

of many organizations' founders and current members and the movements' emphasis on direct action which is, at the same time, deemed "masculinist" (p. 140). I was also struck by the gender imbalance of the participants—only 31 of the 100 interviewees were women, although women make up the bulk of the animal-rights movement. Returning to the origins of these movements, if racism, sexism, and classism (among other oppressions and issues) drove radical protesters to form groups outside of mainstream organizations, then what can the author offer us as to why these groups recreate those same oppressions?

Total Liberation provides a much-needed, in-depth look at radical environmental and animal-rights activists, whose progressive politics and formidable repression by the U.S. government have gone relatively unnoticed by academics. More attention needs to be paid to this issue, and future research could address this topic in a comparative study between radical and mainstream movements, or in a comparison between these movements in different countries. This book, with its gripping topic and its fluid, compelling style, will be of use in both undergraduate and graduate classes on environmental sociology, animals and society, social movements, and political sociology.

Institutions Count: Their Role and Significance in Latin American Development, by **Alejandro Portes** and **Lori D. Smith**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012. 206 pp. \$29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520273542.

MARIELA SZWARCBERG DABY
 Reed College
mariela@reed.edu

Institutions Count advances an important and solid contribution by showing "that it is feasible to bring down the concept of institutions from the heights of theoretical speculation to the level of concrete empirical analysis" (p. 187). The first two chapters establish the theoretical and empirical foundations of the book, which are masterfully applied by several authors to five Latin American countries: Chapter Three examines institutional

change and development in Argentina; Chapter Four does the same in Chilean market society; Chapter Five studies institutions in Colombia; Chapter Six in the Dominican Republic; and Chapter Seven in Mexico. While the majority of edited volumes in the social sciences use a more or less coherent set of knowledge to tackle an issue, Alejandro Portes and Lori D. Smith's edited volume reminds us that edited books can be cohesive and insightful when authors agree to use the same theoretical and empirical framework throughout the manuscript.

Chapter One succinctly reviews the vast literature on institutions and development, focusing on classic works of economists and sociologists that examine the role of power, norms, and culture. The authors' interest in causal arguments leads them to build a framework in which they can identify the interactions between actors and their social structure while taking into account questions of path dependence and diffusion. Chapter Two presents "the comparative study of institutions" (p. 24), which provides a clear and transparent research design for the study and comparison of institutions. The authors select five economic, technical, and social institutions: 1) stock exchanges, 2) tax authorities, 3) public health, 4) postal systems, and 5) civil aviation authorities.

Building on existing research, the authors focus on six factors that have been associated with bureaucratic quality and developmental performance: "1) meritocratic recruitment and promotion, 2) immunity from bribe taking and 'capture' by special interests . . . 3) absence of entrenched 'islands of power' capable of subverting institutional rules to their own ends . . . 4) proactivity or the ability of the organization to involve itself with clients, users, and other relevant actors in its institutional environment . . . 5) technological flexibility and openness to external innovation, and 6) countervailing power, either by the organization itself or its external allies, to prevent control by particularistic interests" (pp. 29–32).

Chapters Four through Seven present year-long studies of target institutions in each country, and Chapter Eight summarizes and assesses the findings from the case studies, focusing on the two outcomes of interest: "1) institutional adequacy, or the extent to

which really existing organizations correspond to their original institutional blueprints; and 2) contribution to development, or the extent to which each organization makes a contribution to the socioeconomic development of the nation in its sphere of activity" (p. 167).

Overall, the authors find "a marked divide between organizations and agencies whose prime mission is economic and those that focus on services for the general population" (p. 178). By their assessment, the former are more successful. The authors also find that "while Chilean institutions are comparatively the strongest in the region, Colombian ones are the weakest" (p. 184).

Institutions Count is a solid and thoughtful book that provides students, scholars, and policy makers with insightful material to understand, study, and change existing institutions in the region and elsewhere. The book would have benefited from a lengthier discussion—or better explanation—of its case selection. While the authors claim that "the countries selected cover the geographic length of Latin America, from south to north, and represent a fair sample of the relative levels of development found in the region" (p. 26), it is hard to imagine that institutions in the Dominican Republic have much in common with those in Argentina. Furthermore, building on the authors' argument that context matters, economic, social, historical, and cultural factors (variables) seem to vary significantly across cases.

In addition, clientelism, a persistent and consolidated practice in these countries, seems to have a significant effect on institutional performance and development. Yet, while several authors mentioned its effects in the cases of Colombia, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico, its effects are muted for the cases of Argentina and Chile. Incorporating clientelism as a form of particularistic politics would have aided the institutional analysis developed in the book. Still, the well-crafted theory and methodology developed in the book and masterfully applied in the case studies make this edited volume required reading for scholars in the social sciences and beyond who are interested in institutions in general, and in Latin America in particular.

Worlds of ScienceCraft: New Horizons in Sociology, Philosophy, and Science Studies, by **Sal Restivo, Sabrina M. Weiss, and Alexander I. Stingl**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2014. 231 pp. \$149.95 cloth. ISBN: 9781409445272.

STEPHEN T. CASPER
Clarkson University
scasper@clarkson.edu

Toward the close of their prologue in *Worlds of ScienceCraft*, Sal Restivo, Sabrina M. Weiss, and Alexander I. Stingl write that their objective in this volume is to "allow our convergences to give birth to a new iteration of technoscience that we call *ScienceCraft*," but,

If you come to this book looking for consistency, ultimate answers, coherence, and lucidly constructed orders you will be disappointed. If you understand that our intersection is also the intersection of the postmodern moment, an inflection point, a cusp characterized by a movement from old to new cultural and epistemic regimes you will be better prepared for the journey you are about to embark on (p. xvii).

This is a fairly apt summation of the book that follows with the perhaps obvious outcome that the resulting volume is difficult and dense. In my opinion, most readers will feel disappointed by the overall execution, which is poorly edited, feels rushed and provisional, and often meanders.

What is *ScienceCraft*? I confess that I have no clear answer to this question. Nor, as the passage quoted above implies, are the authors much interested in providing one. The origins of their program appear to have emerged out of three premises: First, that the production of knowledge in the immediate moment has reached a crisis point—a Spenglerian phase of decline—in terms of methods, theories, and limits. Second, that for a future society to navigate, respond to, and move beyond this crisis, it will be necessary for everyone (scholars, researchers, engineers, policy-makers, etc.) to resist the urge to "purify" knowledge