a methodology whereby centers from around the country are surveyed. It certainly provides some useful information about worker centers and is a must-read for activists. For political scientists, however, it may come as a disappointment. Even though there are chapters devoted to policy and efforts to achieve social justice, political scientists would be more interested in a more in-depth discussion of the role of organizations in affecting policy, in mobilizing support, and how these centers might be well poised to continue in that tradition. Much of the writing style is a cross between journalism and an infomercial. Toward the end of the book, Fine asserts that worker centers have been quite successful at integrating the low-wage worker's point of view into public debates about economic development and immigration issues. She further asserts that "By shining a light on the working poor and forcing the issues to be debated, worker centers are laying the groundwork for new national policies on low-wage workers and the rights of immigrants . . ." (p. 260). Yet, one searches in vain for support for these types of assertions. We do know that various coalitions in recent years—most notably living wage coalitions—have been successful in getting more than 100 cities to pass such ordinances. Scholars, however, have been able to place these movements into context and in some cases quantify the effects (e.g., see Oren M. Levin-Waldman, *The Political Economy of the Living Wage,* 2005; Isaac Martin, "Dawn of the Living Wage: The Diffusion of Redistributive Municipal Policy," *Urban Affairs Review* 36 [March 2002]: 470–96). Without similar attempts to do the same with worker centers, the overall argument of the book becomes less convincing.

Disarmed: The Missing Movement for Gun Control in America. By Kristin A. Goss. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. 304p. $29.95.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071034

— Clarissa Rile Hayward, *Ohio State University*

If popular political movements attract the attention of a wide range of political scientists, this is the case, to no small degree, because they seem to bridge an impossible chasm. They seem to bridge—or at least to begin to build a bridge between—on the one hand, the lofty aspirations of democrats who invoke a language of government "by the people," and on the other, the reality of modern democracies in which elites govern, while citizens judge their performances. When people vote, they affirm—or they reject—the leaders who make and enforce collective decisions. When people participate in popular movements, by contrast, they act in public to articulate and press claims about collective norms. When ordinary citizens participate in mass political movements, that is to say, they act collectively to exercise political power.

In *Disarmed: The Missing Movement for Gun Control in America,* Kristin Goss asks, "What prompts them to do that?" What conditions make it likely (or unlikely) that ordinary citizens who share some set(s) of preferences, or who share some set(s) of potential political claims, will mobilize around those preferences and claims and act in concert to advance them? The book's principal interlocutors, then, are participants in the literature on social movements. The author proceeds, however, by examining *not* a full-fledged movement, but rather what she identifies as a nonmovement. The "missing movement for gun control," she suggests, on the face of things seems as if it *should* have happened. But it did not.

Goss begins by explaining why one might expect a gun control movement in the contemporary United States. Public opinion surveys in this country consistently show widespread and strong support for gun control. Key political elites are in favor, as well. Since the 1970s, what is more, the United States has seen the development of both state- and national-level organizations that are devoted to pressing for government regulation of firearms. In addition, the country suffers from high levels of gun violence, including periodic dramatic, widely publicized incidents (such as political assassinations and mass killings), which presumably could serve as catalysts for a popular gun control movement. Yet Americans have not mobilized in any sustained way to press political claims for state regulation of firearms. Why not?

Goss's principal explanation is that gun control supporters in this country have failed to solve the free rider problem that plagues every would-be movement, by shaping, in salutary ways, how people calculate the difference between participation's individualized benefits and costs. Specifically, they have failed to recruit institutional patrons—such as state agencies, private associations, and philanthropic organizations—to "socialize the costs of participation" (p. 51) by providing resources like capital, labor, and expert advice. They have failed to develop and to circulate narratives about gun violence that frame it as a problem that personally affects potential movement participants, rather than a problem of law enforcement: the proper province of experts. And they have failed to adopt the kinds of political strategies that might encourage potential participants to understand their personal involvement as linked to immediate, concrete gains.

Of these three failures, it is the third that receives the most attention. Goss argues that it is crucial for popular political movements to proceed incrementally, targeting relatively modest, local win, before they undertake bold legislative initiatives at higher levels of government. Incremental approaches to political change, according to her claim, are best suited to the federal structure of the American system of government. What is more, they appeal to a relatively broad segment of the population, thus attracting greater numbers of participants, and they reinforce participation with the near-immediate gratification of small and local victories. In addition, incremental strategies

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 19 Nov 2026 at 03:21:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707071034

enable movements to gather steam by encouraging a gradual shift in social norms, while signaling to elected officials and to would-be officials the relevant preferences of the public. Although it is understandable that movement leaders are tempted by what Goss terms the "rational national" alternative to incrementalism (p. 66)—a strategy of aiming for comprehensive change at the highest possible level of government—the pursuit of such a strategy, she argues, is the biggest mistake advocates of gun control in the United States have made. The National Rifle Association, a mass-membership group organized at the national, state, and local levels, nimbly shifts its attention—and its resources—to fight gun control efforts when and where they arise. Gun control groups, by contrast—expert-led, and focused almost exclusively on Washington—lack both the flexibility and the manpower to respond.

In advancing these claims, Goss builds a compelling case. She amasses a wide array of evidence—from personal interviews to newspaper and organizational archival data—which she employs to induce an intelligent theory of movement (in)effectiveness. Faced with the daunting methodological challenge of studying something that did not happen, she adopts a strategy similar to John Gaventa's (in *Power and Powerlessness,* 1982): She uses multiple methods to arrive at her argument. Goss employs comparative case studies, contrasting the American nonmovement for gun control with mass movements against smoking, alcohol abuse, and abortion: popular movements that faced challenges similar to those faced by gun control advocates, but overcame them by solving the free rider problem. She performs in-depth historical analyses of the "missing movement" for gun control, as well, tracing gun control's failures through a series of "movement moments" (p. 34) during which the structural preconditions for mass mobilization typically stressed by social movement theorists were in place, and yet no mass movement arose. Finally, Goss studies the results of what she characterizes as a natural experiment: the Million Mom March of the year 2000, which, by building a grassroots movement based in local chapters, began to rectify the strategic mistakes she posits as key obstacles to mass mobilization for gun control.

This study is an exemplar of the use of qualitative methods to generate explanatory theory. Substantively, its most significant contribution is to posit a trade-off between, on the one hand, aiming for large, consequential changes in laws and policies and on the other, effectively mobilizing citizens to participate in mass political movements.

If, at times, it seems like devastating news for democracy ("If you want to change anything, change very little, and very slowly!"), the case Goss builds for incremental movement making is not entirely pessimistic. At least with respect to some political problems and some proposed policies, she suggests, the wants and the claims of nonelites in modern democracies make a difference. If you want to change policy, you may need to go through—rather than around—ordinary citizens. You may need to find ways not just to win people's affirmation but also to motivate them to participate in collective political action.

Democracy for All: Restoring Immigrant Voting Rights in the United States. By Ron Hayduk. New York: Routledge, 2006. 264p. $24.95 paper, $95.00 cloth.

The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror. By Stanley A. Renshon. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005. 298p. $26.95 cloth.

DOI: 10.1017/S153759270707106X

— Jane Junn, *Rutgers University*

Immigration is a powerful narrative in the history of the United States, at times evoking optimism and at other times providing fodder to foment xenophobia. These two books, authored by a pair of New York City–based scholars, share a common vantage point in the experience of the most racially and ethnically diverse city of immigrants in the United States. At the same time, the books are a study in contrasts, a neat fit to both ends of the spectrum between hope and fear. One is concerned with enhancing freedom and the other with maintaining order. One advocates expansion of political expression in the form of the franchise, the other recommends constraint. One looks to our nation's history—to our sometimes ignominious past of exclusion, as well as to expansive practices allowing noncitizen voting—and highlights inclusionary lessons to draw, and the other looks to the future and sees danger in a post-9/11 world of organized terror. Although distinctive in many ways, both books are passionately written, and one is compelled to read on whether cheering in agreement or taking umbrage, for the arguments will resonate regardless of where one sits on the political spectrum.

Stanley Renshon's book, *The 50% American,* is best distinguished from an already well-developed body of scholarly literature on citizenship in the United States in its claim that those with dual citizenship are only partial Americans. "The 50 percent American, for whom both sides of the hyphen are equal, means in reality that both sides have equal weight in a person's psychology and that in any particular instance the scale could tip to one side or the other" (p. 74). Renshon sees danger in dual status; he reserves his strongest critique for foreign states encouraging continued loyalty among émigrés and the American state for its lax attitude in demanding undivided loyalty from immigrants. Alternatively, Renshon is sympathetic to the predicament faced by "half-Americans," acknowledging how hard it is to love only one country and recognizing the emotional dilemmas one faces in leaving a

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 19 Nov 2026 at 03:21:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707071034