

What does it mean to recover the history of solidarity and internationalism at the heart of *Thinking Black* and what advantages does it hold over the present formation of anti-racism? How does this history, for example, allow us to understand the colonial and post-colonial racisms of Brexit? And why might its recovery help form solidarities that could deal with rampant state racism both within and at the edges of Britain's borders? Indeed, in the spectre of Grenfell Tower – where so many Black and Brown bodies perished partly due to the racialized contours of British neo-liberalism – what does it mean to Think Black?

Even if I think Waters should have asked these questions as a matter of urgency, perhaps the best compliment I can pay to the text is that many of the answers to these questions are buried within *Thinking Black*. For that reason alone, I implore you to get hold of the book and go looking for them!

John Narayan

King's College London

Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite, *Class, Politics, and the Decline of Deference in England, 1968–2000*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018; vi + 246 pp.; £63.00 hbk; ISBN 9780198812579

Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite set out to understand how political change impacted ideas about class. She wound up explaining how changing ideas about class facilitated political change. That subtle evolution followed from two attributes of this impressive book: a formidable source base, including the revisiting of social surveys undertaken between 1968 and 2000; and an attentiveness to findings that neither those surveys, nor Sutcliffe-Braithwaite, initially intended. The result is not only a major contribution to understandings of class, popular identity and political change in the last third of Britain's twentieth century, but also a model of the virtues of qualitative analysis for sociology and politics, no less than for history.

The book is divided into two parts. The first, consisting of six chapters, examines the development of vernacular ideas about class during the late-twentieth century. Sources include oral histories, autobiographies and Mass Observation directives, in addition to those social surveys. Revisiting these materials with new questions in mind places Sutcliffe-Braithwaite alongside scholars such as Mike Savage and Jon Lawrence, but her approach focuses less upon the assumptions of experts than the perceptions of their subjects. She finds that, although class remained a preoccupation, respondents resisted the language of class when characterizing their own identities and experiences. They viewed themselves instead as 'ordinary' people, for whom the language of class represented an outmoded snobbishness; they preferred a more egalitarian outlook, one that prioritized 'authenticity' and 'individuality'. Though we know what was coming after 1979, Sutcliffe-Braithwaite rightly notes that these attitudes did not necessarily point in any single political direction. 'Egalitarian' did not signal a collectivist politics, but neither did 'individualism' herald neoliberalism's arrival. She instead identifies the

most salient feature in these testimonies as a 'decline of deference'. As deference declined, class figured as something to leave behind, in favour of an emergent emphasis upon ordinary people, unpretentious and authentic, disdainful of snobberies of all kinds.

The second part revisits Thatcherism and New Labour in light of these findings. These chapters succeed on three distinct levels. First, readers (who are likely also teachers) will not find a more cogent discussion of historians' preoccupations regarding Thatcherism and New Labour. In the case of Thatcherism, this concern comprises the search for the appropriate tradition in which to situate this ostensible historical rupture; in the case of New Labour, this concern asks whether Blair *et al* represented a capitulation to Thatcher or the development of a meaningful alternative. Second, having demonstrated the retreat of class language in favour of a broad anti-elitism, Sutcliffe-Braithwaite turns to explain Thatcher's success. Despite her unpopular fixation upon purportedly bourgeois virtues, Thatcher stumbled upon a language of ordinary people, impatient with class labels, that happened to echo these broader perceptions. Sutcliffe-Braithwaite then applies this insight, which sees political success as bringing party discourse into alignment with vernacular experience, to the case of New Labour. But by contrast with Thatcher, New Labour's theorists knew what they were seeking, which explains their own unpopular fixation upon opinion polls, focus groups and market research. Third, Sutcliffe-Braithwaite indicates the contours of a general account of political success. If social scientists in the 1960s read political allegiance as an expression of social identification, while their successors read social identification as the product of political languages, *Class, Politics, and the Decline of Deference in England* reconnects the social and political in a more modest, sensitive, and plausible way. 'Politics' here figures less as the mobilization of interests or creation of constituencies, than as the tuning of vocabularies to popular experiences and perceptions.

Readers might question the 'decline' in Sutcliffe-Braithwaite's 'decline of deference', sceptical that Britain's working class was ever so deferential towards hierarchies social and cultural. More persuasive is her demonstration that, by the turn of the century, the middle classes had internalized a broadly egalitarian language – making it less likely, for example, to elicit a response such as this one from 1975: 'People will always be different, even if everyone has the same houses and the same money. We'd always be richer in our minds than the working classes, just by reading books... Jealousy and bitching is their main occupation' (p. 46). Based on the evidence offered here, whether or not working class deference actually declined, the middle class's sense of an entitlement to deference certainly did. *Class, Politics, and the Decline of Deference in England* successfully shows that class became obscured as a category of popular identification during the late twentieth century; draws upon those findings to reframe the political successes of Thatcherism and New Labour; and – most ambitiously – offers a compelling explanation of the complex relationship between social experience, popular perception and political change.

Guy Ortolano

New York University

Vladimir Kulić, ed., *Second World Postmodernisms: Architecture and Society under Late Socialism*, London, Bloomsbury, 2019; xi + 254 pp., £75.00 hbk; ISBN 9781350014442

This new edited volume draws our attention to the development and dissemination of postmodernist ideas in the architecture of the 'Second World' during the 1970s and 1980s. The purpose of the book is twofold. First, it aims to demonstrate that postmodernism was not alien to the architectural theories and practices of the socialist world. And second, it questions how best to conceptualise and comprehend 'postmodernism' in historical terms that are not tethered to a 'crisis of capitalism' or the specific socio-economic conditions of the West.

With its centre of gravity in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but including contributions on Cuba and China, the essays of *Second World Postmodernisms* evaluate the penetration of postmodernism into architectural discourses across a wide range of countries and regions. By the early 1980s, it is clear, architectural theorists all throughout the socialist world were discussing and debating postmodernism and the many fundamental questions it posed for socialist culture and society. The ideas of postmodern theorists such as Charles Jencks and Fredric Jameson circulated widely, often in samizdat form. A number of Second World architects came to see postmodernism's versatility and adaptability as ripe for addressing the increasingly palpable problems of functionalism and industrial construction that had typified socialist 'high modernism'. At least in the Eastern European cases, most of the volume's contributors generally agree on two points: that the emergence of postmodernism grew out of the cultural conditions of the 1970s, and that socialist postmodernisms did not simply consist of a unidirectional importation of the theories and aesthetics of 'First World postmodernism'.

This is about all they agree on, however. Kulić sets the field of play in his stimulating introduction, advancing the programmatic claim that 'socialism produced its own forms of postmodern architecture' (p. 2). Many contributors concur, some using the term 'socialist postmodernism' to describe a relatively autonomous architectural discourse bearing formal similarities to 'First World postmodernism' but lacking in key aspects, such as irony. Others, however, emphasise the inextricability of socialist postmodern discourses from those taking place in the West. Sometimes, postmodernism as a term is used simply to describe a certain set of aesthetic ideas and architectural practices. At other points, though, the very term is deconstructed to within a bare inch of its life. A short concluding essay by Reinhold Martin – suggestively titled 'A postmodernist international?' – cleverly elides the problem by celebrating postmodernism's inherent multiplicity.

The space afforded to disagreement on the subject is one of the book's great strengths. The effect can sometimes be disorienting, as the term 'postmodernism' is used with a huge variety of definitions and conceptual emphases. But in some ways, this is precisely the point. As outlined in his introduction, Kulić sets his