

says that comprise *This is What a Feminist Slut Looks Like* address a variety of issues surrounding the movement, including the creation of privileged places and the efficacy of the movement—past, present and future. The authors utilize autobiographical approaches to explain challenges of modern feminism and the SlutWalk, such as white supremacy, ableism, and fatphobia, that have seeped into the SlutWalk. Authors tackle these challenges head on with the feminist perspective of intersectionality. This book is a must read for anyone interested in social movements and feminist reclamation in the twenty-first century.

In Our Hands: The Struggle for U.S. Child Care Policy

Elizabeth Palley and Corey S. Shdaimah
New York: New York University Press

REVIEWED BY KRISTIN MARSH

At the heart of Elizabeth Palley and Corey Shdaimah's *In Our Hands: The Struggle for U.S. Child Care Policy*, is a persistent policy paradox. Although 64.2 percent of mothers with children under six participate in the paid labor force, appropriate child care is notoriously difficult to find and afford. Confoundingly, there is currently no will either at grassroots, advocacy, or legislative levels to coordinate change efforts. Palley and Shdaimah provide a multi-tiered understanding of the history and persistence of our patchwork system of care policies. Culturally, the dominant ideological divide between the public and private spheres renders child care a personal problem to be solved within the family; in this ideological frame, mothers should be caring for young children in the home. Further, the current political climate eschews government spending and, especially, government intervention in our private lives.

Given this ideological backdrop, the authors analyze the history of policy formation and legislative debates over the past 40 years. The U.S. public and congress broadly supported the first and only potentially comprehensive bill (the *Comprehensive Child Development Act*, vetoed by President Nixon in 1971). Successful legislative initiatives since then have been narrow in scope and the resulting patchwork of programs are generally underfunded and divided between those concerned with providing early childhood education and those addressing custodial care needs. Head Start and pre-K programs, for example, focus on the importance of early education and are often only partial

day programs. The Child Care Development Fund, in contrast, targets poor single mothers who need to work. Finally, income tax deductions are inadequate and end up benefitting only families in the middle class.

Next, the authors draw on extensive interview data with leading policy advocates, representing a broad range of national interest-group and policy research organizations that would logically prioritize childcare. These organizational spokespersons and elite leaders provide their perspective on whether and to what extent childcare policies are on their organizational agenda and to what extent broad-based childcare policy is strategically feasible and desirable. By examining, first, the history and current landscape of care policies and, second, the perspective of policy/research organizations, the authors' analysis points to entrenched institutional stasis and an understandable constraining effect of the relationship between policy-making and interest-group advocacy for universal care.

Understanding why we have no universal, comprehensive childcare is one thing; understanding what to do about it is another. The great contribution of *In Our Hands* is that it explains both well. Pally and Shdaimah argue that, if we are to revolutionize childcare policy, we cannot rely on elites to lead the way. Rather, grassroots mobilization and cross-class, cross-race coalition building allows for social movement mobilization on a broad, populist scale. They call for a series of required steps: leveraging facts (raising public awareness); cross-jurisdictional comparison; framing the problem in terms of moral outrage rather than cost-benefit analysis; and articulating a vision for universal care. The lynchpin of their argument is the social movement concept of framing. Re-framing the national discussion about childcare is a huge task, but the authors argue that it is possible to frame the well-being of children as "a moral value or a public good" (208), against opponents of universal childcare, who can be characterized as "antichildren and antiwomen or, even, to tap into conservative rhetoric, as antifamily" (210). In addition, activists need to replace the dominant frame of government retrenchment with one that recognizes the supportive potential of government.

This book represents a meaningful first step toward that important reframing. As the authors point out, we may not all be parents (though many are), but we have all been children. Other countries (notably, France, Sweden, and Denmark; also Canada and England) have effective models for quality, affordable child care. The U.S. military provides a U.S. example of childcare as a public good. While the welfare states scholarship emphasizes differences in welfare state regimes and the limiting policy potential in market-based systems, Palley and Shdaimah argue that—given the right moment and the right strategy—the U.S. public could effectively demand and achieve large-scale reform. Most women work, poor women struggle especially hard to find