ative, however they require long explanatory passages that at times lose their connection to the discursive analysis of travel guides. Commentary addressing the devices deployed by guidebooks, such as the selection of what constitutes "sights" worth seeing, the interpretation of local customs, or the evaluation of hotels deemed suitable or unsuitable to "international standards" could have been expanded. The perspective of overseas Vietnamese, which is absent except in a brief reference to the competing narratives surrounding the Huế massacre, would add another important dimension to the study. How are the impressions of second generation Vietnamese, who may have grown up in the West with little knowledge of the war, determined by the guidebooks they potentially carry, or the other forms of guidance they receive through museum catalogues, tour guides, or tourist site pamphlets?

Laderman shows how, particularly in the living and contested memory symbolized by the War Remnants Museum in Hồ Chí Minh City, "tourism has been (and, in important ways, has continued to be) intertwined with the projection of American power." (10) In sum, *Tours of Vietnam* is a valuable addition to the scholarship on the larger questions around the US foreign policy and the unexpectedly substantial role that presumably apolitical cultural products play in shaping national memory and global imaginations.

Lana Lin
New York University

NOTES

[1] See, for instance, Graham M.S. Dann and A.V. Seaton, *Slavery, Contested Heritage, and Thanatourism*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 2002); Malcolm Foley and John Lennon, *Dark Tourism*, 1st ed. (Cengage Learning Business Press, 2000); Richard Sharpley and Philip R. Stone, *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism* (Channel View Publications, 2009); and Marita Sturken, *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero* (Duke University Press, 2007).

Edward W. Soja, *Seeking Spatial Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

Edward Soja states that his point in *Seeking Social Justice* is not to argue only that "space matters" in social practices – and especially in theories and struggles over social justice – but rather "that *whatever your interests may be, they can be significantly advanced by adopting a critical spatial perspective*" (2, emphasis in original). When research and theorizing starts from the ineluctable spatiality of things and processes, Soja argues, a quite different way of understanding what justice *is* necessarily results. As Soja himself claims, this is an ambitious argument. It is also an important one. It is rather disappointing then, that, in fact, it is not the one Soja pursues.

The book begins with a compelling discussion of the Los Angeles Bus

Riders Union (BRU) and by arguing that paying attention to successes and failures of BRU itself and of "the strategic coalition behind" it is vital for those "seeking to erase injustices wherever they may be found." (xiii) The expectation raised for the reader is that what will follow will be a deep engagement with theories of social justice and their creative reconceptualization as *spatial* justice. This is the dual meaning of the title. On the one hand, Soja seeks to outline how spatial justice has been sought in a series of struggles in (mostly) the Los Angeles region. On the other hand, he seeks theories of spatial justice in the works of a lineage of thinkers that stretches from Lefebvre through Castells, Harvey, and Young, and beyond.

The book does not live up to its billing on either hand. Instead of really pursuing the former goal – engaging in a close examination of how spatial justice has been conceptualized and struggled over in LA-based social movement – Soja details the (really quite impressive) interventions of various faculty and students associated with UCLA's Department of Planning. There is much of interest here, much to celebrate in the very real (if never easy) success Soja and his compatriots have had in interdigitating planning program scholarship with social movements (with UCLA-trained planner-activists often taking leading positions), and much to lament in the crass political attacks the program has suffered from campus administrators and state-level politicians. Unfortunately, Soja is mostly content to *list* those successes (and attacks) rather than to analyze what has gone into them. The result is a celebration of UCLA planning by someone who has devoted his career to it, and who is rightly proud of its accomplishments. Lacking, however, is a clear sense of what the ingredients of such successes are and thus how they might be replicated elsewhere. For example, Soja argues that the UCLA Urban Planning program developed into a "graduate school for activists," and central to this was a commitment to "participatory democracy." This entailed on the one hand not "strip-min[ing] communities and localities for empirical data and ideas that would lead only to career-boosting and academic publication rather than improvements in the communities studies." (160-161) On the other hand, it meant having "working groups rather than committees" (161) handle admissions decisions, as well as assuring that each working group reported out to the program as a whole every year. Little, however, is said about the mechanisms or the difficulties of such laudable goals. Many other programs and projects have sought, with greater or lesser success to achieve similar goals, and much has been written on their successes and failures: the numerous intro- and retrospective publications of the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies immediately come to mind. It is impossible to tell how Soja's planning program negotiated the shoals that grounded so many other similarly focused academic enterprises. The result, then, is we learn little about the actual difficulties and strategies of UCLA Planning (to say nothing of the wider social movements with which it worked) in seeking spatial justice. Given the evident successes UCLA Planning has had in this area,

this is a sadly missed opportunity.

In relation to the latter goal, Soja rightly shows that much spatial theoretical development must be understood as rooted in the insights Henri Lefebvre developed over his long career (leavened with more than a few dashes of Foucault). He explains that a robust theory of spatial justice requires an "ontological restructuring" (69) that allows the aspatial, liberal, Rawlsian theories of justice that are dominant in much political philosophy to be transcended by a spatialized theory of justice that understands uneven development to be a root fact of life and that gives rise to and supports both the theorizing of, and political struggle for, what Lefebvre called the "right to the city." But then things turn weird. Instead of examining in any depth the work of those theorists who have toiled away on this project of ontological restructuring (Harvey, Castells, Young, and a raft of lesser theorists, myself included), critiquing them where necessary and out of that developing a more robust theory of spatial justice, Soja instead dismisses them not because their work is lacking (he is in fact frequently generous in his appreciation of aspects of this work), but because they possess "little inclination to use either of the specific terms of spatial or territorial justice." (91) This complaint – a dismissal, really – is repeated over and over again (e.g. 82 [twice], 87, 91, 107), even as those couple of geographers who have used the terms explicitly are praised. In neither case, however, does Soja really examine the *substance* of the arguments he is examining to see whether or not the arguments at stake in fact contribute to the project of theorizing spatial justice, even if the explicit term is not used. The result, intended or not, reads like a blacklist rather than an engaged critique. This too is a sadly missed opportunity.

Nonetheless *Seeking Social Justice* possesses much of value. As a chronicle of Soja's long and productive career, it is enlightening. The vignettes about organizing in LA of which the BRU is just one example whet the appetite. The bibliographic essay that concludes the book is an excellent resource for anyone seeking the richness of theories of spatial justice (as long as they are not too worried about whether the specific term is used or not). And the encomium for the Right to the City movement that appears off and on throughout the book is particularly welcome at a moment when signs of progressive organizing around critical urban issues are all too few and far between.

Don Mitchell
Syracuse University

Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

In the United States and other multiracial nations, how do workers from different races and ethnic groups become a unified class? According to most labour histo-