Michel Agier’s *Managing the Undesirables* is one of several texts that addresses the complex and proliferating humanitarian infrastructure that is increasingly prevalent in regions of the world besieged by violence and displacement, but his work stands out as particularly important and innovative. Agier addresses some of the central questions facing our world today: belonging, personhood, and the ability of those most cut off from political power to speak for themselves and shape their own lives, and he does so in a way that combines passion and keen observation. In doing so, his work should be of interest to a broad range of sociologists who study social inequality and the structures (even those built from the best of intentions) that perpetuate it.

In this volume, Agier explores the concept of humanitarian government, the political apparatus set up during emergency situations that takes responsibility for the life and death of individuals no longer protected adequately by a state. For as Agier shows, a refugee camp is far more than a place of shelters and emergency food aid. They are places in which someone decides who gets plastic sheeting and who does not, who receives food rations and for how long, what social programs should be put into place and who should be in charge of them, and what barriers need to be constructed (barbed wired, armed guards, cinderblock walls) to ostensibly protect those inside but also to protect the local population from incursions of these displaced “undesirables.” Further, these “camps” are hardly temporary shelters; many have existed for decades, taking on the appearance of towns and cities with entrepreneurs setting up small businesses and political elites emerging from the post-flight chaos. And yet, the camp is a hybrid social form, taking the shape of something entirely new from what existed before in the lives of its inhabitants, and as Agier convincingly argues, it exists in a state of exception, outside the bounds of the political and social life that humanitarian law and human rights ostensibly guarantee.

Agier uses his ethnologist’s eye for culture to analyze observations he made during fieldwork in refugee camps in Kenya, Zambia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea between 2000-2007, accessing the camps through Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF; in English, Doctors Without Borders). His affiliation with MSF gave him a level of flexibility and independence (particularly from the United Nations High Commission for Refugees) that allowed him sufficient time in the camps to not only observe humanitarian government at work but also the response of the refugees under its purview. He combines his observations with detailed histories of different migrations, explaining the historical and geographic paths that led different groups of refugees to the camps that he studied.

Agier demonstrates the discursive power that humanitarian organizations have over defining and categorizing the displaced individuals in the camps; defining a person’s status as a refugee leads to acceptance into the camp and the security that brings, but the denial of such status leads to rejection and often deportation back to life-threatening circumstances. Once determined as a refugee, a person’s suffering and vulnerability come to define their place in the camp and the world, with moral hierarchies created around different definitions of vulnerability with different access to resources provided by the humanitarian organization. This process, Agier argues, de-socializes refugees; they lose their individual personhood and either become ahistorical, pitiable masses that the charitable-at-heart seek to keep alive, or potential threats to order and the safety of the non-displaced that must be managed or
removed. In the post-9/11 environment of endless emergency, suspicion and hostility toward the “undesirables” has grown, but Agier shows that even those deemed worthy of pity are just as unwanted.

The ease at which one slips into discourses that define refugees by their suffering is demonstrated in moments where Agier himself falls into this trap, referring without further explanation to the proportion of women and children that make up the population of a camp (as if the lives of adult men are somehow less than those of the women and children, or at least that their suffering does not deserve the same response). And as a reader, it is easy to be overwhelmed by stories of the terrifying violence that many refugees endure. However, Agier sets his work apart from some previous scholarship by also including the ways that refugees speak out and insist upon their social and political personhood even within structures that allow almost no room for such possibilities. Organizing demonstrations to demand plastic sheeting, boycotting or selling food rations, and electing their own representatives to replace those appointed by the humanitarian agency are all ways in which refugees reclaim their personhood. So while Agier shows that the logic of humanitarianism often leads to the de-socialization of refugees, he also shows that de-socialization is not absolute.

The style of analysis and theoretical framing is typical of anthropological work, particularly from European scholars (the French edition was first published in 2008), so those social scientists not familiar or comfortable with somewhat dense theoretical prose and discourse analysis might find the book disappointing. However, the writing is accessible (the translation is excellent) and the ideas are expansive, making this a relevant volume to those not involved in refugee studies. This book is particularly important and provocative to those of us concerned about the state of human rights in this post-9/11, compassion-fatigued world.

The contributors to this edited volume cast a critical eye on the field of housing and urban studies in the contemporary United Kingdom. Their argument in essence is that external economic and political interests have created a market for the purchase and sale of academic knowledge that has fundamentally distorted (i.e., commodified) its quality and production. The contributors set forth their case compellingly, in a series of well-written chapters that address different aspects of the core process. The details are provocative, and the implications extend well beyond the immediate context, into a wide range of academic fields.

Housing and urban studies appeared in the nineteenth century to address the problems of overcrowding, sanitation, and hygiene that arose with the Industrial Revolution. Early practitioners aimed to defend the poor and working classes against the excesses of capitalism. Thus, it is no small irony that in the present day, the field has increasingly abandoned those original goals and become the handmaidens of capital, advancing the interests of the middle and upper classes under banners of redevelopment and regeneration.

The field’s shifting allegiances, a recent and ongoing development, track shifts in the apparatus of funding. Diminishing pools of long-term support (the block grant system) mean that housing and urban researchers now have little choice but to scramble for short-term contracts—from commercial developers and/or the governmental agencies that represent developer interests. These entities seek the legitimating cloaks of academic knowledge, to justify their incursions into “blighted” (working-class and poor) neighborhoods. But even as they seek its legitimating cover, contractors compromise the integrity of academic knowledge by rendering it a product for
purchase and sale. Marketization means that private and public contractors readily influence what will be studied, how it will be studied, and even what researchers will find. The consequences for neutrality and objectivity are clear. Commissioned research “cannot possibly speak from a position of impartiality. It speaks from a political position. Moreover it speaks from a hegemonic neo-liberal political position” (p. 72). Merton’s disinterested scientists have left the room.

This depiction of housing and urban studies in the United Kingdom comes through vividly in the book’s chapters, with alternately sinister and baleful overtones. The antagonists of the narrative appear as conspirators, knowledge police, parasites, and government poodles. Their actions commercialize, undermine, alienate, and distort. Clearly from the point of view of the contributors, commercial and governmental interlopers have exerted a profaning influence on housing and urban studies, one that threatens the heart of the academic enterprise.

The immediate value of this book lies in the attention it calls to the rise of economic and political forces in the field of urban and housing studies in the contemporary United Kingdom. But even greater value may derive from the attention it calls to a more general and global process, reconstituting the university on the whole. Virtually every disciplinary field now is being interrogated for its functional utilities. The celebration of knowledge qua knowledge, held in the bosom of the university, is giving way to the celebration of knowledge in action, part and parcel of everyday life.

The consequences of commodification, while significant, may be less dire than most contributors to this volume seem to anticipate. Universities in the United States have never been as bounded from commercial and policy sectors as universities in the United Kingdom and the Continent. In fact in the United States, ties to the market and state have often been portrayed as mutually enriching partnerships. Even if one resists this glib assessment, the fact remains that U.S. universities are stronger today than ever before, producing more and better graduates and more and better research, regardless of elaborate and longstanding ties to external interests.

Many contributors to this volume may overstate the externality of external interests. Certainly, the boundary between the university and wider society is diminishing. But this is a two-way street. It means not only that the academy opens to society but also that society opens to the academy. We live today in a richly and deeply schooled society.

After all, it was not so long ago that housing and urban studies did not exist as an academic field. It appeared as the university staked a claim to previously untouched cultural territory. And not so long ago, policy makers did not consult housing and urban studies researchers, and public policy did not reflect research findings. They increasingly came to do so as the legitimating authority of academic knowledge grew in stature and significance. And not so long ago, developers and policy makers seldom graduated from universities, much less housing and urban studies programs. More and more they came to do so as university, and even housing and urban studies, degrees become essential certifications of standing.

Perhaps academics have grown docile in the process of knowledge production. But they have grown docile before a society that has itself been thoroughly reconstituted by academic knowledge. This book illuminates important dimensions of this crucial social transformation, and sociologists of many stripes—knowledge, science, higher education, and of course urban—will benefit greatly from reading it.
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The essays collected in this book present an engaging examination of two of the defining aspects of contemporary social and cultural life: mobility and diaspora, and new information and communication technologies. One of the abiding concerns underlying the study of diaspora identity and politics has
been the processes through which relations are constructed, maintained and modified. While the creation and preservation of social relations in general has been a principal preoccupation in social and cultural research for a long time, what is distinctive about the concept and experience of diaspora is its constitution, in particular, the key defining characteristic of deterritorialized social relations that transcend national and cultural boundaries while preserving ties that simultaneously distinguish its members from others within geographic territories, and connect them with others in distant locales. The ways in which these diverse relationships with both physically co-present and distantly-located others contribute to formations of immigrant identity have been theorized and empirically investigated over the past few decades, and the concept of diaspora refined as a result. Developments in communication technologies, on the other hand, have been celebrated, both in academic research and in the popular imagination, as having modified fundamentally our experience of geographic space, and as such, have come to be seen as one of the key markers of contemporary life, in terms of not only enabling us to maintain personal and social relationships across vast distances and continents, but also, through social media, enabling an altogether different kind of sociality, which in turn, is refashioning the internet domain.

Conceived, Andoni Alonso and Pedro J. Oiarzabal claim, “under the framework of the so-called Web 2.0, or social Internet network,” this collection sets out “to analyze the interrelation between diasporas and global communication media from an interdisciplinary perspective” (p. x). The four essays in first part of the book, entitled “Inside-Out the Screen: Diasporas at the Margins of Cyberspace,” explore diverse aspects of the conceptual terrain encompassing diasporic identity formation and the internet and other communication technologies, examining such issues as the relations between diasporic communities and host cultures, migration and telecommunications policies, the notions of online communities, digital diaspora and digital activism. Part Two, entitled “Dialogues Across Cyberspace,” which forms two-thirds of the book, comprises case studies analyzing the complex negotiations that constitute diasporic social, political and cultural experience. The essays in this section cover a range of diasporas: European, Latin American, Asian, African and Afro-Caribbean, and together these analyses tease out the commonalities and divergences between these diasporic formations and how digital technologies enable the re-creation of identities and the development of deterritorialized communities.

One of the book’s main strengths is the wide-ranging, multi-disciplinary analyses that the essays offer. While it is difficult to provide an adequate summary of all the contributions that effectively capture this diversity, the range of diasporas and approaches can perhaps be signalled by looking at a few of the essays. Using as her case study the monitoring of the effects of Hurricane Dean by the Jamaican diaspora, Heather Horst examines the ways in which the diaspora used the facilities offered by a local talk radio station available on the internet, Power 106 FM, to communicate with those at home to and keep tabs on the consequences of the hurricane. She develops the distinction between roots and routes, initially suggested by scholars such as the sociologist Paul Gilroy and the anthropologist James Clifford, to examine, respectively, the diaspora’s negotiations of Jamaican culture through digital media, and the more everyday practices of maintaining links with families and friends. Radhika Gajjala’s piece too, begins with an acknowledgement of the multiple “routes” that characterize South Asian digital formations. Her interest is in tracing the interweaving of the social, the cultural and the economic in the Indian diaspora’s communication landscape, which she achieves in her essay by means of an ethnography (including some auto-ethnography) of her passage through the 3D virtual environment of Second Life, in particular those areas featuring predominantly Indian cultural iconography. Gajjala’s essay is a conceptually imaginative and empirically rich engagement with the idea of virtual communities and the processes that allow creative re-imaginnings of diasporic identities.

Brenda Chan attempts to tackle the question of whether an online diasporic public sphere leads to a form of ethnic ghettolization on the internet, thereby distinguishing it
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further from host societies in which the diaspora is domiciled—and underlines the need to study the internet’s potential to mobilize diasporic groups in collective action. Her analysis of two websites set up by mainland Chinese students in Singapore teases out the perceptions of difference between the immigrant Chinese communities and the hosts, and how crises in the homeland—in this instance the SARS epidemic—engender specific kinds of long distance nationalism. Khalil Rinnawi’s examination of the Arab diaspora in Germany is based largely on an investigation of consumption of transnational Arab television among the Arab communities in Berlin. Using a clearly delineated notion of “McArabism” characterized by intensification of shared values, common language, access to broadcast media free of state control, and the affective dimensions of news, Rinnawi argues that exposure to transnational Arab media intensifies a form of Pan-Arabism that promotes allegiances to a “national” identity that is separate from the German.

As indicated by this sample, the chapters in this collection present empirically rich, conceptually sophisticated, multidisciplinary engagements with two of the most significant aspects of contemporary socio-cultural formations. It is to the editors’ credit that they have been able to bring together such an interesting group of scholars scrutinizing these formations from multiple perspectives. Both academically and politically this is an important book.
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In this volume, Paul Apostolidis reanimates the story of a Northwestern meatpacking plant as a site of not only egregious abuses and discrimination, but also unlikely politicization and mobilization of workers. The author draws on Gramscian and Foucauldian theories of hegemony and discipline, and infuses them with powerful examples of individual agency. In doing so, he provides us with a more complex understanding of how power operates and the importance of not only material resources, but also cultural and narrative ones, for labor organizing.

Apostolidis’ contribution is both methodological and theoretical. The author begins by reflecting on the multi-faceted opportunities and drawbacks of social science research. Rather than narrowly defend the superiority of in-depth interviewing, he acknowledges the inevitable bias that his progressive political disposition and relative privilege pose for understanding the “true common sense” of his subjects and co-activists. He also challenges the familiar dichotomies social scientists so often erect between practice and theory. Instead of viewing his subjects solely as data sources, he argues in favor of the potential for grassroots theorizing as well. The “breaks in the chain” to which the provocative title refers become the connective tissue of the book, as the author uses the metaphor of the meatpacking disassembly line to identify the broad palette of micro-techniques and the “art of self-preservation” that workers use to challenge the macro-level corporate techniques of labor management.

At the outset, the author’s cross-border account of neoliberalism in the United States and Mexico is a reminder of the role of migrant labor within the broader system of globalized capitalism. However, the author does not provide the unoriented reader with a good grounding in who the relevant power brokers are within the Tyson management and the Teamsters union. Nonetheless, the book’s comprehensive description of workers’ complex job histories—both here and in Mexico—is an important corrective to our understanding of stratification and one that takes seriously the fluidity of migrant life. The chilling accounts of overt employer abuses challenge a conventionally Foucauldian interpretation of biopolitics. Rather than exercising power via subtle forms of discipline, Apostolidis shows that direct and open hostility is rampant at the Tyson plant. The book provides a counter-narrative of worker agency in this shadow of despotism.
However, the proof Apostolidis provides for this “disciplinary vacuum” (p. 104) is not always compelling. In fact, the individual agency and self-care that the book describes not only compensate for the tragic effects of the dangerously high-speed disassembly line and the dismal access to post-injury medical care, but they are also what allow workers to continue (out of necessity) to run a disassembly line. The author further shows that high turnover at the plant destabilizes any fomentation of worker consent, which Burawoy identifies as crucial for hegemony to operate. However, the argument that workers’ disinterest in building a career at Tyson subverts competition among workers overlooks short-term openings for competition among workers and assumes that opportunities for mobility are even available. The brief discussion of cross-group dynamics in Chapter Four provides a captivating snapshot of the broader workforce at the plant and their relationship to the main protagonists of the book. However, few details are offered regarding the role of non-Latinos in the union, and those Latino workers who were not involved in either the reformer or counter-reformer movement.

Apostolidis likewise alludes to the intersectional experiences of his subjects. One of the book’s recurring themes is the gendered dynamics of political mobilization. He argues that the agency that female workers deploy—which is primarily directed externally through self-sacrifice, responsibility to family, and a sense of sisterhood—differs from the agency of male workers who instead assert internally-focused masculine individuality. Apostolidis, however, does not ground these rich narratives in the established literatures on gender and politicization, which the foundational theorists he engages admittedly largely ignore as well. Similarly, an early reference to a process of “racilization” (p. 64) is also left undeveloped. It is not clear what the experiences of these legalized Mexican workers have in common with other racialized workers, including those who migrated with legal status and those who continue to live in perpetual fear of deportation. Nonetheless, the book gives life to the Foucauldian metaphor for the “indirect murder” of marginalized bodies, which contrasts sharply with the benefits that these cost-cutting, degrading and dangerous practices afford the native-born population.

*Breaks in the Chain* is a cautionary tale against any policy prescription that focuses exclusively on improving legal protections and educating workers about these rights. To this end, the book contrasts two goals of worker education—one which focuses on training workers to navigate existing policies and bureaucracies, and another that is more interested in politicizing workers through even extra-legal action. This argument has also been made in other literatures, namely key historical accounts of union organizing, such as Lichtenstein (2002) and Fantasia and Voss (2004) who caution against the depoliticizing effects of business unionism. Similarly, more contemporary accounts of emerging forms of organized labor, such as Gordon (2007) and Fine (2006), also highlight the tension advocates face between “lawyering” versus “organizing.” Like these authors, Apostolidis points to other key debates within the labor movement, such as the potential for the state as an advocate, the utility of “legal activism” versus militant protest, and whether elites or grassroots members should lead the charge of reform.

Though at times Apostolidis’ own narrative becomes unbearably cumbersome and abstract, *Breaks in the Chain* paints a complex portrait of the “zone of illegality” and the overall dynamics of organized labor. This is a persuasive story of the irony of institutionalized rights and of the subsequent depoliticization that labor and legal scholars have warned. Readers from a wide range of disciplines will find *Breaks in the Chain* to be an engrossing account of the potential for even the most vulnerable workers to challenge the hegemonic apparatus.

**References**


The rising tide of education throughout the globe has been well-documented by sociologists and others. We know much less about how the rise in average years of schooling has affected educational inequality within countries. This book aims squarely to address that issue—the issue of educational inequality “around the world,” as the title suggests—through national case studies.

For some readers the first chapter alone will be worth the price of the book. In those 30 pages, Paul Attewell provides a perceptive overview of sharply differing views on the function of education in today’s world, ranging from human capital theory to perspectives based on signalling and credentialism, to those based on queuing. His conclusion that “educational growth is far from uniform in terms of its effects” (p. 29) no doubt is correct, if unsatisfying for those who want to cast education either as villain or hero.

Like many edited volumes, this one is based on a conference—in this instance, an annual conference sponsored by Princeton University’s Global Network on Inequality—and the remaining 12 chapters consist of case studies that presumably were presented at that conference. Chapter Two, “Educational Inequality in Latin America,” speaks most directly to the book’s broad theme of how education intersects with inequality in the world today. Cristián Cox presents World Bank data on educational and income inequality in 18 Latin American countries. With one exception (Nicaragua), inequality in education is lower than inequality in income. The cross-country correlation between the two types of inequality is surprisingly modest, however. In some countries (such as Panama) higher-than-average income inequality exists with lower-than-average educational inequality; in Nicaragua the reverse is true. Cox also presents data comparing between-school and within-school variance on students’ reading test scores in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay versus countries in Western Europe. One finding is that total variance in student performance is very roughly the same in the Latin American countries as in Western Europe, with the exception of Argentina and Uruguay, where student variance is 50 percent higher than in the other countries. Another finding is that the percentage of the total variance that is between-school variance tends to be higher in the Latin American countries than in the countries of Western Europe.

The remaining chapters investigate a potpourri of issues and for the most part are less comparative in their approach. There is little that ties them together beyond the theme that education is expanding everywhere, and the notion that education plays a significant role in both social mobility and social reproduction. Some of the specific issues they address nonetheless will be of interest to a number of readers. One chapter uses regression decomposition methods to examine the effects of race and education on earnings in post-apartheid South Africa. The basic finding is that, while the additive effect of race has diminished since apartheid, the white advantage with respect to returns to education has increased dramatically in the post-apartheid period. Another chapter looks at social class and education in South Korea, pointing out that 95 percent of Korean youth expect to go to college, a significantly higher percentage than in the West. The chapter uses loglinear models to examine what this extreme competition among Koreans for university slots implies for the relationship between a father’s social class and his children’s educational attainment in South Korea. Other chapters explore such diverse issues as post-1978 changes in the relationship between family background and education in China, black students in the University of Sao Paulo, education and...
the labor market in Poland, and cohort differences in returns to education in France.

Although Attewell summarizes each of the chapters in his introductory chapter, a concluding chapter would have been helpful in digging deeper into what these case studies actually tell us about educational inequality around the world. Several fundamental questions come to mind. Perhaps the most fundamental question is this: what is educational inequality, and how do we measure it? In the case of income inequality we have a convenient monetary metric (e.g., dollars) with meaningful ratios: $2 is twice as much as $1, and $4 is twice as much as $2. Years is also a ratio variable, of course, so in some sense four years of schooling is twice as much as two years of schooling. Yet in terms of the implications of education for life chances, years of schooling is at best ordinal; what matters is meeting some threshold level of schooling (e.g., 12 years to obtain a secondary degree in the United States). What is the best way to take these thresholds into account when comparing educational inequality across societies? This is a vexing issue, to be sure, but it is an issue that merits more attention than is given in this volume, particularly if the objective is—as here—an investigation of how trends in educational inequality relate to the “broad patterns of inequality sweeping the modern world” (p. v).
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Chief Justice Warren famously asserted that “Citizenship is man’s basic right, for it is nothing less than the right to have rights” (Perez v. Brownell 1958). His legal views are remarkably parallel to the philosophical argument advanced by Hannah Arendt, namely that rightlessness is the consequence of being deprived of citizenship, or statelessness (1951:251–2). Though Warren’s and Arendt’s assumptions are somewhat different, with Warren arguing on constitutional grounds, specifically citing the Fourteenth Amendment, and Arendt taking a broader scope grounded in political economy and notions of human security, neither problematizes the role of the state. The state, with all its warts and blemishes, for both Warren and Arendt, provides basic protections to citizens. Although contemporary social scientists often problematize the role of the state (and I am as guilty of this as any are) Children Without a State ought to send us flying back in time to meet up with the assumptions of Warren and Arendt, and to jettison—at least in this context—newer assumptions that relate to the liberating conditions of globalism, cosmopolitan citizenship, and multiculturalism.

A theme that unites all of the chapters is that refugees who are fleeing persecution need protection, and those who need the most protection are children. If this book would be a documentary, I guarantee all viewers would be sobbing from beginning to end. It is instead a scholarly, analytical and empirical treatment of stateless children. Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland and United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights, clearly frames the tragedy in the foreword: about one-third of the world’s children do not have their birth registered and therefore risk being denied state services, such as education, medical care, and housing. Yes, this was not a typo: about-third of all children, everywhere. This, in spite of the fact that children are universally and unconditionally valued. The usual empirical indicator of this is that more states have ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child than any other human rights treaty. 1 That is, there is virtual unanimity that children have the right to state protection, through registration at birth.

How can we possibly explain the disparities between international law (as well as the universal regard for children’s well-being) and the fact that about-one-third of all children worldwide are stateless? This is the question that motivates the authors of chapters in this remarkable book, beautifully edited by Jacqueline Bhabha. This 14-chapter volume is divided into three sections: legal

1 The only two states that have not ratified the Convention are Somalia and the United States.
statelessness, de facto statelessness, and effective statelessness. The volume grew out of an interdisciplinary conference held at Harvard University in 2008. The chapters are uniformly high in quality, each meriting at least mention.

If we stray for a moment from children to adults, Bhabha (Chapter One) has an interesting observation, namely that the label is everything: instead of referring to undocumented migrants, we can instead note that the burden borne by undocumented residents of the United States and elsewhere is not that they are undocumented—and, indeed, most do have documents—but instead that they are stateless. The label makes all the difference. I highlight this point because it puts the burden on the state, not on individuals. Bhabha’s chapter centrally focuses on the three major themes of the book, namely, the contrasts involving de jure statelessness (those who are literally without a nationality), de facto statelessness (those who do not live legally in a country), and effectively stateless, (those whose nationality is not registered).

Remarkably, as Brad K. Blitz writes in Chapter Two, there has been little effort in making sure that states do all in their power to promote birth registration and to ensure that children have the rights to a name, an identity and a nationality. He outlines the relevant declarations and treaties that bear on the rights of children: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and most centrally, the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Christina O. Alfirev (in Chapter Three) outlines possible consequences of Israel’s Temporary Order that puts Palestinians at risk of becoming stateless. In Chapter Four, Bela Hovy clarifies the need for better data on noncitizens, especially data on children, and assesses the quality of statistics currently in use for human-rights reporting.

In spite of vigorous advocacy, Luca Bicocchi reports a dangerous trend towards an erosion of the rights of migrant children across the European Union (Chapter Five), which is followed up by Jyothi Kanics (Chapter Six), who lays out a set of good practices for the EU. Spain faces special challenges, owing to its being a main destination for migrants. Daniel Senovilla Hernández (Chapter Seven) explains how Spain’s policy of forced repatriation, which though highly criticized, is only slowly being abandoned. Elena Rozzi (Chapter Eight) explains some of the legal complexities and deprivations that Roma children face in Italy; for example, they are often denied access to healthcare, and although Italian law grants Roma children the right to attend school, the law is not always applied. Besides that, many Roma children who agreed to be registered have been forcefully repatriated. Rozzi concludes her article by asserting that advisers and social workers have an obligation to inform migrants of their rights to make choices, even if it is to remain undocumented.

Stephen H. Legomsky’s chapter (Nine) on de facto statelessness in the United States, and its implications for the denial of education for undocumented children came to the fore again in 2011 with the introduction of the DREAM Act (an acronym for Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors) on the floor of the Senate for the second time. The premise of the DREAM Act at either the federal or the state level is that young people who came to the United States as young children deserve a path to citizenship either through higher education or military service. Also enlightening is Chapter Ten, in which David B. Thronson shows that the framework for family-sponsored immigration subordinates children’s status to that of their parents. To continue this line of inquiry about the United States, Linda K. Kerber’s chapter ( Eleven) on jus soli (birth on U.S. soil) paints a largely positive picture of citizenship rights in the United States, and she draws usefully from U.S. case law.

The final three chapters beautifully wrap up the earlier arguments, while introducing new materials on China (Kirsten Di Martino), Nepal and Bangladesh (Caroline Vandena- beele), and children in English history (Simon Szreter). The power of the typology made in Chapter One is wonderfully evident in these chapters that deal with effective statelessness.

In sum, this is a splendid book, based on empirical research and the authors’ knowledge of laws and how children’s rights vary...
over time and space. There is an ease with which they address the three main forms of children’s statelessness and take into account the interdisciplinary nature of the topic. I would have liked some ethnographic accounts, but the editor and authors have been wise. By the end I felt I had learned a great deal and I was not sobbing my heart out. Children Without a State sets the gold standard for research and writing on human rights. It shows that advocacy and rigorous scholarship can go hand in hand, and also reminds us that the state matters. Chief Justice Warren and Hannah Arendt would approve.
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During his long, illustrious, and probably underappreciated career at Berkeley, Bob Blauner published influential works on class (Alienation and Freedom) and race (Racial Oppression in America; Black Lives, White Lives) and also, if less influentially, on gender (Our Mothers’ Spirits, ed.). In retirement he has turned to writing history, the history of the controversy over the 1950 Loyalty Oath required of all teachers at the University of California (UC). Thirty-one of the sixty-nine American professors fired during the McCarthy Era taught at UC. (Disclaimer: one of the other thirty-eight was my godfather, much later knighted by Queen Elizabeth). Blauner interviewed survivors and their families. He thoroughly combed a variety of archival sources that included oral histories, minutes of meetings (UC Regents, UCLA and Berkeley Academic Senate) and both commercial and campus student newspapers. He has produced a useful and sometimes dramatic account of this episode and its effects. Its primary appeal will be to sociologists specializing in U.S. higher education and to historians of both the 1940s–1950s and of California, but its analytical last chapter and its epilogue on connections forward to the Free Speech Movement deserve wider attention. And while no sociologists figure as principals among faculty signers or resisters of the Oath, the text is sprinkled with references to many of our forebears in that somewhat tarnished golden age of the discipline.

The book begins by recounting the tensions between academic freedom and anticommunism from the 1920s to the 1940s when, surprisingly perhaps, UCLA’s faculty was regarded with greater suspicion than UCB’s. It shows how the university’s governing body, the Regents, though including several liberal Republicans, was dominated, if not overwhelmingly so, by conservatives with corporate (especially Bank of America) and military ties and often manipulated by the extreme right-wing regent John Francis Neylan, in an era before the term “liberal Republican” had become the oxymoron it is today. It documents the continuity between the internment of Japanese-Americans and the post-war anticommunist hysteria. The book’s central chapters then detail, sometimes confusingly, the various versions of the Oath, the arguments pro and con among the faculties at both Berkeley and UCLA, the compromises arranged by the Academic Senate and largely ignored by the Regents, and the vacillations of UC President Robert Sproul. Most fascinating in these chapters is learning the backgrounds and fates of those who resisted signing, some of them refugees from Hitler or Mussolini, others home-grown American radicals, still others adamant civil libertarians. Few faculty were women, Blauner notes, but they were slightly overrepresented among the resisters. Near the height of the controversy, the Korean War began, an event with a profound effect: as the United States was now at war with a communist state allegedly under the Kremlin’s sway, the stakes were raised for any dissent that could plausibly be tainted by
accusations of disloyalty. As the global and local conflicts continued, non-signing faculty were fired, some sought employment elsewhere, some stayed to fight on, and a few participants in the struggle suffered strokes or heart attacks. UC’s reputation was tarnished, and much local and national faculty organizing was devoted to raising funds to support the fired professors, instructors, and TAs.

It is here that more names familiar to sociologists enter the picture. Robert Merton and Paul Lazarsfeld declined appointments as visiting professors, Merton at UCLA, Lazarsfeld at Berkeley. Talcott Parsons and Louis Wirth were national leaders in raising funds for the non-signers. C. Wright Mills was among a number of prominent Columbia professors who signed a letter of protest to the Regents. We had previously learned that Reinhard Bendix did sign the Oath, but only at the last minute because he believed it “threatened democratic freedoms”; he pointedly asked Sproul why fascists were not also excluded from the faculty” (p. 141). S. M. Lipset said in 1950 he would not return to Berkeley from a visiting appointment at Columbia if he had to sign an oath. And Philip Selznick, who moved from UCLA to Berkeley at the height of the crisis, provided Blauner with part of the basis for comparing the two campuses, an analytic theme that runs throughout the book. In fact, one of its major contributions is to rescue UCLA’s role from the relative oblivion to which previous works on the Oath controversy had consigned it.

But Berkeley is at the center of this show. In his epilogue, Blauner contests Clark Kerr’s thesis that Academic Senate support was “the critical link” (p. 236) animating the Free Speech Movement in 1964, the Oath episode having radicalized many UCB faculty and attracted left-leaning professors. In Blauner’s view, Senate support came too late to be granted so much causal credit, and was not galvanized, finally, until three months after the FSM began. But when that support came, it was overwhelming, and Oath veterans played a major role in propelling it. Not surprisingly, sociology graduate students and faculty were heavily involved. Ironically, in 1964 they had just moved into Barrows Hall, a hideous new building named for the 1919–1923 president whom Blauner calls “UC’s first anti-communist,” a man who had served with the American Expeditionary Forces in Manchuria and Siberia against the Bolsheviks, commanded the California branch of the American Legion, and, as head of the National Guard in the western United States, led the military suppression of the 1934 Bay Area general strike. One may speculate that Barrows got his edifice to offset the simultaneous naming of the psychology building for Edward Tolman, the towering figure who led the faculty resistance in 1950.
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In Cuban Youth and Revolutionary Values: Educating the New Socialist Citizen, Denise Blum describes how the Cuban education system has evolved since the 1959 revolution. She details changes from the 1960s, when “children of the revolution” became agents of the new society-in-the-making, through the post-Soviet era, when the economy dipped into deep recession, employment opportunities caved, and the regime’s legitimacy was challenged as never before. Blum bases her analysis on secondary sources, but also on (limited) ethnographic and survey research in secondary schools in Havana. She is one of the all too few American scholars who has managed to investigate Cuban schools first hand.

Descriptively, Blum details how the education system dramatically expanded, became a vehicle through which the Castro regime transformed the country’s value system, inculcated loyalty to the New Order, and trained the younger generation in ways useful to the new economy. She details how some education reforms worked, while others did not because they met up with teacher, student, and family resistance. Blum shows the Cuban government to be...
sufficiently flexible to modify their education policies when societal conditions and state priorities and exigencies changed, and as some programs proved ineffective.

Among the values the government sought to imbue through the education system, and in the society at-large, were a commitment to the collectivity, egalitarianism, sacrifice, patriotism, internationalism (i.e., “Third World” solidarity), and an integration of work with study—what Cuban officials call “conciencia.”

The 1959–1989 programs she describes are well known to scholars of Cuba. What the author addresses that is less well known are the changes in the austere post-Soviet era, the so-called Special Period. She details how state efforts to inculcate values of the revolution into youth of the time have broken down. Youth are voting with their feet. Their absentee rates have increased, and their willingness to study has decreased. They can earn more money in illegal, informal work in the black market than in professional jobs in the state-socialist economy. Meanwhile, teachers are abandoning their careers as their real earnings have plunged with the de facto devaluation of the value of the peso (relative to the dollar, accessible through remittances from family abroad and from black market activity). The government has been forced to recruit poorly educated teachers, such that the quality of education, one of the genuine accomplishments of the revolution, has deteriorated, and enrollment rates have declined. Cuban youth have become more individualistic, materialistic, and interested in a new kind of internationalism, namely emigration or attainment of remittances from family members who emigrated.

Through the window of the education system we witness the problems of socialism in one country. The Cuban government is far from omnipotent, though still a one-party state. Families who remain committed to the schooling of their children try to make it work best for them, far from the egalitarian ethos of the 1960s. They want their children, for example, to qualify for the best, highly selective merit entry-based schools, and with this goal in mind now pay tutors, in much-coveted dollars. Good teachers, in response, have been exiting the school system, to work less and earn more as tutors.

Blum is problematic in her theoretical effort to explain the education changes she describes. She draws on Damian Fernández’s thesis of a Cuban politics of passion to account for developments in the society at large as well as within the school system. She argues that as the lofty ideals of the state wilted away, Cubans increasingly reverted from state to informal networks of affection. But how does a “politics of passion” help us understand “why the state does what it does” and what effects the state has had and why. To best answer these questions we need to incorporate political economy into the analysis. All states rely on what Blum calls passion, albeit different passions and with different impacts under different conditions (but which?). Passion involves ideology and ways of involving the citizenry to capture their hearts and minds and inculcate “habits of the heart.”

The world and Cuba have changed since 1959. The fiscal base of the state has decreased dramatically, and the state has little to offer its people. Ordinary Cubans, disillusioned, resort to their own ways to make do, on both sides of the law. A shift from state to societal modes of passion at best is descriptively on the mark. Analytically it is wanting.
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When economic sociologists study markets, they study networks, organizations, institutions, shared understandings and ideas that underpin and shape them. But what about supply and demand, production, exchange, economic value and prices? A walk through the three decades of new economic sociology reveals surprisingly few studies that systematically address what a layperson would see...
as core issues of markets. With Market Threads, Koray Çalışkan ventures into this sparsely populated field to produce a fascinating book that offers interesting findings and novel theoretical ideas.

Market Threads “follows the cotton” through multiple sites of production and exchange to investigate how this quintessential global commodity gets produced, how cotton prices are formed, and how the circulation and exchange of cotton function. Drawing on a wide range of literature in anthropology, sociology, and science and technology studies, Çalışkan argues that “the global market is an indexical possibility” (p. 13) and that markets are sociotechnical universes as well as economizing tools, whose functioning mechanisms emanate from asymmetric distributions of resources, power, and knowledge. Production, exchange, and pricing come about, Çalışkan avers, only because calculative devices and power relations are endogenous determinants of market dynamics.

Within this ambitious framework, Çalışkan first shows how a world price for cotton is established. He contends that prices are not set through supply and demand meeting at an equilibrium point, but rather realized through market devices and technologies in fields of unequal power, and knowledge relations where supply and demand are the outcomes of continuous management and intervention. This chapter (entitled “What Is a World Price?”) is based on fieldwork as a professional trader trainee in Memphis, Tennessee, interviews with cotton traders and market analysts, as well as documentary sources such as market reports and price indexes, and is a breathtaking contribution to the sociology of prices. One leaves this chapter, thanks to ample qualitative evidence in service of well-crafted theoretical arguments, with a solid idea of how techniques of knowing, representing, managing, and calculating (e.g., price indices, the imposition of equilibrium through formulas derived from neoclassical economics, institutions of exchange and price-making with a global reach) are endogenous, not exogenous, to price realization and the making of “free markets.”

As techniques of representation and calculation harnessed through asymmetric power relations are endogenous to price realization, bridging social networks and documentary routes are essential to the circulation of cotton as a commodity, and, thus, to the making and maintenance of a world market for it. Hence Market Threads analyzes the routes and social processes of circulation of 2,000 bales of cotton between the United States and Turkey, showing how capital (be it material or symbolic), knowledge, networks, and practices, such as gift-giving, are part and parcel of the global circulation of commodities. Next, a superb chapter on the Izmir Mercantile Exchange (IME) in Turkey reexamines the process of price realization in regional cotton markets. What it reveals, through an ethnographic account, is an intriguing picture of price articulation and the making of supply and demand for cotton in Turkey, one of the most important producers of this commodity in the world. First, the ethnographic analysis in this chapter clearly demonstrates that three distinct forms of prices exist at IME: rehearsal, transaction, and market price. Second, it becomes evident that power struggles and political conflicts play a major role in the determination of the amount of supply and demand for cotton. The “invisible hand” of the market mysteriously balancing supply and demand disappears in empirical scrutiny. Instead, the reader gets a documentation of the all-too-human works of visible forces such as the Closing Price Committee and the Permanent Working Group on Cotton, determining cotton prices, supply, and demand after a conflict and compromise process involving farmers, merchants, and government agencies.

An investigation of cotton markets without organized exchange in Egypt parallels and complements Çalışkan’s inquiry into price- and market-making in Turkey. Then, Market Threads delves into the worlds of cotton production in Turkey and Egypt, presenting participant observational data on the day-to-day labor, social struggles, and market performances that figure into the arduous process of growing cotton. These chapters depict how farmers are excluded from the process of price realization and the ensuing passivity of the producers of cotton when it comes to obtaining the rewards of their labor. In particular, the final chapter on the cotton fields of power in Egypt is a vivid portrayal of the macabre follies of
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neoliberal reform. It is also a stark reminder that production, markets, prices, and supply-demand relations are matters of politics as much as they are matters of economizing.

Çalışkan provides illuminating arguments and a refreshing internal criticism of economic sociology. His book demonstrates, convincingly, that the price-supply-demand mechanism is not a universal law, but a field of power whose very possibility is a function of cognitive devices, scientific assumptions, and institutional designs. This argument notwithstanding, Market Threads is silent on a number of key issues pertaining to how markets work. For instance, there is no theoretical synthesis on how prices vary or the correspondences between power dynamics and the levels of supply and demand for cotton in regional and global markets. Such questions are concerned with economic value and its determination in markets. They are the home ground of economics where utilitarian equilibrium analysis, which Çalışkan criticizes admirably, reigns supreme.

To be sure, Market Threads is a remarkable book, elegantly theorized and meticulously researched. The depth of its findings matches the ambitions of its multi-sited ethnography, occasionally offering priceless observations that only a thick study of price-making can yield ("if you let [the market] free, it’ll kill us," divulges one cotton trader on p. 54). Çalışkan’s is an able and generative book that tackles crucial questions in the sociology of markets and economic life. Few economic sociologists will want to miss it.
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If cosmopolitanism is the culture of global capitalism, then transnationalists are arguably that set of actors whose interconnections form the global corporate elite. This includes the idea of globally elite cosmopolitans transgressing national boundaries just as effortlessly as do transnational corporations or global finance markets. But what sociological evidence is there that transnational elites represent the emergence of a new social class, or indeed that the activities of such elites should be of vital political concern?

The complex, contradictory ways in which transnational corporate elites reach beyond national forms of organization into a global field is the focus of William K. Carroll’s The Making of a Transnational Capitalist Class. The book is a remarkable feat of sociological analysis, skillfully weaving together social network analysis and empirical data in a sound critique of the interlocking corporate ties across the global capitalist network.

Carroll, a sociologist at the University of Victoria, is the author of previous books on the political economy of corporate capitalism. This latest work extends these previous interests to a consideration of the networks of corporate power, mapping as it does the formations of a transnational corporate community. The book is arguably the best work on corporate elites since Leslie Sklair’s The Transnational Capitalist Class (2001), which has clearly influenced Carroll—and who has named this new book in its honor.

Massive institutional change is seen by Carroll as underpinning the new social organization of a transnational capitalist class. New information technologies, the global electronic economy and its digitalized finance markets, the near universalism of consumer capitalism: these are the essential institutional foundations of twenty-first century forms of corporate power.

Carroll uses a mass of empirical data—looking in depth at statistics on global policy groups, leading billionaire families, financial institutions in the global corporate network, trends in capital accumulation, and the spread of transnational business councils—to contextualize the embedding of networks in social structures and to trace the multiple affiliations of elites in terms of global corporate power. And he makes a good fist of this, producing a persuasive institutional account of corporate interlocks within the accumulation processes of late capitalism.
Carroll’s somewhat predictably provocative thesis is that the global electronic economy remains dominated by Euro-North American corporate networks—a case which, in casting globalization as an objectivist structure, allows him to speak of “global class-wide hegemony.” There is, it is true, some attention devoted to the rise of the global South—though insufficient attention is paid, I think, to the combined impact of Chinese and Indian corporate networks on capital control, coordination and allocation throughout the world economy and, in particular, finance markets.

Even so, the book ranges widely across the economic and political networks of transnational corporate power today. There are illuminating chapters on the changing organization of corporate power, global cities, transnational corporate-policy networks, billionaires and super-wealth, as well as analysis of corporate Europe and its complex patterns of inter-corporate relations.

Carroll has produced a full-bloodedly sociological account of transnational corporate power, the value of which lies in its close attention to rigorous empirical research while all the time keeping an eye on the big questions of capitalism, globalization and hegemonic power structures. But is this enough? While the institutional analysis developed by Carroll is of incomparable value, the activities of global corporate elites press equally for sociological attention in terms of lifestyle politics, culture and the transformation of values. Carroll’s study refuses to have much truck with such issues, which is more than a pity because the personal and cultural ramifications of the practices and discourses of global corporate power unearthed in this book need to be examined.

Another way of putting this is, given all the facts and figures Carroll reviews in respect of the interlocks of global corporate elites, how are such elite linkages actually forged, sustained and transformed into symbolic power? If global elites roam the planet in first-class comfort, overseeing vast capital investments and transnational operations, then what role does networked power actually play in the constitution of such lives? Or, more to the point, how do global elites achieve extremely high forms of connectivity with other global elites via networks, connectors, and hubs? What is the role of travel in elite linkages? What import new information technologies? These are not issues Carroll directly raises, because the bulk of his efforts are directed to establishing the nature and distribution of such elite linkages.

Carroll is the kind of sociologist any professional would want on their side, an author who combines intense empirical engagement with interesting institutional perspectives. The limit of The Making of a Transnational Capitalist Class, however, is that it closes down discussion on new global elites just at the point where the topic gets most interesting. He is still owed our considerable appreciation, though, for mapping in such fine detail the geopolitics of corporate power in the twenty-first century.
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In this first book to focus on women in Cape Verde, an archipelago of ten islands off the coast of Senegal, West Africa, Katherine Carter and Judy Aulette provide readers with a good introduction to the nation, its place in the globalized world, and the lives of women there today. Although the authors’ basic research questions are “what problems do Cape Verdean women face in the globalized world? And how are they responding to those challenges?” (p. 15), Carter and Aulette provide readers with far more than answers to those questions.

The opening chapters are rich with history, a history that informs many of the problems women face today as well as some of their methods of resistance. Portugal colonized the uninhabited islands in the fifteenth century, bringing enslaved West Africans to work on plantations and in the transatlantic slave trade. In addition to the centuries of exploitative colonization, slavery, and peonage that so many people in the Global South
experienced, Cape Verde also suffered from regular droughts and famines. In fact, “in every century [including the twentieth] there were one or two more famines than the previous century” (p. 24). Not surprisingly, extensive and mainly male emigration began in the nineteenth century to the United States and other Portuguese colonies, then to Senegal, Portugal, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain. Today, remittances are critically important to the nation’s economy, constituting 23.2 percent of its GDP. Nevertheless, despite some agriculture, forestry, fishing, manufacturing and service industries, the nation remains poor and is one of the “largest recipients per capita of foreign aid in the world” (p. 68).

Carter and Aulette’s description of Cape Verde’s dependent place in the world economic system is succinct and clear, especially in the discussion of the effects of the policies of the IMF and World Bank. As in most other countries of the Global South, the economic changes mandated as conditions of loans—government cutbacks in health, education and food subsidies along with increased privatization and restrictions on workers’ rights—have led to more unemployment (now 25 percent), price increases, export-oriented production and greater stratification.

To understand women’s lives, Carter and Aulette used three methods of gathering data: 50 questionnaires were distributed to women attending a 2001 conference focusing on violence against women; 40 Cape Verdean college students filled out questionnaires with open-ended questions about government policies, economics, dance and language; and 36 women were interviewed by Cape Verdean college students about their lives. Additionally, for a year beginning in 2003, Carter observed life in the capital city, Praia. The authors’ discussion of their methods is one of the unexpected highlights of the book. They not only explain what they did, they also discuss fully their reasons for their choices. The chapter “Insiders and Outsiders Exploring Cape Verde” covers that ongoing debate (clearly relevant to this study conducted by two Euro-American women on an African population, i.e., researchers working across both racial-ethnic and North-South national boundaries) and provides guidance on conducting ethnographic research, with clear definitions of terms at every step. This chapter, along with the excellent “reflections of methods” sections at the end of every chapter, makes this book especially valuable to students of qualitative research methods.

Carter and Aulette’s main conclusions to their research question about Cape Verdaen women’s problems are that, for most, their lives are characterized by economic marginality, full responsibility for childcare (even when a partner is present), more often than not being a single head of household, the infidelity of men, and domestic violence. The authors see the women’s situation as a result of, first, the economic forces that characterize a dependent economy within globalization and, second, an internal system of gender inequality. In the latter discussion, Carter and Aulette explore aspects of history—especially the male emigration which has left a gender imbalance—and contemporary patterns of behavior, including pervasive male infidelity, which “expresses and reproduces gender relationships where men dominate over women” (p. 100).

How do women resist? The authors look at both conventional organizing and resistance through everyday cultural expression. The chapter on conventional ways of protesting offers a rather limited overview of Cape Verdaen women’s organizing to address gender-based inequities, focusing mainly on anti-violence activism. We do learn that Cape Verde signed on to CEDAW in 1980, that the Institute on the Status of Women was created in 1994 (focusing on employment, politics and gender mainstreaming), and that the Organization of Cape Verdean women produced a radio show in 2004. However, we are not told about the women who were part of these efforts, their ideas, or how they organized to achieve their goals. This omission dovetails with another aspect of the book: the lack of a presence of the more educated and wealthier women. Although a small minority, they are probably disproportionately influential in women’s “conventional” organizations. More information about their lives and ideas would have enhanced this chapter and the entire book.

Because the authors made their focus on cultural forms of resistance clear since the beginning of the book, it is surprising that
the chapter on the *batuku* dance is the shortest and most repetitious in the book, providing only sparse evidence—mainly, the descriptions of earlier writers—of the power of the dance as a means of resistance. The one paragraph that describes the dance (p. 122) does not give a clear sense of what it entails and why it should be considered a threat to power. And while Cape Verdean interviewees said that the words sung during the dance were most important, the authors provide the lyrics of only one song. It does address famine, forced labor and other painful experiences, but translations of more than one song and a fuller description of the dance itself are needed to support their argument that this dance and these songs are an important cultural expression of resistance.

Carter and Aulette are more effective in demonstrating how women’s use of proverbs, sayings and metaphors in Creole expresses and reinforces a consciousness of resistance. In this discussion, the authors provide many examples from the interviews with Cape Verdean women to support their contention that women use indirect and, sometimes, playful language to criticize men, politicians and gender inequities, and to describe their strategies for coping with and challenging injustices. Here, the validity of Carter and Aulette’s advocacy of seeking elements of resistance embedded in the everyday practices of women is evident.

While the book deserves better editing and more than a scant index, it is successful in introducing us to Cape Verdean women’s lives, in smoothly integrating a thorough literature review throughout the text, in providing readers with an excellent bibliography, in explicating its qualitative methods clearly, and in demonstrating the importance of culture and consciousness in resisting injustices. Thus, it would be especially useful to those interested in women’s studies, African studies, qualitative methods (especially, critical ethnography), globalization, and culture.

*Activists in City Hall* offers a blow-by-blow description of how social reformers, both inside and outside of city government, attempted to enact progressive policies during a time period when “progressive” seemed destined to become either a dirty word or an antiquated ideal in American politics. As jobs and people with money moved out of the central cities, tax revenues in the cities declined precisely when they were most needed to address problems related to failing educational systems, concentrated poverty, and crime. Voters sent Ronald Reagan to the White House, as many Americans bought into the argument that the nation’s problems would fix themselves by the magic of market forces if government would just get out of the way. Changing demographics led to greater representation of racial and ethnic minorities in city governments, but at a time when cities were increasingly viewed as liabilities and those who were responsible for managing them were rendered powerless by forces beyond their control. With shrinking revenues and declining public confidence in government’s ability to contribute to prosperity and happiness, city government seemed to be more about damage control than progressive change.

Pierre Clavel’s book focuses on outliers who bucked the national trend. In cities such as Berkeley, Hartford, Cleveland, Madison, Santa Monica, Santa Cruz, Burlington, and San Francisco, community activists worked with local governmental officials to enact reforms designed to promote broader citizen participation in governance and redistribution of wealth and resources. Clavel devotes most of his attention to two large cities: Boston and Chicago. In Boston, Mayor Raymond Flynn’s administration prioritized affordable housing, while in Chicago Mayor Harold Washington’s administration....
struggled to keep manufacturing jobs from leaving the cities. The results of their efforts were mixed. Today, housing in Boston is not cheap and Chicago, like many other industrial cities, lost a lot of manufacturing jobs during and after Washington’s reign as mayor. Yet Clavel seems to be most interested in understanding how activists and politicians collaborated to enact a model of the “progressive city” that is defined in terms of a highly developed capacity to redistribute wealth and resources and a highly developed and organized social base in the city neighborhoods.

Clavel’s analysis highlights the way in which policy makers would have to come to grips with a set of unique obstacles to progressive reform. In Boston, racial divisions were particularly challenging as the city was still reeling from a nasty rebellion to court-ordered busing that was intended to serve as a remedy for racial inequality in educational opportunities. After defeating progressive African American candidate Mel King in the Democratic primary, Mayor Flynn hoped that a populist message might cut across racial barriers to unite poor and working class white and black constituents. Yet he would also have to find ways to engage the business elite, who were the villains of the populist message. With some measure of success, Flynn capitalized on a real estate boom in the city to accommodate growth and development, but doing so in a way that required developers to pony up significant chunks of money to promote affordable housing in the city. In Chicago, Mayor Washington’s administration sought to prioritize “jobs over real estate development.” In doing so, Washington and his team had to deal with the weighty legacy of machine politics in Chicago, a city council that was at first able to block their agenda, and a broadly-held view that holding onto manufacturing jobs was something of a lost cause—a painful but inevitable casualty of Chicago’s adaptation to the global economy.

The detailed description of political action in Boston and Chicago offers a revealing window into blurred boundaries separating institutionalized and extra-institutional politics. As the title of the book suggests, many key actors in the city governments had deep roots in community activism. Finding ways to stay true to the activist’s agenda while charged with the task of serving all residents of the city is a complex undertaking, Clavel’s analysis emphasizes the importance of maintaining strong community organizations. Constant pressure from an organized base can strengthen the hand of activists in city hall. Compromise with conservative foes is hard to resist when the progressive base is quiescent. Also important, community activist organizations are likely to outlive progressive administrations. If the activist organizations become too reliant on city officials to promote their agendas, they will be ill-prepared to fight when the political winds shift.

Activists in City Hall should interest readers who care about progressive politics and are looking for lessons that these historical cases provide for keeping progressive goals alive in an era of economic crisis and Tea Party reaction. The appeal of the book may be somewhat limited however, among sociologists, as it is written more for a public policy audience. It is based on meticulous research and provides rich detail pertaining to the cases, but there is little or no attempt to engage social movement theory in a way that might draw in researchers who are not particularly interested in the substantive cases.
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The purpose of Politics and Partnerships is to present various perspectives and examples of how nonprofit organizations in the United States relate to both government and business past and present. Elisabeth Clemens and Doug Guthrie give us a broad summary of trends, and the chapters hone in on specific cases that illustrate these trends in detail. With its original research articles, this volume provides many interesting insights on the nonprofit sector and American society.
The first chapter outlined the intellectual challenge of trying to understand how the nonprofit sector has fit into the institutional mix. It summarized the history of government and nonprofit relations, emphasizing the nonprofit’s role as advocate, provider of public goods, and partner with government. It also described the often tense relationships between business and nonprofits. The assessment of the current state of affairs was accurate: business logics worming their way into the nonprofit organization and greater nonprofit accountability especially to private donors. It also described the rise of nonprofits as brokers between foundations, corporations, governments, and citizens. While the relationships among the sectors are very complex and there is a variety of partnership models, the authors presented a responsible and concise overview of past and current patterns.

As noted, the chapters were focused on and address different aspects of the partnerships. Chapters Two through Four concern government/nonprofit relations. Rather than being the bedrock of American institutional life, Johann Neem explained that voluntary associations were viewed with suspicion at the end of the Revolutionary War as a force that would undermine nationalism. Over time this changed, and broad-based voluntary associations became a crucial part of the American landscape and a platform for political dissension and reconciliation. Neem observed that nationalism in the United States became, in fact, rooted in voluntary association participation and was not the product of government initiatives or actions. Foundations emerged as important institutions in the late nineteenth century and assumed a different role. Mark Hendrickson described how they, with their expertise, worked with government after World War I to change labor law and, without government support, challenged racial stereotypes. They effectively grappled with what electoral politics was unable to address. The New Deal has often been depicted as the advent of big government. Elisabeth Clemens examined the Roosevelt administration which developed new roles, albeit subordinate to the state, for the nonprofit sector. The case was the Red Cross and its role in responding to national emergencies during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations.

The next three chapters examine nonprofit and business relations. Rather than operating in distinct sectors, the two often intersected. Alice O’Connor looked at the entry of conservative business interests into the world of foundation philanthropy in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Having accepted their role as experimenter and innovator in the context of a “welfare-statist capitalism” (p. 129), the large foundations found themselves attacked by groups of business leaders, publicists, and intellectuals who felt that these organizations had betrayed the very institution to which they owed their existence, capitalism. Her description of the new activist conservative foundations and their projects was very informative. James A. Evans examined the nonprofit research institute. He described how these institutes were funded in the 1940s by philanthropists and the federal government to develop new technologies/products, but by the 1980s and 1990s had become more like research universities doing basic science. His description of how they were absorbed into that world was apt in light of the O’Connor piece. Doug Guthrie examined who and what corporate philanthropy supported. This article used data from a national survey of 3,000 corporations in 2002 and qualitative interviews with 150 people in nonprofits, businesses and government agencies. After reviewing the findings, the author concluded that these gifts reflected not only “corporate values but also corporate strategy” (p. 118). Also, although the amounts are relatively small, they can have a big impact on specific projects.

The last part of the book looked at changing nonprofit roles with the shrinkage of the welfare state, the rise in free market logics, and new funding from private sources. These were interesting cases that showed how malleable nonprofits were as they interacted with public and business organizations. Nicole Marwell showed how some New York community organizations have been re-politicized and have increased linkages among nonprofits, residents, and elected officials. Michael McQuarrie examined the new commercial roles for nonprofits in public housing programs and how nonprofits became important mediators and partners with local government. Omri Elisha showed...
how a nonprofit intermediary helped to overcome the social and cultural divide between a wealthy suburban white congregation and an inner-city black congregation as they strove to build low-income housing together. Finally, Alyshia Gálvez showed how a loosely structured New York network of parish-based confraternal societies, because of its involvement in the September 11 relief efforts for undocumented workers, became an important broker between families, foundations, governmental and nongovernmental agencies. The editors correctly argued that these cases highlighted the flexibility of the nonprofit form which allowed it to assume various brokerage roles and new identities.

Each of the articles is an important contribution to a complicated literature. The collection, and particularly the last four chapters, highlights a trend in the field away from formulating and testing overarching theories of sector differences to case analysis. While the authors focus on the growth and contraction of the government and business sectors, changes in the ways managers view their organizational roles, lax policing of institutional borders, and various social movements have greatly altered institutional scripts as well. There is probably enough inertia in all three sectors to ensure that nonprofit, for-profit, and governmental identities will remain meaningful, but “on the edge or in between” (to borrow a phrase from Popielarz and McPherson, 1995), there is considerable innovation and opportunism. If you want insights into the history and the contemporary nonprofit scene, this volume holds great promise for you.
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wave detection community a suspect reputation in the past?

Or was it a third option: a deliberate test of that community’s ability to sort real events from noise? The need for such a test arises from a methodological Catch-22. Because of their field’s reputation for error, gravitational wave detection physicists perceive a need for extreme caution in declaring that a blip is an “event” rather than “noise.” But if they are too cautious, then their instrument will, effectively, be insensitive to all but monumentally unlikely events, and taxpayers and politicians may feel they have been sold a bill of goods. Thus, the (largely European and American) collaboration responsible for the three largest interferometric detectors assigned two of its members to “inject” anywhere between zero and three false events into the data stream at random times during the first year of full operation. The Equinox Event might or might not be one of those fakes. In theory, that possibility should create an incentive against overcautiously declaring it “noise.” In practice, as Collins shows, things are more complicated.

Collins uses the Equinox Event to explore some standard themes from the sociology of scientific knowledge: the inability of rules to fully specify their own application, the inability of tests to fully simulate the conditions that the device being tested might face, the “experimenter’s regress” of using incomplete (perhaps incorrect) knowledge of phenomena to calibrate instruments that will be used to characterize those same phenomena, and the value-ladenness of statistical analysis.

It is only in a final “Envoi” that Collins stakes out a new, normative position. There, he argues that the gravitational wave detection community’s relentless self-questioning makes it a model for other sciences and for any society dependent on technical expertise. Collins marvels at gravity wave researchers’ experimentation with organizational structures and incentive schemes in order to make their knowledge more robust—and sees in that social experimentation a way to rescue science and society from science-skeptical market and religious fundamentalists.

Collins also casts his admiration for scientific social experimentation as a rebuke to the field of Science and Technology Studies (STS) that he helped create in the 1970s and 80s. Back then, some philosophers and scientists believed that Collins was the corrosive science skeptic. As the acknowledgments to Gravity’s Ghost show, however, former adversaries now embrace Collins’ overt enthusiasm for science (and disaffection for much of STS). Collins frames this turnabout as a “Third Wave” of STS—the First Wave being pre-Kuhnian apologia for (and rational reconstruction of) science, and the Second Wave the constructivist turn typified by Changing Order. The Third Wave swings the pendulum back: “Wave Three makes it explicit that in spite of the logic of Wave Two . . . science is still the best thing we have where knowledge about the natural world is concerned. Here, the processes of science are unapologetically spoken of as the most valuable models for the making of technological knowledge” (p. 5).

I am sympathetic with Collins’ admiration for the gravitational wave detection community’s social experimentation and his desire to harness constructivist STS to a pro-science agenda. The Third Wave framework, however, turns so far back to something like Merton’s norms that it undermines some of Collins’ own Second Wave achievements. Changing Order was eye-opening because it paid attention to the things scientists themselves took to be important in real time, rather than to the things philosophers and Mertonian sociologists retrospectively said were “really” important. Scientists argue with each other. They make seemingly extra-scientific judgments about each other. They have trouble replicating each other’s—and even their own—experiments, even ones they know are supposed to work. Many spend much of their time teaching, cultivating funders, traveling, and writing and reading grants, textbooks, and even science fiction. Many of them would like to profit monetarily from their research; even those who do not must participate in various markets in order to build their experiments.

Gravity’s Ghost is strongest in showing how scientists fuse these multiple identities and loyalties into a complicated, inherently social (yet still admirably reliable) logic for establishing truth. Yet in the Envoi, Collins argues that some scientific identities—e.g., scientists as entrepreneurs, celebrities,
New Atheist gadflies—are dispensable and even inimical to proper science. It is an argument that only tenuously connects to the rest of the book. Let’s hope Collins eventually explains this notion more fully, with the empirical basis that it deserves (and that we would expect from his earlier work).
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Sustainability and environmental issues have become hot topics as the public recognizes that U.S. consumerist lifestyles cannot be environmentally, socially, or economically sustained indefinitely. However, the connection between environmental health, social inequality, and place is often absent from discussions about sustainability. Kevin Fitzpatrick and Mark LaGory’s book, Unhealthy Cities: Poverty, Race, and Place in America, makes those important connections. This is an essential source for policymakers, public health practitioners, and those who research and teach about social stratification, and urban, environmental, and/or medical sociology. With this work, the authors clearly tie together social theory, empirical work in psychology and sociology, and analyses of public health programs to construct a sociology of health that is place-based.

If there is one “take-home” message here, it is that “place matters.” In particular, it matters when assessing health inequities in the United States and globally. While globalization has seemingly connected people and ideas all over the world, people are anchored to place, and often cannot or choose not to leave unhealthy environments. Weaving throughout the text the example of a 1987 Birmingham, Alabama ecological disaster in which a warehouse fire released over 5,000 gallons of the chemical Dursban into the surrounding air and water of Village Creek, Fitzpatrick and LaGory illustrate how health is less a matter of individual choice (choosing a healthy lifestyle over an unhealthy one) than a state constrained by race, gender, social class, and other social inequities. In the case of Village Creek, the area most affected by the Dursban spill (which can cause breathing problems, nausea, and birth defects) were poor African American communities along the creek. Not surprisingly, the state was very slow to respond to the disaster and little was done to stem the damage until the chemicals were discovered in wealthier neighborhoods downstream.

This example is but one of many ecological disasters that have hit hardest those who can least withstand them. Locating dangerous facilities within poor neighborhoods is not accidental, but rather a product of conscious decisions by corporations and governments. It is part of the “ecology of disadvantage,” (p. 6) where place determines life chances. Fitzpatrick and LaGory argue, “For certain segments of the population, being in the wrong place is not a matter of timing or accident, but rather a function of the social structure” (p. 4). The “health penalty” that people pay in disadvantaged neighborhoods exceeds the placement of chemical spewing factories in the ghetto; it includes a lack of access to quality health care, dangerous, crowded, and dilapidated housing, community violence and gangs, rampant open-air drug markets, high rates of unemployment, limited access to healthy foods, crumbling infrastructure and schools, and a lack of public safety. In short, because of high levels of economic and racial segregation in the United States, inner city ghetto neighborhoods (the focus in the book) place the individuals residing in them at very high risk.

Instead of packing their text with facts and figures about the health inequities based on race and social class, the authors start with an exploration of the meaning of space and place and build to a sociology of health, explaining how certain groups are especially vulnerable and what policymakers and social institutions can do to ameliorate the health risks present in poor neighborhoods. The reader is given the opportunity to connect the philosophical aspects of what place means to humans and how humans become human through place. Using the framework of constrained choice, Fitzpatrick and LaGory explore what urban environments mean for humans and their health. Although
transportation connects us to many parts of a city, our surrounding space has a larger effect on our cognitive map of options and resources.

Fitzpatrick and LaGory reject the individualistic “lifestyle” health perspective and argue that lifestyles are produced within the constraints of neighborhood resources available to residents. Unhealthy places produce unhealthy lifestyles, not the other way around: “These ecological circumstances (high density, high segregation, low access to health-promoting resources, presence of illegitimate institutions, presence of deviant role models) represent the spatial conditions that nurture high probabilities of health-compromising behaviors and health beliefs” (p. 99). Thus the disadvantage that residents in poor communities experience produces negative health outcomes that cannot be blamed on individual choice. Those choices have been constrained by lack of social capital and the structural conditions of the neighborhood.

In the latter half of the book, Fitzpatrick and LaGory explain the particular risks to vulnerable populations in the urban realm, using the metaphor of the city as a “mosaic of risk and protection” (p. 102). They discuss the health risks to those who live in high poverty ghettos and the informal and formal “blankets of protection” that can serve to lessen the health risks present, such as churches, a strong family structure, and school-based health clinics. Examples of health risks include high rates of HIV infection, lead paint poisoning, asthma, youth violence victimization, and mental illness. Four populations—the homeless, the poor, youth, and the elderly—are at special risk for the health disadvantage in general. Those who live in high poverty places are in “double jeopardy” for negative health outcomes.

Fitzpatrick and LaGory argue that in order to alleviate health risk and unhealthy outcomes, any health promotion strategy must be infused with “place.” If unequal places produce health inequities, then social institutions should focus on making places more equal, rather than treating health as an individual problem. The authors offer many excellent examples of community-based programs that have intervened in neighborhoods to lessen health risk and improve life chances. While programs that explicitly work to promote health in poor communities are necessary to alleviate health inequality, the authors emphasize that “…they cannot succeed without simultaneously implementing comprehensive, place-sensitive strategies for healthy communities. Such an approach must include programs to promote both social capital as well as the human and physical capital contained in the community” (p. 188). With this book, Fitzpatrick and LaGory have created a more holistic approach to public health by connecting place inequities to wellness.


SUSAN WALZER
Skidmore College
swalzer@skidmore.edu

Individual sociologists come to their work with varying aims—some leaning toward examining the social world as it is and others more explicit about calling for social change. Charlotte Perkins Gilman was definitely in the latter camp. For her, “the constructive sociologist” evaluates social institutions not only as they “maintain and reproduce” but as they “improve humanity” (p. 13). This volume of previously difficult to find selections from The Forerunner—a journal that Gilman wrote, edited, and published in the early 1900s—reflects what she perceived to be a major societal priority: bringing down the patriarchal family. “We have done strange things to the family; or more specifically, men have,” Gilman writes (p. 3). From her perspective, an institution meant to serve children serves instead as a vehicle for the “comfort, power, and pride” of a male head—largely through his wife’s disenfranchisement from other work besides domestic (p. 3). Gilman questions women’s relegation to homemaking—“A woman slave is not a wife” (p. 19)—and calls for equality in marriage: “Friendship does not need ‘a head.’ Love does not need ‘a head.’ Why should a family?” (p. 10).
As tempting as it is to simply quote Gilman’s pointed and pithy arguments throughout this review (and there is a lot of grist here for CPG tee shirts and other swag), let me say a bit more about the volume’s content as well as questions it might evoke about what it means to do sociology. The collection is divided into four thematic groups: family, home, and society; men and marriage; motherhood; and children and parents. The introduction by the editor, Michael Hill, offers background on Gilman and historical context for some of her language. Hill challenges readers “to identify and evaluate the basic principles that give cohesion and coherence to her sociological vision” in spite of any discomfort or outrage her assertions might generate (p. xiii). He presents Gilman as “a catalyst for dialogue” (p. ix) and suggests that readers consider any confusion they experience as at least partly rooted in their own “unexamined defenses” against ideas that challenge their “deepest emotions and cultural biases” (p. xiv). Gilman herself was not immune from cultural bias, however; her nativism and classism are now well-documented. Like many of her contemporaries, she maintained a paradoxical sense of social justice: on one hand, she was deeply committed to the advancement of white women, and on the other, she sought to restrict the rights of immigrants and African Americans.

While Hill situates his volume as a corrective to literary treatments of Gilman that he perceives “fail miserably to articulate her work and perspective as a professional sociologist” (p. xii), I suspect that students of sociology who are newly encountering Gilman might need guidance around the forms her analyses of social life take. Hill correctly does not shy away from Gilman’s eclectic approaches, which at times blur the boundaries between “professional sociologist” and the fiction writer she also was. The collection includes, for example, a parable in which the narrator receives a visitation from a spirit in the night that metaphorically critiques the notion that social worth should be based on ancestry. This piece links intellectually to another that takes on the concept of “illegitimacy” and asserts that children’s well-being ought not to be negatively influenced by the circumstances of their births or the misguided connection of women’s economic status to men and marriage.

A task for teachers who use this book will be to help current students of sociology make sense of the expressive rhetorical strategies that Gilman uses to present her sociological perspective. Hill characterizes Gilman as “a pioneering sociologist, feminist pragmatist, author, and lecturer” (p. xi). The volume prompts consideration of what distinguishes these roles and how standards for expressing and evaluating contentions like those Gilman makes have changed over time. In a couple of the pieces, she alludes to data or to another author’s work, but more often the selections read as editorials (not surprising given the journalistic venue in which they were published). Hill notes that “Gilman never hides her conclusions behind sociological jargon, as do many writers today” (p. xii), but the collection is likely to generate bewilderment in students schooled in current dominant disciplinary norms for social scientists (in which night visions, exclamation points, and humor figure less prominently). Given that one of the primary intentions of the editor is to foreground Gilman’s contribution to sociology per se, a teacher using this book should expect to address the implications of her process as a self-taught sociologist working in a new and different historical moment in U.S. sociology.

Hill’s emphasis on the continued relevance of Gilman’s content is apt. When it comes to family and gender arrangements, her commentary of a century ago reflects that old news is still news. Gilman is concerned with how best to raise children, with the “injurious and degrading” implications of inequality in grown-up relationships (p. 42), even with constraints on women’s “natural” bodies (“Should we not laugh to see a horse in corsets?” [p. 97]). Her larger vision of the human condition is also resonant: “In a large sociological sense no civilized human being is ‘self-supporting’” (p. 39). She argues not only for recognition of interdependence, but for equality and reciprocity in family relationships: “The least efficient, most wasteful labor, is that of every man for himself. The next lowest is that of every woman for her man” (p. 43). Gilman’s enduring sociological vision helps us to see the chronic intersections between our everyday relationships
and our social imperfection as well as the continued possibility that we might live with each other more humanely and improve what we offer to the next generation.
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When thinking of merchant/customer conflicts, often the stories that are most familiar are tales of friction between black customers and other racial minorities who operate stores in urban areas. Friction between black urban residents and Korean entrepreneurs, Jewish merchants, and Chinese business owners is well documented. Often, these stories are framed as examples of black communities failing to retain their purchasing power, or as a case of interracial conflict between more and less economically successful racial minority groups. Yet these conflicts—and the explanations attributed to them—represent only a small portion of the type and landscape of conflicts between store owners and patrons. The Store in the Hood proves this decisively, as Steven Gold takes an interesting, timely look at the history of contact and conflict between merchants and customers in urban areas.

Rather than focus exclusively on conflicts between black clients and entrepreneurs of other races, Gold gives readers a much more comprehensive look at the causes, explanations, and consequences of tension between urban business owners and the customers who they serve. In doing so, he introduces cases of merchant/customer conflict that are less widely known but no less informative. After an introduction in Chapter One, Chapter Two traces the history of black entrepreneurship from 1900-1935, showing the ways that intentional structural forces (Jim Crow segregation, government policy) acted destructively to significantly undermine black entrepreneurial progress. This chapter also provides an important context to understand the roots of the tensions that do erupt from time to time between black customers and entrepreneurs of other racial groups. Chapters Three-Six consider different cases of owner/client conflict over the course of the twentieth century. Gold explores the ways that white citizens targeted Greek, Jewish, Japanese, and other entrepreneurs during time periods of great change and uncertainty, particularly when these groups immigrated to the United States in large numbers and became more successful than some of their white counterparts. Chapter Seven examines entrepreneurship in the informal economy, while Chapter Eight explores ethnic entrepreneurship in Detroit in order to assess minority business ownership in a majority-black urban area. Chapter Nine concludes the book with suggestions for social policy.

One of the strengths of Gold’s book is its focus on conflicts that may not be familiar to readers. While the history of anti-Semitism—and its implications for Jewish business owners—is well known, readers may be surprised to learn that Greek immigrant entrepreneurs were similarly targeted in campaigns of racial and ethnic harassment during the early 1900s. In one particularly striking example, Gold includes a Roanoke, Virginia mayor’s defense of white mobs who destroyed Greek-owned stores. This mayor’s exoneration of white vigilantes is based on stereotypes of Greek criminality and deviousness that are eerily reminiscent of the types of language used to describe black Americans during the era of legal segregation. Many readers may be unaware of the type of harassment, stereotyping, and violence that Greek immigrants faced, and may be even more surprised to learn that they faced these grievances at the hands of other whites.

While the book offers key insights about the various contexts of entrepreneur/customer conflict, I found this book’s most important strength to be the contributions it makes to the literature on racial/ethnic relations. In a particularly fascinating chapter that analyzes the role that public policy has played in shaping tensions between merchants and patrons, Gold contends that enterprise zones, business development programs, and anti-affirmative action initiatives...
actually served to worsen black economic inequality and exacerbate joblessness, poverty, and police brutality. Interestingly, Gold notes that these very social problems are likely to be associated with urban riots, and are a much more compelling explanation of tensions between merchants and customers in urban areas than black patrons’ jealousy, laziness, or innate tendency towards violence. Given that these same factors of high unemployment and poverty sparked recent riots in Cairo, Egypt and several other Middle Eastern nations, Gold’s analysis has particular relevance for understanding urban unrest in the global arena.

Gold’s attention to the different ways that mainstream media and sociological literatures describe racial groups’ quests for economic stability through entrepreneurship is another important point. Specifically, Gold contends that while many racial and ethnic minority groups seek to advance their collective self-interest through entrepreneurial policies, when these efforts are undertaken by blacks, they are seen as evidence of black nationalism and often described as threatening, dangerous, and misguided. In contrast, Gold notes that similar or even the same initiatives by white ethnics are taken as examples of rational thought and evidence of conforming to the American desire to succeed. Again, this contributes to the literature on race and ethnicity by highlighting the implicit ways that blacks’ efforts at economic advancement are treated suspiciously and cast as problematic.

Finally, it is important to point out the clear contributions this book makes to the literature on ethnic entrepreneurship. Gold takes a topic that has been indirectly addressed in several studies of ethnic business and tackles it head-on with a refreshing, unique approach. In focusing on merchant/customer conflict over the past century, Gold is able to touch on issues of public policy, immigration, race, ethnicity, and economic sociology and the way these various factors can facilitate business owners’ conflicts with their customers. By grounding these tensions between entrepreneurs and patrons in a broader context, Gold makes an important contribution to ethnic enterprise literature that too often treats this phenomenon as self-explanatory. Overall, Gold has written an easily accessible, informative book that will appeal to students and faculty in a variety of fields, as well as anyone interested in learning more about the sociological factors that lead to conflict between business owners and those they serve.


STEPHEN STEINBERG
Queens College & Graduate Center, CUNY
ssteinberg1@gc.cuny.edu

This is a second edition of a volume published in 1992, just prior to Bill Clinton’s first term in office. When the authors concluded the first edition with an optimistic appraisal of policy options that could alleviate poverty and inequality, they could not have known that the nation was on the cusp of a political and economic transformation that would greatly exacerbate existing inequalities. Therefore, this second edition is all the more welcome. Their chapters bulge with important statistics that document recent economic trends, culminating with the economic meltdown in 2008. As William Goldsmith and Edward Blakely write: “Now, after two terms of Bill Clinton centrisim followed by two frightening terms of George W. Bush conservative radicalism, we find the entire nation burdened by the decay and hopeless poverty of some city neighborhoods and a growing number of inner suburbs. As the mortgage crisis brings home, not only do central cities suffer, but so do entire metropolitan areas, even the well-off suburbs that felt so protected” (p. 4).

The rhetorical frame for Separate Societies, from its title to its three core chapters—“Separate Assets,” “Separate Opportunities,” “Separate Places”—is “separation.” As the authors write: “By this usage of separation we mean to include ideas of social segmentation, economic division, and sharp geographic isolation. We see separation as a matter not just of degree, but of kind, a process like the melting pot in reverse” (p. 28). But it is one thing to explore the ecological
dimensions of poverty and inequality, and another to posit “separation” itself as an explanatory factor in the production and reproduction of poverty. This theoretical leap is hugely problematic, both in terms of theory and public policy. There is a school of thought that shifts attention away from poverty to “concentrated poverty”—especially the “hypersegregation” of “black ghettos,” “Latino barrios,” and “poor Asian enclaves.” The presumption is that we can remedy poverty by eliminating the places where the poor are concentrated, which is the dubious theoretical underpinning of HOPE VI, a policy initiated under Clinton and Cisneros that has led to the destruction of public housing across the nation. Indeed, Goldsmith and Blakely laud HOPE VI for reducing concentrated poverty, though they also fret that it “caused new housing shortages through displacement, a familiar problem from earlier renewal programs” (p. 151).

Goldsmith and Blakely are on a stronger theoretical foundation when they write: “Economic and political forces no longer combat poverty, they generate poverty” (p. 28). The core chapters offer a cornucopia of empirical data on poverty and inequality—a one-stop reference for students who will read this book in courses on urban poverty, stratification, and public policy. In their chapter on “Separate Assets,” Goldsmith and Blakely document the upward distribution of income that began during Clinton’s first term and escalated during the Bush years. On the assumption that the inability to get a well-paid job is the most common cause of family poverty, due emphasis is placed on employment and wages. The cumulative impact of their statistical volley is to shatter the myth of the United States as a middle-class society. As they write, “the present danger in the United States is that we are creating a bottom level, like that taken for granted by some in the Third World” (p. 74).

The chapter on “Separate Opportunities” focuses on the extent to which poverty is not an individual event, but is rooted in major economic and political institutions. Deindustrialization and the restructuring of urban economies and job hierarchies have condemned massive numbers of workers—and not only minorities—to languish on the periphery of the job market or in jobs that pay a poverty wage. Much of this is a product of globalization, but as the authors show, it is also abetted by free trade agreements, tax laws that encourage corporations to shift production abroad, deregulation of industries that increased competitive pressures, and privatization of public services. The result is a society that is bifurcated not only by income, but by opportunity as well.

The chapter on “Separate Places” examines the changing configuration of the American metropolis, the “doughnuts” and “checkerboards” that mark uneven rates of regional development and prevailing wages, and the “global cities” that have prospered, partly thanks to the influx of immigrant workers. In the case of African Americans, however, these economic developments, including mass immigration, have increased competition for jobs, resulting in a pattern of “hypersegregation” that functions as a “spatial lock,” offering few channels of escape.

In the concluding chapter, “Rebuilding the American City,” Goldsmith and Blakely assert that “it is not enough to call for a return to generous liberal federal policy” (p. 150), though for the most part they proffer the familiar liberal reforms: transfer payments, a universal family support policy, healthcare, education programs, a youth service corps, and affirmative action (“most unfortunately, still an essential requirement in the United States” [p. 177]). Consistent with their urban focus, they also envision “a new urban coalition,” built on neighborhood community development corporations and local governments, in cities and suburbs alike, which could become multi-city coalitions that influence national policy.

Sadly, this vision is even more unlikely given the political and ideological cleavages that have erupted in the year since Separate Societies was published. Goldsmith and Blakely were prescient in their observation that “despite capturing the presidency and sizable majorities in the House of Representatives and Senate, the Democratic Party hardly seems a voice for the future, as its ideas lag far behind the requirements of the age” (p. 165). As they write, “the time is ripe for new ideas.” Perhaps in their third edition, Goldsmith and Blakely will contemplate the political challenges in the age of neoliberalism.
Although readers picking up this book might be misled by the title, this is not a book about the problems faced by individual households pursuing the “American Dream.” Rather, the focus is on the problems faced by suburban communities (especially older inner-ring suburbs) including the impacts of economic and population change on aging suburban communities, and the need for policies that differentiate between deteriorating older suburbs and affluent older suburbs.

Bernadette Hanlon drew a sample of 3,428 suburbs from metropolitan areas of different sizes throughout the United States. Her sample allowed her to compare development trends between 1980 and 2000 in suburbs located in all the major regions of the United States. Those regional comparisons confirm some commonly held views about the state of suburbia, while challenging others. For example, we are not surprised to read that inner-ring suburbs in the metropolitan areas of the West suffered less from population declines between 1980 and 2000 than did inner-ring suburbs in older regions of the country. In fact, many inner-ring suburbs in the metropolitan areas of the West actually gained population between 1980 and 2000, much of that gain coming from immigration. (Happily, this book gives more attention than others to the role played by immigrants in suburbanization.)

However, in terms of population composition, some of Hanlon’s findings are counter-intuitive. Since most of the urban centers of the Northeast and Midwest regions were built earlier than cities of the Sunbelt, we might expect that by the end of the twentieth century, their inner suburbs had grown poorer than inner suburbs in newer parts of the nation. Not so. In the Northeast and Midwest, Hanlon found surprisingly low rates of poverty (below 10 percent) in inner-ring suburbs because poor people in those regions have continued to cluster in central cities. In parts of the West and South, a different picture emerged. There, inner suburbs saw increases in poverty from 1980 to 2000 such that by 2000, many more inner-ring suburbs were classified as “high poverty” (that is, having over 20 percent of their populations living in poverty) than in the Northeast and Midwest. High-poverty suburbs were especially numerous in the inner rings surrounding Miami and Los Angeles. Even in the outer suburbs surrounding the big cities of the West and South, significantly higher percentages of suburban communities were classified as “high poverty” compared to the Northeast and Midwest. Hanlon attributed this to immigrants seeking low-wage service jobs on the metropolitan fringe, a pattern more common in the Sunbelt than in the Northeast and Midwest.

Among the most interesting parts of the book is Chapter Eight, where the author compared different types of inner-ring suburbs with each other (as opposed to comparing them to outer-ring suburbs). For example, she singled out industrial suburbs for more attention than they ordinarily receive in a literature that focuses almost exclusively on residential suburbs. Compared to other inner suburbs, many industrial suburbs in the inner ring suffered steep losses in employment from 1980 to 2000, along with dramatic declines of white residents as a share of their population.

Perhaps her most intriguing observation is that older, inner-ring suburbs need not inevitably decline. Using indicators like population growth, income levels and poverty rates, Hanlon identified many inner-ring suburbs that are doing quite well. For example, comparing the median household income for individual suburbs with the median household income for their respective metropolitan areas, Hanlon found that in the Northeastern United States a larger proportion of inner ring suburbs could be classified as affluent than could be classified as poor (p. 85). Unlike other researchers, Hanlon deliberately chose a definition of “inner-ring suburbs” that was not limited to distressed suburbs. She used the age of a community’s housing stock (specifically, the proportion built before 1969) and...
its geographic location adjacent to a central city to define her sample of “inner-ring” communities. Given that definition, her sample contained both affluent and declining older suburbs. Her comparison of inner suburbs doing well and those doing poorly draws our attention to the very interesting fact that the age of housing alone does not condemn any suburb to decline. In fact, the book identifies inner suburbs that appear to have capitalized on housing stocks built before 1939 with both a quality and a character that continue to attract residents.

Challenged by exactly the same market forces as other older communities (which Hanlon elaborated in Chapter Four), the successful older communities warrant much more examination than was possible in this book. It is unlikely that housing style alone explains the very different trajectories taken by older suburbs in the late twentieth century. What other factors have determined their fates? That is an essential question to answer, if we are to develop strategies to mitigate, or even reverse, the declining fortunes of many inner suburbs. It would have strengthened the book if Hanlon had linked her observations about successful versus failing older suburbs with the policy discussion in Chapter Nine. That final chapter of the book put forward the usual array of strategies (including urban growth boundaries, affordable housing for suburbs, and living wage legislation), all of which are widely seen by planners to be desirable yet politically unfeasible in the near term.

This book will be useful for courses covering metropolitan or suburban development, courses that are increasingly offered in urban studies programs. In compact form, it synthesizes much of what we know about patterns of development and decline in U.S. urban regions. It provides a useful summary of much of the literature on older suburbs. A particularly helpful feature for students and other newcomers to the topic is a full-page table (p. 26) summarizing the results of over a dozen important studies on the topic. Hanlon makes skillful use of concrete examples found in specific suburbs around the United States to illustrate points she is making. Chosen from all the major regions of the country, those examples enliven Hanlon’s argument for readers across the United States.

While social scientists, policy makers and other observers have known for many years that youth populations form solid majorities in most of the Muslim world, there are strangely few studies of this population. This absence is all the more striking given how youthfulness has been either linked to all kinds of social problems, from unemployment to political instability to extremism, or alternatively identified as a great collective “asset” and an “opportunity.” A factor in this absence may be that while enormous resources have been devoted to studying Muslims primarily as a security problem, there are in fact hardly any resourceful institutions devoted to the sociological study of Muslim societies. This book itself is a case in point: prepared first through a workshop organized in 2005 at the International Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World (ISIM) in Leiden, the book appeared after that highly unique and successful institute was defunded by the Dutch government and forced to close.

This very useful book came out before the 2011 revolutions in the Arab World, which in their initial phases were identified as youth rebellions and which were indeed spearheaded by youth populations, even when such mass movements eventually involve all generations. While revolutionary potentials are of course not explicitly addressed here, the Arab Spring adds all the more to the relevance of this volume as a significant source for anyone interested in the background of revolutionary movements in some aspects of youth cultures and modern experiences. The fact that the book is conceived more generally as a global exploration of youthfulness in connection to Muslimness could be somewhat misleading, since in fact the stress tends to be far more on questions of youth than on those of religion.
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In conceiving of such a volume, the editors embarked on a daring challenge. The Muslim World is geographically vast and richly varied. It encompasses communities in virtually all world regions. Researchers often find it difficult to separate clearly the effects of the local context from those of global connections; indeed, in most cases a more realistic approach would be to treat global connections as simply another facet of the local context itself. Furthermore, “Muslims” are often seen—sometimes by outside observers, other times by Muslims themselves—less as pious people obeying specific rituals than as a cultural group sharing a general and fluid sense of identity. While this may or may not be a passing problem of perspective, it is worth keeping in mind that it is difficult to imagine a comparable book with such a title as “Being Young and Christian,” unless one refers specifically to those young for whom religion as such is important. That is not the case with this book.

The editors tell us that by “Muslim” they are adjusting to a current reality of flexible usage. The category includes “secular Muslims, hybrid Muslims, non-Muslim minorities in Muslim majority societies, and religious Muslims who take part in Muslim youth cultural politics” (pp. 357-58). This broad scope seems adequate for the purposes of capturing and comparing broad contemporary social phenomena. It is also partially justifiable by some historical usages in which Muslimness could serve to designate a type of pluralistic culture rather than a particular religious belief. As such, it could indeed accommodate non-Muslims living in Muslim-majority territories.

The studies in this large edited volume cover a rich span of cases, showcasing “Rasta Sufis” alongside Salafi youth, politicized youth alongside youth submerged in global music subgenres, youth for whom the biggest headache is Muslim authorities alongside youth for whom a comparable dead weight is that of secular authorities. All are studied in a common context of neoliberal transformations in the global South as well as the global North. The twenty studies cover a broad spectrum of locations, including Indonesia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Gambia, Palestine, Egypt, Cameroon, Thailand, Brooklyn, France, Germany, Iran, Niger, Mali, Turkey, and the Netherlands. A unifying approach consists of the contributors’ attempt not only to study youth as a research object, but to showcase youth agency. This is evident in the methodological preferences which throughout this volume bring out most the strengths of cultural approaches—notably critical ethnography, interviews, biographies, and oral histories. These methods enable the contributors to remain close to the ground and sensitive to nuance and difference.

Throughout, youth appear more as creative actors and designers of their own environments, rather than as victims of global and local circumstances they cannot control. In this spirit, the case studies steer away from a “problem-centered” approach, in which youth are either associated with certain social problems, or are themselves defined by problems whose description becomes the goal of research. Rather, the case studies highlight the importance of describing how youth themselves define their own conditions and explore possibilities in their own terms.

While the case studies vary in their specific approach and conclusion, they seem to show some key common factors. Muslim youth in general do share significant similar concerns with non-Muslim youth around the world, especially when it comes to their use of modern media technology, susceptibility to intergenerational conflicts, acceptance of human rights, and demands for political inclusion. In addition, contemporary Muslim youth, facing multiple obstacles in neoliberal times and benefiting from multiple nodes of connectivity to global styles and movements, no longer seek a traditional path to adulthood. Rather, they seem more inclined to define their world in new terms that make sense to them. They make sense of their world not necessarily by going to the Qur’an or listening to religious authorities, but by proactively seeking connections and meanings, which they assemble from a variety of available sources and in their own way. The result is not a uniform youth culture. Youth may of course respond to their exclusion and targeting by exuding profound alienation. This may be the case, for example, where youth in particular, or their larger communities in general, are expressly...
targeted as a problem population—as in many Western countries in recent years. On the other hand, youth incomprehension of a world that excludes both them and their elders, as we see in the Arab Spring, may become the basis of their unprecedented mobilization, through which the world they inhabit is rejuvenated—as a whole.


Gabrielle Raley
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For all that sociologists know about the institutional and historical aspects of cultural production, we know less about how cultural products are made on a day-to-day basis. It is this gap in knowledge that David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker set out to fill in Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries, a valuable contribution to the recent surge of U.K. scholarship on creative work. Hesmondhalgh and Baker situate interview and ethnographic data against a panoramic theoretical backdrop, which includes cultural studies, the sociology of work, political economy, business school studies of creativity, cultural sociology, and “liberal political thought.” Though the authors’ sympathies clearly lie with the critical stance of cultural studies, the book is a worthy addition to scholarship on cultural sociology and the sociology of work.

In Part One of the book, Hesmondhalgh and Baker argue that creative work is a complicating case for the theorization of both work and culture, and devote a chapter to reviewing the theoretical literature in each area. The chapter on work is squarely in the labor process tradition, though the authors advocate substituting the concepts of “good” and “bad” work for alienation, and considering the products, and not just processes, of production. In the following chapter on cultural theory, the authors launch a convincing argument that creative labor should be analyzed as a distinct aspect of cultural production. They orient this discussion in relation to the political economy of culture; organizational, business, and management studies (into which they put “production of culture” research in sociology); and cultural studies. An excellent discussion of the concept of creativity in Raymond Williams’ work is included here as it relates to commerce, and an original and useful synthesis of Bourdieu on the art/commerce division follows. Overall, Hesmondhalgh and Baker frame their theoretical approach as infusing an appreciation of subjective experience into the political economy perspective, a normative orientation into the management/organizational approach, and a consideration of the contradictions of creative work into the cultural studies standpoint.

In Part Two of Creative Labour, the authors present findings from 63 interviews with creative workers in television production, music recording, and magazine publishing, along with twelve weeks of participant observation by Baker in an independent TV production company in London. This is a strong stand-alone section. In it, the authors answer their research question—“What kinds of experiences do jobs and occupations in the cultural industries offer their workers?”—by examining the aspects of work that creative workers find engaging, difficult, and rewarding (p. 1). Their interview data show well the intrinsically conflicted nature of creative labor. On the one hand, creative workers experience what could be conceived of as genuine charm and engagement in their labor, due to the high possibility of creativity in their work, the public nature of their products, the status of the industries in which they work, and, for some, the comfortable incomes and high sociability with fellow creatives. On the other hand, the work can be hard to come by, hard to do full time, and precarious. There is also the risk, as several respondents note with eloquence, of over-identification with one’s work—not being able to set it down or distance oneself from it, and the black vacuum of time and identity that can result. The chapter on Baker’s participant observation adds the concept of emotional labor to these points, showing that the precariousness of TV production and daily work with heart-rendingly hopeful contestants involve a significant outlay.
Chapter Eight, “Creative Products, Good and Bad,” is the star of the empirical section. Here, Hesmondhalgh and Baker consider creative workers’ relationship to the products they make, an empirical angle that forces a simultaneous consideration of work and culture. Data in this chapter investigate issues of ownership and the “good works” aspect of feeling that a creative product has a positive influence on society; though this is hard to imagine for some cultural products, other products are seen as “world changing” in their creators’ minds, or at least offering them the ability to create a unique aesthetic point of view. Conversely, the experience of producing a “bad” product is what most leads to a sense of forced creative production for workers, with commercial concerns often seen as the culprit for the decline in creative quality. Interestingly, the authors find that creative workers do not view their products as bad if they involve any commercial motivation, but only if they involve too much.

*Creative Labour* does a skillful job in showing the analytical and empirical relevance of a recent area of research and in enticing a wide range of readers, given its theoretical breadth. Of course, this breadth is also a liability in some sense, and leads Hesmondhalgh and Baker to make a more diffuse contribution than working within a more narrowly defined theoretical area would have enabled. Their empirical chapters contain informative data and their research design—namely, interviewing workers across three distinct cultural industries—is robust. However, the data analysis is hampered by a rather broad research question (noted above), which leads the authors to trace the usual contours of job satisfaction in their data; it is not always clear how culture matters in their analysis. At the same time, many points are revelatory. Culture and commerce are not idle abstractions for creative workers; they work out the contradictions that exist between the logics of culture and commerce as they sit down at their keyboards, editing stations, digital and virtual canvases. *Creative Labour*’s data and theoretical framing are effective in unpacking some of these contradictions, and Hesmondhalgh and Baker set several disciplines ahead with this research.
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The American public’s fascination with extramarital affairs of male politicians and celebrities is currently at a fever pitch. Such dalliances surely provide salacious entertainment, but our interest in them is not only frivolous. In searching for their details, we consider Foucauldian questions about when, where, and why men are unfaithful. Do men who have sex outside of marriage do so for variety? Because they can? *The Secret: Love, Marriage, and HIV* is an eclectic yet sharp-eyed inquiry into the motivations and meanings of men’s sexual and social lives outside of, and to a lesser extent within, marriage.

The book is impressive in substance and method. It is a sweeping comparison of five locales within five countries: Mexico, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Uganda, and Vietnam. Based on long-term research in respective settings, in five chapters five authors give rich, historical accounts of “sexual geographies”—the economic structures that facilitate sexual risk as it relates to HIV—and of the specific motivations of men who take advantage of sexual opportunities. The sixth author, Constance Nathanson, contributes to an exceptional introduction and conclusion. The book offers new ways to think about male desire, inextricably linking it with inequalities produced by changes in economy and society. In Papua New Guinea, for example, the new economic struggles men face have fostered a “compensatory masculinity” that takes shape in extramarital trysts. Harriet Phinney finds that under the *Doi Moi* policies of economic liberalization, Vietnam experienced a rapid growth of its pleasure industry, which
generated new notions of permissible sexuality. And in Nigeria, cell phones provide new ways for lovers to communicate, effectively revolutionizing extramarital relations. These changes put faithful wives at greater risk of contracting HIV.

The authors detail day-to-day inflections of male sexual desires and masculinities. In all settings, the provision of private time and space for men but not women is demonstrable. Mexican women in Degollado, for example, shoulder domestic responsibilities (child care, cooking, cleaning, and ironing), while men are geographically mobile. This mobility is partially attributable to employment seeking or working, but they also enjoy, as Shanti Parikh observes in Uganda, a “daily, prosaic” mobility (p. 187). Time away sustains male-dominated social spaces, like rodeos near Degollado or beer halls in Uganda, which incite an “aura of expectation” about sex and facilitate group behavior. Men were shown to approve when other men pursued a sexual liaison, and to shun men who did not. Thus such spaces serve as sites where men jockey for social position to earn reputation and status, which are critical where male identities are linked with economic viability amidst uncertainty. Nigerian men, therefore, purchase food and drink for other men and girlfriends as much to promote themselves as able bodies, as to create sexual ties with women. It is important, however, the authors argue, to recognize that once men are presented with sexual opportunities, they must choose whether to grasp them. Many men viewed their infidelities with ambiguity, suffering inner conflict and guilt, especially if they spent money on beer and other women. This very recognition—of an intertwining between an individual’s intentional action and the social-structural opportunities that make certain actions possible—diverges from the kind of social science that sees marital events (formation, dissolution, etc.) in probabilistic terms: where, for example, whether an event occurs is a function of the number of attractive marital partners who might serve as alternatives. Such is the value of ethnography.

Also important are shifts in the constitution of marriage. Scholars such as Jane Collier, Stephanie Coontz, and Andrew Cherlin have observed, despite the resilience of gender roles, increasingly the ideal marriage is companionate, based more on notions of love and togetherness than on duty or obligations. Because the modern project of “developing a home” has changed expectations within middle-class Ugandan marriages, women may become disappointed should husbands fail to provide wealth and luxuries, making faithfulness difficult (p. 182). Companionate marriage may also lead to sexual risk when men resist its domesticating ideals by seeking extramarital sex, or, as Elisa Sobo has shown in the United States, when women do not seek condom use, thus upholding “a fiction of mutual monogamy” (p. 10).

The book exhorts the commonplace occurrence of men’s but not women’s extramarital relations. Quantitatively oriented researchers will wonder whether sample sizes are sufficient to generalize to wider populations. Others may wonder about the extent to which wives too are unfaithful, a possibility with some support from studies of sero-discordant couples finding many women are the infected partners, as well as from Mark Hunter’s work in South Africa describing women’s infidelities. Still, years of research and rigorous methods support a convincing argument that within each study population, it is common for men to have sex outside of marriage. How do wives respond? Generally, women’s economic reliance on spouses and segregation away from male spaces does foil surveillance. Mostly, though, women know of their husbands’ infidelities, but usually comply with keeping them secret as long as men maintain their familial economic responsibilities and never flaunt their affairs. Violation of either expectation justifies confrontation, outrage, and sometimes divorce. Yet how wives respond also depends on the setting. Huli wives in Papua New Guinea publicize suspicions of unfaithfulness to garner their own support, or even respond violently, as did Miriam, who caught in the act and then stabbed her husband’s lover. The social costs of a public reaction are greater in other settings, such as among the Igbo in Nigeria, where a woman risks accusations of underperformance as a wife or lover.

By naming and describing how economy, collective groups, and time and space influence men’s infidelities, the authors expose
the inadequacies of merely essentialist interpretations of men’s sexual desire, relegated to the intrinsic and seen amorphously. It is not enough to say that men have sex outside of marriage for variety or orgasm: “It’s not entirely about the sex” (p. 204). It is also about the importance of men’s relations with other men, with their lovers, and with their wives. The book makes a major public-health contribution precisely because it emphatically moves sexual action and risk away from individuals to collectivities. For policy prescriptions, this route may pose practical challenges, and may be subject to skepticism on moral or ideological grounds, but it may too ultimately bring about superior results.
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A recent boom in religion and media literature has highlighted the many ways religious actors adopt and adapt new communication technologies into their practices, rituals and identities. They use these technologies to reimagine their relations with the divine, with co-religionists, and with their own traditions’ authority. These activities are no less present in conservative religious groups than “liberal” ones. In fact, as this growing literature clearly demonstrates, conservative religious groups are frequently the first to adapt and eagerly develop new communications technologies. This is clearly proven in Digital Jesus, a new book by Robert Glenn Howard. Drawing on nearly two decades of online field research with conservative Christians who are deeply devoted to interpreting current events in relation to biblical “End Times” prophecy and publishing their views online, Howard argues that the internet and its various platforms have enabled the development of a new fundamentalist online community (or “virtual ekklesia”). This ekklesia is sustained over time yet has no clear lines of religious authority. Rather, website developers’ religious authority is developed and displayed through numerous online ritual performances. There is much to appreciate in this book, particularly its rich ethnographic material. Unfortunately, its most interesting observations are overshadowed by ill-supported claims about the group’s “newness” that add little to our understanding of these phenomena.

Digital Jesus charts the development of a number of End Times prophetic websites and their links and connections. Howard observes that many of the website creators have had sustained internet presence, changing platforms (from Usenet to HTML-blogs to MySpace) as they develop, and shifting strategies of claiming special religious authority as they do. Digital Jesus is at its best when it focuses on the strategies that creators of online prophecy sites use to establish their own interpretive authority and build (or display) an online community of readers. Its most forceful passages closely analyze these discursive cultures. Howard’s contributions to our understandings of discursive ritual are quite important and unique.

But Howard’s insights are overshadowed by the book’s anachronistic analytical framework. This framework enables Howard to claim that his group is a new religious movement with a new kind of authority structure that is made possible by online technologies. To make this claim, he first argues that his online group is not “old” fundamentalism. He argues that American fundamentalism became de-institutionalized in the mid-twentieth century, and has since then been a vernacular movement without central authority. Viewing American fundamentalism as de-institutionalized allows him to identify his online community as a new fundamentalist movement, where “fundamentalism” is described typologically as a belief, among other things, in the imminence of the Second Coming.

There are two missteps in this argument. First, Howard equates institutions with religious institutions (for example, churches, denominations, and seminaries) and orthodox religious authority as what emanates from those institutions. Second, and as a consequence, he fails to recognize the variety of
institutions where conservative Christian beliefs—including End Times belief—have become authoritative. Many of these institutions are mass media outlets including the radio, television, direct mail, and (we might assume) the internet as well.

One of the galvanizing tensions in the history of conservative American Christianity is that between individual and “institutional” (or churchly) interpretational authority: too much church authority means that the church is “dead,” yet not enough structure means anarchy. This tension makes conservative Christians suspicious of any “institutional religion,” including denominations—but at the same time this suspicion has not limited their investments in building institutions that reproduce conservative beliefs and authority structures. This observation lies at the heart of much of the recent literature on media and religion, where scholars investigate how conservative Christians adopt “new” communications technologies to establish ways of teaching and reproducing individual religious authority—sometimes alongside and sometimes in clear distinction from other “religious institutions.” As these studies make clear, various vernacular religious products (books, YouTube videos, DVDs, radio programs) are widely used in churches, study groups, and other face-to-face religious community settings. While these might appear to be unmediated “products” that can be used for personal religious gain (and hence do not carry the taint of “institutionalized” religion), they nonetheless are frequently embedded in authoritative networks of conservative Christian religious production.

_Digital Jesus_ does not engage this mainstream social scientific understanding of conservative Christian institutions. While Howard might be correct that his virtual ekklesia is cut off from these other movements and trends, he does not provide a convincing argument or examples of how his virtual ekklesia might be. As a result, it is also hard to know what to make of Howard’s argument that his group’s exclusionary and intolerant practices are a result of the internet’s unique platforms. Howard suggests that it is the peculiar structure of the online ekklesia and its discursive exclusionary practices that contribute to the virulent intolerance espoused therein. Drawing on interviews with the creators of these websites, Howard notes that few participate in “off-line” religious connections. As a result, Howard argues that while at some level the fact that these groups are cut off and highly intolerant is cause for alarm, their exclusionary views and practices will probably keep the ekklesia small and fragile, and thus not ripe for “institutionalization” on a larger scale.

But what if this virtual ekklesia is not a cutoff community? Howard does not interview these websites’ regular users—the many thousands who read (but do not maintain or create) the ekklesia’s sites. How do they use this material? Do they stop going to church too? Given that conservative Christians use a wide range of “vernacular” religious materials, it seems important to know how, if at all, the exclusionary, sometimes virulently intolerant prophetic sites that Howard follows are used. What if the End Times digital community and its thousands of pages of prophetic discourse are being discussed in book clubs and Bible studies? Would we then have more, or different, reason to be concerned about the sites that produce ways of establishing the religiously authoritative intolerance that _Digital Jesus_ describes?
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This well-written book is primarily a tough-minded attempt in the face of major cross-cultural variation to define a core conception of friendship-like relationships, in the terms of common behaviors, feelings, and thoughts. The attempt is mainly an anthropological and psychological one, although it is also one with major sociological implications.

Although _Friendship_ does contain many qualitative illustrations, the quantitative methodology employed in this thoroughly
empirical work is that of secondary research, synthesizing a wide range of methods, including ethnographic descriptions, behavioral experiments, hypothetical decision scenarios, and self-report and observational data. The studies examined are generally well selected, testing many putative differences (e.g., between men and women) and theoretical explanations (e.g., attachment theory). When synthesizing the results of such studies, David Hruschka generally converts them to Cohen’s d; indeed, he provides an entire appendix of d-statistics for studies cited. The sampling of ethnographic descriptions is systematic, relying primarily on the sixty small-scale societies comprising the Probability Sample File (PSF) of the much larger Human Relations Area Files (HRAF). (The PSF is a sub-sample of the four-hundred HRAF cultures “specifically chosen by anthropologists in the 1960s to ensure representative coverage of peasant and small-scale societies around the world” [p. 50] and is shown in Figure 8.)

Based on this systematic sampling, the book puts forward the key finding that, of eleven elements of friendship commonly cited in the United States, only four—mutual aid, need-based helping, positive affect, and gift giving among partners—survived disconfirmation through systematic examination of the sixty societies of the PSF. (However, despite the author’s silence on the matter, a fifth element—informality—appears from the summary in Figure 10 (p. 69) to have equally survived disconfirmation.) This finding about positive affect underwrites the author’s persistent thesis (indeed, the book was once an anthropological dissertation) that behaviors (such as mutual aid) alone cannot define friendship adequately but such a definition must also take account of psychological states—how we think and feel about friends.

The book is clearly organized (see p. 13), taking successively a developmental, an ecological, and an evolutionary perspective on friendship. Chapters One and Two are mostly definitional in character, focused on the question, “What are the basic behaviors and feelings among friends across human societies?” (p. 13). Chapters Three and Four examine whether friendships might find their foundation in either kinship or sexual pair-bonding, and largely reject any such claims. The rest of the book considers, in turn, Hruschka’s three perspectives: developmental (whether by age of the persons or by stage of their friendship), ecological (how friendships respond to social and ecological variation), and evolutionary (how the unconditional support provided by friends can still prove viable in the face of selection pressures). Toward the last of these, Hruschka repeatedly rejects the economic ideas that friendships follow “a norm of reciprocity, maintain a balance of favors, or consider the shadow of the future” and in their place suggests that close friends undergo a transformation from such detailed calculations to “knee-jerk altruism”—“a shift between two kinds of decision-making—what some psychologists call deliberation and habit” (p. 204). Hruschka suggests, in effect, that “[f]eelings of closeness toward a friend” become a more important consideration in the decision to help another than deliberations about costs and benefits (pp. 212-214). In support of such new notions the author contributes a revision of the standard repeated prisoner’s dilemma situation (namely, “the favor game”) featuring a revised “raise-the-stakes strategy” (pp. 201-204), all of which are further elaborated upon in a mathematical appendix.

Unfortunately, this book, though offering considerable theoretical and empirical wisdom about friendship, I consider less appealing to sociologists than to anthropologists, psychologists, and evolutionary biologists. First, the author does mention as references many of the standard sociological citations on friendship, yet he fails to mention the seminal works of Georg Simmel on features of relationships. Second, survey findings (common in much sociological work) often take a definite backseat to findings from other methods. Third, even though the vast bulk of empirical findings about friendships come from the United States and from similar industrialized societies, the author of this book elects to omit many of those findings—about features that define friendships by the Western world, such as sharing personal matters and secrets among friends—solely because these features are not salient among small-scale
societies (Chapters Two and Four). Fourth, some sociologists may be distressed by Hruschka’s relative emphasis on physiology (Figure 3, p. 19). At many junctures throughout the book the author turns to evidence that key psychological processes are underlain by equally important physiological processes; this evidence most often takes the form of findings from neuroimaging studies.
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The Myth of Post-Racial America belongs to a growing cadre of scholarship that debunks the notion of a racially egalitarian society in the Age of Obama. In the tradition of McConahay and Hough’s “symbolic racism,” Bobo’s “laissez-faire racism,” and Bonilla-Silva’s “color-blind racism,” the text centers on the critical disconnect of mainstream racial attitudes from racialized realities. That is, work of this ilk centers on the raison d’être of modern racial debate: supposedly neutral aspirations for a “color-blind” society coupled with the desire to employ “color-conscious” views to address racism. Consequently, the text delivers a scathing expose of the invention of racial categories and their collusion with colonialism, capitalism, and captivity.

H. Roy Kaplan presents a seventeen-chapter treatise on the development of race and racism as a chief variable in human action and order. Through an historical, theoretical (and at times empirical) overview of both causes and effects of racial categorization and racism, Kaplan writes in four broad strokes. First, he discusses the origins of humankind and how race took shape as a meaningful marker of human difference and rationale for stratification. Second, he provides a succinct, yet encompassing, overview of why people hold racial prejudice in relation to competition for scarce or valuable resources. Kaplan next turns to an analysis of material racial disparities and the sacrosanct belief in meritocracy (largely structured by the white/nonwhite color-line) in terms of education, health, crime, housing, and politics. Fourth, the final chapters and postscript examine the import of inter-racial dialogue and activism in order to reduce racism and racial inequality.

Kaplan’s text serves as a cursory overview of the major currents, actors, and debates that, from the top down, came to shape today’s racial landscape. Toward this end, I view the text’s focus on the development of colonial expansion and trade, the prevalence of scientific racism, and the enshrinement of racist doctrine in laws and social structures as a handy resource. Especially for teachers aiming to convince the skeptical student, Kaplan’s review of social scientific findings and major legal precedent unequivocally demonstrate the saturation of racism in modern society. Together, the bantam-weight size chapters serve up heavy-weight evidence of the white supremacist foundations of our contemporary moment.

What does Kaplan take away from this whirlwind racial review of international history and present-day America? At base he contends “… competition and materialism led to the emergence of status distinctions [and] … From these movements racism evolved to rationalize the existing social order established in white European nations” (p. xxi). Hence—as denoted in the subtitle reference to the “Age of Materialism”—Kaplan anoints cupidity and avarice as the “principle source of pathologies in modern society” (p. 75). The heart of the book unapologetically pumps lifeblood into the thesis that human desire for material domination birthed the ideological configuration of racial prejudice. Woven throughout, this string of thought pulls together a neatly packaged critique of the individualist pursuit of resources and fetishization of material goods.

While this animating theme remains a consistent line throughout, the text holds two noteworthy shortcomings. First, materialism and racism are less a “cause and effect” theory than a “chicken or egg” story. To be clear, I do not seek a coup de main in which I pronounce Kaplan either right or wrong, but his taken-for-granted tone and timbre of capitalistic materialism’s causation of both
race and racism may leave puzzled those better acquainted with the literature on race, colonialism, and slavery (particularly the ideas of Winthrop Jordan). His thesis begs for at least an interrogation of the notion that the pre-modern religious and political underpinnings of race and racism may have also caused and rationalized economic exploitation just as much as the pursuit of materialism reified race. Unfortunately, Kaplan leaves the debate unmentioned, due largely in part to his belief that materialism is the origin of all evil. Perhaps if Kaplan’s central thesis were better bolstered with citations and evidence, one might be more persuaded by his sermon.

Second, Kaplan uses morphing and vague definitions of racism throughout. At times racism is framed as an intentional “struggle for power and privilege” (p. xi). At another place it is the result of a biological “fear-based flight or fight reaction” tendency such as the “Startle Reaction” (p. 77). Racism sometimes manifests (recalling Fromm and Adorno) as either “rational or reactive hate” or an “authoritarian personality type” (p. 78), while at other times racism becomes “an ideology to legitimize hegemony.” While racism may certainly have many faces, Kaplan does not present a nuanced prism-like theory that refracts the resource-competition model of human domination into a spectrum of human interaction. Rather, racism appears to operate like a neo-Kantian transcendental force. That is, aside from the constantly shifting definition of racism, Kaplan depicts racism’s function as an all-powerful ideological force that invades the black boxes of human minds that fall prey to the temptations of materialism. Transformed into nihilistic cultural dupes, people then robotically act out their prejudice on others (and in the case of people of color, on themselves). His rendering is most apparent in discussing some African Americans as: “Naïvely brainwashed into self-loathing by the dominant white Eurocentric culture…” (p. 82). While I sympathize with Kaplan’s goal of burning down the strawman of “post-racial” rhetoric, his lack of analytic precision glosses over a key principle of racial hegemony—it is always, unsettled, unfinished, and requires our consent. While white supremacy certainly has an intra-racial effect on nonwhites (creating divisions and animosities that reproduce social marginality), one must avoid a priori readings of cultural behaviors as direct reflections of racist ideology.

While these two points pose a serious enough critique in their own right, they do not prevent Kaplan’s elucidation of “post-racial” discourse as a white supremacist myth. Overall, The Myth of Post-Racial America makes a strong case for the continued significance of race in a Herrenvolk nation in which “non-whites and other minorities are still viewed as outsiders” (p. 220).
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Capitalizing on Crisis is not another recitation of the proximate causes of the speculative bubble that burst to wreak the 2008 Great Recession. Nor is the book a meeting-by-meeting account of elite bailout decisions. Rather than focusing on 2008 at all, the book makes a more profound contribution through its historical and sociological explanation of the familiar events that have so affected our time.

Other scholars have sought to explain the collapse, yet Greta Krippner finds their attempts narrow because of the disciplinary and theoretical limitations of the analytical tools that they use. Robert Schiller articulates an economic model of how speculation can accelerate, providing a useful corrective to conventional models claiming that investment markets are rational. Nevertheless, Krippner argues that economic modeling, even Schiller’s, cannot provide a complete explanation, because it downplays the social and political preconditions for economic phenomena. Structural and critical theories of capitalism and neo-liberalism (David Harvey) provide the historical context needed to situate a social and political analysis. But according to Krippner, broad theories have
not yet been applied to the detailed mechanisms of how economic interests are translated, sometimes less than rationally, into public policy. Theorists of investor capitalism (Michael Useem, Neil Fligstein) and Krippner share a home domain of institutional analysis that seeks to understand how corporations turn to financialization, away from production to financial transactions. To these institutional theories that focus on the governance and incentive systems within corporations, Krippner adds a welcome focus on the role of the government.

Krippner’s explanation of the rise of finance begins with a spotlight on three policies of the 1970s and 1980s, which at the time seemed to be completely unremarkable. Nevertheless, they together constituted an opening, discovered years later, to a new pathway along which speculation could speed, driven by the engines of institutional greed. At the time, the three trends—deregulated interest rates for savings accounts at banks, foreigners buying and holding U.S. debt, and a monetary policy that would move in tandem with the largest players on Wall Street—seemed wise, efficient, even progressive, but above all were ill-understood in their transformative implications.

Exhaustively documented empirical chapters detail the three key trends, beginning with adjustments in Federal interest rate regulations. We now take for granted the prevalence of variable rate mortgages. But the rise of these peculiar instruments needs to be explained, as do other historical innovations like bank certificates of deposit that became negotiable and travelled, and money market funds yielding a variable interest rate (based on the short-term debt of corporations). These instruments became, quite literally, common currency (Chapter Three). *Capitalizing on Crisis* details how deregulation of interest rates overthrew the ancien regime of the Federal Reserve Board (the “Fed”) setting the maximum interest rate that banks could offer to entice savers. But once depositors were promised a hefty interest rate, banks had to scramble to find investments that earned them an even higher rate, leading to successive waves of speculation from junk bonds to bundles of variable rate, and subprime mortgages. Underlying the easy decision to deregulate, however, were unresolved social tensions about which groups would get loans and which would suffer from the high interest rates that plagued America in 1970s and 1980s. Middle-class individual savers pushed for deregulated rates so that they could earn high interest in the money markets of the time. Ironically, the system of deregulation that arose was to be the middle class’ undoing in 2008.

Another prerequisite for financialization was the increase in the international flows of dollars to the United States, providing loans to U.S. corporations and its people and government (Chapter Four). These inflows increased because of the high interest rates the Reagan administration maintained to fight inflation. The inflows financed the large Federal budget deficits of the time caused by the Reagan tax cuts and military spending. Krippner in this case disagrees with the narrative that hegemonic elites consciously pushed global neo-liberalism as a strategy. Instead, she emphasizes that the highly abundant, global provision of credit for the U.S. deficit was a welcome but unintended side-effect of Reagan’s inflation-fighting policies. Some will disagree with Krippner’s interpretation of the documentary evidence. Whereas the U.S. state may not have had a coordinated policy to attract foreign capital on loan in the early Reagan years, the preceding administrations were consciously formulating international economic policies (not discussed in the book) to attract petrodollars, the huge sums flowing to OPEC nations due to the spikes in oil prices after 1973.

Krippner argues that the final prerequisite for speculative financialization is a Fed that in its monetary policies, follows the big market players (Chapter Five). She creatively applies the theories of Jürgen Habermas and Claus Offe about an underlying crisis of institutional trust and legitimacy in late capitalism. Krippner demonstrates how the Fed shied away from the direct and authoritative determination of monetary policy. Even though highly technical language helped to legitimate Fed policy, clear and independent Fed action invited the public to pin responsibility for economic performance on specific decisions and individuals. When private sector actors dissected Fed comments, took their
own stands on the future of long-term interest rates, and overwrote Greenspan's pronouncements to create their own commentaries, the responsibility of government was diffused and legitimacy was created.

*Capitalizing on Crisis,* in short, makes a major contribution to historical economic sociology. The book shows how the discipline of sociology is best suited to bring a full theory of the state back into historical analysis. And it does so, not by analyzing the state as an institution whose capacity and autonomy are direct causal variables. Rather it demonstrates that state actions are complexly interwoven into economic conflicts and crisis that are, at best, only temporarily fixed by government policy.

Krippner correctly points to the importance of underlying problems of legitimation. Central to her concept of legitimacy is the openness of a democratic polity to economic groups contending for political influence. Ideally, social democracy can legitimate capitalism. But, in the current gilded age, executive-worker inequalities and the maldistribution of income and wealth have reached historically unprecedented levels, with no intense crisis of legitimation apparent.

The standard for legitimation in the United States might not be the social-democratic equality that John Rawls portrayed and is now glaringly absent. Perhaps another, less stringent standard of justice/fairness governs. Fairness is providing similar opportunities for workers, investors, and racial and other groups to be rewarded according to their work or other contribution to productivity, measured by success on the market. U.S. institutions reinforce an understanding that workers are fairly rewarded according to their effort at work, and by extension, investors are fairly rewarded with earnings according to the risk they bear and the chips they place on their bets. Perhaps legitimacy is not only a matter for which social democratic politics fight. It is also an historical residue of culture and institutions that needs to be addressed if equality is to have a chance.

As technologies for the automated identification of people's bodily features grow, public opinion offers important guideposts for public policy governing their use. At least so argues this book, a study of the social acceptability of what political scientist Lisa Nelson calls "biometric technology" (BT). BT is an umbrella term including technologies for identifying people or verifying their identity claims using measures of fingerprints, retinas, irises, and faces, as well as of behavioral features like gait, voice, handwriting, and "keystrokes" (look it up). Nelson argues that these technologies have become increasingly common, but, invoking the "social construction of technology" (SCOT) approach, their future role in the lives of Americans is ambiguous and currently in-the-making. On one hand, BTs have good potential to defend individuals from those who might assume their identities and invade their privacy; on the other hand, they stand to deprive individuals of their privacy altogether, through biometric records of movements in public environments, consumption, or of personal transactions.

These ambiguities became pressing political issues in the immediate wake of 9/11, the text argues, when representatives of the various BT industries advocated their wares as cure-alls for security concerns, and policymakers (perhaps stymied to "do something" quick) entertained these claims. Seeking to understand the public disposition towards BTs, Nelson conducted a national survey and a series of focus groups on which applications of BTs Americans might accept in an array of settings, from boarding an airplane to picking the kids up from school or buying a gun.

Nelson rightly points out that the controversies of BTs are not merely ideological—they are also technical and practical, and BTs perhaps do not work with the same rigor.
and ease as their boosters claim. This point gives way to a number of excellent and insightful passages covering the technical principles undergirding BTs, and practical obstacles against their use in real-world settings. These identification systems are subject to serious complications. They can only recognize whether or not an input (like a voice recording or picture of a face) is an instance of a record known to the system by comparing it to stored entries. To work without false positives or negatives, the BT has to separate the input from the noise (e.g., other voices, a greasy lens). The measurement parameters need to be sufficiently flexible to account for variances in the measured property (e.g., when a speaker is congested or using falsetto, or a face now carries a beard or suntan) while also sufficiently unique from one another to yield only one match. The more identities stored in the system, the more rigor is required in all of these technical respects, and the more complex are the practical obstacles. This attention to matters of technology and practice sets the book clearly apart from much of the large body of work concerned with the expansion of surveillance apparatuses in the United States and elsewhere, and is a welcome step in helping us understand surveillance technologies beyond the claims of their advocates or the anxieties of their conscientious objectors.

Some of Nelson’s respondents were aware of these technical and practical challenges, and used them as a basis to object to BTs in a number of settings. The book shares the bulk of its findings in three substantive chapters, each oriented around what Nelson describes as a longstanding issue in the United States: anonymity, trust in institutions, and paternalism. The findings show that, on average, respondents do not automatically drink the technological Kool-Aid, but nor do they reject many possible uses of BTs out-of-hand, and might accept many if certain protections and limitations are in place. These findings are enlisted to describe what considerations ought to be distilled in public policy to respond to the nuanced concerns of future users those who might someday see their lives pervaded by biometric identification technologies.

Current users, however, are central to the book, and also the book’s great mystery. The book relies on the distinction between respondents who have used biometric technology and those who never have as the central axis of comparison. A few anecdotes from the focus groups indicate some “users” have their fingerprints scanned on the job, but I spent much of the book trying to imagine the contexts in which the other respondents were “using” BTs. Are they also being subject to biometric identity verification in the workplace? Are they securing their home computers with a biometric login? Or are there people out there scanning one another’s retinas? I never got a complete or intuitive picture of the existing uses of BTs, which made it a real challenge to make sense of the category or its members’ opinions.

Given the centrality of the user/nonuser distinction in the book, we might expect the dichotomy to build towards some heuristic payoff, but it never quite does. On just about every table in the text, the average opinions of users differ from nonusers by little decimals on a 5-point Likert scale (where 3 is neutral); but the standard deviation within each category is often greater than 1, indicating far more diversity of opinion within each category than between them. This leaves “users” with underwhelming analytic relevance. Fairly late in the text, however, it is revealed that of the 188 survey respondents classified as users (in a sample of 1,000), most said they were compelled to use a BT, while the remainder chose to have their identities verified biometrically. Aggregating their opinions seems similar to aggregating the opinions of prisoners about the locks on their cells with those of apartment dwellers about the locks on their doors. As the book itself culminates in a convincing argument for the consent of BT users in the construction of good public policy, it is unclear why the consent of existing users was not granted much analytic standing. Nonetheless, this book is an important and needed resource for understanding public perceptions of technological realities which may come to be, and for strategizing protections long beforehand.

JOE R. FEAGIN
Texas A & M University
feagin@tamu.edu

Drawing on numerous sources in the humanities, social sciences, and legal studies, Imani Perry, author of the much-praised Prophets of the Hood: Politics and Poetics in Hip Hop (Duke 2004), here offers provocative essays exploring various aspects of the societal contradictions between continuing racial inequalities and public professions of equality. Her book title comes from a James Baldwin phrase signalling both the terrible realities of contemporary racist practices and the beautiful possibilities that can arise from equality practices in society.

Preferring the useful term “practices of inequality,” Perry early on questions much contemporary theorizing of structural racism, a concept that in her view is typically too static, does not accent agency, and thus has lost much usefulness. Still, she does show later on how the everyday actions and practices of racial inequality by elite and ordinary people routinely do translate into “large-scale institutional, social, economic, and political inequalities” (p. 42). Throughout her detailed analyses she moves back and forth between the everyday practices of discrimination and the systemic racism they create and reinforce. Discriminatory choices are frequently identified generally, such as doctors differentiating in choosing tests, jurors making discriminatory choices about convictions, and teachers making biased choices about children. Much of the time, clearly, she means but does not specify white actors’ choices when assessing such recurring discrimination. In my view her analysis would have been enhanced by more often calling out and assessing more explicitly these white practitioners of everyday racism.

In her central chapters Perry assesses with much originality the everyday practices of racial inequality, the role of racial narratives and categorizations in creating and defending this inequality, issues around the lack of privacy for people of color, racial “escape hatches” such as black exceptionalism, the costs of racism for people of color, and the benefits of racism for whites.

In one major chapter Perry provides probing and original analyses of racial narratives such as the “acting white” narrative that numerous prominent Americans, white and black, have periodically emphasized. With significant originality she analyzes the research refuting this common narrative, a narrative whose proclamation has not as yet been significantly reduced much by the substantial research evidence against it. In line with the theme of personal agency, Perry cites the activist Young People’s Project in Baltimore, a diverse but substantially black group of youth who organized themselves and protested great inequalities in their educational system, including inequitable funding and few college-oriented classes. The students have been articulating clearly a strong counter-narrative asserting they wanted to achieve academically, yet few across the country have heard of such examples of student initiatives. Perry sets such youthful African American agency in the long tradition of African American citizenship and activism going back to the era of abolitionists like Frederick Douglass.

Perry’s chapter on “Inequality via Category” is also provocative and distinctive. Here she thoroughly critiques yet other commonplace narratives from the dominant white racial framing. These include the “fatherless” narrative directed at black men and families since at least the 1960s. She notes how parents with out-of-wedlock births are treated differently here than in Europe and analyzes just how battered poor men are, in an exploitative economy providing them with few decent-paying jobs. Most fathers of poor children are of course poor themselves and, contrary to common stereotyping, many provide significant nonfinancial support in raising their children. Perry calls out critically concepts like “fatherless,” “intact families,” and “illegal aliens,” as racialized and harmful categorizing. She concludes with an intriguing discussion of the commonplace phrase “becoming a statistic” as reflecting a quantification process often associated with individuals being
categorized as failures. Being a statistic is frequently associated with “being studied” by those seeking to ferret out negative individual and group realities, and thus is disproportionately used to label impoverished Americans. Particularly in policymaking arenas, she argues, we need to challenge aggressively such framing of people as “statistics” and the tendency to repeatedly “otherize” them.

Another especially important chapter targets of privacy, and the lack thereof, that U.S. bureaucratization processes especially force on Americans of color. She accents state-agent-enforced exclusions to the human right to privacy for many people of color, most dramatically the intrusions by agents of the welfare bureaucracies and the police. She assesses examples of hyper-surveillance and criminal harassment of residents of public housing, chronic intrusion into the private lives of assistance recipients, and racial profiling police stops. Especially important is her distinctive emphasis on the emotional impacts of the inequality practices of policing and welfare agents.

Perry concludes with an accent on more collective agency directed at the “promised land of equality,” even as she notes Derrick Bell’s pessimistic racial realism, which asserts this racist society can never get to that point of equality. Very aware of today’s growing economic inequalities along racial lines, Perry insists that recognition of persisting inequality must not make us impotent, but encourage us to “treat equality as intentional practice.” She catalogues needed new efforts as democratizing opportunities, aggressively shifting racial narratives, building general capacities to work against inequality, and building up socioeconomic capacities within communities of color. Perry concludes on an optimistic note that the measure of societal possibilities should not be “present claims to impotence,” but instead centuries of historic “resilience and then transcendence” (p. 207).

In a memorable 1975 article, Edward Tiryakian posed the question of which member of sociology’s originating theoretical trio—Durkheim, Marx, or Weber?—bequeathed the intellectual perspective with the greatest applicability to the analysis of contemporary American society. Answering in favor of Max Weber, Tiryakian attributed Weber’s comparative superiority to his closer familiarity with American history and with life in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century. Probing the sources of this deeper familiarity, Tiryakian observed that Weber, alone among his contemporaries in the sociological trio, journeyed from Europe to the United States, travelling extensively throughout the country at a transformative period in its modern history.

In Max Weber in America, Lawrence Scaff furnishes a comprehensive and absorbing account of Weber’s American trip, a three-month sojourn which earlier scholars—including Weber’s wife and traveling companion, Marianne—have previously described only in bits and pieces. As such, the book is a rich contribution to understanding Weber’s biography and what Scaff calls “the biography of his work” (p. 7), as well as to illuminating certain major, widely neglected features of the Weberian oeuvre and strengthening the case for the contemporary applicability of Weber’s ideas.

Weber’s visit to America occurred between August and November of 1904 and was prompted by an invitation to attend the St. Louis Congress of Arts and Science, an international conference organized to celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase. At the conference, Weber—then age 40 and scarcely known to American social scientists—presented (in German) a paper on the effects of capitalism on the rural and urban economies of Europe and North America. Having long been fascinated by America,
however, Weber extended his itinerary to include other major cities (Chicago, New Orleans, Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York) and stops in such varied locations as North Tonawanda, New York; the Oklahoma and Indian Territories; Tuskegee, Alabama; Knoxville, Tennessee; Asheville, Greensboro, and Mount Airy, North Carolina; Richmond and Mount Vernon, Virginia; and Providence, Rhode Island. Scaff carefully chronicles all of these segments of the journey, describing the local economic, political, and social conditions that Weber witnessed en route and the viewpoints of the broad cross-section of Americans—academics, politicians, businessmen, clergymen, descendants of Weber’s own extended family, and many others—whom Weber sought out for conversations.

In this way, Scaff adds a surprising new dimension to the received picture of Max Weber, presenting the master theorist and preeminent comparative-historical scholar here in the role of a dogged ethnographer of contemporary life—though “ethnographer” is my expression, not Scaff’s. Traipsing the streets of Chicago (a generation before Robert Park), Weber writes to his German correspondents about the city’s stratified housing arrangements, segregated ethnic groups, boiling labor unrest, and stockyards of “steam, muck, blood and hides,” likening the panorama to “a human being with its skin peeled off and whose intestines are seen at work” (pp. 45, 41-42). Leaving the Congress in St. Louis, Weber passes up a Presidential reception for participating scholars at the White House for the opportunity to spend a week on the Western Frontier interviewing real estate agents, land speculators, and federal and local government authorities about land use policies and practices. What’s more, everywhere he goes, Weber insists on attending local religious services—Methodist, Baptist, Quaker, German Reform, Christian Scientist, even a meeting of the Ethical Culture Society—and questioning those he encounters about their ceremonies and beliefs.

An impressive feature of Scaff’s account is his discussion of the frequent uses that Weber made throughout his subsequent writings of these first-hand observations of American life. In the aftermath of his 1904 trip, America became for Weber a wellspring of pointed illustrations on topics ranging from the organization of higher education to the nature of charismatic leadership. More than this, though, Scaff demonstrates that the American experience nourished Weber’s thinking on some of the most fundamental issues that his work addresses. In terms of chronology, Weber’s trip occurred shortly after he sent to press the article that would form the first half of The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (the section where he formulates “The Problem”) and just before he composed the second half of that study (the section where he describes “The Vocational Ethic of Asetic Protestantism”). Scaff convincingly argues that Weber’s observations in the United States of the interplay between the practical ethos of the various Protestant confessions, on the one hand, and rational capitalist economic activity, on the other hand, cemented the bridge between these two parts of his most famous work, providing Weber with “persuasive evidence supporting the postulated relationship” between Protestantism and capitalism (p. 190).

Still further, in Scaff’s view, the American sojourn opened up for Weber fresh lines of thinking, two of them especially consequential. The first of these pertained to social stratification. According to Scaff, not only does Weber’s celebrated differentiation of “class” from “status” and “party” have deep roots in his American experiences, but the same holds true for his widely-overlooked views on “race,” which Scaff trenchantly discusses. Particularly relevant for Weber in this regard, aside from his direct observations during his travels through the South, were his interactions with leaders of the African American community, including W. E. B. Du Bois, to whom Weber conceded near the end of his journey: “I am absolutely convinced that the ‘colour-line’ problem will be the paramount problem of the time to come, here and everywhere in the world” (p. 100). (In an appendix, Scaff usefully reproduces Weber’s letters to Du Bois and to Booker T. Washington.)

A second significant development that Scaff traces to Weber’s American sojourn is his distinction between “church” and “sect” and, closely related to this, his analysis of voluntary religious and political associations and of their importance as potential
counterweights to processes of capitalist rationalization. Following his trip, Weber was persuaded, as he reflected on contemporary society, “that we have the sects to thank for things that none of us could give up in the present day: [among them] freedom of conscience and the most elementary ‘human rights’” (p. 154). Scaff’s penetrating treatment of this associational strand in Weber’s thought alone makes his book a substantial addition to the scholarship on Max Weber.

Nor does Scaff slight Marianne Weber and the impact of the months in America on her thinking. Sometimes along with her husband and sometimes without him, Marianne visited urban settlement houses (including Hull House), women’s clubs and educational facilities, and a variety of religious services, participating in discussions with major figures of the period (Jane Addams and Florence Kelley among them). Like Max, she was dismayed at the state of race relations in America, but in other respects was mostly impressed favorably, speaking warmly about the United States after her return to Germany.

Scaff’s book does not end with the Webers’ return, however. Instead, he continues his study with several chapters that move into the middle decades of the twentieth century to unravel the tangled story of the translation into English of (some of) Max Weber’s writings and the piecemeal presentation of his ideas by Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, Hans Gerth, C. Wright Mills, and others. These chapters on the reception of Weber’s work in the United States provide a valuable coda to Scaff’s compelling account of Weber’s formative encounter with America.
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Eleventh-century Bishop Wulfstan, renowned for his miracle cures, reportedly healed a beggar crippled from birth, cured a monk suffering from fever, and restored to health a leper whose disease was so advanced he appeared to be a living corpse. Were these reports of miracle cures, which continued even after his death, the result of divine intervention, enthusiastic publicists, the placebo effect, or the Thomas Theorem (situations defined as real are real in their consequences)?

Robert A. Scott takes up those questions in his exploration of “miracle cures” that weaves together strands from two types of explanations, the theological and the scientific. Prompted by questions raised from his earlier research on Gothic cathedrals of Europe, this medievalist set out to understand the phenomenon that was the primary source of funds for building the grand structures like the Chartres, Notre Dame, and Canterbury cathedrals: donations from the cured.

Scott promises “an attempt to anneal traditions of scholarship that until now have developed largely independently of one another,” i.e., “the work of historians, scholars of religion, theologians, spiritualists and others” regarding healing shrines, on the one hand, and “contemporary biomedical, social, and behavioral-science research,” on the other. He delivers the latter more forcefully than the former. It is the spiritual stuff that grabs our attention, but the scientific theories that satisfy the author and most readers, I suspect, despite Scott’s occasional caveat that “Some of the cures I have read about frankly mystify me” (pp. xxiv-v). He often seems to be explaining away the mystical theories with the scientific, reflecting perhaps a narrowness in the current Weltanschauung that would amuse the medieval pilgrims as much as their explanations might be belittled by us.

Scott’s tour through the medieval symptoms and their likely causes in medieval life is edifying and eloquent, with vivid descriptions of medieval life and its medical miseries. He offers a brief description of what the saints reportedly provided those hapless medieval village dwellers cooped up during European winters without adequate nutrition, warmth, or biological disease theory, and little if any medical treatment. To top it all off, the major available theory of disease was a theological one: the victim was a sinner, labeled and shamed, thus multiplying the...
very psychological conditions that may have hampered immune systems and facilitated disease.

We are given disappointingly little detail about the tales of Canterbury and other pilgrimages and the actual rituals of healing, but many relevant anecdotes about contemporary scientific experiments that illuminate psychological and physiological processes that our medieval protagonists may have experienced. At Lourdes and other healing shrines, “sickness was equated with sin, and healing with forgiveness” (p. 99). Visits to shrines inspired hope and belief in cures—moreover, “Recent research by biomedical, social, and behavioral scientists into factors associated with illness lends plausibility to the suggestion that these two factors actually helped those who were sick to feel better and in some cases even to recover from their illnesses” (ibid.).

Scott scrutinized the historical registers of cures from the shrines, especially the extensive records at Lourdes, and found that the symptoms expressed by those reporting their cures may have been addressed by “leaving home and taking to the road.” Changes in routines, improved hygiene, exposure to fresh air and sunshine, especially in the springtime when many such pilgrimages occurred after months of disease-breeding conditions in winter confinement, may have combined with belief in the healing power of the saints and the structuring of the illness experience by religious beliefs in such a way that people engaged in actions that might have benefited their health (p. 120).

The scientific explanations go much further, however, especially in recent studies of health and illness that demonstrate the stressful conditions of existence at the time and the emotional turmoil they caused as well as “the social isolation resulting from stigmatization of the sick” which hastened illness and had adverse effects on the immune system. “Venerating saints through the institution of pilgrimage offered an escape from the circumstances that created these emotions, alleviated despair, and gave rise to hope” (p. 127).

But that is not all. Modern placebo studies suggest that some nonmedical treatments actually trigger biochemical mechanisms in the body, causing not perceived reductions of pain and even inflammation but also improved healing of stomach ulcers and relief from depression and anxiety disorders. “We have traveled a long distance from medieval ... healing shrines to modern-day medical and psychological laboratories,” Scott notes, but “It is now time to connect these disparate worlds” by noting that placebo effects occur within rigorous laboratory settings, even when underlying conditions are not cured, and changed environmental and psychological circumstances facilitate healing.

What Scott has discovered, of course, is W.I. Thomas’ famous theorem: “If the sufferers went on a pilgrimage, prayed to a saint, and in the end felt better for it, it does not matter whether the recovery was due to spontaneous remission or the natural course of illness. From the pilgrims’ point of view, they took action, and it made them feel better” (p. 147). The “impression” of a divine presence combined with authority figures, caregivers, and rituals choreographed to define the situation as cure-providing.

But the effect is not simply psychological: Scott discovered confirmation of his explanations in recent neuroscience studies at Oxford University, where he was examining the medieval manuscripts. Researchers examined real-time MRI images of brain activity while showing Catholics and nonbelievers images of the Virgin Mary and administering electric shocks to both groups. Unlike the nonbelievers, Catholics had not only pain relief but also “increased activity in the right ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, which is the area associated with perceived control over pain” (p. 148). The effects of pilgrimage planning, framing (if only Professor Scott had read David Snow and Robert Benford), and rituals of confession parallel other current studies of health effects.

In the end, I mused about sociological parallels to the individual miracle cures. Could there be placebo effects on the Body Politic when participants in movements of nonviolent civil resistance venerate Gandhi and other saints of global civic culture? After all, it seems like our socially constructed institutions are even more susceptible to culture and less ruled by biology than our distressed medieval pilgrim ancestors.
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Clearly we need more cross-fertilization of our isolated disciplinary quests—that may be the most healthy response reading Robert Scott’s *Miracle Cures*. I, for one, would prescribe it.
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The well-written focus of Andrew Smith on “cultural forms and practices” enabled him to bring together a large body of work by C.L.R. James with themes that are not mainly political or revolutionary, but central to the theorization of the uses of leisure activities in capitalist societies. Often, Smith throws up some critics of James and fiercely dismisses their criticism as missing the significance of the contributions of James to “culture”—without offering his own critique of James.

While reading the book, I kept looking for a definition of culture that guides the book, but Smith clearly avoided offering one. Rather he speculated on what culture is not, repetitively, as a strategy of exclusion in order to keep his focus narrowly on what is taken for granted as the subject matter of “cultural forms and practices.” Excluded from the implicit definition of culture are politics, the economy, the law, education, imperialism, philosophy and other cultural institutional practices that were mentioned in passing only to be excluded from the focus of the book, presumably because James privileged “cultural forms” in his work.

Smith says that he is concerned with ‘James’ approach to the various practices and products of human creativity, of what gets called ‘culture’ with a small ‘c’ (as opposed to the more encompassing way in which the word is used by anthropologists)” (p. 17). This is the closest that he came to defining “culture” as “creative practices” in order to restrict the concept to sports, music, spectatorship and players; as if the revolutionary struggles that James dedicated his life to were not “creative practices” sui generis.

From the perspectives of revolutionary thinkers like James and many others who see culture as the dialectical thesis of destructive practices of domination imposed by oppressive forces and the antithesis of liberation struggles to change the world for the better, it will not be acceptable to analyze cultural forms and practices in isolation from the struggles underway the wider world. James always went beyond sports, literature, players and spectators to call attention to the ongoing struggles for social justice (as Smith acknowledged repetitively).

This is minimized by Smith’s apparent obsession with what he called the purely “cultural form”; he even implied that James was a cultural formalist (as some of his leftist critics alleged). But James was mainly a scholar-activist who took care to emphasize the articulation of the aesthetic with the ideological (as Terry Eagleton would put it). Even when James was writing a mere sports column for bourgeois newspapers in England where the medium obviously massaged the message, his revolutionary ideology was not completely silenced.

Also missing from this book is any attempt to make the reader aware that James was a founding father of what is known worldwide as “Cultural Studies.” Instead, a leading theorist of this emergent field, Stuart Hall, is only mentioned (p.73) to support a view that James borrowed his models from European scholars like Thackeray, Trotsky, and Tocqueville, without adequate recognition of the fact that there is originality in something called Cultural Studies that James pioneered independent of Eurocentric thinkers. Smith even asserted that James wrote “like Pierre Bourdieu” (p. 31) when in fact it should be the other way around because James was already theorizing when Bourdieu was probably still in *couches*. Chinua Achebe dismisses this kind of Eurocentrist literary theory as colonialist criticism—the assumption that the value of any writer can only be established in comparison with a supposedly European colonialist standard-bearer.

James himself may be to blame for the Eurocentric interpretation of his work, given his own theoretical preferences for European culture and thought that caused Gordon
Rohlehr to dub him an “Afro Saxon” in an interview with me that Smith cited but mistakenly attributed to the “disgust” of Rohlehr (p. 95). The title The Black Jacobins said it all, it was not the black Africans but black French men; his Notes of Dialectics appeared to grovel at the feet of the notorious Hegel without the slightest critique of the sort that Marx, Lenin, and Fanon leveled at Hegel; his Castaways and Renegades was all about white American literature with hardly any attention to the Harlem Renaissance; he wrote volumes of apparently unrequited love letters to Constance Webb but none to any black woman; he loved Picasso’s Guernica but not a word about the African Fractals motifs of Trinidadian master artist, Chief Abiodun LeRoy Clarke; and given the choice in his youth to join a dark-skinned cricket team or a light-skinned one, he chose the light-skinned team that was apparently not as good as the black team of Constantine, which could have made a cricketer out of him, as he was later told.

Nevertheless, an exploration of the links between Cultural Studies and “the Study of Culture” could have helped Smith to demonstrate that the influence of James endures not only in his analysis of “creative practices” of sports and literature but also in the creative practices of original sociological theory and revolutionary scholarly activism for social justice. Rather, Smith defended his narrow focus all the way to the conclusion where he asserts that James was of the view that culture is not just a place where “politics gets done” and that culture may even suggest the end of politics (p. 159). Nothing could be further from the truth since politics is inherently always already cultural and culture is inherently always already political because they are never separate: they are articulated, disarticulated and rearticulated, as Stuart Hall keeps reminding us; or intersectional, as Kimberley Crenshaw would put it.

In Urban Tourism and Urban Change, Costas Spirou attempts a broad overview of the relationship between investment in the tourism economy and the economic and social transformation of cities. The volume is aimed at an undergraduate audience with an interdisciplinary interest in urban studies and is based mainly on secondary sources. The original research within it consists primarily of compilations of data concerning facilities, investment levels, travel expenditures, along with brief accounts of tourism development within cities in both the United States and abroad. The reason for the selection of particular cases is not made totally clear; although the author intends them to be exemplary, they seem somewhat randomly selected and the justification of their inclusion not fully explicated.

As a survey of the field, the book covers a great deal of ground. It would serve as an excellent introduction for students unacquainted with the ways in which tourism has been reshaping the urban built environment and influencing the character of neighborhoods. It has chapters, inter alia, on the commodification of leisure, competition for tourist dollars, tourism infrastructure, and the relationship between urban amenities and the attraction of the “creative class.” The emphasis is on the growth of leisure and how that leads to the consumption of services and the development of neighborhoods so that they provide consumption opportunities for those seeking entertainment. A link is made between tourism growth and residential gentrification.

Contemporary urban observers are aware that cities everywhere have been developing strategies for bringing in export income through restructuring space to appeal to travelers. There has been a major shift in economic development programming away from office-centric or smokestack-chasing...
approaches. Although efforts at generating retail and hotel business are not new, the style and centrality of these attempts differ substantially from those of the heyday of urban renewal. This process raises important questions for social analysis, as it creates tensions between residents and visitors, changes the economic base, and becomes manifest in a different built environment. The discussion in this book is aimed at providing a picture of these effects.

Spirou places tourism within the context of the transformation of cities from places of production to sites of consumption and the cultural changes that have ensued. He wrestles with issues of authenticity, gentrification, and uneven development. He criticizes policies for tourism promotion through city marketing as undermining authenticity, and worries that the industry produces mostly low-wage jobs. He further condemns it for drawing public money into the coffers of profitable sports teams and commodifying culture. At the same time he recognizes that tourism has succeeded in revitalizing moribund areas, produced employment in deindustrialized localities, and created amenities enjoyed by locals as well as visitors.

Despite its virtues the book lacks coherence. It presents a great deal of information but does not have a consistent outlook. Rather than making a sustained argument, Spirou tends to delineate the pros and cons relevant to each issue, usually referencing what other scholars have said on the subject, then evading a clear statement of his own views. While he is familiar with and cites some of the theoretical formulations that have been made regarding the tourist city, he does not explore recent arguments concerning new forms of tourism that are less disturbing than mass tourism.

One problem of the book is that it does not offer a concise definition or typology of tourism. Sometimes it refers to leisure travel and talks about tourism as if its raison d’être is wholly the search for entertainment and enlightenment to absorb leisure time. At other points it recognizes the importance of business travel but does not explore its ramifications in terms of the types of facilities investment and locations it stimulates. It does not discuss at all some kinds of tourism that have become prominent, including trips for the purpose of medical treatment, educational advancement, political protest. Nor does it develop an argument concerning how tourism can be made more democratic, less exploitive of its workers, and less disruptive to the cities which it affects.

In sum, this is a useful book for providing an overview of the subject. Its interdisciplinary approach means that it can be used in a variety of courses that examine urban change. It lacks, however, a clear thesis. The research underlying it is substantial but somewhat scattershot. For those new to the subject it offers a helpful guide; those already familiar with the various theoretical and empirical works that already exist on urban tourism will not find much they do not already know.
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Environmental City offers an investigative and historical narrative of how Austin came to acquire the identity of an environmental city. William Swearingen explores the confluence of the impact of the natural physical landscape and changing understandings of residents’ relationship to that space within the context of the city’s economic growth and a larger national environmental movement. The author provides in much detail, an account of the key players, multiple citizen activist coalitions (both of which require remembering names and acronyms) and the rough and tumble political context for this evolution. For that reason, even though Austin’s experience is unlikely to be unique within the nation, this in-depth socio-logical perspective of the struggle to transform the city’s relationship to the natural physical environment is a refreshing contribution to the body of work on environmental social movements, particularly in municipal settings. It is an insider’s narrative that is passionate, rich and stimulating. And it is
one that could have been made richer with more careful analysis of issues of gender and race.

The book follows a chronological format covering the period from the 1960s that roughly marks the rise of the environmental movement to the current time. In Part One, the author draws on theoretical concepts from sociology and geography to set the foundation for the rest of the book. The focus is predominantly on conceptual understandings of people/place connections, how these are influenced by use value versus exchange value and the tensions that arise from these different understandings. Austin is remarkable as a site to examine how this tension plays out, because it is one of the few liberal cities in the generally conservative state of Texas. In essence, the author argues that over time in Austin a particular meaning was constructed under the banner of “environment” that was strong enough for coalitions and social movements to coalesce around. This framing was used as a political organizing tool to fight for policy and regulation to protect a particular sense of place. By the turn of the twenty-first century the success of this framing—if not evident in the actual percentage of battles fought and won—certainly was evident in the widespread acceptance of it in city council, city government, the commercial sector and wider population. So what conditions might explain how Austin came to be labeled “environmental city”?

Part Two examines how it is that a built environmental landscape would come to represent the antithesis of growth that discounts an adverse environmental impact. It is an intriguing account from an anthropocentric perspective. Over time the appreciation of nature includes built parts such as recreational parks and golf courses. Although regrettably the author does not discuss this explicitly, it is reasonably clear that this evolution is closely paralleled by the changing socioeconomic demographic of residents. How the landscape and its resources are valued evolves as residents shift from being involved in direct resource extraction and industry, to being more highly educated and dependent on the technological sector and employment in higher education and government. Appreciation develops from the benefits of economic resource exploitation, to appreciation for green spaces, natural and built, for recreation, and a healthy, pollutant-free environment (there is no comment about whether the high-tech sector is water intensive or polluting), to appreciation of a “livable” city that strives to reduce its carbon footprint. But that evolution does not account for the entire population of residents: Swearingen mentions the difficulty in coalition building with the University of Texas-Austin student-led effort to form the Coalition for a Progressive Austin. The group made an attempt to include “east side minorities who believed that growth was necessary for the economic advancement of the Hispanic and black populations” (p. 87), but there is no explanation of how east side minorities experienced Austin’s evolution. This part of the story is left untold.

In this section readers are also introduced to the structure and workings of city government and how this is integrated with the way politics is conducted. Swearingen exposes the relative influence of elected leaders, city employees in strategic positions, citizen advocacy groups, and processes for decision making and policy implementation. He skillfully presents the strategizing power plays that are colorful, savory, and sometimes corrupt.

Institutional structure, mass activism and coalition building are all evident in the text but it is individual agency that captures the focus. Readers are treated to an account of how the powerful, wealthy and well-connected individuals (he names names) on both sides of the struggle rely on their influence and networks to shape the policy landscape. There are good “guys” and bad “guys” and many of the good guys, indeed a striking number, are actually women. One is left with a great deal of curiosity about what explains the high number of very influential and powerful women, from the larger than life Roberta Crenshaw to the “small” and “quiet” Jackie Goodman who provided critical leadership for the environmental movement. Indeed, Swearingen dedicates the book to “all the ‘little old ladies in tennis shoes’” but disappointingly there is no sociological elaboration on the role of gender in the transformation of Austin.
In the third part of the book the author focuses on efforts to resist development growth in the 1980s. It is in this period that the discourse became environmentalists versus developers, with both sides fighting to provide the dominant frame. The frame then evolves into development versus managed growth in realignment with new interests that join the movement in the form of a newer generation of developers, who see the merit and understand the value of carefully managed growth that is sensitive to protection of environmental benefits. Environmentalists come to link the protection of the environment as a quality of life issue and Austin becomes valued for its environmental features (built and natural), that in turn are leveraged as an amenity to attract new residents of a particular socioeconomic stripe. Readers follow the slow and painful rise of social networks of activists, and the strategies they pursue, as they weather repeated policy and political losses but eventually produce Austin’s first environmental city council in 1985, the Cooksey Council.

Part Four concludes in current time with a review of the physical and social landscapes that have become normalized in Austinites’ understanding of their city as an environmental, livable city. Is Austin’s story unique? A similar narrative might be recounted for Portland, Oregon. In producing such a dynamic account of Austin however, Swearingen provides a book that is well worth the read. Even though the book focuses far more on individual agents than on the movement itself, there is much to be understood and valued from its detailed insider’s perspective of how social movements begin, the coalitions that are built, the strategies that work and fail, and the connections between a national movement and its manifestation in a particular location, place, and time.

This edited collection of an interesting series of articles explores the contemporary significance of class analysis in sociological thinking. The chapters engage with key questions about class and its importance for contemporary sociological thinking and analysis. The book arose from a seminar series about working class lives and thus, perhaps unsurprisingly the chapters are quite eclectic, covering different sorts of issues, from questions on the existence of the so-called “working class academic” to gay men’s experiences of tourism. The book is challenging and, at times, provocative. It is informative on the topics which are covered, although it may appeal more to academics and postgraduates rather than undergraduate students, because of the complexity and diversity of material.

The book starts with an introductory chapter by the editor, Yvette Taylor, and is followed by twelve individual chapters, which are organized around three broad themes: class and the self; class location and belonging; and finally, class transformations and intersections. Some chapters are more theoretically dense than others, but all engage with their subjects in sophisticated and illuminating ways with accounts which are engaging as well as readable. The first substantive chapter by Sue Parker presents some of her empirical work with young mothers and children; this chapter also provides an excellent introduction to the core themes of the book. Anyone looking for a sophisticated overview of some of the recent developments in class analysis would do well to read this piece. The chapter by Paul Wakeling on the question of the working class academic was innovative and thought-provoking both in its style and its argument. This chapter was privileged in my feelings about the book only because it tied more closely to my own research and biographical interests; all of the contributions are highly readable.
Anyone expecting book to be about social class and inequality might be surprised to find that it has a much broader remit. It addresses complex issues and questions around gender and sexuality in particular, and to a lesser degree ethnicity—the book is trying to understand social class along with of other dimensions of inequality. As Elizabeth McDermott argues in her insightful chapter “Class and the Making of the Sexual Self,” “researching both social class and sexuality presents some complex theoretical negotiation” (p. 201). McDermott, like many of the contributors to the volume, handles well the complex job of exploring social class along with other dimensions of difference, and this particular chapter highlights how social class impacts the making of the sexual self. The chapter by Jody Mellor looks at British Muslim women’s transitions to university and offers a fascinating insight into the complex relationship between class, ethnicity, and faith in the lives of her interviewees as they negotiated their transitions through education.

Throughout the book most of the chapters are similarly ambitious and theoretically advanced. Yet, this complexity is sometimes overwhelming and on occasions the focus on social class recedes into the background. This is unavoidable in a text with such a wide topic, but some readers may be disappointed by this. The book reports some quality qualitative interview data, although in the volume as a whole, there is an over-emphasis on female perspectives. Mark Casey’s interesting and entertaining chapter on gay men and tourism stands out as a notable exception and while this is not a particular problem in itself, it would have been worthy to see more emphasis on male perspectives, experiences, and positions. Of course, no one book can cover everything.

A weakness in the book came from the fact that it did not include a wide ranging and substantive introductory or concluding chapter which might have pulled the volume together in a more coherent way. With edited collections there is always the temptation to use the introduction to simply describe what follows in the various chapters. But as this volume deals with such complex and interconnected issues, a clearer statement about the overall contribution of the volume would have been valuable. Taylor offers some insights in the introductory chapter, but most of the space is given over to a description of the chapters that follow, explaining that the chapters expand the emerging agendas in working class studies. She is probably right in this assertion, but it would have been useful to see the exact nature of this contribution set out more clearly for readers. This would have been especially helpful for students and course tutors. Given this, my guess is that some readers will dip in and out of the book, taking in chapters that appeal to their own areas of interest. Overall, this is a book which is accomplished and challenging and it certainly deserves a wide readership.
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The basic theme of this book is Balzac’s Vautrin’s mot juste: Le secret des grandes fortunes sans cause apparente est un crime oublié, parce qu’il a été proprement fait. The authors’ target is the ubiquitous and elaborate public relations apparatus that proclaims extraordinary business success and the accumulation of vast wealth as due to creative innovation and the courageous willingness to take risks.

Michel Villette and Catherine Vuillermot’s data are biographies and occasional autobiographies of men who have accumulated vast amounts of capital during their careers, legendary business figures such as: Laurent Beaudoin, Claude Bébéar, Carlo De Benedetti, Vincent Bolloré, Francis Bouygues, André Citroën, James Clark, François Dalle, George Eastman, André Essel, François Pinault, Paul Ricard, Sam Walton, and

---

2 Honoré de Balzac. Le Père Goriot. 1835. [“The secret of great wealth with no obvious source is some forgotten crime, forgotten because it was done neatly.” p. 103 in Le Père Goriot. Oxford University Press, 1991.]
Thomas J. Watson. This distinctive literary genre is generally characterized by plausible explanations and accounts for businessmen’s actions, tales of gut-wrenching der-ring-do, and hagiographic reverence toward its subjects. But the authors concentrate instead on the biographies’ concomitant stories of detailed business operations and their documentation of the personal characteristics and formative experiences of men who have amassed fortunes in business.

Villette and Vuillermot find commonalities both in their subjects’ modi operandi and early socialization. First, great success in business depends on making “good deals,” that is, getting a lot for a little in as short a time as possible and with negligible risk. The adroit businessman sees and exploits imperfections in the market working with coalitions of partners, such as investors, lenders, customers, employees, politicians, and public officials, who share the dangers of anomalous markets without grasping fully the great financial opportunities that market inconsistencies often present. As the businessman’s wealth grows, he spots and appropriates others’ innovations and harnesses others’ creativity to further enrich himself. All the while, he constructs elaborate faades that shield his actions from public scrutiny, knowing that the appearance of moral probity makes a career of brigandage possible. And he crowns his achievements with generous philanthropy and sometimes public service to immortalize for posterity his contributions to society.

Second, fabulously successful businessmen share common head starts. They grow up in families where enterprise is second nature; they get solid educations; as young men, they gain extensive business experiences especially in sales; they receive decisive advice and even material help from mentors at timely moments early in their careers; and, perhaps most important, they develop and embrace very early on moral rules-in-use suited to men of affairs. These rules sweep away the cobwebs of conventional pieties; they require an alertness to expediency and a responsiveness to exigencies, whatever compromises with traditional moralities these entail; they demand merciless self-scrutiny and self-rationalization, the relentless subjection of self to external criteria; they necessitate the strict compartmentalization of human sentiment and loyalties from the hard calculation of what has to be done; and they compel a continual attentiveness to the intersection of the exigencies of the marketplace, the interests of one’s organization, and, especially, one’s own advantage.

If this book has a flaw, it rests in the authors’ (or their translator’s) regular use of terms such as “predatory,” “predation,” and “pillage” to characterize the actions of their businessmen subjects. Such terms suggest indignation, a sentiment better left to those worthies of the Fourth Estate who specialize in dudgeon. In fact, the ways of acting, the habits of mind, and the moral rules-in-use that the authors document among fabulously wealthy businessmen are simply a special—albeit avant-garde—case of a much broader modern phenomenon. Indeed, mutatis mutandis, they are typical of ambitious, high-achieving men and women in every institutional arena of our society, not only in business enterprise, but in the visual and performing arts, the propaganda industries, the vast apparatus of law and advocacy, government, and the academy. Plagiarism of ideas, symbols, drama plots, moralistic rhetorics, and arguments is rife; excuses and justifications for the worst kind of criminal depredations are common; our highest-ranking congressional officials work hand-in-glove with the industries they presumably regulate; our presidents bypass black-letter law for political advantage; and professors and academic administrators alike jettison time-honored curricula and rigorous standards in service to the all-leveling religion of equality. The authors, perhaps unwittingly, perhaps discreetly, point to the ongoing unmooring of our whole social order from traditional morals and rules of conduct.

Two important events happened in the South in 2011. On May 13, Nathan Deal, the Governor of Georgia, signed The Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act, HB 87. About four weeks later, on June 9, Robert Bentley, the Governor of Alabama, signed The Immigrant Trespassing Law, HB 56. A casual observer might wonder why these southern states started to crack down on immigrants and why one of them passed the harshest anti-immigration bill in the United States, surpassing Arizona’s draconian SB 1070 anti-immigration bill. A descriptive analysis of the demographic transitions underway in the South will explain the wave of anti-immigrant and anti-Mexican sentiments in what many scholars call the “Nuevo New South.”

Gregory B. Weeks and John R. Weeks (henceforth W&W), a son and father collaboration, provide us with a well-timed book about the misconceptions of Latino migration to and within the United States. In Irresistible Forces, W&W argue that of the three core demographic transitions (i.e., mortality and fertility) migration is the only demographic transition that is not biological. Migration is a function of choice, resources, and competition. Moreover, the decision to migrate to a country is intrinsically linked to the policies and social networks in the receiving and sending countries. Even though migration is a core demographic process, it is entwined in the complex political culture of the countries.

Irresistible Forces makes a valiant effort to combine the academic traditions of political science and demography, to tell the story of the rebirth of the “Nuevo New South.” W&W’s political demography approach gives them the flexibility to describe and analyze the intended and unintended consequences of economic policies in the “Nuevo New South.” This is to say that migration is not random. Migration, specifically Latin American migration, was and is fostered by economic development policies in the “Nuevo New South.” Although the foreign population in the “Nuevo New South” is small compared to the West or East regions of the United States, more than half of the foreign born population in the “Nuevo New South,” according to W&W, is from Latin America and only half of these Latino migrants are from Mexico, which contrasts with the popular view that the majority of Latino migrants are from Mexico.

W&W provide the reader with a treasure-trove of demographic data about the history of Latin American migration to the United States, beginning their analysis with migration data from 1820. This data is a contribution, in and of itself, but W&W do not commit the cardinal sin that many scholars do when describing Latin American migration (i.e., treat Latino migrants as a homogeneous population). The readers of Irresistible Forces will understand that the historical treatment of different Latin American countries has shaped the spatial-temporal chain migration patterns found in many communities in the United States.

Perhaps one of the most helpful insights from Irresistible Forces was W&W’s analysis of current migration myths in the United States. The first myth they tackle is the “self-deportation” myth, largely driven by reporters trying to find unique storylines about the 2008 recession. W&W argue that most migrants stayed in the United States because of recent state and national efforts to tighten the border between Mexico and the United States. The new border enforcement policies have had an ironic twist. W&W assert that with loose border policies, migrants go back home for holidays and special celebrations. They stay emotionally connected with their country and leave open the option to one day return home. However, tighter border policies force migrants to choose between their home country and their adopted country. Most migrants choose to stay, have children, and make the United States their new home—these migrants feel more American each day they stay in the United States.
The second myth W&W tackle is the “undocumented Mexican myth.” Migration is a complicated process to explain to the average American. However, if you put an undocumented Mexican face on this demographic process and mix it with politics, you have a formula to create easy talking points for politicians. The truth of the matter is, as W&W show, that the Latinization of the South is a product of both legal and illegal immigration. Just like the Bracero program that for over twenty years legally brought about 2.5 million Mexican men to work on farms in over 30 states, farmers and agribusiness are using the H-2A visa program to bring temporary Latino agricultural workers to the South. Moreover, the Latino migrants are more diverse than the Latino migrants living in the West of the United States.

The third myth W&W tackle is the “economic drain” of immigrants. W&W provide several examples where agribusiness and farmers have relocated to Mexico because of the lack of a local, stable labor force. W&W argue that immigrants are not a drain but a needed demographic resource. The final myth W&W tackle is the “assimilation and threat” of immigrants. W&W argue that Latino immigrants learn English, value freedom and democracy, and adopt American cultural values.

Irresistible Forces is an important book that sheds light on the demographic transitions taking place in the “Nuevo New South.” Studying the population movements of Latino immigrants through the lenses of demography and political science provide the reader with a nuanced narrative that redefines demographic problems as irresistible forces. Irresistible forces in the “Nuevo New South” will transform this region, as Latino migrants contribute to future fertility transitions. W&W’s Irresistible Forces has the prophetic message that policies shape migration. However, one day these new Latino migrants and their descendants will shape policies in the “Nuevo New South.”
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Reshaping the Work-Family Debate is an important book for several reasons. First, it is accessible and engaging in ways that many sociological books are not, despite being theoretically sophisticated and empirically sound. Second, it is addressed to multiple audiences for whom the work-family issues it analyzes are exceptionally important. Third, it draws from an astounding range of multi-disciplinary findings to pinpoint with laser accuracy what is wrong with current debates and past approaches to work-family policy. Finally, it offers solutions that are practical and possible, if we could only bridge the political divides it outlines.

This is a book few sociologists could write, but one that most will find is based fundamentally on the key insights of our discipline. Perhaps because she is a law professor and not an academic sociologist, Joan Williams is able to integrate findings from sociology with those from social psychology, political science, economics, and other disciplines without getting caught up in methodological minutiae or ideological turf wars. As a legal researcher, she is able to draw on case material, testimony, union arbitrations, judicial decisions, and related evidence to describe current work-family dilemmas in graphic terms. This approach allows the reader to glimpse the daunting personal struggles when workers balance commitments to family with the often unbending demands of the workplace. In a chapter entitled “One Sick Child Away from Being Fired,” Williams highlights the deep human impacts of workplace inflexibility. This compelling material, in turn, sets up her analysis of how we should think about the integration of work and family, and allows her to propose solutions that could be implemented if public discussions took better account of social class and interrogated notions of the ideal worker.
Three key observations underlie this book’s approach to analyzing how work and family might be better integrated, and Williams pulls no punches in describing them. (1) We need family-friendly policies: “The United States has the most family-hostile public policy in the developed world, and changing that situation will require reshaping American politics in some basic ways” (p. 3). (2) Masculine workplace norms are the problem: “[A]lthough work-family conflict traditionally is associated with women, a prime mover of work-family conflict is masculinity. Inflexible workplaces have proved so hard to change, in significant part, because of the intertwining of masculinity with work schedules and current understandings of work commitment” (p. 33). (3) Class matters: “Understanding the alienation of the white working class is not only about race and religion but also about class—about a deeply patterned series of class conflicts between socially conscious progressives and working-class whites. These conflicts, expressed as cultural differences, have fueled ‘culture wars’ that have cemented a long-standing alliance between working-class whites and business elites” (p. 152). Williams suggests that focusing on class-based masculinities and understanding working-class men’s family lives can help us prepare for building coalitions that will pass better work-family policies in the future.

According to Williams, white working-class men, heavily Democratic in party affiliation until roughly 1970, have abandoned the party because of anxiety over their declining ability to be “real men”—that is to be breadwinners and earn a family wage. Williams suggests that class-based masculinity has played a big part in working-class men voting Republican, but she also attributes this shift to progressives abandoning their traditional posture of respect for the working class. Williams hopes to turn around the political dynamic that has made family supports so hard to enact in this country by helping the professional-managerial class better understand and appreciate working-class culture, especially as it relates to family life. She does this through discussion of class-linked family practices that have been illuminated by sociologists including “commitment to work,” “hard living,” “fear of falling,” “concerted cultivation,” “food preferences and family meals,” “kinship networks,” “family rituals and obligations,” “respect for religion” and “family first moral values.” Ultimately, Williams suggests we should reframe work-family policy debates away from the language of business regulation to the language of promoting family values in order to capture the support of the working class. As a first step she suggests instituting the same kind of taboo against insulting white workers as now exists against using racial innuendo and insults. Other steps include acknowledging and recognizing class privilege and identifying aspects of non-elite culture that offer useful insights for the upper-middle class. In so doing, Williams hopes to shift “the poisonous political dynamic of the last forty years” and lay the groundwork for building coalitions that can pass serious workplace reforms.

Reshaping the Work-Family Debate also addresses several important topics of general interest to sociology researchers and students, including the insight that masculine norms underlie the social structures within which both men and women negotiate their daily lives. An excellent chapter on reconstructive feminism illustrates the author’s broad theoretical reach and her grounded approach: “The question is not whether physical, social, and psychological differences between men and women exist. It is why these particular differences become salient in a particular context and then are used to create and justify women’s continuing disadvantage” (p. 128). In another chapter, Williams reviews four basic patterns of workplace gender bias: “the maternal wall,” “double standards,” “double binds,” and “gender wars among women.” This is where Williams is at her best, and she is indeed one of the most articulate and incisive critics of workplace gender inequities writing today. She shows how these pervasive, yet often unintentional, patterns of interaction serve to police women out of good jobs and men out of caregiving, as well as limiting business productivity. Williams argues against the conventional wisdom that work-family conflict stems from women’s failure to bargain effectively within the family and instead argues for changing
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workplace assumptions that the ideal worker is a man without domestic responsibilities. Because of its engaging style and sound scholarship, this is a great book for both undergraduate and graduate sociology classes touching on inequality, work, gender, families, feminist theory, policy, politics, law, or social change.
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The core of The Destiny of Modern Societies could be roughly summed up by saying that the genesis and fate of America is embedded in Calvinism, but the destiny of the New World has not really been shaped directly by Calvin's theology. Having grafted Anglo-American Puritanism onto the old skin of Calvinism, the outcome was the generation of the myth of America as a New Nation blessed by God, a Promised Land or New Jerusalem. This cultural and religious matrix of America biased the pillars of its social system: from politics to economics, from civil society to its cultural and moral patterns. Because of the profound influence of Calvinism via Anglo-Saxon Puritanism, America has up to now been structurally a theological society.

Milan Zafirovski argues that the peculiar feature of the American nation-building process is precisely the theocratic model of society that was first devised and implemented by Calvin in Geneva, then further developed during the Puritan Revolution in the United Kingdom, and finally reinterpreted by a sectarian Protestantism in America. According to Zafirovski, Calvinism thus imprinted the idea of American society as a nation chosen by God to accomplish the utopia of the Calvinist respublica Christiana. The main consequences of this hypothesis are that: (a) the matrix of American society works intrinsically according to an anti-liberal, anti-democratic and holistic culture; (b) the society’s evolution is oriented towards a totalitarian social system, dominated by a recurrent battle between the secularist and the fundamentalist forces; and (c) the spiritual tyranny of this theocratic model shifts to a moral fascism, with a "great strictness of morals" imposed on society as a whole, any secular and ungodly perspectives and attitudes being rejected in both private and public domains.

Discussing the well-known Tocqueville and Weber thesis on the relationship between Calvinism, Democracy and Capitalism in America, Zafirovski tries to dismantle Tocqueville’s assumption regarding the United States’ democratic nature, partially disputing the elective affinity argued by Weber between the doctrine of Predestination and the spirit of Capitalism. The aim is precisely to argue that the Americans’ libertarian, democratic and secular ideas are dramatically dissociated from their Calvinism via Puritanism.

One of the strongest arguments in favor of this thesis is the resurgence of moral neo-conservatism in contemporary America, particularly in the Bible Belt, and the wave of neo-fundamentalism. In the name of supreme moral values rooted in the Bible, people tend to justify any kind of religious and cultural war, be it against the separation between Church and State, against abortion or homosexual unions, and so on. Reframing the AGIL scheme proposed by Parsons, the author claims that Calvinism’s evangelical theocracy represents the functional imperative, the supreme rule of the social system that laid the foundations for the adaptation (economy), goal attainment (polity), integration (civil society), and latency (cultural and moral patterns) of American society.

The book is divided into seven chapters, plus the conclusions. The central concept briefly outlined above is presented in the first two chapters, while the others (Chapters III to VI) are devoted to the different sub-systems (i.e., the economic, the political, civil society, and the cultural sphere). In nearly five hundred pages, the analysis concentrates on providing one-dimensional evidence of the core theory: the nature of Anglo-American Puritan Calvinism is anti-liberal and anti-democratic, hence the intrinsic fascism behind the idea of America as a Promised Land or New Jerusalem, chosen by God.
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Apart from the repetitiveness of the arguments, the author tends to represent Calvinism in a sort of Hegelian night where all cows are black. Calvinist socio-theology is, metaphorically speaking, like a person accused of murdering American democracy and social justice. The author sees Calvinism as having created the premises for the master-servant economy that penetrated the spirit of predatory (p. 165) capitalism, degenerating into the mafia capitalism (p.167). In this sense, Zafirovski claims not an elective affinity between Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism, but a direct influence of the religious viewpoint on the economic and political structures of American capitalism, overturning the Marxian approach to the relationship between structure and superstructure at the same time. Mafia capitalism and moral Fascism paradoxically converge towards a terrifying representation of Calvinism and Puritanism combining to become a den of vice. Its aim to provide a holistic theological interpretation of reality—including the (pre)destiny of human beings and society—perversely leads to slavery and predation, a theocracy, a moral tyranny that suppresses individual moral freedom, a Puritan culture of death (just to quote some excerpts from the book).

Zafirovski’s thesis is convincing in parts and supported by evidence. The inevitable nexus between the theology of predestination and the contradictions (to use Marxian language) of modern capitalism and modern democracy seems to have been inadequately argued, however. Capitalism and democracy tend to evolve, possibly in spite of some of the religious roots in Western societies, according to their own internal rules, which do not necessarily refer to any theological or moral view of the world. To attribute all deviations and vices of the capitalist economy and the tyranny of the majority in the democratic arena to Calvinism seems to be straining logic, from both the historical and the sociological standpoints.

Other weaknesses of the book are its diffuse and wordy style, and oddly, the absence of any references in the footnotes and bibliography to the classic authors (such as Simmel, Tocqueville and Weber) that Zafirovski frequently mentions in discussing his theory, whereas Parsons is correctly quoted.
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A key sociological issue concerns change in the social stratification system during the process of transformation from a redistribution economy to a market economy in socialist countries. Has the process of marketization in China since 1980 produced a new middle class? What kind of class behavior is marked in the emergence of this middle class? Will the new middle class affect Chinese social, political and economic trends? Those are common questions for sociologists who are concerned with Chinese societies in the future. Some of the traditional studies focus on education, occupation and income, followed by the growth of corporations and rapid bureaucratization.

Li Zhang has opened up a new research method in the book In Search of Paradise: Middle-Class Living in a Chinese Metropolis, an analysis of middle-class living through the production of commodity housing. Emphasis on what links the middle class together is not necessarily a shared structural position or historical condition, but a similar orientation in lifestyles expressed in homeownership, consumerism, and economic liberalism. Zhang has declared an analytical notion of the “Spatialization of Class.” This spatial production affects the political economy of urban restructuring, capital accumulation, new ways of living, and social identification. This perspective of space reflects class formation in both private property and culture identification, social relationships and post-socialist governing. It is an important theoretical contribution to Chinese social stratification studies. The realistic descriptions and analysis are accurate and predictable.

In research methods, this book is different from the mainstream research of social stratification. It makes no use of quantitative methods, but draws from ethnographic fieldwork in Kunming, a provincial capital city. In
modern Chinese history, Kunming is a city with a nostalgic story. It is not an ideal fieldwork site for class analysis, but it is where the author grew up and has maintained close family ties and social networks. Zhang conducted ethnographic fieldwork by visiting over thirty newly-developed gated communities and ten older neighborhoods within Kunming and its suburbs, combining participant observation, semi-structured and informal interviews, and documentary research. The data are abundant, vivid and reliable.

Private home ownership and commercialization of urban land are just two of the most palpable changes that indicate the end of the socialist mode of city life. A new middle class has formed through the production of private housing as well as the consumption of new residential spaces. In this ongoing process, the meaning of being middle class is constantly defined and redefined by a variety of social actors, including real estate developers, advertisers, homeownership, and those who are excluded from such spaces. The notion of “Spatialization of Class” is an accurate and vivid understanding and insight into the changes in the social structure in China. The new middle class in China is marked by three distinct characteristics: their moment of emergence, their highly heterogeneous composition, and their heightened sense of insecurity. As the owner of a house, the new middle class is affected by the “double movement” of Karl Polanyi. On the one hand, they search for a private paradise, and on the other, they engage in public actions to defend their paradise. The latter action creates a condition for the production of a citizenship society. Zhang remarks, “At the heart of the making of the new middle-class citizens as I observed them in Kunming is the formulation of a new kind of subject who is inspired by a different set of ethics than the socialist ones” (p. 19). Under post-socialist urban governing, experiments in that governing and the shifting power dynamics result in two processes: the privatization of urban authorities, and the shift to governing through community and self.

Housing, class and urban governance are key words for China studies, and their changes will influence profoundly the future in China. Social inequality in housing may cause conflict between the poor and rich, and may also lead to a bourgeois revolution asking for the right of private property. The book benefits our understanding of the changes in Chinese social structure.
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Samuel Zipp’s gracefully written Manhattan Projects offers detailed, well-illustrated case studies of famous urban renewal schemes to make a larger point about urban planning in modern America. His episodes of New York City urban renewal have been described elsewhere, but Zipp weaves the community thread into the familiar “big picture” urban development narrative. By doing so he reveals that resistance to famous projects such as Lincoln Center gained a good deal of traction, and even where resistance failed, it exercised lasting influence on planning practice in New York and across the globe. Throughout the book, Zipp demonstrates interdisciplinary flair including sound, readable analysis in architectural history, social history, cultural studies, and political and legal history.

The United Nations headquarters opens the book (pp. 33-72) because it became the model, physically and ideologically, for urban renewal schemes of the era. Its proponents, including Robert Moses and John D Rockefeller Jr., aimed to reshape New York as a global capital by replacing an industrial zone on the East River with a white collar, global institution housed in a modernist tower-in-the-park superblock. There was little organized citizen resistance to the project at this time, so Zipp shows how promoters created a narrative of city improvement (slums replaced by modernity) that could be applied across the city, even where plenty of people would have to be displaced.

Zipp’s story gains momentum at Stuyvesant Town (pp. 73-156) and he ably uses photographs, testimony, and local newspapers to illustrate the vibrancy of a standardized
place frequently ignored by planners and sociologists. His description of the Metropolitan Life photograph collection of the tenement neighborhood before clearance is particularly haunting. He shows that even though the company sought to hide the destruction of the neighborhood by portraying it as a slum, significant business and other activities on the streets were still visible. What is equally useful for sociologists is his description of fights by Stuyvesant Town tenants for both racial integration and a sense of home in a mass-produced environment.

The Lincoln Center/Lincoln Square chapters (pp. 157-252)) are the most disheartening. Zipp unwinds a story of ruthless neighborhood destruction by Robert Moses, John D. Rockefeller III, and other power brokers; he also documents the local resistance that seemed to have a chance of saving the existing neighborhood. Zipp devotes time not only to the official view of the design and development process, but also to the idea of neighborhood vibrancy that emerged during this fight, even if the resistance did not carry the day. Again, cultural studies approaches are used to great effect (including buildings, photographs, plays, paintings, essays and mass media) to illustrate the dramatic conflict over this space. The official narrative of slum clearance (slums were outmoded vestiges of an older age that should always be cleared) began to fall apart during the long battles over redevelopment.

Finally, the chapters on East Harlem and public housing (pp. 253-350) offer a good overview of the place of public housing in both the the national and New York City context. Activists tried to reshape tower block planning and landscapes as the full destructiveness of the massed public housing to neighborhood life in East Harlem (loss of local shops, sense of connections, racial and income stratification, etc.), starkly emerged. Architectural and landscape innovation, inspired by social workers, proposed visionary alternatives to standard towers in the park. Above all, a full blown critique of modern housing design resulted from resistance at the local level, even though the resistance failed to achieve its immediate aims.

Zipp shows throughout the text that although citizens often failed in their individual battles against the Modern movement, their struggles ultimately laid the groundwork for Jane Jacobs’ devastating critique that drove a stake through the remnants of modern architecture and planning. The entire study can be considered, in one light, as a form of contextualizing The Death and Life of Great American Cities. Zipp shows, then explains, that this intellectual monkey wrench in the redevelopment machine resulted from Jacobs’ involvement and knowledge of the episodes and individuals he describes: Death and Life documented hard won insights of a decade-long movement.

Even though Manhattan Projects is essentially an indictment of big government modernism, (and particularly Robert Moses), the author is openly conflicted, as many of us are, about the long-term impact of the collapse of the liberal, modernist urban renewal model. As Zipp concedes, destroying modernism, and the big government model that sponsored it, was not necessarily the goal of all the activists who opposed individual projects. The activists’ inability to articulate a better modernist/liberal consensus ultimately laid the groundwork for the larger conservative countercharge against liberal social policy and a withering away, for instance, of otherwise useful middle- and lower-income housing subsidies.

The other difficulty for Zipp is measuring costs and benefits using a time-limited case study approach. The dramatic and disheartening stories featured throughout the text make it difficult to see any upside to the projects he describes. He admits, however, that the United Nations did make New York a node in the world political system; Lincoln Center has been a successful cultural center; Stuyvesant Town thrives as a middle-class enclave in the city; and even public housing in New York has provided decades of low-cost housing and open space to hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers. The long term benefits, in the particular cases he shows, may have today outweighed the displacement of particular local neighborhoods or industrial zones in the 1940s and 1950s. An entire city destroyed in the manner of these episodes would have been a disaster, but a few nodes of this urban strategy in an otherwise crowded, market-dominated city seems to have added a useful layer to New York’s complex urban fabric.