

United States and elsewhere in the world (e.g., in Singapore and China) given its propensity for authoritarianism.

Hope for the future (and a potential fourth stage) lies, unsurprisingly given Harvey's neo-Marxian orientation, in the development of an organic, left alliance involving workers and racial, ethnic, and gender minorities. He also sees hope in a "stunning variety" of social movements spawned by the abuses associated with neoliberalism. Unfortunately, he mentions only a few of them (surprisingly there is no mention of the important move to the Left in several Latin American countries, especially Venezuela), and like most works of this type this book is strong on criticism, but weak on positive alternatives to the system being critiqued. Ultimately, Harvey (like Michael Polanyi) favors a system where limited freedoms of the market and profit are replaced by a broader set of freedoms, more open democracy, greater social equality, and greater justice in the economic, political, and cultural realms.

While important as a critique of hegemonic development, the book is not without its weaknesses. It is part academic and part popular trade book with the result that it is not fully satisfying as either. From an academic point of view, Harvey describes large-scale historical developments in very broad terms and offers similarly broad descriptions of developments in various societies (including a chapter devoted to China). Scholars who devote their attention to these developments and societies are likely to find Harvey's descriptions and speculations highly superficial. Then there is a tendency to blame neoliberalism for many of the world's ills; it is forced to carry a very heavy burden in this work. In spite of its weaknesses, Harvey's analysis and critique of neoliberalism rings (largely) true and constitutes a powerful call to arms against it and its many problems and abuses.

*Labor's Time: Shorter Hours, the UAW and the Struggle for American Unionism.* By Jonathan Cutler. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004. Pp. xi+236.

Jeffrey J. Sallaz  
*University of Arizona*

We Americans work too much. It is in our nature, our collective psyche. In colonial times we toiled for signs that we were among the saved; during our golden age of abundance to then spend what we had saved. If it is a mark of good sociology to break with commonsense assumptions, Jonathan Cutler's *Labor's Time* definitely qualifies. Cutler avoids the "short-circuit" fallacy of moving from individual psyches to social norms. He shows, through an institutional analysis of how a grassroots movement among workers for a shorter work week failed, that we must reconsider the origins of the overworked, overspent American.

The book documents a movement during the 1950s among U.S. autoworkers—living embodiments, according to Eli Chinoy, of the “American dream”—to reduce the standard work week from 40 to 30 hours. Though the UAW’s power was at its zenith, union leaders—namely, Walter Reuther—not only refused to fight at the national level for the 30-hour week, but actively suppressed workers and local officials who did. Drawing on archival data, Cutler explores how this process unfolded at Ford’s River Rouge factory in Michigan. The reasons workers wanted a 30-hour week are clear. They were willing to trade disposable income for extra leisure time, reducing hours would lessen deleterious effects of unemployment for the workforce as a whole, and furthermore, the 30-hour week would ameliorate racial inequalities inherent to the seniority system of handing layoffs during recessions.

Why the UAW leadership refused to take up the cause is less clear. Indeed, most of the book is dedicated to explaining not *why* Reuther fought the 30-hour movement but *how* he maintained his power despite repeatedly disclaiming workers’ demands and desires. The book’s central insight is that the UAW functioned at this juncture as an autonomous political field in which leaders were buffered via various institutional mechanisms from the rank-and-file. Evidence for his proposition is provided by the history of the political uses to which the 30-hour-week issue was put. “Nothing illustrates the urgency of a structural, rather than a motivational, analysis . . . than the fact that [Reuther] had once been a leading promoter of the shorter hours demand” (p. 16). Indeed, while ascending to power within the UAW in the late 1930s, Reuther championed a 32-hour workweek to win support from the rank-and-file. Upon becoming president, though, Reuther now argued that autoworkers desire “to make more things and to get more money to buy the more things we make. . . . We don’t want more leisure. We want more goods” (p. 37). This was in fact a misrepresentation of workers’ wishes, and one that made Reuther vulnerable. At River Rouge, local union president Carl Stellato led a grassroots movement for a 30-hour week, in response to which Reuther seized control of the local and labeled Stellato a communist. Union factions, in sum, repeatedly tried “to accumulate political capital among union members by championing the shorter workweek, only to spend that capital on various Cold War battles” (p. 176).

The implications for our understanding of labor politics and social movements are depressing. The main force driving action throughout the narrative is opportunism (a term Cutler frequently deploys, betraying his own antimotivational analytic pretensions). Here is a story begging for a hero, but instead we find twin antiheroes. We hold hope that Stellato, the uneducated line worker who becomes king of the Rouge, will act as an organic working-class leader. But he betrays the membership in the end, dropping the 30-hour cause and aligning with the UAW bureaucracy. Meanwhile Reuther, Romulus to Stellato’s Remus, has a final chance at redemption when in 1958 he unexpectedly champions the 30-hour causes

at the UAW national convention. But he drops the cause at the last minute, proposing in its place a corporatist profit-sharing plan roundly detested by workers. Depressing yes, but considering the demise of organized labor in the decades to come, it is hard to envision a different script.

*Labor's Time* would be a valuable addition to reading lists for graduate seminars in the areas of work and labor, political sociology, and American studies. But I do have two critiques. First, the introduction promises to link local struggles at the Rouge over a 30-hour week to "political discourses of race and labor in the postwar era" (p. 6). The analysis, though, rarely moves beyond the confines of the plant and the union bureaucracy. I wanted the author to fulfill the promise to extend outward. Was the 30-hour week championed by other unions and social movements, especially those representing racial minorities? What were the stances of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to the shorter hours proposal? Second, the author should have provided readers more road signs to guide them through the fascinating but often dense historical details on factional maneuvering within the plant. Subheadings within the chapters would have been helpful in this regard.

*Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy.* By Diana C. Mutz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xi+171. \$60.00 (cloth); \$20.99 (paper).

Marc Garcelon  
*Middlebury College*

Democratic political theory in American political science consistently argues that political activism and deliberation of opposing views represent complementary aspects of a democratic polity. On the basis of three nationwide representative surveys of Americans conducted in 1992, 1996, and 2000, Diana C. Mutz argues in *Hearing the Other Side* that in fact the two are at loggerheads, with deliberation of opposing views depressing levels of political activism, and activism in turn depressing deliberation of opposing views. The reasons for this standoff are straightforward. Mutz consistently found that deliberation of opposing positions—what she calls "cross-cutting views"—leads both to increased tolerance and more hesitation in taking sides, thus depressing enthusiasm for the bread-and-butter partisan activities that make up much of political activism. On the other hand, political activism leads to immersion in similar-minded political networks, thus depressing exposure to opposition views among friends and acquaintances. In short, political activism tends to select our exposure to contrary political opinions in the social networks of activities, while serious deliberation of opposing views often leads to political hesitancy and even withdrawal from political life.

Such realities confound basic assumptions of democratic political the-