boundaries of appropriate emotion are policed, and how emotional authenticity is claimed, owned, and enacted.

Overall, I have to commend Stephanie Shields for writing such an engaging, illuminating, and panoramic book. *Speaking from the Heart* is filled with provocative insights. I must admit, however, that I felt disappointed by a few features of the book. I felt most disappointed by the author’s failure to discuss how emotions are generated, defined, and expressed interactively. In exploring this theme, Shields could have drawn usefully upon the work of interactionist scholars such as Candace Clark, Norman Denzin, Thomas Scheff, and Peggy Thoits. I also felt disappointed by the author’s failure to explore how and why sexuality serves as a key medium through which women and men “do gender through doing emotion.” I found it both troubling and surprising that a book examining the links between gender and emotion included no discussion of sex or sexual relationships. Finally, while appreciating the author’s insights regarding the new standard of manly emotion that has gained ascendancy, I was disappointed that she did not offer more discussion of how this standard is contested and negotiated.

I do not offer these critical reflections to deter readers. On the contrary, I offer them in the spirit of calling others to emulate Shields’s goals in this book and to further explore the links between gender and emotion, especially as they get played out in the realms of sports, sex, and politics.

*Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities, and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*. Edited by Barbara Hobson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. x+328. $60.00 (cloth); $22.00 (paper).

Karla B. Hackstaff
*Northern Arizona University*

Studies on social policy, research on fathers and families, and critical men’s studies have tended to be distinct arenas of scholarly activity. *Making Men into Fathers* provides a welcome and sophisticated synthesis of these areas of inquiry. The book is a collection of articles that focuses on how state, market, and family processes construct fatherhood in the United States, Sweden, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. Authors compare these nations on a range of topics including welfare regimes, the cash and care facets of fatherhood, child support and custody, parental leave, and masculinities. All comparisons are anchored in the contexts, histories, and discourses specific to each country. The collection relies on a variety of data and methods including narrative analysis, descriptive statistics, and multivariate analysis. More than a description of national policies on “making men into fathers,” the book is an impressive effort to theorize the various concerns about fatherhood (the ideology), conditions for fathering (the practice), and experiences of fathers (as individ-
uals). Locating gender at the core of its analysis, the book interrogates claims about a “crisis in fatherhood” by analyzing competing definitions of “father” and comparing the social politics affecting the “cash and care” facets of paternal rights and duties. Barbara Hobson explains: “Our purpose is to situate these politics in the broader context of policy regimes, ideological and cultural frames of family and gender, and structural changes in post-industrial globalizing economies” (p. 3).

While the anthology highlights the constraints on fathering, it argues that constructing fathers must be understood as a multilayered and fluid phenomenon, irreducible to policy regimes, market conditions, or cultural ideologies since fathers themselves are multiple, diverse, and differentially empowered. Conceived at a conference in 1995 and developed over four years, the anthology coheres because of themes addressed throughout the text (e.g., cash and care, masculinities, policies, citizenship, and sexuality) and, more important, a model presented in the introduction by Barbara Hobson and David Morgan and carried forward by authors of subsequent chapters. Briefly, the model is constituted by three triangles, each recognizing key relational facets of “making men into fathers”: the “state, market, and family” triangle examines institutional contexts and interfaces with the domestic triangle of “husband/father, wife/mother, and parent-child,” which recognizes the gender and generational relations that constitute being a father; both of these triangles interface with the “fathering, fatherhood, and fathers” triangle.

The triangles provide structure; their rotation provides some fluidity. This model allows authors and readers to compare chapters that address individual nations—such as the Swedish recognition of unmarried, biological fathers versus the German and Dutch emphasis on married or household fathers. It enables analysis of how a state may support a kind of “fatherhood” (obligations and duties promoted by the state), such as the U.S. emphasis on fathers as breadwinners, without supporting many “fathers” regardless of market conditions, class, and race/ethnicity. The model also reveals how contested discourses about masculinities and fatherhood also affect state policies—in the United States, Spain, and Sweden. In addition, every chapter contains insights, frequently based on well-conceived questions and complex analyses. For example, Livia Sz. Oláh, Eva M. Bernhardt, and Frances K. Goldscheider examine how the degree of state support and the nature of gender role attitudes in Hungary, the United States, and Sweden systematically and differentially affect fathering, revealing contradictory results for gender ideology and fathers’ engagement.

David Morgan acknowledges most of the book’s limits in a superb epilogue. This is a Eurocentric analysis—indeed the triangles may lose their heuristic qualities if one wanted to compare constructions of fatherhood in, for example, Egypt and Sweden and South Africa. In spite of its aspirations, only two chapters seriously theorize global influences on fathers (Jeff Hearn’s “Men, Fathers and the State: National and Global
Relations” and Morgan’s epilogue). There are only a few asides in the book regarding gay fathers, and even fewer asides regarding the impact that reproductive technologies are having on constructions of fatherhood. Still, this is an excellent anthology. One can read the well-organized book from the first to the last chapter, as I did. Yet each article can stand alone and be read in combination with different articles. Indeed, I recommend reading Morgan’s epilogue as a prologue. It provides an overview of the text, the limitations of the anthology, and an engaging analysis of the role of modernity in the reconstructions of fatherhood. This book will be essential reading for scholars of the welfare state and social policy. However, it will also be extremely valuable in graduate courses on social policy, family, and gender. It ventures to import masculinity and gender politics into arenas that have tended to be “gender blind”—particularly when it comes to men.


Liahna E. Gordon
California State University, Chico

Bridging communication studies, sociology, and legal studies, Julie M. Thompson argues in Mommy Queerest that the term “lesbian mother” is constructed as an oxymoron. Because dominant discourses vilify lesbians as immoral, criminal, and sexually predatory, lesbian motherhood is constructed as unnatural and dangerously threatening to “the family.” Thompson analyzes the ways in which the validity of lesbian motherhood is contested in three forums for public discourse on the topic: custody cases involving lesbian mothers, the journalistic accounts of these court cases, and the academic research of psychologists whose work is used as evidence in these cases. For each, she critically examines the discourses used about lesbian motherhood, as well as the ways in which these discourses limit what counts as legitimate identity.

Thompson begins by analyzing articles from both mainstream and lesbian publications. She finds that both types of publications take the natural heterosexuality of families for granted, which results in the mainstream press consistently ignoring the existence of lesbian-headed families. When such families do get recognized, it is often within the context of “family values” debates in which lesbian mothers are depicted as contributing to the downfall of U.S. families. Articles in lesbian or feminist publications show more ambivalence, depicting lesbian mothers either as traitors who have succumbed to the will of the patriarchy, or as the vanguard of feminism, daring to create families completely outside the sphere of male control.