crisis emanated after 9/11 is enormous, there is no reason to be overtly optimistic. Civic discourse in America is still largely dominated by various elements of Islamophobia. The Boston bombing has added fuel, casting Muslims out perhaps further. Second, some of Bilici's optimistic claims can potentially be misleading—his research is largely based on Detroit, which he claims is a microcosm of Islam in America. While other American cities have Muslim populations with perhaps different dynamics, the question remains to what extent this research can be representative of the whole nation. Finally, though Bilici recognizes diversity within the Muslim population, it has not been reflected enough in his analysis. While in some instances Islam is a blending force (force of solidarity), it can also be a source of disputes and divisions. Albanian mafias and Iranian or Turkish secular people may relate very little to Islam and the Muslim identity. There is an apparent tension between the Shia and the Sunni, liberals and conservatives, secular and orthodox followers, the Nation of Islam and the Islam of nations (universal brotherhood), but it is not clear in the book how these apparent differences and tensions affect the social organization of the Muslims in America.

Against Security: How We Go Wrong at Airports, Subways, and Other Sites of Ambiguous Danger. By Harvey Molotch. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012. Pp. xviii+260. $35.00.

David Lyon
Queen's University

At last—a sociologist breaks through the official cant about security to offer reasoned and compassionate alternatives. Known for his earlier work on the ethnography of everyday technologies, in *Against Security* Harvey Molotch tackles the political prioritizing of security as something that not only misses the mark of the aspirations of millions of ordinary people but also exacerbates the problems security was supposed to solve. In a manner reminiscent of Ivan Illich's scathing critique of "iatrogenic medicine" (*Medical Nemesis* [Calder & Boyars, 1975])—where "cures" cause further problems—Molotch advocates a program of "civilianization" to counter mistakenly military approaches to disaster, threat, and anxiety.

Though meticulously well informed by his own research and relevant academic references, Molotch writes refreshingly and appropriately for a general audience that knows the frustration of going through an airport—the perversity of restrictions that delay, dull the fun, or deflect from the task in hand, all in the name of some specious security. No one, including Molotch, denies that some basic securities are desirable and necessary. But our world is transformed into a soulless and somber place when security is

mistaken for our chief end and governing authorities suck us all into the vortex of their obsession. The fact that the book is written not merely for an arcane coterie of scholars but for anyone who cares about security is a sign, one hopes, of a new sociology for the real world. This approach is underscored by the conclusion of each chapter, which suggests practical measures for "what to do"—his contribution to civilianization.

Reflections on amber, red, and other alerts mark the start of this study, after which *Against Security* examines security in restrooms, subways, airports, urban areas—where rebuilding at Ground Zero is the focus—and the real factors that made Hurricane Katrina so disastrous (infrastructural inadequacy, ignored expert advice, and long-term activities that directed water into New Orleans and reduced its natural protections). Molotch observes that with uncertainty featuring strongly in contemporary cultural experience, it was hardly surprising that 9/11 brought an ontological sense of threat and fear to the fore. Once named as "terror" and thus carrying an aura of dread, it seemed that responses were scripted to produce military models of response, rather than criminal justice ones, let alone ones that recognized shared responsibility.

One problem arising from this that recurs through the varied analyses of the book is that the bodies that take responsibility for security, particularly after a "crisis," allow authorities to take action on behalf of the public, thus excluding those able and willing to assist. Whether the professionals are capable of carrying through is unknown, which is beautifully illustrated by the color-coded threat levels. These give the impression of confidence, competence, planning, when in fact no one really knows either what the colors mean for actual "threat levels" or for meliorating action. The problem is compounded, argues Molotch, in that those who try to take issue with the myopic version of security as the "only thing that counts" may be silenced.

If such alternative views got an airing, however, Molotch would sidestep the military fallback position in favor of asking a "secular version" of "What would Jesus do?" that he calls a "default to decency" (p. 192). He cautions that some resist "giving in to empathy" (p. 193) but insists that the empirical evidence from disaster response shows clearly that people help each other. The myopic bias toward control and punishment, reappearing in each of Molotch's case studies, seems pitifully inappropriate. So several reasons, again based on the case studies, are given for following a different path. These in turn make way for Molotch's conclusion that much more critical thinking about security is required: "We need considered judgment based on empirical evidence cleansed of the deep anxieties of fear and vengeance that so feed the reflex to command and control" (p. 217).

Observe, says Molotch, that "real security comes from the assemblage of artifacts, habits, and procedures, which mostly are already there" (p. 217). His proposals are, dare I say, disarmingly straightforward, humane, and rich

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