

level racial dynamics. Indeed, census data provides detailed local information that activists can use to advocate for social change—whether that be to denounce racial redistricting efforts or advocate for programs that would ameliorate inequalities at a county or small-community level. As such, community advocates have worked hard to develop mutually supportive relationships with the bureau. For example, every decade Spanish-language media, African-American political groups, and Asian American community organizations develop census campaigns to make sure their communities are counted. From a community-advocacy perspective, eliminating the race question on the census form and assuming that other surveys would have as much support or gather as much information as the decennial census does is presumptuous at best.

Logistically, an open-ended identity question also seems like a statistical nightmare. Various answers, such as black Irish, Creole, or Tejano, would have to be recoded into broader categories for the information to be useful for policy makers and researchers alike.

Why not simply add an ancestry question on the ACS but not eliminate the census race question? For Prewitt this change would not be enough because he is foremost concerned with the census's symbolic race-making power. However, Prewitt downplays the fact that the census is only one institution among many that reproduce race. Schools, prisons, vital statistics offices, local governments, the media, and individuals themselves will continue to sort people into broad racial categories, even if those categories are no longer on the census. The experiences of countries including France and Spain, which do not formally have racial classifications but are still rocked by racial politics and inequality, suggests that racial realities are more complex than Prewitt describes.

Thinking about how race will be understood in the years to come is important. We should be open to suggestions about how to improve our racial classification practices. However, we should do so with the understanding of how incredibly important census racial statistics have been for advocating for social justice.

*Locked In, Locked Out: Gated Communities in a Puerto Rican City.* By Zaire Zenit Dinzey-Flores. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+220. \$65.00.

Sookhee Oh  
*University of Missouri, Kansas City*

Do birds of a feather flock together? Zaire Zenit Dinzey-Flores problematizes the traditional quest for sameness and investigates how spatial boundaries are deliberately delineated to enforce and reinforce social boundaries of inequality based on social class and race. *Locked In, Locked Out* focuses on the public and private housing gates of the city of Ponce in Puerto Rico,

whose gating processes are little known, comparing four communities: Doctor Pila (gated public housing), Gándara (ungated public housing), Alhambra (ungated private housing), and Extension Alhambra (gated private housing).

Dinzey-Flores starts her book arguing that the symbolic and physical power of gates, fences, and walls is a historically persistent mechanism that sorts the insider from the outsider and the haves from the have-nots from Rome to the colonies of the New World to 20th-century urban societies. The power of gates continues, and the city of Ponce is situated in this historical context. In Ponce, increasing crime and, more important, increasing fear of crime during the 1970s and 1980s led to more private-gate permissions and public housing gate controls. The New Deal reform movement of the 1940s and 1950s, intended to promote social integration by developing public housing adjacent to affluent communities, ironically contributed to the gating processes because “the proximity of these public housing sites was perceived to invite crime” (p. 17). Due to increasing fear of crime, gates were erected voluntarily for higher-income communities and involuntarily for the public housing communities. The author boldly states that gates are the “modern-day version of regulatory panoptic structures of the past,” “awarding privilege to the rich and denying it to the poor” (p. 26).

Consequently, everyday life for the city’s residents has changed, and daily routines of the communities and spatial mobility across the city have been reshaped. To borrow Bourdieu’s terms, the residents in both privileged and underprivileged communities have established their own habitus in gated urban Puerto Rico. The gates as instruments of power are further fostered by “the disciplines of techniques and procedures” (p. 55). The author illustrates the way aesthetics and sophisticated technology control social worth and social threats (p. 65). The residents within the privileged gate experience “a sense of entitlement and competence,” whereas the residents locked out experience “a sense of impotence and objective and subjective exclusion” (p. 75). Therefore, the gates reconfigure ideas of community, governance, and democracy. The gates of affluent communities show how home owners cultivate “a clear identity of community membership and a structured system for processing disagreements” (p. 75), whereas public housing residents lack political efficacy. For them, gates “limit their right,” and the outsourced private managers “represent external governing structures” (p. 79). Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that public housing residents are not merely passive agents, as the author exhibits how public housing residents negotiate between apathy and resistance in their everyday acts.

The identity of the community extends beyond their houses and streets to a broader level of Ponce—the garden clubs and the playgrounds. The author examines the association between gardens and privacy, arguing that “while the poor travel a distance to reach contested public spaces, the rich cultivate private botanical clubs and secret gardens” (p. 120). I found it unsurprising that gates also intersect with race. The author suggests that “space, the built environment, exposes the activated racist contours of its

imaginations" (p. 134). Whiteness in Puerto Rico does not merely mean physical features and skin color. It means access to opportunities reserved for the privileged. "Such whiteness is systematically less accessible to the poor" (p. 137), and public housing is a key signifier of the lack of whiteness.

Data for the book were drawn from qualitative field research, including 20 focus groups, individual interviews, and participant observation across the four sites. The four communities were theoretically sampled to ensure "a two-way comparison of four residential sites in Ponce based on two axes: public or private and gated or not gated" (p. 156). Each site required different methods of sampling and interviewing. The author emphasizes her role as "an involved observer" and her research as a personal reflection of her own life (p. 153). Originally a native of Ponce and having grown up with a racially and ethnically marginal status in Puerto Rico, she believes that her subjective experiences helped, rather than hampered, her research. Her methodological approach was additionally augmented through the parallel inclusion of the interview text in the original language (Spanish) and alongside the transcribed text in English.

The book makes a number of important contributions to urban sociology and urban planning literatures. First, the author identifies the unique contribution of her research, which, unlike "most research that has focused on the rise of the gated communities" as an escape and protection from urban chaos, is about "gates used as a barrier between the poor and the rich" in such a way that the practice "distributes power and makes concrete social distinctions" in space (p. 70). She eloquently demonstrates these demarcating processes through an abundance of data from her field research and scholarly literature. Second, the author weaves through her argument and her interpretation of the findings with the theoretical concepts of Foucault, Bourdieu, Lefebvre, and Mumford. This incorporation has the aim of helping readers contextualize the empirical analysis within broader social processes and generalities. Nevertheless, excessive reiteration of these conceptual statements carries the risk of sounding didactic. Finally, the author laments the phenomenon of the shrinking city—the increasing privatization and diminishing public aspect of the city as a result of the gated urban society. This diagnosis assumes, perhaps misguidedly, the idea of the city as an ideal place of public engagement and democracy. Gates and walls have been a historically essential part of the creation and maintenance of the city. It appears the author romanticizes the concept of the city, while its urban dwellers continuously desire to engage in the quest for spatial and social segregation.

For urban scholars and commentators who are interested in social production and organization of space, Dinzey-Flores's *Locked In, Locked Out* is necessary reading. The book will explain the historical trend of gated communities and privatization of public space around the globe as it occurs in a Puerto Rican context.