judged. Even here, they present examples of vernacular discourse on an e-mail distribution list that challenges Proposition 187, but they still use dominant logics in their arguments.

In siding more with the outlaw vernacular logics that offer significant challenges to both Proposition 187 and the dominant discourse, the authors propose that it is important for people to “resist the courts and legislatures of their communities,” but that it is even more important to look seriously at the logics operating in the courts and legislatures, as well as commonsense logics of everyday life.

Because the issues of migration (and the associated issues of gender, race, class, and sexual justice) have become more complex and global, Ono and Sloop make a good argument for why we need to understand these different forms of logic. Without this awareness, our purposes can be defeated in reaching out to the broad majority. Without a discourse that gets at the foundations of what created Proposition 187, the social movements may find themselves moving within the sphere of a dominant logic and instituting a perception of immigrants as mere commodities.

In Shifting Borders, Ono and Sloop bring together every fragment imaginable concerning immigration policies. Consequently, at times it is overdone and repetitive. In reading the descriptions of the various types of discourse, one gets lost in the large number of examples drawn from the local, national, and regional media.

Finally, as a researcher and activist in immigrant communities, I would have liked some practical examples of models that both employ an outlaw vernacular discourse in agreement with the author’s contentions and that also have proved to be successful.
millions of federal dollars for redevelopment that would occur during the 1980s and 1990s to alter conditions that made these developments poster children for what was wrong with public housing.

Vale, however, does not use the book to indict public housing per se but to analyze what went wrong initially and why: the redevelopment process and concept, its level of success, and reasons for success and failure. For Vale does not perceive public housing as a bad idea, but one that one that needs to be “reclaimed.” Therefore, the focus of each case study is not on the similarities between the three cases but on their differences: differences in history, location, amenities, economic development, race and ethnicity, and power. And it is these differences that both explain the success and challenges faced by the redevelopment initiatives, as well as shape the response to the redevelopment process per se.

West Broadway began as a 972 unit project in all white South Boston in 1949, and its history is one of virulent white racism and violence—truly horrific incidents of murder and mayhem. Yet Vale’s chronicle of West Broadway shows the valiant, if not inconsistent, role of tenant leaders, the backing of the Boston Public Housing Authority, the role of political clout (remember, this is South Boston), and the triumph of good architecture and design. What has emerged is a development that is racially integrated, although with very poor families; West Broadway also successfully resisted gentrification pressures. As a public neighborhood, it was reclaimed, but it would appear that its struggle is far from over.

Franklin Fields began as a 504 unit development in Dorchester to house Jewish war veterans in 1954. The dynamics of neighborhood racial change mirror those associated with many urban Jewish neighborhoods with the ensuing block busting, speculation on racial change, FHA scandal, and the exploitation of both white sellers and black buyers. (The book contains a short analysis on whether this reflected institutional targeting of Jewish neighborhoods per se or a larger community of which Jews were a part). What happened at Franklin Fields stems in part from this context of racial change misery but also from the challenges associated with redeveloping it. Good design, money, and good intentions did not work. Franklin Fields was redeveloped but not reclaimed.

Commonwealth was built on a farm with 648 units in Brighton: a public housing anomaly in that it was not used as a tool for urban redevelopment. Regardless, conditions deteriorated dramatically. At the same time, tenants organized and continued to stay organized, and the surrounding neighborhood remained viable. Like the other developments, the redevelopment effort had quality design and architectural guidance. But unlike the other developments, management was turned over to a private company that appeared to be able to work effectively with tenants to maintain physical and social order. Commonwealth, while a success at reclaiming its public neighborhood, remains the home of very poor people.

Of course, success is always judged relative to expectations. From Vale’s perspective (outlined in a must read introductory chapter), housing should operate as mechanism to achieve basic security and privacy at a minimum and, ultimately, some form of community (or social capital). Public housing failed to provide minimum standards expected from housing.

But once those standards are achieved, what other layers are imposed on what housing should deliver for its residents? Why should housing per se (not schools, jobs, or transportation) be a tool for social and economic mobility for the poor? Ultimately, as Vale shows, people’s poverty is not rooted in their housing conditions. New fangled ideas of housing determinism are unlikely mechanisms to alter dynamics of poverty. So public housing remains largely poor; although with Hope VI, experiments of mixed income settings will become more prevalent. In case the richness of the data disguises Vale’s beliefs, the book ends with this clear sentence: “Reclaiming public housing requires the elimination of publicly sponsored ghettos, not the elimination of low rent dwellings” (p. 411).

Reclaiming Public Housing is a jewel among the rich histories of U.S. public housing. It will become a classic, reread with different implied meanings for years to come.
Several essays in this edited volume make a serious attempt to grapple with the theoretical foundations of environmental sociology. In three major sections, the book examines classical sociological theories, twentieth-century sociological theories (up to the 1980s), and contemporary influences on the field of environmental sociology (1990s to 2002). In one of the most useful contributions of the book, several chapters examine how the works of classic sociological theorists like Marx, Weber, and Durkheim relate to environmental sociology, by attempting to examine if and how classic sociological theorists incorporated environmental concerns into their understanding of social relations, and the lessons that can be drawn from their work. Students who are well versed in classic sociological theory will find this section engaging and thought provoking.

The twentieth-century theory section examines how systems theory, critical theory, and world-system theory have influenced environmental sociology. In the most important chapter in this section, authors Roberts and Grimes point out that scholars other than Euro-Americans and Europeans have made intellectual contributions to the discipline of environmental sociology. Roberts and Grimes recognize that environmental sociology has been influenced by ideas and scholarship originating outside of the European and Euro-American tradition, and their chapter analyzes the contributions of Latin American scholars to world-system theory.

(Sociological Theory and the Environment, like its 1995 predecessor, Environmental Sociology: A Social Constructivist Perspective, clings to the notion that environmental sociology was founded by and has been influenced almost exclusively by Euro-American and European thought. In the first chapter, editors Dunlap, Buttel, Dickens, and Gijswijt provide an overview of the discipline of environmental sociology and the scholarship that has influenced the field since its inception. Though the chapter reviews both historical and contemporary contributions to the discipline, the authors do not recognize the scholarship of women or minorities as having influenced the discipline in any significant way. Yet, contrary to the editors’ analysis, even the most casual perusal of the environmental sociology literature will find a robust body of scholarship from women, American minorities, and third world scholars worthy of discussion in any overview and analysis of the discipline.

This omission is most evident in the final section of the book that examines contemporary influences on environmental sociology. Here, environmental justice (a subdiscipline in which many minority, female, and third world environmental sociologists conduct research) is mentioned only in passing. Yet, environmental justice has influenced the discipline of environmental sociology in profound ways.

This is the second of two books to result from a 1997 conference held in Zeist, Netherlands, the first being the 2000, Environment and Global Modernity, edited by Spaargaren, Mol, and Buttel. If Sociological Theory and the Environment is read as one of the outputs of a conference of select environmental sociology scholars, then the book is less problematic. However, if, as the editors suggest, the book is read as part of a larger project to “define and codify” (see the Preface, and Chapters 1 and 15) the field of environmental sociology, then there is much room to question how the editors and contributing scholars have gone about the task of defining and codifying the discipline. The book also raises questions about whether there is a need to define the discipline, and who participates in the process of defining the discipline. The book also points to the need for environmental sociologists to engage in a discussion about the role of women and minorities as scholars, thinkers, and contributors to the intellectual core of the discipline.

If this book is used as text (in environmental sociology courses where the students have some prior sociological theory back-
ground), then professors should be prepared to supplement it with materials that include contributions of women, American minorities, and third world scholars. Without supplementary readings, students are likely to leave the course with a distorted view of the range of scholarship within the discipline of environmental sociology.


ED WALSH
The Pennsylvania State University
e1w@psu.edu

The authors insist that class cleavages, rather than racial or ethnic ones, are critical in explaining which communities are targeted for toxic waste dumps, both within the United States and globally. In support of this thesis, they cite a 1991 World Bank Report of Lawrence Summers, formerly U.S. Treasury Secretary and currently Harvard president, arguing that “the economic logic behind dumping a load of toxic waste in the lowest-wage country is impeccable” (p. 115). After three opening chapters discussing the political economy of toxics, the waste industry in the United States, and the environmental justice movement, attention focuses in the fourth and fifth chapters on the grassroots struggle against a hazardous waste project by the Amoco multinational in Mercer County, Missouri. The final chapter is modestly entitled “Wasting the World.”

Even readers inclined to accept some of this book’s guiding assumptions and assertions may prefer more persuasive supporting logic and documentation. For example, few informed observers would disagree that the waste industry does indeed typically put profits ahead of people’s health in this country and around the world, but an even-handled discussion of the complexities involved in handling and disposing of toxics is more likely to convince than mere repetition of the Marxist “enclosure” analogy. At a more general level, while it is also at least partially true that “neoimperialism forces every nation to obey the neoliberal logic of the market and accept being ‘governed’ from Washington or marginalized in the brave new world of ‘globalization’” (p. vii), the actual dynamics of global markets are more complex than that (see, for example, Schiller’s The New Financial Order).

Focusing on a single Missouri county’s successful mobilization process against the toxics industry, the authors are apparently unaware of numerous concepts and insights from recent decades of movement analysis. Their case study is scattered and lacks a useful analytic framework. While they mention the industry’s infamous 1984 “Cerrell Report,” Girdner and Smith give little indication they absorbed its contents or are aware of its subversive use against such projects by environmental activists across the nation. Few of the entries in their 28 pages of footnotes (the book does not include a “References” section) cite sources more recent than the mid-1990s, but even so this reader was puzzled at the omission of Andrew Szasz’s 1994 book, EcoPopulism, on political processes and grassroots movements involving the handling and mishandling of toxic wastes. It was crushing to find Rex Warland et al.’s 1997 study of eight comparable protest processes (Don’t Burn It Here) likewise ignored. Neutralizing capitalist bromides requires more empirical data and less repetition of Marxist dogma.


DAVID N. PELLOW
University of California-San Diego
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There is no question that in our increasingly global society we will have to rely more and more on the authority, expertise, and good will of global decision-makers. If pollution knows no boundaries, then those individuals and institutions that track, monitor, regulate, and reduce pollution must also have a global reach in order to do their job. Fortunately, there exists an excellent model of such global environmental decision-making at work: the 1987 Montreal Protocol for the
Elimination of Ozone Depleting Substances. This unprecedented agreement, made possible by the United Nations, is believed to be the most successful example of international environmental decision-making on record and perhaps the first truly global treaty of any kind.

Penelope Canan and Nancy Reichman argue that the Protocol was the product of several factors, including intense diplomacy, science advocacy, and informal relationships among global consultants—a new occupation that appeared in late twentieth century policy circles. Based on years of field work, surveys, interviews, and network analysis, the authors offer an unprecedented view of politics and science at work in a global space.

Canan and Reichman provide excellent case studies of key individuals who comprised the leadership behind the Protocol, including the venerable former Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, Mostafa K. Tolba. Adopting C. Wright Mills’ framework of the intersection of biography, personality, and history, Canan and Reichman explain the position of these players in a larger drama that would link people, national governments, and corporations in a collaboration unlike any other. The various social networks that formed during the many years in which the Protocol was being devised allowed scientists the opportunity to develop deep friendships, trust, and relationships that made it possible to bridge national and cultural divides that might ordinarily hinder global decision-making. Another key ingredient in this process was the resource base that allowed participants to travel to several international meetings each year, so that face-to-face meetings were possible. Thus, as much as the Montreal Protocol depended on creative politics and innovative science, without these deep social networks, “communities of practice,” and “communities of expertise,” the treaty might never have been possible. Extending Bourdieu’s analysis of social capital, the authors argue that these actors converted their social capital into what they term “intellectual capital”—the ability to think creatively and recognize the complementary expertise of others.

Canan and Reichman are careful to state that scientific expertise alone is insufficient to produce successful international treaties. They demonstrate that the Protocol participants went beyond the traditionally restrictive role of “objective” scientist and transformed themselves into science advocates. Despite the risks to their careers of engaging in advocacy, these individuals consciously pushed the science on ozone depletion into action. They were allowed the authority, autonomy, and independence from politicians to do their jobs, which ultimately led to decisions that have the force of the United Nations behind them.

Having personally been involved in a number of multi-stakeholder environmental negotiations myself, it is surprising to me that scientists were allowed to do what they did. The authors’ claim, that the work the scientists did was free of political influence, seems difficult to accept, but they support this point with strong evidence.

But the science/politics theme also points to a broader concern. If, as these and other scholars believe, technical expertise and a culture of science are viewed as driving forces in our postindustrial society, this still leaves the unresolved question of democratic decision-making. Given that expertise is, by definition, not widely distributed among populations, how can we be assured that the appointed “experts” are acting in the best interests of the world’s population and the environment? Who has the right to confer the authority on scientists, and exactly whom do the scientists serve? These individuals are appointed, not elected, and if the average world citizen is ill-equipped to evaluate their credentials and the policy problem they are attempting to tackle, then we have an inherent and thorny problem of trust and representation.

The book raises other intriguing questions as well. For example, why did the Montreal Protocol work out so well when the Basel Convention, the Stockholm Convention, and many other international environmental agreements did not? What was so different about Montreal that others failed to see and learn from? For instance, it is interesting that representatives from industry dominated the Montreal Protocol process and this was seen as a positive phenomenon (because, after all, the implementation of harmful chemical phase-outs starts and ends with industry). However, in a host of other national and international environmental agreements, cor-
porate influence—if not hegemony—has been viewed as the major barrier to success (after all, when corporations and their representatives are defining the agenda, they are understandably limiting the kinds of questions that can be asked and the breadth and depth of actions that are allowable). In those cases, fiscal capital seemed to prevent any other forms of capital (human, social, cultural, or intellectual) from having significant impact on negotiations. Future research on international agreements might draw on the Montreal Protocol and a number of other agreements to produce a rich, comparative analysis in order to shed some light on this crucial theoretical and policy question.

Ozone Connections is an outstanding example of the kind of research that sociologists in the twenty-first century will be required to conduct—multidisciplinary, multimethodological, and collaborative approaches that capture social action from the micro to the global. This book will appeal to sociologists of all persuasions, and to students and policymakers and anyone interested in models of international decision-making that really work.
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The Silicon Valley of Dreams joins a small, yet growing number of scholarly works treating critically the global high-tech industry. By focusing on the low end of the production chain, David Pellow and Lisa Sun-Hee Park challenge the image of an environmentally friendly industry that operates smokeless factories within aesthetic industrial parks, while employing middle class “knowledge-workers.” The authors describe the work realities in Silicon Valley, California, but rather than portray the work of engineers and scientists, they provide a stage for workers who engage in semiconductor chip production and “clean room” work, as well as more peripheral work, such as printed circuit board production and cable and printer assembly. Today, when the high-tech industry has taken a downturn, we read about unemployed software and hardware engineers living on employment insurance. Yet, hazardous working conditions for a largely invisible underclass of production workers have never captured public attention. Most of the protagonists of this book are members of this underclass, namely legal and illegal immigrants from the Far East and Central America.

Pellow and Park take a moral stance from the outset, and explicitly attempt to give a voice to this neglected segment of the high-tech labor force. While the ideological stance is clear and narrow, the theoretical scope of the book is wide: It includes an ambitious attempt to weave together diverse literature in fields such as environmental studies, social movements, industrial relations, and studies of ethnic and social inequality. This attempt, which the writers use later in organizing their empirical findings (see, e.g., pp. 181–84), sometimes leaves the reader confused by the quick transitions from one body of literature to the other and by the brevity of the theoretical discussion. Yet, the attempt to tackle the research questions from diverse theoretical dimensions is also thought-provoking and educational.

The theoretical concept underpinning the book is Environmental Racism and Injustice. This term is defined several times, highlighting different dimensions of the higher probability for women, minorities, and new immigrants to be exposed to toxic substances in their communities and on the job. After a theoretical Introduction, the next three chapters provide a short overview of Silicon Valley’s history. Chapter 4, on the emergence of Silicon Valley, provides an excellent description of the making of the Valley into the world’s most famous high-tech center. This chapter presents data on the development of high-tech firms in the valley and their connection to the Federal Government and Stanford University. It also sets the stage for the empirical chapters that follow by presenting the tension between the clean image of the industry and its use of highly toxic substances, and by presenting and discussing
data about environmental inequalities in Silicon Valley.

Management in high tech industry is well known for its relentless, and successful, struggle against unions. Chapter 5 describes the unique model of community organizations that fused traditional approaches and priorities (and created new ones) to respond to the newly created needs of electronic workers in Silicon Valley. Chemical hazard information, support for injured workers, and legal and language assistance offered by individuals and grassroots organizations constitute an innovative example of resistance to environmental and workplace injustice, without the structural benefit of a union.

Chapters 6 and 7 compose the heart of this book. Here, the authors excerpt interviews depicting the disturbing outcomes of exposure to an array of chemicals on the shop floor, at “clean rooms,” and other locations in semiconductor manufacturing. These outcomes, according to workers’ accounts, range from sensitivity to certain smells, severe migraines, problems with menstrual cycles, and even to high rates of miscarriage and cancer. Management’s reported unwillingness to respond to simple workers’ complaints about strong odors or direct exposure to chemicals is striking. Of particular interest is management’s claimed tendency to label women workers’ complaints “mass hysteria” (pp. 124–25). Since the vast majority of managers are men, Pellow and Park see this also as “a form of patriarchal control, the use of power exercised by men and male-dominated institutions over women to maintain the status quo” (p. 124). One worker even described management’s unwillingness to disclose the names of the chemicals used in production work, which are simply labeled “Yellow no. 2” or “Blue no. 5” (p. 128). This is reminiscent of Scientific Management’s attempts during the progressive era in the United States to rename simple workshop tools in an attempt to reduce worker’s autonomy and skills. Finally, I found the short description of home-based piecework in Silicon Valley fascinating and revealing. Here, the book claims, thousands of immigrants make circuit boards, cables, and other components in their homes, using toxic chemicals such as lead and acids in their kitchen sinks. Children and the elderly join forces in this type of work, which, being labor intensive, is considered by management more efficient than factory work (pp. 158–66). The three last chapters provide a broader picture of the global microelectronics industry and try to formulate a strategy toward social and environmental justice in Silicon Valley and abroad. I found the discussion here interesting and thought-provoking.

The strong ideological stance characterizing the book at times weakens the argument and the connection between data and conclusion. For example, based on relatively little data, “dozens of workers’ cases we examined via interviews and legal deposits” (p. 134), the authors go on to describe “a medical system that is stubbornly ignorant of, or resistant to, any suggestion that the workplace could be a cause of health problem” (p. 135). In addition, there are ongoing attempts to justify the book’s moral mission, and repetition of the definition of environmental injustice often distracts the reader. But despite this critique, I see Silicon Valley of Dreams as an important contribution to the contemporary critique of high tech industry, and an excellent source for undergraduate and graduate classes on workplace conflicts, industrial relations, environmental injustice, and social movements.
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Steven J. Gold, a professor of sociology at Michigan State University, has written a model book, the way a study should be undertaken: It is focused, well-researched, well-written, and makes a strong contribution to diaspora studies, international migration research, and ethnic minorities. As someone who has studied and lived in Israel (Kibbutz Gesher Haziv, Jerusalem) and has often thought of returning to live there, I learned a great deal from this book. This review examines Gold’s goals, research methods, and conclusions.
The Israeli Diaspora not only focuses on Israelis in the United States, but also those in London, Sydney, and Paris, as well as Israelis who have lived in Argentina, Holland, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Japan, Italy, South Africa, and Canada. The major American locales are Los Angeles and New York City, which have large Israeli populations.

Gold is interested not in the negative picture of such vordim (Hebrew for “those who go down,” or leave Israel) but in their positive make-up: their reasons for leaving Israel, their links abroad, political and economic satisfactions and dissatisfactions, the lure of world-class careers outside of Israel, and their relationship to the host Jewish community.

Israels live in several spheres. They are Jewish, yet they are different from the general cultural and social structure of the host Jewish community. Often, they are Sephardim or of non-European origin, and may even look “black,” yet their allegiance is not to the Arab or minority host communities but to their fellow Israelis. A blond Russian Israeli woman has more in common with a dark-skinned Moroccan or Ethiopian Israeli than she does with an American Jew. Often, the darker skinned Israelis are treated as second-class citizens sociologically, and sadly, due to the present tensions in Israel, some Israelis are discriminated against in employment or in academia. There was a recent case of an Oxford University biology professor who would not take on an Israeli graduate student because of his opposition to the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.

Gold aims to give us an ethnographic account of a subculture that, despite its ambivalent identity and lonely exile, is remarkable in its ability to build a sub-society of its own, separate from the general host society and the Jewish community. He succeeds handsomely. In fact, as I read the book, I held in my hand a kind of “Yellow Pages” for Boston Israelis called “Israpages.” It is over 200 pages long, and Boston has only a small community of Israelis.

Gold notes that research on diasporas has usually been undertaken by historians who relied on archives, ship records, and other published sources. Gold however followed a different route, relying primarily on ethnographic materials, including 194 in-depth interviews conducted in both Hebrew and English, and fieldwork (attending meetings, fairs, coffee house events, religious services). As for numbers, the 1990 U.S. Census showed 144,000 people living in Hebrew-speaking homes, almost all of whom could be assumed to be Israelis. This does not count Israelis who are trying to “hide” (like any other immigrant group that might fear the state) or Israelis married to non-Israelis, Jewish or not, who are living in primarily non-Hebrew speaking homes. I could easily double that figure to nearly 300,000 Israelis in the United States. The 1996 Canadian Census showed 21,965; and a 1996 Australian Census showed 5,923 Hebrew-speaking people. France showed 2,900 in 1990. These are low figures.

Data show that a significant fraction of Israeli emigrants eventually return home. The Israeli population is a very young population. The 1990 U.S. Census shows that 79 percent of them in New York and 70 percent in Los Angeles are under age 44. New York was also 55 percent male while LA was 54 percent male. They have a very low divorce rate of 2 to 5 percent. In short, they are a stable, hard-working part of America, England, France, or Australia. The same could be said of other diaspora groups: Greek, Palestinian, African, Croatian. They too are hardworking yet almost invisible to the general population.

In terms of intervention and outreach, the host country or Jewish community has much to learn. Like Soviet Jews, Israeli Jews are a distinct group with their own special needs, and they tend to be quite self-reliant. Thus, it is a challenge for any refugee or immigrant-oriented social agency to do outreach to them. Israelis have problems with visas, work, familial stress, wife and child abuse, and isolation, and they need help. The question is how and when to intervene in such an international migratory community; in short, how does one reach out to them?

I highly recommend this book. Sociologists and their students, as well as social agency personnel will find it useful.
The majority of contributions to this edited volume originated as papers delivered in early 1996 at a conference organized by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Committee on International Migration. The goal of the conference was to have a multidisciplinary group of the leading scholars of international migration and immigration come together to “assess the state of knowledge, core theoretical issues, and unresolved empirical questions” (p. xiii) in the field. To keep the task at hand from becoming too unwieldy, attention was focused on the U.S. case.

The Handbook is organized into three sections. The first, “Theories and Concepts of International Migration,” consists of six articles that address the basic question of what factors underlie the decision to migrate from one country to another. In addition to doing an excellent job of presenting and integrating the leading theories concerning the causes of international population movements, the contributions in this section also extend existing theory by incorporating a number of factors that have received less attention. For example, Aristide Zolberg focuses on the role of the state, both in terms of areas to which individuals migrate as well as who is allowed to migrate, and Patricia Pessar argues for greater attention paid to the roles of gender, households, and networks in the development of immigration theory. Taken as a whole, this set of articles represents a comprehensive treatment of the current state of theory concerning the causes of immigration, at least in the U.S. case.

The second section, “Immigrant Adaptation, Assimilation, and Incorporation,” is organized around the fundamental question of what happens to migrants after they arrive in the United States. Earlier versions of some of the eight articles in this section appeared in a 1997 issue of International Migration Review that dealt with the prospects for assimilation of the current wave of immigrants and their children. In addition to providing thorough reviews of assimilation and segmented assimilation theories, this collection of articles draws on both historical and contemporary evidence to provide a lively debate on this as-yet-unsettled question. Also of particular note in this section is the contribution by Rebeca Rajzman and Marta Tienda, which offers a lucid and extremely useful discussion of the extant approaches to the study of immigrants’ socioeconomic incorporation, while identifying specific gaps in the conceptualization and examination of this important topic. As with the first section of this volume, this set of articles is an indispensable resource for anyone interested in the issue of immigrant incorporation in U.S. society.

The final section of the volume, “The American Response to Immigration,” consists of ten articles that seek to identify the influences that immigrants have had on American society, particularly their economic and fiscal effects, and their influences on politics and intergroup relations. By its very nature, this section is less integrated around a common theme, and reflects greater diversity in terms of the disciplines of the contributors, than is the case of the first two sections. Yet it shares with the other sections a number of strengths, including a comparison of the past with the present, and an interplay among the authors as they implicitly and explicitly refer and respond to each other’s contributions. This undercurrent of discussion among the authors is a rare commodity in edited volumes, and thanks should go both to the authors as well as the editors for this entertaining and useful feature. Another key feature of this section is the contrast it provides between the influence that immigrants may have generally on various aspects of American society and the way that immigrants may influence conditions locally, with contributions focusing on three important immigrant destinations: New York (John Hull Mollenkopf), Houston (Nestor Rodriguez), and Los Angeles (James H. Johnson Jr., Walter C. Farrell Jr., and Chandra Guinn). This “general versus local” approach is important given immigrants’ high degree of concentration in just a handful of metropoli-
Tan areas, and in the major urban centers within these areas. Yet the focus on these three cities also demonstrates the variation in responses to immigration, a variation that is intricately linked to the specific historical and political circumstances in each place. This variation may also influence the potential for incorporation of different immigrant groups.

Overall, this volume is an excellent collection of extremely useful articles that will serve as a valuable resource to students and scholars of immigration to the United States for some time to come. For sociologists, its multidisciplinary nature provides easy access to the work of scholars in fields with which some may not be terribly familiar or comfortable, and as such, represents an important reference tool for those interested in this essentially interdisciplinary field.

**POLITICS, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND THE STATE**
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This is an important book, making both theoretical and empirical contributions to the sociology of social movements, political sociology, the sociology of culture, and democratic theory. *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting* will become required reading in its fields. Francesca Polletta breaks new ground concerning a number of specific social movements and uses empirical work to make several important theoretical points.

The book tackles a much debated question in the study of social movements: whether the emergence, trajectory, and outcomes of collective action are influenced more by conditions and events external to the movement, or by internal dynamics of movements themselves. The conventional wisdom is the external structure of “political opportunities” is the most efficacious influence on movements. In contrast, Polletta examines the internal culture of a number of movements in the United States in the twentieth century, particularly movements that operated under the rubric of “participatory democracy” in their decision-making. Polletta is interested in the “etiquette of deliberation” among groups that eschewed formal bureaucratic structures as hierarchical and nondemocratic. That is, despite a lack of formal rules and structure, there was still a set of normative expectations as to how deliberations should be conducted and decisions made. This deliberative etiquette, what one might call a “cultural” style, is distinct from the more often studied ideological consensus or collective identity.

The most interesting empirical outcome of this approach is Polletta’s typology of “associational models” that structured the deliberative etiquettes; these models were understandings about the relationships among members and how, given those relations, meetings were run, decisions were made, and tasks were assigned. Polletta finds three associational models: friendship, tutelage, and religious fellowship. While the use of any particular model was not exclusive, among the groups she examines there was a distinct tendency to treat relations among movement members as either relations between friends (e.g., early SDS, women’s movement collectives), relations between teachers and students (e.g., faith-based community organizing, SNCC) or relations between co-religionists (e.g., pacifists). Importantly, along with using the associational models to help understand the bases of authority for making deliberations and decisions, Polletta uses them to help explain why any particular version of participatory democracy ran into difficulties over a movement’s life-course (e.g., movements guided by “friendship” etiquettes facilitated quick trust and consensus, but often had difficulty incorporating new members). This strikes me as a significant step: Network analysts often just posit a relationship, while Polletta gives us its content.

This important empirical discovery brings the book to the next level of theoretical significance—challenging the too easy distinc-