

state university system, including its unique attempts to improve Chicana/o education such as Operation Chicano Teacher. He argues that Chicana/o studies started to “get it right” by addressing sexism and homophobia (p. xi). Occasionally, efforts to build Chicana/o studies programs required extraordinary means, such as at the University of California, Los Angeles, where students organized a hunger strike to create the department.

Historians will not find an institutional history of Chicana/o studies across the country or an intellectual history of Chicana/o studies in *The Making of Chicana/o Studies*, and readers may still not understand why Chicana/o studies was necessary. Acuña shows that by using different strategies, activist students, professors, and writers were able to create Chicana/o departments, centers, and programs. He suggests that “mainstreaming” (the employment of Chicana/o scholars in already-existing departments) controls those scholars. Yet Acuña shows that sexism and homophobia have existed and even thrived in Chicana/o studies departments and programs. Acuña himself was disregarded by University of California, Santa Barbara Chicana/o academics.

Readers may want to know more about intellectual/theoretical influences on Chicana/o studies such as internal colonialism, Marxism, feminism of various persuasions, critical race theory, and cultural studies. Moreover, which creative writings, articles, books, journals, and newsletters have had a major impact? Acuña states that he believes pedagogy is more important than field content, but he does not discuss how Chicana/o studies has been taught. He correctly credits the scholar Gloria Anzaldúa’s writing in the making of Chicana studies, but always the anti-individualist, Acuña does not discuss the impact of his *Occupied America*.

Future institutional approaches might focus on key departments, centers, and programs in regions across the nation. Moreover, the role of the National Association for Chicano and Chicana Studies might be included. Acuña reminds us that the “constant theme of the book is that students are the lifeline of the growth of Chicana/o Studies” (p. xi). Population growth and student activism suggest that Chicana/o studies will continue to grow even as Chicana/o studies transitions into Latina/o

studies. However, he reminds us that today “all Ethnic Studies programs . . . are under siege” (p. 209). Acuña has done a good job, considering that needed archives are stored away in the filing cabinets of each Chicana/o studies program across the country and that numerous oral histories are needed.

Cynthia E. Orozco  
*Eastern New Mexico University*  
*Ruidoso, New Mexico*

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jas253

*A Plague of Prisons: The Epidemiology of Mass Incarceration in America.* By Ernest Drucker. (New York: New Press, 2011. xiv, 226 pp. \$26.95.)

Criminologists and physicians have long believed that crime control and the regulation of health go hand in hand, applying models from one field to the other. In this short, impassioned book the epidemiologist Ernest Drucker turns the traditional logic on its head. Rather than using public health models to contain the spread of crime, Drucker argues that prisons and American drug policy since the 1970s have become the real danger to the nation’s well-being. To sensationalize crack epidemics or attendant crime waves is to miss the point, he suggests, because we have effective tools to manage drug addiction. Instead, the disease we must quarantine, the toxic agent we must control, is the prison itself.

Drucker suggests that what he calls interdisciplinary social epidemiology can offer a new paradigm for assessing the impact of mass incarceration. Early chapters on the sinking of the *Titanic*, on London cholera outbreaks and public health responses, and on HIV/AIDS (human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome) illustrate basic epidemiological method—mapping outbreaks, tracing vectors, identifying the demography of the afflicted—in the interest of preventing disease transmission.

The strongest chapters document the specific health consequences of incarceration in the wake of New York’s highly punitive Rockefeller drug laws (named for Governor Nelson Rockefeller, who signed the acts into law in 1973). In memorable sections, Drucker

adds empirical data to debates about the effects of mass incarceration through the public health concepts of “years of life lost” and “disability-adjusted life years,” measurements that epidemiologists use to quantify the relative magnitude of disasters. Drucker counts the years that New Yorkers—disproportionately black, brown, and poor—have lost to drug sentences and the long-term, chronic disabilities that incarceration imposes. By these measurements, he argues, the Rockefeller drug laws are a public health calamity comparable to more recognizable disasters. The years of life lost to New York drug laws, for example, are three times greater than those lost in the September 11, 2001, World Trade Center attacks. By such measures, he writes, “our nation’s drug laws count as a very significant catastrophe” (p. 74). Mass incarceration can be understood as akin to toxic exposure, with physical, psychological, and legal impediments that disrupt entire communities, across generations.

*A Plague of Prisons* identifies the Rockefeller drug laws as patient zero in the epidemic of punishment. There is much to be said for this argument, and many have, but it pays short shrift to other contextualizing factors in contemporary mass incarceration—deindustrialization, post-civil rights era white backlash—that others have identified. Moreover, as someone who has spent considerable time on earlier histories of punishment, I fear we lose much if we begin the story in the 1970s. Rather than chapters on the *Titanic* or cholera in London, discussion of earlier drug policies or shifts in medical conceptualizations of crime would have bolstered his analysis.

But Drucker is an epidemiologist, not a historian, and one gets the sense that he wrote for physicians and general readers. The final chapter proposes solutions to overincarceration and refers at one point to International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Those doctors helped transform public understanding of nuclear weapons from sources of security to sources of risk. *A Plague of Prisons’s* promise of a paradigm shift may be overstated, but Drucker has nonetheless written an accessible, compelling book. If physicians join activists and engaged intellectuals, the social movement against hyperincarceration will gain

strength, and Drucker will have served as an important voice.

Ethan Blue  
*University of Western Australia*  
*Crawley, Australia*

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jas315

*Madness Is Civilization: When the Diagnosis Was Social, 1948–1980.* By Michael E. Staub. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011. xii, 252 pp. \$40.00.)

I once read a book about the Civil War that detailed the battles beautifully, but when I had finished, I did not understand what the war had been about. I had the same feeling when I finished E. Michael Staub’s *Madness Is Civilization*. The author does a praiseworthy job of detailing the antipsychiatry battles of the 1960s and 1970s, and as a factual history of that period in American psychiatry the book is good. Missing is a view of the forest through the trees.

The book focuses on three major antipsychiatry figures—Ronald Laing, Erving Goffman, and Thomas Szasz—but also looks at other antipsychiatry activists and, in a particularly strong chapter, at the women’s movement that criticized psychiatry. The author correctly notes that Laing, Goffman, Szasz, and other antipsychiatrists are now “derided” or “summarily ignored” (p. 6).

The author fails to establish why anyone should be interested in the antipsychiatrists other than as historical footnotes. Laing, for example, claimed that schizophrenia was caused by faulty parenting. Staub neglects to add what Laing acknowledged in a 1982 interview: “I was looked to as one who had the answers but I never had them.” His claim that schizophrenia was caused by faulty parenting ran aground when Laing’s own daughter developed schizophrenia. His addiction to alcohol grew worse as he aged, and his 1994 biography by his son, Adrian, implies that Laing was a charlatan, not a thinker worthy of study.

Goffman’s 1961 book *Asylums* argued that there was not much wrong with patients in psychiatric hospitals and that hospitalization itself was doing the damage. He suggested that the doors should be opened and the patients freed so they could live happily ever after. *Asylums*