conditions. She notes that domestic jobs are subject to minimum wage laws, although most employers are unaware of this. She also frankly acknowledges the difficulty of upgrading an occupation where workers have individual employers. The flow of new immigrants into the occupation makes upgrading wages and working conditions difficult. There is almost no bottom on the domestic worker market in Los Angeles, creating constant downward pressure for workers.

White European immigrants escaped domestic work in one generation, while Black women were not freed from it until the civil rights movement. Hondagneu-Sotelo suggests that even second-generation Latinas with some college might end up trapped as domestics as jobs at the bottom of the white-collar ladder pay too little to live on. And yet this is not unique to them. As early as the 1940s, economist George Stigler (1946) pointed out that domestic work actually pays a premium compared to other jobs open to similar women, as potential recruits find domestic work distasteful. It would be surprising if Latinas did not join their forebears in fleeing this occupation at the first opportunity, even though they might end up living on less. In this occupation, dignity and respect are hard to come by, even with employers out of the home.

Doméstica is a lively and engaging book that updates and deepens our understanding of how domestic work fits into the political economy of modern America. It is balanced, sociologically insightful, and rich in detail. This would be an excellent book for classes in women's studies, race and ethnic relations, and stratification.

JULIA WRIGLEY
City University of New York Graduate Center

REFERENCE

Stigler, George J. 1946. *Domestic servants in the United States 1900-1940*. Occasional paper no. 23. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values. By Nancy Folbre. New York: New Press, 2001, 267 pp., $24.95 (cloth).

DOI: 10.1177/0891243202250853

It was predetermined that I would like this book. Nancy Folbre writes about what I feel are the most important intellectual topics in contemporary gender studies and writes about them with wit and intelligence. The major theme of this book is that reproductive labor is increasingly important in creating the human capital needed in modern information economies such as our own, yet it is provided mostly by families (and mostly by women in families) who are economically punished rather than rewarded for doing so. She argues persuasively that our moral values about caring and providing for family members, including children and the elderly, are at odds with our political economy—as reflected in governmental taxation and spending priorities and the operation of market capitalism itself. In the past, we were collectively able to keep at bay the economic disincentives to perform caring labor

by restricting women's rights and confining them mostly to unpaid carework in return for limited guarantees of support through marriage or government welfare provision. As that system breaks down and women gain new economic and political rights, the questions of who will perform carework and how it will be performed become increasingly problematic and socially divisive. Because issues such as welfare reform, divorce and child custody, declining public schools, social security insolvency, immigration, day care quality, mandatory overtime, and so forth are rarely framed as the systemic results of this larger contradiction between the logics of capitalism and the moral imperatives of carework, we fail to see how these social problems are intimately interconnected. Folbre tackles each one in turn, showing how the typical analytic frame of each issue masks their underlying causes and leads to limited (and likely ineffective) solutions.

Having said that I loved this book, let me place it in context. This is one of several books that has recently appeared with similar themes, including Joan Williams's (2001) *Unbending Gender*, Ann Crittenden's (2001) *The Price of Motherhood*, and Sylvia Hewlett and Cornel West's (1999) *The War against Parents*. But the most marked similarities are to an earlier work by economist Shirley Burgraff (1997) titled *The Feminine Economy and Economic Man*. Burgraff and Folbre come up with similar analyses of the problem and some policy recommendations in common (longer paid parental leaves, for example). But they differ dramatically in terms of the overall solutions offered: Burgraff recommends using a market system to reward good parenting and make it a rational investment again, while Folbre recommends socializing many of the costs of care through government taxation and redistribution. In Burgraff's system, parents would be individually repaid for successful childrearing through pension support and tax benefits. (James Coleman wrote a variant of this same scheme to make parenting "pay" in his 1993 article on the rational reconstruction of society.) Folbre, in contrast, seeks to alleviate the immediate economic hardships of caregiving by socializing the costs of care and shifting a greater proportion to those currently free riding on the creation of human capital—businesses and childless individuals.

Folbre's book stands out from other similar volumes because of her insightful treatment of several issues that often go unmentioned in this genre. In her chapter "Corpornation," she shows how the growing unfettered globalization of corporate capitalism allows corporations to avoid paying the costs of reproducing labor power by moving (or threatening to move) wherever welfare state provision is weakest. This inherently weakens the position of national governments struggling to promote good care and equitable compensation for care providers. Folbre also notes that some industrialized nations buffer the effects of their economic disincentives to have children by tacitly encouraging immigration, especially importing foreigners with high levels of human capital and/or the right work habits. In an eerily prescient manner, she also shows how the Taliban and other antifeminist, anti-Western fundamentalisms grow out of the extreme commodification anxiety produced in modernizing economies when caregiving begins to become as economically irrational there as it is in Western capitalist countries.

Overall, Folbre's book is an excellent contribution to the literature on gender stratification and work-family issues that, with its folksy and less academic tone than most economics texts, will be accessible to undergraduates and nonspecialists as well as specialists in the field.

JENNIFER GLASS
University of Iowa

REFERENCES

Burgraff, Shirley. 1997. *The feminine economy and economic man*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
Coleman, James S. 1993. The rational reconstruction of society: 1992 presidential address. *American Sociological Review* 58 (1): 1-15.
Crittenden, Ann. 2001. *The price of motherhood*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
Hewlett, Sylvia, and Cornel West. 1999. *The war against parents*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
Williams, Joan. 2001. *Unbending gender: Why work and family conflict and what we can do about it*. New York: Oxford.

Family Men: Middle-Class Fatherhood in Early Industrializing America. By Shawn Johansen. New York: Routledge, 2001, 249 pp., $80.00 (cloth), $21.99 (paper).

DOI: 10.1177/0891243202250853

Twenty years ago, historian John Demos (1982) made the now widely cited point that "fatherhood has a very long history, but virtually no historians" (p. 425). Since then, no fewer than five research monographs and an even greater number of refereed journal articles and book chapters on the social, cultural, and political history of fatherhood have been published. Among these is Shawn Johansen's *Family Men: Middle-Class Fatherhood in Early Industrializing America*, a useful addition to the burgeoning literature on fatherhood past.

Johansen sets his sights on the antebellum years from 1800 to 1860. The conventional scholarly wisdom about this period is that the industrial revolution led to a greater separation of work and home and to the social construction of separate spheres, with men in the public sphere and women in the private sphere. The argument has been that as a result of industrialization, fathers became less of a physical and psychological presence in their daughters' and sons' lives and increasingly had little to do with—or little say in—how their children were raised. The presumed reason for the shift was that fathers were simply too preoccupied with economic providing to offer much emotional sustenance to their families. Lured by the world of commerce, they became the classic "distant or missing patriarchs" whose authority at home was significantly reduced.

Or so it has been said. Johansen questions how much this portrayal of nineteenth-century fatherhood is more stereotype than true. He argues that the notion of a decline in father involvement and paternal authority is based on incomplete baseline data—seventeenth- and eighteenth-century images of fathers that were presented in New England Puritan religious writings. These documents, he correctly notes, tell us more about how ministers and lawmakers wanted fathers to behave than how they actually behaved. The same applies to our understanding of fathers in the antebellum era. It turns out that we know a lot about what fathers in industrializing America were expected to do as opposed to what they actually did.

Family Men is an attempt to fill the gap. Johansen's aim is to "step beyond simplified and nostalgic representations to a more complex view of fatherhood based on actual fathering behaviors," as revealed in the letters and diaries of "over one hundred middle-class fathers during the years between 1800 and the Civil War" (pp. 2-3). For the most part, he grounds his book on the "twenty men and their families who left especially detailed records of their lives" (p. 181). Every now and then, he is able to draw on documents from other family members to show how men were viewed by their wives, children, and their own fathers.