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.

His analysis draws on U.S. decennial census and county business patterns data from 1970 to 2000 on 80 small cities. Following a descriptive characterization of these places' changing demographics, the analysis proceeds in three stages. First, he examines the predictors of three separate demographic variables—change in population growth, in median household income, and in income inequality—finding that small cities with greater diversity and higher levels of educational attainment grow faster and have higher incomes and less income inequality. Second, he examines the predictors of three separate economic variables—median employment, number of firms, and wages—finding two types of small cities, those with new economies rooted in FIRE (i.e., finance, insurance, and real estate) and high-end service jobs and those with old manufacturing-based economies. Finally, he proposes a "success index" that combines measures of population, income, and inequality, from which he offers a series of policy recommendations for small cities' leaders.

Small cities are difficult to define, and this difficulty is reflected in Norman's use of data. First, he notes that the "80 small places . . . will be referred to as 'cities' . . . and 'metro areas'" interchangeably (p. 2). This choice is problematic for an analysis of census data because cities and metropolitan areas are very different animals. Their difference is particularly apparent in his characterization of the primarily Latino agricultural city of Salinas, California, using data on the 3,800 square-mile Monterey County, which also includes the affluent resort towns of Monterey and Carmel. Second, his definition of "small" includes metropolitan areas with central city populations of 100,000–200,000 at any time between 1970 and 2000. As a result, the sample of "small" places on which Norman reports include some fairly large cities like Las Vegas and Orlando. These issues require the reader to pay careful attention to the data, considering whether it tells a story about cities or metro areas and about small cities per se or the much broader (indeed, all-encompassing) category of cities that once were small.

The observed demographic and economic transformations of small cities are examined through the lens of two theoretical concepts typically applied to large cities: John Friedmann's and Saskia Sassen's notion of world/global cities and Richard Florida's notion of the creative class. Norman rejects the global cities theory because he finds evidence of some small cities that have successfully engaged the global economy. However, this rejection seems to be based on a misreading of the theory; Friedmann and Sassen do not argue that "smaller cities are not economic centers" (p. 137). Their arguments focus on cities' economic functions, not population size, and thus can accommodate the existence of demographically small but functionally global cities. Norman also rejects Florida's creative-class model for small cities because he finds that educational attainment,

not openness to alternative lifestyles, predicts their success. But again, this finding seems to derive from a partial treatment of the original theory: Florida's "three T's" model does highlight tolerance via his "gay" and "bohemian" indices, but also recognizes the role of talent via educational attainment.

Seeking to offer a small-city alternative to these large-city theories, Norman develops the notion of "glocal" places to make sense of successful small cities. He contends that the driving force behind glocal places is geography, "but not in the way that some scholars have posited. Glocal places are father away from larger metro areas, and this may have helped them become the most important and desirable place in their local region" (p. 133). That is, small cities thrive when they operate outside the shadow of a metropolis and can cultivate dominance on a regional scale. But this idea is precisely how many scholars, from Walter Christaller to Otis Duncan, have argued cities find success. Norman's glocal place concept may help us understand small cities in the contemporary United States, but whether it pushes our understanding beyond the central-place theory of the 1930s or Otis Dudley Duncan and colleagues' *Metropolis and Region* from 1960 (Johns Hopkins Press) is less clear.

Ultimately, Norman's *Small Cities USA* takes an important step toward reminding urban scholars of the importance of smaller cities. It is a welcome alternative to the deluge of global cities research and offers a clear and concise point of entry for those wanting to explore this neglected side of urban studies. Pedagogically, alongside the extensive demographic and economic data presented on these places, Norman takes the time to provide straightforward explanations of the methods he employs—for example, the 90:10 inequality index, location quotients, and fixed-effects regression—that will be invaluable to students. And theoretically, the book presents an opportunity to reconsider some old (e.g., central place) and new (e.g., global cities) theories in a new light.

Strangers at the Gates: Movements and States in Contentious Politics. By Sidney G. Tarrow. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii+260. $26.99 (paper).

Brayden King
Northwestern University

The analysis of social movements has cohered as few research areas in sociology have. Scholars in the subfield share a high level of consensus about key problems and concepts. Sidney Tarrow's career has spanned the development of this field from the 1970s until now. Tarrow helped to articulate the political process model—a perspective that emphasized how so-