

dies, also reinforce the belief that becoming a young woman is tied to better understanding one's culture and fashioning oneself into a virtuous ethnic subject. At the same time, Rodriguez is careful to show that the production of ethnicized femininities is contentious and unstable, as unruly subjects—assertive women, unmarried adults, gay men, and others who do not conform to ethnic ideals—disrupt these carefully staged rituals and demand that their families and communities forge new and more varied ways of being “Mexican” and “Filipino.”

In all, *Celebrating Debutantes and Quinceañeras* underscores how much of the labor involved in sustaining and promoting U.S. immigrant communities is kin work that relies on women's work and women's bodies. The book's comparative focus, attentiveness to politics and power within and across communities, and deep respect for its research subjects make this a model text for undergraduate courses on immigration; race, gender and ethnicity; and Asian American studies and Latino and Latina studies.

The Marrying Kind? Debating Same-sex Marriage within the Lesbian and Gay Movement. Edited by Mary Bernstein and Verta Taylor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Pp. xii+416. \$75.00 (cloth); \$25.00 (paper).

Ken Plummer
University of Essex

Gay marriage was scarcely a whisper 20 years ago. Now it has become a global public issue. How can this can be? How have a movement and an argument (or “claims,” as social movement theorists like to say) so fired across the world that gay marriage has become such a global issue in such a short space of time? Detested and resisted in many African and Arab states as further evidence of Western decadence and imperialism, over 20 countries across the world have nevertheless legislated for it. As of July 2013, the growing list included Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, England and Wales, France, Iceland, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, and Uruguay. Moreover, there are many countries where it is “under development.” Denmark was the first country in the world to legally recognize same-sex couples through registered partnerships in 1989; the Netherlands was the first to legislate marriage in 2001. It is, as they say, a “sociological phenomenon.” All the time, many from within the gay movement have either not wanted this development at all or even actively resisted it.

Mary Bernstein and Verta Taylor's timely study *The Marrying Kind* (shades of the 1952 George Cukor film?) looks at much of this resistance from *within* the schisms of the LGBT/queer movement in North America. They start with a marvelous overview of these conflicts, providing a powerful introduction that clarifies six broad positions (gay liberation, lesbian feminism, queer activism, homonormativity, beyond the closet, and post-

gay) and outlines the three main arguments against gay marriage that are made by gay activists ("normalization," "privatizing lesbian and gay identity," and "misguided energy"). At the broadest level, the tension is an old and well-trodden one: between the assimilationists (mainly identified with the LGBT, etc., movement) and the radicals against normalization (most identified with queer theorists).

The individual contributors (Ellen Ann Andersen, Mary C. Burke, Adam Isaiah Green, Melanie Heath, Kathleen E. Hull, Katrina Kimport, Jeffrey Kosbie, Katie Oliviero, Kristine A. Olsen, Timothy A. Ortyl, Arlene Stein, Amy L. Stone, and Nella Van Dyke) provide case studies where black and white divides are eschewed for findings that show that tidy or polar divides are misleading. What they find instead is complexity "marked by contradictory impulses and unintended consequences" (p. 3). Of course there is nothing to be surprised at here; this has to be a basic law of sociological analysis—we can always expect contradiction, complexity, and unintended consequences. These factors characterize social life everywhere. The news would be if they were not found. Still the beauty here lies in the detail.

The authors come from a range of backgrounds (from senior academics to doctoral candidates). They cover a range of states (California, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Connecticut, as well as Canada—all sympathetic places; there is little here from the vast "heartlands" except for a group of gays fleeing from Oklahoma). And they deal with a range of topics: mobilization and marital discord, the opposition to marriage, "marriage activism," and finally the impact of the marriage equality movement (very considerable). The main thrust is to detail a variety of responses toward gay marriage that are far from normalizing.

As well as queer scholars, these case studies should be of great interest to academics who work in social movement analysis. The gay/queer movement has to be one of the most successful of movements of the last decade; much of the social movement conceptual apparatus is well illustrated here. The book would find a good home on any social movement reading list, as there is much to learn from it.

But useful as the book is, it is also surprisingly limited. The United States has generally lagged behind many countries in the world in both argumentations and implementations of gay marriages. So a really significant weakness of this book is the total neglect of any mention, let alone analysis, of the wider global success or the "arguments within" that have raged across the world. The editors have ignored Ulrich Beck's admonitions that from now on, all sociology should be global; they have simply avoided considering any of the major advances that have been taken on a global stage by a global movement. For me, the central problem with this book is one of omission: its provincialism limits its insights to the narrow world of the recent United States. Yet the politics of same-sex marriage goes back a long way (I think of the tremendously influential work of John Boswell) in the worldwide international gay movement, where such debates have been both earlier and more advanced than many of those heard in the United States. Bernstein and Taylor's authors show nowhere a sense of the Danish debate

and its pioneering work. Nor is the fact that gay marriages are now legal in 20 countries mentioned. In focusing on just the United States and just progressive states within it, the frame is very narrow; there is much to be learned from the politics and sociology outside their country.

Mothers Unite! Organizing for Workplace Flexibility and the Transformation of Family Life. By Jocelyn Elise Crowley. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, 2013. Pp. xii+227. \$29.95.

Shira Offer
Bar-Ilan University

Could mothers' groups come together and form a cohesive movement that would sensitize the public to the daily challenges experienced by mothers across the country and push toward reform in the realm of work and family? The answer is clearly yes. In her thoughtful and rigorous analysis of data collected through observation, in-depth interviews, and an extensive web-based survey in five nationally active mothers' groups (Mothers of Preschoolers, Mocha Moms, Mothers and More, the National Association of Mothers' Centers, and MomsRising), Jocelyn Elise Crowley finds that of all policy issues confronting women today, workplace flexibility is considered the most important issue that has the potential to bring all women together. *Mothers Unite* shows that workplace flexibility receives support across the board and is appealing to employed and stay-at-home mothers alike, who believe that flexible arrangements could help them better manage their daily lives while providing the best care for their children. Across groups, the most popular options cited by the mothers are "flexible starting and stopping times, compressed workweeks, advance notice of overtime, advance notice of shift schedules, and the option of part-time work" (p. 98).

Crowley shows that the majority of the mothers who participated in her study are not judgmental of themselves or others regarding the decision to work for pay or stay at home. This is good news, according to Crowley, because it dismisses the popular idea of "Mommy Wars" and suggests instead that mothers in different positions are understanding of each other and capable of developing a sense of solidarity, which is critical for collective action. Her findings further indicate that most mothers agreed that the government should be a key actor in pushing for reform by educating businesses about best practices and by financing initiatives such as awarding grants and tax incentives for the development and implementation of flexible programs. A major contribution of Crowley's book is not only that it identifies a unifying concept but also helps reveal the major barrier to mass mobilization. Crowley finds that although a consensus exists regarding workplace flexibility as a unifying issue, with the exception of MomsRising, whose agenda is to raise awareness on policy issues, mothers join the various groups mainly for intrinsic purposes (e.g., to gain emotional support, develop friendship ties, and