projects, generation of improved technical data by credible researchers, and full public participation as solutions for irrational public resistance, based on a "psychology of fear." To the contrary, there is little evidence that improved information and effective dissemination will lower public resistance to a LULU perceived to threaten property values and community self-esteem. This is amply demonstrated by the continuing battles to site other LULUs like group homes for the mentally impaired and power plants where the effects are much better known. Moreover, the creation and employment of knowledge respond to power relationships. As is evident during the Reagan administration, the odds are against objective assessment and neutral application.

It appears that the liberal experiment with informed participatory democracy will give way unfortunately either to economic inducements or to state preemption of local landuse controls, if new hazardous waste facilities are to be sited. The real credibility gap is emerging from disappointed liberal reformers rather than from a politically active public that is defending its local residential and consumption space against the negative aftereffects of expanded production.

Although many political and economic factors complicate Greenberg and Anderson's prognosis and thwart their sincere prescription, the book is not without merit. It remains a thorough and relatively inexpensive compendium on existent research about the most enigmatic environmental problem of our time. As such, the book is an important reference for the practitioner.—MICHAEL K. HEIMAN

SPATIAL DIVISION OF LABOR: Social Structures and the Geography of Production. By DOREEN MASSEY. xi and 339 pp.; diagrs., bibliogr., index. New York: Methuen, 1984. $29.95 (hardbound); $11.95 (softbound). 21.5 × 13.5 cm.

In the United States since 1973 and in Great Britain since the mid-1960s, a sharply new spatial division of labor has been in the making. The patterns that were filled out, solidified, and fought against since the late 1940s were demolished in the 1970s. In the large sense this change produced a new regional geography, while at a local scale it has led to a virtual confusion of geographical patterns, trends, and singularities. These dramatic changes in the real world have provoked considerable academic research, concern, and commentary, but this work has been characterized by a substantial dichotomy between theoretical treatments too abstract to be operable and empirical descriptions too specific to be generalizable. In her much-awaited book, Doreen Massey attempts to bridge the gulf between these disjointed, if not necessarily opposing, perspectives. Her subject is the changing industrial geography, transformed spatial division of labor, and new regional geography of the United Kingdom.
Massey attempts to join arguments and perspectives that have tended to remain separate: social and spatial, economic and cultural, regional and international, class and gender, geographical differentiation and homogenization. What she accomplishes is an impressive crystallization of patterns in process, a succinct summary and development of work on the new regional geography. This book will function as a baseline for future work.

In the introductory chapter, Massey offers her general argument: recent changes in industrial geography result partly from economic imperatives, but more importantly from class struggle and changes in class relationships. It is not simply the logic of capital accumulation, but a broad pattern of social and political struggle and transformation that is responsible for these new spatial divisions of labor, the new regional geography. In Chapter 2, Massey expostulates on the social character of production and points to its inherently spatial character; geography matters, she asserts. Chapter 3 places regional change in the context of general patterns of uneven development and proposes a tripartite classification of industrial spatial structures. The three main types of spatial organization in British industry are the concentrated model, where most of the corporate activity and all control are centralized in one place or at least one region; the cloning model, where integrated production and control facilities are replicated across the landscape in different locations; and the parts-processing model, where parts are made in the various peripheral regions and assembled at one central point. Illustrations of these different spatial structures are provided in Chapter 4, where Massey looks at the changing geography of electronics, apparel, and services.

In Chapter 5 her comparison and contrast of the different experiences of decline in South Wales and Cornwall concludes that, while the center-periphery generalization has some currency, the periphery is peripheral for a wide variety of place-specific reasons. In the final chapter she attempts an overview of the changing regional policies of British governments since the early 1960s and insists that the role of the state is crucial in the contemporary regional geography of the United Kingdom. But it is not just a one-way logic. As much as a new geography is the product of the social, political, and economic transformation in the last twenty years, so too geography has shaped that transformation. Engrained geographical divisions and links have been sharpened or flattened: old regions have been stretched beyond their limits, but old and new regions have also given form and content to the new strivings toward social and industrial organization.

Massey has written an elegant statement on the state of the art in regional research. She combines theoretical insights with a commitment to empirical detail, generalization with an eye for differentiated regional patterns. A principal cornerstone for future research, this book will act as a measure against which others will be evaluated. It is also important to highlight the weaknesses of the analysis, and here there are two main issues. There is a question of scale. Although this work examines the regional scale
and regions, Massey nowhere states her definitions of a region or regional scale. Indeed this central idea is uncharacteristically vague. Regions are variously as large as Scotland and as small as the Rhoda. Furthermore, discussions of "greenfield" siting away from urban centers are often mixed with arguments about the decline of the north at the expense of the southeast; thus the urban scale of analysis is confused with the regional. This observation might appear picky, but I think it goes to the heart of Massey’s ambiguity about regional restructuring. She emphasizes that the internal society of regions is completely changed, their labor markets transformed, their coherence shattered, and their external links reorganized, but she omits any explicit discussion of the complete change of scale at which regions are constituted. She glosses over the problem with a discussion of specific regions—particularly the coalfields of South Wales—that are seemingly changing in relation to a nebulous “wider region.” The point is that the current structuring eliminates the neat, nested hierarchy of regions and regional scales (was Scotland ever a single region?), and the developing regions are much more systematic, functional, and international than ever before. If we had a more elaborated historical theory of spatial scale, some of the complexities identified by Massey might begin to make sense as a part of large patterns rather than as unique details of change.

The second criticism, not wholly separate from the first, is temporal rather than spatial in focus. The overall picture of a tripartite industrial structure and a geography that generally mirrors this division is more a continuation of the 1960 patterns than an anticipation of the patterns and processes already in place in the 1980s. If the north-south division has become more acute, the north has also experienced an internal reorganization so that parts of Scotland have experienced limited growth or at least an abeyance of decline, while the northwest has become the most-depressed region outside Northern Ireland. This pattern suggests a complex geographical division that cannot be understood without an articulate understanding of scale.

If these problems emerge in Massey’s text, they are not hers alone. The problems are worth emphasizing precisely because they are general and apply to all researchers who are involved in the project Massey addresses. “Spatial Division of Labor” is the best exploration of the patterns and complexities of regional restructuring so far available.—Neil Smith