CHICAGO JOURNALS

Politics and Partnerships: The Role of Voluntary Associations in America's Political Past and Present , edited by Elisabeth S. Clemens and Doug Guthrie
Politics and Partnerships: The Role of Voluntary Associations in America's Political Past and Present by Elisabeth S. Clemens; Doug Guthrie
Review by: Nina Eliasoph
American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 118, No. 2 (September 2012), pp. 504-506
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/666598
Accessed: 11/04/2013 13:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Sociology.*
http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.3 on Thu, 11 Apr 2013 13:54:00 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of novel human behaviors and institutions" (p. 111). This book makes a strong case for returning as a discipline to this vexed theme. I can only hope we do so with the analytical ingenuity and empirical humility that Bowles and Gintis display.

Politics and Partnerships: The Role of Voluntary Associations in America's Political Past and Present. Edited by Elisabeth S. Clemens and Doug Guthrie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011. Pp. viii+329. $55.00 (cloth); $19.00 (paper).

Nina Eliasoph
University of Southern California

After *Politics and Partnerships* circulates as widely as it deserves to, many unexamined truisms about civic associations will finally be lain to rest: that the civic sphere is intrinsically distinct from, and separate from, market and state; that more government funding causes less civic involvement; that civic engagement is a tidy quantity that can be measured like capital that rises and falls over time without dramatic difference in its characteristics. In fact, "tidy" is the last word one would use to describe this book's contents, and that is its prime virtue. The chapters Elisabeth S. Clemens and Doug Guthrie have gathered show how each step in the American nonprofit sector's development has been the result of a messy compromise. Parts of the social body decompose and recompose, each time stitching themselves together into a new, equally ungainly creature, and so it lopes forward.

For example, Michael McQuarrie's story starts with the breakdown of a long-standing midcentury truce between elites and local activists, fueled by steady growth. When the growth ends, so does the truce. By detailing a complex history of scrimmages, this excellent chapter shows how contenders reach a new provisional balance, agreeing to focus on developing low-income housing. An apparent victory for the activists turns out to mean that not only do the activists have to stop talking about economic redistribution in the process, but also, the new nonprofit housing organizations end up operating very much like for-profit housing developers. This chapter illustrates the book's message: the nonprofit sector has always existed as a set of complex, provisional answers in an ongoing argument.

Chapters proceed in roughly chronological order. Johann Neem shows how and why colonial-era civic associations crystallized American national identity. The central government assiduously regulated civic associations, while appearing to avoid dictating a substantive definition of American identity. The penultimate chapter in the volume illustrates a tension in this method of creating national identity: associations might drive people apart as easily as they bind them together. When a wealthy

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.3 on Thu, 11 Apr 2013 13:54:00 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

white church partners with a black church in Tennessee to build housing, whites see that the black church has less money, but can interpret this fact only through a shared vision of individual economic "accountability," overlaid on a shared religious vision that also focuses on individual "accountability." The visions merges with and reinforces racism.

Elisabeth Clemens's article describes how a now-familiar organizational form solidified: the nonprofit that got government funding. Arguing against giving federal aid to victims of the dust bowl and the Depression, Herbert Hoover recited a refrain in American politics: "If we break down this sense of responsibility and individual generosity . . . and we start appropriations . . . we have not only impaired something infinitely valuable in the life of the American people, we have struck at the roots of self-government" (p. 88). Instead, he wanted private charities like the Red Cross to provide the needed relief. Hoover's idea is based only very partially on historical fact, but the sentiment he described inspired groups of convicts, hospital patients, and "an Eskimo village" to gather tiny sums for the Red Cross. The voluntary donations were certainly not enough. Legislators arrived at a truce: to funnel government funds into charities. This truce uneasily blended three missions: preserving the hope that the needy could receive adequate care, keeping the voluntaristic image of American togetherness intact, and simultaneously avoiding politics by pretending that socially produced suffering could be alleviated without conflict.

Rather than making political conflict seem irrelevant, the community-based organizations that Nicole Marwell describes invoke and channel local political activism. Participants become a political machine that pressures the state to fund the organizations themselves. In another twist in this ongoing argument about nonprofits and politics, sometimes Hoover was partly right about the volunteer spirit; sometimes, a spontaneous, creative volunteer group's work does become rigidified when it gets funding. Alyshia Gálvez studied an organization that sprang up to help families of immigrant victims of the Twin Towers attack. The decline in the organization's initial creativity might make Hoover grin, or scream, or both: the informal volunteers were more creative before they sought funding, but what they were so creatively doing was demanding government money for their clients.

Many chapters have immediate political relevance. Doug Guthrie's chapter on current corporate giving shows, for example, that higher state tax rates for corporations go with higher corporate philanthropy rates, and that corporate giving is higher in cities with high union density. Alice O'Conner shows that by the 1970s, elites started to feel that nonprofit research institutes like Ford and Carnegie were not promarket enough, so these elites started their own foundations. They funded pundits and researchers, and they also lavishly funded seeming civic associations to stage seemingly grassroots speak-outs—on behalf of school vouchers and school choice, for example. The Tea Party's Koch brothers' origins are

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.3 on Thu, 11 Apr 2013 13:54:00 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

here. Again, clean distinctions between market and civic association are deceptive.

O'Connor's chapter seems hard to mesh with another, equally convincing one. James Evans shows how it has come to be that nonprofit research institute scientists' work has become virtually indistinguishable from that of university scientists. Perhaps punditry is easier to buy than hard science? Mark Hendrickson's article shows an earlier iteration of the relationship between expertise, politics, and nonprofits. Early 20th-century nonprofit and federal agencies incubated experts who developed leftist analyses of "the Negro problem." Appealing to elites' faith in science, these experts used social science to show elites that what unions were demanding might be good *science*. When backed by activism, these discoveries had an effect on policy.

It is frustrating not to have space to lavish more detail on these rich essays. Just one taste: one might consider annual reports to be drab detritus, but early civic associations invented this literary form, which implicitly showed Americans how associations' fates were linked to the fate of the nation. Some chapters are dry, but colorful insights like the genesis of annual reports abound in this book. Anyone teaching courses in political sociology, the nonprofit sector, or social movements should consider assigning it. Each chapter is a gem, precisely portraying changes in the subtle integuments that link nonprofits to the rest of society, in a process of mutual creation.

Fighting for the Future of Food: Activists versus Agribusiness in the Struggle over Biotechnology. By Rachel Schurman and William A. Munro. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. xxx+262. $22.50 (paper).

Romand Coles
Northern Arizona University

Fighting for the Future of Food provides an excellent account of the political struggles around biotechnology in an age of vast and fast-paced global circulations of technology, capital, markets, risk, and social movements. Methodologically, Rachel Schurman and William Munro combine carefully crafted analyses of the lifeworlds of both the biotechnology industry and social movement actors, with a focus on "relational comparison," which examines "the ways in which ideas, information, and repertoires of action flowed from among these locations, reflecting the relationship between national and transnational activism" (p. xxvii). The result is not only a superbly insightful book on the contentious politics around biotechnological agriculture, but an exemplary contribution to the growing literature on social movements.

Michel Foucault insightfully theorized how contemporary powers increasingly develop modes of "governmentality" that variously target, stim-

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.3 on Thu, 11 Apr 2013 13:54:00 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions