attractive young female hostesses, and are willing to pay for these opportunities in whatever contexts become available. Perhaps to encounter this type of “essentialist” argument, Zheng’s narrative of a “coarsening of masculine identity”—illustrated in men preferring nude hostesses in 2004 to the “cultured courtesans” of the Qing era (p. 245)—purports to show a changing pattern of male sexual desire, but this historical trajectory is not as well-grounded empirically as her first-hand account. For example, nude shows were popular throughout China in the Republican era, and there is little evidence that completely nude hostesses will remain in fashion for long in contemporary China, or even that they are popular at all. Zheng’s concern with hostess’s dignity is politically well placed, but I am unsure whether the answer lies in constructing an increasingly pathological Chinese masculine sexuality. To describe sex work simply as “humiliation” seems dangerously close to advocating harsher criminal penalties, which is clearly not Zheng’s intent. The more pertinent critique focuses on the system of illegality and official corruption that results in women losing control over their workplaces.

The concept of “patriarchy” becomes the primary theoretical category for explaining the social relations of sex work in China. With patriarchy as a master category, the huge distinctions we can find, for example, between the practices of karaoke hostessing in China and Japan find little explanation. The strongest and most original theoretical formulations in the book concern the unique distinctions in reform-era China between rural and urban residency. Zheng’s accounts of women’s attempts to remake themselves as modern urbanites through fashion consumption ring very true, and provide a useful contribution not only to the literature on sex work but also to that on urban–rural migration. The same patterns of harsh discrimination against rural people may partly explain the cruel social and sexual treatment to which these women become subject within the nightclubs.

This book is one whose flaws are also very nearly virtues, because they are generally revealed with a highly transparent and reflexive ethnographic account that gains in authority from its honest treatment of the researchers’ encounters with both the world of the hostess and the world of American academia. We see where Tiantian Zheng is coming from, and we see what she has seen and experienced. We are thus in a strong position to interpret the evidence she presents, making this a very useful monograph for teaching in both undergraduate and graduate courses.

James Farrer
Sophia University


Lena Y. Zhong is presented as one of “a new generation of Chinese criminologists, trained in the West” (p. x). Her book is based on her University of Hong Kong PhD thesis. It examines changes in crime during China’s reform years, with a focus on the “overnight city”, Shenzhen. The book moves beyond the thesis thematically, but its
structure and presentation still have the feel of a thesis. The reader has to push through several chapters of extended literature review and historical background before reaching the core of the study which discusses “social capital” as it is deployed in the explanation of grass-roots community crime prevention in Shenzhen.

The book essentially asks whether Chinese communitarianism has provided a viable approach to China’s changing criminal reality and whether the notion of “social capital” has any value in the Chinese context. Zhong’s cross-cultural perspective makes for interesting reading. She argues that there is a lot of “social capital” in the Chinese context that revolves around guanxi, the household registration system (hukou), the neighborhood committee and the work unit (danwei). The “social capital” of these agencies is critical to the success of what has been called in China the “comprehensive management of public order”. The book’s analysis focuses on the development of community crime prevention based on “Building Little Safe and Civilized Communities”, within the highly transition context of Shenzhen. Zhong’s surveying brings together a comparative reading of both a strong and a weak community experience in Shenzhen’s crime prevention campaigning.

Zhong attempts to correct the over-emphasis on individual versus society in Western observation of China by focusing on the positive correlation of “bonding”, or “localized capital” with “bridging capital”. She argues that an “integrated model” of crime prevention needs to consider the “strong ties between family member and neighbours” as well as the “weak ties with outside communities and between communities, formal institutions (including laws and norms), and state–community interactions”. The reader is then advised of the importance of “both the internal and external dynamics of a social structure” (p. 98). Such analysis of China’s specific situation naturally raises the question of the relation between the state and society in Chinese community crime prevention. The analysis does acknowledge a blurring between “formal” and “informal social control in the Chinese context” (p. 218). Indeed, the state and society are very closely tied together through Party leadership of the process of the comprehensive management of public order.

Zhong is wary of what is described as a non-empirical Chinese criminology that is politically inspired and appears to endorse Turk’s statement: “Formal agencies make informal groups the locus of social control” (p. 218). “Social capital” in China is discussed with appropriate consideration of the changing nature of the household registration system, the work unit and the neighborhood committee in the heightened and complex deepening of economic reform. “Comprehensive management”, however, does presume that these key institutions work alongside formal state structures, the “comprehensive” range of which will vary depending on the politically determined focus of crime fighting.

The concluding analysis notes that dichotomies of informal and formal social control imply “an underlying theme”, namely, “the role of the state” (p. 224). However, “the role of the state” is integral and highly explicit as it seeks to unify formal and informal dimensions of crime control from within a top-down as well as horizontally comprehensive management of public order. What then is the relation between the state and social capital? Perhaps the state mobilizes the latter and is
effectively in the driver’s seat. Or perhaps the state is in retreat, given the new complexities of the market era. In my view, it is highly unlikely that an informal control network can exist outside state control in China.

Zhong recognizes that more research will be needed to measure the effectiveness of changing Chinese communitarian approaches. She explores the implications of the *danwei* system. The latter can no longer provide the same level of social welfare, and it cannot make the same contribution to social control. Her argument that policy professionalization does not inversely guarantee a decline in informal mass line mechanisms is also persuasive. Further, the appearance of private as distinct from public crime prevention is discussed as it complicates the state’s objective in encouraging the formation of “bridging social capital”.

Zhong is concerned about the gap between “criminology” and “criminal policy” in China. One suspects, however, that the Chinese strategy for the prevention of crime draws creatively from an extraordinary domestic organizational experience that has adapted to one of the most profound socio–economic transitions of our time. Under China’s circumstances, Chinese “communitarianism” may actually demonstrate a highly adaptive deployment of social capital. Many more studies may be needed before we can reach a definitive conclusion. In the meantime, this book supports a more deliberate interaction between Chinese and Western criminologies and should make the reader think.

Shumei Hou
Griffith Asia Institute, Griffith University


In recent years the policies and principles of the Chinese Party-state with regard to religion have changed. Religions are now conceived to play a positive role in social development, representing positive values and contributing to the development of a harmonious society. In the last decade, Western scholarship has extensively examined these changes, analyzing modifications in central state policies and the revitalization of religious activities, including popular religion. This book edited by Yoshiko Ashiwa and David L. Wank conceptualizes the interrelationship between the state and religion from a somewhat different perspective. It shows that both religious élites and the various echelons of the state are interested in institutionalizing religion and religious activities, as well as in opposing “superstition”. The editors argue that, during the process of modernization, the politics of modern “religion” is constituted by ongoing negotiations between various state and non-state actors. This leads to specific patterns of interweaving, bargaining and shared interests between state agencies on the one hand and religious actors on the other. This book’s objective is thus to display the emergence of a concept of modern religion during the process of China’s state-building.