

Stuart concludes with calls to help youth scrub their media profiles, analogous to tattoo removal clinics. We might also target youth before they become involved in drill production, disrupt violence before it starts, and recognize young people as artists and cultural producers through a new Federal Art Project. Regardless of whether such initiatives may succeed, any understanding of gangs is now incomplete without Stuart's analysis. The detail, rigor, and organization of his work clearly mark it as a new standard-bearer for contemporary gang research.

Grocery Activism: The Radical History of Food Cooperatives in Minnesota. By Craig B. Upright. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2020. Pp. 256. \$100.00 (cloth); \$25.00 (paper).

Ivy Ken
George Washington University

When you hear the term “co-op” you might conjure an image of a dimly lit, high-priced, natural food store filled with ugly fruit and an intimidating array of homeopathic tinctures—a place where you were supposed to have brought your own canvas shopping bag long before it was fashionable. A co-op, however, is just a type of organization that could be adopted by any grocery store, bank, power supplier, or home insurer. The cooperative structure, which has historically been guided by minimalism and a concern for mutual aid, dictates that the business is owned by members, who may be workers, community residents, or even other businesses. Co-ops can be organized around producers' or consumers' needs, but they are not in the business of maximizing profit. Since the formation of the first formal co-op in the United States by Benjamin Franklin in 1752, this organizational form has existed for the benefit of its members rather than for the opportunity to concentrate ownership and extract surplus value.

The explicit anticapitalist leanings of many cooperatives serve as part of the intrigue in for Craig B. Upright in *Grocery Activism: The Radical History of Food Cooperatives in Minnesota*. In Minnesota in the 1970s, Marxists opened storefront grocery co-ops as worker-owned social movement organizations to meet hyperlocal working-class demand for affordable food and to establish independence from mainstream capitalist stores. The co-op as an organizational form, Upright says, seemed natural in Minnesota, where the history of agricultural co-ops was long and robust. With 42 stores, Minnesota currently has the most grocery co-ops in the country.

Today, however, co-op shoppers do not take home much Marxism with their organic produce. In the 1970s, contradictions emerged between how the visions of sustainable production and post-Vietnam War anti-imperialism would be carried out. An ideological debate that could have been called the “Canned Food Wars” found cooperators flaming each other in passionate,

multipage, mimeographed broadsides. The anti-imperialist faction wanted to provide canned goods, beer, and cigarettes in their co-op stores because they believed the “hard core working class” members of their communities wanted them. The environmental faction, concerned more with pollutants and respect for the land, felt a mandate from members to provide “healthy” food, whether that was natural, organic, unprocessed, or local. Their characterizations of each other as being willing to “molest socialist history” and “throw a nasty bourgeois-intellectual stone from the unsanitary cesspool of anti-communism” (p. 144) are hilarious in their earnestness and fervor. They also provide evidence of how the linkage between organic food and the co-op economic form was neither immediate nor automatic, but rather contentiously achieved.

Upright argues convincingly that the centrality of organic food in grocery co-ops was established store by store, farmer by farmer. Amazon’s purchase of the grocery behemoth Whole Foods for \$14.7 billion in 2017 may make the demand for organic food seem obvious and inevitable, but *Grocery Activism* allows readers to consider the idiosyncratic conversations and associations that had to occur for this market to emerge. At first, there was simply too little supply. Early 1970s grocery cooperators in Minnesota had to establish face-to-face relationships with local farmers and ask them to grow using “pure” methods because there was no national or even regional distribution of organic food at that time. This serves as an important reminder of how thoroughly our supply of food has been affected by the brief, 150-year moment in human agriculture when “organic farming” (which the government has called “food quackery”) has needed to be specified as such while the new, deviant practices of monocropping and chemical spraying came to be understood as “conventional.” Because there were so few “organic” growers in Minnesota at this time, some grocery cooperators even considered *not* offering organic food because they did not want their significant demand to prohibitively increase its price. They ultimately—and cooperatively—established distribution facilities and networks that were successful enough for mainstream stores to poach, replicate, and dominate.

Grocery Activism is part social history, placing co-ops in the contexts of postmodern art movements, the havoc of highways, and even the creation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is also a novel census of co-ops and as such is an important bit of public sociology. The author assembled a unique archive of records of storefront grocery co-ops in Minnesota from 1970 to 2020. These records were difficult to obtain for the very reason the co-ops emerged in the first place: the activists who opened the stores and kept the records operate in ways that are counter to convention. This is one of the charms of these minimalist organizations. Another is a very folksy set of stories, such as the co-op that kept a key at the police department for after-hours shopping. Members would get the key, shop, deposit their money in a cash box in the salted peanut area, and take the key back to the police.

Upright has a pleasantly inquisitive analytical style. He lays out counter explanations to demonstrate how he arrived at his conclusions, which inspires confidence. However, while capitalism is central in the book, the author

includes almost no analysis of how gender, ethnicity, or race are implicated. There are events and issues where this may have been relevant, such as the somewhat bizarre authoritarian orientation of the most ardent anticapitalists in the co-op wars. Gender, race, and white men's structural location are not incidental to that. Minnesota in the 1970s also had a significant Latinx population that was greatly involved in agricultural production, and the book leaves readers wondering whether and how this population may have contributed to (or been excluded from) the growth of co-ops in the state. Given the importance of the cooperators' resistance to industrial agriculture, a discussion of the influence of the communities of the Anishinaabe and Dakota nations on white Minnesotans' approaches to the land and mutual aid would have been informative as well. Still, the book is a robust consideration of both the cooperative spirit and the cooperative economic form and how these propelled local-level collective action that altered the national food-related institutions that sustain us.

Public Opinion. By David L. Weakliem. Medford, Mass.: Polity Press, 2020. Pp. viii+184. \$64.95 (cloth) \$22.95 (paper).

Robert W. Oldendick
University of South Carolina

The premise of *Public Opinion* by David L. Weakliem is "that the study of public opinion can benefit from a sociological perspective, and that sociologists can benefit from thinking more systematically about public opinion" (p. 22). This work provides a broad overview of the sociological approach to public opinion, including its social bases and short- and long-term changes in public opinion, and explores some of the major questions facing the field.

Weakliem begins by attempting to define public opinion and eliminates possibilities such as election results, letters and petitions to government officials or rallies and demonstrations, and in-depth interviews and focus groups as not representative of the public's views. He ultimately lands on the commonly accepted use of public opinion as measured by polls and surveys (Philip E. Converse, "Changing Conceptions of Public Opinion in the Political Process," *Public Opinion Quarterly* [1987]: S14). While acknowledging the limitations of this approach (e.g., increasing nonresponse), he proceeds to explore the main theme of this sociological approach to public opinion, that opinions are formed through social interactions.

Chapter 2 provides a very broad examination of the social bases of public opinion and examines the influence of a number of factors, including religion, class, place of residence, age, gender, and race. This extensive approach examines the degree to which the tendency of individuals to comply with group norms is evidenced in various groups. The descriptions and explanations in terms of the stability and change in the opinions of various groups are quite plausible. This is an area, however, in which the analysis may have