in common sense. Nonetheless, the author does not assume that all is plain sailing; the default to decency leads to further moral and political debate because things are still ambiguous, uncertain. And, one might add, further sociological analysis, but not of the kind that simply accepts the situation as defined by "shock doctrine" and command and control. For what Molotch proposes is a sociology willing to hear a different voice; ironically, the voice of "the public."

Some sociologists, including those contributing to newer fields such as security studies and surveillance studies, need to hear Molotch's message (indeed, one might wish that he had interacted more with some of those literatures). All too often, research funding relates to the very practices that Molotch criticizes—those of military, high-tech and market-driven responses to threat and disaster that are also parroted in the mass media. How can a sociology that is serious about its independence seek new paths that are more in tune with how ordinary people might approach a perceived lack of security? Even those who might choose different topics, theories, and methods would still do well to take a moral and political leaf out of *Against Security.*

Everyday Law on the Street: City Governance in an Age of Diversity. By Mariana Valverde. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012. Pp. viii+247. $85.00 (cloth); $27.50 (paper).

Patricia Ewick
Clark University

Mariana Valverde's *Everyday Law on the Street: City Governance in an Age of Diversity* examines the welter of bylaws, standards, inspections, zoning hearings, licensing procedures, and political structures that characterize urban governance in Toronto. The processes and mechanisms that determine who and what belongs in the city and whom the city belongs to tend to be one-off solutions and exceptions that micromanage residential and commercial life. Various chapters are devoted to such issues as zoning, food vendors, taxi licenses, and the regulation of taste. Valverde argues that despite the deployment of a discourse of diversity, municipal governance processes operate to contain and minimize diversity by privileging certain kinds of living arrangements (single-family homes) and business activities (corporate capitalism or the selling of hot dogs). For instance, in the chapter on the regulation of taste, municipal bylaws dictate culturally biased aesthetics, such as those pertaining to sights (messy yards), smells (cooking), and sounds (noise from bars) that favor middle-class sensibilities. The licensing of street-food vendors—largely through the compulsory hot dog rule—disciplines the urban

sidewalk by making it economically unviable to sell any other food, depriving many immigrants of making a living selling diverse ethnic foods.

The scale at which municipal governance operates has implications for participatory democracy in the city as well. The disputes that are mediated by the city tend to be temporally and spatially localized in such a way as to prevent the development of long-term policies that might benefit the entire city. The decision making of city bureaucrats tends to be more responsive to local neighborhood associations and "village elders" than to the less well-organized members of the community.

Throughout the book Valverde demonstrates the significance of scale in understanding law on the street. Geographers tell us that the scalar resolution of action is related to power and that scalar shifts always entail shifts in power. Yet Valverde's analysis reminds us that power is not simply a quantitative entity; at different scales power become qualitatively different. For instance, she points out that cities are not simply smaller versions of states. Their distinctive jurisdictions and processes are both limited (cities cannot absolutely prohibit behavior since that would encroach on state's control over criminal law) but, in another sense, their power is more expansive (cities can regulate the time, place, and manner of behavior with few restrictions). In regard to business regulation, Valverde sums up what she calls the neofeudal principle that emerges from this type of power: "Every kind of trade is forbidden unless it is allowed, only for a particular space and time, through a very specific and hard-to-get-permission" (p. 150). Needless to say, with such a principle operating it is not surprising that the resulting regulations reflect existing social privilege and power.

This work is groundbreaking, important, and fascinating. I must admit I was unprepared to be riveted by a book about the seeming minutiae of law at this scale, but I couldn't put it down. In part, the book is so compelling because it reveals a world that exists "right before our eyes" but that remains unseen. (The world it reveals reminded me of looking at a drop of water under a microscope and seeing—with some measure of revulsion—living things squirming about.) Certainly, this world has been largely unseen by sociologists and sociolegal scholarship. Whereas I can recall specific and focused analyses of facets of this world (zoning or licensing, for instance), I am unaware of anything that takes as its subject the entire array of municipal governance. Valverde should also be commended for resisting the temptation to tidy up this world for her readers by summarizing her data in tables or reducing them to general processes. She doesn't just allow us to see the city, but to see *like* a city—anecdotally, partially, and up close.

Of course, offering this view of and through the city is also important because, as Valverde demonstrates, all of that dizzying and unruly squirm-

ing has surprisingly predictable consequences (that are also revolting). Even though there is no all-seeing state and no overarching plan or perspective for siting low-income housing, granting taxi or vending licenses, or policing messy front laws, Valverde shows that the form of local municipal governance reproduces the cultural, social, and economic hierarchies of the city with a remarkable consistency. A stubborn order of inequality emerges from all of this fragmented, reactive, and ad hoc governance. The book ends with a provocative question and a challenge to the conventional wisdom regarding urban planning ever since Jane Jacobs wrote *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Vintage, 1961). Valverde suggests that it might be time to reevaluate the capacity of unplanned, local governance based on the ideal of the urban "village" to secure inclusion and diversity in a global city such as Toronto. We may have won the battle against the bureaucratic urban planners decried by Jacobs, but only by sacrificing social inclusion and the very diversity it was supposed to secure. The book is richly detailed, beautifully written, and entirely persuasive.

Small Cities USA: Growth, Diversity, and Inequality. By Jon R. Norman. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii+188. $68.00 (cloth); $23.95 (paper).

Zachary Neal
Michigan State University

The majority of urban sociological research has focused on relatively large cities, while smaller cities have received much less attention, and indeed one can find an unresolved tension concerning the nature of small cities. On the one hand, poets offer a romantic view of the small city as qualitatively different, observing that "New York . . . is not Spokane multiplied by 60, or Detroit multiplied by four" (E. B. White, *Here Is New York* [Harper & Brothers, 1949], pp. 22–23). On the other hand, physicists offer a more universalist and directly opposite view, observing that "New York and Tokyo are . . . scaled-up versions of San Francisco in California or Nagoya in Japan" (Luis Bettencourt and Geoffrey West, "A Unified Theory of Urban Living," *Nature* 467 [2010]: 912–13, p. 913). In *Small Cities USA*, Jon Norman engages this tension by asking whether small cities can be understood using theories developed to make sense of large cities. Over the course of a clear and compact analysis, his answer to this question evolves. On page 2, he contends that "smaller cities are not identical to their larger cousins," while by page 132 he has reversed course and concludes that "small cities . . . look like the major cities of the world but are not very large in terms of population." Norman begins as a poet, but concludes as a physicist.