

gence of nonideological freedom-seekers offers hope for positive change, which will not be found, she suggests, through the ballot box alone. Indeed, the 2015 elections, as well as the violence and polarization that characterized the election campaign, offer scant reason for optimism. A more significant criticism would be whether the sites of Turam's research are representative of something larger, or has she instead, in the parlance of social science, selected her cases on the dependent variable, highlighting isolated "zones of freedom" that are the exception rather than the norm. She anticipates and shrugs off such arguments, insisting that her goal is not generalizability but rather "to focus on a place that is capable of contesting, challenging, and puncturing holes in the seemingly indestructible supremacy of political rule" (p. 78). By that criterion, this book is successful and also enlightening by focusing on complex developments that are transpiring under the political headlines that often present developments in binary, black-and-white terms. While all readers may not share her essential optimism, this is a valuable book both for its rich ethnographic approach and for presenting an alternative, microlevel perspective to think about what democratization entails and how it can progress.

*Some Men: Feminist Allies and the Movement to End Violence against Women.* By Michael A. Messner, Max A. Greenberg, and Tal Peretz. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. Pp. xvi+256. \$99.00 (cloth); \$24.95 (paper).

Molly Dragiewicz  
*Queensland University of Technology*

In *Some Men* Michael Messner, Max Greenberg, and Tal Peretz provide a sympathetic account of men's work on men's violence against women in the United States since the 1970s. The book's most interesting contribution is as a collective historical account of men's antiviolence work. The book is based on interviews with 52 men who have worked in the field and a dozen of their female coworkers and mentors. It is focused on the United States, but there are a couple of Canadians in the mix. *Some Men* divides interviewees into generational groups based on shifting entry points into antiviolence activism: from social movements to university education and public health to intersectional community work.

Chapter 1, "This Is Men's Work," introduces the book with reflections on why men's antiviolence work is important by men from different generations. It introduces the history of feminist organizing to provide a foundation for the emergence of the cohorts in the book. The chapter also considers what it means to be a feminist ally and reviews key feminist contributions to theory and organizing on men's violence against women.

Chapter 2, "Diving In: The Movement Cohort, 1970s to 1980s," includes interviews with men and women who have been involved with feminism from

the early days of feminist and other progressive social movement organizing. This section reminds readers of the prefeminist cultural context of victim blaming, rape culture, and silence around violence against women. It stresses the centrality of violence against women as a political issue in early feminist organizing as well as the diversity of approaches involved. This chapter provides a useful counternarrative to claims that feminist antiviolence work is static, monolithic, and solely focused on criminal justice responses. It also reminds readers of the messy politics of social movement organizing and the challenges of ally work, especially around the discussion of the pornography debates that produced important divisions in approaches to antiviolence activism.

Chapter 3, "Digging In: The Bridge Cohort, Mid-1980s to 1990s," is based on interviews with men who largely came into antiviolence work via women's studies on university campuses. This cohort, beneficiaries of feminist work to institutionalize and mainstream antiviolence work, remained connected to feminist theories of violence generated by the previous cohort via university education.

Chapter 4, "Plugging In: The Professional Cohort, Mid-1990s to Present," describes the current context of men's paid antiviolence work. This cohort's stories illustrate the benefits and challenges of doing antiviolence work in a social context in which selected aspects of feminism have been assimilated into mainstream discourse. This chapter includes interviews with young men doing intersectional antiviolence work off campus. Although this group of men is the least directly connected to feminist theory and politics, their activism echoes earlier radical politics and structural critiques by connecting violence against women to violence against men and race and class inequality.

Chapter 5, "Earning Your Ally Badge: Men, Feminism, and Accountability," is one of the most interesting chapters in the book. It addresses the sometimes thorny issue of relationships between men and women doing antiviolence work. This chapter presents a variety of perspectives on accountability and includes some of the most critical reflection in the book.

Chapter 6, "Men, Feminism, and Social Justice," assesses the politics and efficacy of antiviolence campaigns aimed at men in the context of sexist institutions and culture. Some men interviewed in this chapter raise concerns about the use of antiviolence publicity as window dressing to disguise an underlying lack of commitment to organizational policies to address men's violence against women and the structures that engender it. This chapter highlights the problems with public condemnations of violence in the absence of critical reflection about their own behaviors by some "violence preventionists" and their audiences.

Historical accounts are valuable because they record critical information that could easily be lost as people retire, change jobs, and pass away, so this book is a welcome contribution to the field. Some themes crop up repeatedly in the book. First, a lot of the men who have internalized critical analyses of gendered violence have been mentored by and really listened to longtime feminist activists. For example, Phyllis Frank, who provides some of the

most critical analysis of men's work in the book, is also a very important mentor in the field. Second, university-based women's studies courses and women's centers are an extremely important context for educating men and women about violence and abuse. Third, this work is a tricky place for men to be. Men who do antiviolence work are not outside of patriarchy or the privileges it entails, and this works to their advantage in some respects and potentially poses problems in others. These themes point to significant and ongoing accomplishments of feminism and antiviolence activism that can easily be forgotten in the course of reflexive practice.

Although some challenges of men's antiviolence work are mentioned in the book, such as men who are perpetrators of violence against women claiming public roles as antiviolence authorities, it is not a particularly critical analysis. The authors opt for a gentle account of men's antiviolence work and its tribulations. Ultimately, there are as many ways to respond to men's violence against women as there are to be feminist or antifeminist. Antiviolence work is complicated for all of us as we negotiate practical concerns, theoretical orientations, and political realities. There is no ideologically pure or perfect work on violence. We are all trying to change the cultures and systems that engender violence and abuse from where we are and what we know. I appreciate the people who choose to engage in this work with integrity, and I welcome future scholarship on the finer points of appropriation, assimilation, and cultural change manifested in feminist antiviolence activism and antifeminist resistance to it. This book will be of greatest interest to readers who share an interest in antiviolence work and feminist politics.

*Taking the Heat: Women Chefs and Gender Inequality in the Professional Kitchen.* By Deborah A. Harris and Patti Guiffre. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2015. Pp. x+246. \$90.00 (cloth); \$27.95 (paper).

Sharon R. Bird  
*Iowa State University*

The idiom "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen" was one of U.S. president Harry Truman's favorites. The message Truman meant to convey was that if the people under his command lacked the physical and mental strength needed to succeed under pressure, they should look for another job. The type of kitchen to which the saying refers, it seems, was not the one associated with the 1950s media messages about the rapidly expanding and predominantly white suburbs. Domestic kitchens, according to the dominant media messages, were spaces where middle-class, white housewives enjoyed the luxury of new appliances that supposedly made cooking an endless delight. The high-pressure kitchens of idiomatic fame, on the other hand, must have been those associated with bustling restaurants in big cities, or perhaps the military kitchens where war-weary soldiers prepared food for fellow soldiers.