This volume represents the collection of a number of related writings on the sociology of organisations, Weberian themes and issues and the discussion of emotion and affectivity. These essays are the product of thirty years work, with the first published as long ago as 1968. Later material is drawn from subsequent decades with new introductory sections to each part, as well as two entirely new chapters. The book is divided into four distinct parts prefaced by an introduction which draws out the inter-linked themes within and between the essays. Albrow states that the aims of his book are to highlight the enduring qualities and relevance of sociology in this field, and to stress the need for the continual linkage between organisations and the social milieux they inhabit. As part of this project the author attempts to highlight the particular contribution of sociology to the study of organisations, especially with regard to that of the business school. Here an important point is made about the critical difference between the aims and objectives of the two disciplines, which re-emerges in later chapters.

The first section, which contains the two oldest pieces, deals with the study of organisation within and outside the sociological canon and, as such, is an important reminder of the enduring issues facing the sociologist exploring such fields as the ideas of value freedom. There is also a discussion of the discrete approaches of the sociologist and organisation theorist.

The next section contains two essays on Weber and the relevance of his theories for the late twentieth century. Chapter 3 deals with the theme of rationality and in particular the development of the thesis since Weber’s death. Chapter 4 likewise explores the concept of authority. In many ways this coupling marks the richest segment of the whole book with its stress on the continued importance of Weber for the subject, albeit with amendment. Much is made – as it is throughout the book – of Weber as the theorist of modernity and his attempt to uncover what was unique and distinctive about the era. The author carefully teases out Weber’s tendency to overstatement of the attributes of charismatic authority and the later managerial writers’ understatement of the relational aspect of authority.

Part III builds on the previous section by analysing the place of feeling and emotion within organisations by stressing the way in which Weber’s sociology is centrally concerned with the understanding of the role of meaning and motive. The final section is composed of two new essays. Chapter 7, jointly authored with Neil Washbourne, examines sociology for postmodern organisers and the last chapter is formed around an exploration of where to place the organisation within contemporary discussions about modernity and postmodernity.

This latter concern with postmodernity is perhaps a weakness that runs throughout the volume. Albrow makes clear that he views the contemporary world as being very different from that of the modernist Weber. At numerous points in the text the era we now inhabit is variously described as being postmodern, or the author’s preferred designation of ‘global age’. From this standpoint the later chapters, and the additions or introductory commentaries, view Weber as a theorist trapped in a modernist framework. This seems to lead at times to the author eliding Weber’s ideal typical account of formally rational organisations and modernity, as if all ‘modern organisations’ were undifferentiated rational bureaucracies, or aspired to be so. In periodising the history of organisations
and their study in such a way violence is
done to the empirical reality. And such a
situation is all the more problematic in
this volume given that the author
acknowledges both the continuity of
affectivity in organisation across time and
that this has been an object of study
within sociology – Albw right himself cites
Robert Merton’s claim that he was
‘lecturing on emotions in organisations in
Harvard in the 1930s’ (p. 126).

While there is much of interest within
the book it is difficult to see the market
being aimed at. Much of the content
would seem to offer a great deal to those
interested in the history of organisational
analysis and yet it is perhaps too overtly
sociological for a business school readership.
Likewise, the detailed argument
would make it appealing only, however
unfortunately, to the advanced undergrad-uate and postgraduate audiences.
Overall the volume would have benefited
from the expansion of the discussion
contained in the second and third parts,
where present themes lie under-
developed for want of space.

University of Manchester
TIM STRANGLEMAN

Barker, Chris, Global Television: An
Introduction, Oxford; Blackwell,
1997, £45.00 (£13.99 pbk), ix +

Books subtitled ‘An Introduction’ can
sometimes comprise little more than yet
another reintroduction. However, Barker’s
text genuinely provides readers with a
more than useful insight into the
development of globalisation as it relates
to the mass media and, more specifically,
television. It also addresses a range of
wider and significant theoretical issues.
Globalisation theory is convincingly
allied with a cultural studies perspective
which emphasises the need for a tripartite
analysis of institutions, texts and
audiences, and cultural politics. In fact,
this, and the underlying view that
postmodern culture is a marker within
radicalised modernity, provides the
skeleton for the structure of the book.

Following various theorists, notably
Giddens, Barker argues that late modern-
ity constitutes and is constituted by
the global ownership, distribution and
experience of transnational television.
This is characterised by corporate merg-
ers, new technologies, an increase in the
number of channels and broadcasting
hours, and deregulation with the appar-
ent eclipse of traditional public service
communications agencies. Overlying
these trends has been the rise in trans-
national and monopoly ownership. The
reductionism of a cultural imperialist
approach is avoided through a stress on
the multi-dimensional, multi-directional
and localised configurations of global
media development. However, it is
pointed out, using the cases of Australia,
India, the Netherlands, Britain, and the
United States that this global expansion
of television has been uneven, favouring
the West. His focus is understandable
but, in keeping with the direction of the
book (and later sections which roam from
Venezuelan telenovelas to Caribbean
news), consideration of an African or
Latin American example might have been
useful.

Part II focuses on the global television
genres of soaps and news and the ways in
which audiences actively construct mean-
ings in the context of varying domestic
routines. Barker shows that whilst similar
narratives circulate globally (for instance
Poles might watch and ‘understand’ a
Colombian telenovela), there are localised
generic differences. ‘Western’ soaps and
Latin American telenovelas may share
key structural and thematic qualities but
the latter have a finite number of
episodes and owe some of their ancestry
to an oral story-telling tradition. Further,
heterogeneous global audiences bring
their own cultural competencies and
contexts to bear on texts, as with critical
viewings of Dallas by some Arab
audiences.

The final part of the book concerns
itself with cultural politics. The context is
the seemingly irresistible commercialis-
ation of global television and the omnipresence of a thriving promotional culture based around advertising. This has led to an increasingly complex semiotic environment where news, drama and other genres circulate and collide in a postmodern *bricolage*. ‘The nation’, in an era of post-traditional and hybrid identity formation, is seen as an inadequate locus of analysis. Television, Barker concludes, is a diverse plurality of discourses, with the potential to be both ideological and misleading as well as democratic, educational and entertaining.

The co-existence of these two conclusions is the tension at the heart of the entire book and for that matter in so much of sociological theorising on the media. Barker vividly establishes that audiences actively organise their own meanings in the array of local social contexts. At the same time he hangs on to the view that global television, for instance through advertising, has the capacity to organise a hegemony which can promote Western cultural homogenisation. Then again, he sees the construction of multiple selves and identities in different discursive contexts as providing the scope for resistance. So radicalised doubt is at the centre of this melange of power and fragmentation. This is unsatisfying for the reader who craves glib answers. But there are answers of a kind and they are evident in one of Barker’s examples. Soap operas throughout the world are revealed as interesting and complex sites both of reflexive resistance and discursive identity formation. However, the case of television news does not fit Barker’s explanation quite so easily. Despite his caveats I found it hard to escape the culturally imperialistic conclusion that television news is a powerful ideological force providing Western news for global audiences.

By its very nature globalisation is a difficult topic requiring a breadth of analysis which can resist detailed empirical evidence. Barker seeks to cover, amongst other things, cultural studies, audience research, theories of ideology and discourse, debates on the post-modern, the significance of identity, as well as globalisation and related theories. Each of these is concisely and clearly summarised so that importantly, whilst his case studies will provide something of interest for the reader familiar with the debates, this will be a genuinely useful text for students.

*University College of St Mark & St John*  
*NEIL CASEY*


The ‘state nobility’ is Bourdieu’s concept for that section of the dominant class which enters the highest level of the French administrative system, manages finance capital and the great companies, and attains distinguished positions within the professions. Like the noblesse de robe which was the beneficiary of the educational reforms of the seventeenth century, the State nobility is distinguished by its possession of state-nominated academic titles. As a bourgeois class, its legitimation requires that its bureaucratic recruitment be impersonal and be based on the free exchangeability of educational distinctions. Yet its nobility derives from its exclusive possession of (cultural) capital, which, if not transmitted by direct inheritance, is still acquired within the domestic arena of the family. This research also shows that the ‘State magic’ of academic titles is a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite for the attainment of a position in the field of temporal power. Economic or social capital are essential in this respect.

In this book, Bourdieu dissects the peculiarly French institution of the grandes écoles and their preparatory classes (*khâgnes, taupes*, etc.), which cater for the best candidates (1 per cent of men/0.5 per cent of women in post-secondary education) and which should be opposed to both the petites écoles and the universities. With methodological
virtuosity, Bourdieu deploys a battery of instruments to lay bare the underlying relational significance of the grandes écoles. These techniques range from the questionnaire to detailed hermeneutic analyses, including studies of alumni obituaries and of a philosophy teacher’s comments on her students’ essays. Matched to information on student backgrounds that she herself lacked, these show a symptomatic fit between their social origins and the essay evaluations – as lucid or masterly, on the one hand, or pedestrian and ‘servile’, on the other.

Bourdieu constructs and tests a precise theoretical homology between the hierarchies of academic space and those of the field of power. His research proves that the most academically prestigious schools, the so-called grande porte schools, acquire around 60 per cent of their intake from the dominant class and especially from those richest in cultural capital, while the petite porte schools (for example, École Normale Supérieure (ENS) at Fontenay and Saint-Cloud; Douanes) and the specialised technical schools (such as Tannerie, Lyons), acquire only around 30 per cent from this source. Applying an anthropological model of power, Bourdieu contends that the student body of each grande école (École des Hautes Études Commerciales (HEC), Ecole Polytechnique, Ecole Nationale d’Administration (ENA), ENS (Rue d’Ulm), Sciences-Po, etc.) is constituted through a Hegelian spirit or esprit de corps into a social essence, as naturalised as gender, which is crystallised positively through the consecratory rites of each institution and negatively through their rigorous repudiation of failures. The more elevated their discipline within the academic hierarchy (for example, in the 1960s, French and philosophy) the more often the initiates attribute success to extraordinary gifts.

In the most intellectually rigorous of the grandes écoles, these students of the elect virtually become disciplined academic machines, fuelled by a consummate sense of ease. Amongst them are a tiny minority, the ‘wonder-children’, who have acquired academic grace solely as a result of the school and who especially remain on intellectual trajectories equivalent to the spiritual power of feudalism, as in the 20 per cent of the ENS who are the sons of teachers (p. 171) or the 7 per cent (average) of all preparatory-class children who come from the manual working class (pp. 76, 80). The Durkheimian concept of ‘attraction’ is effectively deployed against the rival claims of Althusserians, ethnomethodologists and the economists of human capital, to show the ‘algorithmic’ operation of the habitus to positions of academic space.

This field, perpetually riven by disputes over academic objectives, is marked by a transformation from the Fifth Republic (i.e. 1967–68). The new mode of reproduction of the dominant class is generated by the relative decline in the ‘morale and morals’ of the more autonomous grande écoles to the benefit of the less autonomous. It represents the successful technocratic challenge to the old mandarins of the ENS on the part of the ‘ambitious bastards’ of the graduate power-house, the ENA. Moreover, in this new mode, women students have acquired more places, but from within the dominant class and at the cost of a diminution of the working-class or primary-teachers’ children. The technocrats’ demands within the grand école is typified in their ‘royal science’, ENA economics. But the sea-change is also towards what might be called ‘new utilitarianism’ privileging personality and performance in the place of erudition or, in another register, permitting the demotion of the technical skills taught by engineering écoles vis-à-vis the education founded on the skills of a globally competitive managerial elite (languages, advertising, presentation of the self).

The major educational divisions are homologous with the divisions of groups separated by the passage of time, especially between ‘old money’ (with its slow but guaranteed accumulation) and ‘new money’ (with its abrasive but riskier
means of accumulation). Bourdieu totally disregards the strategic outcomes of the struggles of the dominated class, yet their concerns, too, help to shape the strategies of the dominants and hence the parameters of the scientific, artistic and educational fields. Another difficulty relates to the empirical illumination of the deep categories of academic classification. Bourdieu is quick to apply a thing-like objectivity to such classifications (for example disciplinary hierarchy), which are more subject to interpretative disagreements than he implies in this text. Despite these problems, this is a brilliant work in which Bourdieu provides us with the tools for an elegant demystification of power. Within it, the stigmatising determinisms – of which Jeffrey Alexander and others have accused him – are revealed not to operate by natural necessity but only by human agency. They are therefore mastered by enhancing, as this book does, our capacity for free consciousness.

University of Glasgow  BRIDGET FOWLER


Interest in social aspects of health and illness is at an all time high, with those who make health-care decisions finally acknowledging this work when formulating the policy agenda. With this in mind Michael Bury’s book is written with one eye on those in the health professions as an audience, as well as the academic market. The book is mainly based on research and teaching on the postgraduate course given by Bury at Royal Holloway, University of London.

The book is divided into six chapters plus a brief introduction, with each chapter covering a separate sociological topic. Chapter 1 covers illness behaviours, health beliefs and knowledge in a comprehensive and easily understandable manner. There is excellent coverage of sociological development in the field since the 1950s with particular emphasis on medical–lay perspectives in illness causation, and health-care seeking behaviour. The second chapter covers health inequalities in a reasonably comprehensive manner, with a particularly good analysis of the Black Report, and subsequent challenges by Raymond Illsley, as well as debates between Townsend and Klein. However, much of the chapter focuses on class, not covering current important debates such as the influence of gender, geography and ethnic origin in the production of variations in health status.

The next two chapters cover interaction in health-care, chronic illness and disability. In the former, the doctor–patient relationship is covered well with sections covering the different models of consensus, conflict and negotiation, as well as a short piece of medical authority in late modern cultures. The longest chapter in the book focuses upon chronic illness and disability and reflects upon the growing interest in disability studies. Firstly, Bury covers the relationship between chronic illness and disability and discusses the development of a socio-medical model through the clarification of terminology such as impairment, handicap and disability, which has allowed collaboration between public health doctors and social scientists. Next, the sociology of chronic illness and disability is discussed, organised into the three themes of biographical disruption, the impact of treatment, and coping and treatment. Much is also made of more contemporary issues such as politicisation of both the researchers and the researched, which Bury takes us through with clarity, ending with a note on how the disability movement is challenging researchers themselves with claims that the research process is exclusionary and oppressive.

Chapter 5 introduces the study of death and dying as social phenomena. Bury comments on how this is a relatively new topic, replacing the more epidemiological outlook of ‘mortality’. The chapter
traces historical/cultural approaches to death and dying over recent years focusing on Aries and Elias. The chapter also covers the ‘Good Death’ which emphasises control and empowerment by the individual as well as the rise of the hospice movement as the institutional acceptance of death and dying in modern society. The final chapter covers body, health and risk, and briefly charts the rise of interest in the body, before turning to more medico-sociological perspectives. Risk is also introduced under two themes, lifestyle and the body, and the impact of medical treatment. Bury’s final comments argue for a combined research effort between biologists and sociologists, an effort that is already being started with work on the ‘new genetics’. Bury concludes by saying that sociologists still need to overcome their reductionist fear of the biological sciences.

Health and Illness in a Changing Society is an excellent book, which neatly summarises current thinking and research with clarity and brevity. Though text-heavy (there are only five illustrations in the whole book), it is accessible and entertaining, perfect for those who want to keep abreast of the rapid changes in medical sociology.

MRC Medical Sociology
Unit, Glasgow

STEVEN CUMMINS


Davidson’s book, a political history of citizenship in Australia, provides both an exemplary historical study of the administrative criteria for determining the categories of belonging and a valuable theoretical critique of the existing traditions of political thought on citizenship and social rights. He thereby makes three important moves in the discourse on citizenship. First, he notes that the debates in Australia have been predominantly confined to discussion over the utility and reform of British legal-administrative institutions and an engagement with British traditions of political thought. He proposes that we need to go beyond these models and interrogates a number of schools of thought from Continental philosophy and considers examples of constitutional debates in contemporary Europe.

Second, although Davidson clearly acknowledges both the historical and demographic links between migration and nation building, a major weakness of this book is in the crudity of the theoretical framework for explaining migration. Davidson notes the complexity and significance of migration, and then proceeds to utilise an untenable version of the push–pull model, as if it were sufficient to account for the turbulent patterns of global migration. In the last decade the world has witnessed greater flows of human movement than ever before in its history. Davidson’s attempt to sketch the interconnection of the self–other relationship, while drawing from a crude psycho-social model, would also benefit from the more sophisticated debates that have been conducted within post-colonial cultural theory.

Davidson’s most interesting move is his third, where he goes beyond the conventional understandings of citizenship rights in passive terms. He suggests the need to distinguish between active and passive concepts of citizenship: that is, not just what the citizen ‘gets’ but what he or she ‘does’. This is a bold gesture that hints at the possibility of redefining citizenship away from purely territorial affiliation, where someone was born, or hereditary links, the ethnicity of parents, and towards a sense of inclusion and exclusion that is more fundamentally linked to social and political practices. It
is an ambitious proposal, but the discussion on how such practices could be defined, evaluated and policed are left out. While Davidson believes in a loose sense of collectivity and upholds the value of diversity in unity, and thereby rejects a communitarian view of citizenship which demands exclusive bonds to place and culture, it is not clear how this robust form of liberalism could be distinguished or even safeguarded from the authoritarian abuses of citizenship that the book is implicitly written against.

However, my major concern with Davidson’s book is the degree to which he is prepared to critique the utility of the nation state as geo-political unit in the age of globalisation. Davidson’s account of the status of citizenship within the global order is in fact a mixture and loosening up of the democratic ideals and institutional models, that were defined in the Greek polis and the modern European nation state. Throughout the book there is the assumption that Australia, as a discrete geo-political unit, is not in jeopardy, the cultural identity and socio-economic structures are seen as being in crisis, but the political unity remains uncontested. However, given the radical structural transformations noted by Davidson, does this not at least demand a consideration of the viability of existing boundaries?

These books by Davidson and Kapferer both confront the legacies and challenges that face all Australians in the twentieth century. However, the weakness of Kapferer’s book is that although it examines the rituals and practices of everyday life that are seen as constitutive of the national culture, it fails to question the dialectic of forces operating at the boundaries of that culture. While showing an awareness that globalisation is imposing itself on the national culture, it fails to measure the degree to which the forces of globalisation have been either internalised or resisted in the cultural sphere. By concentrating on the internal development of rituals and traditions, it thereby misses the opportunity to engage critically with the interaction of internal and external forces that are reshaping the forms and boundaries of cultural life in Australia. The pressures of globalisation are displacing Australian social structures and polarising social classes. The ‘safety nets’ for the needy are increasingly being taken down, and the opportunities for a ‘fair go’ are diminishing. In this context it is hard to accept the general tenet that Australia is still, or is likely to continue as, an egalitarian society. A more useful book would set out to explain why the concept of egalitarianism persists in the Australian imagination despite profound changes in the social fabric.

I would like to end with a quotation from Davidson’s introduction and a suggestion that the crisis that faces Australia will not be resolved by simply learning lessons and updating practices which had been defined elsewhere: ‘It is Australia’s proud boast that its multicultural policies show the way to the management of cultural diversity in a globalising world. If more were learnt by studying the state of the art theory of democratic citizenship which has been developed elsewhere in the globalising world, this boast would be more convincing.’ (p. 11)

University of New South Wales

NIKOS PAPASTERGIADIS


This slim volume of five essays and an overview Introduction is the outcome of a conference at the University of Northumbria. As with many publications which originate from conference papers, it is of variable quality and does not quite hang together as a coherent whole. Nevertheless, the editors have made a valiant attempt to impose a structure, and individual papers contain some interesting ideas and material.

The most important contribution from
a theoretical point of view is the essay by Sandra Walklate, entitled ‘Can There Be a Feminist Victimology?’ This contains brief but effective critiques both of ‘positivist victimology’ and of various approaches which have been put forward under the name of ‘critical victimology’. Walklate advocates instead a new form of critical victimology, underpinned by modern feminist thinking and drawing upon Giddens’s notion of structuration, in which accounts of the processes of victimisation are socio-economically and socially situated, and in which empirical research focuses upon people’s ‘lived realities’ and the conscious and unconscious activities through which these are constructed.

Unfortunately, she has little space to develop these ideas and the text is in places rather dense and over-theorised: some concrete examples of the kind of research she envisages would have made her argument both more accessible and more convincing. It would also have been helpful to define more clearly how and why critical victimology should be distinguished from critical criminology: ‘victimology’ is assumed throughout to be a ‘discipline’ in its own right, although many would take issue with this. Even so, the chapter is well worth reading, and a welcome addition to the relatively small body of serious theoretical writing to be found among the huge (and too often unreflective) literature on victims.

The other chapters are less ambitious, but nevertheless contain some valuable material. Most notably, Rob Mawby and Gerd Kirchhoff present some of the results of a cross-national victim survey, showing how both the experiences of burglary victims and the official responses to their victimisation, differ considerably between Germany and Britain. Pat Mayhew also provides some useful information about changes to the British Crime Survey, while the other articles provide overviews of victim issues relating to crime prevention and criminal justice processes.

All in all, then, although it is weak in parts (and, it has to be said, would have benefited from closer proof-reading), this is quite a useful product from what was clearly an interesting conference.

University of Cardiff

MIKE MAGUIRE


Books that survey the philosophy of social science and the history of social theory tend to be purely descriptive, which only serves to reinforce what our empiricist colleagues have always thought, namely, that theoretical discourse is just so much babble. Of course, much of it is, but here we have a concise text that focuses the various strands of theory into a coherent normative agenda for the future of social science. Gerard Delanty, who recently founded the European Journal of Social Theory, refreshingly admits that the time-honoured debate between ‘positivists’ and ‘interpretivists’ has been little more than an academic turf war that obscures the more fundamental question of social science’s relationship to society.

This question has become all the more urgent with the decline of the nation-state – classical sociology’s model of society – and, ultimately of greater importance, the blurring of the boundary between the social and the natural. Delanty sees social science at a turning point: it will either occupy centre-stage in the mediation of expert and lay knowledges or wither away as a vestige of nineteenth century nationalism. Delanty is clearly banking on the former future, but he is the first to admit that never before have so many social scientists had so little influence in public affairs. Even the currency of Ulrich Beck’s ‘risk society’ owes less to the forcefulness of Beck’s own arguments than the convenience with which his label can be attached to any number of self-evidently risky situations that capture the journalistic imagination.
Delanty’s rhetorical strategy in *Social Science* is to use Habermas as a flawed exemplar of the critical social science he urges. Habermas scores points for his unflagging commitment to expanding the sphere of rational freedom through ‘Enlightenment’ and ‘critique’ in both academic and public forums, while avoiding the Scylla and Charybdis of positivist neutrality and interpretivist relativism. That critique can be both universalist and interested in its aspirations will remain a powerful ideal in social science as long as humanity is treated as a single biological species. To his credit, Delanty draws attention to other recent champions of this perspective – Alvin Gouldner, Karl-Otto Apel, Pierre Bourdieu and Roberto Unger – often in the face of various fashionable postmodern critiques.

Delanty singles out Foucault for having had a corrosively sceptical effect on social science. After Foucault, victims are given voice without being given a means of escaping victimhood. However, Habermas wins no easy victory here. Many persistent forms of social victimisation have had a strong ‘naturalistic’ component, often turning on race or gender based inferiority. Habermas’s failure to incorporate ‘nature’ within his sociological critique has inhibited his joining the debate with those who claim to ground their arguments in the deliveries of nature through science. As Delanty rightly observes, this failure reflects Habermas’s residual positivism with regard to the natural sciences. Like Karl Mannheim before him, Habermas may need to believe that the natural sciences have achieved a transcendent form of knowledge to which social scientists can only aspire.

Delanty compensates for Habermas’s shortcomings by taking seriously a variety of recent developments that highlight the ‘constructed’ character of nature. Feminism is perhaps the premier example, though Delanty treats it less fully than two other growth areas; new social movements and science and technology studies. In both of these cases, the reorganisation of established social formations is crucial for injecting a measure of democracy in a world where the public sphere appears to have become fragmented beyond recognition. The common strategy is to challenge the privilege traditionally enjoyed by scientific modes of legitimation by examining how that privilege is created and maintained in particular cases.

That science should increasingly become the focus of attack by democratisers is itself worthy of sociological investigation, given science’s historic role in deconstructing other forms of privilege. However, much of science’s emancipatory potential has rested on its commitment to the welfare state, which is quickly coming to an end. Set adrift from these political moorings into the sea of privatisation, science may well do more damage than good. Habermas himself may not be up to the challenge of reinvigorating the link between science and the state, but that does not obviate the value of such a project. Delanty puts us in the right frame of mind for addressing this weighty issue.

*University of Durham*  
STEVE FULLER


This book seeks to explore the uncertainty and unpredictability of policy restructuring in the National Health Service (NHS) as implemented through the Griffiths Report of the early 1980s. It considers the extra-material affects – discourse, education etc. – of past generations on existing social relations. using an Eliasian-informed methodology to study social networks – in keeping with a Latourian approach – the author presents actors within the NHS in their social context and argues that the NHS itself is ‘not a static organisation but a process’ (p. 54).

The book consists of seven chapters.
In the Introduction the author makes it clear that she is not seeking to provide a ‘summary of the consequences of implementation of the Griffiths Report or to offer a general evaluation of the effectiveness of general management’ (p. 3). Instead she seeks to take a broad view of the analysis of ‘processes of managed social change’ (p. 4). One of the central tenets of the book is that the study of the management of organisational change can be supplemented through ‘a fuller understanding of the way in which the actions of inter-dependent people interweave to produce trends which no one had planned or intended, and which then constitute and constrain the perceptions, goals and actions of people’ (p. 106). This shapes how the book is organised and written, and sets it empirically and theoretically apart from other academic works on the restructuring of the NHS.

The second chapter outlines a genealogy of re-organisation in the NHS up to 1983. This is then augmented through the use of case-study material from other academics’ earlier research. The author draws upon Stephen Harrison’s four propositions of managerial behaviour to discuss thematically the findings of the existing corpus. The author argues, in part to make clear how her own position is distinctive, that although the studies reveal the dilemmas faced by health service managers, they do not locate managers’ actions in their social context. Chapter 3 provides a theoretically rigorous discussion of the ‘figurational’ approach of Norbert Elias. It is argued that his ‘process sociology’ provides a means of understanding better ‘the complex interweaving of planned and unplanned processes which is involved in all processes of managed change’ (p. 56). This approach considers the influence of social mores on actions and uses the ‘network’ metaphorically to describe the complexity of decision making. This chapter pulls out of the theoretical standpoint a methodological template, to which the author turns in later chapters when considering the management of the Griffiths Report. In concluding this chapter the author makes an excellent case for an Eliasian approach to the studying of change in the organisation.

The bulk of the book’s empirical analysis is presented in Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4 it is argued that ‘in many senses, the Griffiths proposals were an act of faith, based on a report whose recommendations lack substantive evidence’ (p. 71). The main findings of the Report are presented to demonstrate how they structured the responses of managers at different levels of the NHS. Chapter 5 takes up this point and looks at the actions and strategies of District General Managers (DGMs). Using interview material a series of themes are explored: ‘the problem of regions’, ‘the accountability question’, ‘the “problem of doctors”’, ‘the “problem of managers”’ from the doctors’ point of view, ‘non problematic relationships’ and ‘improving quality’. Findings are pulled together through an Eliasian-informed discussion of ‘blind social processes and the planning processes’, which leads the reader to ‘game models’. These provide a way of temporarily holding still fluid human interactions: they are ‘analogies of more complex social processes’ (p. 108). Figures 5.1 and 5.2 depict the DGM in their social networks and illustrate the power asymmetries that exist between different actors. Chapter 6 contains the final layer of empirical analysis: the micro-politics of a DGM’s attempt to improve mental health services. Using interview-generated quotes, actors are located within the network figuration.

Given the interesting way NHS reorganisation is presented throughout the book, Chapter 7, the Conclusion, is a disappointment. It reinforces the conclusion of each individual chapter but makes little attempt to present a more general and substantive summary of the findings of the book. This aside, the book provides a thought-provoking and sophisticated analysis of change in the NHS. A convincing case is made for Eliasian sociology to be taken seriously, and its use in this example points to a fuller and
more rounded future for studies of the management of organisational change.

University of Manchester  KEVIN G. WARD


When it comes to gender issues, mainstream media studies, unlike the social sciences generally, always was a bit slow on the uptake. When it comes to gender issues in relation to international communication studies one wonders if the past thirty years ever really happened. As Annabelle Sreberny-Mohammadi suggests: ‘international communication remains intriguing for its nostalgic embrace of old paradigms and refusal to rethink and re-examine the verities of decades, indeed for its conservatism.’ (Sreberny-Mohammadi, 1996:1).

In this respect, disappointingly, neither of the books to be reviewed here are much of an exception. Whilst Ali Mohammadi’s edited collection International Communication and Globalization mentions ‘race’ and prejudice and briefly the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (p. 98), it does not include the contributions of feminist theory and praxis to international communication debates. John Downing’s Internationalising Media Theory does acknowledge in a limited respect some of these debates, such as those related to questions concerning the public sphere raised by scholars such as Nancy Fraser, but it is still weak in this respect. Both books would benefit in terms of their theoretical import if only they had taken the issue of gender and the insights of feminist cultural and communication theory in relation to the media more seriously. Given that these books do not include in their agenda these areas and insights, what exactly is it that they contribute to media theory?

International Communication and Globalization is the first ‘critical’ reader aimed at students studying communication studies – it would also be useful for those interested in development issues and society in relation to globalisation. The authors include the founding scholars of the field with chapters generated from world research centres. The book is divided into four parts: the first outlines the key research tendencies in international communication; the second looks at ‘developing’ countries and the impact of globalisation; the third considers the processes of media privatisation and deregulation, including the question of morality, ethics and alternative paradigms. The final part, probably of most interest to scholars of sociology, concerns the cultural aspects of globalisation including debates on postmodernism and the relationship between cultural studies and sociology.

International Communication and Globalization begins with a comprehensive introduction by Ali Mohammadi in which he defines the field as encompassing ‘the issues of culture and cultural commodification (the turning of cultural products into commodities) the diffusion of information and news broadcasting by media empires around the world, and the challenges faced by the developing world in the light of these processes’ (p. 1). Mohammadi then explores the issues of poverty and the information gap, the ‘information highway’ and aspects of postmodernism in relation to communication.

Oliver Boyd-Barratt’s piece (pp. 11–26) opens with a fascinating account of the city of Leicester in relation to the media and globalisation, before taking us through the theoretical movements and broader discourses through which international communication paradigms have developed. He concludes by discussing what future research agendas might include.
In his essay ‘International Communication Research: Opportunities and Obstacles’ (pp. 27–47), James Halloran discusses the different approaches taken by European scholars of international communication and suggests that the two key questions at the end of the century concern the gap between the ‘haves and have-nots’ (p. 27).

Ralph Negrine (pp. 50–66) provides an extremely useful overview of approaches to communication technologies, with up-to-date information of both international regulation systems and the technologies themselves. Ali Mohammadi (pp. 67–89) looks at the processes of globalisation and the kind of impact it has had on developing countries and the manner in which this has led to changes in communication policies. The essay includes some fascinating insights into Iran and the tension between globalisation and Islamisation.

Cees J. Hamelink (pp. 92–118) considers the impact of globalisation by addressing some of the tensions between ideas concerning the free market and the morality of human rights as embodied in, for example, UN conventions. Majid Tehranian and Katherine Tia Tehranian discuss the possibility of a new paradigm as they consider the impact of the break up of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, Tadjikistan, Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti and the Gulf war.

John Tomlinson (pp. 170–90) begins the final section of the book with a consideration of the debates concerning the cultural impact of globalisation. Richard Maxwell (pp. 191–209) argues that for globalisation to work, corporations require local consumption knowledge. From this he questions the practices of market research which provide this ‘local knowledge’ and suggests that they allow the global control of differences in local tastes.

The book includes useful summaries in the introduction to each section, with each chapter also preceded by its own summary in italics. This is followed at the end of each chapter by questions for the reader to consider. It also includes a fairly comprehensive index and collective bibliography.

Nevertheless, despite its undoubted value and scholarly merit, the question of the position of gender and the impact of feminist theory emerges again and again in relation to the arguments of International Communication and Globalization. Out of the nine international scholars only two are women, which raises interesting questions about the nature and structure of international communication research, although I would not suggest that an even gender balance would necessarily essentially alter the content of the book. Second, Mohammadi’s definition of international communication contains an important absence, as he argues that cultural commodification is the ‘turning of cultural products into commodities’. Perhaps this should also include the commodification of identities and gendered identities especially. Another absence is in relation to one of the book’s key themes concerning the gap between the information rich and the information poor; gender is a key factor in this, since women still form the largest proportion of those who cannot read or write. These are some examples of where a sensitivity to gender could enrich or theoretical understanding of international communication, but which, unfortunately, is lacking here.

John Downing’s Internationalising Media Theory is an analysis of the changes in the media systems in Russia, Poland and Hungary between 1980 and 1995. It makes an invaluable contribution to the development of international communication theory and is undoubtedly a book that scholars and students will find insightful and thought-provoking. Downing begins by discussing the concept of totalitarianism and an examination of three key debates relating to the transitions in these countries: theories relating to civil society and the public sphere; social movements theory and explanations of democratic transitions and consolidations.
In the second chapter Downing provides an extremely useful overview of Russia, Poland and Hungary in the Soviet and post-Soviet eras. This includes a table of key dates and names (pp. 36–41), which is a valuable resource, although slightly blemished by the lack of discussion concerning the question of writing ‘history’ and media history in particular. The third chapter narrows its focus to communication after Stalin’s death which marked a watershed both in terms of state power and ideology, and in terms of communication policies and culture.

Chapter 4 telescopes the discussion further to look at the communication/cultural dimension in the period of transition. Downing focuses this around the questions of youth culture, music, religion and social movements such as Solidarnosc. This is continued in the fifth chapter with an examination of the political/economic dimension in the same period. Chapter 6 then discusses the media in the period from 1989 to 1995. The penultimate chapters address ‘mainstream’ and ‘critical’ explanations of the changes in the media in Eastern Europe. Downing concludes by proposing a new topography for mass communication theory that he suggests warrants further study. One of the most interesting areas he considers is that of social memory, which is something that is now becoming a hot topic amongst scholars working in a range of fields, including media.

Downing also asks where are the ‘women-in-minorities’ in terms of ‘their experiences with media, mainstream or alternative or international in the theorising about media communication that has taken place? (p. 232). This I would suggest is not because they are as he states ‘virtually nowhere’, but because he does not include them. Some of the first research on culture and communication in Eastern Europe was from a feminist perspective, and since then there has been a substantial body of research. There is also a range of literature by gender-sensitive scholars in the region which would have added another dimension to the arguments concerning the media and Solidarity for example (See Siemienka, 1986). Such sources might have encouraged a more critical approach to anecdotal sources, such as that of the only feminist left in Budapest (p. 97), used to justify ignoring the feminist movements in Russia and Eastern Europe and their links with Western groups.

This is the crucial flaw of Internationalising Media Theory and of many ‘mainstream’ approaches to theorising the transition in Eastern Europe. In my view it is not simply that gender is an important addition we need to consider, but it is at the very heart of the way in which society is mediated. Surely the time has long since passed when we could really understand social transitions and international communication without it?
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Alison James, Jenny Hockey and Andrew Dawson (eds.), After Writing Culture: Epistemology and Praxis in Contemporary Anthropology, London: Routledge, 1997, £50.00 (£15.99 pbk) x+273 pp. (ISBN 0-415-150051). Questions of representation or (re)presentation were brought into sharp(er) focus by anthropology’s ‘postmodern turn’ exemplified by Clifford and Marcus’s (1986) collection Writing Culture (hereafter WC). Representation was a concern pre-WC, but it was the singular achievement of that text to displace politics into concerns with literary form
and epistemology into self-conscious textual discursus.

The introduction to After Writing Culture runs through standard questions of representation, its formal qualities, ‘humanism’ and partiality without addressing the foundational epistemological problem running through post-WC anthropology. Any anthropology that trades on correspondence epistemology, whatever new transcodings (Crews 1986) are used, will run into now familiar questions time and again. It seems that the postmodern turn has led to inchoate epistemology and that its mix and match approach to various literatures can be seen as a paradigm exemplar of the category mistake.

Josephides outlines strategies for ethnographic writing as a means of ‘coping’ with the anthropologist’s role in the creation of accounts. She attempts to explicate the relationship between epistemology and fieldwork, arguing for an ethnographically situated theorising. While the accounts given are intrinsically interesting, Josephides offers little more than grounded theorising modified for postmodern palates.

Bowman critically interrogates the notion of alterity, arguing that the other is a category within anthropology per se as opposed to postmodern, post-WC anthropology. Alterity is integral to the project of modernity and it is important to engage with the epistemology in which this is founded. Unfortunately, what appears a promising interrogation ends with the suggestion that ethnographers engage in psychoanalytic deconstruction of alterity. Edgar’s psychoethnographic account of ‘dream workshops’ regards these as struggles with cultural frames to make sense of dreams. Edgar does not see the natural language used by the participants as a topic in itself (see Coulter 1979), but as a resource for psychoanalytic theorising.

Simpson’s paper on divorced parents engages with categorial ordering. Representations of ‘the family’ are regarded as negotiations between experience and hegemony. The paper misses the potential of the versions members offer, preferring instead to impose analytic frames that ironicise the practical work of making one’s situation accountable.

Partially grounded in symbolic interactionism (SI), Rapport suggests that we can consider culture as conversation carried on, in and through symbols. While acceptable within the language game of SI, it is symptomatic of the problems in WC anthropology that Rapport overlays the assertion with incommensurable approaches: ethnomethodology alongside social constructionism, Geertz and Jane Austen. Rapport’s account of conversations simply misunderstands what it is for humans to talk: conversation has coherence for those involved; it is the analyst’s methodologically ironic position that suggests otherwise.

A number of papers discuss representations of place and identity and their impact on issues such as land rights. Layton shows the disjunctiveness of Alawan and Western cartographies, identifying the deleterious impact that this has on claims made by those with non-Western cartographies. Cheater and Hopa interrogate the notion of Maori identity (itself a colonial product) and the effect that identity has on the ability to claim resources – they rightly criticise post-WC anthropology for being more concerned about discourses of identity than the ensuing consequences. Okely considers the role of the anthropologist as expert, pointing out that ethnographies impact on contested identities and on civil rights claims. In all the contributions it is rightly noted that ‘representations’ are indissolubly bound up with wider struggles.

Knight shows how the folkloric past is a contested terrain in terms of realisations of community in rural Japan. Macdonald, in her discussion of ethnography in a museum, illustrates the reflexive relations between informants and their ‘readings’ of ongoing research. Hendry points to the blurred genres in representations of Japanese and European theme parks and gardens.
By way of a conclusion, Wallman discusses ‘appropriate anthropology’ defined in terms of its context, capacity and ability to communicate with ‘subjects’. While stressing context, she falls into the same trap of swapping new transcodings for old. In sum, this collection has a worn feel about it. There is no sense of movement – the same tired epistemology persists despite the work of Watson (1991) and others. After writing culture it appears there is only more writing culture.
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Congleton, Nottingham, Rochdale and the Orkneys are only the most notorious sites where adults have allegedly abused children in rituals invoking occult powers and/or the Devil, but, as this important and cool-headed book makes clear, similar allegations have surfaced in many other locations in recent years. Indeed, some child protection activists fear that an epidemic of satanic abuse is occurring but that evil people are conspiring to conceal its real extent.

Jean La Fontaine, distinguished anthropologist from the LSE, may well have thought she had been handed a poisoned chalice when the Department of Health commissioned research from her on these allegations. Although her early work on witchcraft in Africa and her book on Child Sexual Abuse in 1990 made her an ideal choice, it was unusual for a social anthropologist to undertake research with so many legal and policy implications. The report that was published in 1994 elicited abuse from the journalist, Beatrix Campbell, and from other believers in the ‘myth of satanic abuse’; because it allegedly failed to take victims’ accounts seriously and regarded them as the products of fantasy. Speak of the Devil, as an elaboration of her report, shows that Jean La Fontaine actually paid very close attention to the written evidence and to interview data relating to eighty-four cases in which public authorities in England had investigated claims that children had been subjected to various forms of organised abuse associated with satanic beliefs, symbols or rituals. But she found evidence to corroborate the allegations in only three cases.

La Fontaine’s explanation of the other eighty-one cases draws impressively on anthropological, sociological and historical understanding of allegations that witches, devil worshippers or occultists regularly conspire to undermine public morality and orderly social life. She shows that ‘beliefs in mystical evil’ (p. 180) have a long history in many parts of the world, but that only in some Western societies today are perverse sexual acts against children believed to be associated with maleficium. She speculates that the causes of the recent epidemic of satanic abuse allegations lie in anxiety about the end of the current millennium, the growth of public interest in occultism and the spread of psychotherapy. She attributes much of the responsibility for cultivating beliefs in the ‘myth of satanic abuse’ to a loose alliance of evangelical Christians and psychotherapeutically oriented social workers and counsellors.

The central chapters of the book represent a painstaking scrutiny of the known facts about these allegations in the search for causes and agencies. The findings show that a few cases in the
United States gave the initial impetus for similar allegations in England but that, in contrast to the US cases, the latter allegations of abuse tended to be made against severely deprived people and to be blamed on parents and other close relatives of the child victims. This is not the pattern of non-satanic sexual abuse cases.

Another important finding was that all but one of the ‘experts’ consulted by police and social workers about allegations of satanic abuse endorsed the suspicion that this form of abuse had indeed taken place. There was a strong predisposition, therefore, to interpret children’s accounts of their experiences as evidence of satanic abuse. But it was also clear to La Fontaine that adults had coached, coaxed and constructed these accounts to such an extent that the children had invented ‘stories that support the allegations of adults and reflect their beliefs’ (p. 126). This has damning implications for debates about ‘recovered memory syndrome’ and for the groups campaigning on behalf of so-called victims of satanic abuse.

In short, Jean La Fontaine demolishes the claim that children in England have been the victims of an evil conspiracy to abuse them in the name of satanism, although she also insists that other forms of abuse are disturbingly common. Moreover, her book is not only a wide-ranging discussion of accusations of satanic abuse but also a fascinating account of the tribulations of a social scientist who finds herself caught between, on the one hand, the obligation to examine evidence dispassionately and carefully and, on the other hand, individuals and groups campaigning to expose what they consider to be a monstrous conspiracy to harm children.

This is one of the volumes to come from the 1993 BSA Conference held at Essex. And as someone who was not there, I can say that if these papers are representative of it, then very good it was too. The authors and the editors work the Millsian tension between ‘the rule-bound, rational, rigorous and systematic activity called methods of enquiry, and more personal, creative, critical and diverse leaps into the unknown afforded by the imagination;’ (p. xi). I think that the editors are absolutely right in spotting that the essays collectively stand against the familiar but too seductively convenient dichotomies (especially when teaching) of theory and data as well as qualitative and quantitative. Further, they illustrate the changing conception of the relationship between researcher and researched, as well as the impossibility of maintaining a distinction between pure and applied. Of course, reflexivity is now the name of everybody’s game. Anyway, it is of all those who play here (and go to BSA Conferences? It is those who don’t whom we should worry about!). This collection should be highly recommended to senior undergraduates, all postgraduates and quite a few of our colleagues.

It starts with Jenny Shaw taking us back to Mass Observation and Geoff Payne reflecting on community study as a method. Both show that British sociology has an increasingly sophisticated and historically situated understanding of itself. Then two excellent accounts of specific methods: Marlene Morrison and Sheila Galloway on the use of diaries (analysing supply teachers’ lives) and Susan Smith on in-depth interviews (analysing women returning to education). We then have two pieces on the use of visual materials: Barbara Harrison on visual resources and Anthony Pryce’s (illustrated) paper on visual iconography. Both challenge us to widen our sources – as well as our vision. Monder Ram and Karen Ramsay use their own experience in the workplace – the former in the West Midland clothing industry, the latter academia. Ram’s is much the more substantial. Woolgar and Cooper have
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great fun in an artfully playful, and I gather oft-rehearsed, piece on the research process. Mark Liddle and Paul Connolly in the two culminating pieces respectively ask whether men can know feminist truths and secondly whether white men can do feminist and anti-racist work. Both papers are importantly bold repositionings in what has become known as ‘standpoint epistemology’.

Together these papers, and I presume the Conference, show British sociology happily talking to itself in a comfortable yet sophisticated way. With the occasional exception, Ram for example, there is not enough about society for my taste, but lots of healthy fare on how we might begin to work on it.

There is an intriguing mistake too. The index has two page references to ‘Jenkins, R.’ Actually, they are two different people: the first is to Richard and the second Robin. They, as anyone who knows them would say, are not to be confused! The latter reference provides an interesting point of continuity as it is to a paper given at the meeting from which Volume 1 in this Central Explorations in Sociology BSA Conference volume series was produced. Who would ever have thought it would be referred to in Volume 45 – especially as it was not chosen for inclusion in Volume 1.

**University of Edinburgh**

**COLIN BELL**


It is estimated that ‘there are about 120 million workplace accidents and about 200,000 deaths a year worldwide’ (p. 1). If advanced capitalist economies have witnessed a long-term decline in fatalities at least (p. 114) – though there has been no unilinear downward trend in injuries or deaths in Britain since the introduction of the 1974 Health and Safety at Work Act (pp. 121–44, 200–5) – some of these may have been exported to developing economies (pp. 105–8). As a social problem, and as indices of complex social phenomena and processes, occupational injuries demand sociological study. Yet at Nichols observed in 1973, ‘most sociologists ... have simply ignored accidents and job induced illness’ (p. 39); it is difficult to disagree with that statement a quarter of a century later.

This text is of enormous importance as a statement of the promise and contours of a sociology of industrial injury. Two substantial chapters review social scientific treatments of accidents and injuries. In Chapter 4, Nichols reviews the contribution of psychology (also treated partially in Chapter 2) and economics. The former remains dominated by attempts to explain accidents and injuries through individual attributes, being more concerned ‘with poster campaigns than changes in political climate, with menstrual cycles than with economic cycles’ (p. 68). Nichols is equally, though less convincingly, dismissive of economics. Subjecting to sustained criticism much of the economic literature on accidents and injuries – on the market as regulator, trade-off and risk, wages as compensation for dangerous work, the use of injury taxes – he concludes (without irony) that ‘the ideal typical economist reduces everything to the economic’ (p. 77). However, despite the best efforts of the ideologues of neo-liberalism, economics as a discipline is not wholly defined by the neo-classical variant upon which Nichols focuses here, and forms of economics which do not conflate the ‘economic’ with the ‘commercial’ might provide greater insight into the production of workplace injury.

A fifth chapter considers approaches which largely ‘eschew methodological individualism’ (p. 81), namely sociology and political economy. Nichols reviews much sociological work on industrial injury, though there are some curious omissions to this review, and thus to an otherwise invaluable bibliography. While recognising strengths of this work, he indicates its limitations, particularly a tendency towards a micro-sociology.
which takes the organisation as its unit of analysis; aspects of wider political economy are taken as givens. But what determines these determinants? 'If men make accidents they do not do so under conditions of their own choosing' (p. 117). Micro-sociologies tend not to stretch ‘upwards . . . to a more macro-level of analysis’ (p. 93), obscuring processes of capital accumulation and the role of the State (p. 93). And so Nichols establishes a case for a particular form of sociology of industrial injury, a (Marxist) political economy. This treats safety ‘at the level of the enterprise’ (p. 103), but also encompasses ‘growth and stagnation in the world economy . . . the problems and nature of particular regimes of accumulation, including their resort to labour intensification and corner cutting, and the extent to which through legislation and unemployment there is weakening of labour’s capacity to resist. Account must also be taken of the reshaping of national and international industrial composition and of the relation between big and small capital and the rise and fall of different categories of labour with different relations to their employer’ (p. 103).

Nichols highlights a daunting, and largely ignored, research agenda. Other chapters indicate how such a mode of analysis might proceed, as Nichols presents: a reassessment of work by the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations on putative relationships between accidents and absenteeism (Chapter 2); a scathing refutation of assumptions regarding accident and injury causation enshrined in the Robens Report, 1972 (Chapter 3, with Armstrong); a review of safety in British manufacturing between 1960 and 1985 (Chapter 6); an interrogation of the institutional correlates of injury, utilising data from the 1990 Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (Chapter 7); and (with Kahveci) a focus upon injuries sustained by Turkish miners-workers within a highly labour intensive regime of accumulation (Chapter 8). These chapters – over half of the text – have all appeared in published form over the past twenty-five years, with only Chapter 7 subject to any real re-writing. A final chapter, as postscript rather than conclusion, briefly addresses recent trends and phenomena relevant to the form of analysis argued for here, reviewing the level of ‘safety’ in British industry, the relationships between trades unions and safety, and broaching new, European inspired legislation within the context of contemporary pressures towards deregulation.

This text confirms Nichols’s place as the key sociologist of industrial injury, certainly in British sociology. The factors crucial to an understanding of the social production of industry are the archetypal stuff of sociological analysis, yet have received relatively little sociological scrutiny. If Nichols’s argument and modes of analysis reach a wider audience through this text, the beginnings of a sociology of industrial injury may be established.
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Let’s start with a point of clarification; this book actually weighs in at 103 pp. of text and the rest is made up of various lists and a gnomish television ‘diary’ on the 1994 World Cup Finals in the United States which might easily have been culled from Goal magazine (‘Germany win Group C with this victory and remain, ominously, unbeaten’). Come back Brian Glanville.

It has always been slightly intimidating picking up earlier Redheads, not so much for the test provided by the content of his case – though the style has often been a challenge – but more for the long list of ‘forthcomings’ usually featured in the references. ‘How can he keep two or even three book contracts going at once?’ one has been forced to wonder, only later to
see a slim ‘new’ text emerge which seems to churn over a little new ground but, sadly, to no great effect. Disappointingly, this latest offering fits into that category. Routledge clearly feel that grouping a few of the current ‘hot’ themes and names – television, football, United States, Baudrillard (of course), Virilio and ‘post’ pretty much anything – is enough to shift some copies regardless of coherence. They are probably right, of course, and Redhead’s own championing of ‘pulp theory’ which ‘combine(s) elements from what has been called the new journalism, the beat poetry of Jack Kerouac and several decades of American rock and pop culture with an iconoclastic use of theories of the postmodern condition’ (p. 49), probably mitigates against some decent editorial control and direction here.

This sort of approach to ‘doing’ up popular culture is much trickier than it might seem and is something very few can pull off – Hebdige could do it at his best and Baudrillard himself, of course, has had great fun in this sort of territory – but it ill suits the academic frame provided here and especially when the material is so stretched. Here we get pages of direct quotation from the great French tease himself but with little in the way of contextualising commentary. But, worse, we get even more of the same from composer/fan Michael Nyman on the ‘death’ of the working-class game, for Marx’s sake, and from ‘cultural commentator’, Paul Morley, on virtually anything and everything from inflatable bananas through to the dangers of ‘trying to read more into football, sociologically, and make it something else’ (pp. 89–90). Quite. No other ‘fans’ figure.

A few aphorisms drawn from Philosophy Football sweatshirts and the curious use of quotes ‘from’ Eric Cantona – which are, surely, taken from a collection which has been ironically invented for the great cod football philosopher, also feature here. So, too, does constant sign-posting about the ‘argument’ in the text (which I still found hard to trace) and the regular references to Redhead’s own work which eventually collapses into a hyper-solipsistic run through favourable reviews of his much earlier (and much better) books (pp. 96–7). This is a great shame, because Redhead’s earliest work in this area was both entertaining and enlightening, though it probably suffered from being too obtusely ‘hip’ and self-consciously analytical for the popular reader (it generally suffered at the hands of the fanzines he praised), and it lacked the rigour demanded by academics.

Following a gentle stroll through some largely familiar music, hooligan and ‘hyperlegal’ territory, this new book gnaws tangentially away, as promised, at the idea of the ‘post-fan’ – Richard Giulianotti and Redhead seem to be in dispute about who originated the term – a reconfiguring of Urry’s ‘post tourist’, an ‘accelerated hypermodern culture of post-fandom’ which means the fan does not have to leave the home or the bar to see the object of the gaze because television and video provide endless opportunity for ‘grazing’ and ‘channel surfing’ (p. 29).

‘Post-fandom’ is best exemplified, of course, by the staging of World Cup ’94 in the USA and this is the ostensible ‘focus’ for the book. The commercial and ‘governance’ issues of FIFA taking the Finals to the United States are little touched upon here and, actually, US television coverage and advertising did little (more) to corrupt the sport despite early threats about introducing four quarters (for more television advertisements) and about ‘livening’ up those perplexing nil–nil draws for an American sports crowd force-fed on the regular scoring highs of basketball and grid-iron. Redhead, suitably perhaps, seems to have done his research at home in front of the box and muses on the television-induced possible ‘disappearance’ of the ‘live’ crowd (ironic, perhaps, given the real mad scramble for match tickets for France ’98).

Few would doubt the role of television in the ‘media-isation’ of all popular cultural forms – perhaps especially
football – in the late twentieth century. But there is disappointingly little detailed work here on the media text for football or on the ‘post-real’ (p. 103) dimensions of the television coverage of the sport, even in the media-saturated United States. Also, according to the references, Redhead’s next book is out soon.

University of Leicester JOHN WILLIAMS


The two current official systems of social classification derive from those first adopted in the 1911 and 1951 Populations Censuses, respectively the six category Social Class Based on Occupation (SC) and the twenty-category Socio-Economic Groups (SEG). SEG is also available in a collapsed form which approximates to SC. SC used to be described as grouping occupations according to ‘standing in the community’ but this was changed in 1980 to ‘occupational skill (without explanation)’; neither descriptive phrase has been validated by empirical research. A perennial criticism of the classifications is that explicit rationales have never been stated for allocating social positions to the various categories, an embarrassing silence which derives from the fact that they do indeed lack theoretical bases.

Constructing Classes describes the ongoing process of revising the classifications with the aim of rectifying this intellectual muddle. The outcome of the review will undoubtedly have long-term consequences for the way official statistics are collected, presented and analysed and this book therefore fulfils a very valuable service in informing potential users of the thinking that drives the review. It also provides access to a very useful database created from Office for National Statistics sources by Abigail McKnight and Peter Elias, which, incidentally, enables one to judge intra-occupational variation in earnings and qualifications at the level of the 371 Occupation Unit Groups. SC and SEG (usually in a collapsed form) are widely used in central and local government, the private sector and academic research – and the review noted unanimity among these users in urging continued collection and presentation of data in some form of authoritative standard classification. Many users take a pragmatic view of the classifications, regarding them simply as convenient means for condensing data about individuals and households in a ‘sensible’ way that allows comparison across time and space. What tends to worry these pragmatists more is the lack of coverage of those who are not or have not recently been in employment. The Phase I Report, included as an appendix, argued forcefully that a more comprehensive non-occupational social classification should not be seen as an alternative to occupationally based classifications and would require extensive research as to its practicality and potential utility. In any case, Sara Arber demonstrates that, apart from the youngest age group of the adult population, the proportion that has never worked is very small, so good coverage can be attained by asking about their last main job, a strategy that the review advocates.

The review favours an occupationally based classification on the grounds that, ‘an individual’s position within employment relations . . . is a key determinant of life chances, access to other types of social good and subjective quality of life’ (p. 158). Specifically, it advocates developing the occupationally based schema which it avers is both best theorised and has been subject to the fullest validity tests, namely that long propounded by John Goldthorpe and his various co-workers. In the proposed schema, classes are distinguished within each economic status according to size of organisation and professional status in the cases of proprietors and the self-employed respectively – and, among employees, according to the dimension of ‘service relationship’ versus ‘labour
contract’. The resulting schema can be collapsed in various ways, in particular to approximations of SEG and SC.

Quite apart from whether statistical correlations are improved, David Rose asserts that because the proposed classification has a conceptual rationale – we know what we are measuring – it will be possible to construct causal narratives via intervening variables to outcomes like health, income, education, housing and consumption patterns. However, this is more a matter of hope than promise, for criterion validity does not logically entail privileged causal determination with regard to those supposed outcomes. It may well be that quite other concepts – and their related classifications, whether based on occupational skill or income or some non-occupational measures – may be causal to the various ‘effects’ (with different classifications corresponding to different ‘outcomes’).

Although Constructing Classes reports a determined and ambitious effort to sort out the vexed issue of devising a practically useful and rationally defensible schema for social classification, criticisms of the new classification are likely to spring up again. Aside from the above objection, my own scepticism is because the criteria for ‘service relationship’ versus ‘labour contract’ generate multi-dimensional continua, because the validity of the proposed aggregations of occupation with economic status is questionable and because the collapsed categories that will actually be used lack whatever conceptual grounding exists in the full schema.

University of East Anglia
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This book is an edited collection of previously unpublished material whose editorial brief is to provide both a summary and critical analysis of existing debates on electoral politics and race, but one which moves beyond the confines of the ‘ethnic minority electoral behaviour’ (EMEB) tradition to encapsulate broader issues of race and political participation.

It is organised into three sections. Part I, ‘Examining Race and Ethnicity in the British Electoral Context’, opens with an introductory chapter in which Saggar develops the argument that existing research on EMEB ‘remains immature and lacking in analytical depth’ (p. 8). The following chapter, again by Saggar, goes on to map out some of the theoretical issues in understanding and explaining the role race and ethnicity play in electoral politics. Messina provides an analysis of the relationship of the black and Asian population to the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties.

Part II of the book deals with ‘Political Parties and “Race Politics”’. In this section, Le Lohe provides a wide-ranging, but somewhat unfocused discussion of ethnic minority participation and representation with particular reference to local government elections. The chapter by Geddes examines the explanations which have been put forward for low levels of ethnic minority parliamentary party representation. Rich provides an account of the relation of the Conservative party to ethnic minorities and racist discourse in the 1980s and 1990s. Shukra’s chapter on the Labour party is one of the liveliest in the book. She traces the history of black sections and the Black Socialist Society, the rise of anti-racist and anti-fascist campaigns in the early 1990s attendant upon racist attacks and the electoral success of the British National Party in Tower Hamlets, and she also discusses shifts in equal opportunities’ strategies.

Part III of the book examines ‘Levels of Participation and Policy Influence’. Adolino uses interview data to explore the views of ethnic minority councillors on political participation, whilst Nixon provides a fascinating research-based account of the role played by black and
Asian MPs in the House of Commons. Nanton examines the role of ethnic minorities in urban regeneration schemes and in so doing makes a valuable contribution to urban policy debates. Amin and Richardson, in a somewhat uneven chapter, explore how the political parties might put the notion of a ‘multi-ethnic good society’ on their agendas.

The book provides a very useful and welcome addition to the literature for students of race and electoral politics. It is also a very coherent collection, as the editor suggests. However, this coherence is perhaps bought at the cost of a certain degree of repetition, notably in terms of discussions on the Labour party, which is, incidentally, the only one of the ‘big three’ to get its own index entry. Given this repetition, it seems a pity that the Liberal Democrat party did not merit its own chapter and also that there is hardly any mention of the smaller parties.

There are other blind spots, notably in terms of a general lack of consideration of both youth and gender issues. Although Gifford in the Foreword alludes to the ‘alienation which dissuades many ethnic minority young people from participating in the system themselves’ (p. x), it is particularly disappointing that this theme is not directly tackled by any of the contributors. On class, Saggar notes that amongst black and Asian professionals and managers Labour voting remains high, but here perhaps reference could have been made to sociological work on the problematic status of black and Asian people within the middle classes (Daye 1994; Phillips and Sarre 1995).

One of the key issues which emerges from the book is the long-standing, and seemingly relatively constant, support of the black and Asian population for the Labour party. Several of the chapters discuss this issue, with Messina being the most uncritical of Labour. For example, he suggests that Labour, rather than Liberal Democrat, support makes sense for the non-white electorate since the Labour party is now in government and is ‘expected, sooner or later, to implement [it’s promises]’ (pp. 60–1). By contrast, Shukra explicitly casts doubt on such an optimistic scenario. Her approach echoes the question now being asked by many political commentators and Labour activists: can New Labour deliver to its traditional supporters, including its steadfast black and Asian supporters, whilst at the same time not upsetting its new, Daily Mail reading, Middle England (white) votes? This book provides a useful background for beginning to debate such issues.
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As others have noted before, the concept of a ‘moral panic’ is particularly interesting as one of the few cases where a concept developed within sociology has gained widespread, including popular, acceptance. Its status and use therefore are well worth revisiting. This is a useful, but in some ways quite disappointing, introduction to the concept and its history, within Routledge’s Key Ideas series.

Where Thompson is good is in his careful retellings of a series of cases where the concept has been most closely applied. His account of Cohen’s original research on the Mods and Rockers recapitulates the extraordinary nature of the original materials very well, for instance; and his emphasis on the ‘spirals of signification’ in Hall et al.’s Policing the Crisis is very helpful. His other major exemplars are the running crisis over sex and AIDS, the various flare-ups over the ‘decline and
collapse of the family’ and the ‘death of childhood innocence’, the shorter but arguably every bit as important debate over girl gangs, and finally the recurrent scares about sex on television. These are all essentially British examples. A question which keeps resurfacing in the book is whether Britain has had a special propensity to such panics. Thompson several times touches upon an answer which is simultaneously interesting but has troublesome implications: that perhaps the Press here have been configured (in the forms of competition, and in their relations to politics, for example) in a way that leads them strongly in this direction. This is certainly worth developing as an idea, but it does connect with the weaknesses I feel this book contains.

The key problem is that although at the outset Thompson professes interest in the theoretical status of ‘moral panic’, in fact that interest retreats as the book progresses. And by the end there is a blurriness about the concept. Thompson’s argument repeatedly adopts a common-sense phrasing for discussing published reactions: he calls them ‘sensationalist’ (see, for example, p. 88). He must regard this as a descriptive term, since it is not indexed. Yet the idea of ‘sensationalism’ has a distinctive history; it is at least a highly judgemental term, and arguably is politically loaded with middle-class fears of a particular kind of journalism.

In the end, it seems unclear, from Thompson’s account, to what extent a moral panic is simply a creature of the media, or what beyond such published – and therefore highly mediated – reactions it accounts for. Mostly, Thompson is very careful not to assume or attribute effects to orchestrated Press campaigns; but every now and then a phrasing slips through which presumes their efficacy. For example, p. 88 again has him talking of the media ‘amplifying these anxieties’ – in whom? How do we know? There is a telling moment later on when he retells (p. 101) the moment when the uncle of James Bulger appeared on morning television, to swear (literally) vengeance on the boys – to the consternation of presenters Nick and Anne. We simply know too little about the relations between circulated representations – on which almost all our accounts of ‘moral

This leaves us with a problem, in my view. What exactly are we gaining by the nomination ‘moral panic’ – what criteria should apply? How and when can we identify a set of events as a ‘moral panic’? It would have been interesting, given the series within which the book belongs, to have seen how Thompson might have advised on how putative ‘panics’ should be researched. This would, I suspect, focus attention rather awkwardly on the status and range of the concept.

It is notable that although Thompson mentions it, Waddington’s critique of the concept ‘moral panic’ is not taken much account of. Waddington argued that the concept was essentially polemical: your worries are evidence of ‘panic’, mine are legitimate concerns. Not only was this largely unexamined, but in fact Thompson’s argument repeatedly adopts a common-sense phrasing for discussing published reactions: he calls them ‘sensationalist’ (see, for example, p. 88). He must regard this as a descriptive term, since it is not indexed. Yet the idea of ‘sensationalism’ has a distinctive history; it is at least a highly judgemental term, and arguably is politically loaded with middle-class fears of a particular kind of journalism.

In the end, it seems unclear, from Thompson’s account, to what extent a moral panic is simply a creature of the media, or what beyond such published – and therefore highly mediated – reactions it accounts for. Mostly, Thompson is very careful not to assume or attribute effects to orchestrated Press campaigns; but every now and then a phrasing slips through which presumes their efficacy. For example, p. 88 again has him talking of the media ‘amplifying these anxieties’ – in whom? How do we know? There is a telling moment later on when he retells (p. 101) the moment when the uncle of James Bulger appeared on morning television, to swear (literally) vengeance on the boys – to the consternation of presenters Nick and Anne. We simply know too little about the relations between circulated representations – on which almost all our accounts of ‘moral
panics’ are based – and public reactions. And, for the record, I have never used the concept ‘moral panic’ in my analyses of censorious media campaigns, although Thompson counts me as having done so.
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