and poker players makes for a tired analogy that merely rehearses well-known complaints against the financial industry. Furthermore, the author's observation that a hedge fund trader that faced uncertainty "was not a strict quant" (p. 193) reveals a limited understanding of the profession, for *all* traders (including quants) confront uncertainty (Daniel Beunza and David Stark, "Tools of the Trade: The Socio-technology of Arbitrage in a Wall Street Trading Room," *Industrial and Corporate Change* 13 [2004]: 369–400). I was not quite able to tell, based on his methodological section, how many hedge fund manager interviews he had undertaken, or how extensive his exposure had been to the world of traders.

Notwithstanding the above, Delaney's book is an important step in rethinking the social use of money. Outside the world of investment banks and credit derivatives is an entire sphere of activity around money—personal finance—that now lies at the center of an intellectual and public policy debate. If economic sociologists intend to remain relevant in this debate, they would do well to build on his ideas.

No More Invisible Man: Race and Gender in Men's Work. By Adia Harvey Wingfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013. Pp. x+200. $25.95 (paper).

Alford A. Young, Jr.
University of Michigan

In the past decades sociological studies of black men have proliferated. However, much of the attention in this genre of scholarship usually has been given to the most socioeconomically disadvantaged of the lot (my own work included). Of course, there are many more black men to talk about than those who toil in socioeconomic despair, and in *No More Invisible Man: Race and Gender in Men's Work*, Adia Harvey Wingfield aspires to do just that. Her work is a deliberate effort to explore how 42 African-American men of white-collar professional class status discuss their experiences at work, with particular emphasis placed on how they think that their gender and racial status matter for such experiences.

In pursuing her objective, Wingfield explores how such men aim to portray themselves while at work (with great emphasis on looking "sharp" so that their professional demeanor cannot be doubted), how they commit to racial solidarity more than gender solidarity (and, therefore, often develop empathy for and solidarity with women at work much more than with white males), and how they embrace a collective racial solidarity rather than individualism in their outlooks concerning occupational mobility. Wingfield also highlights how rarely these men report having provided the kind of emotional support for each other that is more commonly associated with solidarity efforts exemplified by women, this occurring despite the men's strong articulations of maintaining racial solidarity. Hence, these men re-

port functioning much like traditional men (solidarity without emotional expressivity) despite having to grapple with subordination that in many ways resembles what women encounter in the white-collar professional world.

In exploring these and other issues in this work Wingfield aspires to put an African-American male spin on a some theses introduced many years ago by Rosabeth Moss Kanter in her classic study, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (Basic Books, 1977). Kanter's classic work, which was a pioneering contribution to the study of women's experiences in the corporate sector, did not offer or develop any racially specific arguments. In contrast, Wingfield deliberately places race at the center of her analysis while maintaining an equivalent degree of focus on gender. Although not as groundbreaking as Kanter's study (not least because there has been some sociological attention given to black men of professional class standing), *No More Invisible Man* admirably extends and revises Kanter's major claims in order to make a case for the particular experience of black men in professional sectors.

In doing so, Wingfield presents a conservatively styled analysis. In saying this I make no claims about her political orientations. Instead, I specifically refer to the design and logic of her arguments. One indicator of the conservative flavor of this work is that Wingfield remains very close to logic and structure of Kanter's pathbreaking book. In fact, she does so with such consistency that Wingfield's book does not generate new theory as much as modify and reapply Kanter's original claims. Consequently, *No More Invisible Man* takes the form of an investigation that stays firmly within already established conceptual and theoretical boundaries.

Another reflection of the conservative style of *No More Invisible Man* is the layout of the material. Each chapter begins with a basic overview of chapter aims and objectives, delivers its analyses arguments in its middle sections, and then ends with a summary section. This pattern preserves the dissertation-style narrative that was the first iteration of the material. In taking this approach, Wingfield provides an easily readable and very transparent commentary. The reader receives exactly what is expected from each chapter, and any nuances and subtleties are given immediate attention at the start of each chapter.

Finally, the kind of conservative flavor that I refer to appears in Wingfield's depiction of various African-American male social types in the white-collar professional arena. Here she delineates types such as the superbrother (who aspires to overachieve so that he may be at least minimally recognized as a solid achiever), the imposer (who aims to create a fake impression of the self that is appealing to the authority figures in the workplace), the race representative (who strives to address the issues concerning race at the workplace and who is committed to opening doors for other blacks to follow), and the nonthreatening black professional (who consistently tempers his response to workplace situations and circumstances so as to avoid reifying the image of the angry black male). While these certainly appear to be valid depictions of professional black men, Wingfield could provide a

bolder analysis by unpacking more thoroughly what kinds of men seem to adapt each persona. Rather than investing so thoroughly in identifying the characteristics of each type, she would be more daring if she explicated more fully what the existence and persistence of these types reveals about the status, possibilities, and challenges of African-American mobility in the professional world now two generations removed from the Civil Rights era.

That critique having been said, the findings in *No More Invisible Man* are straightforwardly communicated. The men studied here report facing considerable challenges in getting the kind of respect and deference they feel they have earned. They report having to overachieve, yet sometimes be strategically understated in talking about their approach at work least they been seen as too uppity, hostile, or socially incompatible. Indeed, the book covers a wide range of professional sectors, including medicine, academia, law, and engineering. As the terrain is so wide, the issue of whether there are particular circumstances confronting black men in any particular professional sector is not specifically addressed. Instead, the work is an exploration of seemingly successful black men and their relationship to the general white-collar work environment. The true jewel of this book, however, is that it encourages critical readers to consider how both race and gender work simultaneously in individuals' constructions of the social reality of their everyday lives and the assessments of their own agency in those contexts. This addition is a welcome and necessary advance over scholarship on black men that often privileges race and therefore is less attentive to interconnection of the two categories.

This Is Not Civil Rights: Discovering Rights Talk in 1939 America. By George I. Lovell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012. Pp. xx+259. $27.50 (paper).

Kristin Bumiller
Amherst College

This Is Not Civil Rights offers a tremendously interesting analysis of what *is* civil rights; in fact, the book may do a better job of illuminating the meaning of civil rights in American society than the jurisprudential analysis that has attempted to define them over past 75 years. This book provides a rare glimpse at how ordinary people understood civil rights by analyzing correspondence processed by the civil rights section of the Justice Department in 1939. The research is based upon archival data, mostly handwritten letters from a wide variety of individuals across the socioeconomic spectrum and response letters, often pro forma, from Justice Department officials. George Lovell, a political scientist at the University of Washington, interprets these letters as a keenly engaged ethnographer, sensitive to the writers' cultural and regional circumstances. The author is also remarkably receptive to how the commonplace knowledge about life and the law is