into this project, which is impossible not to admire. There are a few instances admittedly where readers might have wished for a bit more trimming; fewer block quotes from the secondary literature would not have hurt the book, nor would the excision of some of the more sweeping claims about what drove "the entire history of the Church" (p. 102) or "the beginning of modernity" (p. 211).

Second, *Compromise* displays a striking and welcome methodological self-awareness. The author does justice to the complexity of his concept by noting the degree to which it resists study apart from a thick web of political and theoretical developments that shaped its evolution. In this respect, his approach to his subject is guided by the conviction, expressed by James Farr and quoted here approvingly, that "concepts are never held or used in isolation, but in constellations which make up entire schemes or belief systems" (p. 107). At the same time, this approach itself raises a challenge of which the author is well aware, namely, that if concepts can be fully understood only in the context of their relationship to other concepts—which themselves are tied to hosts of other concepts—inquiry into any single concept will need to determine for itself where and how far into this panoply of concepts it needs to go. Fumurescu answers this challenge in part by usefully invoking the "tunnel history" approach that he borrows from J. G. A. Pocock (p. 196; cf. p. 234). It is a welcome move that enables him to survey Spinoza and Locke and Hobbes without allowing his surveys to become sprawling; this approach is in fact so effective that some may wish that it had been employed elsewhere as well.

Third, this book is distinguished by its theoretical acumen. The author often shows himself to be not only a meticulous historian but also an innovative theorist, and offers a host of novel syntheses that deserve further attention, even if some rest on causal chains that might be difficult for readers without the author's erudition to assess. For example, there is the claim that in France, "increased pressure for conformity applied by absolutism on the *forum externum* had as a counterreaction a withdrawal of the individual into his *forum internum* which came to be understood—mistakenly, from a medieval perspective—as the sole repository and last bastion of uniqueness and authenticity, hence the fear of compromising one's inner self" (p. 114), or the claim that "British centrifugal individualism and the *collapse* of the two fora into one-dimensional man, once externalized, ended up with the total *estrangement* of the political from the personal, as a counterreaction to the politicization of the personal" (pp. 274–75; italics in the original).

Compromise begins and ends by suggesting that the failure to recover the dialectic of the individual here being traced will result in our being "condemned to run in the same ruts over and over again" (p. 23) and, indeed, "to run not in circles, but in a downward spiral, with frightening prospects" (p. 286). This message is likely to resonate with many, and while the book's recovery of this dialectic is principally executed at a conceptual and genealogical level rather than on normative grounds, it deserves and will reward the attention of contemporary theorists of its core concept, as well as the attention of historians of early modern political thought more broadly.

Conflicting Commitments: The Politics of Enforcing Immigrant Worker Rights in San Jose and Houston.

By Shannon Gleeson. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 2013. 272p. $69.95 cloth, $24.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592714001091

— Margaret Gray, *Adelphi University*

Undocumented workers experience a range of labor abuses. One of the most common is wage theft: the underpayment of wages. The frequency with which this occurs speaks not only to the vulnerability of undocumented workers in the workplace but also to the fact that enforcement of labor rights for low-wage workers is often lacking. Moreover, employers do not expect these workers to make claims against them or to be successful when they do. At the same time, advocates—from both government and civil society—have played an active role in promoting the enforcement of labor rights. Despite the commonality of crimes against undocumented workers, different advocacy models have emerged across the United States.

Explaining why these differences occur is one of the main tasks taken on by Shannon Gleeson in *Conflicting Commitments*. Her argument, as you might expect, is that local political culture shapes advocates' responses. Political culture influences the resources available to help immigrant workers and determines whether such efforts have allies or opponents. What is less predictable about this study is the author's impressive analysis of exactly how this process occurs.

Gleeson offers a comparative study between the metropolitan regions of Houston, Texas and San Jose, California. For her comparison, she relies on 90 interviews that she conducted with advocates for immigrant worker rights in these two cities and 50 interviews with immigrant restaurant workers. In addition, she relies on primary and secondary literature to offer a national context that makes this a well-rounded study of immigrant worker rights. Gleeson not only offers examples of labor abuses and advocate remedies but also gives the reader an overview of turn-of-the-century low-wage work.

Although these cities have similar immigration histories, their political cultures differ greatly. Gleeson finds that San Jose has a strong union movement, which has friendly relations with local politicians who aim to incorporate immigrants into the community. In addition, the state of California has some of the strongest labor laws in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001091 Published online by Cambridge University Press

country. Houston, however, "can't even spell worker rights" (p. 97), and its pro-business lobby has successfully limited regulations and created an anti-union atmosphere. Moreover, anti-immigrant sentiment has led to a call for aggressive immigration enforcement and attempts to shut down services for the undocumented. A telling example of this difference between the cities is that while San Jose was implementing programs such as "Safe Neighborhoods" and "Hate Free Communities" (pp. 107–9) to define itself as a welcoming, sanctuary city for immigrants, Houston immigrant advocates working in a hostile environment spearheaded "Protect Yourself!" (p. 132) to educate immigrants about their labor rights.

Gleeson describes San Jose advocates as having a "specialized division of labor" in which government agencies and civil society organizations each focus on what they do most effectively and otherwise defer to the expertise of others. In San Jose, federal and state agencies do a competent job of addressing workers' claims, including wage theft. Nonprofit legal services might play a role in ushering workers through the state bureaucracy, while unions, faith groups, and allies can organize workers. In the meantime, labor and immigrant rights organizations lobby for political change.

Houston has a much different advocacy system, which Gleeson calls a "diversified division of labor." Here, collaboration is vital, as no one group has sufficient resources or political support to address the needs of low-wage, immigrant workers. Furthermore, the state bureaucracy to address undocumented workers is much weaker than in California. As a result, federal agencies, local government, unions, and nonprofits must work in coalition to help workers press their claims. Notably, the main state agency, the Texas Workforce Commission, has been a minimal participant. This agency has only one office in the state (in Austin). However, such logistical limitations are not the only barriers for labor law enforcement, as problems within legal and political structures themselves also create obstacles. The main Houston legal aid organization is barred from helping the undocumented, and the state legislature passed a law that capped the fees of private attorneys for this sort of work at $400.

Differentiating the political contexts and the advocacy response is only one layer of Gleeson's accomplishments. Chapter 1—a great primer for undergraduates—offers a succinct overview of immigrant labor at the turn of the twenty-first century, explains the postindustrial work economy, and describes the main areas of labor rights (wages and hours, health and safety, discrimination protection, and the right to organize). In Chapter 2, Gleeson's examination of state and federal agencies is firmly placed in the contradictory federal mandates of serving workers and enforcing immigration laws. This chapter also fully describes the efforts of labor enforcement agencies to distance themselves from immigration enforcement, with mixed success. Chapter 3 investigates the local political cultures of the author's two cases by comparing their political histories, the role of unions in each site, the devolution of immigration enforcement to local authorities, and the overall climate toward immigrant workers.

Chapter 4, which I found to be the most animated chapter (probably reflecting my own interest in the ways in which immigrant workers are directly served), explains the development of civil society's labor enforcement strategies in each city, details the specialized and diversified divisions of labor among advocates, and gives example after rich example of the different agencies and organizations and how, together and separately, they work to promote workers claims, creatively empower immigrant laborers, and advocate new policies. How these mechanics play out offers a striking distinction between the ways in which workers are served in San Jose versus the ways they are assisted in Houston. One might be tempted to conclude that undocumented immigrant workers are better served by the specialized division of labor in San Jose than by the diversified one in Houston, but Gleeson steers clear of such judgments (even when you wish she would take sides). Instead, she outlines the pros and cons of both models. Her main point, however, is not that one model is better; rather, she is focused on explaining why the different models emerged.

Gleeson's work nicely complements existing studies of immigrant advocacy (e.g., Janice Fine, *Worker Centers*, 2006; Jennifer Gordon, *Suburban Sweatshops*, 2007). Her examination offers a unique contribution in two regards. First, she closely examines how government agencies work alongside civil society networks. Second, she introduces a transnational dimension by explaining how the Mexican consulate, which has offices across the United States, has become a hybrid institution that plays an important role in promoting labor enforcement (Chapter 5). The role of the consulate exemplifies the difference between the specialized and diversified divisions of labor. In Houston, the consulate is on the front line of labor advocacy, helping to fill an institutional gap and directly aiding workers in pursuing their claims. This is quite distinct from the role of the consulate in San Jose, where it helps low-wage workers with grievances by referring them to government agencies and nonprofits. This allows the consulate to pursue other efforts, such as a campaign to thwart sexual harassment of female farmworkers.

In short, *Conflicting Commitments* is a well-documented, interesting, and important study of immigrant worker advocacy by government, nonprofits, and the Mexican consulate. It highlights how the balance of labor rights and immigration enforcement differ greatly depending on regional context. As such, Gleeson elucidates the contemporary "immigration debate" in a clear and accessible way.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001091 Published online by Cambridge University Press