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Writing research on the importance of men’s mentorship can be a tricky task. As a feminist sociologist, how does one manage to balance discussion of the need for male mentorship without reifying the rhetoric of blaming societal problems such as poverty and gangs on single mothers and absentee fathers? William Marsiglio’s *Men on a Mission* fearlessly attempts to do just that with much success. In the beginning of his book he claims that “far too many kids are at-risk and deserve more and better social support” (p. 3) and men can do their part in supplying such support. His research combines extensive interviews and observations of 45 men who mentor youth either through their jobs (including teachers, child care workers, coaches, corrections officers, and religious leaders) or as volunteers with organizations like the Boy Scouts and Big Brothers.

The most interesting portion of the book was Marsiglio’s examination of the way male respondents try to combat observers’ distrust as the men work with youth in a manner that runs counter to masculine norms that leave little space for emotional or physical contact and treat nurturing behavior by men with suspicion. With these fears in mind, Marsiglio’s respondents mentor youth while facing the “stranger danger” discourse surrounding men’s involvement with “others’” children. For his gay male respondents, this is a far more precarious position as they attempt to mentor youth in a way that does not provoke homophobic fears among youth and adults. Many of his respondents use strategies to avoid physical contact or being alone with youth to avoid accusations and the appearance of inappropriateness while trying to create nurturing and intimate relationships.

In chapter three Marsiglio raises interesting points concerning how physical space shapes personal relationships, but some of the chapter seems forced. At one point he uses the example of young men on a camping trip sitting in a circle around a campfire opening up to one another by sharing information about their lives. He states that the transformative power of the great outdoors allows men to drop their masculine guard. Later in the chapter, he shares how another respondent, working with a support group in
the city, constructs a “circle of trust” (p. 58) to create a safe space for greater emotional intimacy. This left me wondering whether it was nature or the safe space created by the mentor that facilitated open discussion. He also explores male volunteers’ use of private and public spaces to ensure that their interactions are always in the view of others. However, he points out that with increasing use of technologies like email, the visibility of interactions becomes harder to monitor and maintain.

In chapter four, he explores what motivates his respondents to mentor and includes an interesting gendered analysis of this type of care work. Many of the men he interviewed state various motives for doing this type of mentoring including “giving back” or “filling the void.” His respondents’ family backgrounds vary from nurturing intact households to dysfunctional and from solidly middle class to low income. The section titled “Gender and the Boy Code” argues that younger men, who were recruited into doing care work of other youth, must navigate the perception that care work is a feminine action. He believes that characters like the fictional Harry Potter, who is not overtly masculine but is protective and nurturing of other youth, challenge and redefine traditional images of manhood.

Marsiglio has created a book that is valuable in the fields of gender, masculinity, and mentorship. He demonstrates convincingly that men’s mentorship is a feminist endeavor with transformative potential. In his concluding chapter, he argues that it is men who can most effectively deliver a more “compassionate and less violent brand of masculinity” (p. 322). While women can deliver the message, he feels that without role modeling and messages directly from men, women’s efforts may be in vain. For Marsiglio it is not simply a matter of the need for men to raise children. Rather, he supports the approach that “it takes a village to raise a child” and argues that men have been absent from the village for far too long. Thus, men’s mentorship is actually a partnership with women, and this partnership is both valuable and necessary for improving outcomes for youth and community.

A. JAMES McKEEVER
Los Angeles Pierce College


DOI: 10.1177/0891243211405192

The concept and practice of patriarchal bargaining has presented an ongoing dilemma for feminists; this dilemma has once again been
explored in Kelly Chong’s study of the religious experiences of middle-class evangelical women in South Korea. Based on intensive 16-month fieldwork during which she examined every aspect of two “megachurches” in Seoul, Chong’s carefully-written book, Deliverance and Submission, details how domestic hardship motivates Korean women to convert to Christianity as a means of deliverance from gender oppression at home. Through their church involvement, these women cope with the emotional injuries from domestic problems, negotiate marital relations with their husbands, and even achieve a sense of empowerment; paradoxically, however, their Christian faith redomesticates these women. Ultimately, Chong presents feminists with a bold question about women’s ideological consent to male domination and patriarchal operations.

The book begins with a history of Protestant evangelicalism in South Korea—according to Chong, the only East Asian country in which Protestantism experienced considerable success. To explain the larger forces that have shaped women’s decisions to convert to fundamentalist religion, she describes the historical and contemporary South Korean social, cultural, and economic context, a discussion that is lengthy and thus helpful for those who are unfamiliar with it. Chong shows how Neo-Confucian patriarchy still significantly limits women’s participation in economic activities, even as the forces of modernity have introduced gender egalitarianism in areas such as women’s education, thereby raising women’s expectations. To deal with domestic conflicts and their manifestations in the form of physical illnesses, Korean women turn to evangelicalism and find a source of emotional healing.

As the stories of Korean women unfold, a main trope is the juxtaposition of contradictory principles and practices and the dilemmas women face between them. The Korean evangelical church—a deeply gendered organization—provides Korean women with women-centered community and social outlets in which they can channel their frustrations with domestic conflicts, recognition that is translated into a sense of empowerment and self-fulfillment, and a space for learning and self-development. However, the church simultaneously reproduces the gender hierarchy by relegating women to a secondary status as “service workers” and by criticizing “smarty” women and stressing women’s endurance and docile obedience. Women who converted to escape domestic burdens find themselves once again trapped within a traditional Confucian–Christian ideology. Many women recognize the injustice but remain in the church.

Chong investigates this paradoxical response by interweaving her sociological analysis throughout her exploration of women’s spiritual rationales.
She examines how women enact the role of submission and delineates the implications of these actions. Some Korean evangelical women embody acquiescence strategically to effect changes in their husbands’ behaviors. Other women replace male authority with God and therefore create subversive resistance against male domination at home. The act of submission, as well as a sincere internal commitment to follow the church’s tenets of love and forgiveness, leads some of Chong’s respondents to make an ideological and spiritual commitment to religious patriarchy. In this process of “redo-mestication,” Chong argues, evangelical beliefs secure women’s “consent” to the current patriarchal regime. Women’s contradictory desires—to both be free from hierarchical gender relations and preserve the patriarchal family system—create fragmentary subjectivities that can hinder the formation of an oppositional consciousness.

Though her conclusion takes on a more optimistic tone, Chong’s notion of consent, even an ideological one, may be difficult for some feminists to accept because of the potential for victim blaming. The author’s emphasis on consent can be misleading because it does not reflect the difficulty many women have accepting the church’s teachings. A reluctance to consent is apparent in one woman’s lengthy struggle to express affection for her husband and the disaffection some women expressed about the church’s teachings. Chong alludes to these women but does not fully relay their accounts. Lastly, her lack of attention to the use of the concept “family” allows “family” to be regarded as an inherently patriarchal unit rather than a familial patriarchy that is simultaneously reinforced with relentless conservatism at evangelical churches. Nonetheless, Deliverance and Submission is a very valuable feminist text because of Chong’s meticulous description of how modern patriarchy works to maintain gender hierarchy.

This book is useful for graduate and upper-level undergraduate students in gender studies, religious studies, and (East) Asian studies, especially Korean studies. Finally, considering the recent rise of conservative women’s visibility in the public sphere, this book is extremely timely.

MINJEONG KIM
Virginia Tech
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As I was walking into the office recently, a new colleague, eager to foster community, foisted a brochure in my direction and said, “Look!
Join our team!” It was for a university-sponsored program called “My Weight Race,” where groups of four compete for total weight loss. Navigating a line between camaraderie and annoyance, I said no, unsure how to explain my nonparticipation. Should I summarize my antifat activism research in two sentences? Make it simple and say, “I don’t believe in weight measures for health,” or provoke a challenge with, “No thanks! I like being fat.”

The ever-increasing focus on fat and weight in Western culture makes it a constant component of everyday life, a problem that most people must manage in regular interactions with coworkers, family members, and others in public settings. Although talk about diet, bodies, fat, and health is ever present, how people respond varies based on their ability to access different accounts of self. By examining men’s experiences with the global war on fat, Lee Monaghan’s book adds more critical understanding of how the gendered body becomes “an index of moral worth in the face of rational and risk-focused society” (p. 17).

The war on fat seems democratic (in an epidemic, everyone is at risk), but as numerous scholars have noted, the moral panic generated by media, governments, scholars, and health care officials sanctions a critique of marginalized segments of the population. Poverty, race, immigration, and gender offer up examples of individual moral failure that shift the focus away from a food system where corporations and governments alike support the production of unhealthy edibles. Unsurprisingly, women as food providers and consumers often wear the blame.

The war on obesity, the “terror within,” erases fat subjectivity and shifts public discourse away from other global acts of violence. Monaghan uses this militarization of obesity to explore men’s experiences, particularly since very little research examines how they navigate the constraints presented by this contemporary interpretation of embodiment. While men and women are unequally affected by the gender discourses of weight and size, men have specific risks in this war (p. 5).

A good portion of the book examines gendered bodies, discourses, and lived experiences of corporeality. Most importantly, by “bringing men in,” Monaghan critiques a sleight of hand, where the seemingly gender-neutral approach of “obesity as a public health problem” undercuts the “fat is a feminist problem” analysis, even as the institutionalized public discourse continues to point out gender-specific risks of large embodiment (p. 184).

The book’s strength is the ethnographic research of a mixed gender “slimming club” in England. Interviews and observations are rich, situated within a typology of “weight stories,” including fat activism, and online
media–based narratives. Little is known about how men’s dieting connects to identities as fat embodied subjects in a neoliberal, rationalized society. With great care, Monaghan engages Ritzer’s McDonaldization and symbolic interactionism’s “accounts” to explore dominant narratives about men’s weight and health. Using responses and reactions to slimming, Monaghan illustrates gendered resources for resistance. Masculine embodiment brings different challenges and issues, such that men rely on excuses, justifications, biomedical examples, and denial. One of the best sections explores the relationship between “bigness” and masculinity, where some men navigate between the two in a way that protects their gendered identity in the face of social pressures to slim down.

Of note is the way men’s engagement with physical activity, even when attenuated by age, injury, or illness, allowed them more leverage than women in navigating the social pressures and public warnings related to identity, weight, and well-being. Some men access a certain amount of “healthy skepticism” as a rational response to the war on fat. In other cases, size brings associations of feminine softness that need to be repudiated. One absence in the data is an analysis of food preparation—how do cooking and feeding work, activities deeply implicated in “doing gender” and caring labor, affect resources for resistance?

Activists, health professionals, and academic sociologists all have different parts to play in the response to this “epidemic.” The author desires to construct a critically engaged response to the obesity warmongering without operating from a politicized standpoint. This self-positioning is laudable but, woven throughout each chapter, becomes distracting. To “promote productive discussion and hopefully change institutional practices,” at some point Monaghan has to take a stance against the war on obesity (p. 71).

Given the data, the concluding policy recommendations appear both reasonable and necessary, perhaps difficult but sensible. They include creating a climate where the scientific links between obesity and health are presented with less certainty, where public funds are not used to support sizeism and fat phobia, where social fitness and metabolic fitness are not conflated, and where social factors (access to good food, safe neighborhoods, reduced environmental risks) are the primary issues in public health rather than obesity. When such a discursive climate exists, it will be much easier to “just say no” to public weight contests disguised as social commitment.

ALICE P. JULIER
Chatham University
The authors of this edited volume explore the intertwining role of the European Union, national governments, and feminist civil organizations in conceptualizing and redrawing gender equality legislation and gendered outcomes on the European continent and beyond. One of the major contributions of the articles collected and edited by Silke Roth in *Gender Politics in the Expanding European Union* is the specification and contextualization of this often ambiguous, never easily tangible position of the European Union—as a catalyst, mediator, initiator, enabler, legitimacy provider, even inhibitor—in gender policy making.

The first part of the volume, comprising three articles, introduces major concepts and addresses larger and topical problem areas in EU policy making. von Wahl describes her concept of “equal opportunity regimes” as a way to frame the volume, while Morgan provides an exemplary analysis of the passage and impact of work–life balance policies in the old members states. Zippel highlights the discursive frames used within the EU to define sexual harassment as a social problem and the consequences of the shifting and varying dominance of one frame over another in different locations and among different stakeholders. All three studies provide thoughtful analysis of, and lessons for, some of the new member states. They argue for the importance of domestic political forces—spurred into action by EU requirements—to demand, realize, and monitor the implementation of policies promoting gender equality.

Part 2 includes six case studies of old and new member countries in addition to one of a “candidate” country, Turkey. Each author provides a brief description of the existing legal framework in key areas of gender inequality in their country and analyzes the contribution of domestic NGOs, national legislatures, and accession and membership requirements in the European Union to its creation. A number of interesting themes emerge here. For example, case studies from Spain, Ireland, and Poland describe the ways in which the Catholic Church as a political force rallied, with varying success, against certain measures (e.g., abortion or childcare legislation) seen to promote gender equality by EU policy makers. More generally, the importance of cultural and ideological factors, broadly defined, is often mentioned by the authors as an independent force shaping policy outcomes.
Some of the articles highlight areas where conflict may have existed between local and international feminists (e.g., Hašková and Křížková’s article quotes Czech feminists feeling insufficiently supported in their struggle by their colleagues who had control over the budgets of funding agencies). Indeed, all of the articles reveal the existence of real or perceived conflicts of interest between EU politicians requiring the passage of certain legislation and national governments resisting this and occasionally describe struggles fought around the definition of what is meant by gender equality, who a feminist is, or who can speak for women. The articles give us a glimpse of some of these contestations as well as much of the local—unfortunately, less of the global—power dynamics behind them.

The last two articles tease out some of the theoretical implications of the empirical case studies and link them to the conceptualization introduced at the beginning of the volume. Hellgren and Hobson describe the parallels and differences between the adoption of antidiscriminatory legislation targeting women and those designed to protect ethnic minorities in Sweden. Finally, in an impressive show of intellectual force, Marx Ferree returns to the opportunities and challenges the “hybrid” framing of gendered citizenship within the European Union offers for feminist political action. She uses the examples of Germany and the United States to differentiate between a social democracy leaning model that takes class seriously as an analogy to understand women’s interests (in Germany) and a more neoliberal–bent model with a focus on antidiscrimination measures, honed in struggles against racial inequality in the United States. Marx Ferree argues that EU feminists can and do draw on each of these as theoretical tools and means of political struggle.

This is an informative, nicely organized and easily accessible volume, which will be and should be read by policy makers as well as students and scholars of international feminism, equal opportunity policy making, and supranational organizations. Ironically, if understandably, many of the authors simultaneously question and assume some of the important dilemmas in this research field: what gender inequality is, that feminist NGOs and civil activists work in women’s “real” interest, or that the divisions between “East” and “West” are meaningful and real. As such, this book asks more questions than it answers and like its subject matter, the European Union, opens up and shapes the space for the discussion about policing gender policy.

EVA FODOR
Central European University
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The relationship between sport and hegemonic masculinity has been well documented by research since the beginning of the 1980s. Both as an institution as well as a performative phenomenon, sport has a long tradition of being seen as a place where parents could send their sons and then close their eyes, the best environment to create “real men,” creating and showcasing not only the physical prowess associated with great men, but also displaying “true” masculine virtues.

Among these values, normative heterosexuality is featured as one of the most important virtues to evaluate and measure athlete men. However, to be considered at the top of the “masculine” rank, athletes are not supposed to be merely heterosexual, but, as David Coad argues in his book, they need to “provide constant visible proof of heterosexuality” (p. 14). By the end of the twentieth century, though, things have started to change. Metrosexual men showing an interest in fashionable clothes and accessories, as well as high-profile athletes coming out and declaring their homosexuality, some during their careers and some after retirement, and similar events have started to make some cracks in the solid masculine world of sports. These cracks are now explored in two books: David Coad’s book focusing on the metrosexual phenomenon in sports, its paradoxes and its challenge to sport gender structures, and Eric Anderson’s book focusing on—and offering extremely refined data about—men who “maintain a sexual orientation, identity, and behaviors that are consistent with their notion of gay” (p. 6). Despite some interconnections—both deal with new masculinities in the sports world and how these have not only been affected by but are also transforming this world in terms of gender perspective and sexuality—the two books have clearly different approaches, use distinctly different languages, and focus on different masculinities.

Coad’s book explores the metrosexual phenomenon and its association with the world of professional sport, both of which are subject to high levels of media coverage and scrutiny. The author exhaustively analyzes the links between these phenomena and concepts of gender and sexuality. Coad begins by offering a detailed conceptualization of the term “metrosexual,” and does it in a clear and effective way. In the second chapter, he
searches for the roots of the term and finds it in a 1994 article in the *Independent* by British cultural critic Mark Simpson. This article, titled “Here come the Mirror Men,” “foregrounds male vanity and male narcissism as two fundamental characteristics of metrosexuality” (p. 19). Coad explores these two vectors of the metrosexual throughout his book and notes that both vanity and narcissism require looks of admiration from others. The hegemonic male whose priority is to see, desire, and chase his “prey” no longer exists: The metrosexual is the male on stage, a body to be seen, admired, and desired. The metrosexual male needs the other’s gaze and he arouses the other’s desires; thus, Coad argues, metrosexuality is often confused with homosexuality as both collude on the same premise—the male being desired rather than desiring and chasing women. However, Coad’s point is to distinguish clearly between the two things: While homosexuality is a sexual orientation that allows plural masculine performances, metrosexuality is a lifestyle of men who are attracted by fashion and appearance. Following this conceptualization, Coad states that metrosexuality in the sports world is a considerable paradox, effectively assembled evidence of how in the homosocial world of sports—where boys and men are encouraged to stay together in same-sex groups for long periods of time and where heteronormativity is continually reinforced by a range of activities—the metrosexual-athlete has developed and now provided “the most important models of metrosexuality in the twenty-first century” (p. 17).

In the following chapters, the author outlines the central role that male fashion stylists, notably the Italian Giorgio Armani, have had in promoting a strong association and a reciprocal relationship between male sports stars (e.g., Andre Agassi, Pete Sampras, David Beckham, Kaka, and others) and the haute couture world. Coad shows how Armani’s marketing strategy using “fashion-conscious and high-profile athletes” has been “a powerful instrument in providing a positive portrayal of metrosexuality” (p. 69). Coad provides a sequence of sixteen photos, beginning in 1977, that shows players from different parts of the world and from different kinds of sports wearing underwear, providing evidence that metrosexuality has passed the mere connection between sports stars and fashion and has entered into the everyday life of men. Coad’s book is not only worthwhile reading for all who are interested in the changing world of masculinities in sports, but also a useful resource for researchers, as the book is written in a highly rigorous academic style, with a large number of sources and, as stated earlier, well-documented information.
While Coad’s book is written from an outsider’s perspective, Anderson presents himself as an “insider”: He is gay and has worked for many years as a sports coach. Anderson’s work is based on years of research and data collection, interviewing dozens of gay athletes. At the beginning of the book, Anderson lists the many reasons he came out after many years of silence, stating that 1993 “was also the year that I came out of the closet as an openly gay distance running coach at a rather conservative high school in Southern California” (p. 2). One of the strengths of this book flows from this statement, from Anderson’s deeply personal knowledge of the consequences, the suffering, of being a closeted sportsman, of the discrimination endured as an openly gay man in the homophobic sports environment, and the way he navigates in an engaging and lucid manner between the data (the interviews, the athletes’ words and worlds) and the theories that both support and emerge from the data.

Anderson’s sociological background and his gender perspective inform his critical analysis and thinking. In each chapter, he shows the life story of one or more of his informants (gay athletes, some of whom are still in the closet and some who have come out in the previous years) and focuses on the paradoxes involved with being gay and working in one of the most homophobic environments that have ever existed: the world of high-performance sports. Anderson relates a number of enchanting stories that highlight a passion for sport and the overcoming of many obstacles to stick with the sport while living as a homosexual, whether openly or, in most cases, making determined efforts to hide this from teammates and from the gaze of the media and society. However, Anderson advises that “life is not a bed of roses”: There are also sad stories of violence, prejudice, and persecution. In the “warming up” (chapter 1) the author establishes the links between sport and homophobia, presenting research that demonstrates that, among others reasons, homophobia in sports could be a means to “nullify the homoeroticism of the sporting arena” (p. 14).

From the beginning, Anderson makes clear that he uses qualitative methods to gather and analyze his data as well as grounded theory. In the following chapters, and always building from an extract of his data, the author analyzes and even untangles the relationships between sports and different sorts of masculinities, always asking why gay men like and even love the institution that most oppresses and discriminates against them. There are no easy answers, and the author does not seek to suggest there are: After being “contaminated” by the sports virus, gay athletes find themselves in a difficult position, whether to come out or not. Some of his informants are professional players, some are high school or even college
athletes, and many remain “prisoner of narrow masculine expressions” (p. 20) inside the sports world.

After reading all these bitter stories, highlighted by Anderson’s intellectual insights, someone could ask: “Where to from here?” The final chapter in this book really makes the difference. Anderson does not think it is enough to listen to the athletes, analyze the data, and offer a strong critique of the hegemonic masculinity that controls sports. Indeed, he goes on to provide gay athletes with some positive ways to “do something about It” (p. 159). He writes this chapter in a “nonacademic fashion,” aiming to be accessible to people outside the academic world. He discusses such factors as the “positive coming out experience” (“the better you are the easier coming out is,” he writes, p. 162), how to come out to your team, as well as providing scenarios, including possible dialogues a gay athlete might have after coming out. This is a sort of conclusion that is rare to see in academic books. It is valuable for both academics and non-academics who are concerned about the issue of heterosexism and gay men in sports.

In summary, both books explore how the once orthodox masculine sports world has changed and step by step is becoming more permeable to different sorts of masculine expressions. It would be impossible to write these books if the sports world were monolithic. As the cracks appear and widen, Coad and Anderson offer well-written books and up-to-date research. These books are valuable resources for all those concerned about gender and sexuality issues in sports.

Jorge Kniijnik

University of Western Sydney
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No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed provides a much needed account of the Mexican American civil rights movement through a comprehensive social history of the League of United Latin Americans Citizens (LULAC). Cynthia Orozco unveils the overtly racist projects many Mexicans and Mexican Americans faced in South Texas between the 1920s and 1960s. More important, Orozco breaks new ground by presenting a cogent explanation of how race, class, gender, and nativity
played significant roles in shaping this social movement that would challenge overt racism targeting anyone labeled “Mexican.”

To accomplish these feats, Orozco relies on an extensive collection of in-depth interviews, public archives, and personal accounts, as well as critical social theories to deconstruct the movement into several substantive chapters. Chapters one and two set up the contextual backdrop to the rise of a Mexican American social movement. In these chapters, Orozco points out the contentious rifts between Anglos and Mexicans in Texas, as well as between Anglos and the people of Mexican descent (La Raza). These chapters provide powerful and sobering examples of the systematic and brutal exclusion of Mexican-identified people and their families by white Texans. Certainly, Orozco’s selected examples of hyper-segregation in Texas public schools and the numerous lynchings of Mexicans and Mexican Americans imply obvious parallels concerning the racialization and discrimination Mexican Americans and African Americans faced throughout the South.

Chapters three through six provide a thorough description of the formation of several organizations (i.e., mutualistas, Order Sons of America, Order Knights of America) dedicated to uniting La Raza in addressing the racial discrimination faced in Texas. In these chapters, social class and nativity become complicating factors in arranging a unified Mexican front against discrimination. Orozco discusses the formation of LULAC at length in an attempt to dismiss scholars’ accusations that LULAC was exclusionary and only established to address middle-class Mexican American male interests. While her defense against these accusations is vague, it is apparent that the developments of all of these organizations, including LULAC, were often bitterly divided by class and nativity. In fact, chapters five and six plainly underscore that LULAC wanted an organization that combined both Mexican and American ideals but did not want members who resisted Americanization. Surely, what destroyed the alliances between different Mexican-identified groups in this era are the significant social status differences resulting from acculturation, achieved wealth, and citizenship. What is missing, however, is some discussion of the possibility of “external” forces (i.e., alliances with white Texans) that pushed Mexican Americans to dissolve most of their relationships with Mexican immigrants, Mexican nationals, and immigrants.

The book’s final two chapters offer some theoretical and empirical conclusions. In chapter seven, Orozco explains how the personal endeavors and organizational actions by Mexicans and Mexican Americans in Texas characterized an important social movement that she coins the “Mexican American civil rights movement.” While most scholars refer to
the Chicano movement as the start of Mexican American social movements, Orozco highlights how the work done in the 1920s through 1960s laid the foundations of social movements to come. Chapter eight presents a critical discussion of women’s participation in this social movement. Even though Orozco suggests in several prior chapters that Latinas supported this movement in gendered ways (i.e., hosting parties and charity drives), most of the organizations excluded women from participating. However, Orozco points out that much of the work of these associations would have never occurred or been recorded without women. Moreover, Orozco points out that because women took care of the children and their husbands, they were in turn serving the cause by giving their husbands free time to be politically active. In later years, women became more involved and today represent over half of the LULAC membership. Undoubtedly, while the title implies more discussions about women’s roles in this social movement, Orozco would be hard-pressed to discover such roles in an era of male-dominated activism.

Ultimately, No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed is an important and well written social history that critically examines the Mexican American civil rights movement. By deconstructing the roles of race, class, gender, and nativity, this book shines as an excellent example of a critical social scientific approach to a social movement. I highly recommend this book to both scholars and students who want more in-depth knowledge of Mexican American social movements, the Latino struggle with racism, and as an important book for comprehending the socio-political integration of Latinos into America.

CAMERON D. LIPPARD
Appalachian State University
handful of states. The struggle for the right to marry dates back to Hawaii a decade earlier. The United States lags behind numerous countries, including the Netherlands, which provides same-sex partnered citizens options for legally recognizing relationships. Badgett’s book places the United States in a global context by examining such progressive European countries, while the Rimmerman and Wilcox’s edited volume deals largely with the politics and legislation around the marriage equality movement in the United States. Together they cover the history of movement struggles, political alignments, strategies, and policy outcomes, as well as the experiences of same-gender loving couples. Actual impacts of same-sex marriage on the institution of marriage and heterosexuals are also examined. Both books target an audience of scholars and advanced students of sexuality, politics, and social movements.

The preface outlines the central themes of the Rimmerman and Wilcox volume: the description and critique of the movement, the history and trajectory of same-sex marriage in the United States (excepting a comparative piece by Rayside), and the theological, party, and institutional political conflict. Beginning chapters provide a thorough overview. D’Emilio’s “Will the Court Set Us Free: Reflections on the Campaign for Same-Sex Marriage” makes a compelling evidence-based argument against the movement’s court strategy. Riggle and Rostosky have a slightly different focus: the well-being and stress of couples as a result of living in a “culture of devaluation.” Using qualitative data, they contend that marriage policy is a public health issue. In a similar vein, Badgett’s work attends to quality of life issues. Ronald G. Shaiko offers a critique of both strategy and leadership, arguing that to move forward the movement needs to work with allies and opponents.

In the next two chapters, religion and religious organizations and coalitions become central. Wald and Glover lay out the main American (primarily Christian or Judeo-Christian) theological perspectives—one rooted in “traditional” interpretations of the Bible and the other a “progressive” view. They describe how such views are converted into political action. Campbell and Robinson’s work elucidates the antigay movement’s religious-based organizations and coalitions. Cahill then does an excellent job characterizing the Christian right religiously and organizationally. “The Anti-Gay Marriage Movement” details their policy agenda, campaigns, arguments, and strategy. For instance, Cahill describes the rhetoric from 1992 to 2000, including, among others, the mutability of sexuality and “special rights.” Tadlock, Gordon, and Popp further contribute as they compare “traditional values” claims to “equal rights” frames of equality proponents.
Wilcox and colleagues turn attention to public opinion and identify factors that the public uses in forming views on LGBT issues including employment discrimination and military service. Using National Elections Study data, they explore the extent to which views on some issues affect public opinion on same-sex marriage. Despite support for various gay rights, marriage remains a holdout. The next several chapters attend to institutionalized politics and same-sex marriage in the 2004 elections, the presidency and congress, and the courts before returning to public opinion in Lofton and Haider-Markel’s piece. The final chapter, by David Rayside, describes the United States in a context of progressive countries including Canada and Europe. Rayside claims that comparatively the United States has been slow to change. Factors influencing the more rapid “takeoff” elsewhere include a weaker Right, less fragmented political systems, relationship recognition for heterosexuals, stronger welfare states, and other country-specific variables.

Badgett’s book turns to countries that have the longest history of providing equal access to marriage: the Netherlands and other European countries. Badgett contends that the focus on European countries is important since it is where legally registered same-sex couples have existed for the longest time (since 1989). She establishes clear research questions: (1) Will gay people change the institution of marriage? (2) Will marriage change gay people? and (3) What path should change take in the United States? Is change gradual or immediate? Are alternatives to marriage needed? The two appendices detail the different measures and comparisons as well as the methodology for Badgett’s Dutch Couples study. She uses both quantitative data from the World Values Survey, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the European Union, and the International Labor Organization and qualitative data from interviews with 34 Dutch individuals in same-sex relationships.

Same-sex couples cite the same reasons for marrying as their heterosexual counterparts including a desire to express commitment, establish a legal bond, and raise children. Badgett demonstrates that gay couples are marrying at very low rates (less than 25 percent) but finds the potential reasons difficult to determine. Barriers include concerns about making a personal commitment and political principles. Yet, when presented with the legal option, gay and heterosexual couples overwhelmingly choose marriage.

Has same-sex marriage changed heterosexual marriage? Badgett contends that “whether we look at marriage behavior or marriage beliefs, none of the data convincingly link the recognition of same-sex partners to either fewer marriages or declining belief in the current relevance of
marriage” (p. 85). Positive experiences for gay couples include full inclusion in social and legal institutions, an increase in overall quality of life including health and happiness, and feelings of legitimization from family and friends. If anything, same-sex married couples have served as “poster children of deinstitutionalization” for those different-sex couples who chose to break out of the typical gender norms attached to the roles of husband and wife.

Badgett also attends to opposition from within the gay community (“dissidents”). Dissidents fear that the fight for marriage detracts from other, more important issues. Concerns include a belief that marriage would mean adopting heterosexual family forms, compromises to other family structures, and the creation of a hierarchy of relationships within the LGBT community that would marginalize and stigmatize the non-normative. Badgett counters with evidence suggesting that there is enough activism to cover multiple issues, that the amount of resources for marriage equality has been overestimated and the fact that LGB couples are still marginalized. While marriage will improve the lives of LGB people, it also appears to be heightening conflict within the U.S. gay community.

The author dedicates a chapter to justifying her attention to the European experience to understand and predict U.S. changes. Despite initial appearances, she argues that the United States is moving at the rate predicted by the experiences of other countries. Furthermore, the characteristics of European countries that lead to action appear to be the same as those in the individual states: low religiousness, high tolerance of homosexuality, and high levels of cohabitation, in the first wave of change (the 1990s) and, in the second wave, continued tolerance of homosexuality and high cohabitation. She strongly suggests we look more toward the West for an understanding of what will happen if same-sex couples have the right to marry including the creation of stronger families and more societal inclusion rather than what will not occur—namely, damage to heterosexual marriage and behaviors.

These two books fill a gap in the literature on marriage equality for LGB people. The Rimmerman and Wilcox book is an important contribution with a wide array of readings addressing U.S. movement strategy, political players and processes, and outcomes. It provides a rich background to understanding the U.S. same-sex marriage issue and introduces readers to the global context. Using a comparative lens, Badgett addresses the hardball questions that opponents like to lob. Her work clearly, methodically, and empirically puts to rest false claims against marriage equality and gay rights. Badgett’s study and her book greatly enhance
our understanding of the real issues and the actual impact of marriage equality. Together, these books provide a full picture of the life of this important social policy challenge.

THERESA M. BOULEY and KIMBERLY B. DUGAN
Eastern Connecticut State University
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Rachel Thomson eloquently delves into the lives of adolescents in the United Kingdom in this look at teen transitions into adulthood. As part of a larger project (the U.K. Inventing Adulthood study), Thomson analyzes the particular social locations (gender and age as they intersect with social class, race, and sexuality) of 4 youths who participated in the 10-year longitudinal study that included 100 youths. Thomson concludes that it is impossible to condense the experiences of her respondents into a neat, linear transitional pattern to adulthood; thus, Unfolding Lives: Youth, Gender, and Change was conceived.

Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the book take up the individual experiences of Sherleen, Stan, Devon, and Karin, respectively. The chapter titles give a sense of the larger experience of each youth. For example, Sherleen’s chapter, “Going Up! Discipline and Opportunism,” is juxtaposed with Stan’s chapter, “Going Down? Caught between Stasis and Mobility.” Thomson suggests that each youth has similar and different fields of existence that lead to the formation of identities to prepare for the transition to adulthood. For example, like Sherleen, an African Caribbean girl, Stan, a white boy, has an identity that is rooted in the family. However, Stan’s identities are also formed through the fields of work and consumption, unlike Sherleen’s, which are formed through the fields of education and leisure.

Not only is Thomson’s book a theoretical lesson in intersectionality; it is also a work in methodology. Thomson explains her view of oral history data collection as an appropriate offshoot of longitudinal analysis in this project. The collection of oral histories for each youth is pertinent in the accumulation of meaningful events that stand to explain transitional experiences from youth to adulthood, with gender at the crux of each analysis. For example, Karin’s transition is documented as a “gendered self-in-the-making” (p. 111), and her life history includes acts of rebellion, gendered expectations, and sexual activity over the course of four interviews.
Another example is the history of Sherleen, a girl of color who has high expectations for herself as a student and who wants to continue her education at university despite obstacles such as gender, social class, and race. Thomson explains that she conducted secondary data analysis of Sherleen’s case from the previous interviews and then chose to conduct a fifth interview to round out the “incremental approach,” allowing for more complexity in the fields in which Sherleen’s identity exists (education, family, leisure) (p. 45). Thus, Thomson combines methodological expertise with evocative examples from her findings.

As Thomson notes, it may appear that the narratives are but temporal loops, perhaps of the four years that the study respondents were interviewed. However, life-course analysis reveals that the point in time in which an individual is interviewed affects his or her outlook on particular fields, for example, the field of education or work being a smaller or larger part of one’s identity at any given time. The shifting narratives are essential in highlighting important events of the time period, thus allowing Thomson to extrapolate that particular identities are more salient than others at particular points.

While this is a U.K.-centered study, it may be possible to generalize many of the British youths’ experiences to those of youths in other Western societies but not to all. In particular, the field of education is explicitly different in the United Kingdom than primary and secondary education in the United States and therefore may not be especially useful for those interested in the experiences of youth, gender, and education in the United States. With that said, Devon’s experience (titled “Coming Out: From the Closet to Stepping Stones”) as a queer youth has broad resonance and would, indeed, be useful in a U.S. classroom.

Overall, this book is an intriguing look into the world of British teens attempting to make the transition into adulthood. Thomson provides empirical support for the notion that youths have gendered experiences and that not all youths experience the transition to adulthood in the same way. Therefore, one cannot study the life course and the transition into adulthood as a linear process. Although the intersections of age, gender, race, class, and sexuality are important in the individual narratives, more broadly, Thomson’s research shows that age and gendered experiences are the primary contexts that coalesce in the process of becoming an adult.

ALISON R. MOSS
University of Illinois at Chicago
This collection of essays edited by Bradley, Tomalin, and Subramaniam explores the experiences of South Asian women, primarily Indian and Bangladeshi women, with dowry-based violence. The anthology fills a critical gap in feminist critiques of dowry by providing current accounts using an ethnographic method. The essays collectively address issues related to the production of gender-based violence and successfully merge the viewpoints of academics, practitioners, and activists, making it a truly feminist endeavor. While the larger purpose of the collection is to raise the visibility of issues relating to dowry, the research considers an alternate vantage point in examining dowry—Kandiyoti’s notion of “bargaining with patriarchy,” as described in her 1988 *Gender & Society* article of the same name. The authors consider the possibility that dowry may serve as an avenue for women to negotiate the transition from their parents’ homes to their husbands’ homes. The authors also lucidly address representations of dowry as well as the personal narratives of those who have experienced it. Although the chapters cover diverse regions, disciplines, and audiences, they work well together to offer a critical lens onto dowry, bride burning, and son preference in South Asia.

Bradley’s chapter demonstrates the interface among gender, religion, and dowry by using intersectional methodological approach, arguing that religion as a variable is often left out in both “western” and “non-western” societies’ understanding of patriarchy. Her point is that the pervasive nature of dowry and gender ideology depends on religion. Dalmia and Lawrence argue that while historical evidence shows that dowry spread to different regions, religious groups, and castes and has been inflated over time, the secondary data show that the real value of net dowry is declining in both north and south India. Jehan provides cutting-edge research on masculinities and dowry—male dowry—in Tamil Nadu, dispelling the myth that dowry is simply a woman’s problem.

The contributors of this volume begin to reexamine the literature on dowry in South Asia, and one of the central ideas is that dowry must be understood from an intersectional approach that includes culture, religion, and the legal status of women. Here, the collection breaks ground in assessing gender and the current ways dowry negatively affects South Asian women, especially poor, rural women. There is no doubt that the
editors and authors included in this volume are in the pursuit of human rights for women. However, the volume falls short in assessing the complex nature of intersectionality, often reducing South Asian women to a homogeneous category victimized by cultural practices. The volume continues to capture “western” imperialist forms of feminism and mark “eastern” women as marginalized and underprivileged.

First, since every essay emphasizes its own understanding of what constitutes dowry, a concise definition is needed. Also known as *trousseau* in Latin, *dehej* in Hindi, and *meher* in Islamic societies, dowry is the money, goods, or estate that a woman brings to her husband in marriage. Historically, in South Asian countries—mostly Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka—the purpose of a dowry was to provide money or property for the establishment of a new household, to help a husband feed and protect his family, and to give the wife and children some support if he were to die. Dowry is declining in urban, metropolitan cities; nevertheless, dowry continues to be linked problematically to South Asia through gendered forms of violence or dowry murder.

Next, the essays simplistically link dowry to an unjust cultural practice in the lives of South Asian women when, in fact, dowry is a cross-national phenomenon. Dowry was widely practiced in medieval Europe, for example. Dowry also cuts across religion, from Hinduism to Christianity to Islam. When women experience violence due to lack of dowry, the violence is based on their identities as women in general, not as South Asian women in particular. Dowry violence against South Asian women should be more appropriately understood as a form of gender-based violence, such as domestic violence, rather than a function of culture, legal status, and nationalism. This point goes virtually unnoticed. Dowry may be a form of cultural practice, but dowry murder is not. Dowry murder occurs when a woman is murdered by her husband or his family for her family’s refusal to pay additional dowry. The woman is typically doused with a flammable liquid such as kerosene and set alight, leading to death by fire. Here, a false relationship is developed between death by fire and Uma Narayan’s notion of “death by culture.”

Hence, the authors are inattentive to the link between dowry and dowry murder. The variable that links the practice of dowry with dowry murder is capitalism. In India, in particular, the practice of dowry, which historically provided financial safety for married women, has been exploited by men and their families despite numerous legal prohibitions. Such exploitation includes reframing marriage within a capitalist model allowing men
to view marriage as a profit-making endeavor. The authors largely fail to recognize that dowry is a cross-cultural practice, while dowry murder is an extreme form of domestic violence.

ROKSANA BADRUDDOJA
California State University, Fresno
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