

systems. The theories work well for abstracting the relevant factors. Yet, they remain implicit in the empirical chapters and are not commented on in the synthesizing and concluding parts of the book, which focus more on the historical argument and the negative prediction that the United States will generally fail to contribute in counteracting climate change. The book has lots to offer for scholars in political, economic, and environmental sociology and in science and technology studies. Personally, I found the historical argument centered on the rising developmentalist political ideology particularly interesting. Hess himself does not favor this ideology; his analysis is theoretical and descriptive, not normative. Yet, what I found interesting is his realistic diagnosis and prognosis and the insight that it is essential for any country to develop a repertoire of policies in order to support and protect the development of green and clean domestic industries. Laissez-faire politics and aggressive trade liberalization won't make this happen. Indeed, more a "inward-looking" United States may not be a bad development for the rest of the world, Hess suggests.

People's Science: Bodies and Rights on the Stem Cell Frontier. By Ruha Benjamin. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii + 249. \$85.00 (cloth); \$24.95 (paper).

Daniel R. Morrison
Pepperdine University

People's Science is an important work on a complex topic, written with a passion for social justice and inclusion. Ruha Benjamin explores how California's 2004 Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative, Proposition 71, entangled science and society in ways that both reproduce and exacerbate existing inequalities. This multisited ethnography tracks the biomedical, regulatory, and civic life of the initiative, combining the political sociology of science and public participation in science while remaining attentive to how this "public science" includes some while excluding others. Borrowing from Sheila Jasanoff, Benjamin argues that Proposition 71 is a particularly vivid example of bioconstitutionalism, the commingling of innovations in the life sciences, and claims to political rights. Instead of following scientists through society, Benjamin follows the Stem Cell Research and Cures Initiative through its implementation and into the clinic.

The book works on multiple levels. On the one hand, Benjamin's well-crafted chapters focus on the politics, promise, and peril of Proposition 71. This \$3 billion, 10-year project uses public monies funneled through the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) to fund private-sector research and discovery with the aim of developing treatments and cures for conditions like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other chronic diseases. On the other hand, Benjamin elaborates a new, socially inclusive science, symbolized by the Ghanaian *sankofa* bird, which reaches backward, reflecting on the past while moving forward. The *sankofa* is meant to

evoke a socially and politically conscious science that is maximally inclusive, participatory, and oriented toward social justice.

Benjamin investigates how the CIRM gathered stakeholders and distributed influence among disease advocates, weighing social justice, public participation, and inclusion versus concerns for quick innovation through investments in private biotechnology companies and their future profits. The CIRM ultimately prioritized speed over solidarity. Although the initiative was framed as a kind of "science for the people" by its proponents, Benjamin documents how the CIRM's format and funding decisions silenced poor and marginalized communities while relying on these same populations as resources for stem cell research. She tracks the struggle between disability rights activists, many of whom favor a social model of disability, and advocates for a medical model of disability who suggested that stem cell research is necessary in order to end the suffering caused by chronic and disabling conditions. Another chapter focuses on the bioconstitutional struggles over whether women who are asked to "donate" their eggs for stem cell research are either bioworkers or research subjects. Making this determination, a kind of bio-ontology, determines whether such activity should be incentivized by pay. Beyond the policy-making arena, Benjamin interviewed doctors, medical staff, and families who work with or consider stem cell therapies for sickle-cell disease and cord blood transfusions.

These empirical chapters lead Benjamin to consider the sociology of trust and how distrust of biomedical and scientific institutions is a reasonable response to the inequitable distribution of health care resources in the United States. It is not surprising, Benjamin suggests, that poor and minority communities are reluctant to donate their biological material for high-technology research when these communities lack basic health services. This ambivalence toward the potential benefits and risks associated with stem cell research and treatment is aptly summarized in an epigraph attributed to one potential research subject, who said, "Why am I in such demand as a research subject when no one wants me as a patient?" (p. 113).

Benjamin argues that our social and political imaginations are all too weak when we invest billions in the promise of discovery through high technology while basic health care including preventative and public health services, is subject to budget cuts or is simply unavailable to the millions of Californians due to a lack of health insurance. Benjamin asks us to consider stem cell research in a context of growing economic inequality and to question our faith in technological transformation that surpasses our willingness to engage in political and economic transformation. In fact, Californians had the opportunity to approve Proposition 72 alongside the stem cell initiative. This initiative would have mandated that employers with 20 or more employees pay at least 80% of their health coverage costs or pay a fee. Voters narrowly rejected Proposition 72 and thus prioritized funding the promise of future discoveries and cures over extending health coverage to nearly all working people.

The book concludes with a utopian vision of science with and for the people, a democratic and engaged science that understands “the public” as a body of consultants instead of consumers, partners instead of ignorant or misinformed enemies of progress. This kind of science would engage youth from marginalized communities to cultivate decision-making power and it would empower thinking with scientists about the political, economic, and social issues emerging with discovery and innovation. This “partnership governance” (p. 181), Benjamin argues, is an important step toward a science that is respectful of the past while contributing to the collective good.

In *People's Science*, Benjamin offers us an engaging, insightful, and challenging call to examine both the rhetoric and reality of innovation and inclusion in science and science policy. Using a clear and persuasive, moral, and sometimes even prophetic voice, Benjamin calls sociologists of science, technology, and medicine to investigate ever more deeply how scientific innovation works within a deeply unequal society, advantaging the already powerful and ignoring or silencing those who suffer from existing public policy.

Disability and Identity: Negotiating Self in a Changing Society. By Rosalyn Benjamin Darling. Boulder, Col.: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2013. Pp. xiv+189. \$55.00.

Christopher Johnstone
University of Minnesota

Rosalyn Benjamin Darling's *Disability and Identity: Negotiating Self in a Changing Society* is a contemporary reexamination of Erving Goffman's 1963 *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Prentice Hall). Goffman's 50-year-old work outlined how societal stigma around difference in appearance, communication, and so on led to negative or “spoiled” identity formation among persons with disabilities.

Early in the book Darling questions whether Goffman's findings are still relevant in 2013 and brings readers on a journey through a review of literature that spans several decades. The author outlines the methodological flaws in historic studies of identity, questioning whether the notion of a universally spoiled identity among persons with disabilities could be theoretically supported. The author uses succinct language to demonstrate it could not. Darling's empirical critique of early identity studies is very helpful. She demonstrates that the notion of negative or spoiled identity is an assumption on the part of researchers but does not always stand up to rigorous review.

As a reader, I was very interested in the next steps in the evolution of identity theory of persons with disabilities but did not find the answers I sought. Parallel to the important questions critiquing early identity studies, a flurry of new research has emerged as the social model of disability and