

81, 84). With this “mobility script” (p. 84) came the grand narrative of second-modern history (pp. 183–184). Mobility became an all-embracing term for any “change of state” (p. 3) and thus the assertion that “mobility research is on the way to the head of social sciences” (p. 181). The “cosmobilities network” should “de-nationalize social science”.

The reader should be prepared to accept “subtly differentiated terminology of mobility” (p. 8), a multiplication of invented, newly released terms, or new senses attributed to old terms—and the use of tropes (“route” pp. 92–93) that are not defined in dictionaries like “the multiplexity of multimobilities” (p. 96) and, of course, “second-modern modernization” (p. 33). Perhaps some terminological complexity comes from the translation of long German terms.

In this futurological discourse, as opposed to an old-fashioned nationalist approach, an ideological preference also appears for pioneering cosmopolitanism. The U.N. represents cosmopolitanization, while the U.S.A. represents only globalism (p. 28). However, some brief remarks also mention “negative externalities of increasing mobilities” (pp. 70, 84, 120), counterproductive effects e.g., the potential for the neglect of individual citizenship, which could negatively influence permanent democratic participation and solidarity.

The second part of the book takes an “applied” approach: “Finding traces in mobility practices.” Beside qualitative case studies (including one from France), it contains a 20-page empirical study that relates job-mobility to living arrangements in Germany (Schneider and Limmer).

Like many others, these authors try to find a salient label to distinguish and delineate (p. 91) today’s epoch in the context of a universal, historical perspective. However, for sociology as an empirical science without adequate spatio-temporal scope in the sampling, the characterization of the twentieth century as a mobile century and cosmopolitan second-modernity age remains impressionistic speculation. When considering universal cosmopolitanization by mobilities, it is not enough to consider the motility in, for example, the former East and West Germany, or even Europeanization in the whole “European

monotopia” (p. 83) enlarged with Turkey, or the “diasporic cultural setting such as the worldwide mobility culture in Israel” (p. 182). In fact, beside our Western neighborhood, the world is composed of other spheres of civilization with their own systems of writing (such as China and India). Because of the existence of these large civilization-states, less than 3 percent of the world’s population lives outside their country of origin, despite today’s geographical mobility potential. (See Ankerl, Guy. 2000. *Coexisting Contemporary Civilizations*. Geneva).

“Tracing Mobilities” will satisfy the current curiosity of readers who will learn more about an up-to-date European—especially German—perspective and approach to the construction of *Das kosmopolitische Europa* (Beck and Grande, 2004), conceived as a paradigm for a cosmopolitan world.

---

*Sociology of Law: Visions of a Scholarly Tradition*, by **Mathieu Deflem**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 340pp. \$39.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521673921.

CARY FEDERMAN  
Montclair State University  
feder manc@mail.montclair.edu

---

Matthieu Deflem writes in his new book, *Sociology of Law: Visions of a Scholarly Tradition*, “it remains somewhat of a struggle to have the sociology of law accepted as a distinct and valid enterprise by legal scholars” (p. 77). He suggests that part of the reason for the sociology of law’s marginality as a social science or as a necessary complement to the social and behavioral sciences is the “inability to acknowledge law as a social issue that must be sociologically explored” (p. 78). Why is the sociology of law—whose pedigree runs through Holmes and Brandeis, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons and Habermas, to name a few—so marginalized?

Deflem explores several reasons for this development, such as the monopolization of legal thought by the legal profession, a latent “Kantianism” in legal thinking that posits transcendental norms over sociological inquiry and regard for context (“No law means no law,” in Justice Hugo Black’s classic comment on the First Amendment), the

“retreat” (p. 3) of the sociology of law into law and society and a general preference for disciplinarity over interdisciplinarity. To right this trend, he extends his formidable scholarly gifts by placing the sociology of law firmly within its historical roots in sociology.

The book is arranged thematically, beginning with Weber and Durkheim, and ending with the globalization of law. Going over the traditional ground of Weberian and Durkheimian sociology, Deflem keeps his focus on each thinker’s understanding and use of law in sociology to frame the early chapters. One of the key aspects of his analysis here is that these chapters are not simply reaffirmations of known material. Rather, after careful review of the place of the sociology of law within each thinker’s framework, Deflem focuses on how modern scholars have appropriated each thinker’s ideas; and introduces readers to those who work within a neo-Weberian and neo-Durkheimian framework without being slavishly devoted to their methodologies. Deflem’s point is to show the relevance of each thinker’s research for modern times, but also to point out the richness of the tradition within which sociologists of law operate.

In the middle of the book (Parts II and III), the reader is introduced to a number of forgotten sociology of law thinkers from central Europe. The European tradition is far more hospitable to the sociology of law than the American, and Deflem is clear that that tradition has a lot to offer American scholars. In the next two chapters of Part II, Deflem analyzes the American scene, in both its early modern and postmodern incarnations. As American law found itself caught in the grip of functionalism and formalism at the beginning of the twentieth century, a new party arose that tried to link law to experience and detach it from the rigidities of logic and formalism. Over time, the problem became how to maintain law’s commitment to experiential learning without itself becoming rigidly formalistic. Increasingly, Deflem astutely shows, the sociology of law came to rest on sociology itself, with its critical tradition dating from Marx to Mills, which gave rise to the scholarship of Chambliss, Currie, and Selznick. Overall, the chapters in Part II are historically rich and deeply informative. Scholars in this field would benefit greatly if

the works found here were re-issued or newly translated.

In the last two parts of the book, the author turns his attention to the sociology of law in action. After analyzing the law and economics movement, he focuses on the work of Jurgen Habermas and Niklas Luhmann. Deflem has written thoughtfully on Habermas before, and it is not surprising that he treats the engagement between Luhmann and Habermas with the care and finesse it deserves. From these defenders of modernism, Deflem reflects on the critical tradition of postmodernism and deconstruction in law. To be sure, this is a shaky tradition within law, with much philosophical speculation, but Deflem shows how the works of Milovanovic and de Sousa Santos apply their critique of law through the lens of sociology and critical thought in a way that validates the aims of the sociology of law.

This is a formidable work of sociology. Matthieu Deflem spans the spectrum of the sociology of law neither to bury it nor to praise it. Rather, he seeks through careful and thorough analysis, to explain the thought of its founders, its defenders, and its detractors, and to place this important scholarly endeavor firmly within the sociological tradition from which it emerged.

---

*The Promise of Poststructuralist Sociology: Marginalized Peoples and the Problem of Knowledge*, by **Clayton W. Dumont Jr.** Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2008. 226pp. \$26.95 paper. ISBN: 9780791474426.

MOHAMMAD H. TAMDGIDI  
 University of Massachusetts Boston  
 mohammad.tamdgidi@umb.edu

---

Clayton Dumont revisits recent debates on poststructuralism in order to argue that its adoption in sociology can be more effective than “structuralist sociology” in tackling issues central to the interests of marginalized peoples (e.g., Native Americans’ right to bury their dead, and African Americans’ right to Affirmative Action).

Conceding that poststructuralist literature has been difficult to comprehend, though not necessarily lacking in substance, Dumont succeeds in his intended aim of making his prose accessible to readers