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drugs, the authors suggest four issues that need scholarly investigation: (1) discrimination in the plea bargaining process; (2) different treatment of African American female and male defendants; (3) the importance of the race of the victim; and (4) discrimination in the formal parts of the criminal justice process. In addition, these authors note the paucity of investigation regarding the decision to reject bail and the dismissal of charges once filed. Citing ambiguous and contradictory data on minority youth crime, the authors briefly discuss the discretionary power of the juvenile justice system and its severe impact on employment opportunities for African American youth upon release.

These essays may not provide new data, but their historical comparisons offer food for thought and suggestions for further research.


Reviewer: JAMES J. DOWD, University of Georgia

It is interesting to consider the corrosive and redefining properties of time and history. The challenge to mainstream sociology posed by the ethnomethodological "movement," as some (see Pierce J. Flynn's The Ethnomethodological Movement 1991) consider the writing and research of Garfinkel, Cicourel, Sacks and others to be, no longer seems quite so interesting. In fact, in the wake of the postmodernist surge, this challenge seems remarkably conservative in its insistence on the precise analysis of carefully coded conversations and other discourse. Hilbert's analysis of the elective affinities between ethnomethodology and the writings of Durkheim and Weber has much to recommend it but also suffers from a lack of originality that, given the author's focus on the arcane niceties of whether Parsons or Garfinkle provides a better reading of Durkheim and Weber, consigns this book to the farther reaches of the shelf.

The central themes of Hilbert's argument have already been developed in John Heritage's Garfinkle and Ethnomethodology (1984), which Hilbert cites with admiration. Hilbert's thesis is that Parsons, while justifiably important for his integration of classical writers like Weber and Durkheim, also suppressed some of their essential insights and directly negated some of their other lines of argument. Parsons's student, Garfinkle, in his empirical ethnomethodological studies, reclaims these suppressed and negated themes in Durkheim and Weber. In this sense, ethnomethodology is true to the classics. Ethnomethodology is much closer to Durkheim's original analysis of anomie, for example, than is Parsons, who claimed that anomie leads to behavior breakdown. Ethnomethodology is also much closer to the Weberian emphasis on the empirical study of ideas in history than is Parsons's preference for conceptual work. For Weber, the normative order has no place at all in sociology while, for Parsons, it exists as a second, separate order apart from a factual order. While Hilbert is on solid ground in his critique of Parsons's claim that a normative order exists separately from and prior to the factual order of behavior, the deconstruction of the Parsonsian claim that values drive behavior is not original with Hilbert but has been accomplished by others, most notably by Swidler in her oft-cited paper, "Culture in Action" (1986).

Apart from offering an apologia for ethnomethodology, Hilbert also claims to show that functionalism should be understood as a good instance of Weberian
rational-legal bureaucratization. His intent, then, is not only to provide a strong rationale for ethnomethodology's support of sociology's most productive traditions, but also to demonstrate, as if such demonstration were necessary, that the functionalism of Parsons is flawed. Ironically, however, one is left more sympathetic to Parsons after reading Hilbert than one may have been before. It makes little sense, after all, to insist that because one may gain a new appreciation of Weber or Durkheim after a close reading of Garfinkle, earlier readings of the classics such as, in the present case, Parsons's own classical interpretation from The Structure of Social Action must therefore be false.

Neither is Hilbert persuasive in his argument that it has been Durkheim, Weber, and Parsons, rather than the phenomenologists Schutz and Husserl, who have served as the major influences on Garfinkle. The influence of Schutz and Husserl, as well as Parsons, on the sociological imagination of Garfinkle cannot be gainsaid. Not only did Garfinkle attend lectures by Schutz, cite his work continually, and incorporate phenomenological ideas and assumptions into his own work, but his teacher (Parsons) himself is known to have carried on a lengthy correspondence with Schutz.

Toward the end of this book, Hilbert completes his case on behalf of ethnomethodology's importance to sociology by arguing for its compatibility on key issues with other sociological theories such as neofunctionalism, Collins's conflict theory, Giddens's structuration theory, and even Marxism (not to mention Durkheimian and Weberian approaches that had been examined previously). In summary, then, Hilbert offers a provocative and informative discussion of ethnomethodology's roots in the classics, via its encounter with Parsons. Since Garfinkle's project is a radically empirical one, it has never fully developed its theoretical implications or retraced its own theoretical lineage. It is this latter task that Hilbert has successfully accomplished in this work.

**Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory**


**Reviewer: JEFFREY K. O LiCK, Columbia University**

On the evidence of this book, Iwona Irwin-Zarecka is a dedicated and good teacher. *Frames of Remembrance* lays out in an accessible, interesting, and thorough manner major methodological and substantive issues in social memory studies. She demonstrates to the novice sociologist as well as to those new to the specialty why we should care about memory. She discusses the multiple forms it may take and roles it may play and gives good advice about how to study it. The book is impressive in the scope of issues it raises and examples it provides, and it is filled with good common sense for those headed into the field.

The book is divided into three major sections. In the first, Irwin-Zarecka justifies a sociological approach to memory and provides a basic orientation drawn on Goffman's frame theory. In the second section, called "Dynamics of Relevance," she reviews various modes, locations, and processes of collective remembrance, including its contribution to identity, its essentially contested nature, its embeddedness in material and popular culture and contemporary politics, as well as its connections with images of the future. The third section focuses more on the social action involved in memory production, including the social organization of