, demonstrating power and strength full of noise and reverberations that convey affective states and facilitate bonding. Secondly, the open-day at Fuchiyama Camp presents an intimate, unscripted opportunity for civilians to mingle with soldiers in their "home," domesticating and personalizing the military through tactile experiences. Hence, "violence perpetuated by states is aestheticized so that it can be willingly accepted by individuals" (p. 64). Also in this section, Andre Gingrich explores the violent aesthetics of idealized male gender roles in southwestern Arabia through two in-depth case studies. Øivind Fugelrud concludes with an exploration of the celebration of tragic martyrdom by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, as meticulously cultivated in elaborate cemeteries that were often the first places to be destroyed by invading government forces.

Normalization and aesthetics is perhaps a more straight-forward topic than muted language and justifications discussed in Part II. Erella Grassiani finds fault with Israeli conscripts' minimization of moral agency for their violence, and their use of passive, indifferent or professionalizing discourses, which rarely express empathy for those they subjected to humiliating searches and surveillance. Grassiani notes critically that even expressions of moral re-sensitizing "almost never spurred the soldiers into action to

change the situation they and the Palestinians were in" (p. 107), without recognizing or explaining the structural constraints and potential consequences of such behavior. Janine Klungel reports from a claustrophobic field setting in the yard of a single extended family wracked by abuse, rumor and intimidation in Guadeloupe. Blood becomes a primary, if stomach-turning metaphor in this analysis, a hidden transcript or mask by which women "can find a vehement and full-throated expression for their unspoken riposte and stifled anger caused by rape relations" (p. 143). As powerful and poetic as this conclusion is, the reader may wonder if the analyst has taken liberties to draw connections not made explicit by the women themselves. Esben Leifsen's study of extremely young, abused and abandoned children in Quito also tackles very tricky and gut-wrenching methodological grounds. In one section on the interpretation of "muted signs," he postulates the significance of an airplane, a kite and a key for a chronically abandoned five-year-old, and the limits of agency for a two-year-old crippled by his stepfather. Such signs become interpretable in light of the children's case files and other ethnographic evidence, but at times it seems the researcher finds fault with the standards and boundaries of family violence in Ecuador contrasted to those in his home country of Norway. Finally, Nerina Weiss presents a deeply contextualized and insightful study of how one murder in a small town in Eastern Turkey leads to martyrdom, while another is enshrouded in justifications and silence. Perhaps more significantly, this realization leads Weiss to reflect on how she was unwittingly (at first) used by her informants in the interest of furthering their stories and their cause. While these four chapters are remarkable and reveal great personal cost and care taken by each respective researcher, I found that Weiss may have insights to offer the other three authors regarding the evidentiary bases for our claims and the conclusions we might be able to draw from silence.

Part III probes the memory and aftermath of violent events, involving methodologies that did not include the hardships evinced in Part II. Antonius Robben provides a useful and galvanizing tale of the lengths to which officials will go to deny wrongdoing in the

wake of Argentine military terror, and the dire price often paid by those who break ranks and confess. Adelheid Pichler offers a fascinating interpretation of Afro-Cuban religious rituals as the living embodiment of the suffering of slavery. One insightful comment by an informant, which could lead to an entirely revised analysis, is that rather than recapitulating the suffering of slavery, such rituals were meant to be *fun*—a provocative statement well worth further exploration. Michaela Schäuble investigates the vagaries of memory and remorse as expressed in the landmark film, *Waltz with Bashir*, and Maria Six-Hohenbalken concludes by exploring the ways in which three individual Austrians took note of the Armenian genocide during World War I—one as an accomplice over time, one a bystander, and one an engaged witness. The reader is hence reminded that even a personal journal may eventually be subjected to critical scrutiny.

Sociologists should not be put off by the subtitle of this collection referring to our sister discipline. Although the substantial cost of the volume may present an obstacle for students, the wide variety of examples from around the world provide much to ponder in addition to our homegrown villains typically defined in terms of race, class and gender. The text could use another review by a copy editor, but none of the typographical errors interfere with the comprehensibility or usefulness of this fascinating volume.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Das, Veena. 2007. *Life and Worlds: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Learning by Example: Imitation and Innovation at a Global Bank, by **David Strang**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010. 284pp. \$35.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780691142180.

MICHAEL GOLDMAN

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
mgoldman@umn.edu

Asking the absorbing question of how globally competitive firms learn by example, David Strang delves deeply into one of the world's largest banks, which we only know by its pseudonym Global Financial. Within the firm, Strang studies a benchmarking program called Team Challenge, operated from 1996 to 1998, in which 22 managerial teams were charged with the mandate to develop proposals for corporate innovation in 13 different arenas, including questions of work/life balance, the role of the internet in the firm, improving customer service, and the role of derivatives. Through interviews and surveys, Strang sought to understand how highly motivated managers translated site visits to exemplary firms into plans of action, revealing insights into the "cognitive processes that underlie imitation and learning" (p. 14). In doing so, he has added demonstrably to the literature on institutional learning.

The book's greatest strengths are the lively interviews of managers who freely reflect upon the gaping deficiencies of their own firm's culture and their intrigue in the "successes" of the Fortune 500 firms they visited. In visiting non-bank firms such as Disney, Xerox, and Motorola, their intentions were to learn what worked in the global firms they most admired. As Team Challenge members noted: "Some had clear missions. Merck—'improve human health.' FedEx—'the world on time.' It's a powerful tool." Contrast that with what they found at their own firm: "[Their colleagues] said they were limited by a lack of clear purpose. . . ." (p. 83). One was asked to define the firm's purpose: unlike at Disney, where managers clearly stated "we make people happy," at Global Financial, managers were unsure. As one commented glibly: "return on equity of 21 percent?" Another of Strang's interviewees elaborated: "When I joined the

bank, it was organized around loosely defined franchises. 'Go to Spain, buy a failed bank, put up a flag, send back the money' . . . Not much sense of a team, or a global relationship to the customer. Cowboys were rewarded. . ." (p. 55). How to motivate employees to excel in a firm, and how to expect them to sell their firm's purpose to customers, based on such a narrow and unseemly mandate?

By following Team Challenge through their site visits and careful readings of their proposals for change, Strang offers us insight into what inspired the team, what they sought to change at their own firm, and how they envisioned innovation within a large firm. This narrative is the book's greatest strength. These managers enthusiastically worked on this benchmarking project, enjoyed their site visits, and understood for the first time, as the quotations above suggest, why and how their own firm, an enormous bank with global reach and profits, was behind the curve in terms of running a successful firm—if success is defined by employee and customer satisfaction. But are CEOs still motivated by such concerns?

We learn a part of the answer from observing what happens to Team Challenge's creative and bold proposals. According to Strang, a new CEO took over and brought with him a completely new "strategic and managerial sensibility." "The bank's growth strategy became tied to mergers and acquisitions rather than process improvement" (p. 212). What happened to the new programs implemented to address the firm's "people management" problems (i.e., work/life balance concerns)? The new CEO dropped the recommended programs and preferred instead to offer stock options to his employees. In terms of a "corporate quality initiative," the new CEO preferred ones that the Team Challenge, after countless hours of learning and reflection, did not recommend.

Fascinating findings. But the question of why the firm's time and money went into "learning by example," and yet Team Challenge's conclusions were thrown out the window, is an important inquiry that is not fully answered here. As we learn from the recent global financial crisis and by new studies on the financial system, such as Karen Ho's *Liquidated*, global banks are not playing by the

old Fordist rule book, nor are they making profits by pleasing employees or customers. The enterprise of the firm is rapidly changing, and large financial institutions such as Global Financial are at the heart of this great transformation. Routine firing-and-hiring is *de rigueur* within the sector and the model for other sectors; the clarion call of "liquidate" is one that influences decision-making culture up and down the firm, and keeps employees and smaller-sized investors reeling from the volatility. The nature of the highly financialized U.S. economy reflects a new era in business. Although the book hints of these major shifts, they are not explored enough to develop the appropriate context for us to understand why the latest CEO in Strang's book makes his seemingly harsh and demoralizing decisions.

Overall, *Learning by Example* helps us rethink how firms learn, how they do not, and implicitly, which signals CEOs must respond to, amidst worldwide convulsions, in order for at least some players at the firm to survive.

Wrigley Regulars: Finding Community in the Bleachers, by **Holly Swyers**. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2010. 179pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780252077401.

MICHAEL IAN BORER
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
michael.borer@unlv.edu

The bleachers behind the outfield in Chicago's Wrigley Field, the second oldest ballpark in professional baseball, might seem like an artifact from a different world rather than from a different era. Other ballparks and stadiums often have a section called "bleachers" but they are usually just less comfortable versions of the individually-marked seats found in other sections. Wrigley's bleachers, however, are actual bleachers. Long metal planks stretch and follow the curve of the outfield with slight interruptions for aisles and concessions. The aisles create seemingly natural borders that double as symbolic boundaries for the regulars who, on their own accord because of general admission, seat themselves in one of four sections, each with its own regulars and, thus, its own

organizational and interactional norms. Though Wrigley's bleachers were renovated in 2006, some things, like the regulars themselves, still remain the same. *Wrigley Regulars* is the story of how, in a world where people move fast and ideas move faster, lack of change is possible.

Anthropologist Holly Swyers, or "Holly from Centerfield" as she's known to the folks at Wrigley Field, takes readers into the bleachers with her to show us how this somewhat unusual social space fosters a sense of community in ways that Robert Putnam could not imagine while bowling alone. Swyers offers some strong, though admittedly not entirely original, critiques of Putnam's "social capital model" and its tendency to over-value rationality and rational actions. Instead, Swyers favors an approach that recognizes how "community is a profoundly emotional and irrational experience" (p. 6). Whereas Putnam and other "community lost" scholars have spent many pages of text telling us how community in contemporary Western society is doomed, Swyers shows how community is possible and, perhaps more importantly, how it is practiced. Acutely aware that the term "community" is nearly bankrupt, throughout her study of Wrigley's bleacher regulars Swyers delineates how community is experienced through actions and habits.

True to her anthropological training, she admits to studying a lost tribe amidst the urban jungle of Chicago, a "group of regulars out there who regard themselves as one of the last true communities in the United States" (p. 8). And this tribe is kept together by their collective experiences of space (Chapter Two) and time (Chapter Three), practicing unified and defined rituals (Chapter Seven) and worshipping the same god (Chapter Eight)—though replacing "worship" and "god" with "despise" and "goat" might be more appropriate for this group.

Filled with details and descriptions that are as thick as the green ivy that lines the walls beneath the outfield bleachers, *Wrigley Regulars* demonstrates the abilities that strangers have to build lasting bonds through informally agreed upon rules and boundaries. Swyers shows us the ways that the community she found in the bleachers is organized through collective behaviors, motivations,

and emotions. In fact, this tight-knit group is so emotionally charged that members often refer to it as a "family." Though some might see this, perhaps, as a condemnation of the state of the family in contemporary American culture, Swyers goes to great lengths to show us that both terms, "family" and "community," are, in effect, placeholders for individuals' devotion to one another. Though the Cubs may be the reason they came to the ballpark in the first place, these regulars (if we choose to believe them, and I don't see why we shouldn't) leave the ballpark each game with feelings of kinship and camaraderie regardless of the final score.

Chock full of intimated stories about the bleacher regulars and their views of what to do and what not to do at the ballpark (e.g., don't start a wave, don't talk loudly on your cell phone), *Wrigley Regulars* often reads like a guide on how to become a Northside insider. Unfortunately, it runs the risk of being too much like the Cubs themselves, who, due to their not-so-winning ways, are often called the "Lovable Losers." That moniker may be a bit harsh for this book, but the reader, like many non-regular yet still devoted Cubs fans, is left feeling unfulfilled, wanting more, wanting something bigger and better. Swyers spends too much time in the bleachers and not enough time outside of them in order to look back in. We are presented with a universe that is comprised of only two worlds: the bleachers and everything else. Swyers' analysis would have benefitted from a more robust approach that connects the bleacher regulars more directly to the historical and contemporary social currents of Chicago. Sociologists who have written about ballparks, stadiums, and other important cultural, "community-building" sites have succeeded in addressing the larger social issues that inevitably affect the people and places studied. Swyers falls into the trap of seeing the trees but not the forest or (more contextually) the bleachers but not the city.

To Swyers's credit, her ambitions are modest. She is not swinging for the fence, she is just trying to get on base. Early on, Swyers tells us that she has "written this book to be easily taught to undergraduates" (p. xvii). In order to explain the symbols, rites, and rituals of the bleacher regulars that she

communed with and got to know very well, Swyers relies on some of anthropology's most notable hall-of-famers (e.g., Durkheim, Turner, Geertz). Connecting their often complex ideas about culture and community to "America's pastime" provides a clear introduction for those still trying to make the big leagues. Read as a kind of academic batting cage, *Wrigley Regulars* sheds its lovable loser status and should be regarded as a success. As every player who has ever struggled to get their bat on the ball has been told, a walk is as good as a hit.

The Insurgent Barricade, by **Mark Traugott**. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010. 436pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780520266322.

ANDREW G. WALDER
Stanford University
walder@stanford.edu

In this brilliant and elegantly written work of historical sociology, Mark Traugott develops the analysis of the familiar notion of a "repertoire" of collective action. Charles Tilly first introduced the concept in the 1970s as a way to characterize changes in popular contention in European history in response to the long-term structural changes of state building, proletarianization, and the spread of capitalist markets. Tilly introduced that notion to link macro-structural changes over the long run with changes in popular culture and political protest. Subsequent authors have often used the concept to frame largely descriptive studies that highlight the cultural dimensions of popular mobilization, leading skeptics to question whether the idea has real analytic utility. Traugott's finely crafted study will put these doubts to rest.

A "repertoire" has explicit dramatic connotations—the label was chosen to indicate the enactment of a familiar script, a routine of familiar actions taken to challenge authority. The "insurgent barricade" is the most important single example in European history, culminating in urban insurrections across the continent in the nineteenth century. Traugott defines it as "an improvised structure, built and defended by civilian insurgents as a means of laying claim to

urban space and mobilizing against military or police forces representing the constituted authorities" (p. 21). He begins the book with a spirited search for the origins of the term in French history and the development of what he calls "barricade consciousness." The earliest known use of the term was in a publication issued at 1571. The earliest barricades were chains drawn across the narrow streets of cities, often reinforced by barrels that could be rolled into place and filled with earth. The barrels ("barriques") were the origins of the term "barricade." Constructions in subsequent centuries would use virtually any material at hand: paving stones, overturned carts, park benches, scrap wood, and even dead horses.

Parisian insurrections in 1588 and 1648 employed barricades extensively, and became known in history and legend as the "First" and "Second" "Days of the Barricade." What is remarkable about the use of barricades during urban insurrections—and what the historical record clearly shows—is that residents throughout the city rapidly constructed these improvised barriers without any apparent planning, coordination, or organization. Traugott argues that well before the great upheaval of 1789, Parisian citizens had already developed a "barricade consciousness" based on folk knowledge rooted in oral tradition, which gave urban populations in Paris a capacity for large-scale mobilization and a "genius for improvisation" that was well established before the later popular upheavals in the city. Students of collective action will immediately understand the implication of this point: "A local uprising in a city well-versed in the art of insurrection might even dispense with the need for a tightly integrated command structure to the extent that the participants acted according to a well-defined set of roles and expectations" (p. 70).

Traugott compiled a database of 155 European "barricade events" over a span of 332 years before 1900 (fully documented in a 70-page appendix), and identifies six spikes in barricade activity: 1588–89, 1648–52, 1789–95, 1830–34, 1848–51 (the largest of all), and 1869–71. French events dominate the database—92 of the total, or 59 percent. The cases are almost exclusively French before the barricade began to spread throughout Europe in the great upheavals of the nineteenth century.

Traugott deals carefully with the issue of diffusion—both the empirical patterns and the mechanisms through which the repertoire spread. He contrasts "cultural transmission" of the kind that is prominent in the work of John Meyer and others with "relational transmission" through network ties. The earliest spread of the repertoire was to the adjacent territories of Belgium from 1787 to 1830, where it was employed in urban insurrections tied to Belgium's struggle for independence from Austria and the Dutch. Traugott concludes from the evidence in this case that the diffusion was primarily "cultural," due to geographic proximity, knowledge of the symbolism of French republicanism, and the absence of evidence of direct political contacts across the border.

Traugott's conclusions about the massive European revolutionary wave of 1848 are very different—here he finds an abundance of relational ties that transmitted "barricade consciousness" to the German states, Ireland, and a far-flung Austrian Empire that spanned cities now located in Italy, Hungary, Austria, and the Czech Republic. In the early nineteenth century Paris was the main center of European culture, had the largest publishing industry and institutions of higher education, and was filled with European political exiles (Marx, Bakunin, Heine, Mazzini, Herzen, and hundreds of the lesser-known) and foreign workers who were active in political clubs. The revolutionary upheaval in Paris in 1830 was the precursor to the later February revolution of 1848. Traugott shows how foreign students returned to their home countries and spread the insurrection, and he documents the repatriation of some 400,000 foreign workers from France due to the economic depression of 1847—110,000 from Paris alone.

Perhaps the most valuable single contribution of this book is the penultimate chapter, which explicates "the functions of the barricade" in facilitating popular mobilization, which are both "practical" and "social and symbolic." There are, first (following Merton), the "manifest functions": providing protective cover for street fighters, barring passage and impeding movement, and isolating the forces of order and blocking their communications. Of much greater interest to students of contentious politics are the

“latent functions.” Traugott documents beyond dispute that barricades in practice served to mobilize crowds and attract and identify new recruits, claim turf, openly challenge the legitimacy of the authorities, and build solidarity across occupational groups. These activities, in turn, help insurgents to gauge public sentiment and the probability of success. Even more important are Traugott’s observations that barricades themselves “foster an appropriate level of insurgent organization”—that is, cooperation emerges in the course of building the barricades, as shown in evidence that a division of labor develops at each barricade, assigning roles to individuals based on age, gender, occupation, leadership ability and prior military experience. Barricades also “promote fraternization with soldiers and police” across the barricades, which can prove crucial in undermining their discipline and solidarity. In other words, Traugott is arguing that the “insurgent barricade,” as a repertoire of collective action, can initiate an endogenous process that generates organization, solidarity, and identities that did not exist before the episode of contention begins. This may well be the most memorable contribution of this masterful work of historical sociology.

Managing the Margins: Gender, Citizenship, and the International Regulation of Precarious Employment, by **Leah F. Vosko**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010. 311pp. \$90.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780199574810.

RINA AGARWALA
Johns Hopkins University
 agarwala@jhu.edu

Leah Vosko’s *Managing the Margins* is a very welcome addition to the dismally thin (although growing) literature on precarious work. Drawing from an impressive range of sources, Vosko analyzes how labor regulations at the national and international levels have evolved since the late 1800s. Specifically, Vosko focuses on the construction and contraction of what she refers to as “the standard employment relationship” (SER). Vosko defines SER as a full-time permanent relationship, where the worker has one

employer, has standardized working hours, works on the employer’s premises under direct supervision, and has access to benefits. Her analysis centers on two central areas: (1) the interaction between gender and SER’s life-cycle, and (2) the failure of recent regulatory efforts to protect precarious workers. Vosko focuses on industrialized countries (Australia, Canada, the United States and Western Europe) and international regulatory bodies (the International Labour Organization (ILO), the European Union (EU), and the United Nations (UN)). Her sources include documents from the ILO archives, participant observation in ILO meetings, interviews with employer and worker representatives and ILO officials, and national labor statistics.

Perhaps most refreshing is that from the start and throughout the book, Vosko emphasizes how SER was never (and perhaps never meant to be) accessible to all workers. Therefore, Vosko’s analysis of SER’s lifecycle explicitly highlights the work (such as temporary casual employment or self-employment) and the workers (specifically women and migrants) that SER *excludes*. As the world now grapples with the demise of the SER model, Vosko’s analysis of SER’s exclusions offers a much-needed antidote to the commonplace attempts to simply reassert the SER model as the best way to protect the world’s workers.

In Chapters One-Three, Vosko documents how international regulations constructing SER have interacted with gender norms within the household. In the nineteenth century, international labor standards delineated women and children as the weakest segments of society and thus tried to protect them against long working hours, night work, and dangerous substances. In effect, these regulations disadvantaged women in the labor market. As international labor regulations consolidated SER in the early-to-mid-1900s, workers were guaranteed wages, benefits, and more humane working conditions for their productive work outside the household. However, these rights primarily benefited male workers, since they relied on women taking care of all reproductive work in the household without pay. Feminist movements fought to make SER more inclusive through anti-discrimination laws.

However, Vosko uses national labor data to illustrate how women in developed countries remain outside SER even today. Since the early 1980s, Vosko confirms the (albeit varied) decline of the SER. In an effort to grapple with this decline, as well as the exclusions inherent to SER, international bodies have enacted some labor regulations to protect more workers. These chapters are well synthesized and extremely accessible, making them ideal for new students of gender and labor.

In Chapters Four-Six, Vosko details and explains the failure of international regulatory attempts to grapple with precarious employment since the 1990s. Vosko argues that these attempts fail, because they continue to rely on an SER-centric approach to labor protection and thus regulate only those workers operating at the margins of SER. By doing so, these regulations reproduce precariousness, since the majority of the world's workers operate far outside the realm of SER and even outside SER's less secure margins. The majority of the world's workers, especially female workers, remain as vulnerable as ever. Efforts to protect part-time workers, for example, only cover permanent part-time workers, thereby omitting the majority of part-time workers who are self-employed or casually employed. This omission has important gender implications; in Australia, for example, 64 percent of part-time casuals are women. Similarly EU efforts to regulate temporary employment (which is mostly women), broadly protects fixed-term workers, but fails to protect adequately temporary agency workers, who are even more vulnerable. Finally, efforts to protect the self-employed have omitted those who work for more than one client—again those who are most precarious. These chapters teem with detail and offer an enormous variety of new insights for any student of contemporary labor issues.

The main weaknesses of this book, for this reader, were ironically related to its greatest strengths—that is, its focus on SER's exclusions along lines of gender and citizenship. In terms of gender, Chapters One-Three felt somewhat disjointed from the subsequent chapters. While Chapters Four-Six are rich in new insights, Vosko herself notes that SER's reliance on unpaid female caregiving

(points explained in Chapters One-Three) have already been well highlighted in the feminist literature, to which Vosko has contributed a great deal in her earlier works. While Chapters Four-Six explain the failure of contemporary regulations on precarious work, the prior chapters do not answer *why* the male breadwinner/female caregiver model of SER remained so entrenched despite feminist challenges, despite regulatory adjustments designed to create more equality in SER, and even despite ILO and EU attempts to improve working conditions for women falling outside SER. Why did feminist movements in most industrialized countries fail to incorporate the costs of social reproduction into SER? Why did Western feminist movements fail to fight states' attempts to offload the costs of social reproduction on female migrant labor? Finally, and perhaps most important, it was unclear at times where women stood in the trends described in Chapters Four-Six. For example, Vosko notes that policies promoting part-time employment emerged as a response to women's collective struggles for access to the labor force. So where were women's movements in Australia when labor protections omitted part-time casuals? Similarly, Vosko notes that efforts to protect fixed-term workers emerged as an effort to protect its largely female workforce. So did women's movements help put these regulations in place? If yes, why did they omit temporary agency workers?

A second weakness centers on the discussions around citizenship. In her introduction, Vosko provides a beautifully articulated discussion of the role of migrant labor in subsidizing SER in developed countries. However, in her analysis of specific regulatory attempts to manage precarious work (Chapters Four-Six), Vosko does not address issues of migration or citizenship much, especially when compared to the extent she engages issues of gender.

In her concluding chapter, Vosko returns to the topic of citizenship in a thought-provoking discussion of possible alternatives to SER. Vosko summarizes three possible alternatives, which she calls "tiered SER," "flexible SER," and "beyond employment." She then moves on to make some of her most exciting suggestions, such as the need

to move toward a *global* universal caregiving model that would eliminate the ability to exploit a precarious migrant workforce or poor workers in poor countries. Denationalizing citizenship and taxing receiving countries to fund public infrastructure in sending countries are two possible mechanisms to achieve this. As a testament to its strength, this concluding discussion calls on the reader to want more, especially with regard to how these alternative approaches might be funded and made politically attractive. And the reader is left wondering how these issues emerged (if at all) in the discussions of the regulations detailed in Chapters Four-Six.

All in all, this is an important and fascinating book that is a must read for anyone interested in contemporary issues of labor and labor regulation.

Katrina's Imprint: Race and Vulnerability in America, edited by **Keith Wailoo, Karen M. O'Neill, Jeffrey Dowd, and Roland Anglin**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 209pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547749.

LYNN WEBER
University of South Carolina
 weberl@sc.edu

Six years after Hurricane Katrina, the disaster is etched in the American consciousness as a symbol of many things about our culture, including its deeply embedded poverty and racial inequality. Hundreds of books, research articles, documentaries, and commentaries have been produced about the disaster and its aftermath. As someone who has been involved in research on inequalities in the aftermath of Katrina, I approached this book with interest, but also with scepticism—about whether I would encounter much that I had not already learned. I was wrong. *Katrina's Imprint* is a unique book that makes critical contributions to our understanding not only of the event itself but also of the ongoing production of social inequalities in our society as a whole.

Katrina's Imprint, an edited collection of 14 essays, is the product of a multidisciplinary group of Rutgers University scholars who

came together after the storm to reflect on its multiple meanings. Although diverse in disciplinary backgrounds—law, history, sociology, psychology, English, labor, environmental, and African American studies—the group found common ground in questions about the social and political origins of vulnerability.

The chapters, well written and focused, present an interesting and insightful analysis of the complexities of the disaster and of the vulnerabilities inherent in it. One great strength of the book is that it combines an overarching emphasis in the entire text on the processes—both structural and cultural—which produce vulnerabilities, while each chapter provides a unique substantive focus and angle of vision. Unlike many edited books with multiple authors, these scholars have collaborated and referenced each others' work throughout. A blend of informed essays and original empirical research, of humanities and social science, the book should work well in both graduate and undergraduate classrooms.

In her 2003 presidential address to the American Sociological Association, Barbara Reskin argued that scholars and activists studying inequality should shift our attention away from studying the *motives* of individual decision-makers who discriminate and instead focus on how their actions produce inequality—its *mechanisms*. That charge remains perhaps the most difficult and yet critical challenge to reveal the underlying social processes which produce social inequality. Through in-depth analyses of land use policy (Karen O'Neill); media framing (Keith Wailoo and Jeffrey Dowd), transportation policy (Mia Bay), governmental structures of federalism and localism (Roland Anglin, David Troutt), health (Wailoo), chronic stress of racism (Nancy Boyd-Franklin), labor market and economic policies (William Rodgers), residential segregation and employment (Niki Dickerson), and public versus private responses (John Aiello and Lyra Stein), the authors in this volume not only make the claim that structural inequalities of race and class were reproduced in Katrina, but they also show *how* they were reproduced and continue to be reproduced—in the cultural, political, economic, and ideological realms.

The blend of social science and humanities scholarship contributes both to the readability of the book and to a more holistic image of the structural and cultural processes reproducing social inequalities in the New Orleans' experience of the disaster. The social science reveals policies and practices undergirding social inequalities, while humanist analyses show us how to conceptualize the issues in cultural contexts (Evie Shockley, Ann Fabian), and to imagine a new future by building on cultural strengths. For example, Richard Mizelle demonstrates how the Jazz funeral promotes community resilience and serves as a metaphor for engaging community in recovery, renewal, and rebuilding.

Although the chapters in this volume are uniformly strong, a description of two may provide a sense of the insights offered. For example, while many have written about the racism in media coverage of Katrina, Wailoo and Dowd present a unique analysis demonstrating how the lenses developed in the coverage of Katrina have framed portrayals of disasters ever since. While tropes of personal responsibility remain dominant, some media coverage now points to structural, power-based, and historical decisions setting the conditions for disaster and for the plight of the vulnerable in disasters.

Bay presents a similarly complex analysis of transportation's role in the disaster. Most observers know that many African Americans in New Orleans were unable to leave because they did not have cars. And there is still a widespread belief that taking personal responsibility for yourself and your family involves owning a car. A year after the storm, for example, the city's website called for "personal responsibility" and car ownership as key elements in its disaster preparedness plan. Yet Bay reminds us of the historically pivotal role of transportation policies in producing and sustaining racial segregation and discrimination—from Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896, a transportation case establishing the separate but equal doctrine, until today when 80 percent of transportation funds go to highways while only 20 percent to public transportation. And African Americans are less likely to own cars but to pay more than whites for comparable cars and car insurance.

By documenting the systemic, historically embedded policies and practices that undergird the seeming independence of the privileged, the dependence of the vulnerable, and the ideology of individual responsibility and blame to explain the differences between the two, analyses like these throughout the book reveal the "myth of self-sufficiency." And in the process, they advance our understanding of inequality and disasters. The strong blend of empirically-based social science and textual and cultural analyses of *Katrina's Imprint* leads to a holistic understanding of the ways that structural inequalities are reproduced, but also resisted and challenged.

Unequal Partners: The United States and Mexico, by **Sidney Weintraub**. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010. 172pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822960584.

JON SHEFNER
University of Tennessee
 jshefner@utk.edu

Few nations have been as closely linked throughout their histories as Mexico and the United States. For Sidney Weintraub, this historically asymmetric relationship is best understood as one of dependency and dominance, revealed not just by policy choices, but also by attitudes that guide policymakers and mold public opinion. Weintraub looks at a variety of political and economic issues over which the two nations have negotiated, focusing on the post-1982 debt crisis era until the present day. The issues Weintraub finds most telling in the relationship include trade, foreign investment, drugs, oil, and migration. In all of these policy areas, Weintraub documents Mexican officials largely, but not always, making decisions that demonstrate their reliance on the United States. In most decisions, Weintraub finds Mexican policymakers playing a reactive role to their U.S. counterparts, with reactions ranging from full acquiescence to limited defensive measures.

Weintraub recognizes that U.S. policymaking has at times been mistaken, and always has U.S. interests as its first priority. The author's affection and sympathy for Mexico

is especially demonstrated in the chapters critiquing both migration and drug policies. Weintraub recognizes much better than many U.S. policymakers that the consumption north of the border creates an untenable environment for Mexican drug policy, just as he recognizes that U.S. migration policy has been neither consistent nor logical. The author similarly recognizes that the upsurge of immigration in recent decades is clearly linked to Mexico's polarized society.

Despite his sympathy, Weintraub is convinced that Mexico's problem has been rooted in insufficient openness to free markets. This position is problematic throughout this book. Following neoliberal policy has leveled significant costs on Mexico; Weintraub fails to see that such policy has caused high unemployment and underemployment, low wages and job security for Mexican workers, and reductions in welfare state provision. Weintraub also acknowledges the rise of the informal labor market, but finds it important only because high participation in informal work diminishes tax revenues, without conceding the cost to informal workers in diminished job security and wages.

Contrasting debt-crisis and post-North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) policies with earlier moments of Mexican economic development, Weintraub offers ringing endorsement of foreign domestic investment, including the vast movement into foreign ownership of Mexican banks. In doing so, however, the author fails to consider potential problems such as foreign repatriation of profits or loan decisions that benefit foreign enterprises at the expense of national needs. Weintraub's echoing of the neoliberal line carries over into energy policy: his critique of Mexico's petroleum industry is rooted in the too-familiar complaint of that sector's domination by powerful unions.

This book is largely solution-oriented, as befits a review of policy, but the favored solutions are exclusively oriented to market opening. Weintraub criticizes Mexico's earlier import substitution industrialization, joining the chorus of neoliberal-friendly critics of the policy that protected national industries while limiting entry of foreign goods and investment. A recent book by James Cypher and Raúl Delgado Wise (2010) offers a very different analysis, and indeed some different

data. Mexico's decisions to open markets cannot be understood without recognizing that the subsequent increase in manufacturing production was tied to U.S. consumer needs at the expense of building internal markets. Such close ties meant that in both the debt crisis and NAFTA eras, Mexican industrialization was not only increasingly dependent on foreign capital, so too was its export production. The comparative advantage won by proximity and cheap labor soon diminished when using cheaper Asian labor became an option, and Mexican manufacturing declined during the new century as a result. Mexico's externally centered economy, which grew after the 1994 passage of NAFTA, failed to focus sufficiently on internal markets, not to mention domestic employment.

In assessing the partnership between the two nations, Weintraub is careful to avoid wider theories of political economy or international relations; indeed, his use of the term dependency shies away from that classic theory of Latin American development. For Weintraub, the relationship between Mexico and the United States is neither generalizable to a system of relationships nor contingent on moments of globalization.

The author's refusal to see Mexico in any systemic way yields an exclusively binational analysis. Certainly Mexico pursued any number of economic paths because of discrete decisions by policymakers on both sides of the border. But Mexico also confronts a universe of limited options due to its position in a globalized economy. Ignoring the possibility that economic limitations posed by globalization make Mexico's history like many other Latin American nations, discounts the past thirty years of global political economy. Comparison to other nations, or at least acknowledging a shared history, would show large similarities rather than the differences Weintraub is intent on documenting.

This is not to suggest that case studies are not useful. As an ethnographer, I would never make such a claim. But cases are always cases of something. Occasionally they are singular events or places, and important to understand as such. But they can also be cases of more generalizable relationships, out of which we can glean even more useful information. Weintraub's assertion that the

relationship between Mexico and the United States is solely unique misses the opportunity to build upon our historical and theoretical knowledge.

Reference

Cypher, James M. and Raúl Delgado Wise. 2010. *Mexico's Economic Dilemma: The Developmental Failure of Neoliberalism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

One Country, Two Societies: Rural-Urban Inequality in Contemporary China, edited by **Martin King Whyte**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. 445pp. \$27.95 paper. ISBN: 9780674036321.

DOUG GUTHRIE

George Washington University
guthrie@gwu.edu

For over four decades, Martin Whyte has been a mainstay of the China research community. In the 1970s and early 1980s, his collaboration with William Parish produced classic works on the social structure of rural and urban China under communism. These works set a standard on conceptual and methodological levels at a time when so much about communist China was unknown and inaccessible. In the late 1980s and 1990s, Professor Whyte added to this research agenda with seminal work on marriage and the family in China's transforming economy. Most recently he has been working on issues of inequality, urban-rural divide, and the social unrest that may be tied to rising inequality between these areas. In many ways, he is the consummate sociologist, not locked into any one narrowly defined topic or sub-field, but instead committed to continually seeking different angles and lenses through which to analyze one of the most dynamic economic transformation stories in the world. As the title conveys, *One Country, Two Societies: Rural-Urban Inequality in Contemporary China* fits into his last line of work. It is an insightful volume and will be essential reading for those interested in the social dimensions of reform-era China.

The issue of rural-urban inequality, and its apparent rise in the reform era, is a topic that is often in the news and often raised as a criticism of China's transition from plan to market. Indeed, as a China scholar myself, I often get asked critical questions about the rapid rise in rural-urban inequality. These questions are invariably frustrating for a variety of reasons. For one thing, capitalism—especially the version we have had in the United States over the last 40 years—is inherently unequal (by Gini coefficients, the level of inequality in the United States is very close to that of China); and given China's gradualist approach to the transition from plan to market, the country has handled the transition from plan to market more responsibly than most transition economies. Further, the issue of rural-urban inequality runs much deeper than is typically understood and it is deeply embedded in the history of the PRC. While Mao came to power on a rhetorical platform of creating an equal society, what he really created was a system that Whyte refers to as "socialist serfdom," binding the rural population to the land and channeling very little to that sector in terms of resources. Several important scholars have spoken to this issue: Whyte and Parish's important work on the structure of rural and urban life under communism makes this point; and Andrew Walder's important work on the structure of rewards under communism emphatically makes the point about the logic of stratification in pre-reform China. This edited volume finally brings all of this into graphic relief. But it is important to note here that this volume does not buy into the simplistic view of rapidly rising inequality. By working to understand the complexities of this history and the complexities of the process of change, the volume advances the conversation on rural-urban inequality in significant ways.

The volume begins by exploring the issue of rural-urban inequality at a conceptual level. Whyte's introductory essay on this issue is the best overview on the topic I have read. That chapter plus the first two chapters on "context" give us great background on the empirical realities of this issue, and the key institutional issues that matter here—decollectivization and the loosening of migration restrictions—are explored

extensively. I enjoyed these chapters especially because there are very radical views on the urban-rural citizenship divide that are especially critical of the reform-era leaders. These chapters put this issue in historical context and allow us to understand, given the "socialist serfdom" system the reformers were up against, how much inequality was endemic in the system from the outset. They also give an empirically-grounded sense of what the rural-urban gap is today. Section Two continues the analysis of this topic, with more sophisticated analyses of income inequality including issues like nonwage benefits, access to other resources, and the drivers of the income gap.

Appropriately, given the importance of nonwage benefits for social stratification in pre-reform China, Section Three dives into the link between inequality and access to social resources. The chapter by Emily Hannum, Meiyang Wang, and Jennifer Adams deals with access to education as it relates to inequality. Their chapter shows that China has done fairly well in the transition era, but there are many questions about whether the rural population has benefitted from educational expansion. Chapters Seven through Nine deal with issues of access to health care, the "digital divide," and the variation in registration in urban areas. The second half of the book, Chapters 10–15, deals with a variety of issues surrounding rural-urban migration and migrant labor. This is appropriate, as one of the major institutional changes, Whyte notes, that redefined peasant life was the loosening of ties to a specific place, and migration thus plays significantly into the ways in which inequality is evolving in China. Further, migrant labor is one of the major engines of China's economic growth.

This is an outstanding volume that delivers a great amount of empirical information as well as a powerful theoretical lens through which to view inequality in China today.

China's Long March to Freedom: Grassroots Modernization, by **Kate Zhou**. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009. 349pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781412810296.

YANG SU
University of California, Irvine
 su.yang@uci.edu

The profound social changes which occurred in China over the past thirty years await illumination and the angle chosen in this book is certainly promising. Other scholars have expended much effort analyzing new policies that were supposedly causing the changes. Kate Zhou documents a driving force that is equally formidable yet less studied—the impetus emerging from the grassroots. She contends that such impetus came neither as organized dissent nor interest group, but in the form of "social movements" that are "essentially spontaneous, with no spokespersons or leaders." Called "SULNAM (a spontaneous, unorganized, leaderless, non-ideological and apolitical movement)," her theoretical construct is not elegant, but thankfully the chapters that follow provide clear enough examples to show what it means. Documenting a wide range of grassroots activities, the book succeeds in creating a textured portrayal of China in transformation.

Built on the author's earlier work, the book argues that post-Mao China's first major reform measure was a product of grassroots creative power rather than typical policy-making procedures within the government. At the outset of major reforms in 1979, only 1 percent of farmers practiced the household responsibility system, a system that returned land to individual households; this quickly grew into 14 percent the following year, 80 percent in 1982, and 98 percent by 1983. As Zhou astutely observes, the rapid spread of the reform was possible because the farmers had already been attempting the changes for decades, in contrast to past rural reforms such as people's communes, which had to be enforced by bureaucrats sent down from urban centers. The measure set off two other processes—labor migration and the emergence of entrepreneurship, both contributing

to the formation of the free market. Again, the government is found originally to be a constricting force, discouraging the institution of new changes as national policies, and eventually doing so only reluctantly. Depicting a similar dynamic between citizens' striving for freedom and the state's seemingly innate tendency to constrain, the author proceeds to document changes in more areas such as civic society and sexual mores. She closes with a chapter on foreign investment and globalization.

Zhou's thesis is less plausible in the later chapters. For one thing, it is a stretch to call state decisions (such as joining WTO, and instituting a stock market) the product of grassroots efforts. Furthermore, it is almost absurd to lump the practice of keeping mistresses, common among newly-rich married men, together with real achievements in gender equality, claiming that they are all representative of the newfound "freedom" of the "sexual revolution." When speaking of the practice of bribery, Zhou astutely points out that this may have helped the early wave of entrepreneurs to bypass government restrictions on business. However, she neglects to inform readers that corruption in general has hurt the market more than it has helped.

The book tries very hard to argue that the changes were not from the government (sometimes equated with elites in the book) but from the masses. In reality, however, they were from both. What typically happened was that a new practice was first allowed in one or a few locales. Once the party center not only recognized its value but also found ways to reconcile the new practice with party doctrine, the government promoted it nationwide. In a way, this pattern dated back to the Mao years, when the government's leadership style was to cultivate and promote models. What was new in the reform era was that unlike past models, which were born out of ultra-left ideology, the new models were the genuine creations of local grassroots actors and were eagerly desired elsewhere. All the same, the state was one of the driving forces in deciding which practices were permitted and when and where they could be implemented. Only by keeping the state's role in mind can we explain why some grassroots initiatives were adopted while many others were

not. Therefore the central argument of the book, that the masses were the true agents of change, is more a polemic than a theoretical analysis. Indeed, polemical passion runs high in the book, enthroning "individual freedom" while condemning the government. At times it reads like the platform of an Orange County Republican Party candidate in the United States, complete with quotes from Friedrich Hayek, George W. Bush, Condoleezza Rice, and Rupert Murdoch.

While it is a valuable contribution for showcasing how changes were taking place at the grassroots level, the book does little to explain the dynamics of these changes. It seems to suggest that so long as the government unleashes the thirst for individual freedom, social changes will ensue. This proposition partly holds true for China at the beginning of the Reform, when it had a socialist command economy and militarized social organization. It is a glaringly inadequate proposition, however, as scholars have shown time and again that new institutions are not just a collection of individual freedoms. Instead they are the result of a balance between individual interests and governmental success in regulating these interests. One has to explain why countless individual impulses and free-wheeling pursuits result in only a few policy changes.

Stylistically, I have to disagree with the writer of the book's foreword, who lauds the author for "writing in powerful English." The text often includes abstract statements and ungrounded assertions. Consider this: "*The state* used the class labeling to divide the rural population which had formerly organized itself along clan, family and village lines. *The communists* assigned each family to class, based on the family's economic circumstances at the time of land reform (1947–52). *Mao* defined six classes: landlords, rich peasants, upper-middle peasants, middle peasants, lower-middle peasants, and poor peasants" (p. 2, emphasis added). Setting the accuracy of these statements aside, subjects such as "the state," "the Communists," and "Mao" are too abstract and simplistic. Or consider this: "Chinese culture has always valued entrepreneurs. But the culture was lost for thirty years until the grassroots *baochan daohu*

revived it." (p. 63) The proposition that Chinese culture has always valued entrepreneurs is hardly grounded in facts or scholarship. Finally, reading is inconvenienced by Chinese *pinyin* terms appearing on almost every page. Worse still, many of them are misspelled.

Social Theories of Risk and Uncertainty: An Introduction, edited by **Jens O. Zinn**. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. 252pp. \$49.95 paper. ISBN: 9781405153362.

STEVEN NEY

Jacobs University, Bremen
s.ney@jacobs-university.de

This edited volume surveys theories that look at the relationship between society and risk. Social theories of risk, the editor Jens Zinn suggests, emerged as a counterpoint to "realist" conceptions of risk and uncertainty. Why, these theories ask, has "rational" risk management based on "objective" measures of risk invariably caused considerable social conflict? The answer is that risk is about more than just objective knowledge. Properly understood as a social phenomenon, risk spans five dimensions: values, knowledge, rationality, power, and emotions. Zinn identifies five "streams" of social theory that forge some or all of these dimensions into an understanding of risk and uncertainty: the "risk society," "governmentality," "systems theory," "edgework," and "cultural approaches."

The five streams structure the book. Each of the chapters outlines the assumptions, internal logic and implications of the streams. The authors locate the conceptual origins of each stream (i.e., Beck for "risk society," Foucault for "governmentality," etc.). The chapters also retrace the course of each social risk theory as it has flown through academic communities and is applied. Some theories—governmentality or systems theory—have branched farther than others—edgework or cultural approaches. Some theories explain society in terms of risk—Beck's risk society or Lyng's edgework—while explaining risk in terms of the social—Douglas' cultural theory or Luhmann's systems theory. Each chapter engages with criticisms and provides an

outlook for future development of the theory. All chapters commendably manage this within about 30 pages.

In the final chapter, Zinn, rather bravely, methodically contrasts each stream in terms of its historical context, its conception of risk as well as the five dimensions identified in the introduction. This analysis reveals how aptly the stream metaphor depicts social theories of risk. Some approaches emerge from neighboring origins (e.g., systems theory and cultural approaches), others are rather remote from each other (e.g., Beck's risk society and Foucauldian governmentality). In places, some of the streams converge and pool (for example, both "edgework" and "risk society" look to late modernity to understand risk perception), elsewhere the same streams diverge considerably. At no point, it would seem, do all five streams converge on the same point or even follow the same course. Zinn documents this in terms of helpful comparative tables. The reader is left with the impression that a few complementarities mingle with a lot of incommensurability.

The book does two things very well. First, it covers an immense amount of rugged conceptual terrain in only 200 pages. The chapters outline the theories for a sociologically well-educated reader to get a good idea of the approaches without a prohibitive investment in time or effort. Doing this for Luhmann or Foucault is no mean feat. Second, Zinn's comparative approach is both refreshing and potentially useful. Zinn commendably does not reinforce boundaries, and thereby misses synergies, between what are closely related theories. Nor does the book encourage using theoretical incompatibilities as an excuse to shield theoretical preferences from critical scrutiny. The structure and orientation of this book suggest, albeit very implicitly, a more agnostic view. Here, theories are tools, necessarily partial and ultimately flawed, for understanding the complexities of risk and uncertainty. The book seems to intimate that different theories produce complementary and conflicting insights. Findings about social risk and uncertainty (this seems to be the implicit message) will be more robust the more researchers can harness and deploy these diverse insights.

Yet for all its potential strengths, the volume lacks balance. For one, the book needs more thematic integration. None of the chapters explicitly addresses the five dimensions of risk Zinn identifies in the introduction. Worse still, the book makes little use of overlaps and synergies. For example, we read largely the same about Beck in Chapters Two, Five, and Six. The idea of governmentality appears in detail in Chapters Three and Six. Instead of repeating essentially the same material, it would have been refreshing to read about the implications of these synergies for the respective theories.

Further, the chapters hardly develop the implications of each stream for research and policy practice. Instead of explaining the streams at a high level of abstraction, the authors, with the possible exception of the edgework chapter, would have done well to use examples from their own research to show how these theories help understand risk and uncertainty in the real world. More real-life cases, rather than the fictitious examples in the systems-theory chapter, or even John Tulloch's disturbing and very personal account of his traumatic experiences of 7/7, would have brought the somewhat dry exposition to life. Even the final chapter, good as it is, seems to run out of steam. Instead of outlining the implications of the similarities and differences for our understanding of risk and the way we should go about researching risk, it concludes with a limp section consisting of a bullet-point list of issues for further research.

The chapters also strike a poor balance between advocacy and criticism of the respective approaches. The authors reproduce the essence and spirit of each theory a little too faithfully. Thus, the chapters on Beck and Luhmann echo the stodgy formalism of *Gesellschaftstheorie*. The piece on

governmentality is playfully postmodern as it glibly sidesteps any criticism. The piece on edgework poorly conceals its admiration for rugged individuals who take immense risks and live to tell the tale. Regrettably, the chapters discuss the limitations of the theories as little more than an afterthought.

Moreover, in terms of content, the volume does not always provide a fair or balanced account of risk theorists. For example, the chapter on cultural approaches depicts Mary Douglas' thinking around the mid-1980s. By the mid-1990s, let alone at the time when the book was written, much of these positions—particularly the implicit conservatism of the 1982 book *Risk and Culture* to which both Zinn and Tulloch disapprovingly point—had been revised by Douglas herself as well as others using her approach. This sort of selective perception does not inspire trust in the exposition.

Surprisingly, the book has nothing to say about the concept of security. Published in 2008, none of the pieces engage with the discourse and policy practices surrounding the concept of "security" that have emerged in the aftermath of 9/11. Security and securitization have become powerful ideas with significant real world implications. And yet, although the risk of terrorism pops up repeatedly throughout, the book is largely silent on questions pertaining to the so-called securitization. This seems like a wasted opportunity.

In sum, the volume provides a good overview of contending social theories of risk and offers the reader a glimpse of conceptual pluralism in risk research. However, the book would have profited from a more balanced presentation of the theories, as well as more substantial development of the implications of the comparison for risk research and risk management practice.