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topics. Nevertheless, the book will be essential reading for scholars concerned with crime and inequality.


Like many others social science terms, communitarianism is very difficult to define. Although used imprecisely, the term has been employed for many decades. It is usually associated with the exaltation of the community as a desirable social entity and with the celebration of community based activities. With its evocation of the intimacy and security of community living, it has instinctive appeal especially in American society where the notion of the integrated, harmonious community has been a recurrent historical theme.

In this book, the respected sociologist and public policy commentator, Amitai Etzioni seeks not only to define the concept but to offer a detailed account of the communitarian agenda. Transcending his earlier role as social scientist and policy analyst, Etzioni has become a campaigner for reform believing in the need to recreate community based institutions. His writings on the subject have attracted considerable media interest and intellectual support. The book is a sequel to Etzioni's successful earlier book The Spirit of Community (Crown Publishers, 1993) which outlined the communitarian manifesto in some detail. Consisting of more than 30 essays by different authors, the book offers detailed discussions on different aspects of communitarianism. The introductory chapter by Etzioni is particularly important for its summary of the communitarian agenda. As Etzioni points out, communitarianism represents a normative ideal type which may be contrasted with other normative traditions in Western political thought such as large scale collectivism and atomistic individualism. Other chapters deal with the notion of rights and responsibilities in communitarianism, the difference between communitarianism and populism, the role of the family and schools, the importance of voluntarism and other mediating structures, community policing and the relationship between communitarianism and capitalism. Although some of the chapters are more interesting than others, the book provides extensive elaboration of the communitarian
agenda and will be essential reading for anyone interested in the topic.


The Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago has long been recognized as one of the premier centers for sociological inquiry in the United States. Its reputation emerged in early decades of this century when the contribution of scholars such as Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, George Herbert Mead, W. I. Thomas and others dominated the field. Their contribution was so widely recognized that these scholars came to be known as the Chicago School. However, it is widely believed that Chicago’s contribution was eclipsed in the years after the Second World War. While Harvard, and to a lesser extent Columbia emerged as the new centers of excellence in sociology, Chicago appeared to be in decline.

This book has been specifically compiled to refute the impression that sociology at Chicago during the years after the Second World War had descended into academic mediocrity. The editor and contributors assert that sociology at Chicago was in fact flourishing and that it deserves the appellation of a ‘second’ Chicago School equal to that of its illustrious predecessor. To support this claim, the book contains articles on different facets of sociological inquiry at the University of Chicago in the postwar years. These articles cover topics as wide ranging as the department’s contribution to research methodology, research into race and ethnicity, studies of deviance and the development of symbolic interactionism under Becker and Goffman. Two chapters deal with social relations in the department at this time. One focuses on faculty relations while the other is concerned with the position of women. Both make for interesting reading and transcend the book’s partiality for nostalgia.

While the book will be useful to sociologists concerned with the meta-theory of their discipline, its wider interest is questionable. This is not to deny that it is well written and readable. But it could have been enriched by an attempt to ensure broader relevance through, for example, using the Chicago material to ask