neglected in Anglophone political theory, Topper characterizes Bourdieu's work as involving the explication of "the precise ways in which contingent social norms, practices, and structures become 'naturalized'" and thus is intended "to open new spaces of political agency and resistance, to liberate social and political actors by enabling them to shape and act upon those forces that previously shaped and acted upon them, and to facilitate interventions in those chains of causality that restrict the development of more vital democratic institutions and practices" (p. 157). By attending to the nondiscursive sources of what Topper calls "ordinary violences," such as in linguistic or cultural competences, Bourdieu exposes dimensions of power that "are neither simply consented to nor simply imposed" (p. 180) and are otherwise opaque to the view of many institutionally centered approaches in political science.

Having put Bourdieu forward as a style of inquiry that conforms to the basic tenets of his pragmatic hermeneutics, Topper returns, in his concluding chapter, to Perestroika and the calls for methodological pluralism. Here, Topper claims that he is staking out a unique position by claiming that, rather than affixing positive or negative judgments to this or that method, "we are likely to gain better purchase on the stakes of methodological debates if we examine closely the potential gains and losses that attend the use of particular methodological approaches in specific contexts" (p. 189). Using Bourdieu's work as a benchmark, Topper then assesses several well-known examples of work either in the area of quantitative research or rational choice theory. His judgments here may be controversial, but his points are generally well taken and his larger intention to provide the basis for judging the contributions to political inquiry of specific works rather than to advance either monolithic dogmas or anything goes vacuities should be welcomed.

Topper likely overstates the public political stakes in the methodology wars—it is doubtful that anyone beyond the shores of academe is really paying attention—but that does not diminish the value of this responsibly thoughtful book to those of us trying to negotiate our way through the reefs.

AMERICAN POLITICS

The U.S. Women's Movement in Global Perspective.
Edited by Lee Ann Banaszak. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005. 288p. $72.00 cloth, $27.95 paper.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070296

— Lorraine Bayard de Volo, *University of Colorado, Boulder*

This pathbreaking edited volume combines a classic article with 10 original essays to present a comparative examination of the women's movement. As the title indicates, analyses largely revolve around the U.S. case, with comparison carried out over time or in relation to cases in other countries. In bringing together this group of prominent and emerging scholars of women's movements to place the United States in international perspective, this volume works to fill a large gap in the literature.

This set of essays is effectively geared toward two audiences. Because of the combination of rich detail and sophisticated yet accessible development of theory, it is ideally suited for courses on gender, politics, and social movements. At the same time, social movement scholars will find a generous array of top-notch theory building based upon new material derived from primary sources.

In her introductory chapter, volume editor Lee Ann Banaszak lays out three theoretical concepts that orient the essays that follow: resource mobilization, political opportunities, and ideational factors (i.e., frames, discourse, identity, and culture). Banaszak rightly emphasizes that these concepts often causally intersect rather than function independently, an argument confirmed by many of the chapters (p. 17). The importance of preexisting communications networks, as argued in Freeman's classic essay "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement" republished in this volume, is also a theme in many of the chapters (p. 27). Using the Banaszak and Freeman chapters as keystones, volume contributors build theory relating to the causes and consequences of the women's movement, producing an unusually rich and cohesive volume.

All of the nine original substantive chapters have merits, yet several deserve special mention. Nancy Whittier presents a brilliant comparison of the second and third waves of the U.S. women's movement, providing new insights through which to better understand and place into perspective this latter wave. She argues that both the radical "younger branch" of the second wave and the third wave are best understood as grassroots organizations that share a nonbureaucratic approach to many of the same issues of concern to women, despite an otherwise significant political generational divide.

Lisa Baldez and Celeste Montoya Kirk compare Chile and the United States for a sophisticated inquiry into the conditions triggering women's collective action. They point to two changes in political opportunities. First, a shift in political context generates a new rhetorical framework conducive to women's coalition building. Second, a common "precipitant" prompts women's mobilization—the perceived failure in both cases of male officials to act on women's concerns (p. 136). These authors are particularly adept at making clear the interdependence of their guiding theoretical concepts.

In another intriguing case, Carol Nechemias compares three women's movements within Russia, examining each case in terms of resource mobilization, political opportunity structure, and cultural framing. The result is a fascinating exploration of these theoretical concepts that is enhanced by rich empirical detail.

In the U.S. cases examined here, "the women's movement" refers to the contemporary feminist movement, including both its second and third waves. However, as many of the "global" chapters on Chile (Baldez and Kirk), Japan (Gelb), and Russia (Nechemias) show, women collectively organize over an array of issues not limited to feminist concerns with citizenship and equality. For example, women in Russia and Chile mobilized in response to militarized violence against their children. A notable difference between this U.S.-centric volume and studies that are more broadly comparative is the lack of theoretical attention to nongovernmental organizations. The expanding attention to NGOs in the literature of the comparative politics and international relations subfields is rapidly eclipsing attention to social movements. In this volume, the term *NGO* does not appear in the index, although Nechemias' chapter on Russian women's organizing clearly demonstrates their importance.

This suggests a limitation in this volume's approach. The first half of the book deals exclusively with U.S. cases. In the second half, the U.S. women's movement is compared to Chile (Baldez and Kirk), Russia (Nechemias), Japan (Gelb), and England and Ireland (Rohlinger and Meyer) in search of common causal pathways across all women's movements. However, because the questions, terminology, and foci themselves arise primarily from U.S. research as opposed to a more global reading, the volume misses the opportunity to enrich American politics with the vast array of research on women's organizing outside of the United States. Future research would do well to build upon the findings in this volume by comparing the causes and consequences of self-proclaimed feminist movements with those of other types of women's movements. Furthermore, what are the implications of the "NGO-ization" of women organizing globally? Has this process impacted the U.S. women's movement? More importantly, as suggested by Banaszak in her concluding chapter, how has the international activism and funding of the U.S. women's movement impacted women overseas (p. 221)? The U.S. women's movement, with its relatively significant pool of resources, access to media, and ability to impact foreign policy, can impact women's lives in other societies. This volume has taken great strides in understanding the domestic consequences to U.S. women's activism. The next step, urgently needed, is to better understand the international consequences of U.S. women's overseas activism. Does microcredit to poor women empower them or entrench their marginalization (p. 221)? Does a focus on female genital cutting or forced veiling serve to liberate women from particularly brutal patriarchies or suggest a type of feminist imperialism that ignores these women's own understanding of their interests?

Admittedly, such concerns are beyond the scope of this volume. All the contributors are to be commended for sticking closely to the questions and concepts laid out by Banaszak. Even though each essay stands well on its own, when taken together the effect is even greater, sure to inspire future projects ranging from senior honor's theses to collaborative research grants.

Common Ground: Committee Politics in the U.S. House of Representatives. By John Baughman. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006. 272p. $50.00.
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707070302

— Stanley P. Berard, *Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania*

A handful of scholars have devoted attention in recent years to the dynamics of standing committee jurisdictions in the U.S. Congress. This is an important focus because congressional rules and procedures give committees a central role in the legislative process and because the increasingly complex policy environment of recent decades has made clear demarcations of subject matter jurisdiction more difficult. How Congress resolves overlapping committee jurisdictions can affect both the deliberative quality and the substantive outcomes of policymaking. This is an important point of departure for reading John Baughman's new book.

Baughman opens by describing academic and journalistic accounts of the contentious nature of jurisdictional politics among congressional committees. He questions this conventional wisdom, noting that reliance on the "war stories" that reporters and staffers tell is likely to skew our evidence of committee interaction toward the more confrontational episodes. This bias is also evident in academic work: The most sustained scholarly treatment to date on the evolution of committee jurisdictions, David C. King's *Turf Wars* (1997), casts its light on committees (like House Commerce) that aggressively use the rules to add new issues to their own jurisdictions. Such behavior often precipitates conflict with other committees that have a claim to the same turf, but it represents only one slice of a wider range of committee interaction. If cooperative relations characterize any substantial share of jurisdictional negotiations between committees, then our theories of intercommittee politics need to be broadened to account for cooperation.

From this point of departure, Baughman develops a theory of the conditions under which committees will engage in cooperation or conflict over jurisdiction and connects his theory to the three extant models of legislative organization. He bases his theory in transaction cost economics, which contributes the key insight that cooperative bargains are more likely to occur between committees that have a history of interaction with each other and