

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 128 · Number 1 · Spring 2013

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of the publisher.

Copyright © 2013 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

circumstances it would have been pointless to argue in 1896 that there was no such thing as race. That said, this is a book worth reading.

LELAND WARE
University of Delaware

Poverty in Common: The Politics of Community Action during the American Century by Alyosha Goldstein. Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2012. 392 pp. Paper, \$26.90.

Alyosha Goldstein's book examines U.S. liberalism's conceptualizations of community and poverty in the 30 years following the Second World War. Goldstein argues that liberals used the concept of community, and by extension community "participation," as methods to address the newly consolidated category of the poor, thus implicating them in their own projects of governance. Liberal democracy's "strategies of containment" of the "dispossessed" were "both reactionary means of inclusive political management and a dynamic condition of possibility" (p. 6). Goldstein explores how the dispossessed used this tension to their advantage in both participating in and resisting the roles circumscribed by liberal policymakers.

Poverty in Common is structured roughly in chronological order from the First World War through the 1970s. Political scientists will appreciate how each chapter includes short comparative case studies of state efforts to construct policy around definitions of community, participation, and poverty with the concomitant responses from these multiple communities. The policies and movements covered in the book are too numerous to list here, but the highlights include: the Black Panther Party, the Mobilization of Youth, the National Congress of American Indians, the Office of Economic Opportunity's Community Action Programs, the Peace Corps, the 1968 Poor People's Campaign, the Welfare Rights Movement, and the Young Lords. The tension between ideologies of self-help and self-determination is a common theme throughout the chapters, as are the continuities between constructions of domestic and international poverty as central to the project of liberal democracy.

Goldstein's book is an exemplary history of mid-twentieth-century liberalism. The emphasis on Cold War convergence between domestic and international discourse around "underdevelopment" highlights the strengthening of U.S. empire during this period. Moreover, the argument that "the poor" are constructed by liberals as a monolithic, foreign body in a liberal democracy is persuasive and worth considering further in current discussions of global capitalism.

Despite Goldstein's rich illustrative profiles of policies and movements, statements in theoretical portions of the book that emphasize the contingent

and contested are sometimes contradicted by strong (and compelling) claims hidden in the chapters. The undertaking of such an impressive number of histories leads to some slippage about the term “liberalism” itself throughout the text. One of the major strengths of the book is the varieties of liberalism he describes, but exactly which types are at play and in which eras is not always clear. I often found myself wanting to know who or what was responsible for many of these developments. For example, Goldstein writes, “For some, these violent uprisings [1960s] were evidence of the excesses of poor people’s participation. For others, they were a symptom of the failure to institute substantive participation” (p. 153). For whom? White, middle-class people? Liberal elites? Conservatives? The dispossessed are discussed in terms of how they were marked as primarily racial others, but Goldstein’s argument would be strengthened by an explicit identification and discussion of white people as the primary beneficiaries of this liberal hegemony. He does not acknowledge this fact except for a short discussion in one of the case studies of the complexities of whiteness and class in Appalachia. Nevertheless, the book offers a look into the thinly veiled violence of the project of Cold War liberalism, making it a worthwhile read for scholars of social movements and the politics of poverty.

ROSE ERNST
Seattle University

China or Japan: Which Will Lead Asia? by Claude Meyer. New York, Columbia University Press, 2011. 176 pp. \$35.00.

According to most projections, Asia will account for half of global economic output by 2050. Who will lead Asia is thus a question of vital importance. In this readable and succinct book, Claude Meyer, a former Japanese bank executive and current scholar at Sciences Po, assesses the prospects of the two leading contenders: a rising China and a resilient Japan.

The conventional wisdom is that China is poised to become Asia’s most-powerful country while Japan is locked in demographically determined decline. Meyer agrees with but also adds nuance to this conventional wisdom by highlighting China’s fundamental weaknesses—massive debt and a low capacity for technological innovation—and Japan’s enduring strengths. China has already surpassed Japan as the world’s second largest economy, and its prospects for continued growth seem brighter. Yet Japan looks set to retain its technological superiority and clout in financial markets. In the short-to-medium-term, therefore, the two countries’ economies will remain more compatible than competitive, marked not by head-to-head competition for control of industries, but by a division of labor within industries in which Japan