

profiling faced by Hmong import-car racers in chapter 3 calls to mind the post-9/11 profiling of South Asians and other “Muslim-looking” people who may also fall under the category of “Asian American.” This study provides the voices of an underrepresented segment of America that have much to tell us about race, culture, and youth in America.

Klansville, U.S.A.: The Rise and Fall of the Civil Rights–Era Ku Klux Klan. By David Cunningham. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii+337. \$29.95.

Pete Simi
University of Nebraska, Omaha

The Ku Klux Klan (KKK) represents one of the most significant social movement organizations in American history. The Reconstruction-era Klan became an early example of an insurgency movement deploying the tactic of domestic terror, accounting for thousands of targeted murders and brutal beatings across the southern states. Several decades later, during the 1920s, the Klan became a national movement and grew to some four or five million members helping elect governors, senators, and state legislators. Yet aside from a few notable exceptions, sociologists have neglected the Klan’s significance. David Cunningham’s scholarship is certainly one of those exceptions. Cunningham’s most recent book, *Klansville, U.S.A.: The Rise and Fall of the Civil Rights–Era Ku Klux Klan*, represents his latest effort to systematically study Klan activism by relying on a case-study approach to examine North Carolina’s United Klans of America (UKA). Cunningham’s selection of North Carolina allowed him to pose a fascinating question: Why did the 1960s Klan flourish in a state characterized by a relatively progressive stance on racial matters?

The main theme running throughout *Klansville* is that the UKA’s success was precisely because of, not in spite of, the state’s overall lack of overt official resistance to desegregation. The UKA filled a void left by North Carolina’s acquiescence to desegregation, in which citizen councils or state-sponsored efforts were largely absent. In this context, the UKA experienced substantial and rapid growth in North Carolina, increasing from just over 500 members in 1963 to nearly 12,000 by 1966. The decision to focus on a single state helped Cunningham delve deeply into the cultural and historical “weeds” where state politics lies, but he also does not lose sight of the larger context surrounding North Carolina politics. Throughout the narrative, Cunningham weaves in a number of interesting comparisons between North Carolina and nearby states such as Mississippi, where Klan activism was unabashedly violent and competed with more mainstream governmental and nongovernmental segregationists.

Drawing on a rich combination of archival research and interviews, *Klansville* is organized into a series of seven chapters along with an introduction and epilogue. The introductory chapter clearly situates *Klansville* as an effort that is part historical and part theoretical. The theoretical framework, "mediated competition theory," is a variant of the broader body of ethnic competition theory. In his revised theory, greater focus is placed on local as opposed to national conditions in order to produce a more fine-grained analysis. In addition, Cunningham combines concepts from social movement theory to analyze how the UKA capitalized on perceptions of racial threat and translated these conditions into action. Chapter 1 focuses on the history of the KKK, discussing the ebb and flow since its founding shortly following the close of the Civil War. Chapter 2 shifts the focus specifically to the UKA while chapter 3 details the context of race relations and economics in North Carolina. Maybe most important, chapter 3 discusses how the state's lax police response to the Klan provided an opportunity for the UKA to mobilize, unhampered, across the state. Chapter 4 addresses the variation in the UKA's strength in North Carolina, concluding that much of this variation was due to county-level differences in the perceptions of racial threat. Chapter 5 provides a microlevel examination of how social ties facilitated UKA involvement. Of particular interest is the finding that Klan membership did not correspond with individuals directly competing for jobs and other resources with African-Americans. Instead, members were drawn to the UKA via social network links and a more general identification with the idea of racial threat. Chapter 6 transitions to a focus on three specific communities in North Carolina and the factors that helped or hindered UKA mobilization in each area. Chapter 7 highlights several important lessons, including the state's decision to initiate a more aggressive and proactive approach to policing the Klan. But as Cunningham points out, these tactics also involved protecting the UKA's constitutional rights to free speech and free assembly, and North Carolina officials resisted proposals to simply declare the UKA an illegal organization. Much can be learned from this case that can be applied to policing contemporary extremists and other groups whose members may be a risk for engaging in criminal activity.

The Klan's legacy is the focus of the epilogue. One of the most interesting points raised in the book involves the finding that during the 1960s, in counties where Klan activism was greatest some two decades later, these same counties were characterized by higher-than-expected rates of violent crime. The explanation for this finding rests on the idea that the tradition of Klan violence created ripple effects over time. To be more specific, the Klan's vigilantism during the 1960s undermined the legitimacy of formal authority, which resulted in a deterioration of collective efficacy as residents lost faith in the ability of other residents and authorities to intervene

in the resolution of conflict. In turn, diminished collective efficacy in these areas continued long after the Klan's presence had dwindled. A substantial literature suggests that a lack of collective efficacy is a characteristic commonly found in areas with higher levels of crime, and thus the Klan's activism in the 1960s seems to have unleashed a set of social processes still reverberating today.

Few studies of a single social movement organization match the comprehensiveness or meticulousness found in *Klansville*. Broadly speaking, *Klansville* challenges various assumptions regarding the Klan, or rather the unsociological perceptions long fed by anecdotal evidence and various limited studies that depict Klan membership as filled with the "dregs" of society. Last, *Klansville* is an antidote of sorts to the dizzying increase of terrorism studies since September 11, that either explicitly or, more often, implicitly conflate terrorist violence with violent Islamic jihadists. As such, *Klansville* offers an important opportunity to reflect on the long history of white supremacist-inspired terrorism in U.S. society and should be of interest to policy makers and the general public alike. The writing is clear and accessible and would be an excellent selection in undergraduate and graduate courses on social movements, race or ethnicity, and political sociology.

Generations, Discourse, and Social Change. By Karen Foster. New York: Routledge, 2013. Pp. xiv+175. \$125.00.

Lauren A. Rivera
Northwestern University

In the wake of rapid technological change and growing age diversity in the workforce, a new field of business research has emerged: generation management. A bevy of popular press publications assert that individuals born in different time periods have distinct work values, needs, and orientations. Millennials are often presented as entitled and in need of constant feedback, Gen Xers as desperately seeking work-life balance, and baby boomers as valuing stability, security, and the status quo. This literature presents generational differences as major sources of workplace conflict and miscommunication and argues that, to be successful, 21st-century employers need to not only understand such age-based differences but also actively manage them. Generation management is a booming industry; many employers now require workers to undergo generational difference education in addition to traditional diversity training.

But are generational differences real? Do individuals born in different eras actually have different orientations to work? If so, where do these distinctions come from? And what are their consequences? These are the questions Karen Foster tackles in *Generation, Discourse, and Social Change*.