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Paul Robeson—rather than on the less famous activists and participants. In addition, those who are interested primarily in the study of social welfare policy may feel that Kazin’s emphasis on culture is misplaced. Finally, Kazin does not say too much about the obstacles, resistance and repression that have also been major parts of the history of the left. At the end of the book, he suggests that those who seek social change need to reclaim the “utopian impulse”—even for the sake of achieving moderate reform. But it is not clear that one can embrace a belief in radical change simply in order to achieve more limited goals. Nor is it evident that the real problem of the left today—especially in the wake of the 2011 Occupy Wall Street mobilization—is a lack of big dreams. Still, by advancing an interpretation of American history that places political radicalism at the center of the story, Kazin does a real service to those thinking about the history of social change.

Kim Phillips-Fein, Gallatin School of Individualized Study, New York University


On the heels of renewed activism, exemplified by the Occupy movement, academics and activists may want to know about the motivations and life courses of those who have devoted at least some portion of their lives to social and political causes. These two books—the first, a sociological examination of the career paths of self-defined activists and the second, first-person retrospective narratives by six political activists—provide a great deal of information.

Patterns of Protest carefully investigates various dimensions of political activists’ lives, including the duration of their engagement, the strength of their activist identities, and the significance of social interactions within the social movement organizations (abbreviated as SMOs). The author employed a
secondary analysis methodology of a large longitudinal panel study conducted by M. Kent Jennings and colleagues that surveyed a probability sample of high school seniors in 1965. The survey, repeated four times, ending in 1997 with 56% of the original respondents, investigated respondents' political engagement (pp. 139-140). Corrigal-Brown supplemented the quantitative data with interviews of 60 self-identified activists in four organizations, two left-leaning (Catholic Workers and Farm Workers Union) and two right-leaning (Concerned Women for America, an anti-abortion organization, and Homeowners' Association). The SMOs chosen differ by structure (the degree to which they are hierarchical versus democratic) and focus (single versus multi-issue) and by size and locale.

Survey data reveal that 65% of sample respondents have participated in an SMO or politics at some time in their lives; 30% have engaged in "contentious" (not defined) political activity in their young adulthoods; 30 years later, only about 5% had so participated throughout the survey period (pp. 26-27). These changes reflected not only cultural differences (the 1960s and 1970s were periods of significant protest activity) but also differences in personal responsibilities and time demands experienced by the respondents over time. Indeed, it is the activists' "trajectories" that are the author's focus, and she discusses three patterns: persistence, abeyance (disengagement followed by re-engagement), transfer (the issue remains the same but the location changes) and disengagement. Not surprisingly, family and work obligations reduce the amount of time that individuals can spend on political activities, although those with more cultural and educational resources tend to go in and out of participation rather than dropping out altogether. The book examines many other variables that affect participation, including gender, race, ideology and financial resources. Chapter 5, entitled "Ties that Bind," provides strong evidence that social contacts and activities have a very strong influence on individuals' joining and continuing to engage in organizations.

Written Out of History presents six first-person accounts of what is appropriately characterized as radical activity by five women and one man, now in their 60s (essentially the same cohort as those interviewed by Corrigal-Brown). (N.B.: this
is a self-published book, available commercially, that came to my attention because two of the authors are my friends.)

The writers describe their active participation in anti-Vietnam War protests, educational work during wartime in Nicaragua, teaching in Cuba and community organizing and teaching in distressed neighborhoods in Boston from the 1960s through the 1980s. While these accounts are of activities that doubtless were more daring and less mainstream than those of the interviewees in Corrigal-Brown’s sample, in many ways these activists’ trajectories resemble those in the persistence category. Active participation was fueled by ideology but also, importantly, by social and friendship networks. Most of the contributors became politically active in college or soon thereafter, a period of political upheaval in the U.S. Two gave up academic careers to work, for a time, in factories, in order to do political education and/or union organizing with their working class colleagues. Several lived in communes where their political activities were shared with housemates. Two spent considerable time in Latin America after their family responsibilities abated; the others apparently dropped out during mid-life while they were raising children. Later, most chose careers in teaching or work at the community college level, work that is respectable but in keeping with their tempered political ideologies. The book is very engaging, a reminder to their contemporaries, including the less adventurous, of what those turbulent times were like and informative for others who may want to know more about those times and to compare them to what may be coming.

Marguerite G. Rosenthal, Emerita, Social Work, Salem State University


As has been widely documented, the 1970s ushered in a new era of crime control. Since then, what, when, and how punishment should be used have been topics of intense, contentious, and very public debate. Less widely appreciated, though of equal consequence, is that during this same period,