

Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews

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

Science-Mart: Privatizing American Science

Stephen Diamond

Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews 2012 41: 226

DOI: 10.1177/0094306112438190ii

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://csx.sagepub.com/content/41/2/226>

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](#) - Mar 20, 2012

[What is This?](#)

REVIEWS

The Making of a Generation: The Children of the 1970s in Adulthood, by **Lesley Andres** and **Johanna Wyn**. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press, 2010. 271pp. \$32.95 paper. ISBN: 9780802094674.

MELISSA HARDY
Pennsylvania State University
Melissa.Hardy@psu.edu

Periods of economic insecurity affect different age groups in different ways. Whether you call them generations or cohorts, life experiences framed by the unique intersection of age and history have proved a fascinating subject for social scientists. In their coming-of-age account of the group of birth cohorts some have dubbed Generation X, Lesley Andres and Johanna Wyn provide a readable, theoretically embedded, and empirically supported account of how policy, economic conditions, and persistent inequality create currents that can lead us to different futures from those we imagined. Utilizing a longitudinal design and 14 to 15 years of data from the "Paths on Life's Way" project, based in British Columbia, Canada, and the "Life Patterns" project, set in Victoria, Australia, the authors examine how these two sets of adolescents, who completed their secondary schooling in the late 1980s and early 1990s, manage decisions about post-secondary education, work, and relationships in a context of increasing economic insecurity, global competition, workplace restructuring, and persistent inequalities by class and gender. The similarities in the political, social, and economic institutions of Canada and Australia allow the authors to spotlight how expansions in post-secondary education were orchestrated, how the goal of expanding education opportunity was reflected in education achievement, and how these young adults tried to articulate their educational credentials and life goals with the changing work environment.

The authors organize the material into five interrelated themes: reluctant change makers, an education generation, generating

new patterns of family life, a generation in search of work/life balance, and a diverse generation. In unfolding these themes, they show us how, on the one hand, these young people wanted the same sorts of things we wanted at their age—financial security (but not necessarily wealth), good relationships, and happiness. But the circumstances they face are different—better in some ways, more difficult in others. Part of that difficulty stems from the diverse pathways available to young people, which may appear incomprehensible to those who argue that more choice is always better. Those trying to figure out how to get from here to there find that having "endless possibilities" is not necessarily a comfort, especially when we later discover that some of those routes are in disrepair, others are too crowded, and still others come with detours that may keep us from ever reaching our destinations. Rather, seeing some number of clearly articulated routes that lead to a specific outcome assures us that we will be able to reach our goals.

The trend toward the individualization of risk that has been noted in both the academic and popular press appears here in various manifestations—for example, the anxiety felt over choosing the right major, finding more than a dead-end job, and paying off student loans. The other side of this trend is showing how the costs of social change are externalized, sometimes with unintended consequences. As families and students absorb the higher costs of post-secondary schooling, parents continue to house their graduates well into their 20s, graduates delay marriage and children until they are able to establish some financial foothold, while employers are able to hire college graduates to fill clerical jobs.

When the costs of such widespread social change are shifted, those already in a position of disadvantage are often the most vulnerable. Despite the expansion of post-secondary education, existing patterns of inequality are reproduced as new generations are sorted into winners and losers. Those whose parents are college graduates manage the secondary to post-secondary transition more smoothly

and are better able to navigate the labor market. Those whose parents can afford tuition begin their working lives unfettered by student loans and are more likely to receive help in setting up an independent household. Young men from low socioeconomic backgrounds fare the worst, as the experiences and outcomes of this generation vary considerably by class and gender.

The authors also demonstrate how the costs of homemaking and childcare are shifted to women in the absence of workplace policies that provide a better family/work balance and a persistent normative view that continues to place certain tasks in a category of "women's work." More highly educated young men are more likely to remain with (and financially dependent on) their parents and rely on their mothers to "make" a home. More educated young women are more likely to set out on their own, but they delay marriage and having children because, like their mothers, they either have to choose or find the energy to manage both. These personal choices are reflected in changing society patterns as well, as nations note the rise in rates of cohabitation and the decline in fertility, and a tendency for more educated women to have no or fewer children later in life than their less educated counterparts.

Those who work with longitudinal data know the problems of sample attrition. Although both data collections begin with more than ten thousand people, both also suffer from a substantial loss of respondents over time. These data are primarily used to identify patterns—how behaviors are sequenced and timed, for example, and the authors provide some comparative information in an appendix on non-respondents. In addition, the authors rely on longitudinal interview data, which allow them to develop a fuller picture of the patterns they identify.

Based on their findings, Andres and Wyn end the book arguing for a new approach to social welfare systems that acknowledges the importance of integrated policies to address not only the connection between education and the labor market, but policies that support personal relationships, family life, a desire to have children, overall health, and well-being. Given the current political

climate, rejuvenating social welfare policies will be an uphill battle, but the mounting evidence of persistent and entrenched inequalities by class and gender demand nothing less.

After Khomeini: Iran Under His Successors, by **Saïd Amir Arjomand**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009. 268pp. \$24.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780195391794.

CYRUS YEGANEH
University of Art, Tehran
cyeganeh@hotmail.com

After Khomeini's publication and the bulk of Saïd Amir Arjomand's references predate two major recent developments, one regional and one domestic: regionally, the Arab Spring and Awakening; and domestically, the internal dynamics of leadership in Iranian society. Nevertheless, based on meticulous textual research, this book sheds light on aspects of both—directly on the latter, and indirectly by extension on the former development. Thus, it serves as a useful source for the scholarly and policy communities, as well as the public at large.

Its most salient feature is a fairly accurate account and a cogent analysis of the place of constitutionalism in present-day Iranian society, specifically the course of its post-revolutionary evolution to the present. As any reading of the constitution would reveal, it embodies what can best be described as rule by the clergy, or more precisely, a theocracy, as opposed to Western-style liberal democracy. Officially it is called "religious democracy," a modification of liberal democracy and avowedly more democratic than the original liberal version developed in the West. It is widely believed that liberal democracy is secular by nature, neglecting its religious roots in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, as well as the prevalence of democracy (but not theocracy) in otherwise religious societies in the West and elsewhere.

Gradual evolution of this position, and its embodiment in the two constitutions since the Revolution, is fairly well-documented; so is the evolution of the various reformist positions. The same trends are responsible today for the current polarization in

government and changing concentration of power. There are at least three factions that have recently branched away from the radical end of the political spectrum, in the absence of a viable reformist faction, which are vying for parliamentary seats in the upcoming elections of March 2012.

The reformists did not propose reforms in the constitution, especially when it came to modifying or limiting theocratic authority, let alone proposing secularism. It is often erroneously assumed by many that the present constitution is violated. This is not true, since by and large it is followed. If there are differences with a Western-style democracy, Arjomand demonstrates that it is due to the theocratic Islamic foundations of the constitution, resulting in a modified form of Western democracy. Indeed, officials have on many occasions reiterated that the Revolution was not for democracy, but that "Islam has everything." Liberal democracy is generally critiqued; and books by scholars (such as the Frankfurt School) who criticize liberalism, liberal democracy and the culture and values of modernity, and support "social democracy," are published by private publishers and sponsored by the Organization of Islamic Propaganda (*Saziman Tablighat Islami*). There has not been a transformation of the dominant revolutionary Islamic ideology, nor has a shift away from religious democracy toward liberal democracy materialized, demographic, social and political consequences of the Revolution notwithstanding.

Important relevant works by Iranian sociologists and other social scientists living and working in Iran are absent from the book's many references. Such works provide further social, cultural and historical explanations for current developments as well as those leading up to the Revolution of 1979. This particularly manifests itself in the quality and extent of mass support for the Revolution. The author rightly points out the main intellectual contributors to the nationalist-cum-xenophobic-cum-nativistic outlook, which was a large part of the discourse and social psyche during the Revolution and the post-revolutionary era. As partly mentioned by Arjomand, it is an admixture of several historical traditions and heritages and their various "readings":

Mesopotamian (going as far back as Sumerians, but never mentioned and consciously recognized); nationalistic-pre-Islamic (more than three thousand years old, even six thousand, as commonly believed to be the "Aryan" heritage as opposed to the Semitic Islam); Islamic-Shi'ite (1,400 years); Turkic-Mongolian (close to 1,000 years, which is not consciously present in the common discourse and psyche, even ignored); and the various European ideologies, prominently nationalisms, liberalisms and communisms and socialisms of different sorts (for almost 400 years). These are the red threads that run through social and cultural history, leaving their indelible marks to the present. They form the culture and the many ethnic-regional-class subcultures running the gamut from urban to rural to tribal (whether urban, agrarian or nomadic).

Not that such complexity makes Iranian society unique in any way, at all; but it does point to complexities that easily escape outsiders and the domestic population and their policy makers alike, whether concerning Iran, Iraq, or Afghanistan—in fact, all societies from Austria to Zimbabwe. This has implications of enormous international significance in today's world, namely that of national sovereignty versus universal international norms, due to different countries' constitutions supporting their versions of democracy. This is more than just the issue of observing human rights; it becomes a matter of definitions that are culture-bound, which can result in widely divergent perceptions embodied in different constitutions and socio-political systems and their worldviews. Where does one draw the line? This forms the underlying dynamics of the Arab Spring and Awakening.

Banished: The New Social Control in Urban America, by **Katherine Beckett** and **Steve Herbert**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010. 207pp. \$19.95 paper. ISBN: 9780199830008.

GWENDOLYN DORDICK
City College of New York
edugdordick@ccny.cuny

"Banishment," a provocative term coined by Katherine Beckett and Steve Herbert, captures the fusion and implementation of civil and criminal law that now gives cops, lawyers and judges—our law enforcement and the judicial system—the power to amputate "undesirable" citizens, the visible poor, from public landscapes in urban America. Using Seattle as their case study, Beckett and Herbert discuss the evolution of social control mechanisms from the now defunct loitering and vagrancy laws to contemporary civility codes that have led to a variety of legal mechanisms used to recriminalize and ideally control social disorder. Seattle's Stay Out of Drug Areas (SODAs) and Stay Out of Areas of Prostitution (SOAPs) orders, in addition to trespass orders and park exclusion laws are, according to Beckett and Herbert, "a flawed endeavor to use the criminal justice system to address the manifestation of social disadvantage" (p.153).

We continue to use religion and therapy, staples of behavioral explanations of why people are poor, to combat those who are caught when publically misbehaving—what ever that means. Religious salvation, rehabilitation and the rationalization and legislation of morally infused policies dominate our urban poverty policies. What Beckett and Herbert add to this chronicle of less-than-successful *policies-in-action* is an account of "banishment," a practice that not only fails to address the underlying economic and political sources of social misery, but further, abandons the possibility of behavioral improvement and rehabilitation. Instead, the problem of social misery and disadvantage has been handed over to the criminal justice system in an attempt to remove the visible poor from prospering urban landscapes.

While *Banished's* analysis emerges from an either/or academic, political, and policy

discourse that has permeated, and perhaps hijacked the debates over the causes and subsequent solutions in dealing with America's urban poor, it provides a useful and cogent evaluation of how Seattle moved toward the criminalization of the poor, and by extension, poverty. In the end, even the highly touted and well-meaning problem-solving "therapeutic" drug courts are undermined by this policy of banishment, a policy that, according to the authors, has been justified by two essential goals. First, "to improve the quality of life in allegedly disorderly neighborhoods," and second, "to encourage the banished to desist from any deviant behaviors in which they may engage" (p. 105).

Beckett and Herbert's case study of Seattle is well suited to their argument. On the one hand, Seattle is one of the most progressive post-industrial and environmentally friendly U.S. cities with a large progressive citizenry. On the other hand, Seattle is also on the forefront of using banishment practices as a mechanism of social control and spatial exclusion that has come to define urban poverty policy in other U.S. cities. New York, Los Angeles, Portland, and Boston, to name a few, have recently begun to employ one or more methods of banishment. Whether one sees their selection of Seattle in terms of purposive sampling, an example of an extreme case analysis, and/or being in the right place at the right time, does not really matter. By using Seattle to explore banishment, they are able to gain a more comprehensive picture of this practice for their readers. This is a book I would recommend for those interested in equality, civility and poverty as well as a more academic audience of teachers, graduate and undergraduate students. It is an enjoyable and informative read.

The authors' thorough and targeted case study of banishment, as another misguided attempt to solve urban poverty in U.S. cities, seamlessly provides a platform for Beckett and Herbert to advance an alternative approach to quell urban poverty and its associated social dislocations. Harm reduction and housing first, distinct but complementary policies, acknowledge that there will always be men and women who are socially and economically excluded from adequate

employment and affordable housing and/or folks who cannot abstain from drugs and alcohol and find themselves working and living in open spaces that make their actions and behaviors vulnerable to public scrutiny. It follows that if we cannot eradicate the sources of such overtly risky behaviors then we should focus on reducing the negative consequences of such behaviors. Healthcare, social services and housing policies, such as housing first, are comprehensive approaches designed to reduce the amount of potential harm the disadvantaged might cause themselves and others.

While this is a somewhat worthy goal, resources applied to it thus far have not led to success. Rather than improving the situation, behavior and character of the urban poor, poverty policy in this day and age must reconcile with the political climate and will. Harm reduction is not equivalent to a strong welfare state and provisions for its most disadvantaged citizens. Housing first clearly removes the homeless from a system of temporary housing programs that continue to marginalize them, but does little to promote the building of more affordable housing. Advocates of harm reduction and housing first policies are not blind to the underlying structural manifestations of urban problems, nor their desire to directly address these causes, but they are also pragmatists, and are willing to advance solutions that combat policies such as banishment which cause our most disadvantaged urban residents even more harm. In drafting viable solutions to urban problems, academics and policy makers can learn much from Beckett and Herbert's case study. "The lesson of the Garden of Eden is not that we should renounce apples. Understanding the causes of homelessness is a good first step in devising policies to deal with it, but still only a first step" (O'Flaherty 1996: 277). The authors reconcile their frustration of wanting to eradicate the suffering of the poor with the urgency in which cities need to address their immediate needs. Beckett and Herbert have made an important contribution in helping us to understand that banishment is clearly not a step in the right direction.

Reference

O'Flaherty, Brendan. 1996. *Making Room: The Economics of Homelessness*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity, by **Cristina Beltrán**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010. 226pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780195375916.

HOWARD CAMPBELL
University of Texas at El Paso
hcampbel@utep.edu

In this pioneering work of social theory, Cristina Beltrán applies the best of European and American political thought to the contemporary predicament of "Latinos," that portion of the U.S. population which is of Latin American origin or social identity. *The Trouble with Unity*, the author's evocative title, is that the 45 million Latinos have always been a diverse and heterogeneous group. For the author, attempts to create a homogeneous Latino identity and united political movement are not only hopeless but harmful to the interests of Latinos as a whole. The notion of a common Latino way of life and shared political destiny is more a fiction of activist discourse and journalistic rhetoric than a grounded reality.

Through a conceptual apparatus assembled from mainstream political science, post-colonial, feminist and cultural studies theorists (including Anzaldúa, Arendt, Brown, Butler, Connolly, Deleuze, Guattari, and Warner), Beltrán exposes the myth that the largest ethnic minority group in the United States will one day arise like a wide-awake Frankenstein to take its rightful share of power. According to Beltrán, both the Puerto Rican and Chicano movements of the 1960s attempted to naturalize particular representations of a unified Latino polity and shared traditions and make them a basis for popular mobilizations. The author subjects both movements to a rigorous feminist and queer theory-based critique. In the end,

she argues, these iconic movements limited rather than widened political alternatives for gay Latinos and women.

In subsequent decades, *Latinidad*, a more diffuse, amorphous, culturally-oriented and less politicized sense of pan-Latin ethnicity moved to the forefront. One of the most intriguing sections of the book concerns the "politics of resonance" as it relates to Latino political relationships. Resonance refers to linguistic, emotional, spiritual, physiognomic, or other senses of self and political affiliation that are not necessarily ideological, ancient, policy-oriented, or deeply rooted. Such connections, per Connolly, underlie primarily white Christian-oriented movements such as Bush-era Republicanism. The Tea Party appears to spring from similar antecedents. One would hope that the "rhizomatic" political resonances of Latinos would generate a more progressive, forward-looking politics than that of evangelical white Protestants and the "cowboy capitalists." But this remains to be seen.

Throughout the book Beltrán systematically dismantles outmoded political discourses in favor of emergent, negotiated, more complex coalitions of Latino solidarity. Inspired by feminist and queer theory, she considers Latino a verb rather than a noun and "Latino interests" a perpetually contingent space of contestation and alliance. The author explicitly disavows the idea that she has ignored the practical needs of real-world Latinos. She also rejects the suggestion that post-colonial critics must not only deconstruct colonial frameworks but also replace them with a new emancipatory framework.

Overall, the book is logically coherent, well supported by information on the historical experience of Latino social movements, and theoretically convincing. Yet as one envisions the future of Latino groups in the light of Beltrán's Deleuzian theorizing, a number of political possibilities seem likely. Most notably, I would suggest that the fragmentation that Beltrán analyzes, and to some extent advocates, may well lead to the emergence of new Mexican-American political coalitions that are less focused on the interests of other Latino groups (Puerto Ricans, Cuban-Americans, Dominicans, Central Americans, etc.) and more closely concerned with conflicts or alliances vis-à-vis their primary

political interlocutors (Anglo Americans and Mexican nationals). Mexican Americans/Chicanos make up roughly two-thirds of the U.S. Latino population and in some cities, such as San Antonio, El Paso, and East Los Angeles, and regions, they comprise the vast majority. In such regional places and situations, Mexican Americans/Chicanos may still be able to mobilize around more essentialized notions of identity and presumptively shared interests related to issues of immigration, language policy, hiring and labor practices, religion, customs, and traditions. They may also create unique coalitions of political resonance à la Connolly. The U.S.-Mexico border and the divisive political discourses and practices surrounding it looms large in these political struggles and debates, though the border is little discussed in Beltrán's book.

Ultimately, *The Trouble with Unity* does not provide political prescriptions for quotidian policies, party politics or electoral strategies. It is primarily a philosophical probing into how Latinos have been conceived as a cultural and political entity, and how they may be reimagined in the future. To that end this book will be required reading in courses, especially at the graduate level, in social theory, anthropology, feminism, Latino Studies, and political science. It will also be a vital stimulus for debate among scholars who work in these areas and their intersections. Hopefully Latino and non-Latino politicians and activists will take notice as well.

The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American Religious Imagination, by **Courtney Bender**. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 254pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226042800.

ERIKA SUMMERS-EFFLER
University of Notre Dame
 eeffler@nd.edu

The New Metaphysicals is Courtney Bender's ethnography of self-identified spiritual practitioners in Cambridge, Massachusetts. *The New Metaphysicals* captures rich complexity while providing pithy insights into the ironies uncovered within the observed phenomena.

This book is beautifully crafted. In the interpretivist tradition, Bender weaves analysis of ethnographic data together with incisive commentary on theology and the sociology of religion. Bender presents an elegant combination of organizational, geographical, and historical analysis. Histories of spiritual seeking in the United States, and within Cambridge, pepper Bender's accounts. This narrative gives depth and texture to Bender's observations without requiring her to generalize overly much from the specific location and historical moment.

Bender focuses on the ways in which spirituality is entangled in history, organizations, religion, the arts, medicine, culture, science, and interaction, among other things. To begin with the concept of entanglement is to assume a phenomenon is embedded in multiple dynamics that are often in tension with each other. Addressing entanglements requires deep attention to historical, geographical, and interactional context, thus leaving Bender with the difficult job of understanding and theorizing spirituality in all the varying contexts. This complex local analysis and theorizing must then be developed into a general theory. This is not an easy job, but one that Bender carries out successfully.

The subject matter itself is also compelling. For example, there are past life regressions, auras, kindred spirits, and more. It is impossible not to be interested in Max, the Nobel Prize-winning scientist who is reincarnated in a woman named Cathy, and the drama that ensues when Cathy discovers that another mover in the mystics' circle was Max's wife in a past life.

Bender's book does what ethnography does so well: it contextualizes that which would apparently resist contextualization. This book problematizes the long-standing claim (c.f. Eliade, Otto, Schleiermacher, and Wach) that religion is ineffable because it is *a priori*. Bender explains why religious experiences have been neglected in the realm of sociology: there have been more than a hundred years of theology, religious studies, and philosophy arguing that religious experience is unlike any other—it is entirely personal and immune to the influence of social dynamics. In Schutz's terms, the balance of the work on religious experience has argued

that religious experience is an essentially actual experience, and it is therefore beyond the bounds of sociology. Bender goes against the grain and contextualizes the practices of spiritual seekers in Cambridge. By unearthing the social dynamics in which these practices and practitioners are embedded, Bender throws critical light on theorists' and theologians' unsupported, or at least underexplored, assumptions about religious experience. This is to say that Bender illustrates how and why we are drawn to versions of spiritual stories that highlight independent, unmediated experience rather than stories that illustrate social foundations.

Bender also illustrates how the practitioners themselves, either directly or indirectly, draw on this history of scientific, philosophical, and theological discourse on the *a priori* nature of religious experience. In doing so, Bender explains how, ironically, the history of discourse on religion makes it possible for spiritual practitioners to claim that their experiences are *not* shaped by social or historical forces. Throughout the book, Bender sets up similar paradoxes, and then takes you on a journey through different elements of these spiritual practices as she solves each puzzle. I'll go through an abbreviated list of the ironies Bender addresses in *The New Metaphysicals*.

Irony 1: Shared discourse about the personal nature of religious experience hides the role of social dynamics

Bender explains how she asked informants about their networks, but subjects would skirt the question. In fact they did quite the opposite; subjects focused on the personal and unique nature of their experience as a claim to authenticity. Because subjects resisted, Bender takes what I believe to be a more interesting approach. She stepped back and investigated how social dynamics shape such claims to individual experience. As a result, this book addresses a quiescently sociological question: *How are experiences that feel and are cultivated and understood to be completely individual, rooted in social process?* Bender's answer is that the discourse of individually-focused spirituality glosses over the social history, processes, and

institutions that form the foundation of these spiritual/religious practices.

Bender does extensive ethnographic detective work. In spite of this culture of individuality and personal experience, Bender finds her way into an informal network of practitioners. By finding and mapping the dynamics of this network, Bender's work contributes to the literature on networks that rarely gets on the ground to see how networks and diffusion of information across them actually happen in real time.

Bender's argument contending that apparently individual spiritual practices are socially embedded and entangled in multiple ways is also important because it has radical consequences for two major lines of academic treatment of religious experience: (1) Bender argues against the notion that religious experience is based on an *a priori*, universal, and private experiences and is therefore beyond the scope of social science, and (2) in demonstrating the social roots of these spiritual practices, Bender's work counters the concern that a focus on individual mysticism undermines social integration and social capital.

Irony 2: The claim to uniqueness is the basis for claims to universality

This point is connected to another irony that is woven throughout Bender's book: it is the claims to radically individual and ineffable spiritual experiences that enable practitioners to recognize them as universal. In other words, the radically decontextualized understanding of personal religious experience is the basis for belief in the universality of the source of and capacity for such experience.

Irony 3: Boundaries are created out of a discourse of a lack of boundaries

Although many participate in organized religion to some extent, the spiritual seekers position themselves against traditional religions' claim to universal truth. Rather the seekers have few religious boundaries. This is an ironic form of marking boundaries—insisting that there are none. Durkheim would anticipate that such boundary-marking would be inevitable, even for

groups who do not see themselves as groups or boundary-markers. This aspect of Bender's argument is reminiscent of Lichterman's *The Search for Political Community* (1997), where he demonstrates how a culture of individuality can support civic participation. In spite of the universal of boundary setting, the paradoxical discourse of anti-boundary boundary-making is not without its particularities. For example, it makes it difficult, or at least uncomfortable, for the practitioners to invoke boundaries to curtail "over the top" or otherwise undesirable behavior.

Irony 4: In spite of the discourse of individuality, practitioners are continually concerned with establishing and preforming authenticity

If there is one way in which these spiritual seekers are in fact more individualized than practitioners of traditional religion, it is in the difference between apologetics. Established organized religions have official apologists, but these spiritual seekers, by purposefully cultivating and preforming personal religious experience, have to preform their own apologetics. They do this with conversion/initiation stories that include multiple false paths where enlightenment was on the verge of happening but did not. Bender points out that such rhetorical devices support the mystics' stories of themselves by highlighting the fact that the mystic clearly understood the difference between almost-enlightenment and real enlightenment. This need to continually preform authenticity is such a rich dynamic in Bender's analysis that I found myself wanting a whole chapter, if not a whole book, dedicated to the issues of spiritual authenticity.

Irony 5: These spiritual seekers are more likely to use science than theology to justify their spiritual claims and practices

Unlike religious practitioners who primarily draw on theology and social thought within their own religious traditions to establish authenticity, Bender demonstrates how these spiritual practitioners draw on a uniquely

American combination of science, theology, art, and medicine. In fact, from Bender's work, it is clear that practitioners treat secular support as the most legitimate. They borrow from science, and their own science-like standards, to corroborate their spiritual insights.

Irony 6: The material body is a source of wisdom, yet a constraint on the energetic body

There is tension between different discourses about the body. One privileges bodily wisdom and the importance of the mind/body connection for spiritual, emotional, and physical well-being. The other discourse highlights the difference between the energetic body and the physical body. When the mind/body connection is invoked, it is central to spiritual practice. But when the energetic body is invoked, the physical body is treated as little other than a temporary constraint. It is a distraction from the true essential self that is embodied in the energetic rather than physical body.

In sum, most of the solutions to the apparent paradoxes Bender identifies can be explained by three central points: (1) what looks and sounds like "I'm spiritual but not religious," is indeed religious by any standard use of the term, (2) what would appear to be emergent behavior is as shaped by history as any other behavior in traditional religions is, and (3) even the most seemingly independent personal experience—religious experience—is socially informed. This is to say, Bender illustrates that spiritual individuality is not independent from social forces. Rather the presentation of personal religious experiences obscures the role that history and social dynamics play in shaping even these experiences. These spiritual practices and experiences are as socially and historically embedded as any practices grounded in traditional religious denominations.

In closing, Bender's work provides contextual richness about undeniably interesting spiritual practices, incisive insight into the tendency to romanticize these practices and the people who perform them, and, finally, explanations for how such past romanticized notions have obscured the social dynamics at

play in the conceiving and carrying out of these practices. All of this is to say, Bender's *The New Metaphysicals* is an example of how engaging ethnography can offer substantial contributions to social theory.

Reference

Lichterman, Paul. 1997. *The Search for Political Community*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Theocratic Democracy: The Social Construction of Religious and Secular Extremism, by **Nachman Ben-Yehuda**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010. 296pp. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780199734863.

JOHN R. HALL
University of California, Davis
jrhall@ucdavis.edu

By theocratic democracy, Nachman Ben-Yehuda refers to the tensed relationship between religion and state in a nominally secular society where a particular religion holds a privileged position in laws and policies. His case in point is Israel, the site of a *kulturkampf*, a cultural struggle, between secularists (including Zionists) and ultra-orthodox Jews, *Haredim*. Despite Ben-Yehuda's invocation of secular as well as religious extremism in the book's title and occasional discussions in the book itself, he largely focuses on *Haredim*, with a subculture that bridges several sects and other organized groups, defined by cultural markers such as distinctive dress and religious observance.

Theocratic Democracy is centrally concerned with acts of religious extremism, including *Haredi* violence against archeologists, Conservative and Reform Jews, Christians, Muslims, non-conforming *Haredi*, purveyors of non-kosher food, and individuals deemed to have violated the Sabbath (*Shabbat*). The book draws on an archive of all secular and *Haredi* newspaper reports concerning "deviant" and criminal acts in which *Haredi* participants are identified. The archive covers the period from the founding of Israel as a state, in 1948, though 1998. Analyzing this data qualitatively and with

summary statistics allows Ben-Yehuda to probe the public constructions through which an extremely conservative religious minority is portrayed in newspapers. More important, in my view, the archive catalogues the strategic violence carried out by participants in a zealous religious counter-culture, showing how that violence works, and with what consequences.

As sociologists have long understood, not all events of a similar nature come to the attention of news organizations, or receive equal reporting at the hands of a given news organization, much less across multiple news organizations. News stories do not "represent" reality in any objective sense; they are accounts, social constructions. Moreover, Ben-Yehuda and his research team could identify whether actions involved *Haredim* only if news stories contained obvious clues or indicators. Finally, the researchers did not analyze news stories about non-*Haredi* deviance and crime. For these reasons, it would be very difficult to disentangle the multiple processes by which *Haredi* deviance and crime got reported, and its significance. Thus, analysis can only proceed with numerous caveats, which Ben-Yehuda duly provides.

Yet the archive encompasses the universe of news reports of a certain type for a certain time period. Ben-Yehuda is not making inferences when he notes that the secular Israeli press report about events that place *Haredi* in a negative light far more frequently than do *Haredi* newspapers. And he offers reasonable interpretations for yearly fluctuations in negative news reports concerning *Haredi*, variously due to extraneous distractions of the press (war, political crisis), internal dynamics and strategies of *Haredi* movements, and cycles of new reporting agendas (pp. 162-68). These findings help explain the character of the news coverage. However, they do not constitute the intellectual core of the book.

Ben-Yehuda is centrally concerned with how conflicting political logics of democracy and theocracy are pursued in Israeli society. Hegemonic secular culture obtains a *de facto* legitimacy in its permeation of everyday and public life. Its media do a great deal to construct the *Haredim* as "Other." However, despite Ben-Yehuda's discussion of this

process, he clearly sympathizes with secularists, and his core analytic narrative concentrates on *Haredi* actions, along with the often difficult-to-establish links between *Haredi* violence and various *Haredi* sects, underground direct-action groups, and Modesty Guards—"an inner, secret, illegal, and violent semipolice *Haredi* enforcement organization" (p. 93). Because Ben-Yehuda's news archive reports a variety of *Haredim* activist actions, *Theocratic Democracy* offers a rare opportunity to catalogue the mechanisms by which participants in an extreme religious movement seek to (and variously succeed at): affecting state laws and policies, intimidating non-*Haredi* Israelis deemed to have violated *Haredi* theocratic precepts, and internally enforcing *Haredi* norms on ultra-Orthodox Jews.

The accounts are sobering. *Haredi* activists set fire to bus stops displaying advertising posters they deem offensive. They have staged massive blockages to protest certain streets open to traffic on the Sabbath, calling police who try to stop them "Nazis." Someone placed a hand grenade (found and dismantled) in a delicatessen selling pork. *Haredi* have used violence to try to block archeological excavations. Thugs beat an Armenian priest. On a Sabbath, over one hundred *Haredim* surrounded a car containing five Jews who had mistakenly driven into an *Haredi* neighborhood, tried to break into it, and attacked police who worked to rescue the passengers. During a 2005 protest against a gay-lesbian pride parade, an *Haredi* stabbed a marcher, later claiming that he came to kill in the name of the Almighty (p. 82). And although the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995 was carried out by an Orthodox non-*Haredi* Jew, *Haredi* commentators fueled an anti-Rabin climate before the assassination, and they gloated afterward.

Haredi Jews—and more broadly, Orthodox Jews—and their religion have a special status inscribed in various Israeli laws. Rituals such as marriage and burial must be performed under Orthodox regulation. *Haredim* are not subject to the draft. Nevertheless, Israel is not a theocratic society, and *Haredim* use violence: to advance a theocratic agenda, protest against secularizing tendencies, and punish and intimidate both their own

and non-*Haredi* who violate their religious code.

Questions remain. Ben-Yehuda's methodology does not identify the specific cultural mechanisms and social processes by which *Haredi* religious violence is organized, practiced, and perpetuated. And we are left to wonder how ultra-Orthodox violence in Israel would compare to, say, fundamentalist violence in Iran or the United States. The strength of the book precedes these questions. *Theocratic Democracy* charts significant and enduring patterns of ultra-orthodox religious violence in Israel. Ben-Yehuda thereby opens the door to a broad cultural and organizational analysis of religious violence in supposedly secular societies, even as he shows that the mainstream press constructs a religious minority as the "Other" that secular society must control and suppress. The resulting *kulturkampf* haunts modernity.

Everyone's a Winner: Life in Our Congratulatory Culture, by Joel Best. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011. 199pp. \$24.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780520267169.

JOHN BRUEGGEMANN
Skidmore College
jbruegge@skidmore.edu

"Most status is local" (p. 160). It is created in different social worlds where people nurture webs of meaningful relationships. Indeed, status helps define the boundaries of social worlds. The honor garnered by status has proliferated in American society since World War II. Our "self-congratulatory culture" is now characterized by status inflation. Fifty years ago, for example, there were half a dozen awards for English language mystery writers. Now there are more than a hundred. The same broad trend has occurred in sports, the military, and of course education.

In *Everyone's a Winner*, Joel Best describes these examples and mentions many others (e.g., schools, restaurants, government agencies, businesses, fire fighters, film, science, state fairs, criminology, Special Olympics, journalism, altruism, hospitals). Particular forms of status are derived from and therefore are as ubiquitous as specific clusters of

norms. The overwhelming abundance of status is evident everywhere but somehow obscured by its normalcy. In addition to grade inflation and college rankings, which Best addresses, I kept thinking of letters of reference, résumés, departmental honors, college honors, national honor societies, service awards, endowed chairs, commencement speeches, honorary degrees, named buildings, and other aspects of the status apparatus of the academy.

Pessimistic critics of this "status affluence" care about true mastery and distinctive accomplishment and therefore rue the proliferation of such commendation. Optimistic advocates of the spread of status care more about opportunity, worry about the stratification of life chances, and thus welcome a broad distribution of recognition. Ironically, Best explains, these two camps have together created cycles of status inflation that neither wants. For instance, optimists in education (concerned about some students being left behind) have facilitated the designation of multiple valedictorians, sometimes dozens at a time. But as the honors spread, critics (disappointed that truly talented students are lumped in with the rest) have attempted to distinguish tiers of graduation degrees such as "advanced diplomas" or "honors diplomas." Since status is pretty easy to construct, there is a kind of escalation redolent of Star-Belly Sneetches. Everyone wants some recognition. Once they get it, a new kind of reward is created for the genuinely deserving. So everyone then wants that affirmation. And so on.

Professor Best is making a habit of writing enjoyable books on timely topics that are relevant and accessible to a broad audience. For a discipline that struggles with intellectual insularity, and relishes methodological acrobatics and obscure theoretical pronouncements (i.e., "why don't more people pay attention to our findings?"), it is a productive habit worth emulating. (He should get an award!) Our discipline needs more professionals like Best willing to integrate and translate findings that can inform public discourse. This bit of social criticism is about social patterns that affect a lot of people and provoke intense dispute.

Wonderful insights jump off the pages here, most of which will be novel for lay

people and some of which will be fresh to sociologists. For example, it may interest students seeking public recognition to learn that prize proliferation benefits those who receive the prizes, as well as those who award them and the specific audience of the relevant social worlds, while at the same time degrading the very point of such distinction. How the ongoing debate between the most strident critics and proponents of status affluence undermines the goals of each is certainly worth consideration. In addition, sociologists interested in the complexity of social identity should take seriously the suggestion made here that we might productively widen our gaze past the now conventional trilogy of class, gender and race. Different social worlds revere varied forms of status, which give rise to much more multifaceted sources of identity than current orthodoxies in our discipline claim. "Class, race, and gender are not irrelevant to our everyday lives," Best notes, "but we probably spend more hours of most days thinking about status" (p. 159).

Everyone's a Winner promises a lot and delivers much. "This book is my effort to describe how and why status is increasing and to assess the consequences of this development" (p. 27). The "how" is presented cleverly. As it did for me, this book will likely compel many readers to reflect on the accolades they hope will be awarded to their children, firms, departments, schools, communities, or themselves.

Best is less successful with the "why." As with other distinctive aspects of our culture noted here, the American fetish for rankings and numbers is described but not really explained. I found myself pondering rationality and disenchantment, the rise of capitalism, the differentiation of modern institutions, as well as the hegemony of market culture in recent decades, and wondered what Professor Best's take would be. There is a significant disconnect in this regard. Status is locally determined, yes. But status affluence has increased across social worlds throughout American society during the same time period. What is the connection? Why are so many different kinds of people concerned about achievement and recognition? The few pages about post-WWII affluence, diversity of social worlds, and multiple

justifications for status affluence only hint at an answer.

Another matter is Best's admirable but ultimately unsatisfying effort to be neutral. "The point," he writes, "is not that the trend toward increasing status is good or bad, but that it has been largely unrecognized" (p. 27). Justice is done to the perspectives of the critics and proponents of status affluence. However, the insidious consequences of both hollow affirmation and narrow-minded elitism documented throughout this text are at odds with the cheerful conclusion: "status affluence exists because it serves social ends" (166). The seemingly endless escalation of status allocation itself undermines the argument for its functionality. This self-contradictory pattern of constructing meaning by heaping on more meaning is unworkable.

These criticisms notwithstanding, I believe this book is successful in its fundamental goal, which is to draw attention to this issue and invite a broad conversation about our self-congratulatory culture. Congratulations, Professor Best!

Fallen Elites: The Military Other in Post-Unification Germany, by **Andrew Bickford**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011. 268pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780804773966.

JEREMY BROOKE STRAUGHN
Westminster College
jeremy.straughn@westminster-mo.edu

Is it possible to serve honorably in the military of a dishonorable regime? Any answer to this question undoubtedly depends on whom you ask. The views of regime skeptics are likely to be predictable. But to make sense of what soldiers themselves have to say, you also need to know something about the vocation of soldiering. In *Fallen Elites*, anthropologist Andrew Bickford makes important contributions on both fronts.

In this ethnography of East German army officers and border guards, Bickford investigates the lives and fate of men who, as they see it, helped keep the peace in Europe for the duration of the Cold War. *Fallen Elites* tells a story about soldiers and soldiering that only an erstwhile soldier could credibly

tell. A former linguist for the U.S. Army, Bickford had been stationed in West Berlin during the four years leading up to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Eight years later, he returned to Berlin on a very different mission—to gain insight into the minds of military men who had been trained to see him as their “class enemy.” Over the next few years, Bickford worked his way up from interviews with mid-level officers to the *pièce de résistance* of the book—a meeting with East Germany’s top border official in the retired general’s own home. The end result is an admirably nuanced account of “fallen” military elites, framed by a critical reflection on the role of the citizen soldier in the modern state.

By the time Bickford entered the field, former officers of the East German National People’s Army (NVA) had a good deal to complain about, and complain they did. As in the East generally, unemployment was rampant among Bickford’s informants, even as NVA pensions remained, for many years, a fraction of those paid to West German counterparts. At least as painful were the many injuries to informants’ self-images as German patriots. With the self-dissolution of the GDR, NVA officers had been deprived of both their homeland and their sense of purpose. Victors’ prerogative in hand, Western elites were now free to write the NVA out of German history. While its veterans were unquestionably Germans, the NVA itself was declared a “foreign” army, an alien occupying force on German soil. Though permitted to join the national veterans association, retired NVA officers would never be honored as *German* veterans. Perhaps the most galling insult of all was the prohibition against employing one’s former rank as a form of address—an indignity that even erstwhile *Wehrmacht* officers did not have to suffer. (In a few cases, NVA and *Wehrmacht* veterans turn out to be the same people.)

After getting to know the “military other,” the picture we have is one of marginalized military men struggling to salvage their manhood after an emasculating surrender to the enemy. Above all, these are men who were once feared (if not always revered) and who desperately long to matter again—if nothing else, by casting themselves as martyrs to the cause of peace. While this portrait cannot

but evoke sympathy, at least to a point, Bickford reminds us that certain of these “elite victims” (notably the Border Guard general) are also convicted perpetrators. He also points to instances when self-pity is taken to disturbing extremes. Evidently parroting the propaganda of far-right parties, a small group of veterans concludes that employment discrimination makes them the “white negroes” of Germany, even worse off, they claim, than many non-German immigrants. More shocking still, one informant likens the NVA’s gradual disappearance (due to natural mortality) to the mass murder of Jews under Hitler. However gratuitous their humiliating treatment by the West, some NVA officers turn out to be their own worst enemies, behaving in ways that only vindicate their exclusion from further service.

Though occasionally given to excessive repetition and airy generalization, *Fallen Elites* achieves uncommon eloquence when the author is relating stories told by his informants or recounting his own experiences in the field. The tantalizing prologue, for instance, evokes the opening pages of a Cold War thriller. (The follow-up doesn’t come for another two hundred pages, but is worth the wait.) My chief complaint, and I do not have many, is that some stories are so good they leave us wanting to hear more. Perhaps the best example is in Chapter Four. Coming at the juncture between historical past and ethnographic present, it tells the bizarre tale of one NVA Lieutenant Colonel who, in March 1990, tries to surrender to the French(!) authorities in West Berlin. Though well-crafted as far as it goes, this slight chapter (just under five pages) only whets the appetite for a full-throated narrative. Given the importance of 1989–90 in the lives of the informants, one would like to know more of what they were doing during this pivotal period.

Another underdeveloped storyline concerns the long-term consequences of militarization in the GDR. In Chapters Two and Three, we learn about the vast arsenal of tactics deployed by the East German state to transform citizen soldiers into convinced socialists. But how effective were these efforts in the long run? Is it significant how seldom we hear informants lamenting the passing of socialism as such? At least during

the period of study, they seem less grieved by the fall of the GDR than by the loss of their status within it. Perhaps they had come to see themselves as soldiers first and Communists second, if at all.

In the end, the book's most important insight may be that, more often than we think, soldiers are simply soldiers, regardless of whom they serve. For better or worse, loyalty, honor, and self-sacrifice are the code they live by, and rarely question. When their period of service is over, sometimes their belief in these ideals, and their camaraderie with each other, may be all they have left.

Policing Problem Places: Crime Hot Spots and Effective Prevention, by **Anthony A. Braga** and **David L. Weisburd**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010. 299pp. \$34.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780195341966.

NICK TILLEY
University College, London
n.tilley@ucl.c.uk

The past thirty years have seen exciting developments in criminology and police studies. These have challenged conventional wisdom about crime and about corresponding crime control policies. The prevailing view has been that to understand crime we need to understand criminals. Moreover, to control crime we need to target enforcement and treatment efforts on those criminals and also try to ameliorate the conditions giving rise to their criminality. In contrast to this, the theory and research discussed in this book strongly suggest that crime control focused on places rather than people is a more effective means of dealing with crime problems and that this method of dealing with crime has important legitimacy advantages over traditional approaches.

Three bodies of crime theory and one theory of policing lie behind the arguments advanced in *Policing Problem Places*. Routine Activities Theory suggests that crime patterns are a function of the supply, distribution, and movement of likely offenders, suitable targets, and those who might intervene to prevent an offense from occurring (as "handlers" of offenders or "capable

guardians" or prospective targets). Opportunity Theory, which is closely aligned to situational crime prevention and bounded rational choice, suggests that patterns of crime can be understood (and controlled) by focusing on the immediate circumstances surrounding incidents. More specifically, the "choice structuring" properties of the situation, which shape the perceived risk, effort, and reward of a particular crime or which might provoke it or remind the prospective offender of rules prohibiting it, are crucial to decisions to commit or not to commit a crime. Crime Pattern Theory suggests that the everyday life patterns of offenders shape their "awareness spaces" and hence where they are likely to commit crimes. In particular, like the rest of us, offenders are aware of the spaces surrounding nodes for their daily life (home, work, school, place of entertainment) and the routes between them. Crimes are committed against targets that are known because they fall within this awareness space, but not so close as to risk recognition of the offenders. These bodies of theory help explain the very uneven distribution of crime: it is concentrated, as Anthony Braga and David Weisburd amply demonstrate, on very particular hot spots where opportunities are rich and which fall within the awareness spaces of likely offenders. Problem-oriented policing is based on a critical interrogation of traditional policing methods that have been ineffective and/or unethical in the responses made to problems that the police are expected to address. It stresses that the role of the police is to identify and analyze in detail specific local police-relevant problems (be they crime-related or otherwise) with a view to looking broadly and imaginatively for effective means to address them. Given that traditional police methods are found to have been largely ineffective, the police are enjoined to work through alternative responses that might include the community and non-police agencies as well as the police themselves. At best these involve focusing on altering those attributes of the location that furnish ready opportunities for those liable to offend there.

Braga and Weisburd draw heavily on previous research they have conducted separately and together to demonstrate the

continuity of small crime hotspots. They also demonstrate, using the most rigorous research methods available, that problem-oriented approaches to deal with those hotspots, even where implemented in a relatively dilute form, have achieved demonstrable, statistically significant, real benefits. In addition, they put paid to the canard that would have it that any success in preventing a particular crime will simply displace it to another place, time, target, method or offender. Although put sufficiently loosely, the displacement hypothesis is in practice unfalsifiable, when specific efforts are made to trace geographical displacement (the most readily measured), where it appears most likely to occur, as Braga and Weisburd show research is consistent in finding that preventive effects are not matched by corresponding levels of displacement, and in some cases no displacement is found. Moreover, spillover benefits (known as "diffusion of benefits") are routinely observed, where crime reductions are found beyond the operational range of the measures that are put in place. This presumably occurs in large part because prospective offenders are unaware of the exact coverage of the interventions.

Braga and Weisburd argue that "situational problem-oriented policing," as they term it, has benefits beyond its efficacy in reducing specific problems. In contrast to problem-solving efforts that involve police crack-downs, which may indeed produce short-term benefits, situational problem-oriented policing avoids the threats to police legitimacy that arise from what are often perceived to be heavy-handed or discriminatory responses. Changing the environment in ways that no longer facilitate crime in observed hotspots promises sustained benefits without alienating local people, especially where they themselves are drawn into the problem-solving processes.

I would quarrel with some of the details in the book. For example, what the authors term "hot spots policing" seems to me to be but one part of situational problem-oriented policing more generally. Crime is concentrated not only in hot spots but also on "hot products" whose design facilitates crime. Design modifications to products (such as laptops and cell phones) that are targeted by offenders are also important, even if the

preventive effects are not confined to geographical hot spots.

Notwithstanding a few minor quibbles I would, however, recommend this book unreservedly. Braga and Weisburd's text is highly readable. It draws on a wide range of research to present a practical, coherent, evidence-based and theoretically sophisticated account of ways in which policing in America can be improved. The book also represents an excellent case study in applied social science, where strong theory and rigorous research are married in the production of challenging but workable recommendations for improvements in policy and practice.

Rich, Free, and Miserable: The Failure of Success in America, by **John Brueggemann**. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2010. 233 pp. \$36.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781442200937.

MICHAEL SAUDER

University of Iowa

Michael-sauder@uiowa.edu

Rich, Free, and Miserable (RF&M) has a story to tell, one that is both expansive in its scope and bold in its claims. Market logic in the United States, traditionally kept in check by the state and civil society, has broken free of all fetters. Now unencumbered, this logic has created a moral crisis that has, in turn, produced "the mess" that now characterizes the culture and climate of modern life. Especially for the middle class, life in the twenty-first century United States is comparable to the "Death Zone" of Mt. Everest: the most treacherous part of the climb, a place where life is unsustainable and climbers are only responsible for themselves, even if it means abandoning dying companions. Explaining how an "Everest psychology" has come to dominate American life, John Brueggemann writes, "I am talking about unforgiving conditions in which sacrificing one's own interests for another is extremely costly. . . . Such a thin line separates winners from losers that we dare not gamble being on the wrong side by attending to anything but the highest priorities. We cannot afford to indulge the golden rule" (p. 3). The Death Zone analogy is to be taken seriously: "The reality is much more ominous than people realize" (p. 12).

Even this brief overview of the arguments of *RF&M* provides a sense of both its compelling and problematic elements. On the one hand, it is easy to sympathize with the work's general intuition: the influence of the market and its logic has encroached upon nearly every sphere of modern life, and it has done so in ways that are discomfiting. On the other hand, and as the Death Zone analogy typifies, the book's arguments are painted with a broad brush, tending toward oversimplification (e.g., market logic is the root cause of nearly every current social problem) and overstatement (e.g., things are now worse than they have ever been). These problems are magnified by *RF&M*'s reliance on a barrage of anecdotes and rhetorical appeals to make its case rather than convincing empirical evidence of burgeoning moral crises, unparalleled social and psychological disorder, or the overall worsening of conditions of the middle class.

The oversimplification is exemplified in *RF&M*'s single bullet theory of modern social disorder. The list of problems laid at the doorstep of market logic is impressive and at times dizzying. It has led, *RF&M* claims, to a moral crisis that is identifiable by (to take just a few examples discussed in the introduction) cheating executives, government corruption, child abuse, declines in community spirit, Black Friday, increasing rudeness, too much television watching, unhealthy diets, the cynicism and vulgarity of popular culture, and the scandals surrounding the famous. The moral crisis reflected in these phenomena, in turn, has led to a multitude of other dysfunctions: "overworked parents, overscheduled kids, unhealthy personal choices, fears of the dangers in public spaces, and weakening commitment to community, . . . [startling levels of] anxiety, exhaustion, anger, depression, obesity, addiction, debt, rudeness, and violence" (p. 6). These lists—often conflating the signs and outcomes of moral crisis—grow throughout the book, as later chapters link nearly every current family or civil problem (ranging from sleep deprivation to global warming) to the growth of market logic. But little effort is made to establish empirically the causal links between these problems and market culture; their

correlation in time is implied to make these links apparent.

RF&M also has a propensity to overstate the seriousness of the modern moral crisis relative to other eras. For instance, two early chapters in *RF&M* consist of very broad historical arguments (e.g., tracing the evolution of six general values—progress, freedom, prosperity, productivity, equality, and authority—through 250 years of American history in less than thirty pages) intended to justify the claim that the moral crisis we now face is unprecedented. This argument is difficult to square with historical events and eras—think here of slavery, the Civil War, Jim Crow, and the social unrest of the 1960s—often associated with deep moral disorder. It also fails to address parallel critiques of the middle class from different eras. Veblen's 1899 *The Theory of the Leisure Class* and Mills' 1951 *White Collar*—both conspicuously absent from the text—would be insightful comparisons, providing a better sense of proportion and subtlety to this book's arguments.

The flip side of this idealization of the past is that the particularities of the present, especially in regard to youth, are judged harshly. Too often one hears a curmudgeonly voice in the text pining for a past where the market was kept in check by civic forces, complaining about MTV and the "cruddy entertainment" of modern popular culture, and bemoaning the isolation of modern teenagers with their ever-present iPod earbuds and their obsession with social media. This emphasis on the current time period's singular failings is precisely what Claude Fischer warns against in his excellent recent book on the history of American culture and character (*Made in America* 2010). Fischer's nuanced study of social histories emphasizes continuity and steady improvement over the long term, noting that every generation tends to see itself either arriving or having just made the wrong turn at a key historical juncture. *RF&M* seems to fall into this very trap.

To be fair, I have discussed this book with a sociological audience in mind, and this audience may not have been the author's primary target. The recommendations outlined at the end of the book certainly point toward a readership looking for inspirational rather

than structural solutions. "We need to *make wise personal choices and restore vital social institutions*," RF&M advises, "Slow down. Don't spend so much time and energy at work. Turn off the TV and computer. Interact with people. Encounter nature. Reflect" (p. 147, italics in original); insights from *Tuesdays with Morrie* soon follow. No matter the audience, however, the book would benefit from a narrower focus, providing more grounding for its sweeping claims and showing more precisely the mechanisms by which market logic has contributed to particular social ills. While one comes away with a new appreciation of the many ways in which the market may be affecting various aspects of our lives, the scattershot approach leaves the reader to ponder where and when its influence has been most decisive.

References

- Fischer, Claude. 2010. *Made in America: A Social History of American Culture and Character*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1951. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

The Social after Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessments, edited by **Matei Candea**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010. 287pp. \$150.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780415543392.

ANDREA MUBI BRIGHENTI
University of Trento, Italy
Andrea.Brighenti@unitn.it

Gabriel Tarde is a society. *The Social after Gabriel Tarde* is a perfect illustration that Tarde's maxim "everything is a society" nicely applies to its author in the first place. Indeed, this edited book contains a wealth of insights into contemporary social science—in particular anthropology and sociology—that draw from the thought of the eclectic late nineteenth century French author. Although the rhetoric of the "fore-runner" or "predecessor"—as well as the

"rediscovery" of a "forgotten classic"—endorsed by the editor Matei Candea and some of the contributors, is not entirely convincing (insofar as it tends to function largely as a self-fulfilling prophecy: arguably, while Tarde may have not been preponderant in introductory textbooks, he has never disappeared from sociological thinking), several chapters in this book are enlightening in their use of Tarde's oeuvre to face twenty-first century puzzles in social theory. The fact that the provided interpretations are divergent, and may sometimes be said to even contradict each other, does not detract from but rather enrich the overall picture. Also, Candea has written a knowledgeable introduction to Tarde's oeuvre which readers unfamiliar with the whole of this author's production will find greatly beneficial.

The book, which is the outcome of a 2007 Cambridge conference organized by Candea, is strategically divided into two parts. Part I provides a series of historical and conceptual re-examinations of the Tarde/Durkheim debate. This section is opened by a reconstruction of the 1903 debate which took place at the Ecole des hautes études sociales in Paris. Contrary to received knowledge, the reconstructed debate—which is also performed as a theatre piece, a specialty in which Bruno Latour, who plays Tarde, excels—leaves twenty-first century social theorists with the impression that Tarde was by far the best (hence, incidentally, the section's title, "reconsideration"). It was, at any rate, the story of a *mauvaise rencontre* between two great men of intellect who were doomed not to understand each other, due to a combination of diverging worldviews, metaphysical pathos, and academic ambitions.

The first part of the book also hosts an excellent chapter by Bruno Karsenti which provides an historico-conceptual clarification of the notion of imitation. Tarde's idea of imitation, argues Karsenti, is extremely original and represents a break away from nineteenth-century crowd psychology (way ahead, one would say, considering that crowd psychology was still worked upon in the 1930s), insofar as imitation would be for Tarde an active rather than merely reactive or suggestive process. David Toews seems to endorse such a quest for the actor's activity and, in a non-intuitive yet persuasive way,

places the idea of unsociability as crucial to understand Tarde's endeavor (as well as Durkheim's). Unsociability is a moment of pause, an awakening from the "dogmatic slumber" of the everyday, whereby the actor actively suspends the striving for good social form and, possibly, clarifies his/her own *ubi consistam*—or, as Tarde himself wrote, cultivates the "right to spread his own particular faith."

Part II of the collection focuses on the possible applications of Tarde's method to contemporary social research. The success of Durkheim as a sociological founding figure was linked, as many have acknowledged, to the very simple and clear methodological rules which he theoretically outlined and consistently applied as a social researcher. Now, Tarde is both more rich in ideas and apparently less apt at formalization. But the chapters by Bruno Latour, Emmanuel Didier, and Andrew Barry concur in arguing that Tarde's theory in fact makes it possible to develop a more precise social science, that is, according to the authors, a wholly quantifiable one. While Durkheim considered only invariants, Tarde always focused on variations, all of which are—Latour and the others claim—measurable. Hence, a methodology inspired by Tarde enables today's social scientists to track the trajectories of imitative rays across the social space. From this perspective, phenomena such as enhanced digital traceability of people and things, which characterizes contemporary settings, represents, according to Latour, "Tarde's vindication."

Whereas Durkheim was a theorist of the discontinuity between the individual and the social (which he equated with the collective) Tarde was a deeply "continuist" theorist, who viewed all layers of psychic, organic and social life as prolonging into each other. This is also the reason why he was an anti-institutional thinker, one who deemed that institutions can never subsume, replace or "totalize" the parts they are made of. In the final chapter of the book, Nigel Thrift suggests that Tarde's way of thinking may help us to bridge the gulf between economy and biology, a gulf which, he argues, late capitalism has already bridged on the ground, but which social theory has still to catch up with. Thrift thus leaves us with the

suggestion that we are entering an age in which the "feeling of knowledge" is going to be increasingly worked upon and engineered. Gabriel Tarde, who was also a science fiction writer, might have mused on such a scene—although of course the political stakes that are implied in this type of social transformation are in bad need of an ample public debate. While addressed to a presumably restricted public of specialists, this book might contribute to set in motion a series of ideas capable of stirring it up.

Biomedicalization: Technoscience, Health, and Illness in the U.S., edited by **Adele E. Clarke, Laura Mamo, Jennifer Ruth Fosket, Jennifer R. Fishman, and Janet K. Shim**. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010. 498pp. \$28.95 paper. ISBN: 9780822345701.

SUSAN MARKENS

Lehman College and the Graduate Center, CUNY
susan.markens@lehman.cuny.edu

Several decades ago, medicalization theory was developed by scholars such as Irving Zola and Peter Conrad. Medicalization theory has played an important role in the sociological study of health and illness, establishing the extension of medical definitions of and control over an increasing array of human life and conditions. In 2003, a seminal theoretical article on biomedicalization theory was published in the *American Sociological Review* by the editors of this volume. This article expanded and challenged medicalization theory, particularly emphasizing the "technoscientific transformations" in the organization and practice of biomedicine (Clarke et al. 2003). Building on their 2003 essay, the editors of *Biomedicalization: Technoscience, Health, and Illness in the U.S.* further elaborate their theses about the technoscientific transformations in health, medicine, and illness that have occurred in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The specific goal of the volume is to provide the "missing link" (p. viii) to their earlier theoretical article—that is, empirical research that further specifies biomedicalization theory. Their illuminating case studies address many of the main health issues

of contemporary U.S. society, from conditions such as heart disease, cancer, (in)fertility, obesity, psychiatric diagnoses, and even erectile dysfunction, to the use of MRIs, molecular markers and race-based medicine in the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of these and other conditions. In doing so, the chapters in this edited collection provide a broad array of empirical cases that interrogate some of the main tendencies in contemporary American (bio)medicine.

One central trend addressed throughout the chapters is the individualizing tendencies in contemporary health care regimens. For instance, the empirical chapters that analyze conditions as diverse as cancer, heart disease, obesity, and (in)fertility demonstrate how individuals are increasingly viewed as responsible for their own risk management with regard to prevention, as well as treatment. Additionally, several chapters show how the push towards personalized medicine via molecular markers (e.g., epidemiology) and pharmacogenomics (e.g., race-based medicine) contributes to a growing medical focus on the interior of individual bodies—what they term the molecularization of disease. As the authors convincingly demonstrate, such developments in (bio)medicine come at the expense of ignoring the social aspects of health and illness (e.g., disregarding racial inequalities, shifting away from community-level disease prevention interventions). Furthermore, these trends exemplify what they term the shift from the clinical gaze to the molecular gaze. This, in turn, has led to different forms of surveillance and control, of both individuals and populations. Indeed, these chapters, like biomedicalization theory itself, are much influenced by Foucault's concept of biopower that focuses attention to the various ways power is "built in" and embodied via social practices and norms in contemporary society.

Another key aspect of twenty-first-century American (bio)medicine that the chapters in the volume address is the impact of commodification processes on health research and delivery—from the unregulated infertility industry and the use of race-based medicine to protect patents, to the increasing use of MRIs for medical diagnoses and the biomedicalization of sexual dysfunction. Of

course, the growing use of technology, one of the central trends the authors identify in contemporary biomedicine, functions in conjunction with the commodification of the health industry. The authors have powerfully labeled the pervasive institutionalized effect of markets, profits and technology on knowledge, science, and the delivery of health care, "The U.S. Biomedical TechnoService Complex, Inc."

While the introduction nicely updates and expands their 2003 article, the rest of the book is organized into three parts. Part I is entitled "Theoretical and Historical Framings." These chapters, which include a revised version of the original 2003 article, delineate what they describe as the three eras of modern medicine (the rise of medicine, medicalization, and biomedicalization), and thus further elucidate the differences between medicalization and biomedicalization processes and theory. The chapters in Part II "Case Studies: Focus on Difference" and Part III "Focus on Enhancement" then fulfill the task of the book—to lay out empirical studies that engage with biomedicalization theory. Some studies are used to illustrate the key points from the introductory overview (as well as the 2003 ASR article), while others are used to expand and modify it. It is in these chapters that the central ideas of biomedicalization are explored. As a collection, the chapters reveal biomedicalization processes to be a cultural force (e.g., via the mass media and popular culture), as well as supported by institutional-structural arrangements (e.g., NIH funding priorities, legal regulations, and the lack of them). The collection ends with a chapter by Adele Clarke that explores how biomedicalization theory may be used in studying transnational processes outside of the United States. This is an important chapter, for as the authors are quite aware and as clearly indicated in the subtitle of the volume, the empirical cases presented in this collection only investigate issues within the United States. Gladly, the last chapter confronts this lacuna head-on, and lays out suggestions for future research.

Unlike other edited collections, all of the chapters in *Biomedicalization* are actively engaged in interrogating and applying the same concepts. As a result it comes together

as a cohesive whole, not only fulfilling its empirical goals, but contributing to theorizing about biomedicalization as well. For anyone studying or interested in Western (specifically U.S.) trends in science, technology, and medicine, this collection will be of immense value for both the breadth of empirical topics on and analytical depth about key trends and negotiations in twenty-first-century American biomedicine.

Reference

- Clarke, Adele E., Janet K. Shim, Laura Mamo, Jennifer Ruth Fosket, and Jennifer R. Fishman. 2003. "Biomedicalization: Technoscientific Transformations of Health, Illness, and U.S. Biomedicine." *American Sociological Review* 68 (2): 161–94.

Uncommon Schools: The Global Rise of Postsecondary Institutions for Indigenous Peoples, by **Wade M. Cole**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011. 263pp. \$60.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780804772105.

MIKAILA MARIEL LEMONIK ARTHUR
Rhode Island College
marthur@ric.edu

We live today with the potential for dramatic transformations in higher education across the globe. Pundits and politicians are consumed with debating and indeed reshaping the organizational structures and curricular foci of colleges and universities; educational entrepreneurs busy themselves with promises of the next innovation; and the current, former, and future constituents of higher education decry high prices while asking for more services. Wade M. Cole's book steps into this bubbling morass with a perspective that few of us have considered: that of higher education for indigenous students.

Uncommon Schools details the historical foundations of indigenous higher education (IHE) in four former British colonies: the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Despite their common colonial and historical roots, and despite fairly similar treatment of indigenous populations in their early history, the ultimate outcomes of

IHE systems are rather different across these four cases. Cole argues that these differences stem from four axes upon which the cases vary: competition under colonialism, treaty-making, administrative controls around reservations, and the federal or local jurisdiction over tribal groups. Various configurations of these factors resulted in different sorts of political opportunity for the establishment of IHE, resulting in extraordinary variation in outcomes: the US has more than 30 IHEs offering education from the associates level to graduate degrees, while at the other extreme Australia has just one low-status institution.

Cole's central argument has much to offer scholars, especially considering that it is a novel treatment of what is indeed a novel question. Oddly, however, the "global rise" of IHE is not the main focus of much of the book. The beginning of the book addresses primarily the complex global politics surrounding indigenous peoples, with a particular emphasis on the dynamics of sovereignty across world-historical periods. Cole then moves on to consider the broader history of education for indigenous peoples, highlighting how such education was used first as a tool for religious domination, then as a supposed civilizing agent that aimed to strip indigenous peoples of their culture and selfhood, and finally as a tool for political incorporation into modern states.

The latter part of the book attends specifically to the United States by drawing comparisons between the establishment of and the curricula at IHE (called in the United States, Tribal Colleges and Universities, or TCUs), and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). It is here that Cole presents his most interesting argument. Before the Civil Rights Movement, he writes, blacks were excluded from a society they wished to be part of, while Native Americans were forced to assimilate into a society they wished to avoid. This dynamic carried into the realm of education, where blacks were forced to attend segregated institutions while Native Americans experienced education primarily as a tool of forced assimilation. But, Cole argues, the dynamic reversed after the Civil Rights Movement. Then, blacks became free to attend predominantly white colleges and universities and the number of HBCUs

started to drop off, while Native Americans were finally free to establish segregated institutions focusing on their own unique needs and identities. Indeed, today many HBCUs struggle with the implications of *United States vs. Fordice*, a 1992 U.S. Supreme Court case that has pushed HBCUs actively to recruit white students, while TCUs are allowed actively to exclude non-Native American students or to set tuition rates for such students at triple those charged to Native Americans.

This discussion also considers the greater presence of what Cole calls “ethnocentric” curricula at TCIs in comparison to HBCUs, where Afrocentric coursework is relatively rare. The quantitative analysis Cole presents is interesting and methodologically sound, though for me it did raise some additional questions. Most TCIs were established by tribes or by other groups primarily accountable to Native Americans themselves. The same is not true of HBCUs; while some were founded by pioneering black professionals or by black Christian denominations, the majority were founded by white missionaries or by segregationist governments. Cole does separate out the public HBCUs and finds that those which are private are more likely to offer Afrocentric courses, and he does determine that being founded by a black church has little effect. However, by my count over 30 of the still-extant HBCUs were founded by white religious groups which might leave the resulting institutions with value commitments that are more religiously than racially based.

Despite the very clear contribution that this book makes to our understanding of an important and understudied aspect of both higher education and global politics, there are two significant shortcomings. First of all, despite the title’s promise of a global look at IHE, the book is predominantly focused on an Anglocentric analysis. Cole does provide an enlightening detour into the world of indigenous people in Greenland and Norway, a discussion of the role of religion for the Spanish colonies in Latin America, and brief mentions of IHE in Russia and the Caribbean. However, he argues that Africa and Asia cannot properly be discussed from the perspective of indigenous issues, as they are more properly understood

as having experienced external rather than internal colonialism. Perhaps. On the other hand, there are many parts of the world that experience ongoing internal colonialism, such as Kurds and nomadic peoples in the Middle East as well as many ethnic groups in western China. The exclusion of these groups is not necessarily a limitation of the book—but it is an indication that it does not live up to its title.

Secondly, the book gives short shrift to the role of social movements in driving the establishment of IHE. While Cole details several important instances of activism by indigenous groups and draws on a political opportunity structure perspective in framing his analysis, his narratives leave little room for the role of activists in demanding and creating IHE. More attention to this question would have made a novel contribution to our understanding of the effects of geopolitical forces on educational change into a fully realized account of the rise of IHE.

The Myth of the Ethical Consumer, by **Timothy M. Devinney, Pat Auger, and Giana M. Eckhardt**. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 240pp. \$36.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521747554.

DENISE KLEINRICHERT
San Francisco State University
 dk@sfsu.edu

Apples-to-oranges theory is an apt application to the study of consumer responses towards ethical, responsible corporate practices. Consumers are at least as diverse as the comparables and dissonances between these two fruits—both are grown on trees, have seeds (generally), skins, pulp, some nutritional value upon consumption, and either sweet or sour tastes. However, apples and oranges are as varied within their genus as consumers and their ethical considerations. The authors of *The Myth of the Ethical Consumer* argue that the consumer movement towards ethical decision-making in product choices in the market creates a myth, rather than a reality, of an “ethical consumer.” The purchase choices of consumers are investigated in a variety of

methods employed by authors Timothy Devinney, Pat Auger, and Giana Eckhardt.

Their studies provide intriguing investigations of consumer social and environmental attitudes, product functionality trade-offs, and purchase decisions. The basis of each study includes a consumer valuation of either social or environmental aspects of only a few products and their supply chains—primarily the raw materials, manufacture, or labor characteristics and the effects of these on various stakeholders. These studies flesh out the notion of the “ethical consumer” through the use of a number of perspectives in literature ranging from the 1700s (Adam Smith) to the mid-2000s, and the authors’ use of both quantitative (survey instruments of specific sample populations) and qualitative (interviews and video ethnography) studies. Their purpose is to debunk the existence of the “ethical consumer” as a consistently moral decision-maker in choosing commodities. The products they selected for studying consumer perceptions include ethical conflicts regarding supply chain or product impacts to particular stakeholders (e.g., child labor or safe working conditions or fair wages; also natural environmental harm). In other words, the authors’ argument states that the social construct of an “ethical consumer” is not based in any theoretical perspective, but rather is a myth, “an idealized fiction” (p. 9) of consumer practices.

A number of constructs of consumer behavior have been examined in this book using a focus of “social” consumerism. The methodological investigations of the authors’ prior work on consumer social responsibility (C_NSR) (Devinney et al. 2006), and a number of other studies, have value for examining collective consumer perspectives about businesses’ social practices. This book also provides an examination of the behavioral intentions of consumers in purchasing specific products of fictional firms. While much value is found in the various studies used to support the authors’ primary argument, there appears to be author bias against two critical correlatives of market transactions—socioeconomic theories (Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* [1776] and *Theory of Moral Sentiments* [1759]) and stakeholder theories (A. Carroll 1991; R.E. Freeman 1984).

Further, the authors neglected to explore theory that does support ethical behavior of individuals, including ethical motives regarding consumer decision-making (e.g., Kant 1785; 1797) and utilitarian product functionality tradeoffs (e.g., J.S. Mill 1863). Although a single quote for each of these philosopher-economist’s ethical perspectives is included (p. 44), the passage is definitively out of context for each respective thinker. Moreover, sweeping generalizations are made in discussing the study results regarding consumer responses or other consumer examples, which are problematic (i.e., “The reality is that initiatives such as Project Red are subject to higher failure rates than normal marketing activities” [p. 2]). In addition, the authors’ projection of consumer stereotypes based on geographic locations is a concern regarding the investigations of specific consumers (i.e., “three extreme groups” [p. 72]). There are a number of confounding variables for the quantitative studies, which do not investigate comparative sample groups. Therefore, difficulties for interpretative correlations occur.

The breadth of the authors’ and others’ investigations included in this book are admirable and these are a potentially valuable source for further areas of consumer research. A number of arguments could be made using the findings of the authors’ various studies, but the authors’ amalgamation of their particular studies to prove that the concept of the “ethical consumer” is a myth fails to substantiate. Rather, this reviewer sees much more promise in further investigating the findings of what constitutes “a role model for what society expects [consumer] behavior should morally be” (p. 116). Or, an exploration of the ethical concern of most consumers, trust, has significant potential. Trust makes for an intriguing examination of consumer behavior toward their perceptions of social or environmental product characteristics, as might be gleaned from either Likert scale survey instruments and/or ethnographic interviews. The authors’ findings that “people will not sacrifice function for ethics” (p. 176) is an absolutist view, rather than exploratory. For example, does the brand name of batteries versus athletic shoes matter more or less to the consumer for each product, and how

does this impact the perception of functionality versus social (ethics) considerations of each? This latter consideration is briefly acknowledged as a "latent" social characteristic worthy of ethical choice over product function (ibid).

Finally, the notion of the "ethical consumer" has not been demonstrated to be an absolute in any of the consumer values versus behavior or socioeconomic aspects of purchaser decisions literature. Rather, as acknowledged by the authors, consumers bring a "range of social issues [that] include economic and political issues" (p. 152). Yet, the authors seem to indicate that the "ethical consumer" is a single-stripe character, and thus mythical. Their argument fails because ethical behavior is human behavior, with no one source of derived moral value (ethics isn't a genetic characteristic like eye color; it is acquired, varied, inconsistent, and imperfect). Defining an "ethical consumer" as making absolute choices of salient social characteristics is no different from consigning a consumer to being strictly a "functional" consumer. In this fable, the "ethical consumer" is not permitted to have more than one stripe.

References

- Carroll, A. B. 1991. "The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders," *Business Horizons* 34: 39–48.
- Devinney, T.M., P. Auger, G.M. Eckhardt, and T. Birtchnell. 2006. "The Other CSR: Consumer Social Responsibility," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 4: 30–37.
- Freeman, R.E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Kant, I. 1997 [1785]. *Foundations of Metaphysics of Morals*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kant, I. 2006 [1797]. *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mill, J.S. 1993 [1863]. *On Liberty and Utilitarianism*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Smith, A. 2000 [1759]. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. New York, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Smith, A. 2000 [1776]. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, NY: Modern Library.

Neon Wasteland: On Love, Motherhood, and Sex Work in a Rust Belt Town, by **Susan Dewey**. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011. 258pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520266919.

PATTI GIUFFRÉ

Texas State University, San Marcos
pg07@txstate.edu

Susan Dewey has written a fascinating book that explores how topless dancers at a club named "Vixens" feel about their work and family lives. Why do some poor U.S. women "choose" to engage in sex work? What do they do when they are not on stage? Few previous studies of sex work have addressed how women sex workers perceive themselves as mothers or how they attempt to balance work and family responsibilities. Dewey's book offers a unique contribution in that it provides insight into poor sex workers' experiences, their lives as mothers, and how they manage ideas about "proper femininity" and motherhood. It describes an impressive six-month observation and fifty in-depth interviews with women topless dancers, and a few men managers. Dewey, an anthropologist, spent nights backstage talking to dancers before and after shifts. Her book focuses on five of the women interviewed and their male manager. Each chapter begins with an interesting, lengthy interview quote that frames the remainder of the chapter.

Much of Dewey's book discusses the larger economic context of upstate New York, part of the "Rust Belt," where deindustrialization has contributed to an economically depressed region. She claims that there are few alternatives to stable, well-paid work for poor women here, particularly women who have young children. Dewey connects experiences of these poor sex workers to studies of women in the Global South. She argues that the experiences of women at "Vixens" is more similar to sex workers in the Global South than sex workers who are upper-class, highly educated, and/or who work in upscale erotic clubs. "Vixens" is located in a poor area of "Sparksburgh," and is not a high-end strip club. The workers

there are poor and professionally unskilled. Why do they "choose" to be topless dancers?

Dewey's critiques of scholarly perspectives on the "choices" of exploited groups contributes to debates about agency and empowerment. Her analysis can be considered a criticism of "extreme" false consciousness arguments in regards to women choosing to be sex workers. Dewey maintains that scholars often have "binary distinctions between agency and victimization" (p. x). Her book highlights the challenges of seeing sex work as women's choice in the context of living in an economically depressed area with little to no social, emotional or financial support from families. About half of the women interviewed have small children to support and most do so on their own. The jobs available to these professionally unskilled women in "Sparksburgh" are primarily low-wage jobs with few or no benefits. Workers she interviewed perceived topless dancing as a way to earn more than minimum wage and have more autonomy than they would in a low-wage workplace. One woman said, "If you want disrespect, work at Walmart" (p. x). A few women left their jobs as topless dancers, only to return because they did not earn enough money at minimum-wage jobs. Respondents perceived topless dancing as a temporary step to a better life.

Despite their hopeful perspective, women in this study rarely earned enough to get out of living in or close to poverty. They earned on average \$700 a week and most of them spent at least half of their income on rent. Like many "low-end" sex workers, topless dancers at "Vixens" receive no benefits, and have few employment protections. Topless dancing is legally defined by the state as a type of independent contracting and as a result, many regulations do not apply to the job. Owners are not required to pay topless dancers a salary; nor are they required to offer health insurance or other benefits. Although most of the women believed that their work was a temporary step toward financial stability, they were living below or near poverty. Dewey also finds that respondents' economic problems were compounded by a strong consumerist attitude. The women interviewed rarely saved their tips but instead spent them quickly (often, buying

lavish gifts for their children) as a way to feel better about their difficult lives. Dewey concludes that scholars should not interpret that these women "endorse their own victimization" (p. 196), as she demonstrates why and how some poor women define their sexuality as their "most marketable asset" (p. xx).

The topless dancers interviewed not only tried to manage difficult financial circumstances but also negative stereotypes about women who engage in this work. Sex workers are stereotyped as "immoral, irresponsible, and promiscuous" (p. x). These cultural beliefs sharply contradict ideals for motherhood and femininity. According to one respondent, "People don't generally think of dancers as family types" (p. x). Dewey finds that respondents resist and reject these stereotypical notions of sex workers. One chapter discusses how women perceived themselves as "good" people and workers by not receiving government benefits or using social services allowed for those in poverty. Many were eligible for various government benefits but refused to apply for them. Women she interviewed did not want to be perceived as, or think of themselves as, what they referred to as "welfare queens." Many said that receiving benefits or using social services available to people in poverty would be demeaning or suggest that they are failures.

This book will be useful to scholars interested in ethnographic research and, in particular, researcher reflexivity. I enjoyed reading Dewey's reflection about her interactions with the dancers and her feelings about their experiences. The book would also be useful for a graduate course on qualitative methods in order to show how ethnographers negotiate access, status, power, and their feelings about the research process (and in this case, their fears). In one chapter, for example, Dewey describes how she cried in response to a respondent's difficulties with wanting to present a positive life for her son and her concerns about being a bad mother. I appreciated Dewey's compassionate tone towards the respondents' descriptions of their lives and honesty about how her research question changed over time. She began her data collection by wanting to know whether women could be empowered while doing

exploitative work. She says that she first wanted to show that women can, in fact, be empowered. As she talked to more women and completed observations, she says that she began to see that this work is not necessarily empowering for poor women, and especially poor women who have sole responsibility for small children.

This well-written and interesting book will be of interest to scholars of gender, sexuality, social class, feminist theories, work or labor, and qualitative methods. Dewey's research was brave, and her tone empathetic. Her book shows how researchers can engage in both critique and as Dewey states, presenting people's experiences with a "heart." She provides us with a "human face" to what is often defined as dehumanizing work.

Art in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States, edited by **Paul DiMaggio** and **Patricia Fernández-Kelly**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 292pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547589.

STEVEN J. GOLD
Michigan State University
gold@msu.edu

Despite the longstanding interest of sociologists in international migration, little work has been devoted to exploring art related to human movement. This book's editors contend that this gap is detrimental to students of migration, art, and cultural policy—and go on to show that much can be learned about immigrants' subjectivities as well as their adaptive and communicative processes by studying their involvement in artistic expression.

Based on presentations at a 2006 conference sponsored by Princeton University's Center for Art and Cultural Policy Studies, and Center for Migration and Development, editors Paul DiMaggio and Patricia Fernández-Kelly define the book's purpose with a well-documented essay. In describing their examination of immigrants' use of art, DiMaggio and Fernández-Kelly stress the concept of diversity, as it applies to both the nationalities and socio-economic characteristics (class, generation, and rural versus urban origins) of included groups.

Chapters of the book address communities from Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and the Caribbean to explore artistic activities among highly educated and working-class migrants and an assortment of refugees residing in urban, rural, and suburban environments throughout the United States. In addition, the book considers migrants representing several generations and various religious denominations.

In framing their analysis, the editors discuss the myriad functions of art within migrant populations: to provide reassuring familiarity, interpret personal and collective experiences, and teach the younger generation about the country of origin and inured rituals. Art also allows immigrants to represent themselves to the host society, the country of origin, and to other collectivities.

While migrants from an earlier period were assumed to direct their cultural activities toward host societies—thus losing traditional forms to assimilation—the authors point out that today's migrants are involved in multi-directional processes whereby they are able to integrate traditional art forms with those of the larger society, and also link their expressions with transnational, global, and pan-ethnic aesthetics as sources of intrinsic satisfaction and as a means of expressing their own identities.

The editors organize the book around three focal questions concerning the mobility and diversity of immigrant art. The first concerns the role of the arts in adaptation and assimilation, and the second considers how aesthetic expressions simultaneously contribute to affirming cultural distinctiveness while also enabling immigrants to integrate into the host society (p. 4). Finally, the third question seeks to determine the main differences and similarities in the artistic production of various immigrant communities and between first- and second-generation immigrants (p. 4).

Some of the book's most compelling discussions—identified in the introductory essay and elaborated in several chapters—concern the artistic production of second-generation migrants who draw on group-specific traditions to address their roots, while also incorporating cultural forms from popular culture, various subcultures, and aesthetics from other locations in order

to transcend limiting ideologies, stereotypes, and other constraints. Exemplifying this kind of analysis, Fernández-Kelly describes immigrant youths' efforts to subvert the rigidity and limitations of the existing labor market through patterns of self-employment, innovation, and creativity that she labels *expressive entrepreneurship*.

Following the introductory essay, eleven chapters examine various immigrants' involvement with art. In Chapter Two, Mark J. Stern, Susan C. Seifert, and J. Dominic Vitiello draw on data collected by University of Pennsylvania scholars to examine art in Philadelphia in terms of neighborhood, nativity, occupation, kinds of art, and pan-ethnic categories. Among other findings, the authors determine that recent immigrants are much more likely to rely on the informal sector to present their works to audiences than are established groups, who use nonprofit organizations, art centers and galleries to both create art and communicate with various constituencies.

Chapters by Fernández-Kelly, Amaney Jamal, Sunaina Maira, and Deborah Wong explore the place of artistic expression among various nationalities—Cubans, Arab Americans, South Asians, and Asian Americans—who are themselves diverse in generation, politics, and class. Among each of these, the younger generation merges traditional forms with hip-hop to make statements about their perspectives on identity and marginality in view of the local environment, the country of origin, and a broader array of reference groups.

In his chapter about music performed at "Mexican" Boston-area restaurants, Clifford Murphy shows how various Latin American musical and cultural traditions are interwoven by multinational bands, such that they appeal to various Latin American nationalities as well as white and black customers.

Gilberto Cárdenas draws on archival materials as well as recently produced works to create a visual record of the unique but largely obscured character of Mexican involvement with the United States. With a similar goal in mind, Jorge Durand and Douglas Massey analyze the religious and social meanings of important life events honored in a collection of *retablos*—painted commemorations of gratitude for holy interventions

on their behalf—created by Mexican immigrants to the United States that the authors painstakingly acquired as sources of data on undocumented Mexican migration.

Cecilia Menjívar examines art created by Central American refugees that expresses the groups' feeling about their ambivalent legality and tenuous belonging in the United States. Finally, Yen Le Espiritu, and Terry Rey and Alex Stepick's chapters show how Vietnamese and Haitian refugees create artworks to tell their own groups' stories as a means of countering the larger society's negative stereotypes that erase their self identification as a distinctive and worthy people.

Art in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States provides a great deal of information about the way recent arrivals use art to adapt to the United States, to recognize themselves and share outlooks with others. Not only is the resulting documentation in itself valuable, in addition, the book exemplifies a compelling and innovative approach that has considerable potential to improve the study of immigration and of cultural production. Accessible and well written, the volume is of significant value to students, scholars, and general readers.

Sex Slaves and Discourse Masters: The Construction of Trafficking, by **Jo Doezema**. New York, NY: Zed Books, 2010. 216pp. \$32.95 paper. ISBN: 9781848134140.

SHARON S. OSELIN
California State University, Los Angeles
soselin@calstatela.edu

Sex trafficking is a topic known to garner interest and controversy, often fueled by strongly held beliefs about human rights and social justice. *Sex Slaves and Discourse Masters* examines the current debates and policies surrounding sex trafficking by drawing historical comparisons to "white slavery." This provocative book establishes an argument that centers on the use of power, illuminates the persistence and relevance of public beliefs concerning these topics, and explores how socially and culturally constructed perceptions inform policy formation. The author explores this topic by analyzing pervasive narratives, myths,

metaphors and ideologies across both time periods.

Jo Doezenia organizes the book into two parts. The first half investigates the emergence and salience of "white slavery" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by comparing two contexts: Britain and the United States. This analysis does not claim to be an empirically proven assertion; instead Doezenia's aim is to unravel how the narratives, myth, and ideology were formed and shaped by larger socio-political happenings during this period and how they were sustained via publications. As she notes, the "white slavery" myth emphasized the youth, innocence and unwillingness of white women forced to engage in sex work, which became a rallying point for moral crusaders. White slavery was but one form of vice, among a host of others, that was tackled during this time by various groups whose objective was to halt social and political changes perceived to engender these very acts. Doezenia explores this discourse by including passages from past studies and other published historical sources, and sharpens her argument by drawing on theory.

The second half of the book draws comparisons between "white slavery" and sex trafficking, a phenomenon that has received heightened global attention over the last few decades. Specifically, she deconstructs the "global myth of trafficking in women" by comparing contemporary accounts of trafficking to past narratives of white slavery. How trafficking is defined and framed, she argues, has significant impact on international policy formation regardless of the factual basis of such claims. She is quick to note that arriving at a comprehensive understanding of trafficking is an extremely difficult task, but this carefully crafted book may help to further this process. Doezenia points out that one of the most divisive issues among feminists, one that is still ongoing today, revolves around consent of the individual: what is the difference between one who is trafficked and one who chooses to work in and migrate for prostitution? This query encapsulates the tension between liberal feminists, who believe sexuality is a "site of violence" (p. 169), and sex worker advocates, who are skeptical of blanket state regulations and argue it is possible for

individuals to consent to sex work. In a laudable attempt to untangle these complicated issues, she relies on international documents, statements, and notes from a variety of lobbyist groups and affiliated representatives, such as the Human Rights Caucus and Network of Sex Work Projects, to provide insight into the position each side promotes via their discourse.

In a unique approach, Doezenia does not attempt to prove empirically the extent of trafficking or the truth or falsehood of the myths, narratives, and ideologies surrounding it (pp. 9–10). She turns to the culturally produced and sustained accounts that in turn serve as "truth," even when they are not verifiable, as they shape people's perceptions and impact present-day debates (and policies) regarding sex trafficking. This book is not only ambitious in scope but presents an approach to sex trafficking that has previously been neglected. In short, Doezenia does a thorough job exploring the creation and impact of the relevant discourse. The nuances of these arguments are rich and often compelling; however, the complexity of the theory and level of detail in this book at times detract from its central purpose. As a result, readers may find the book a challenge which holds the potential to obscure the important contributions this study offers, particularly among non-academics.

Doezenia also does a good job highlighting populations often conspicuously absent from the discourse. For instance, during the "white slavery" narratives women of color were ignored although they engaged in prostitution; more recently, men are rarely considered in the formation of policy regarding sex trafficking even though they comprise a portion of sex workers. These absences underscore the utility of analyzing myths and narratives generally, as they fall short in presenting a comprehensive image of social phenomena.

While this comparison is very detailed, two full chapters devoted to the "white slavery" narratives in two countries may not be necessary to the overall argument of the book. A limitation of this book is found in the concluding chapter, which begins to outline ways to move beyond the dilemma plaguing the prevalent "myth" of sex trafficking and policies intended to address it.

Here, Doezeema illuminates the ways in which these constructions constrain current debates among international groups and their ability to enact laws. Yet, she also tentatively discusses and envisions how myth can spark social and political change through its re-invention, but in doing so opens up a host of other questions and problems. Perhaps in more clearly outlining and even hypothesizing the mechanisms through which change can transpire, the implications of this book will be that much more relevant to a broader group of readers: policymakers, academics, feminists, and beyond.

Finally, it would be an insightful and interesting addition if Doezeema had included a greater discussion of reflexivity and how her own role in this debate informed her analysis. In a paragraph or so at the end of the final chapter she admits her own struggle with these issues (p. 175), especially in her role as a sex worker activist. I would imagine this position colors her assessment of these events. This does not necessarily detract from the book per se, as all researchers and authors hold some bias, but this insider knowledge could be incorporated in such a way to further illuminate the intricacies of these debates.

Getting Ahead: Social Mobility, Public Housing, and Immigrant Networks, by **Silvia Domínguez**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2011. 269pp. \$45.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780814720776.

LESLEY WILLIAMS REID
 Georgia State University
 lesleyreid@gsu.edu

"You just love to find out how I do things," reports a participant in Silvia Domínguez's compelling study of Latina immigrants. This is a very apt summary about what is so very good about *Getting Ahead: Social Mobility, Public Housing, and Immigrant Networks*. Over a period of years, sometimes many, Domínguez enters the lives of immigrant women living in Boston public housing. She explores how they do so much with so little not only surviving day by day, but actively pursuing social mobility. On this level, Domínguez's book represents an

important contribution to the literature on immigration. Her focus is on how immigrants succeed as individuals and contribute to their communities and society overall. As such, it represents an important corrective to the dominant socio-political climate where immigrants are considered a drain on the collective resources of the native-born.

Domínguez explores five key themes in her data analysis, with a chapter devoted to each. She begins by presenting a detailed examination of Josefa as an exemplar of women who are able to secure the social support they need to survive on a daily basis. Josefa is not successful, however, in translating supportive networks into the type of more diverse network ties that can provide the leverage necessary to move out of poverty. In two subsequent chapters, Domínguez examines two women, Lisa and Camila, who have very different social networks, but who each leverage their networks toward social mobility, one through community activism and the other through the labor market. Domínguez concludes her analysis by discussing Marta and Marcela, who are less successful in developing social networks that might provide support or leverage because of their experiences of domestic violence. The stories of these women are compelling, their successes admirable and their failures understandable.

Domínguez ties these narratives together with a theoretical model she calls the Social Flow framework. The Social Flow framework explains how a self-propelling agent (SPA), who possesses an efficacious cognitive frame, positions herself within a social network, populated by other SPAs, which provides both the support and leverage necessary to attain social mobility. Here is where Domínguez's work falls short. Her Social Flow framework is at essence tautological. Although Domínguez does not draw upon the psychological research literature concerning resilience, her Social Flow framework has much in common with it. Someone is resilient if they survive adversity; they survive adversity because they are resilient. If someone is an SPA, they are able to position themselves within efficacious networks to achieve mobility; if someone positions themselves within efficacious networks to achieve

mobility, they are an SPA. Theoretically, this is unfulfilling.

While I find the Social Flow framework as Domínguez's employs it theoretically unfulfilling, it is nevertheless theoretically ambitious. Unfortunately, Domínguez's data analysis is not rigorous enough to support such an ambitious theory development. Without question, Domínguez is a skilled and dedicated ethnographer. Her sample size is, however, modest at only nineteen women and in her analysis she presents data on only a subset of these. While her approach of focusing entire chapters around one or two women as examples of the broader experiences of multiple women makes for an engaging read, I would have preferred to hear the voices of more of the women in her sample. By presenting only a subset of her data, Domínguez opens herself up to critiques that she makes too much of her data. For example, early in the book, she presents Nina's retelling of how she secured a job with the Boston Housing Authority. Nina went to the housing authority to drop off a résumé and asked a man in the elevator where the human resources office was located. It turned out that he was the HR director. He took her résumé and later hired her. Domínguez interprets this as Nina deploying "her self-propelling agency by using a weak tie and bridge to secure employment" (p. 23). My interpretation is that Nina was quite lucky.

The theoretical and methodological shortcomings of the Social Flow framework would be forgivable if not for the sociopolitical implications that accompany it. At its core, Domínguez's Social Flow framework is a theory of agency, who has it and who does not. The aim of her research is to show that poor immigrant women are getting ahead through their own initiative and drive. Implicitly, she is saying that those who are not getting ahead lack initiative and drive. She makes this implicit comparison explicit when she states that "immigrants are the quintessential self-propelling agents" (p. 209) and do not fit our conventional understanding of people living in poor neighborhoods because that understanding is based on research about African Americans. In my own research of those living in public housing, primarily African American women, I see many examples of people who are desperately exerting

agency in the face of often insurmountable structural barriers. Not all of these people are getting ahead, but it is not because they lack initiative and drive.

This brings me to my final critique of this book. Based on the title, I was expecting to read a book about how public housing helped or hindered the social mobility of immigrant women. Although one chapter presents a detailed history of public housing in Boston, the role that public housing plays in the lives of her study participants is virtually absent. This is a glaring omission given the changes in public housing policy that occurred during the course of her data collection. She mentions participants who were displaced as the result of their public housing development being razed and replaced by HOPE VI mixed-income housing, but she never discusses the effects of this displacement on these women. This would have been an ideal situation to observe how SPAs utilize their agency and social networks to navigate what is often a difficult process.

In conclusion, Domínguez attempts to do too much and ends up doing too little. As an enlightening ethnography of how immigrant women survive and thrive, despite hardship, this book is fascinating—beyond that, it disappoints.

Winning: Reflections on an American Obsession, by **Francesco Duina**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011. 237pp. \$32.50 cloth. ISBN: 9780691147062.

PATRICIA A. ADLER
University of Colorado
adler@colorado.edu

PETER ADLER
University of Denver
socypof@hotmail.com

"Winning isn't everything, it is the only thing," so uttered iconic football coach Vince Lombardi, which became one of the most apt aphorisms to describe the ethos of American culture. In *Winning*, Bates sociologist Francesco Duina takes a look at Americans' obsession with "being the best," the place of being victorious in all that we do, our collective beliefs about winners and losers, and

the positive and detrimental effects of competition. Impressively, Duina draws on a wide spectrum of examples from sociology, economics, psychology, sports, the military, politics, music, science, work, and popular culture to advance his thesis. While concentrating on the United States, he compares the American passion for winning with a smaller, more homogeneous country, Denmark, to contrast the two countries' differing foci on being victorious, no matter the costs.

Although this is a worthy undertaking and heretofore little explored by sociologists, Duina's book is flawed by (1) spurious assumptions, (2) weak methodology, and (3) historically antiquated examples to support his contentions. In his assumptions, he is prone to making broad, sweeping generalizations not corroborated by empirical data. For instance, he claims that "we are engaging, in other words, in a *sadistic* exercise. We feel a sort of pleasure when we see others struggle" (p. 28, emphasis in original). To validate this, Duina supplies us with not much more than our collective reactions to Sarah Palin's gaffes during the 2008 presidential campaign. He further argues, for example, that competition and winning is about acquiring physical and mental space, citing that the wealthy have second or third homes to escape the boredom of living in the same space all year round (p. 70). However true this may be for the über-rich, plenty of affluent New Yorkers prefer to live in cramped, exorbitantly priced Manhattan apartments rather than to be compared with their "bridge-and-tunnel" or "vacuous" suburbanite counterparts, who actually have more space than they. Space, then, is not the necessary by-product of winning, as Duina claims, as much as it is location. About temporality, Duina writes that "[time] usually commands continued respect and prestige. As such, it is a primary driver of competitors' desire to win" (p. 86). Certainly, being a former winner may carry with it some lasting significance (people are called President and Coach long after they have given up these jobs), but Americans are more apt to ask "what have you done for me lately?" Finally, Duina claims that playing well, being proud, giving a good effort, and keeping a positive attitude

can make "losers" into "winners." Again, with examples cherry-picked from politics, sports, and science, he ignores the idea that for many Americans it is not *how* you play the game, but *who* wins.

Second, *Winning* is methodology-lite, using anecdotal data to support the book's main theses. Duina uses examples from a broad base, albeit many from journalistic accounts, but these seem to be hand-selected to prove his point. When he wants to affirm the attitudes of Americans on myriad issues, he relies on the General Social Survey, "the most authoritative and comprehensive source of attitudes in our country" (p. 17). But he takes all of this at face value, never reflecting on the problematic data produced by this instrument. The most recent survey he uses is 2006, and in fact, almost all of his narratives are from this time or earlier. It is perplexing to understand why he did not conduct interviews with "winners" and "losers" to support the websites upon which he chiefly relies.

Third, when discussing winning, worlds have changed in post-Obama, post-Madoff, post-recession America. Although Duina discusses Tiger Woods' phenomenal success, he never mentions the demise which began in 2009, when one of our generation's biggest winners turned into a loser—or the turnaround of Michael Vick, a winner turned loser in 2007, and then resurrected in 2009 as a winner again. Even allowing for delays in production time (i.e., he cites statements from the 2003 Emmy Award winner, Debra Messing, a character from TV's *Will & Grace*, rather than more recent examples), before the book was published, it was out of date. Ponzi-schemer Madoff, arrested in 2008 and arguably America's biggest winner-turned-loser, is not even mentioned.

Drawing on a social constructionist perspective, Duina correctly notes that competition has to do with awareness; it is located in the mind. Yet although what he says is reminiscent of basic tenets of symbolic interactionism, he never invokes these theorists. He does hit his stride in elucidating a taxonomy of winners and losers, a bright point where we see the differences in the ways we might win or lose, and how society reacts to us accordingly. Additionally, his "prize ladder" of success is a brilliant

analysis of the rewards of competition and their meanings.

In and about this book there are some gems, reflections on the nature of American culture, and the aftermath of so much emphasis on winning. That "competition [in the US] is unmatched by any other major industrialized country on earth" (p. 5) is certainly debatable, but winning does lie at the bedrock of who we are and what we want to become. Duina ends with some recommendations for an alternative approach to competition, but many of these come from his observations of Danish society, a culture so vastly different from America's that the comparisons fall flat.

In sum, although the topic is important and some of the ideas are exceptional in their ability to explain our obsession for winning, readers will remain unconvinced by the specious nature of the anecdotal data, the relatively outdated examples (mostly 2005 and before) in a rapidly changing world, and the generalizations based on armchair theorizing rather than solid research design.

Making Volunteers: Civic Life after Welfare's End, by **Nina Eliasoph**. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011. 308pp. \$39.50 cloth. ISBN: 9780691147093.

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

Since the publication of *Avoiding Politics* in 1998, Nina Eliasoph's forte has been the analysis of political talk and its troubled status in our society. Rather than rooting her arguments in structuralist thinking, Eliasoph has insisted that the meaning of language is not grounded in the hardwiring of our brain or the logic of language itself, but the political, cultural, and institutional contexts in which speech is conducted. Eliasoph has also established herself as an ethnographer who manages to combine a genuine concern for the fate of political speech in our society with exceptionally insightful and nuanced ethnography. She builds on this ongoing project in *Making Volunteers* and in the process directly takes on many of our most cherished political values, not to mention many widely held social scientific assumptions.

Eliasoph set out to study youth activism in "Snowy Prairie," but failed to find much. Instead, she stumbled across what she calls a "galaxy of Empowerment Projects" (p. xiii). Empowerment Projects are characterized by short-term funding from a variety of government and private sources. More importantly, they engage in "Empowerment Talk," the sort of talk that rejects bureaucracy and hierarchy while valuing grassroots civic associationalism, participation, inclusion, and voluntarism, characteristics which are thought to produce multiculturalism, leadership, and innovation. Empowerment Projects, then, have what Eliasoph calls "morally magnetic missions," that is, Americans find them to be irresistibly good.

Nonetheless, these organizations confront patterned dilemmas. For example, producing leadership, multicultural understanding, and family-like intimacy is constrained by short-term funding meant to spark innovation and creativity. Organizations tackle this dilemma in a variety of ways, making *organizational style* central in producing distinctive practices. But the tendency to perform these characteristics for funders ends up taking precedent. The result is a rationalized and bureaucratized civic performance that tends to drain the practices intended to "empower" their meaning. Bureaucracy, then, continues to be the core around which the galaxy of empowerment projects revolves.

If empowerment projects are not really empowering youth or building a more vibrant civil society, what are they doing? Eliasoph is clear that empowerment talk is not merely ideology. Rather, it necessarily becomes transformed as it "materializes in these organizations' typical everyday conditions..." such that it turns "inside-out" (p. 234). The overall lesson for participants, far from being one of unlimited possibility, creativity, and personal development leading to transformative programmatic interventions, is a lesson in how bureaucracies and complex organizations function. This is not necessarily negative. If we live in what Charles Perrow described as an "organizational society," learning how such organizations function is an essential component of socialization and personal development. Nor is this the only lesson. Eliasoph identifies many others, including the production

of tolerance, if not understanding, social trust, if not interpersonal trust, and so on. The real problem is not that nothing useful is being produced, but it is the incessant double talk that masks the real function of Empowerment Projects. She suggests that, unfortunately, empowerment projects cannot talk about what they really do.

This book demonstrates Eliasoph's impressive ethnographic chops. She proceeds without using deductive reasoning, theoretical critique, or the mobilization of different subjective positions to enable her analysis. It relies upon ethnographic immersion and, indeed, Eliasoph helpfully points out moments when her own thinking was jarred by specific observations or conversations. Though not always on full display, by weaving in moments of realization she manages to bring the reader along in her process of discovery. The result is an account that admirably captures the many-sidedness of the social life of these organizations without relying upon description to the point that coherent analysis is drowned in detail.

While her first book demonstrated how Americans produce political apathy in everyday life, it seems that Eliasoph undertook to study volunteers to find a more positive account. After all, volunteers by definition have more interest in civic affairs and are more willing to act on their interest. Presumably, volunteers, armed with their investment in civic life and Tocqueville's "self-interest rightly understood" would yield a less pessimistic study than Eliasoph's earlier study did. This is important to note. She appears to be uncomfortable in the role of the cynic. Unfortunately, as her research continued, Eliasoph came to the realization that our current fetish for voluntarism further undermines the health of our public sphere rather than providing a source of renewal. If social discourse produces apathy, it turns out that voluntarism undermines judgment, passion, and commitment while sucking the political out of associational life.

Thinking about Eliasoph's analysis more broadly, a question arises. Projects and talk which claim to "empower" are usually thought of as positive things. In the 1960s and 1970s, situating empowered and anti-bureaucratic voluntary organizations in opposition to established hierarchies was

contentious and politically potent. Eliasoph's analysis suggests that those challenges were possibly too successful, such that they are assumed to be valuable by everyone, including government and private funders. So now all organizations *perform* empowerment, but in the process the substance is drained out and the original critique is rendered meaningless. Eliasoph does not dwell much on the historical argument, but she demonstrates the functioning of these formerly revolutionary values as they are rationalized and bureaucratized.

To the extent this reviewer has a substantive criticism, it is that Eliasoph does not deal with the particular challenges of studying "morally magnetic missions" that tend to be just as magnetic for social scientists. How do we grapple with and objectify these value-laden categories that present themselves as "objective" but which take on Orwellian overtones in new contexts? How do we use social scientific categories that have contested and fluid meanings?

Eliasoph has now twice provided us with volumes that effectively take the pulse of civil society while simultaneously prompting reflection upon the way social scientists think about it. Disentangling how the best of intentions get channeled into poor results is not easily accomplished, but Eliasoph pulls it off in producing a highly readable, ethnographically rich volume with implications that extend far beyond the immediate subject matter. *Making Volunteers* represents the best sociology has to offer while providing an excellent account of our civic ills.

Debates in Transgender, Queer, and Feminist Theory: Contested Sites, by **Patricia Elliot**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010. 185pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781409403937.

NANCY J. MEZEY
Monmouth University
nmezey@monmouth.edu

In 1994, Steven Seidman edited a collection of essays in *Sociological Theory* titled, "Symposium: Queer Theory/Sociology: A Dialogue." In this symposium, sociologists attempted to make sense of how the

sociology of sexualities could learn from queer theory, and how understanding the differences and similarities between these two disciplines could strengthen both and further our understanding of sexualities in general.

Patricia Elliot's book, *Debates in Transgender, Queer, and Feminist Theory: Contested Sites*, serves a similar, yet updated and farther-reaching purpose in which she describes, critiques, and makes sense of the major rifts and connections between trans studies, feminism, and queer studies. This book is not merely an intellectual mapping of three distinct yet overlapping fields of study, although it is written clearly and in a well-organized manner. In the book, Elliot also attends to how theory and academic debates affect and shape the lives of real people. She is particularly concerned with how theory can and should be used to create greater respect for, and foster security and well-being among, transgendered and transsexual people. Not only is this concern one of the greatest assets of Elliot's writing, but because she addresses both ethical and political issues, this book will resonate with academic activists and not just social theorists.

In commenting on her own status as a positioned intellectual—one who is a non-trans feminist—Elliot argues that transstudies have been virtually invisible in feminist studies, and to a lesser degree in queer studies. In many ways, Elliot is writing to and for a non-trans feminist audience. While the voices of feminist sociologists are traditionally the marginalized voice within sociology, Elliot argues that because theorizing about sex, gender, and sexuality has been the domain of feminism over the years, feminism has become the privileged voice in comparison to trans voices. She also argues that feminism continues to marginalize the voices of those who study, and who are, transsexuals and transgendered people.

Just as other groups of privileged people (e.g., white men) find feminism more palatable when it comes out of the mouths of their own group (e.g., other white men), as a non-trans feminist, Elliot's voice may resonate more clearly with other non-trans feminists. Elliot's purpose is not to outshine "insider" academics. But the outcome of her being an "outsider" to transgender people and

transsexuals, but an "insider" to feminists, may be that Elliot's message is effective in reaching the ears of feminist scholars. It is fortunate, therefore, that Elliot's book has much to offer feminists, as well as queer theorists and trans scholars, in terms of explaining trans theory, particularly as she focuses on power and inequality.

The book is organized around five major rifts within feminist, queer, and trans theory: (1) who counts as a "real" woman, (2) who is more oppressed: transgendered people or transsexuals, (3) the question of intelligibility and who counts as a human being, (4) trans and non-trans embodiment, including responses to the surgical altering of bodies, and (5) questions of identities being biologically or socially grounded. Elliot devotes a chapter to each rift. She sandwiches these rifts between an introduction in which she explains the purpose of the book and her own role as a positioned intellectual, and a conclusion in which she reiterates and justifies her purpose for writing the book. The general format for each chapter is to explain the particular rift; give examples as they relate to personal experiences, political consequences, and academic theorizing; and provide strategies for challenging each rift.

Both the author's writing style and the content of her book are refreshing and thoughtfully constructed. The book is written in the first person, a style that allows us to hear the author's voice. Because Elliot asks her readers to enter into a dialogue, she enters that dialogue with them, which is an important component of the book. In using her voice, Elliot also comments on the negative consequences of our actions as academics, particularly in the form of increased transphobia. She includes her own analysis, providing explanations for why she takes a particular stand. She is also willing to challenge and critique established scholars, such as Namaste and Butler. By doing so, she empowers her readers to become more active and critical readers of theory—a main goal of her book.

A colleague once stated that our greatest strengths are our greatest weaknesses. One of the great strengths of Elliot's writing is that she provides in-depth explanations, discussions, and critiques of numerous theoretical works. And while these discussions are

important and educational, they cause the book to drag at times, making the reader wonder if some sections could be shorter. In addition, while Elliot argues that theories should reflect the lives of diverse groups of people, her examples tend to favor transwomen over transmen, and with only a few mentions of diversity by race or class.

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of Elliot's book is that she seems to lump all feminisms together. In Chapter One, she discusses how transsexuals present a challenge to "mainstream feminists." But what are mainstream feminists? Are they radical feminists, liberal feminists, third or fourth wave feminists, multiracial feminists? In 2011, is there still some monolithic form called "mainstream feminism"? Elliot's book begs the question as to whether different types of feminisms theorize differently about trans issues. Perhaps taking up this topic will be some other scholar's project, but readers would have benefited from a clearer notion of which feminism Elliot was critiquing.

Despite these shortcomings, Elliot's book puts transgender and transsexual experiences and theory squarely on some sort of feminist table. After reading this book, feminists of any persuasion will no longer in good conscience be able to omit transsexuals and transgender people, issues, and theory from their own scholarly thoughts and teachings. While readers may not agree with all of Elliot's analyses and critiques, they will find themselves questioning their own analyses and assumptions. As a non-trans feminist researcher, Elliot's writing reinforces my own conviction that ultimately we need to develop theories that are inclusive, promote dignity, and reflect the lived experiences of diverse groups of people. *Debates in Transgender, Queer, and Feminist Theory: Contested Sites* helps us to move solidly in that direction.

Mobile Lives, by **Anthony Elliott** and **John Urry**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010. 188pp. \$47.95 paper. ISBN: 9780415480222.

GEORGE RITZER
University of Maryland
gritzer@umd.edu

There are deep, even fatal, contradictions in this follow-up to, and extension of, John Urry's influential work, *Mobilities* (2007). The goal in *Mobile Lives* is to bring Urry's earlier more macroscopic analysis of mobilities down to the level of everyday life; to subjective and lived experience. This shift connects with co-author Anthony Elliott's well-known interest in that level of analysis, especially from a psychoanalytic perspective. While there are some useful insights in this book, the orientations of the two authors are not well integrated with the result that the book lurches from more micro to more macro discussions. As a result, it does not succeed well in its stated goal. The book also suffers from an inability to decide whether it is an academic or more popular work. Thus, there are highly esoteric chapters, or at least portions of them, on, for example post-Freudian and post-Kleinian theory (pp. 36–41) and the theories of Giddens, Beck and Irigaray (pp. 91–97) on the transformation of intimacy. However, other parts of the book are aimed more at a general, even popular, audience, including Chapter Four on "The Globals and Their Mobilities," Chapter Six, "Consuming to Excess," and Chapter Seven, "Contested Futures."

Because of these inconsistencies, it is difficult to describe what this book is about beyond the goal of bringing mobilities studies down to the micro-level without losing sight of the impact of those macro-level phenomena (for example, to use another concept associated with Urry's work, how "disorganized capitalism" leads to the disorganization of everyday life). One of the ways in which the more micro-level is brought into the discussion is through the use of "fictionalized narratives" at key points in the book. In other places the reader is led to the micro-level by the nature of the theories being deployed.

Perhaps the strongest contribution at the micro-level relates to the role of “miniaturized mobilities”—that is, small, mobile technologies such as smartphones—in shaping individual lives, including the self and identity. These technologies have helped to give us a “portable personhood” (p. 3). As a result, as the authors put it, “the globalization of mobility extends into the core of the self” (p. 3). The self is being reshaped in various ways by increasing mobility including becoming, like the nature of mobile life in general, increasingly short-term and episodic. Miniaturized mobilities enter into the constitution of the self in four ways. First, mobile connectivity leads to a self that is dispersed and adrift. Second, the self is interconnected with a process of continuous coordination of communications and social networks. Third, the self is affected by the strategizing needed to plan travel and to schedule communication with family, friends, and business associates. Finally, as a result of using these technologies, a technological unconscious emerges that leads people to negotiate their social lives “based upon widespread patterns of absence, lack, distance and disconnection” (p. 33). Mobile technologies are also seen as having positive effects in containing anxieties and in maintaining close emotional bonds. However, they also have such negative effects as preoccupation, even obsession, with such technologies, as well as the danger of being engulfed by these technologies, leaving the self “drained and lifeless” (p. 41).

After an early focus on these more micro issues, *Mobile Lives* turns to a series of more macro issues, although the integrative orientation is not completely lost as the book progresses. There is a discussion of networks and the inequalities associated with them. A strong theme here is the need for co-presence even in impersonal and digital networks. There is a useful discussion, influenced by Bourdieu’s work, of the field of “network capital,” as well as of its eight elements (for example, having the appropriate documents and communications systems). Tellingly, while field, the more structural (or macro-) aspect of Bourdieu’s orientation, is important here, the more agential (and micro-) habitus is absent from this

discussion. This reflects bias in the direction of more macro-concerns.

There is then a discussion of the “globals,” a new super elite defined by their great mobility. One of those fictionalized narratives, in this case of the global, is deployed here to good effect. There is a useful, albeit overly jargonized, discussion of the advantages possessed by globals in dealing with the hyper-mobile world including being able to have detached engagements, and having more escape routes and exits from such a world.

The analysis of mobile intimacies offers another fictional narrative of a married couple who live apart most of the time, largely because the husband’s academic job is hundreds of miles from his home. A new kind of intimacy, mobile intimacy, has developed between them and many others, especially those who are globals. This chapter also includes a discussion of mobilizing and global sex, that reads as if it was tacked on to the earlier material.

The book then shifts to a potpourri of issues related to excessive consumption: Dubai, cathedrals of consumption, neoliberalism leading among other things to “addiction” to consumption, and the broad implications of the “casino capitalism” available to elites. Of greatest relevance to the early part of the book are the ideas on the relationship between consumption and designing and re-designing the self as well as the more general point that mobile lives are deeply entangled with consumption.

The final chapter looks to the future in terms of several different scenarios. Its main conclusion is that the mobilities largely fueled by high carbon consumption are insane (the “rich world went mad” [p. 154]) and are unsustainable (“mobile lives may thus be a short interlude” [p. 154]). While Elliott and Urry are clearly right on this, one of the great ironies is that it contradicts and undermines Urry’s case for the mobilities paradigm (summarized in this book on pp. 15–20) as being a new and important approach to the social world. By calling his orientation a new “paradigm,” Urry is according it great status and implying that it will have the staying power of other major sociological paradigms (Ritzer 1980). Based

on the conclusion of this book, the mobilities paradigm also seems to be about to become totally irrelevant even before it has an opportunity to be seriously considered for paradigmatic status.

Reference

Ritzer, George. 1980. *Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science*. Revised Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Democracy Without Decency: Good Citizenship and the War on Poverty, by **William M. Epstein**. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2010. 266pp. \$65.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780271036335.

TORRY DICKINSON
 Kansas State University
 dickins@ksu.edu

What is it like to fly back in time and then to move forward to the present, stopping off at various agencies, state-funded programs, and other service-providing organizations that have fought poverty? A careful reading of William Epstein's book allows one to do just that. It is an exciting journey, one that is full of meaning and social importance. This is an engrossing study for social-change makers, policy and program creators, sociologists, and students from various disciplines. There is a great deal of knowledge to be gained here. And there are many lessons to be learned by those who address inequalities in social services, health care, and education, and by those who work to end the polarization of classes. This book has the potential to change social policy.

By going back to the 1930s and forward through the 1960s and then to the present, Epstein examines all U.S. anti-poverty programs in his sight, from those run by the Office of Economic Opportunity (Upward Bound, Community Action Programs, VISTA, Head Start), Housing and Urban Development (Model Cities), Department of Labor (Job Corps), ADFC and TANF welfare programs, displaced homemaker programs, welfare waiver programs, Social Security, affirmative action, democratic participatory

education programs (the U.S. Cooperative Extension Service and others), and religious and neighborhood-based community organizations. His research question is extremely important: if all these activities have been ongoing, why is there such widespread and entrenched poverty today? More specifically, if the anti-poverty programs had worked, in the year 2000 would we have seen 17 percent of Americans living in poverty (p. 153)?

Epstein looks at selected program evaluations to help explain why poverty has remained a persistent part of life in one of the world's wealthiest nation-states. According to him, class apartheid continued in the United States because anti-poverty programs have been too poorly funded to make an impact, unlike the well-funded and effective G.I. Bill that was passed after World War II. Programs failed to make significant impacts, he writes, and they were poorly designed and evaluated. For one thing, they did not place large numbers of people into newly created jobs. According to Epstein, there were few successes in the seventy-five-year fight against poverty. One notable exception was Kentucky's use of TANF welfare surplus to promote employment by funding education and other employability services (p. 172). But this was not used to create a national model. Just as he found few beneficial programs, the author also found few scholars who have shed light on understanding and ending poverty.

According to Epstein, poverty has endured for one main reason. "Poverty, cultural deprivation, and nagging want endure in the United States because its citizens want it that way" (p. 215). He claims that American citizens from all walks of life, including from the most economically deprived groups in society, have demonstrated a strong agreement about their values. Rather than wanting to create effective programs, most U.S. residents have been stingy and mean-spirited. So it has been more than governmental administrations and powerful businesses that have impeded agencies, programs, and the implementation of equity-focused laws: it has been almost all U.S. citizens. He argues that "[p]ower in the U.S. is largely exercised legitimately with the consent of the masses" (p. 15). And the increasingly homogeneous U.S. population

has bought into the idea that all individuals can become self-sufficient. Inadequate social policies continue to this day because even most low-income people believe that hard work and individual behaviors enable people to move out of poverty.

This argument may help to explain why many U.S. residents have not demanded national health care and the redistribution of income and education resources. From 1935 to 2011, the United States was becoming a hegemonic power, wielding this power, and then creating a post-hegemonic haze. This also might explain why the "haves" did not feel the need to end poverty during these years. As one reads this book, a related question comes to mind: why have huge racial and gender divides managed to survive for 50 years following the U.S. Civil Rights legislation? One wonders how social relations would be today if these civil rights policies had been implemented in a serious way. Particularly because Epstein downplays the importance of cultural divides, the persistence of "race" and gender end up being seen in relation to the persistence of class.

On a methodological level, Epstein looks at classes, but he does not break them down into constellations of stratified ethnic/"racial" and gender groups. He seems to miss groups' ability to see through the government's and business' weak support for anti-poverty programs. He does not catch that disenfranchised residents saw participation in anti-poverty programs to be more than merely sitting as a designated minority on a government- and business-run committee.

Excitement accompanied caution when Model Cities Programs were introduced, something that is not captured in this book. Epstein misses critical program elements that many evaluators failed to track, including the acquisition of survival-related knowledge by disenfranchised groups, and the empowerment of groups on their own terms. Chances to generate and share knowledge need to be redistributed just as much as jobs and income.

The author provides an in-depth analysis of formalistic program and policy considerations as they relate to the United States, but not to other countries. This is evident when he dismisses U.S. participatory action

research and international programs as near-useless endeavors, despite new global connections that have emerged between the global South and North, and despite knowledge acquisition and its influence on U.S. national and community development. Detached role theory is used to explain why U.S. policy is so cruel. The vagaries of the writer's proof raise questions in much the same way that questions are raised by his analysis of program evaluations. Epstein has written a book that should be read and studied by scholars, who may have a chance to help educate policymakers. The critical thinking generated by this book may help form new theoretical, policy, and programmatic perspectives that will help close the gap between classes, ethnic/"racial" groups, and gender and age groups. These new perspectives may help diverse groups as they connect education, work, health, and environmental programs that can create greater equity in the world, including in the United States. Rather than pulling us inward, Epstein's detailed focus on the United States actually draws our attention outward to the larger picture, which becomes etched out before us as we read his book. It becomes clear that U.S. policy-making cannot succeed in a vacuum. Changing the world is a learning process, one that involves intense and sustained democratic engagement. And it will take all of us to do it.

Nicaragua Before Now: Factory Work, Farming, and Fishing in a Low-wage Global Economy, by **Nell Farrell**. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2010. 243pp. \$39.95 paper. ISBN: 9780826346087.

ALESSANDRO BONANNO
Sam Houston State University
soc_aab@shsu.edu

In this interesting book, the social scientist and photographer Nell Farrell analyzes the effects of globalization on the economy and people of Nicaragua. Based on a number of in-depth interviews supported by ethnographic observations and a wealth of artistic photographs, Farrell proposes an account of the effects that the contemporary global neoliberal regime has had on social relations in

this Central American country. The interviews were carried out in 2005 just after the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) was approved, and allow the author to illustrate the everyday lives of local people and the manner in which transnational social relations and neoliberal policies impact them. The book centers on the analysis of four economic sectors: Maquilas, Cattle, Sugar, and Lobster. These are sectors that have been historically important for Nicaragua and represent production systems and products that currently connect it to the global economy. Each of these sections of the book opens with an overview of these sectors' current conditions and historical developments. Chapter introductions are followed by interviews with local actors and ethnographic accounts of their daily existences.

Through her vivid description of the lives of maquila workers, Farrell shows the many contradictions associated with this form of production. For these workers—many of them women—a job in the maquila represents the only alternative to unemployment and a condition that differentiates them from other and less “fortunate” local residents. While undesirable, the low wages and tough working conditions allow local workers to support their families and dream for a better future. Yet, the reality of maquila factories is overwhelmingly harsh as employment is precarious and the future uncertain at best. Subjected to the rough supervision of factory managers, workers face the inevitable consequences of the “race to the bottom” typical of the maquila system. As more favorable conditions become available in other parts of the world, these factories are relocated and jobs lost. Recently, three of the maquila companies operating in the area moved to cheaper Vietnam and Cambodia, leaving 8,000 local maquila workers jobless. Farrell clearly demonstrates that there is neither stability nor a real future for workers in the maquila system.

The chapter on the cattle industry provides an account of the effects of globalization in a rural region. Located in the center of Nicaragua, Matiguas, the area where this portion of the study took place, is a hub of beef and milk production for global markets. Land

was heavily redistributed during the Sandinista administration. But only two decades after the end of that regime, land is largely in the hands of a few large landowners. Indeed, the structure of local agriculture is characterized by a situation in which landless and subsistence peasants represent 70 percent of the local labor force, but control only 3 percent of all land. Agricultural entrepreneurs, on the contrary, represent only 3 percent of the local labor, but control 40 percent of the land. In this highly polarized setting, the major milk buyer is the transnational Parmalat that directs production to local urban markets and international consumption. So heavily dependent on global buyers and markets, the future of the region appears uncertain.

Sugar is produced in the Pacific Northwest. In the second portion of the twentieth century, this fertile land was employed for the monoculture of cotton. This export production was quite successful for large producers but displaced a significant number of small farmers and peasants who became migrant workers, and later fueled the Sandinista movement of the 1980s. The heavy use of pesticides eventually bankrupted the sector and permanently contaminated the soil. When sugar replaced cotton, workers increasingly suffered from chronic kidney insufficiency: a disease that today claims many of the lives of those who cut sugar canes. Farrell skillfully narrates the daily existences of these workers, and we learn of their unwinnable struggles against the uncertainties of the global market and the unforgiving strength of this deadly disease.

Similarly to sugar, lobster production is characterized by the proletarianization of divers, hazardous working conditions, economic uncertainties, and the overexploitation of local natural resources. Controlled by global restaurant chains and retailers, fishing has been increased and industrialized during the last few decades. Now, it requires the use of more sophisticated equipment that permits diving into deeper waters to compensate for overfishing in the shallows. Because divers are contracted by middlemen, their traditionally-learned skills are inadequate for the increasingly sophisticated equipment and techniques, leading to frequent decompression accidents. As a result,

the wages earned are hardly an adequate compensation for the many job-related risks.

Despite the richness of the ethnographic material presented in the book, it is surprising that Farrell carried out her analysis employing almost exclusively a few references from existing literature. A stronger argument could have been generated through a greater use of the rich interviews and field notes. Despite this limitation, the book remains an interesting reading and a good contribution to the literature on the consequences of globalization to developing regions of the world. Its elegant production and photographs surely add to the attractiveness of this publication.

Engaging Social Justice: Critical Studies of 21st Century Social Transformation, edited by **David Fasenfest**. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2009. 350pp. \$144.00 cloth. ISBN: 9789004176546.

SARAN GHATAK
Keene State College
sghatak@keene.edu

Banal as it may sound, these are interesting times for people studying globalization. The euphoria surrounding free trade that marked the 1990s has become much subdued with the economic crises and periodic recessions in the 2000s—especially in the aftermath of the near meltdown of the financial markets in 2008. Lasting stagnation and the fear of economic collapse in parts of the developed world have led to the rethinking of much of conventional political-economic wisdom. While supporters of free-market policies often use the phrase “there is no alternative,” this timely book presents a series of articles on movements and organizations engaged in efforts to provide alternatives to neoliberal globalization.

David Fasenfest’s introductory essay provides a brief historical account of the social background of the contemporary round of globalization. The economic and political framework of Fordism and welfare capitalism that sustained the post-WWII world order began to fray in the 1970s and 80s. The structural changes in the global economy, including deindustrialization in the developed nations, the rise of finance

capitalism, and expansion of international trade led by transnational corporations created the foundation of the present global order. These changes came at significant social and political costs, which have contributed to the rise of a number of popular movements against the capriciousness and rapaciousness of the global economy. Many of these activists and organizations have been involved with the World Social Forum meetings beginning in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 2001.

The first section of the book provides a series of articles on innovations in strategies and techniques of activism in the new century. Melanie Bush and Deborah Little’s article on the pedagogy of social justice and political activism among college students grew out of their own teaching experience. The article discusses the potential of academic practices in promoting social consciousness and civic engagement in the public sphere. Lauren Langman presents a theoretical perspective in understanding global movements that emphasizes the emergence of new forms of political identities, networks, and technologies of collective action challenging the uneven and contradictory development of global capitalism. Victoria Carty shows how developments in information technology have facilitated innovative methods of communication, organization and construction of political identities through a study of the activists associated with MoveOn. Arseniy Gutnik’s article shows the impact of wider social and political forces, whether local, national or international, on HIV/AIDS activist organizations in Ukraine.

The second section continues the discussion with analyses of transnational social movements. Christopher Chase-Dunn and Matheu Kaneshiro finds that stable networks have emerged among activist organizations involved with the World Social Forum. These organizations are linked to one another through their common ties with a set of core movements such as the human rights movement. These have the potential to mobilize across national boundaries on common causes in spite of their organizational differences. Heather Gautney studies the activists, non-governmental organizations and political parties associated with the Globalization Movement and the World Social Forum.

Her research highlights the alliances between and operating principles of these organizations, which deliberately avoid the centralized institutional frameworks and decision-making that characterized many left and right wing political formations in the past. Kristen Hopewell's analysis of transnational advocacy efforts at the World Trade Organization shows an increasing trend of emergence of technical knowledge as the currency of influence. She argues that this process may privilege organizations with more resources and expertise in participating in the debates and discussions on global trade at the cost of others, resulting in the strengthening of the existing structures of inequality of influence and authority within multilateral organizations.

The concluding section focuses specifically on cases from Latin America. Ximena de la Barra and R.A. Dello Buono analyze grass-roots organizational efforts contesting neo-liberal models of economic development in several Latin American nations. They show how these movements have challenged the economic and political dominance of international financial organizations and military regimes through their struggle for legal reform and campaigns of reclaiming natural resources for the people. Victor Figueroa Sepúlveda's article amends and extends Marx's conception of surplus labor with reference to international migration trends and asymmetric integration of migrant labor. Marie Kennedy, Fernando Leiva, and Chris Tilly analyze the electoral victory of reinvigorated leftwing parties in several Latin American nations in the last decade. This "third left" wave is distinguished from the older traditions of guerrilla campaigns and populist movements by its quest for grass-roots decision-making, the cultivation of new political identities, and autonomous political and social development without the revolutionary overthrow of governments. Laura Harguindeguy analyzes the occupation of abandoned factories by workers cooperatives in Argentina leading to the reinvigoration of these enterprises through non-hierarchical organizational practices and collective ownership. Emily Achtenberg analyzes the politics of the Federation of Neighborhood Councils-El Alto (FEJUVE), a coalition of grassroots community organizations, which

played a significant role in Evo Morales' electoral victory in Bolivia. Margaret Cerulo analyzes the efforts by the Zapatistas to gain autonomy from the state and governmental institutions, and their construction of new political subjectivities by establishing institutions and practices of local self-government.

Overall, the articles raise many theoretically compelling and politically relevant questions regarding the global order at the current crossroads of history. It clearly highlights examples of what Susan George called the "thousands of alternatives" to neo-liberal globalization, though discussion of more cases from the developing world beyond Latin America would have been welcome. This volume is an important addition to the literature on social movements, political sociology, globalization, and development studies. It will also be valuable to an audience beyond academia interested in social justice issues.

Through Our Eyes: African American Men's Experiences of Race, Gender, and Violence, by **Gail Garfield**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 250pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813547435.

WAVERLY DUCK
University of Pittsburgh
Wod1@pitt.edu

In *Through Our Eyes: African American Men's Experiences of Race, Gender, and Violence*, Gail Garfield seeks to understand how violence is connected to the masculinity that shapes an African American male's experience from childhood into adulthood. In doing so, she challenges notions of violence and masculinity by placing them within the historical context of African American men's experiences beginning with slavery to the present day. She argues that race, class, and gender, in addition to the intersection of these factors, are all imbued with deep historical and social meanings that have a profound impact on the social lives and identities of African American men. She contends that masculinity and race have a social reality that is unique in shaping the lives of African American men, and that slavery, racial segregation, and race relations in society have special historical significance for those of African descent.

For Garfield, this history must be accounted for in any discussion of African American men's notions of masculinity.

Garfield first connects that masculinity to forms of violence that her subjects experience. Through in-depth interviews with eight African American men, we see the complexity of the violence they deal with and its impact on their views of masculinity. "When agency and social and cultural constraints are in conflict," Garfield writes, "sometimes violence occurs. African American men experience violence as a violation to their physical, personal, and social sense of personhood. These dimensions are reflected in the degrees of disrespect or moral indignation they experience" (p. 24). Garfield explores how these men have interpreted and given meaning to their experiences over time. Through their stories, she shows the mechanisms by which interpretations and meanings change and how they have ultimately influenced her participants' self-perceptions over the life course.

Through Our Eyes uses Athena D. Mutua's concept of "progressive black masculinities," which presents masculinity as a work in progress that changes with age, time, and context. Garfield illustrates how the men in her study search for healthy forms of masculinity—masculinity without violence and conflict—as they struggle with the changing meanings of masculinity and the circumstances in their lives from boyhood to manhood. Specifically, she elucidates the relationship between agency and structure by analyzing the men's lives within a structure that privileges hegemonic masculinity, in this case masculinity that is equated with the aspiration to achieve wealth and social status through physical and interactional dominance. She also explores the difficulties faced by men who attempt to resolve hegemonic masculinity's incompatibility with the opportunity structure in their communities. Her arguments rest on the premise that in American society, men of color have historically been marginalized in their quest for economic fulfillment, which has negatively affected their ability to achieve hegemonic masculinity.

With extensive narratives, Garfield uncovers the race- and class-based discrimination in her participants' daily lives. She

challenges the notions of "color-blind" and "gender-neutral" practices by showing, historically, how the harsh realities of race and hegemonic notions of masculinity have led to the marginalization of black men in America. Three organizing themes shape her data, and also illustrate the uniqueness of her study population. The "Africanlike Persona" illustrates the connection between identity and culture by linking how the men in her study are socially tied to the historical legacy of slavery. Garfield shows how the cultural, political, and economic institution of slavery has shaped the image of blackness that has been an enduring part of black male socialization. The theme of the "Criminal Black Male" goes beyond the degradation and surveillance inherent in American slavery and demonstrates how the image has been perpetuated by both the social and cultural restrictions that shape day-to-day interactions through custom and law. The "Angry Black Male" image is similarly difficult for black men to avoid; it is a stereotype steeped in historical perceptions and assumptions about black men.

By exploring masculinity in historical terms, Garfield goes beyond issues of race and gender to explore sexism, class discrimination, and heterosexism. She presents both the uplifting and the tragic sides of masculinity for these men as they try to become better husbands, fathers, and friends.

Garfield uses her subjects' stories to investigate how they understand their own gender identities, and then examines how that identity—and the identity work they perform to achieve and maintain it—relates to their overall masculine identity and how historic experiences with violence influence their self concept. She reveals that maintaining this identity is a constant struggle. Garfield's writing weaves theory and method together with thick descriptions of strict fathers, the burdens of soldiers' experiences in Vietnam and Korea, domestic violence, and child abuse. She follows Richard, for example, who witnessed his mother stab and kill a drunken neighbor as a child, and then, as an adult in the military, experienced the shipping of dead soldiers back from Vietnam. The narratives are developed by the participants, based on how they see the connection between masculinity and violence.

Garfield develops a portrait of how these men's lives change over time as they progress to a more stable, healthier state of being, and she makes eloquent use of their personal stories to underscore her arguments on gender and racial inequality. Although Garfield relies only on the life histories of eight men, the study is so rich with detailed, informative, and unrestrained personal narratives that it accomplishes its goals by presenting the complex matrix of issues affecting this population. Thus, the story of a single individual, given sufficient historical detail, becomes the story of many men.

This study adds new insights into how a history of violence influences the attitudes and practices of African American men; it argues that these men's conceptions of masculinity differ from mainstream ideals of masculinity and manhood. While the sample size is small, the quality of rich narrative data is strong, especially in identifying various types of thematic masculinities. While the author puts forth the proposition that violence and masculinity are at times interconnected, the study could have added additional layers by exploring how economic marginality over time contributes to this interconnectedness. In addition, a discussion on how economic marginality changes over time (such as post-Jim Crow vs. deindustrialization) would enhance the analysis. Another factor that could have been further explored is how these men are privileged by masculinity, especially in relation to women and other men.

Garfield's study lays the foundation for a more nuanced way of thinking about African American masculinity. The book succeeds by showing readers that masculinity is not static, and that history and personal stories can help us to understand the often overlooked and misunderstood, ever-changing African American male.

Policing Methamphetamine: Narcopolitics in Rural America, by **William Garriott**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2011. 191pp. \$21.00 paper. ISBN: 9780814732403.

KATHERINE BECKETT
University of Washington
kbeckett@uw.edu

Given widespread claims about methamphetamine's devastating impact on rural communities, *Policing Methamphetamine* will likely attract readers from within and outside the academy. But this book does not focus on methamphetamine itself, or the social causes or consequences of its use. Rather, the book examines the transformative effects of *concern* about methamphetamine. Specifically, William Garriott examines how the socio-legal response to methamphetamine has altered the workings of law, the exercise of police power, and the practice of politics in the contemporary United States (p. 2).

Garriott's focus on governance is consistent with his premise that "narcopolitics"—governance through and around narcotics—is "a defining feature of American statecraft in the twentieth century" (p. 6). *Policing Methamphetamine* also rests on the premise that although the U.S. response to methamphetamine is similar to its responses to previous drug threats, methamphetamine is unique. Unlike cocaine and heroin, methamphetamine can be manufactured domestically. In addition, methamphetamine is having a disproportionate impact on predominantly white, rural communities, and at a time when ambivalence about the drug war is pronounced.

Garriott analyzes archival and ethnographic data to trace the response to methamphetamine and analyze its social effects. The fieldwork was conducted in five rural counties in West Virginia, just north of the Shenandoah Valley. To protect the anonymity of his respondents, Garriott calls this conglomeration of jurisdictions "Baker County." "Baker County" is similar to other rural areas impacted by methamphetamine: it is mostly white (though with a growing immigrant population), with relatively low levels of education and high rates of poverty. The

analysis draws on three types of data: records of cases involving methamphetamine; courtroom observations; and interviews with more than one hundred people, including social service professionals, law enforcement officers, teachers, medical personnel, recovering addicts, and everyday residents.

Chapter One provides an overview of global and national trends in methamphetamine use and the war on drugs, past and present. In Chapter Two, Garriott suggests that the response to methamphetamine involves both a repetition of old patterns of enforcement and the introduction of "new trajectories." Because methamphetamine can be manufactured domestically, many new laws regulate the sale of "precursor" chemicals that are used in this process. As a result, where methamphetamine is perceived as a threat, the locus of drug war activity shifts to the local level. To illustrate, Garriott describes how pharmacists and clerks are enlisted to limit the quantity of products sold, and to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate customers. Similarly, state road workers are taught how to discern whether a methamphetamine lab is in operation nearby. Garriott suggests that the anti-methamphetamine effort also expands police power within the field of law enforcement, as the Department of Natural Resources is mobilized to search for signs of methamphetamine production.

In Chapter Three, Garriott suggests that the focus on methamphetamine users incorporates knowledge about addiction into everyday criminal justice practices. Widespread belief in methamphetamine's inherent addictiveness fuels the idea that addicts can no longer be identified in terms of race and class. This, in turn, leads police and others to emphasize the importance of recognizing the physical signs of addiction. And yet the identification of these physical signs is perceived in Baker County to be "insufficient," as addiction could set in before these signs are evident.

Chapter Four examines resulting efforts to identify drug users outside the criminal justice system, in schools, factories and families, primarily through drug testing. Although drug testing technology has spread to hospitals, clinics, and courts, Garriott also documents institutional resistance to testing,

especially in schools. Interestingly, Garriott notes that the failure to adopt widespread testing in schools meant that old enforcement patterns continued to target those at the bottom of the class hierarchy. The chapter thus seems to show that the response to methamphetamine reinforced old patterns more than it introduced "new trajectories."

In Chapter Five, Garriott describes three meth delivery cases that resulted from the work of a regional federal task force. While his analysis of the cases is interesting, it is not clear how these cases were selected or how they compare to the many others that were prosecuted during this time. In the discussion, Garriott suggests that since the state is the only victim in drug cases, the state must prosecute such cases in ways that establish its legitimacy. It does so, he argues, by depicting dealers as a threat to the community. While likely true, this is not a particularly novel insight. Garriott also suggests that in prosecuting possession and drug sales cases, the state is disposing (of waste) and eliminating threats rather than punishing. This strikes me as a highly misleading juxtaposition: drug users and dealers are unquestionably punished, even if they are also perceived as threats and/or waste in need of disposal.

Chapter Six explores a more interesting set of contradictions. Pace Foucault, Garriott's case study suggests that the judicial system increasingly relies on clinical knowledge about addicts and addiction. But contra Foucault, Garriott argues that the work of clinicians has revealed how difficult it is to "cure" addiction. Moreover, the effect of the incorporation of clinical knowledge into the judicial system is not normalization, but rather extended punishment. Indeed, the collection of clinical data justifies heightened surveillance and punishment: clinicians identify not only mitigating circumstances, but also risk factors that predict ongoing criminality and fuel pessimism about addiction.

Garriott's case study is interesting, and ultimately quite sad. While the analysis generates thought-provoking ideas, I was troubled by Garriott's tendency not to contextualize his case study before drawing larger theoretical conclusions. For example, although Garriott's analysis of the importance of clinical knowledge in the judicial

system rings true for West Virginia, clinicians do not play a similar role in the many states in which structured sentencing policies sharply limit judicial discretion and preclude consideration of extra-legal factors. Conversely, his idea that clinical knowledge no longer motivates clinical intervention would not apply in the many jurisdictions in which therapeutic courts now operate. Nonetheless, *Policing Methamphetamine* offers a compelling account of how the response to methamphetamine shapes life in (some) rural communities, and lays the foundation for interesting comparisons of the effects of the drug war in urban and rural areas.

Consumption Challenged: Food in Medialised Everyday Lives, by **Bente Halkier**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 209pp. \$99.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780754674764.

LAUREL GRAHAM
 University of South Florida
 lgraham2@usf.edu

Consumers today find their eating habits questioned and challenged on several grounds including environmental sustainability, safety, and nutritional value. But how do they respond to these everyday warnings? Sociologist Bente Halkier's book *Consumption Challenged: Food in Medialised Everyday Lives* is a welcome addition to the growing literature on food consumption practices and to the nascent body of research on challenged consumption. Through four case studies of Danish food consumers, this book demonstrates the merits of a practice-centered theoretical approach for the purpose of exposing the complexity and diversity of consumer efforts to obtain, prepare, and eat food. The word "medialised" found in the title indicates that food challenges generally reach consumers through the mass media, however, here "media" refers primarily to Danish public health information campaigns and not to the more frequently studied realm of advertising. In any case, media messages are not the book's focal point. Instead, the microscope zooms in on consumers' descriptions of and social interactions around "challenged" cooking and eating activities. In each of the four

substantive chapters (environmental challenges, food risk challenges, challenges of cooking from scratch, and nutritional challenges), Halkier reports on interviews and focus groups carried out with a separate set of Danish consumers. The book is strongest in those passages where the data explode onto the scene to illuminate the personal and social negotiations that mediate food consumption choices and practices.

Conflicting portraits of the consumer as either creative agent or manipulated dupe have long haunted the study of consumer culture. This book circumvents that false dichotomy by viewing performances and practices as complex activities that "strike a balance between the enabling and the conditioning processes" (p. 169). The book's theoretical foundation can be found in the work of Theodore Schatzki (1996) and Alan Warde (2005) who define "integrative practices" as routinized ways of doing and understanding found within a particular slice of social life (e.g., business practices). Integrative practices unite understandings, procedures, and engagements into one socially recognized activity. Throughout the book, Halkier tackles Warde's (2005) suggestion that consumption should be considered one element in many different integrative practices rather than an integrative practice in itself. This leads to a recurring debate about what constitutes an "integrative practice" within the context of challenged food consumption. Integrative practices tend to be stable prioritized elements in everyday life, and because they resist change, they are important to understand, Halkier repeatedly asserts, but the larger upshot is not always clear. For those readers less interested in this theoretical discussion, a more exciting contribution of this book can be found in its exploration of diverse food performances themselves, as these connect to time constraints, family likes and dislikes, financial limitations, ethnic identity, and other factors.

Using data gathered in the late 1990s, each chapter exploits a unique, intelligently chosen sample of women (and some men) within the Danish population. When examining environmental challenges, for instance, the research subjects are young adults who might identify with, feel conflicted about, or reject environmentalist messages. Instead

of pinpointing categories of food consumers or categories of motives/attitudes and other mental constructs, Halkier creates taxonomies that illuminate the consumer performances and negotiations themselves. One consumer is capable of a variety of performances in different interactive moments, she argues, thus throwing into question the cognitivist preoccupation with "attitudes" and "motives" for food choice that dominates the social science literature. Subsequent chapters examine young parents (food risk), the readers of a home cooking magazine (cooking from scratch), and, the most fascinating choice in my view, Pakistani Danes (nutrition). The Pakistani Danes are torn between cooking in ways that reaffirm their ethnic identity and ways that are deemed nutritional by the Danish medical establishment. Here, and in many other moments as well, the author mentions (but does not fully engage) the neo-Foucaultian theoretical constructs surrounding governmentality, even while her case studies can be interpreted as documenting the successes and failures of governmental public health programs in Denmark.

Each chapter establishes an ideal-type for organizing the different responses and reactions people have to particular food challenges. In the chapter on environmental challenges, there are sections on food practices as necessity, as pleasure, as health, and as projects for changing the world. Consumers respond to these challenges either by identifying with them and eating like an environmentalist would, by appropriating parts of the media discourse and rejecting others, or by distancing themselves from environmentalist messages altogether. Halkier is particularly astute at describing the ambivalences that characterize consumer perspectives and responses, and because her focus groups are comprised of subjects' natural peer groups, she is able to draw out these negotiations convincingly. In future research, it would be beneficial to incorporate the concepts of symbolic interactionism and dramaturgy into this type of analysis to further illuminate the micro practices of food performance and risk negotiation.

On the whole, the book succeeds in its mission of transplanting a practice's theoretical framework onto the sociological study of

food consumption. Through a plethora of categorization schemes (sometimes too many), it highlights the complexities of performances around food from the point of view of the actor. Only two bundles of doings, sayings, understandings, procedures, and engagements turn out to meet the definition of an integrative practice: (1) identifying with the environmentalist argument, and (2) cooking from scratch as taken for granted. However, that finding is not the most important contribution of this book, in my view. In fact, in the final pages I was left wondering if the continual emphasis on integrative practices might lead readers to view other types of food performances as inconsequential. For most readers, this book will prove much more valuable for the complexities it unravels regarding social interactions around challenged food consumption. This kind of knowledge is vital, for our capacity to improve human health and to respond intelligently to the climate change crisis will depend significantly on how well we understand the ways people deal with food consumption challenges.

References

- Schatzki, Theodore. 1996. *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Warde, Alan. 2005. "Consumption and the theory of practice." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 5(2):131-54.

Manning Up: How the Rise of Women Has Turned Men into Boys, by **Kay S. Hymowitz**. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2011. 240pp. \$25.99 cloth. ISBN: 9780465018420.

MICHAEL SCHWALBE
North Carolina State University
 michael_schwalbe@ncsu.edu

Adolescent male elephants run amok when there are no mature bulls in the herd to keep them in line. A similar problem has been said to afflict human societies. Without a firm male hand to guide them into clearly defined adult roles, lads become louts and

boys remain guys long after they should have become men.

Robert Bly argued along these lines, invoking traditional cultures rather than elephants, in his book *The Sibling Society* (1997). If young men today are aimless, narcissistic, and unsure of their place in society, Bly said, it is because they are raising themselves, without benefit of adult male wisdom, in a culture rife with schlock and grift. Michael Kimmel's *Guyland* (2008) echoes Bly's theme, though Kimmel does not claim that the wisdom needed to rectify the situation is vested solely in men or to be found in ancient myths. Joining this genre of books on young men failing to grow up is Kay Hymowitz's *Manning Up*.

In Hymowitz's analysis, as in Kimmel's, young men today experience a period of extended adolescence. Whereas once upon a time young men settled down earlier and embraced constructive adult roles as husbands, providers, and fathers, today they remain self-indulgent "preadults" into their late 20s or early 30s. Although the title of Hymowitz's book refers to "men," as if extended adolescence is a universal phenomenon, she is really writing about college-educated white males in the United States. This is much the same group that Kimmel writes about in *Guyland*.

For Kimmel, the problem with guyland is that it fosters sexist, selfish, destructive behavior. For the most part, Hymowitz agrees, though she is less concerned with young men's sexism than with their immaturity. She wants young men to grow up sooner, don the mantle of sober manhood, and become reliable partners for young heterosexual women who want to raise children and have satisfying family lives. But what's the source of the problem? Why don't middle-class white boys morph into Ward Cleaver right out of college?

Hymowitz points to multiple causes. First, there is the economy. She says that the expansion of the knowledge sector has created many new job possibilities, and so young people today need more time to figure out what they want to do. This kind of economic change, she says, has affected both sexes, and it is not necessarily a bad thing if young people take longer to find jobs that are right for them.

Why, then, are young men doing especially badly? Because, Hymowitz argues, birth control and feminism have allowed young women to outcompete them. By delaying childbearing, taking education more seriously, and pursuing their career ambitions more aggressively, women have gotten a leg up on men. While twenty- and thirty-something guys are indulging themselves in an Animal House existence, young women are establishing themselves as competent professionals, making it even tougher for their feckless male age-peers to get good jobs and settle down.

Hymowitz also sees the problem as rooted in culture. Consumerism and pop culture promote narcissism and self-indulgence all around, and this is no boon to anyone's maturity. But the more serious causes of extended male adolescence, Hymowitz alleges, are "loss of the almost universal male life script—manhood defined by marriage and fatherhood" (p. 136) and the "widespread cultural attack on older forms of manhood." Young men thus come of age without understanding what it means to be a man and what is expected of them as men. Hymowitz here sounds like a mash-up of Robert Bly and Harvey Mansfield.

If the only consequence was that young men act like irresponsible frat boys longer than they should, this would be bad enough. But for Hymowitz the bad consequences extend to disruption of the two-parent, married, heterosexual family with children—the kind that most young people still say they want and the kind that, as Hymowitz sees it, best serves the common good. The disruption occurs because young women—emboldened and successful—cannot find equally competent, mature, and reliable male marriage partners, and so, with their biological clocks ticking, they decide to go it alone and become single parents, an arrangement, Hymowitz says, that does not produce the best outcomes for children or society.

If Hymowitz's book sounds like the neo-conservative version of *Guyland*, well, that is probably what one ought to expect from a writer employed by the Manhattan Institute. On the other hand, Hymowitz critiques selfish individualism, excoriates Tucker Max and his sexist ilk, and does not think young women should give up the benefits won by

liberal feminists. It also seems clear that the gender script she would like young men to embrace is one that includes knowing how to deal with women as equals. So there is some distance between Hymowitz and the far-right, turn-back-the-clock crowd.

Sociologists are unlikely, however, to give much credence to Hymowitz's claim that "girls rule" because they are now the numerical majority in college and because there is little or no wage gap between men and women at early career stages. Yes, young men still dominate in high-tech and finance, and, yes, wage gaps emerge later in life but, according to Hymowitz, this is mainly because of women's choices. Sexism as a force that channels women into lower-paying fields, and which affects pay levels in those fields, does not register on Hymowitz's analytic radar.

Hymowitz also seems to confuse pop culture images of powerful women with women having power in the real world. She invokes Xena, Buffy, and the Powerpuff Girls as if they were Census data. The fact of men's continuing near monopoly on institutional power at the highest levels of the economy, government, and the military does not keep Hymowitz from proclaiming, with journalistic cutesiness, that today we live in a "New Girl Order." Actually, no. Some of the young males may be adrift, but the old bulls are still in charge.

Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction, Practices of Global Aid, by **Suzan Ilcan** and **Anita Lacey**. Montreal, CAN: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011. 321pp. \$29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780773538054.

RACHEL SULLIVAN ROBINSON
American University
robinson@american.edu

Suzan Ilcan and Anita Lacey's book introduces readers to the field of global development aid, emphasizing key shifts that occurred during the 1980s in conjunction with the turn to what many would call neoliberalism, and which Ilcan and Lacey refer to as "advanced liberalism." For those already familiar with the field, they will enjoy the sociological attention Ilcan and Lacey give to the modes of governance

associated with different aid regimes. For those new to the field, they will gain an understanding of global development aid through a sociological lens. The "new global aid regime" that emerged in the 1980s and continues into the present locates solutions for poverty in the market, and makes poor individuals responsible for reforming their situation.

Rather than providing relief on an emergency basis, this new regime differs from that which preceded it by giving aid in the name of achieving "development," a supposedly more durable entity that requires the active participation of those it aims to help. Based on the perspective that governmental authorities' tendency to construct "the poor" as a homogeneous entity has negative outcomes, Ilcan and Lacey argue that the new global aid regime fails to improve well-being because, by "viewing poverty as a problem...[it] diverts attention from the social and political relations that generate it" (p. 74). Instead, the true issue, and its solutions, relate to social justice.

To illustrate these arguments, they investigate relationships and processes surrounding development aid in two countries (Namibia and Solomon Islands) and two organizations (Oxfam and USAID). Their analysis is Foucaultian, drawing heavily from Mitchell Dean, and is based on archival research, review of policy documents, and interviews with in-country program staff and community members.

One of the most important contributions of the book is its accounting for the vast number of actors involved in governing the poor: international organizations, regional organizations, states, local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and even communities themselves. As the authors state, "Poverty-reduction efforts are global in reach, but their programs and practices vary among local, national, mezzo, regional, and global settings" (p. 21). By noting that the poor themselves are involved in this governance process, Ilcan and Lacey highlight the complexities of current efforts to reduce poverty. Of particular import is the role of "partnerships"—between organizations, and between organizations and communities—described in Chapter Four, which focuses on USAID. These partnerships,

framed in the language of equal participation, in fact mask power differentials and are part of the process through which individual poor people become responsible for improving their well-being as they "receive encouragement to discover who they are, what they can do for their community and for its members, and how their self-improvement can be thought of as 'empowering'" (p. 84).

Of course, national and international organizations *need* partnerships with local NGOs not only because they allow the contracting-out of service provisions associated with advanced liberalism, but also because such partnerships bring legitimacy to the more distant organizations by demonstrating that local concerns and perspectives have been taken into account. Ilcan and Lacey's observation that such partnerships are a mode of governance is important for anyone studying the developing country context or transnational relationships associated with global aid.

One of the more creative aspects of the book is that its cases consist of different entities—two countries and two organizations—against a backdrop of histories of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency, and the evolution of twentieth-century approaches to reducing poverty. The attention to history provides an important context for understanding contemporary poverty reduction efforts, and while the cases are not selected to be representative of developing countries or development aid providers, they mirror my own observations from time in Namibia (as well as in Senegal, Nigeria, and Malawi) and analysis of the process of aid provision for areas beyond development, including reproductive health, HIV, and population. That said, the authors might have reflected more on how Namibia's particular characteristics (a sparkly, new democracy in 1990 with an exploding AIDS epidemic) brought it into specific types of relationships with international organizations. Their discussion of Solomon Islands, where security became a rationality of governance following conflict, more thoroughly addresses the specificities at play. In addition, there are places in the text where more details from the authors' obviously rich fieldwork and archival research could have been inserted.

The authors hint at the steps that *should* be taken to improve well-being in poor countries, but these ideas do not form a core part of the book. They note the drawbacks of microcredit/microfinance and pro-poor tourism efforts, as well as contradictions inherent in Oxfam's claim to pro-social justice despite emphasizing free trade (and thus, in essence, working within the dominant paradigm). Their solution, stated at various points throughout the book but never deeply examined, is that "grassroots networks consisting of groups of the poor and marginal can better voice their own needs and direct development" (p. 89). Assuming the validity of that claim, a larger but unanswered question looms: is there any role for international organizations in that effort? Many international, national, and local organizations genuinely believe that they *are* helping to facilitate such networks, but poverty continues to exist. In sum, the book provides a helpful background for thinking about such questions, with a demonstration of how sociological concepts of governance can help in identifying both a means to locate answers, and the actual answers themselves.

The Ironies of Citizenship: Naturalization and Integration in Industrialized Countries, by **Thomas Janoski**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 336pp. \$29.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521145411.

DEVORAH KALEKIN-FISHMAN
University of Haifa
 dkalekin@edu.haifa.ac.il

The specter of globalization haunts sociology. In the search for causal explanations of globalizing markets, increasing numbers of global corporations, internationalized legal arrangements, and New Social Movements, some researchers point to an emerging world-without-borders, a world in which states as we know them are disappearing. If that is so, migration, the movement of people and peoples can be read as evidence of far-reaching changes in political configurations. Yet, as the literature has repeatedly shown (Castles and Miller 2009; Joppke 2010; Pitkänen and Kalekin-Fishman 2007),

borders and state sovereignty have deep implications for the fate of migrants and for the makeup of the citizen population. Membership in the UN or in the European Union has not changed the fact that states have unlimited authority to decide what groups are to be allowed to enter their territories and whether they are, or are not, to be integrated. How these mechanisms work has been examined in different ways, and despite an impressive literature on migration as a social process, long-range views of its outcomes are far from consensual. In this book, Thomas Janoski sets out to trace how states with different political histories legislate for migration and for the reception of migrants into the citizenry through naturalization.

Integrating several approaches to the study of immigration, Janoski first follows the history of legislation in eighteen states, hypothesizing that naturalization is likely to be conceived differently in colonizing states and in states that are non-colonizers or "short-term occupiers," in settler states, and in the non-colonizing and non-settler states such as those of Scandinavia. Through a meticulous survey of legislation during the last several centuries, he provides a history of naturalization policies and explores how shifting internal and international contexts affect the extent to which immigrants are enabled to become citizens. Thus, the examination makes clear how the right to naturalization (by residence in a given territory, *jus soli*, or by kinship, *jus sanguinis*) has regularly been manipulated according to prevailing interpretations of economic, military, or demographic ends in given political constellations. Because of Janoski's attention to detail, the case studies highlight not only the similarities between states assigned to each category and the differences between categories, but also the differences between states within each category.

After the examination of "regimes over centuries," Janoski goes on to a quantitative exploration of "politics and institutions over decades" (p. 221 ff.). Using pooled time series and cross-national regression analyses as well as "fixed effects vector decomposition (FEVD)" (p. 222), he is able to demonstrate first of all that the hypothesized division into colonizers, non-colonizers, Norden, and

settler societies is credible. Further, he shows that there is no necessary conjunction between rates of immigration and rates of naturalization. Related as they are to the rigidity of barriers set by state legislation, rates of naturalization are likely to be influenced by subtle shifts in internal political considerations. Indeed, in year-by-year analyses from 1970 to 1989, and from 1990 to 2003 (before and after the fall of the U.S.S.R.), Janoski finds that changes in rates of naturalization can be seen as effects of GDP, as well as of the presence of left and green parties in coalition governments, and of the proportion of women's representation in governing bodies.

Because of the careful documentation, Janoski is able to point to ironies, such as the discovery that colonizers who have oppressed colonials, and settler states (Australia, New Zealand, and the United States) who have mercilessly destroyed indigenous populations, have been more open to naturalization since World War II than non-colonizers (p. 221). Statistical analyses also show that the notion that the United States is one of the states most open to naturalizing immigrants is a myth; it has the lowest naturalization rate of the settler states studied here (p. 248). Ironies emerge as well from the historical case studies. Differences in rates of immigration and naturalization between Germany and Austria can be attributed to Germany's rigid Prussian heritage, on the one hand, and to Austria's traditions from the pre-World War I multi-nationed Austro-Hungarian Empire. Diverse events in the backgrounds of the Netherlands and Belgium are also shown to affect the rates of naturalization in each of these states. In both these cases, the differences are especially interesting because the states cited are geographical neighbors and share a language.

Janoski makes no pretense to having provided decisive solutions to the questions he raises. Building here on his earlier work (Janoski 1990) in which he applied a theoretical approach articulated by Huber and Stephens, here Janoski "incorporates [class and status group struggle through political parties] with a dynamic institutional component invoking state structures and laws with a web of value-based ideological and cultural legitimation" (p. 255). Thus, as he points out,

his work leads to new research questions. There are many possibilities for further developments of the novel statistical analyses deployed here in order to test theories in greater depth. Moreover, there is undoubtedly room for researchers to examine further the roots and operationalization of colonization, occupation, and settlement.

Janoski's book is a *tour de force*; the author demonstrates impressively how it is possible to work with a complex set of sociological principles to further scientific inquiry. He has produced a monograph that is written well, organized clearly, and argued with supreme care. No question but that the blurbs are right. This is an exemplary work that makes a distinctive contribution to a concern central to sociology and to society.

References

- Castles, Stephen and Miller Mark. 2009. *The Age of Migration*, fifth edition. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joppke, Christian. 2010. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Pitkänen, Pirkko and Kalekin-Fishman Deborah. 2007. *Multiple State Membership and Citizenship in the Era of Transnational Migration*. Rotterdam, NLD: Sense Publishers.

The Jihadis' Path to Self-Destruction, by **Nelly Lahoud**. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2010. 285pp. \$55.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780231701808.

SHAHIN GERAMI
San Jose State University
Shahin.gerami@sjsu.edu

This book in five chapters and 285 pages lays the foundation for understanding the historical root of the Jihadis and their closest predecessors, the Kharijites. Nelly Lahoud's main goal is to shed light on the issue of whether Jihadis' ideology will sustain them long enough to grant them their ultimate goal of Islamic caliphate globally. To this end, she poses interrelated queries, to discriminate between the religious philosophy of Islamism and Jihadism in modern political discourse. Are they the same? The second issue

probed is the place of Jihadism within Islamic religious tradition. She interrogates the strongly held and promulgated notion that Islam is inherently violent and Jihadism is its tool (p. xviii). She then seeks answers through painstaking searches of original historical texts, speeches, and blogs.

Lahoud supports her thesis by drawing from the history of the Kharijites who date from the Battle of Siffin (ca. 657 CE). Ali, the prophet's son-in-law and cousin was usurped of his true claim to be the fourth Caliphate by Muawiya, the Syrian ruler. Ali's camp was close to victory when a strategic plan by the other side split his followers over the true rule of the Quran. The strategy worked initially when some denounced Ali for agreeing in arbitration and proceeded to fight him, for no law but the rule (hokum) of Quran is valid. They then became known as the Kharijites (the outsiders). This is an interesting socio-historical event worthy of any massive Hollywood production because it had corrupt rulers, a just side, the cunning strategist, the naïve rebels, and the Kharijites. Their vision of a true Islam negated any attempt at compromise, organizational structure, and inevitable hierarchical structure. Thus the believers became anti-community, which Lahoud argues is the basis of their individualist approach to the Book, with constant splitting in their ranks against anyone who did not believe as they did. Their weapon of choice for separating themselves from, and initiating Jihad, against those who did not believe as they did, was to use the label of takfiri (the unbelievers). It was this uncompromising approach that led to further fractionalization of the Kharijites and finally their demise.

Lahoud claims that current day Jihadis share the same individualistic paradigm that marked the Kharijites and their paradoxical approach leading to their downfall. What feeds the Jihadis' zeal for sacrifice is modern but provokes the same distrust of corrupt rulers and the undesirability of compromise. Lahoud rightly points out that the Jihadis are poorly or even not educated in basic doctrinal principles of Islam. This, she documents, is what separates the Jihadis from Islamists: the Jihadis' penchant for anti-doctrinal literacy separates them from the

Islamists who are more educated in nuances of Islamic precepts.

As she signifies, these young (men) are driven to fight, to kill, and become martyrs before they learn to pray. Consequently, searching for the rule of pure faith, distrust of authority, and disdain for organizational and structural building leads to an individualist approach to the faith. Like the Kharijites, a Jihadi's loyalty is not to his community of comrades but to his God and his covenant as a soldier of God, to fight and to die. In his quest he will "destroy his community if his personal judgment deems it necessary" (p. 253).

Lahoud lays the foundation for us to question once more the corporate global business that has become anti-terrorism to fight only one form of terrorism, namely the Jihadis. By her account the massive infra- and super-structure erected globally is overkill—she implies and I conclude.

Now comes the however, which every reviewer worth their ink should have in their tool box. What could have added a little more pizzazz to the book would have been the recognition that these Jihadis are overwhelmingly young males, and their zeal to fight is partly due to the suffocating anti-youth environment and dim opportunities of the Muslim Middle Eastern countries, as well as the masculine socialization of adventure and risk taking. This explains the lack of Islamic training and especially lack of any interest in Islamic teaching, particularly the very strict catechism promoted by training camp leaders in Afghanistan and even in some Palestinian camps.

While that would have been a nice touch, the following is a more serious theoretical premise: Lahoud's overemphasis on the individualist assumption of the Jihadis. To begin with, though some individualistic ideals have crept into Islamic societies through social media, the Middle Eastern cultures have remained communal and family centered. Therefore, what Lahoud labels as individualist, is the inherent essentialist, anti-establishment rebellion that keeps splitting and finally dies out. The young men who join these and similar social rebellion movements, join because of their affiliation with a group and though in the course of their short life in the rebellion, they may separate

from the original group and label them as takfiri, anticommunist, bourgeois, they have found another group of like-minded comrades and so on. The act of rebellion against your original rebels requires a group affiliation. They do not take to martyrdom singularly. A group, no matter how small, marks the target, provides the support, makes the suicide vest, and finally sings the battle cry.

Despite some minor shortcomings, this book gives us an analytical understanding of Jihad and Jihadism, how terrorism is politically formulated, and how these policies are implemented. We must recommend the book to talking heads, use it in classrooms, and refer it to colleagues to help bring some sanity in what has become a global fear devouring resources and young men.

Surveillance or Security?: The Risks Posed by New Wiretapping Technologies, by **Susan Landau**. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2010. 383pp. \$29.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780262015301.

PHILIP BOYLE

Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
phil.boyle@ncl.ac.uk

Lately, the security of information and communication technology systems has received, and deserves, a great deal of attention. Instances of state-sponsored and industrial espionage, cyber-warfare, and crowd-sourced hacking draw attention to the vulnerability of digital communications systems from even unsophisticated attacks. This situation is alarming given how fundamental these systems have become for contemporary society. Yet what if these vulnerabilities were deliberately engineered in the name of enhancing domestic security? What sorts of direct and indirect risks would this pose? Can we balance these risks with the need for authorities to pursue legitimate aims? Can we get communications security right?

These are the questions addressed by Susan Landau in *Surveillance or Security: The Risks Posed by New Wiretapping Technologies*. "Surveillance" is a broad word that encompasses any effort to collect information about people, events, or processes. As the title suggests, this book is concerned with one

particular form of surveillance: the wiretapping capabilities of U.S. government authorities. At the heart of the matter is the inherent insecurity of digital communications. This insecurity is the result of the way the internet has evolved from an experiment amongst a cadre of computer scientists and engineers to the fundamental communications infrastructure it is today. "Trust was built in, in the sense that the network was a network for research and education, and everyone was viewed as everyone else's friend or colleague" (p. 39). Advances in network security now offer a degree of protection against malicious attacks, but "bolting on security afterward is exceedingly difficult" (p. 63) even if market forces, political inaction, and general apathy did not already counter the uptake of these tools.

Communications security is a policy problem as much as it is a technological problem, and Landau is equally adept at dissecting this as well. Law enforcement and intelligence agencies have long struggled to keep abreast of technological advances, which Landau details in the context of U.S. wiretap policy. A range of initiatives fall within the scope of discussion, but Landau's main critique is with the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) of 1994. CALEA requires that all telecommunications carriers and manufacturers build wiretapping capabilities into communications hardware in order to facilitate real-time surveillance. Originally adopted to address the wiretap challenges posed by mobile phones, the scope of the legislation has progressively broadened to include all forms of internet-based communications.

The central problem Landau identifies is that embedding wiretapping capabilities within physical infrastructures in the name of crime prevention and domestic security generates more risks than it mitigates, particularly given the degree to which contemporary society has come to rely on internet-supported systems. "Wiretapping integrated into a communication network is an architected security breach. An exploitable weakness in a wiretapping system puts society broadly at risk" (p. 234). This is particularly concerning when these vulnerabilities are hardwired into system infrastructures, producing weaknesses that may not be known

until well into the future. "Laws come and go. Installed infrastructure, however, has great longevity" (p. 251). What sort of risks does this pose? The most direct risks include malicious attacks on government agencies, economic institutions, or critical infrastructure. But Landau's concern is much broader than this. For Landau, the danger of CALEA and other like-minded policies granting sweeping powers of surveillance is that they stifle innovation, impede economic development, chill free speech and a free press, infringe upon civil liberties, and ultimately damage the fabric of democracy itself, all of which undermine the security intended to be delivered.

Landau is not advocating against wiretapping, of course; she is clear that the issue is to get wiretapping policy right, not to abolish wiretaps, and the book concludes with a number of principles for doing so. What Landau criticizes are policies that facilitate secret and unaccountable wiretapping, which she argues will inevitably be misused to our collective detriment. Her touchstone for this argument is the unauthorized wiretapping of over 100 Greek politicians in 2004-2005 by unknown sources (widely believed to be U.S. agencies), which demonstrates the misuse that can flow from CALEA-like policies. To this we might add the ongoing media wiretap scandal in the British media, which exemplifies her point that unauthorized wiretaps will eventually erode public trust.

It would be a simplification to say that Landau offers an analysis of the trade-offs between security and privacy. Putting her argument in these terms reconstitutes the same binary that Landau goes beyond. What this book offers is a more nuanced view wherein privacy and security are not mutually exclusive. Instead, privacy is a precondition of security insofar as it is required for strong public and private institutions, a vibrant and innovative marketplace, and strong civic and democratic cultures, all of which are necessary for a robust national security posture. Unauthorized wiretaps and secret surveillance erode these foundations, leaving us impoverished, vulnerable, and insecure in the long run. By advancing these arguments, Landau moves beyond a discussion of the interplay between technology and policy to offer a broad critique

of the unanticipated consequences of government single-mindedness and overreach. The author's primary expertise as a system engineer makes for some technical reading at points for those not versed in computer engineering (though with due warning to the reader), and sociologically-informed readers might wish for more interpretation over factual developments. But the argumentation is accessible and convincing, and will be of interest to anyone interested in science and technology, information systems, public policy, and the burgeoning field of surveillance studies. It ought to be required reading for anyone holding a government office.

The Paradox of Hope: Journeys through a Clinical Borderland, by **Cheryl Mattingly**. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010. 268pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520267350.

Gayle A. Sulik
University at Albany, SUNY
gayle.sulik@gmail.com

The Paradox of Hope, by Cheryl Mattingly, intimately explores the experiences of African American families who are caring for children with severe and chronic health problems and disabilities. Bearing witness to their crises as they navigate the medical system within the specific context of the multicultural urban hospital, Mattingly analyzes hope not only as an existential problem but also as a culturally and structurally situated discursive practice, one that involves deep contemplation about what it means to have a good life and be a good person in the wake of suffering. For those facing serious impairment, hope is a personal practice and an ongoing conversation within the context of interpersonal relationships, the health care system, and the broader culture.

The theoretical-methodological approach Mattingly proposes in this work builds upon her earlier research into the therapeutic practices of occupational therapists. Therapists tried to create "healing dramas" to transform patients' mundane activities in the clinical setting into dramatic moments that represent new possibilities for their futures. Viewing these moments as the seeds

of hope, Mattingly speculates that patients themselves are likely to create meaningful and motivating healing dramas of their own that are more subtle and nuanced than clinical practitioners or scholars may consider. Shifting the gaze from the clinical setting to the lived experiences of patients and families, Mattingly brings a person-centered approach to the foreground, offering snapshots of individual lives to illustrate the strife and changing points of view that affect people as they try to get by in the face of trouble. She theorizes hope in this context as a "border practice" that moves across social spaces and contexts and operates within charged environments marked by differences in race, class, and disease.

To situate the reader, the book opens in the lobby of a clinic, a borderland of its own that serves as a graphic representation of hope as a border activity. The lobby is a space of the "not-yet," where transient encounters bring patients, families, and strangers together in a permeable and seemingly endless state of anticipation, suspense, and uncertainty. It is a place of disquiet where wounds and humanity become more visible. Yet, the harrowing circumstances and dramatic moments within and beyond the lobby have the capacity to foster ties among people who would typically occupy very different social spheres. The tension and distress that mount within circles of care reveal how hope and struggle take on qualities that are personal and communal even as they are shaped by structure, interaction, and personal choices. It is in this lobby, early on, that readers meet a primary character in the story, Andrena, whose presence throughout the book provides a sense of continuity and a narrative thread.

In addition to the personal portraits skillfully intertwined throughout this book, Mattingly's innovative exploration of how hope is cultivated in border zones proposes a "narrative phenomenology of practice" that serves as a theoretical lens (i.e., discursive regimes that are embodied and revealed in everyday practices), and as a methodological device in which stories provide the ground for philosophical inquiry into the human condition. She draws upon three *narrative acts* (e.g., mind reading, storytelling, and emplotment). Then she looks at the discursive level by drawing upon four *healing*

genres as the fabric of social interaction (e.g., the detective story, the battle, the repair job, and most important to families, the transformative journey.) These narrative acts and healing genres demonstrate how people actively work to create hope in the midst of difficulty and misunderstanding in clinical settings and at home.

The Paradox of Hope is based on an extensive multidisciplinary ethnographic study that took place from 1997 to 2009 across three primary sites in Los Angeles. The study involves more than forty families, and more than half of the families were followed for ten years. It considers the perspectives of parents, children, and clinicians, including how they interact and how discursive structures play out in their everyday actions and interactions. The families who participated in the study were all African American and their children had a variety of serious chronic illnesses or disabilities. The story, however, is not about race so much as it is about creating partnerships across race and class divides. As a group, African Americans have faced major health disparities compared to whites. Structurally, the effects of poverty strongly limit access to good health care. And urban healthcare facilities are often underfunded, poorly staffed, and overcrowded. At the same time, the history of the health care system in the United States shapes African American identity vis-à-vis the system itself. When health care professionals do not share the same race or class backgrounds with their patients and their families, as was the case in this study, miscommunications and "othering" may contribute to an erosion of trust in the midst of intense and risky medical situations.

The Paradox of Hope beautifully walks the reader through a narrative phenomenology of practice as well as the clinical settings, family dramas, and mundane events that comprise the territory of suffering. It is an exemplar for anyone interested in documenting and theorizing the complexity of everyday life as deeply rooted in the social and structural. The book takes on additional importance given its subject matter. A discourse of hope dominates technoscientific biomedicine and a broader cultural landscape oriented toward survivorship. To acknowledge hope as a paradox, to

recognize the realities of anguish, despair, and grief, is to give voice to the vicissitudes of life itself.

New York Longshoremen: Class and Power on the Docks, by **William J. Mello**. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2010. 241pp. \$65.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780813034898.

A. J. JACOBS
East Carolina University
drajjacobs@yahoo.com

In his book, *New York Longshoremen: Class and Power on the Docks*, William J. Mello chronicles the plight of New York waterfront dockworkers and the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA), the labor organization which consisted of "approximately seventy local unions on the docks of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and New Jersey (Elizabeth, Jersey City, and Newark), reflecting a highly diverse and segmented workforce" (p. 43). Through his historical-based account, Mello demonstrates how U.S. political economy has never really been pluralist nor devoid of class conflict. Rather, he reveals how national and local elites, working through Congressional Acts, the courts, local officials, the police, and even longshoremen union leadership, have utilized the myth of pluralism to eradicate class conflict from post-War American society. In the process, Mello clearly illustrates how the dominant class has pacified labor (trading wages for control) and ultimately convinced them, and the American masses, that they were on equal footing with management/elites. In addition, he shows how the dominant class' web of false consciousness has served not only to suppress labor power, but to emasculate unions by crafting a collective memory of them as corrupt, violent, and anti-American.

Mello's research draws upon scores of newspaper articles and documents, scholarly literature, oral histories of waterfront activists from the Tamiment labor archives, and interviews with three former longshoremen. While in their preface to the "Working in the Americas" series the editors state that Mello's work follows the theoretical-descriptive approach of Clifford Geertz, his book rather resembles the straightforward "pull no

punches" industrial class analysis of Alvin Gouldner (see his *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* and *Wildcat Strike*). Similar to Gouldner, Mello's writing style is informative, intuitive, and interesting, and thereby accessible to all readers, whether they are scholars, students, or history buffs.

Taking what he calls an "historical perspective" throughout the book, Mello's first chapter delves into the political-economic context for organized labor and class politics on the New York waterfront. Here, he introduces one of the main themes in the text: the existence of structural impediments which have placed strict limits on working-class action, not only on New York dockworkers, but on American labor, in general. "Subsequent chapters focus upon the empirical and historical conditions that served as the basis for power relations on the Port of New York, as well as the nature of resistance and the reform movement initiated during the mid-1930s by left-wing dockworkers" (p. 4). Chapter Two, "Who Controls the Waterfront?" discusses the resurgence of rank-and-file within the ILA during the 1940s, and the resulting class conflicts (wildcat strikes) between the dockworkers and the state and local authorities, and with union leadership. This theme is continued in Chapter Three, "Who Speaks for New York's Dockworkers?" where Mello describes how the conservative elite in the region and in Washington "justified their stringent repressive measures [against insurgent longshoremen] by shrouding their actions in a moral campaign to 'rid the waterfront of its gangster-dominated unions'" (p. 68). These actions were further sanctioned by an anti-communist, national political fervor which was embracing "the McCarthy era red scare" (p. 78).

Next, in Chapter Four, "Port Automation and Control of the Dock Labor Process" Mello examines the ramifications of another push on labor power during the late-1950s: technology. In "The Health and Safety of the Nation," he uncovers how "the limits to working-class action gained national prominence as a result of the 'arsenal of weapons' put forth by the Kennedy Administration" which expanded federal involvement into the dock's labor conflict (p. 153). The result

was a significant enhancement in "the power of the shipping elites and authorities to respond quickly and effectively to the growing work stoppages on the Port of New York" (p. 155). This discussion along with his concluding chapter, "Class and Power: A View from the Docks," indirectly suggests that controlling New York's dockworkers, rather than Reagan's decertifying the Air Traffic Controller's Union, was the launching point for contemporary America's anti-union collective attitudes. Moreover, he concludes that the New York waterfront has become the "global battleground for American labor" and the dockworkers a microcosm of how American workers have become "unwilling participants of 'lean and mean' production schemes. . . that move significant quantities of manufacturing goods across the globe" (p. 201).

While there is much to praise, there are nevertheless, a few criticisms for Mello's book. The first relates to his interviews. He claims his findings are based on three interviews. His mention of this in the introduction leaves the reader anticipating some forthcoming richly-textured commentary from these workers. However, such quotes are essentially non-existent in the text. Finally, this reader would have liked more theoretical/critical analysis and discussion of the larger American labor context evolving out of the Port of New York conflicts. This could have been accomplished in the concluding chapter, which as constituted, is too brief relative to the material covered in the book. Perhaps this was a purposeful attempt by Mello to leave the door ajar for another book.

These comments notwithstanding, Mello's book is recommended reading for those in anthropology, history, political economy, labor studies, and sociology who are interested in social movements, American labor history, and in the disintegration of class conflict in the post-War period.

References

- Gouldner, Alvin. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
 ———. *Wildcat Strike*. Yellow Springs, OH: Anti-och Press.

Science-Mart: Privatizing American Science, by **Philip Mirowski**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011. 454pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674046467.

STEPHEN DIAMOND
Santa Clara University
 sdiamond@scu.edu

In this rich and articulate book, the provocative historian of science Philip Mirowski explores a complex question, namely whether or not the reorganization of the scientific enterprise over the last thirty years has been a success. For Mirowski, the year 1980 was a watershed, as a number of emerging trends in the university lab, the corporate world, and the political arena began to converge. While Mirowski dismisses the claims of some that the Cold War era had been a "golden age" for science as government money flowed freely into university bastions of academic freedom, he nonetheless clearly laments the impact of the changes that have now been widely institutionalized by a neo-liberal counter-revolution against the era of "big science." "What we are living through," Mirowski argues, "is a transnational program for the spread of the neoliberal marketplace of ideas to every nook and cranny of human intellectual discourse" (p. 36).

In particular it is problematic for Mirowski that neo-liberalism wants to "decouple most functions of scientific research from the educational functions to which they had been wedded during much of the twentieth century" (p. 37). His is the story of "the ongoing project to reengineer American universities to become the cash cows of the knowledge economy" (p. 349). Among the critical developments he describes in effective detail is the passage of the Bayh-Dole Act in 1980, which has indeed helped stimulate the rise in importance of intellectual property rights in the academic environment. Mirowski as well as provides an exceptionally sophisticated critique of what might be called the "organic intellectuals" of the capitalist system, including figures like Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman.

The sense of lament is reinforced throughout the book by the introduction into the narrative by Mirowski of a discordantly-stylized

fictional woman scientist, Viridiana Jones. Jones plays for the author a kind of "ideal type" from that mythical Golden Age. Viridiana "knows that money has always been needed to make science, but whoever anticipated that her colleagues would come to take it as axiomatic that science was just another way to make money?" (p. 2). In Mirowski's eyes, Viridiana is the unwitting victim of the neo-liberal assault, led by the hand, so easily it appears, into the "Temple of Mammon."

There can be little doubt though that a new paradigm has taken over the academic environment. Those who have the right skill set and are appropriately opportunistic can become as wealthy as many in the private sector. Those who refuse to play the game have problems. One friend who started out in math and switched to computer science found his career frustrated when he finished his orals and began the search for a thesis advisor at a major research university. One after another faculty member told him that unless his thesis idea could be the basis of a newly funded startup they were not interested. Another friend with a background in biochemistry and physics found herself at the center of a tug of war at a major research university between the bioengineering group that was recruiting her and a computer science group. Since this individual had significant computer skills, the computer scientists were worried the bioengineering group would leave them out of key projects that could lead to venture capital funding.

Indeed, in those fields closely related to the technology boom of the last fifteen years, such as computer science, the wall between the university and the private sector has been all but erased. Stanford and Berkeley, for example, own the fundamental patents underlying the success of companies like Genentech and Google, to the personal benefit of the handful of researchers who participated in their early development and the university as a whole. Indeed, perhaps no institution symbolizes the new era more clearly than Stanford. Its current president, John Hennessy, trained as an electrical engineer and computer scientist, joined the Stanford faculty in 1977 just as the neo-liberal counter-revolution was breaking through the university ramparts. He used a sabbatical

year to found a highly successful technology company that commercialized research he had developed while on the faculty. In addition to running the university, he now finds time to sit on the board of directors of Google and Cisco. Stanford not only aggressively encourages this kind of entrepreneurial effort, it provides significant resources to the surrounding Silicon Valley, including the development of a large industrial park that is now home to Facebook, Hewlett Packard, and numerous law firms, investment firms, and other players in the Valley's success.

But this example tugs at the heart of Mirowski's narrative. Stanford is home as well to a major center of neo-liberal thought, the Hoover Institution, where Milton Friedman spent the latter period of his career. Yet far from a decoupling of the university from the private sector that Mirowski contends is the goal of the neo-liberal agenda, we find a particularly deep-seated partnership between the market and the academy. This partnership stretches back well into the Golden Age when, some have argued, it was really Stanford's role to bring many private sector players to the table with figures from the Department of Defense in order to shape jointly the direction of Cold War science and strategy.

And does Mirowski believe that scientists were ever as naïve about either power or money in American society as he portrays Viridiana Jones to be? Was there an era in which the relationship between the intellectual and surrounding society was not deeply problematic? Certainly the Cold War era was not free of such conflict. In fact, one could argue that the field of science studies itself owes something to efforts like the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964 to recast our understanding of the modern university. The FSM was in part a reaction to the worldview of Clark Kerr, the president of the University of California from 1958 to 1967, and a leading architect of the modern higher education system. As early as 1963 Kerr, certainly no neo-liberal, coined the term "multiversity" and noted in *The Uses of the University* (Harvard 1963) that "the university and segments of industry are becoming more alike. As the university becomes tied into the world of work, the professor—at least

in the natural and in some of the social sciences—takes on the characteristics of an entrepreneur" (p. 90). Kerr's work sparked a response from two key figures at Berkeley, Hal Draper and Mario Savio. Draper's widely circulated essay "The Mind of Clark Kerr" would savage Kerr, noting the irony of promoting the integration of the university with the wider world yet limiting the ability of students to engage in campus political organizing. Savio, in turn, used Draper's work as intellectual capital to give birth to a new era of critical thinking about the university and society.

While I question here the periodization that Mirowski relies upon, nonetheless, in doing so, he provides a powerful and compelling narrative of important trends in the world of science, the university and the wider economy. The book will be of significant value to scholars across numerous disciplines as the institution that sustains them weathers the important changes now underway.

Living in Denial: Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life, by **Kari Marie Norgaard**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011. 279pp. \$25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780262515856.

SAMANTHA MACBRIDE
Columbia University
sm3272@columbia.edu

We all know that citizens and governments of the North are failing to respond to climate change. Year in, year out, Conferences of the Parties fail to yield consensus or concrete plans to curtail developed nations' disproportionate contributions to global warming. In the United States, denial of climate change remains a rhetorically "scientific" position of dissent. Failure to act on materially meaningful policy is seen across the board: in no country have consumption or emissions leveled off. Nations that do implement emissions reduction policies at the national level import resources and energy from nations that do not, displacing effects. The displacement of effects is in fact a rampant and endemic feature of globalization. Direct, secondary and tertiary outcomes of climate change are now crashing, flooding, and generating scarcity among the most vulnerable people of the

world. We have all heard this, we all know it, including those of us who are sociologists. Yet we, sociologists, at times do not want to talk about the subject because it is too overwhelming. We, sociologists, are not really sure about what to do, and we manage to live most of our days comfortably, despite the knowledge that climate change is here and going to get much, much worse. Kari Norgaard's book helps us to understand this condition, and as such makes a huge contribution not only to sociology, but to the collective and urgent challenge that everybody faces today.

Norgaard conducts deep and extensive ethnography among a population in Norway, and on the one hand, is confronted with stark, first-hand evidence of climate change in the marked loss of snow-cover and unseasonal growth of plant species; and on the other, comes from a culture that not only prides itself on thrift and progressive policy, but gave birth to, among other things, the Deep Ecology movement. If one would expect political talk and action in response to global warming anywhere, her choice of study site implies, it would be in Norway. What she finds instead is widespread denial, operating at various levels of consciousness, and articulated in ways that are rich in social significance. As a warm winter with delayed snowfall cuts into cherished traditions of skiing and ice-fishing, threatening the local tourist economy, residents react, if at all, with good-natured resignation or, in a few instances, by producing snow artificially. Absent are expressions of political concern such as protest, electoral pressure, local planning, or general critical dialog in public and private settings.

Norgaard spent a year living in a small town in the mountains of Western Norway in the early 2000s. Involving herself in political groups, voluntary associations, street protest, and social life, she studied the relatively rare instances in which the topic of climate change came up in conversation, noting the emotional and cognitive orientations of speakers in a range of institutional settings. She also conducted a meticulous review of local media content on the subject, and interviewed close to 50 residents. These observations come together in a thick qualitative data set that Norgaard

uses to develop a model of *socially organized denial*.

As Norgaard explains, she wants to understand both *how* and *why* the denial of risks, importance, and need for collective action on global warming takes place. Studying the fleeting moments in which people talk about climate change seriously, Norgaard identifies four core reactions: fear, guilt, helplessness, and crisis of identity. These reactions lend themselves to silent endurance, cultivated distraction, or disassociation via humor or hyper-facticity, because, she argues, the practical organization of the lived social process provides them no alternate purchase. This organization, the social construction of attention and "the normal" that scholars such as Zerubavel have written about, involves two experiential scales: community, and nationhood. Among family, friends, co-workers and even political associates, norms of stoicism, optimism, and conformity squelch expressions of not knowing what to do, and being scared about it. On another level, the narrative of historic, mythic, "little" Norway, where simple folks live traditionally with nature, is discursively mobilized to minimize the country's significant contribution to climate change, assuaging culpability and reinforcing cultural identity.

These are the *hows* of denial, mechanisms that Norgaard painstakingly teases apart to describe, and then skillfully synthesizes across empirical contexts. The *whys* of denial involve hegemony as Gramsci described it, and have to do with the power of those who stand to benefit from keeping political talk among potential dissenters quiet. In this case, the powerful are fossil-fuel and energy-producing sectors, and a state that protects them from national and multilateral regulation. Norgaard discusses Norway's retreat from a position of environmental leadership in national energy policy in the late 1980's, and its turn toward oil development and the internationalization of the climate change issue in the decades that followed. Somewhere between these macro-scale developments and the daily, negotiated practices of discussing and not discussing climate change, hegemonic forces are at work. Here is where Norgaard's otherwise thorough analysis leaves the reader slightly

wanting. Although national-scale policy development and intimate communicative practice have clearly proceeded apace in Norway (and in the counter example of the United States, to which she devotes a chapter), I found myself wanting to know more about the mechanisms of translation from the former sphere to the latter.

Such questions are exceedingly difficult to address, and the importance of Norgaard's work is not seriously diminished by not attending to them. The value of her research is, as she points out, to understand widespread denial of a social fact without historical precedent: the once-preventable, now inevitable anthropogenic alteration of the climate, and consequently the balance of life. Her choice to study denial among the extraordinarily privileged is, as she notes, both strategically urgent and also highly relevant to the understanding of environmental injustice. And perhaps her compassionate, complex, and accessible exegesis of denial without moral condemnation will help open communication on the subject among people everywhere. For, as Norgaard points out, "Somebody has to start talking about it."

Armageddon or Evolution?: The Scientific Method and Escalating World Problems, by **Bernard Phillips**. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2009. 239pp. \$41.95 paper. ISBN: 9781594516078.

ARTHUR S. ALDERSON
Indiana University, Bloomington
aralders@indiana.edu

Reflecting on the arc of the career of C. Wright Mills, Irving Howe (1963) lamented "the sad truth" that his one-time friend "deserved the admirers he won." Howe was referring to the final, pamphleteering phase of Mills' career and to his lionization by characters that Howe found unsavory. As the 1960s wore on, Mills would, of course, go on to win new legions of admirers for Howe to lament. One wonders what Howe would make of *Armageddon or Evolution?* The reader learns from the preface that the book is one in a series edited by the author entitled, "Advancing the Sociological Imagination." One gathers that Bernard Phillips

heads a sort of Mills sect, complete with a manifesto and a web page detailing the history of the group, a biography of Mills, and a "guide to personal evolution." This is all rather unusual, but I am sure the author would have it no other way. Moving reception of Mills firmly into the 1970s, the author takes the charge in *The Sociological Imagination* to link "the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self" (Mills 2000:7) to suggest a therapeutic course in which one unlearns the "stratified or bureaucratic worldview" that generates "increasing personal and social problems" and replaces it with an "interactive or evolutionary scientific method" that will yield "decreasing personal and social problems" (pp. 16–17). In short, I'm not OK, you're not OK, and the world is certainly not OK, largely for the reasons Mills outlined fifty-odd years ago. Unless the vision of the scientific method developed in the book is adopted, Armageddon awaits.

The core argument can be summarized succinctly: Developments of the last few centuries have generated a growing gap between aspirations and fulfillment. This gap is rooted in a "stratified or bureaucratic worldview." It produces a host of new wants, but yields a science, reflective of that worldview, that is incapable of satisfying them and generates an array of ever more threatening externalities. The question thus becomes, "how can we learn to use a broad approach to the scientific method in our everyday lives as a basis for altering our worldview, closing our aspirations-fulfillment gap, and solving personal and social problems" (p. 53)? Sociology holds the key, but sociology, too, is plagued by a stratified or bureaucratic worldview. C. Wright Mills offered a solution. It lies in application of the "sociological imagination."

Having developed his thesis, Phillips draws on *The Wizard of Oz* for inspiration, using the Tin Man (heart), Scarecrow (head), and Cowardly Lion (hand) as organizing ideas for the body of the book. "Heart" involves a commitment to addressing a problem, "head" refers to the scientific concepts necessary for understanding that problem, and "hand" represents the scientific or technical solution to the problem. Three

chapters—heart, head, and hand—follow on each of three topics, personality, social structure, and “the situation.” In each section, the author discusses the conditions necessary for naming a problem, the ideas useful for understanding it, and the action necessary for addressing it. Throughout, Phillips draws on a remarkable range of sources, from Karen Horney, Walt Whitman, and Dr. Phil in Chapter Three, to Paulo Freire, Rudyard Kipling, and Ginchin Funakoshi’s *Twenty Guiding Principles of Karate* in Chapter Eleven. Given the central role the author would have sociology play in resolving the problems that threaten humanity, it is interesting to note that very little sociology produced after the 1970s is referenced in the book. While this may reflect the growing stranglehold of the stratified or bureaucratic worldview on the field, some may nonetheless puzzle at the hold of mid-twentieth-century sociological figures on the author’s thinking.

Considering the influences on the author’s thought provides one important key to understanding the book: The real lodestar of the project is not C. Wright Mills; it is, surprisingly enough, George Lundberg. Indeed, the book can, with little violence, be read as a kinder, gentler (i.e., less angry) restatement of Lundberg’s (1947) *Can Science Save Us?* (For those unfamiliar with the work of the 33rd President of the American Sociological Society, the short answer was, “yes!”) Where Lundberg advocated compulsory education in the scientific method as the last, best hope for humanity, one gets the sense that Phillips is too genial to ever imagine a sociological re-education camp. Over Lundberg, Phillips has two advantages. First, Lundberg was a leader of the “neo-positivists” in sociology. While it is unclear whether Phillips appreciates the gulf separating Lundberg and Mills in this regard, his choice of Mills over Lundberg as figurehead is certainly propitious. It is hard to imagine a commercial press today putting out something like *Can Science Save Us?* in its sociology series, let alone nine volumes under the heading of “Advancing The Positivist Imagination.” Second, Phillips addresses one of the central criticisms made by friendly commentators on Lundberg. Having argued that science can save us, Lundberg offered no account

of *how* science could save us. Phillips offers the sketch of an answer. It is not especially original—largely, as I understand it, “be the change you wish to see”—but there it is nonetheless.

Phillips concludes that his “book is no more than the *dojo* or training hall for evolution-do” (p. 220). The reviewer concludes that Irving Howe’s assessment of the legacy of C. Wright Mills was uncharitable. Lundberg may deserve the admirers he won, but this book does not convince me that Mills did.

References

- Howe, Irving. 1963. “An American Tragedy.” *The New York Review of Books*, September 26, 1:3.
 Lundberg, George A. 1947. *Can Science Save Us?* New York, NY: Longmans, Green, and Co.
 Mills, C. Wright. 2000 [1959]. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

The Labor of Luck: Casino Capitalism in the United States and South Africa, by **Jeffrey Sallaz**. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009. 326pp. \$24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520259492.

TAMMY L. ANDERSON
 University of Delaware, Newark
 tammya@udel.edu

In *The Labor of Luck: Casino Capitalism in the United States and South Africa*, Jeffrey Sallaz offers a much-needed contemporary look at the growing casino industry in the United States and abroad. Since seminal sociological studies of casinos and gambling culture in the 1960s and 1970s, academic attention to the gaming industry has trended heavily to micro-level studies of pathological and addictive gambling. Therefore, Sallaz’s study of casino-based, blackjack dealing in Las Vegas and Johannesburg, South Africa is a welcome return to the more sociological study of gambling.

Sallaz is concerned with the social organization of labor within casinos, especially that of croupiers—e.g., blackjack dealers—since they are the “linchpin” of a casino’s

organizational control. In casinos today, such table games—along with roulette and craps—take a back seat to another more anonymous form of gambling: video lottery terminals or slot machines. Today's blackjack pits are often mere islets surrounded by vast oceans of slots. Yet, Sallaz makes them the focus of his study following the tradition of prior classics on the gambling industry and casino culture. Even though Sallaz does not attend to the work of other casino staff (e.g., waiters, bartenders, clerks, housekeeping and sanitation, security, and management), we can be sympathetic to his study of dealers because they occupy a certain mystique in popular culture and represent the gambler's only "knowable" or human competitor in games of chance.

Sallaz uses a comparative ethnographic approach, at one level, to study the organization of casino work or more specifically blackjack card dealing. He wants to know why card games in Nevada haven't changed in 40 years or more and seeks to offer a "comprehensive study of the constitution of the casino industry on a global scale" (p. 4). This requires Sallaz to find a comparison site, which he locates in Johannesburg, South Africa while occupying a visiting professorship at a local university there. At another level, Sallaz's study is auto-ethnographic, using his employment as a blackjack dealer in both Las Vegas and Johannesburg to execute his study and answer his questions.

Like any other comparative ethnography, Sallaz's task is ambitious and fruitful. While Sallaz sees the "Gold City" casino in Johannesburg as an "exact replica" (p. 16) of his base "Silver State" casino in Las Vegas, he is intrigued to find their organizational styles quite disparate, including seemingly opposing forms of surveillance and organization of dealers' work. In the Las Vegas "Silver State" casino, he notes a dealer-centric model of autonomy operating on trust with management and camaraderie and solidarity with customers. Interactions between dealers, management and customers seem to be mutually rewarding for all parties, but especially dealers who are rewarded for cooperative customer relationships through tips in a spirit of entrepreneurialism. Things are different at the "Gold State" casino in South Africa. There, croupiers are paid a flat wage

and are heavily controlled via centralized surveillance systems and a de-skilling of their work. Sallaz notes that structural and historical factors may explain the divergences in organizational style, including South Africa's racial history of apartheid. This is a novel and valuable discussion, given that attention to such macro-level developments is rare in studies of the leisure industry. Sallaz offers the only discussion I know of regarding race and employment in the casino industry.

Sallaz is at his best describing Las Vegas as a corporate organizational entity offering a unique cultural experience. Chapters Two and Three are the best in his book because they detail the micro-level interactions of dealers and customers and make sense of them from a dealer's perspective. These chapters highlight the auto-ethnographic features of Sallaz's work and showcase his best theoretical contributions. He knows the "labor of luck," dealing cards, very well and has eloquently articulated how their work varies in the two casinos he studied. *The Labor of Luck* also offers an excellent account of the growth of the gaming industry in Nevada and the U.S. government's regulation of it and encounters with organized crime.

Yet even though we can be sympathetic to his focus on table games, Sallaz could have contextualized them with respect to the other gaming activities offered in today's casinos. Sallaz equates table games—like poker and blackjack—with casino capitalism. Instead, the industry is built around many other types of gaming—slots, horse racing, sports betting—as well as other entertainment activities such as shows, dances, live performances, and picnics. Thus, dealers or croupiers are only one type of worker in the industry. There are security officers, service workers who staff restaurants and bars (they make tips too), and cleaning crews and ground maintenance. To what extent does the organization of these forms of labor differ in the casinos Sallaz studied? Do the race-related differences hold here as well? Therefore, making empirical observations and theoretical claims about the casino industry based on table games and those who work at them is problematic. *The Labor of Luck* might better be described as a study of blackjack organization.

When Sallaz moves onto characterizing higher level management patterns and organizational style—see Part II or Chapters Four to Eight—his work becomes less effective. Here, Sallaz privileges Las Vegas as defining casino capitalism today. I would describe it differently. While it is true that places in South Africa and Macau have emulated the Vegas model, other national and global developments in the gaming industry have taken a different path. Consider that gambling establishments provide both local, national, and international entertainment and tourism, targeting divergent audiences. Las Vegas, South Africa, and Macau—the types of casinos Sallaz writes about—are international tourist destinations which seek to provide total holiday experiences. But this sort of model captures only a portion of the contemporary casino industry. More casinos today simply provide locals with a “perceived” opportunity to make a quick buck on an evening out. They do not offer a posh or hedonistic lifestyle or holiday. I wish Sallaz had attended more to this distinction in his text. Again, it might have been best for Sallaz to narrow his objective instead of attempting to offer a “comprehensive study of the global casino industry.”

Finally, an ethnographic study of this scope promises to be of considerable value to students and scholars of qualitative methods. Therefore, I think Sallaz might have given more thought to his Methodological Appendix. He omits fundamental details on his qualitative methodology, which is probably an outcome of editing rather than flaws in research design. For example, Sallaz does not tell us how many hours he spent in each casino or other fieldwork activity, or much about his interviews with respondents. We do not get a clear break down of his informants’ positions in the industry, or their demographic and biographical background. In short, we do not learn much about the very workers whose labor Sallaz seeks to characterize. Moreover, Sallaz unevenly draws on his interview and other data throughout the book. His book reads, at times, more like an account of archival research rather than a comparative auto-ethnography.

Even with these substantive and methodological shortcomings, Sallaz’s work is impressive and is recommended reading

for those interested in organizations, leisure studies and qualitative methodology. Moreover, his pleasant writing style makes the lessons he teaches us even more effective.

Jewish Citizenship in France: The Temptation of Being among One’s Own, by **Dominique Schnapper, Chantal Bordes-Benayoun, and Freddy Raphael**. Translated by Catherine Temerson. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2010. 141pp. \$49.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781412814744.

KATHIE FRIEDMAN
University of Washington
friedman@uw.edu

French citizenship policies increasingly recognize particular ethnic and religious communities, despite the official rhetoric of universal “republican values.” This is making some French Jews anxious. After generations of trying to be acknowledged both as loyal citizens in public space and as Jews, even if non-religious in private life, the turn to identity politics in France has generated insecurity. Whether they will respond by intensifying their specifically Jewish identification in public life or by remaining loyal to universalistic principles of French citizenship is the question the authors of *Jewish Citizenship in France* raise. At the same time, this question serves as the vehicle by which to explore more general changes in contemporary French Jewish identities.

The bulk of *Jewish Citizenship in France* is devoted to the explication and analysis of questionnaires administered between 2004 and 2006 (a time of increased anti-Semitism) to self-identified French Jews in the cities of Paris, Toulouse, and Strasbourg. Dominique Schnapper, Chantal Bordes-Benayoun, and Freddy Raphael were each intimately familiar with the settings through years of previous research. In the late 1970s the authors noted three main types of identification: Jews identified either with religious observance, with the state of Israel, or had an essentially symbolic attachment to Jewish history and culture. Now more than thirty years later, the authors examine the effect of a changed international context and an increasingly “providential” democracy on

French Jewish identities and behaviors. How has state recognition of ethnic and religious particularities in public space affected French Jews (e.g., compensation for the victims of anti-Semitic legislation during the Nazi Occupation, the law on secularity and conspicuous religious symbols, legal recognition of the Armenian genocide of 1915)? Are French Jews tempted by the new multicultural "communitarianism," or faithful to the classic community of French citizenship? Are French Jews as heterogeneous as they were in the 1970s, and are the divisions among them the same?

The book explores these questions in three concise but detailed and data-packed chapters. Chapter One on the political participation of French Jews examines not only voting patterns, but various forms of political expression in civic life, finding that "by and large, though slightly more politicized and very attached to citizenship. . . Jewish citizens differ little from the population as a whole" (p. 32). Like their non-Jewish compatriots, the majority of the 610 French Jews surveyed demonstrated a rejection of political extremes, including leftwing parties. Though the passion for republican values has generally diminished across France during the past few decades, for French Jews specificities remain. That is to say, with rising anti-Semitism, French Jews have lost some confidence in the ability of the Republic to actually protect them.

Chapter Two speaks to the most interesting and significant changes in French Jewish identities over the past thirty years. Whereas the most widespread expression of Jewishness in the 1970s had been the connection with Israel, in the 2000s it is the return to the practice of Judaism. Identification as a Jew has only increased with greater social and political integration in France, in contrast to the predictions of assimilation theory or official republican discourse. This conclusion is reinforced by the finding that the widespread return to religious observance and Jewish identification is accompanied by a significant growth in inter-faith marriage in respondent's families and their close friendships with non-Jews. Attachment to Israel remains more important to the older generation than to the young, and to those who are the most involved in Jewish institutional life.

The authors take care in pointing out that though "the reinterpretation of Judaism in specifically religious terms is an extension of the way in which the Jews of France have lived in the State historically. . . it remains anchored in the civic tradition, which the image of the 'good citizen,' mentioned by the interviewees, tends to affirm" (p. 71). French Jews still trust the "idea of citizenship," but feel insecure about the practice of it, in the face of anti-Semitism and the expression of collective identities in public space by their French contemporaries.

Chapter Three returns to the main question of the book: the temptation of French Jews to withdraw into an exclusive Jewish communitarianism in public life at the expense of the values of French national citizenship. Their findings in this chapter, based on fieldwork in Jewish community organizations, indicate that the reinterpretation of French-Jewish identity as Jewish religious identity has brought traditional religious texts and conservative, if not fundamentalist and superstitious, leaders to the fore of Jewish religious and cultural organizations. Liberal Judaism and modern attitudes towards women and families have been edged out. Yet in 2008, Gilles Bernheim, an advocate of a more religious but still "republican Jewish" model won a landslide election for Chief Rabbi of France. *Jewish Citizenship in France* concludes by positing the coexistence of two categories of Jews in the present and into the future: the new religious republican Jews and the historical secular republican Jews. Apart from the most active community leaders, the majority of French Jews, religious or not, simply desire to receive the genuine application of the universal rights guaranteed by the Republic to all its members, which includes protection from anti-Semitism.

Sociological studies of Jewish life are too few, and fewer still, of contemporary Jewish life and politics in France. *Jewish Citizenship in France* thus fills an important gap in sociology, as well as Jewish Studies. It is methodologically strong, and its translation is for the most part well-done. Its real strength and contribution though is in exposing the increased use of ethnic categories in French public space, despite all official assertions to the contrary, and examining the various repercussions on minority citizens. That

this project can be accomplished without homogenizing or reifying “groups” is a major achievement. This slim volume is recommended to researchers and graduate level-instructors in the fields of ethnic and religious inter-group relations and political sociology, especially concerning post-war Europe and France, though comparisons with the United States will also be interesting.

Homelessness, Housing, and Mental Illness, by **Russell K. Schutt** with **Stephen M. Goldfinger**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011. 376pp. \$49.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674051010.

CRAIG WILLSE
The College of Wooster
 cwills@wooster.edu

A seemingly simple question lies at the heart of *Homelessness, Housing, and Mental Illness*: who knows best what the residents of housing programs need—residents themselves, or the professional staff who oversee them? In the socio-political context of U.S. homeless management—including a punitive social welfare policy culture shaped by notions of deserving and undeserving poor, racialized law-and-order policing that seeks to disappear poor populations in service of post-industrial consumer economies, and decades of political and media representations which pathologize unsheltered populations as unruly animals incapable of self-management—the implications of asking the question, not to mention answering it, are unfortunately profound. Based on two decades of research on an experimental housing program established by the researchers themselves, *Homelessness, Housing, and Mental Illness* looks at a common preference for independent apartments against the realities of the challenges and pleasures of living in group home settings.

Russell K. Schutt and his fellow researchers followed residents of two different types of housing: group homes with a residential staff in which residents played an active role in governance, known as evolving consumer households (ECHs); and independent apartments with no roommates and no onsite

staff, with caseworkers visiting on a regular basis. The project design produced rich opportunities for comparative analyses not only of the two housing approaches, but also of social service “expertise” and residents’ own self-knowledge.

Following a discussion of theoretical approaches to understanding community and social interaction and an historical overview of shifting forms of institutional help, from early asylums to state hospitals to modern shelters, chapters discuss research results through a series of thematic debates on a range of key topics: residential preferences, social relations within residential settings, substance use, mental health, relations with outside community, experiences of self-determination and empowerment in residential settings, and housing loss. In a chapter entitled “Satisfying Wants and Meeting Needs,” Schutt challenges rational choice accounts by examining housing preferences and desires along with perception of needs for support services. While the conclusion may not be shocking—desires and needs changed along with changing living situations—it challenges static and objectifying models in social work and social science, and calls for more nuanced engagement and interpretation. A chapter focused specifically on the mental health needs and experiences of residents thoughtfully explores both medical and sociological models. By considering how experiences of stress and trauma unfolded in the context of housing, Schutt offers a complex and dynamic engagement with both biological and social factors, cautiously concluding, “If a medical model of mental illness interprets mental illness as an immutable barrier to the development of community, the participants in our project showed that model to be lacking. If a sociological model presumes that reducing structural strains will have a parallel effect on mental illness, our participants’ experiences suggest that model misses the mark” (pp. 172–73). While the thoroughness of the research is certainly impressive (if sometimes overwhelming in its detail), more significant perhaps is the conceptual model Schutt offers in his engagement with data drawn from residents. The text avoids a technical abstraction often found in epidemiological studies that seem coldly to forget there are human

experiences of life, vulnerability, and death on the line. But it avoids as well the twinning of pathologization and sanctification that can animate ethnographic accounts of so-called street and shelter life. The text is compassionate without being self-indulgent.

Even as it departs from disciplinary tendencies, *Homelessness, Housing, and Mental Illness* is nonetheless hemmed in by the limits of a sociology of homelessness. Like popular and political accounts, sociology has focused on the mental health statuses of those living without shelter. While Schutt complicates these often lurid depictions, the text still operates within a constrained frame of analysis that relegates social forces and political economy to the background. Schutt challenges pathologization by engaging in meaningful ways with the interests and experiences of program residents, and I think this work would be extended further by a consideration of those social and political contexts. For example, Schutt interrogates the desire for privacy that motivates resistance to the idea of group homes. While this is an understandable response to the invasions of privacy enacted by surveillant social services, not to mention living in public without shelter, there is also a political, economic co-constitution of individualism and private property, traced back at least through Locke. How this supports desires for certain living conditions would be interesting to pursue and would further the anti-pathologizing arguments of *Homelessness, Housing, and Mental Illness* by de-exceptionalizing the residents under study. In other words, how are their experiences representative of forming selves under general conditions of privatized, financialized housing markets? How do populations with access to private housing markets also demonstrate the mismatch between preferences, needs, and experiences? This de-exceptionalizing analysis would then allow for a critical assessment of how social and political depictions of homelessness, as a failed personhood, cast unsheltered populations as unentitled to private space.

Finally, the text misses an opportunity to grapple with the racialized dimensions of homeless management. While most research on housing takes for granted the disproportionate representation of African Americans,

Latino/as, and Natives among street and shelter populations, in fact, not only is housing insecurity shaped by the race hierarchy-building project of privatized housing, but its management is as well. Contemporary homelessness policy—including both quality-of-life policing and more seemingly benevolent chronic homelessness initiatives—responds to race panics over “urban disorder” and its threats to so-called renewal. Furthermore, policy push for independent living programs (referred to as “scatter-site”) has not been motivated by a concern with residents’ preferences, but rather by NIMBYism—neighborhood resistance to sharing space with shelters and housing programs. In its applications, Schutt’s research must inevitably contend with these local unfoldings of a racialized war on the poor.

Players Unleashed!: Modding The Sims and the Culture of Gaming, by **Tanja Sihvonen**. Amsterdam, NL: Amsterdam University Press, 2011. 221pp. \$45.00 paper. ISBN: 9789089642011.

GRAEME KIRKPATRICK
University of Manchester
Graeme.kirkpatrick@manchester.ac.uk

Players Unleashed! is a book about players of *The Sims*, a computer game created by developer Maxis, published by Electronic Arts and often considered to be a simulation of “real life.” Players assume a god-like perspective, steering their characters to perform ordinary tasks in a digital microcosm. Tanja Sihvonen’s study focuses on game modding: the practice of writing additional, unofficial game code, which allows players to modify the appearance of game objects and characters. The resulting “mods” are then circulated among the player community and beyond. Modding is a marginal practice in the sense that only a minority of players actually engage in it, but it is important because many, perhaps most players, enjoy and appreciate its results. Central to Sihvonen’s thesis is that playing a game and modding it are not and never have been thoroughly discrete activities, because in playing a game we necessarily change it and make

it into something its designers could not have anticipated. Having said that, modding is also appreciated by the corporations that manufacture games, since it extends the shelf life of their products.

Sihvonen's book examines the practice of modding primarily from the perspective of the game object, especially the ways in which it supports and encourages players to mod and the effects of modding on it. The book starts out, therefore, with an account of the technical elements that comprise a computer game, with a specific focus on the distinction between its "engine" and other more easily mutable components. This gives us a fresh perspective on the computer game which is too readily understood as a "finished" product, with activities like hacking and modding then seeming to be aberrant or deviant practices. Sihvonen persuades us that the game is inherently open to, even solicits, these kinds of interventions so that the distinction between legitimate play and modding is obscure.

One of the best passages in the book is Sihvonen's discussion of the history of computer games, which draws out the unusual way that the issue of proprietary control has been handled in connection with games, contrasted with other elements in the corporate digital culture. Game companies have had to contend with player creativity from the outset and have been more flexible and creative than, say, the music business or producers of "serious" software when it comes to devising strategies for including players as co-creators of valuable content. Sihvonen examines this in connection with *The Sims* players, showing how the company that owns the game also releases the tools players need to add to the game and change it to their own expressive purposes.

This fresh and illuminating perspective on the game object is a richer understanding of its aesthetic and communicative potentials than we find in much of the extant literature on video games. Sihvonen shows that when players create additional content they do not simply tweak the superficial features of game objects in pursuit of effects that are trivial extensions of a prior narrative context established by the official product. Computer games, she argues, are experiential objects

with no single prescribed modality of engagement—mods work with their components to produce objects that are enjoyed in this fuller sense. Moreover, an important aspect of mods concerns their circulation beyond the game itself to the wider cultures of machinima (the practice of visual storytelling with game characters and environments) and other on-line forums where people play with mods for their own sake. As she puts it, "the relevance of mods is never limited within the in-game world, but they act as vehicles for carrying explicit social and political messages, for instance, by taking part in the negotiations of technological agency, identity and gender" (p.186). This last point is especially important in connection with *The Sims* because it is a game that is widely perceived as being "for" female players. What seems to characterize female modding activity, she concludes, is greater concern with extending the fantasy and role-playing aspects of the game. Her analysis of this, which draws heavily on a clever and interesting analogy with doll houses, effectively highlights the constraining character of the ideology of domestic and suburban space projected by the game and its subversion by modders and players. This dynamic emerges as definitive for much play with *The Sims*.

While she emphasizes the transformative and occasionally subversive effects of player activity, Sihvonen is suitably circumspect about the ultimate significance of this activity. She emphasizes that most players rarely if ever transgress with regard to the game's coding levels. One of the most interesting discussions in the book concerns the idea of "inter-passivity," which is introduced as a counter to the prevailing idea of digital audiences being more autonomous and empowered by the interactivity of new media. Interpassivity is "a transferential relation between the user and the object ('the other'), in which the other not only functions for the user but also employs emotion in the user's or viewer's place" (p.110). Its function is to steer people toward actions they believe are their own but actually are the result of a sense of responsibility they incur through their dealings with the technology. Sihvonen's employment of this idea undercuts the idealistic tenor of much recent analysis

of new media audiences and provides an important sense of balance to her own account of modding.

Players Unleashed! is a valuable addition to the growing literature on computer games and gaming culture. It has important and original arguments to make, especially about the nature of play and its relation to technical activity, player creativity and its limits, and the relation of these activities to gender and identity. It is mostly well written, although the author was let down at the proof-reading stage (there are numerous small errors in the text) and in places theoretical sources are invoked where they actually obscure rather than illuminate Sihvonnen's own points. The latter are invariably useful, and often intriguing and provocative.

Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia, by Dan Slater. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 319pp. \$28.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521165457.

CHIA YOUYE VANG
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
vangcy@uwm.edu

Due to historical regional conflicts and European and Japanese colonialism, political developments in Southeast Asia have indeed been complex. Dan Slater's *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia* examines these shifting regional developments and reveals the fierce struggles that Southeast Asian nations underwent in their post-independence state-building processes. Slater opens up new avenues for historical research while offering bold claims about the tensions that have animated contemporary Southeast Asian states. Comprehensive and comparative, the book uncovers the origins of institutions that channel and facilitate elite collective action. He asks a key question: why are some elites more prone to act collectively in some political systems than other? Throughout the book, he explains the dramatic variations in levels of elite collective action across countries.

Slater argues that contemporary divergence in the elite coalitions underpinning

postcolonial state and regime institutions has been produced largely by historically divergent patterns of *contentious politics*, which he describes as types of internal conflict that have shaped the postcolonial world. He attempts to demonstrate that elite collective action may occur due to violent internal contention as well as international warfare, but only when it takes especially threatening and challenging forms. Specifically, he shows that "when a wide range of elites perceive the danger to their property, privileges, and persons from contentious politics to be endemic and unmanageable under relatively pluralistic political arrangements, they become prone to coalesce in *protection pacts*—broad elite coalitions unified by shared support for heightened state power and tightened authoritarian controls as institutional bulwarks against continued or renewed mass unrest" (p. 5). Although elite politics is rife with factionalism and parochialism, such protection pacts facilitate the simultaneous formation of powerful states, well-organized parties, cohesive militaries, and durable authoritarian regimes. He further contends that World War II unleashed similar defining political dynamics in Southeast Asia as World War I did in Europe. The outcome, on the contrary, is that in Southeast Asia it was more common to see counterrevolution triumph in postwar contentious politics than revolution.

Although Slater uses Southeast Asia as his geopolitical framework, he does not include all Southeast Asian countries. His comparative analysis focuses on Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, South Vietnam, and Thailand in the post-World War II era. The book is arranged into four parts with nine chapters. Part I critiques theoretical works on state-building and democratic transitions. Part II examines the impact of the disruptive effects of colonialism and prewar experiences on the types of conflict Southeast Asian colonies would endure in the postwar period, and compares postwar contentious politics and elite collective action across the geopolitical areas within Slater's focus. He delves deeply into the pathways for political development in Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia at the end of Part II and continues the analysis of democratization struggles in Part III. Part IV reviews

the processes in the remaining four countries and concludes that fragmentation dominated the postcolonial political trajectory of Southeast Asian state-building. He concludes that authoritarian leviathans' capacity to foster and sustain elite collective action varied greatly across countries; and in fact, endemic elite factionalism prevented political institutions from functioning and thus prevented collective action from surfacing as a dominating force.

It should be noted that comparative studies in and of themselves are difficult to accomplish. Although the primary focus of the study is on the postcolonial period, Slater effectively weaves in the diverse local and regional experiences shaped by prewar political struggles. One of the book's strengths is its theoretical analysis; but by the same token, Slater's excessive use of epigraphs, at the beginning of chapters as well as under subheadings, becomes overbearing at times. Additionally, Chapter Eight on "Congruent Cases in Southeast Asia" presents some analytical challenges given the varied histories between Thailand and the postcolonial conditions in Burma, Singapore, and South Vietnam. In particular, the United States' intervention in postcolonial Vietnamese national politics, to some extent, prevented the possibility for elite collective action to emerge that did not align with American interests.

Despite these minor criticisms, Slater succeeds in demonstrating that contentious politics played an instrumental role in political developments in this region, such that they shape how political alliances and rivalries have been and will be defined (p. 276). Thus, this book provides a model for critical comparative analysis and will serve as a valuable resource for those interested in comparative political development histories. Those unfamiliar with the political history of Southeast Asia will find Slater's thoughtful and detailed comparative method helpful, and specialists will appreciate his innovative theoretical approach to understanding the complexity of states' attempts to build durable political regimes.

Consumer Society: Critical Issues and Environmental Consequences, by **Barry Smart**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. 256pp. \$47.95 paper. ISBN: 9781847870506.

MICHAELA DESOUCHEY
Princeton University
desoucey@princeton.edu

In 2006, consumer purchases accounted for 70 percent of the United States' Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Other countries are not far behind. Our modern economy rests on an ideology of consumption. For people in consumer society, shopping not only produces satisfaction, but the things they buy proffer promises of happiness. Consumer "choice" is regarded as an economic driver and an unquestioned virtue, extending beyond the realm of the shopping mall to educational opportunities, health care options, and savings plans. Barry Smart's new book, *Consumer Society: Critical Issues and Environmental Consequences*, aims to dismantle this model and offer alternative explanations for how we think about (and perhaps should think about) consumerism, citizenship, the economy, and our role in the future.

To do this, Smart (at the University of Portsmouth) combines others' theoretical critiques and insights from news articles in both the United States and the United Kingdom. He jumps among Marx, Galbraith, Veblen, Giddens, and other intellectual voices in considering the historical politics of consumption as they inform present-day consumer culture. This book is a compelling read in that it offers a clear synthesis of the ways in which different aspects of consumption have become integrated into the American social, and political, landscape. He addresses the roles of advertising and marketing, the rhetorical power of "consumer choice," the ways products are specifically designed to promote demand (through their planned obsolescence), the power and limits of global branding, and the environmentally damaging impacts of the modern consumption of industrially-produced goods as a way of life. He also presents evidence-based comparisons between the United States and the

United Kingdom in terms of the social experience and consequences of consumerism.

The final sections are called "Consuming Futures" and, like many books of this ilk, offer policy-esque suggestions to change behaviors and create sustainable forms of consuming. One thing I especially liked about this section was that Smart took an eminently sociological perspective and diverged from the "change your light bulb" or "vote with your fork" messages that environmentalists often advocate. In fact, he critiques such individual "buying green" solutions as promoting complacency and instead argues that it is larger social and policy structures that need to evolve. He also warns against relying too heavily on technological innovation to solve climate change issues, saying it may "ameliorate some of the effects of a consumer-driven way of life" but that these are "neutralized by population growth and changes in behavior as consumers feel at liberty to consume more" (p. 211).

Despite some grains of value-neutrality, Smart is definitely inclined toward dichotomizing moralistic concerns about the corrupting effects of consumerism versus interpreting purchases and use of consumer objects as meaningful, and socializing, practices. In fact, moralities of consumption—including those framed in the institutional alternatives Smart offers in the final sections—are specific to time and cultural context, and are mediated by other moralities and power relations.

The book left out a few themes I thought ostensibly germane to Smart's takeaways. For example, I had hoped to read more on social contexts of environmental changes related to consumption, especially regarding the lives of people who labor to make consumer products and their increasing social distance from those who consume them. And, the relationship between consumer culture and growing levels of class inequality is under-examined and yet remains an important area worthy of investigation.

In sum, this book provides an excellent overview of theories, concepts, and issues germane to studies of consumption and consumer culture in the twenty-first century. It provides a nice and timely overview of the history and problems associated with consumer society, as well as a nice (and

welcome) critique of "green washed" initiatives. Smart places a high value on articulating connections to different examples and areas of life influenced by modern consumer culture, from marketing deodorant to economic growth. But *Consumer Society* tends to go broad rather than deep. In some ways, it reads like a "greatest hits" of the ideas of prominent theorists and cultural critics regarding the trials and tribulations of modern society. It is very readable, albeit a bit repetitive at times, and would make an accessible book to use in undergraduate courses in consumption, environmental sociology, and social problems (though its list price is a little high for this audience). The spirit of modern consumerism and attempts to promote alternatives—whether they are through the market or in opposition to it—encourage future studies of their institutional bases, discursive constructions, and mobilizing incentives.

Incivility: The Rude Stranger in Everyday Life, by **Philip Smith, Timothy L. Phillips, and Ryan D. King**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 218 pp. \$30.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521719803.

MARK CALDWELL
 Fordham University
 caldwell@fordham.edu

So deeply do humans care about civility and rudeness that discussions of the subject often give way to a passion less suited to the seminar room than the bear garden. In *Incivility: The Rude Stranger in Everyday Life*, Philip Smith, Timothy L. Phillips, and Ryan D. King enter the carnage armed only with sound sense and a shrewdly devised program of research. Neither weapon will subdue the bears nor rescue their victims, but observers in the stands, interested in the dynamics of the conflict, will find this study most rich and provocative where its results might at first seem—deceptively—underwhelming.

Smith et al. begin by arguing that quantitative studies of rudeness have most often mapped it on the spectrum of criminal behavior, with the offense typically shaping itself as a threat, and the reaction involving some

degree of fear. In this respect, the writers say, the widespread belief that rudeness is a distinctly urban phenomenon appears to have merged with modern perceptions of the city as a place of crime, anomie, and alienation, and led to projects in which students of civil breakdown gravitate toward addicts, and youth gangs, and visible traces of their sociopathic acts—"graffiti, burnt-out cars, empty lots, boarded up buildings, drug needles and so forth" (p. 7)—which, apart from being easy to observe and record, make for convenient correlation with crime and census statistics.

Yet as Smith and colleagues also insist, the classic rude encounter, as most of us experience it, is a faux-pas rather than an instance of hard aggression, and our typical response is less often anxious than annoyed. Someone blunders into you in a crowd, swears loudly within your hearing, spits on the sidewalk, or subjects you to cell-phone maunderings in a crowded elevator; you are likely either to ignore it, respond at most with a dirty look or irked phrase, and then—after a variable period of stewing—get over it. Rudeness is a drama, the authors suggest, that largely rises, takes shape, and ends in the mind of the victim.

In this spirit, their 2005 "Everyday Life Incivility in Australia Survey" (ELIAS) canvassed 1,621 Australian adults contacted by telephone, querying if they had encountered a rude stranger within the past month. If so, they were asked first to characterize the encounter in detail, then were questioned about their demographics, ideas about civility, and attitudes toward crime. Finally they explained how they had coped with the disturbing incident.

By dispensing with a priori categories or any attempt to codify the endlessly disputed "rules" of good manners, ELIAS's design usefully let each respondent establish his or her own center of gravity in this vexed subject. This plants the inquiry squarely in perception, and chimes well with the experience anyone has who engaged in a discussion about manners will realize: what is charming and what is churlish depends on the context and the people caught in it. It is one thing to eat with your hands at McDonald's; at Per Se, it is another. In *Incivility's* jacket photograph, the young woman on the subway is clearly

disgusted that the sprawling young man on her left has fallen asleep, his head lolling on her shoulder. Yet someone else might differ: your feeling of victimhood may be my gateway to bliss.

ELIAS's results and the nuanced interpretations that follow might at first disappoint veterans of the manners wars, particularly those who perceive rudeness as a looming threat to moral and social order. On the whole, Smith, Phillips, and King report, the recipients of rude behavior do not recollect their experiences as apocalyptic. The most frequently reported incidents were having someone push in front of you (p. 25), a disagreeable bodily act (like spitting, littering, or reading pornography in public) (p. 147), or swearing. Nor did the encounters typically occur in classically threatening places like a cul-de-sac at night: 61.8 percent happened "in the process of getting somewhere—roads, footpaths, car parks, etc." (p. 28), and peaked not at night but between 10am and 2pm (p. 89). Such issues of "movement and space management" occurred more than twice as often as annoying bodily gestures and nearly three times as frequently as bad language (p. 30).

Nor, it seems, do the demographics of bad manners entirely conform to beliefs as common among experts as they are in popular opinion. The young were *more* likely to meet with incivility than the old (p. 36); race and ethnicity were negligible factors (p. 37). Gender results were a mixture of the expected (68.2 percent of the rude strangers were male and only 31.2 percent female) (p. 31), and the intriguing: women were more likely than men to *report* rude encounters and react to them fearfully, but the results didn't establish that they actually *experienced* more rudeness during routine activities in public places (pp. 96 and 104).

Further, neither the perpetrators nor the recipients of rude acts meet the expectations of what the authors call the "broken windows" mythos of the crime-ridden urban core. Fear and anger figure to some extent in victims' reactions, but do not dominate, and most respondents coped with relative ease. "The most common reactions to incivility," the writers report, "were self-reported increases in politeness, tolerance and

remonstration" (p. 128). As to the proposition that a vulgar and violent mass media exacerbate fear and resentment of incivility, "the story from the data is all over the place, with bits and pieces of finding and non-finding heading off in various directions" (p. 151).

All in all, there is little in this judicious study or the writers' clear and colloquial analysis to please the gloomy prophet (or for that matter the anarchic cheerleader) of civil catastrophe. The system of manners, it seems, echoes, participates in, and perhaps to some extent even affects serious issues of social morality. But it cannot claim to be the engine driving them. It is more, perhaps, like a clock's escapement mechanism, essential to the machine's functioning, revealing its deeper forces, reacting to them, even delicately governing them—but without dominance.

Global Philadelphia: Immigrant Communities Old and New, edited by **Ayumi Takenaka** and **Mary Johnson Osirim**. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2010. 310pp. \$30.95 paper. ISBN: 9781439900130.

MIMI SELLER
Drexel University
Mimi.sheller@drexel.edu

The title of this book might lead one to think it is about Philadelphia's place in the "global cities" debate, perhaps as a rising star of the creative economy, a hidden hub of global connectivity, or at least a regional semi-periphery in relation to New York. Alternatively, it might be a celebration of the global diversity of the city and its thriving multicultural vibrancy. The opening chapter, then, comes as a shock. Instead of telling the story of a city on the rise, it introduces a city in decline: a shrinking population, loss of economic productivity and employment opportunities, suburbanization, and only a small uptick of the foreign-born population in the last decade or so (the book came out before recent census figures showed slight population growth in the central parts of the city for the first time since the 1940s). The "global" in the title, then, is misleading. It might better have been called *Parochial Philadelphia*.

That said, as a book about how changing patterns of international migration have impacted one city and informed the local ethnic composition of the city's mosaic of old and new immigrant communities, it is a worthwhile collection of historical, sociological, and ethnographic vignettes. The book begins with a statistical and historical overview of Philadelphia's immigrant communities by Ayumi Takenada and Mary Johnson Osirim, which serves as a welcome contextualization for the case-studies that follow. It highlights the growing income disparity between the wealthy and the poor in the city (especially among blacks), the increasing racial diversity of the city (especially the growth in foreign-born black and Latino populations), and the ethnic and socio-economic heterogeneity of the city's foreign-born populations.

The book is divided into three sections. Part I focuses on histories of specific immigrant communities and neighborhoods, including Jewish immigrants to South Philadelphia, Italians in Chestnut Hill, Puerto Ricans in North Philadelphia, and Chinese immigrants in the making of Chinatown. Each chapter gives detailed historical studies of community institutions. Rakhmiel Peltz's fascinating chapter on different periods of Jewish immigration into South Philadelphia (from the late nineteenth century Eastern Europeans, to the Holocaust survivors of the post-World War II period, and the Soviet Jews arriving from the 1970s through the breakup of the Soviet Union into the 1990s) focuses on the role of "hometown" voluntary associations (called *fareins*) and other community cultural institutions in supporting immigrant communities. Joan Saverino's rich discussion of the forgotten history of Italian stone-carvers settled in the Chestnut Hill area of the city, may surprise those readers who associated this neighborhood with its wealthy "WASP" elite. If these chapters emphasize tight-knit community networks and civic associations, the two chapters on Puerto Rican and Chinese enclaves emphasize the shift toward more pan-ethnic working-class neighborhoods, with Puerto Ricans joined by Dominicans, Colombians, Mexicans, and others, and the Chinese community joined by Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian Chinese, as well as a wave

of new migrants from China's Fujian province, adding to the internal diversity of ethnic communities.

Part II focuses on "the critical roles of institutions in the process of immigrant adaptation over time" (p. 17), from German immigrant aid associations, to Irish parochial schools, to issues of access to healthcare among Mexican Philadelphians. Part III focuses on identity formation in transnational contexts, including the Haitian diaspora, new African diasporas, nurses from Kerala, and Cambodians. Overall, the book captures the changing mosaic of small sections and populations of the city, offering intimate portraits of each group based on deep knowledge of specific cases. It depicts the interaction between locally-based urban community institutions and the formation and sustenance of ethnic identities. Garvey Lundy, for example, reminds us of the origin of theories of transnationalism out of the Haitian diaspora, even as they struggle to maintain "unity" and participate in political discourse and activity not only in Philadelphia, but also back in Haiti. Osirim's chapter on the New African Diasporas—those arriving in Philadelphia from Liberia, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, and elsewhere on the African continent—is the most theoretically challenging chapter, deploying migration studies to make sense of the transnational ties of African Philadelphians within the current phase of globalization, with its ease of communication, information, and for some, international travel.

As a teaching volume, especially for undergraduates, *Global Philadelphia* offers a very effective set of case studies, allowing students to explore different issues of ethnicity and urbanization; and those who happen to be in the region can also explore the neighborhoods referred to, as did some members of my own sociology class on race and ethnicity. Although the book claims to be comparative, it is really up to the reader to do the comparisons, as each chapter more or less stands alone. It would have been fruitful if the editors had generated more comparative commentary, perhaps as a conclusion to the volume. While the case-study approach offers rich material on each immigrant community and its history, it mostly avoids delving into questions of inter-ethnic

relations or the problems of racism that have plagued relations between some of the city's native and immigrant communities. Thus, this might serve as a companion to other readings that focus either on racism and conflict in Philadelphia, or those that explore how we overcome our divisions, such as Elijah Anderson's *The Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life*.

A Theory of African American Offending: Race, Racism, and Crime, by **James D. Unnever** and **Shaun L. Gabbidon**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011. 267pp. \$35.95 paper. ISBN: 9780415883580.

FRANÇOIS BONNET
University of Amsterdam
frabonnet@gmail.com

African Americans represent 13 percent of the U.S. population. Yet, they represent half of the murder arrests. Black youth account for 67 percent of all juvenile robbery arrests. By all measures, African Americans are disproportionately engaged in street crime, especially violent crime. James D. Unnever and Shaun L. Gabbidon's timely book opens with a review of criminological theories explaining crime, and concludes that none of them account for the racial disparities in offending—hence the need for an *A Theory of African American Offending*.

The basic premise of their theory is that African Americans share a unique worldview according to which race matters and America is a systematically racist society. African Americans are much more likely than whites to perceive the police as abusive, the war on drugs as a racist enterprise and the death penalty as a modern form of lynching. This makes African Americans more cynical than whites about the criminal justice system. Legal cynicism is a prime determinant of offending; the criminal justice system's lack of legitimacy among African Americans explains why they offend more. Pervasive discrimination and stereotyping weaken the bonds that young African Americans might otherwise form with white-dominated institutions such as the school system or the labor market, in turn facilitating their offending. Some African American parents may also

teach their children to mistrust whites and white institutions (in an effort to prepare them for pervasive racism), which contributes to likelier offending. An epilogue on environmental racism makes the case that African Americans are more likely to see their life-chances hindered by pollution and lead exposure, also contributing to likelier offending. In short, racism causes its victims to offend more.

Given the amount of racism that African Americans endure, Unnever and Gabbidon argue, American society is fortunate that there is not more African American crime. African Americans are extraordinarily resilient, they argue, which explains why such a minority of African Americans actually offend. The authors' theory is conceived to explain much, if not all, of African American offending. They cite many studies in support of each component of their argument, but they offer no empirical test of their theory. Moreover, their emphasis on the uniqueness of African Americans logically prevents them from testing their theory by comparing the African American case with other minorities. It is plausible that the authors' theory is valid to *a certain extent*; but what is the actual variance that it explains? Readers are left to guess, and to wait for further empirical research inspired by their theory.

One may question the idea of an "African American theory of offending." What Unnever and Gabbidon want to show is how the experience of racism leads to more offending. This is a worthy goal. The question is then whether the specific experience of African Americans is different from that of other groups victimized by racism—whether African Americans are *that* unique. Unnever and Gabbidon say yes, except maybe for Native Americans, which is a strange answer: African Americans are either unique, or they are not. As it happens, many groups have been victims of racism and racial oppression. Roma people in Europe have been enslaved for centuries, murdered by the Nazis, and discriminated against on a scale that amply justifies a "Roma theory of offending." As the fourth footnote of the book concedes, Native Americans, regarding their own history of racial oppression, should also have their group-specific theory of offending. Does it mean that each ethnic/racial/social

group should have its own theory of offending? It may be more fruitful to build a theory of how racism fosters crime, and under which conditions victimized groups become more prone to criminal behavior.

But not all groups who are victims of discrimination and heinous violence offend more. One may think of various ethnic groups, but other types of groups can be considered: gays and lesbians may be an example. Is a "gay theory of offending" needed? The book lacks a comparative argument, where the African American case would be systematically contrasted with other cases of victimized minorities, inside and outside the United States. This comparative endeavor may or may not support an argument that African Americans are as exceptional as Unnever and Gabbidon argue; it may or may not support the argument that widespread discrimination and biased law enforcement lead to more offending.

An achievement of *A Theory of African American Offending* is to demonstrate the pervasive extent of racism in the contemporary United States. This book is an efficient reminder that racism matters. The sum of studies, facts and events gathered by Unnever and Gabbidon paints a disturbingly grim (and convincing) picture of how bad the situation has been, *and continues to be*, for African Americans. Another achievement is to bring together hundreds and hundreds of references about race, racism and crime. I have counted about 640 references in the bibliography, which mainly consists of recent, empirical research. The amount of scholarly work to amass and organize such a wealth of references is impressive. Many of these studies are little-known. The book is therefore useful to students of the topic, since it puts together so many studies.

Strategic Alliances: Coalition Building and Social Movements, edited by **Nella Van Dyke** and **Holly J. McCammon**. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. 343pp. \$27.50 paper. ISBN: 9780816667345.

MASSIMILIANO ANDRETTA

University of Pisa
andretta@sp.unipi.it

This book makes an important step forward in analyzing how, when and why social movements' coalitions emerge. Coalition-making is an important strategy for social movements to reach their goals especially under critical circumstances, yet the conditions which facilitate, and the mechanisms through which activists engage in it, are relatively understudied by social movements scholars. The authors in this book deal with this important issue by providing rich empirical evidence on several cases and using both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. All the book is well written and the chapters are very well organized by the editors into four sections, each devoted to one or more factors that facilitate or inhibit coalition formation.

In Part I, Catherine Corrigan-Brown and David Meyer, Larry Isaac, and Dawn Wiest show how pre-existing social ties facilitated the formation of such different coalitions as the Win Without War at the beginning of the last decade, the armed counter-movement coalitions against labor in the late nineteenth century in the United States, and transnational movement coalitions in Asia in 2000. The problem in this section is that the very name of it, social ties, is sometimes underspecified. For instance in the Win Without War coalition, social ties are seen at work, but at the same time ties between leaders are reported to be forged in past protest campaigns; while in the study on Asian transnational coalitions, ties emerged within an international institution like the ASEAN. To what extent can we call those ties "social"?

In Part II, ideological congruence or alignment is found relevant in the merging between the North American trade union federations AFL and CIO in 1955, by Daniel Cornfield and Holly McCammon, and in

transnational feminist coalitions in Eastern Germany shortly after the re-unification, by Katja Guenther, while ideology embedded in organizational logics in the U.S. feminist movement organizations prevented them from forming cross-ethnic and class coalitions, according to Benita Roth. The quantitative analysis provided by Cornfield and McCammon makes clear the process through which progressive policy convergence brought about the merger between the AFL and CIO, but I am still unclear on whether ideology is considered an independent variable or the outcome of the two federations' strategic concerns. Finally, Guenther's analysis seems to be about ideological diffusion rather than ideological congruence.

The chapters devoted to the analysis of broad political influence show how the combination of opportunities' expansion and new threats are crucial to force otherwise competitive individuals and organizations into cooperative coalitions, such as Asian American panethnic coalitions in the United States (Dina Okamoto), and movements/parties coalitions in democratized Latin American countries (Paul Almeida). Brian Obach interestingly demonstrates that what accounts for state opportunities in social movement organizations formation and development may play a crucial role in preventing the formation of inter-movements coalitions, especially cross-policy issues and cross-social classes; finally Mario Diani, Isobel Lindsay, and Derrick Purdue provide an intelligent analysis of how the local political cultures, namely in Bristol and Glasgow in the United Kingdom, may shape different types of coalitions, either a social movement based on shared collective identity and a protest-based style of interest representation, or a mere cooperation between different organizations.

The final chapters specifically try to understand how several factors combine to facilitate or inhibit coalition formation. Thus, Elizabeth Borland's study on the Argentinian women's movement shows how threats associated with the economic crisis, leaders who act as brokers, and ideological alignment have overcome some inter-movement cleavages (ideological, class-based, and generational) but failed to bring about larger cross-movements coalitions; while Ellen

Reese, Christine Petit, and Meyer explain the success of the sudden mobilization of the recent U.S. antiwar movement by underlining how the combination of threats and opportunities (namely President Bush's foreign and domestic policies, and political elites' division) and the strategy of social movement crossovers (leaders who were able to link different SMOs by strategically framing the issue at stake) played a crucial role; and McCammon and Nella Van Dyke propose an interesting review of the literature on social movement coalitions by applying qualitative comparative analysis to the evidence brought by previous studies on this matter, through which they isolated the two most important factors, threats or ideology, among the others generally considered.

The introduction by the editors and the conclusion by Suzanne Staggenborg complete the book, by positing the book's chapters in the broader literature (the former) and by reviewing them and addressing areas for future research (the latter).

I find the book very illuminating and stimulating, and I think it will contribute a lot to future research on coalition formation. Beyond the wise suggestions provided by Staggenborg, I think that future research needs to better specify what accounts for a coalition. For instance, the editors affirm that a coalition "can range from a simple partnership between just two movement groups to a complex network of many social movement organizations" (p. xiv); but some chapters in the book talk about even more complex coalitions which include state and movement actors (Isaac) or oppositional parties and social movements (Almeida), and others focus either on intra-movement coalitions or on inter-movement coalitions or on both, some explore weak coalitions, and one addresses the merging into one organization (even if a federation) such as AFL-CIO. Diani et al. in their chapter provide a distinction between mere coalitions and social movements, and I think further research should go in that direction to distinguish between those and other coalitions. It is not theoretically neutral to deal with one type or another for several reasons: for instance, Obach, Guenther, and Borland point out that the same factors that facilitate intra-movement coalitions (political environment in the first

case, ideology in the second and a combination of factors in the last one) may at the same time inhibit more heterogeneous coalitions. When social movements actors engage in coalition with other types of actors (such as state agencies or actors, or political parties) then it must be specified what is the causal factor (e.g., political opportunities) and what is the outcome (state/movement or party/movement coalitions).

Winds of Change: The Environmental Movement and the Global Development of the Wind Energy Industry, by **Ion Bogdan Vasi**. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011. 256pp. \$49.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780199746927.

MATTHIAS GROSS

Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ, Leipzig
matthias.gross@ufz.de

Unlike in the 1980s and 90s, the environmental movement nowadays receives relatively scant attention from sociologists. So it was certainly refreshing—a hint of skepticism notwithstanding—to find a book by a trained sociologist that discusses the environmental movement (activists, organizations, and institutions) in relation to one of the most pressing issues of our time, namely, how to satisfy the growing energy needs of societies in virtually every corner of the world. The empirical field chosen by Ion Bogdan Vasi in his book *Winds of Change* is wind energy and its transformation into electricity or mechanical power.

Quite frankly, when I read the summary on the book's dustcover, I was skeptical because it stated that the development of wind energy is dependent not only on improvements in technology and on economic factors but, first and foremost, on the efforts of the environmental movement. I thought to myself: how can a scholar claim that the environmental movement, whose influence has been belittled in recent decades, has such power? In my view, and to my surprise, Vasi's answers are clear and convincing. He shows how the environmental movement has indeed been an important driver of market formation and industrial growth in the wind energy

sector, working through various industry and policy channels. The bulk of the book is devoted to tracing four causal strands used by the environmental movement to effect change in the wind energy industry over the last forty years. These are policymakers, consumers, professionals, and international environmental agreements.

Vasi begins his journey with "the big picture," providing an outline of the development of wind energy industries worldwide. Unlike many social movement researchers who have analyzed opportunity structures, advocacy groups, and influences on organizational change via protests or boycotts, Vasi focuses on the impact the environmental movement has had on the emerging wind energy industry. In Vasi's comparison of several countries with similar wind potential, Denmark and Germany stand out as particularly strong in the wind energy sector because the environmental movement also has a strong voice there. Vasi describes the adoption strategies deployed in pro-wind energy policies, including renewable energy feed-in tariffs in Denmark, Germany, and Spain (Chapter Two) and renewable portfolio standards in North America and the United Kingdom (Chapter Three). Chapter Four is especially interesting: here, Vasi shows that over the last 40 years the U.S. environmental movement appears to have had little impact on Federal energy policies but has been able nonetheless to contribute significantly to localized demand for renewable energy. This is exemplified by the decision of many U.S. universities to purchase renewable energy certificates (especially from wind energy sources), accounting for "over 3.1 GW of new renewable energy capacity additions" (p. 140) within a single decade. Vasi then argues that on this level the environmental movement's impact has been achieved mainly through bottom-up approaches, such as student campaigns, though also by providing employers and environmental managers with the resources to push for wind energy purchases. In Chapter Five Vasi goes further. He appears to advocate strategies that could be used by environmental groups to contribute to changes in the energy sector, using detailed examples from North America and Europe of environmental organizations helping to set up wind turbine cooperatives and

supporting alternative wind-farm developers—which, in turn, has encouraged more traditional power plant manufacturers to take up wind turbine production. Although Chapter Five comes across as the most impassioned of Vasi's study, I found myself wishing at times that the lengthy quotes from representatives of different stakeholder groups (including many energy professionals) had been interpreted and theorized more, given that they are not always self-explanatory, as Vasi implicitly seems to suggest. However, this can also be seen as an advantage over more theory-oriented sociological studies: as it stands, Vasi's book is very well-suited to become core reading in courses in environmental and political sociology and related fields. Indeed, I have already added the book to an upcoming course on environmental innovation.

Overall, the most original claim in the book is that in some countries the environmental movement has been able to affect market formation by, on the one hand, fostering the adoption of specific environmental policies and, on the other, influencing consumers' perceptions in order to stimulate demand for new energy products. This in turn, argues Vasi, has also led to changes in attitude within traditional industrial sectors toward more renewable energy generation. *Winds of Change* thus reminds us, happily, that the environmental movement is crucial to our understanding of global transitions to renewable energy sources, the major challenge for the years ahead. It should appeal to scholars across the environmental social sciences, including political sociology and science and technology studies.

Women at Work: Tupperware, Passion Parties, and Beyond, by **L. Susan Williams** and **Michelle Bemiller**. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011. 273 pp. \$58.50 cloth. ISBN: 9781588267207.

SUSAN A. OSTRANDER
 Tufts University
 Susan.ostrander@tufts.edu

"This book is about gender parties: gatherings at which products are sold or made while ideas about culturally appropriate male/female arrangements are constructed"

(p. 1). Gender parties, the book argues, are not only just fun, they are also work and as part of the informal economy they bridge the highly visible and public (masculine) world of economics with the largely invisible private (feminine) world of personal relations. L. Susan Williams and Michelle Bemiller offer the concept of marketplaces of interaction to explain this bridging of the economic and the relational.

Twelve case studies by different authors are presented as evidence. In the broadest sense, Williams and Bemiller want their analysis of gender parties to reveal both gender structures and places where those structures might be challenged. The cases show women "doing gender" as both conformity and resistance (agency) within a (structural) context of gender inequality. The book wants further to explore gender parties as possibilities for women's consciousness-raising and collective action for change.

Studies of U.S. Tupperware, sex toy, designer purse, and gourmet cooking product parties, where women both sell and buy, exemplify what the authors call the party plan economy. Tupperware and Mary Kay Cosmetics promise women the chance to both stay at home and spend time with friends, while at the same time to earn a good income. It turns out not to be the great career opportunity advertised. Economic (market) relationships exist within a web of women's social obligations to one another. Those obligations, as the authors show, contribute to women's own exploitation as well as the exploitation of other women.

Some cases extend to work, which for this reviewer, was beyond what I understood to be the aim of this book and its particular (and original) framework. Much can indeed be learned here about the informal economy and about gendered exploitation from women who do piece work in Eastern Europe, women who work as vendors in the street markets of Brazil, and women who weave at home in Peru. However the thread of the party plan economy applied to these cases, fascinating though they are, seems strained at best. It weakens further when applied to African American women's book clubs where (as the authors say) no products are produced or sold but black culture is developed and preserved. The authors say they

want their analysis to reach "far beyond conventional definitions of gender parties" (p. 101), but they reach too far, extending well beyond their *own* stated definition. While the broad framework of the informal and relational realm of women's work does hold true, this was not the book's intended contribution.

An attempt is made to anchor *Women at Work* through the referencing of the signal contributions of virtually every prominent feminist social scientist in recent decades. We are reminded, to mention just a few, of Connell's gender regimes, Smith's relations of ruling, Collins' intersectionality, Gilligan's ethic of care, and Rich's compulsory heterosexuality. Key established feminist insights are recalled, such as what appears to be leisure is actually work which is trivialized as are the women who do it. At its root, gender is about power not difference. Women do not experience gender all in the same way. While I enjoyed the chance to review these key ideas (since I still teach the sociology of gender but have wandered astray in terms of my latest scholarship), there is simply too much attempted here.

Williams and Bemiller are to be praised for their global perspective spanning region, nationality, race, age, sexuality, and class. Whatever the case of women working in the informal economy, women end up exploited and marginalized—though in different ways and sometimes in part because of their own gendered ties to each other. The idea of examining women's construction of a party plan economy as a way "to escape the constraints of a fully regulated market" (p. 224), except for the corporate-based Mary Kays and Tupperwares, is an interesting project. I just wish the authors had stuck more closely to it.

Is Breast Best?: Taking on the Breastfeeding Experts and the New High Stakes of Motherhood, by **Joan B. Wolf**. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2011. 241pp. \$29.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780814794814.

JACQUELINE H. WOLF

Ohio University
wolfj1@ohio.edu

Public conversations about women's reproductive health in the United States have long been hyperbolic. The current uncompromising debate about abortion is only the latest. Proponents of natural childbirth in the 1970s characterized birth without medical intervention as empowering while its detractors termed it barbaric. Discussions about contraception in the early twentieth century were equally polarizing.

In *Is Breast Best?: Taking on the Breastfeeding Experts and the New High Stakes of Motherhood*, Joan B. Wolf contributes to the ongoing schism by "taking on" breastfeeding advocates in every sense of that antagonistic phrase. Wolf argues that "neoliberal risk culture" exploits the worries inherent in "total motherhood" by exaggerating the value of breastfeeding and ignoring the high costs to mothers who breastfeed. In building her case against the efficacy of breastfeeding, Wolf accuses breastfeeding proponents of many sins including fear mongering, unethical behavior, and "lobbying for their cause with a single-minded zeal that borders on monomania" (p. 139).

Each chapter of Wolf's book expands on a component of her central argument that breastfeeding is inexcusably overvalued to mothers' enormous detriment. The first chapter is a brief history of infant feeding practices in the United States. In the second chapter, Wolf examines select breastfeeding studies (more on that later) and concludes that the evidence for the benefits of breastfeeding in developed countries is overwhelming. Chapter Three explains what Wolf means by neoliberal risk culture, a culture in which individuals are expected to take personal responsibility for their health and, in the case of mothers, the health of their children. In Chapter Four, Wolf defines another phrase she uses throughout her

book, total motherhood, an ideology demanding that mothers devote themselves to eradicating risk from their children's lives no matter how marginal the risk or how costly to mothers the eradication. Chapter Five analyzes and condemns the National Breastfeeding Awareness Campaign (NBAC) sponsored jointly by the Ad Council and the Department of Health and Human Services from 2004 to 2006. A concluding chapter places the effort to encourage breastfeeding in the context of other public health campaigns that invoke the specter of risk, particularly the current campaign to mitigate obesity, a campaign that, like the NBAC, Wolf deems irresponsible.

While Wolf makes some valid arguments, she consistently deploys them to bolster untenable claims. Our culture does presume that health is an individual not a societal responsibility. This unfair presumption implies that health is simply a matter of making sound choices that are available to all. Infant feeding is indeed one of many examples of how inequitable health choices actually are. Today, most mothers of children under the age of one work outside the home. Unlike virtually every other country in the world, the United States does not require employers to offer paid maternity leave. Thus, usually in the first few weeks of an infant's life, according to statistics, most mothers who initiate breastfeeding begin formula feeding as they prepare to return to work. Rather than directing her wrath at a government that refuses to support to new mothers, however, Wolf condemns the public health professionals who promote breastfeeding.

Instead of blaming lack of institutional and social backing for some mothers' difficulties with breastfeeding, Wolf contends that most mothers "find the physical, emotional, and time demands of nursing overwhelming" (p. 32). In other words, mothers commonly find breastfeeding per se to be impossibly challenging. This contention is as indefensible as her charge that the relationship between breastfeeding and health has been overstated. While Wolf has indeed found articles that support this claim, other far more comprehensive studies have come to a different conclusion. A 415-page review by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, of more than 9,000 breastfeeding

studies, concludes that even in our sanitized society a history of breastfeeding is associated with a significantly reduced risk of many diseases.¹ The authors of this review admit that causality cannot be inferred from their findings, a position that Wolf takes repeatedly as she argues that it is the healthy behaviors associated with the decision to breastfeed that likely explain any relationship between human milk and good health. Wolf insists that, except for gastrointestinal infections, scientists have never demonstrated the biological mechanisms in human milk that prevent disease.

She is wrong. Due to her cherry picking of articles, Wolf managed to neglect the array of research that is unraveling the mysteries of the complex, bioactive colloid that is human milk. To take only the example of obesity, scientists discovered several years ago that human milk contains leptin, a previously unknown protein hormone that regulates body weight. In 2009, researchers found four additional hormones affecting food intake regulation and energy balance. Then a 2010 study corroborated this link between breastfeeding and weight by examining sibling pairs, one of whom was breastfed and the other not.² After controlling for factors that might have influenced parents' feeding decisions (the type of confounders in breastfeeding studies that Wolf complains about throughout her book), researchers found that the formula-fed sibling was an average 13 pounds heavier at age 14 than the breastfed sibling. Despite Wolf's repeated claims to the contrary, this is strong evidence that breastfeeding protects against the

development of obesity. Or, to put it in a way that would really rankle Wolf, this is strong evidence that formula feeding is a risk factor for obesity.

In this light, Wolf's rationale for condemning the NBAC collapses. The NBAC portrayed formula feeding as a health risk, a strategy Wolf denounces as "violat[ing] fundamental public health ethics" (p. 113). Yet the public service announcements promoting breastfeeding in television, radio, and print spots from 2004 to 2006 were no more unethical than the 25-year-long Ad Council campaign illustrating the risk of not wearing a seatbelt. Indeed, the fate of the NBAC, designed by the Ad Council and the Department of Health and Human Services under President Clinton and then quashed prematurely under President Bush after the formula industry complained to Tommy Thompson, Bush's secretary of Health and Human Services, suggests that breastfeeding advocates are the ones who have been harangued and censored on a national scale, not formula-feeding mothers.

Breastfeeding rates in the United States are very low. According to the Centers for Disease Control, fewer than 10 percent of babies are exclusively breastfed for the six months recommended by almost every medical organization in the country. We are a formula-feeding culture; even "breastfed" infants tend to consume more formula than human milk in their first year of life. Given that reality, I could not help but wonder throughout this book: What, exactly, is Wolf bellyaching about and why?

¹ Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-Based Practice Center, *Breastfeeding and Maternal and Infant Health Outcomes in Developed Countries*, AHRQ Publication No. 07-E007, April 2007, available online at <http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/brfout/brfout.pdf>.

² Metzger, Molly W. and Thomas W. McDade, "Breastfeeding as Obesity Prevention in the United States: A Sibling Difference Model," *American Journal of Human Biology* 22 (May/June 2010): 291-96.