

“demands a rearticulation of the relationships between what are traditionally perceived as conceptually distinct analytical categories of difference,” such as race and gender (p. 122). After a discussion of the role of narrative in intersectional thought, particularly regarding bridge building across categories, Hancock considers the process of naming and the political and representational power inherent in that process. She lays out the intellectual bonds between “intersectionality-like thought” and the development of social constructivism, arguing that “intersectionality-like thinking about how power is relationally constituted predates and anticipates Michel Foucault’s well-known arguments about power” (p. 164).

In the conclusion, Hancock returns to some of the critiques of intersectionality research, in particular the argument that intersectional research focuses solely on the marginalized aspects of identity, ignores issues such as sexuality and religion, and/or is too focused on the experiences of women of color to “travel” and be able to shed light on other phenomena (p. 195). While acknowledging the many responses that intersectional scholars have made to these claims, she lays out two additional values of intersectional research—its ability to reshape “the relationships among and between categories of difference,” and the fact that “intersectionality’s engagement with the concept of ‘experience’ is distinct from many mainstream engagements with experience in ways that distance it from the standard inclusionary arguments and assumptions of homogeneity associated with identity politics” (p. 196). These insights seem especially valuable in the current political moment.

Considering future directions for intersectionality studies, Hancock builds on Sumi Cho, Kimberlé Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall in arguing that intersectional scholarship should have centrifugal or centripetal foci. Centrifugal work “asks theoretical and methodological questions as intersectionality travels across disciplines in a more integrative mode” (p. 200). Centripetal work takes “intersectionality as its foundation and strikes out on the margins of various disciplines toward methodologies that would do justice to the interventions the normative tenets of intersectionality aspire to implement in order to transform the world we live in” (p. 201). While these foci do not necessarily encompass the entirety of potential types of appropriate and ethical intersectional work, Hancock’s framing gives scholars useful ways to consider their place within this larger body of literature, while reminding them to be certain to consider the intellectual history of intersectionality research when conducting their analyses.

The book’s two greatest contributions are its attempt to break intersectionality as a concept into its key epistemological and conceptual parts and the delineation of intersectionality-like thinking across historical time, na-

tional boundaries, various racial groups, and disciplines. Hancock makes clear that her goal is not to ignore or dislodge the key role that black women have played in creating intersectionality-like claims throughout history. She resists the idea that expanding the diversity of contributors to this area of social thought by definition decenters black women. Rather, she concludes that the richness of this tradition across groups and international borders must be appreciated. This means that scholars must “respect the coherence of the theory” and “read across disciplines, across continents, and across communities of engagement so that we might engage in careful and responsible management of a burgeoning field of study” (p. 201).

Given the complexity of this area of inquiry, no single book can capture all possible aspects of intersectional thought, the breadth of which Hancock alludes to and the popularity of which is reflected in the impressive citation counts she reports for Kimberlé Crenshaw’s and Patricia Hill Collins’s seminal works (p. 13). Clearly, as Hancock acknowledges, there are important areas of the field that are beyond the scope of this book. What is unique about her effort is its deep historical roots and its interdisciplinarity. That breadth, including her exploration of intersectionality’s activist roots, comprises an important resource for present-day scholars engaged in intersectional work and a more accurate and comprehensive intellectual history of this approach than has been available until now.

As someone who teaches a graduate seminar on using intersectionality in empirical research, I know how difficult it is to explain a concept that upsets key, often unquestioned, ontological assumptions that many researchers have concerning what categories such as race and gender are and why they are meaningful within our social world. Hancock deftly walks her readers through this complex terrain, providing new sources to read, new ways of reading old ones, and a conceptual framing that allows the reader to make sense of a very complex, and ontologically destabilizing, intellectual orientation. *Intersectionality* should be required reading for graduate courses in race, feminist theory, and women in politics. Its clarity ensures that it would be appropriate for use with advanced undergraduates as well.

Firms as Political Entities: Saving Democracy Through Economic Bicameralism. By Isabelle Ferreras. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 226p. \$99.99 cloth, \$28.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592718001299

— Abraham Singer, *Loyola University Chicago*

If we think of the changes in work and human labor over the past three centuries, we might characterize them as a movement from private to public. First, with the

industrial and commercial revolutions of the eighteenth century, work was brought out of the domestic sphere and into public *space*, simultaneously socializing it and freeing it from traditional domestic norms and hierarchies. Second, with the labor movements and socialist programs of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, attempts were made to bring work fully into the public sphere by bringing it under the purview of public *norms*. This was borne out in the various attempts to democratize the workplace and bring it under the control of workers, just as democratic reformers and revolutionaries were attempting the same feat in the public sphere more broadly.

As Isabelle Ferreras notes in *Firms as Political Entities*, however, the latter half of the twentieth century saw this general movement stall. Work is still considered a private concern, thus enabling the persistence of domestic forms of hierarchy and domination within the public sphere. Ferreras's argument is that this stalling is the result of our understanding of the sort of institution that is the "firm." By conceiving of the workplace, and therefore work, in purely economic terms, we have missed other values at stake in the institution of the firm. To complete the movement of work from the private sphere to the public requires that we recognize the political and social nature of contemporary labor, and that we restructure the governance of firms accordingly.

On Ferreras's account, the development of economic theory led to a view of the firm as an institution fundamentally underwritten by instrumental rationality—the idea that human action is motivated solely by the intended achievement of some action-independent end. While various parties may interact with the firm in various ways, they do so for commons reasons, namely, to pursue self-interest, however understood. This theory, according to the author, has had the normative consequence of legitimating and justifying the shareholders' dominant position within the firm. If both labor and capital are engaging with the firm for instrumental reasons, then it makes practical and normative sense to place control in the group best positioned to make such instrumental judgments. On the economic theory's account, capital providers are structurally best situated for this charge because they own the right to residual profits and relate to the firm on purely monetary terms. Workers, in contrast, relate to the firm in more intimate ways, which obscures their instrumental judgment. Thus, the workers' subordination to the representatives of capital is legitimated, supposedly because it best secures the interests of *both* parties.

Ferreras argues that this theory is crucially flawed. While shareholders may be the best guarantor of instrumental rationality for the firm, the firm is not constituted solely by instrumentally motivated actors. In contrast to investors, she contends, workers are motivated by "expressive rationality" (p. 79) or by how their actions and experience in work are endowed with (or

robbed of) meaning and significance. Workers do not assess or understand work purely in terms of ends, but in terms of how autonomous it renders them, how included and useful they are made to feel, and how intrinsically interesting they find it. By mistaking instrumental rationality for the whole of the motivations that push parties to join and interact with the firm, the economic theory commits what Ferreras refers to, evocatively, as the "*reductio ad corporationem*" (p. 5): the reduction of the firm, and all its messy complicated meanings, into a mere investment vehicle—the corporation. Workers are made subordinate to shareholders within the workplace, not because it is inherently in their interest but because we misunderstand the nature of the firm as a purely economic institution.

The private rule of shareholder over worker, then, is without justification and illegitimate. Taking a cue from the historical development of democratic representation, Ferreras argues that the governance of the firm can only be made legitimate through the institution of bicameralism. Just as noble classes conceded power to a chamber of representatives elected by the people, thereby allowing for more legitimate and better government, so too must the firm come to be governed by two chambers, one representing shareholders and one representing workers. By institutionalizing the instrumental and expressive rationalities within the governance structure of the firm through these two chambers, she argues, we give labor its rightful influence in the firm, while retaining the various advantages brought by capital's instrumental mind-set. In so doing, not only do we bring the workplace more fully into the public sphere, but we also do it without sacrificing the massive gains in productivity that private capital investment has been able to secure.

By grounding critique and prescription in the idea of "expressive rationality," *Firms as Political Entities* refreshingly points us toward a path for critical reflection that is easily occluded by existing theories of capitalism. As Ferreras correctly notes, Marxists, despite their opposition to liberalism, often ground their critiques of capitalism and capitalist workplaces in similar instrumental assumptions about human action, which can lead them to miscomprehend human actions in ways similar to those of their liberal counterparts. By emphasizing the significance of expressive rationality, Ferreras offers a decidedly *political* account of the workplace, making good on the project of transcending the dichotomies and tensions inherent to "political economy" in a manner that other radical critiques sometimes fail to do.

That said, Ferreras sometimes tries to do too much with the concept of expressive rationality, often discounting how it will conflict with, and be constrained by, instrumental rationality. For starters, it is not so obvious that these concepts attach to parties as distinctively and

completely as she describes. Although the author is surely right that workers' relationship to the firm cannot be reduced to pure instrumentality, it cannot be reduced to mere expression either. She admits as much, though then discounts workers' instrumentality throughout the book. Laborers no doubt seek to find meaning in their work, but they also seek to get paid, and many will prioritize these elements differently, with some willing to sacrifice the intrinsic value they get for the other, action-independent ends they seek.

To illustrate this argument, consider worker cooperatives and nonprofit corporations (about which Ferreras says strangely little). These are firms where capital has no seat at the decision-making table, and yet we see them make deeply instrumental decisions often, if not most of the time: Nonprofits must tend to their bottom lines if they want to win grants and secure loans; worker cooperatives must choose the best marketing strategies in order to best their competition; and so forth. Instrumental rationality is not imposed solely by shareholders, but by the condition of modern commerce itself. Expressive rationality and instrumental rationality both inhabit the firm, yes, but not with each represented by one stakeholder group independently. Both instrumental and expressive rationalities can be found in messy disarray among shareholders and workers alike.

Once this is recognized, Ferreras's categorical call for economic bicameralism loses some normative force. "Expressive rationality" is meant to imply that the desire for democratic control already exists among workers, a desire that must merely be institutionally recognized. Surely, some workers want more control than they currently have, and they ought to be able to attain it. But given their instrumental motivations, some will also be willing to sacrifice such control to gain means (wages, free time, etc.) for other ends they seek. Given this, why should we see control as the *sine qua non* of legitimacy? Note here that Ferreras's claim that shareholders hold illegitimate rule over workers misses the fact that shareholders *do not actually rule* as much as it might seem. Instead, we find that shareholders tend to see more instrumental value in being passive investors than in expending the energy to actively participate. We cannot assume away the possibility that workers might have comparable considerations.

None of this discounts the significant merits of Ferreras's contribution. Aside from offering a useful historical and comparative survey of the different ways in which work is organized, the book's core insight—that a conceptual and normative account of the firm must recognize the importance of both expressive and instrumental rationality—is fundamentally sound and important. What weight we ought to accord these competing logics in the governance of the firm may not be answered completely in this work, but Ferreras has done a great

service by posing the question and illuminating the stakes involved.

Buddhism, Politics and Political Thought in Myanmar.

By Matthew J. Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. 244p. \$105.00 cloth, \$29.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592718001871

— Tun Myint, *Carleton College*

Myanmar (also known as Burma) stands today as having had the world's longest civil war, which was followed by a nominal political transition from military authoritarianism to democracy. However, whether Myanmar actually becomes a more democratic polity and society will depend on peacebuilding processes among diverse ethnic groups. In some ways, Myanmar's path to Hobbesian peace under Leviathan can be seen as the longest struggle to consolidate state power in Southeast Asia. Myanmar is ethnically and culturally the second most diverse country in Southeast Asia, with 135 ethnic groups, following Indonesia. Myanmar now openly faces enduring ethnic conflicts and wars, as well as ethno-religious conflicts between Arakan nationalist Buddhist communities and Muslim communities in Rakhine State. Numerous international observers have described the brutal crackdown on Rohingya Muslims by the Burmese quasi-military government composed of Buddhist Burmese and ethnic leaders, including 1991 Nobel Peace Laureate Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, as a textbook case of ethnic cleansing. Myanmar also faces land-grab conflicts, and conflict within Buddhist communities with the rise of nationalist groups. Under these social and political conditions, Myanmar's uncertain transition from military authoritarianism toward democracy has drawn much-needed scholarly attention.

Against this backdrop, Matthew J. Walton's *Buddhism, Politics and Political Thought in Myanmar* attempts to unravel the critical and contentious role of Theravada Buddhism in Burmese politics and political thought. Walton does this through the lenses of elites in both the Buddhist community, or *Sangha*, and political establishments within power politics. His main argument is "that, in order to understand the political dynamics of contemporary Myanmar, it is necessary to understand the interpretations of Buddhist concepts that underlay much of modern Burmese political thought" (p. 3). Walton also adds that perhaps this discourse and argument might help delineate the framework of Burmese Buddhism (p. 9). He describes his intended audience as "individuals situated outside that tradition and its specific moral tradition" (p. 21). By specifying his audience in this way, he makes clear that one of his purposes in writing the book is "to insist that there is such a thing as Burmese political thinking and that often it does not neatly overlap with common Western political concepts" (pp. 129–30).