spend too much time discussing how well 20th-century events map onto 19th-century conditions. In fact, I am disappointed that he resists several opportunities to draw these connections. Rather, Hunter has a specific theoretical aim—developing the concept of political agency—and the Seventh Ward provides an "ideal case" for elaborating this aim. He accomplishes this task well, contributing to current debates about structure and agency, race and politics, and the heterogeneity of urban space. Scholars and students (advanced undergraduate and graduate) interested in historical, political, and urban sociology as well as race, inequality, and social movements should read this book. DuBois scholars may be disappointed that Hunter engages in a more tangential conversation with *The Philadelphia Negro*, but I suspect that this disappointment will quickly subside as the story of 20th-century Philadelphia unfolds and Hunter's discussion of political agency develops.

DuBois believed that residents of the Seventh Ward were too disconnected from the civic associations that help structure civil society. In *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*, he wrote, "The art of organization is one of the hardest for the freedman to learn, and the Negro shows his greatest deficiency here" (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996 [1899], p. 221). Hunter's book highlighting the political agency of Seventh Ward residents ultimately shows that DuBois was right about the importance of civil society, as Hunter's black city makers, while developing the "art of organization," profoundly changed the urban space in which they lived.

What Is Your Race? The Census and Our Flawed Efforts to Classify Americans. By Kenneth Prewitt. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+271. $29.95.

G. Cristina Mora
University of California, Berkeley

Kenneth Prewitt has written a provocative book on the way that the census counts and sorts individuals by race. Drawing on a wide range of secondary sources as well as his own experience working within the Census Bureau, *What Is Your Race* argues that politics and an outdated logic of racial hierarchy influence the way that the bureau racially classifies individuals. The author advocates for the eventual removal of racial categories on the decennial census and suggests instead that more open-ended ancestry questions should be inserted on the smaller-scale American Community Survey (ACS).

Prewitt's monograph is part history and part policy manual. In the first part, Prewitt draws on published works and sketches a history of how the census has dealt with race. He notes that slavery and taxation politics helped introduce the first black and white binary categories, and he traces the way that arguments about racial hierarchy and immigrant assimilation

helped to introduce subsequent census categories, such as mulatto, Oriental, and even Mexican. The eventual stabilization of the categories we have today—white, black, American Indian/Native Alaskan, Asian, Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian, plus Hispanic ethnicity—are vestiges of American racial politics, Prewitt contends, rather than true reflections of individual identity.

The history of race and the census is more complex than the one the author describes, and Prewitt misinterprets some parts of the historical record. For example, in his assessment of the Hispanic case, he argues that lawmakers, through the enactment of Public Law 94311, mandated that Hispanics be designated as an ethnicity rather than a race (p. 231). In fact, nowhere in the language of that law, or in the congressional record concerning discussions of different versions of the law, does it state that Hispanics should be defined as an ethnic rather than a racial group. Instead, PL-94311 notes that persons of Spanish origin have been "racially discriminated" against (the term ethnicity is never used). The reason why the Hispanic category became an ethnic one is more complicated—having to do with the efforts of anthropologists, community leaders, and media executives, as well as the results of various identification studies. Elsewhere the author only provides a partial telling of events. For example, he notes that the Office of Management and Budget moved the South Asian category from the white to the Asian one without acknowledging that South Asian groups organized and actively called on the bureau and other government agencies to grant them a nonwhite status. Indeed, a more accurate and complete telling of race and the census would suggest that census categories are much less classifications that are imposed onto groups and much more reflections of *both* community-level politics and racial identifications.

History aside, Prewitt's goal is to affect policy. He contends that the nation and its color lines have evolved dramatically, making the existing census race categories obsolete. Keeping the race categories, he argues, reifies the notion that America can actually be racially divided into five (or six) broad categories and thus impedes the road to a more racially enlightened America. To support his stance, Prewitt points to the rise of racialized medicine—drugs like Bidil that are marketed toward blacks—and contends that the persistence of census race categories reifies racial classifications in genetic science. Prewitt also suggests that the bureau could implement a question about African-American ancestry to help track the lasting effects of American slavery. This question, however, would also eventually be phased out.

It would have been helpful if Prewitt had provided—either in the history or the policy recommendation section—the perspective of activists and community advocates. Interviews or archival evidence of just how census data had transformed activists' ability to lobby would have sufficed to provide a much fuller account of the implications of removing the race categories. Had he collected this data he would have found that the census is currently the most complete tool that racial justice activists have for monitoring local-

level racial dynamics. Indeed, census data provides detailed local information that activists can use to advocate for social change—whether that be to denounce racial redistricting efforts or advocate for programs that would ameliorate inequalities at a county or small-community level. As such, community advocates have worked hard to develop mutually supportive relationships with the bureau. For example, every decade Spanish-language media, African-American political groups, and Asian American community organizations develop census campaigns to make sure their communities are counted. From a community-advocacy perspective, eliminating the race question on the census form and assuming that other surveys would have as much support or gather as much information as the decennial census does is presumptuous at best.

Logistically, an open-ended identity question also seems like a statistical nightmare. Various answers, such as black Irish, Creole, or Tejano, would have to be recoded into broader categories for the information to be useful for policy makers and researchers alike.

Why not simply add an ancestry question on the ACS but not eliminate the census race question? For Prewitt this change would not be enough because he is foremost concerned with the census's symbolic race-making power. However, Prewitt downplays the fact that the census is only one institution among many that reproduce race. Schools, prisons, vital statistics offices, local governments, the media, and individuals themselves will continue to sort people into broad racial categories, even if those categories are no longer on the census. The experiences of countries including France and Spain, which do not formally have racial classifications but are still rocked by racial politics and inequality, suggests that racial realities are more complex than Prewitt describes.

Thinking about how race will be understood in the years to come is important. We should be open to suggestions about how to improve our racial classification practices. However, we should do so with the understanding of how incredibly important census racial statistics have been for advocating for social justice.

Locked In, Locked Out: Gated Communities in a Puerto Rican City. By Zaire Zenit Dinzey-Flores. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+220. $65.00.

Sookhee Oh
University of Missouri, Kansas City

Do birds of a feather flock together? Zaire Zenit Dinzey-Flores problematizes the traditional quest for sameness and investigates how spatial boundaries are deliberately delineated to enforce and reinforce social boundaries of inequality based on social class and race. *Locked In, Locked Out* focuses on the public and private housing gates of the city of Ponce in Puerto Rico,