

willingness to not give up on their calling. In fact, her analysis shows the importance of organizational culture in the production of news. “[W]hile redesigned newsrooms can facilitate multiplatform delivery, they are ineffective without a newsroom culture in which journalists feel empowered to work autonomously, free from the corporate emphasis on individual article metrics, on daily story quotas, and on backpack journalism” (p. 38).

The book would have benefited from considering how newspapers are conceptualizing their audiences and how they are responding to generational shifts in reading the news. The lament that young people are not reading newspapers is as old as newspapers, but it would have been interesting to hear from journalists how they think they can reach a younger audience that uses a multitude of channels to engage with the world. Exploring the changing relationship between producers and consumers of news (i.e., interactivity) would have been interesting from another perspective as well. For too long traditional journalism was reluctant to listen more carefully to its communities, and especially to underrepresented social and ethnic groups. We still lack knowledge, effort, and best practices that would remedy these shortcomings.

Nemanic contributes greatly to the scholarship on daily newspapers and their position in the digital news environment as she shows that the current situation of newspapers varies widely, depending on key factors like ownership, management strategies, and professional routines. If there is a silver lining for newspapers to harness the possibilities of digital journalism, it comes from the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. As Nemanic observes, a “major factor contributing to the prosperity of the Star Tribune” is “its willingness to experiment with new practices and new ways of telling stories” (p. 142).

Clearly, the workhorses aren’t done yet. And so they trot on.

Degrees of Separation: Identity Formation while Leaving Ultra-Orthodox Judaism, by **Schneur Zalman Newfield**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2020. 248 pp. \$99.50 cloth. ISBN: 9781439918951.

CAROLINE L. FAULKNER
Franklin & Marshall College
caroline.faulkner@fandm.edu

In the United States, religion is largely treated as a matter of choice. In his book *Degrees of Separation: Identity Formation while Leaving Ultra-Orthodox Judaism*, Schneur Zalman Newfield questions this notion, arguing that some religions, such as ultra-Orthodox Judaism, have such powerful and long-lasting effects on members’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that they persist in some form even among those who choose to leave. According to Newfield, these enduring, often unconscious attachments among exiters to ultra-Orthodox ways of thinking and doing call into question common conceptualizations of religious identity and exit.

Newfield’s primary argument is that religious exit, which occurs when individuals distance themselves from their religious communities in visible, public ways, has been conceived far too often as having a binary outcome, where individuals are either “in” or “out” of a particular religious group. Based on his qualitative interviews of 74 exiters from Lubavitch and Satmar ultra-Orthodox communities, he demonstrates that, for individuals who leave ultra-Orthodox groups, exiting is a long-term process, shaped by the boundaries of their communities of origin. In fact, Newfield describes his interviewees as “exiters” to show that their exit is still in progress.

He proposes that the concept of liminality provides a useful approach to understanding the experience of these religious exiters. To Newfield, liminality is a long-term state of in-betweenness, in which individuals have distanced themselves from their communities of origin without fully entering new communities. It denotes the limits of individuals’ capacities for complete identity transformation. Newfield classifies his interviewees into three different categories of liminality. Those who incorporate without considerable

consternation elements of their communities of origin and their new communities are “hybrid” exiters; those who have difficulty replacing elements of their communities of origin are “trapped” exiters; and those who appear to have had total separation from their communities of origin while exhibiting preoccupation with them are “disconnected” exiters. In addition, Newfield finds evidence of liminality in his interviewees’ narratives themselves, which he categorizes as intellectual, involving critiques of their communities’ beliefs or practices, or social-emotional, revealing emotional suffering in their communities of origin. To Newfield, these narratives reveal liminality because they involve reactions to their ultra-Orthodox communities’ failed promises of intellectualism or support.

Newfield provides considerable additional examination of liminality among his interviewees. For example, he considers their “habits of action,” such as an aversion to pork, and “habits of thought,” such as conservative gender attitudes, to be reflective of at-times unconscious yet lasting connections to their ultra-Orthodox upbringings. Among the subset of hybrid interviewees, Newfield also identifies a number of strategies to manage their liminality—in relation to their communities of origin as well as to their still ultra-Orthodox families, which he emphasizes do not completely shun family members who exit. Ultimately, based on his findings, Newfield proposes the use of the concept of liminality and exploration of habits of thought and action in exits from other total institutions, specifically divorce, exit from prison, and immigration.

Newfield, an exiter himself from a Lubavitch ultra-Orthodox community, is a skilled interpreter of the ultra-Orthodox communities that he investigates. He provides deep insight into their beliefs, practices, and lifestyles, revealing similarities and differences across the Lubavitch and Satmar communities that he studies. Readers of this book will come away with a much deeper sense of ultra-Orthodox life as well as a clearer understanding of the variation that exists under this umbrella term.

In addition, Newfield’s argument that exiting is a long-term process and that elements of their ultra-Orthodox upbringings persist for

exiters is a convincing one. He ably argues for the incorporation of the theoretical concept of liminality into studies of religious exit. Moreover, he marshals substantial compelling evidence in support of his claims. His investigation of his interviewees’ narratives establishes clear links between their ultra-Orthodox origins and their current life situations in their thoughts and actions, demonstrating how they remain in an in-between state.

To support his claims about the sociology of religion’s emphasis on binary conceptions of religious exit, Newfield focuses on scholarship relating to the experiences of individuals who joined and left New Religious Movements. Yet, to gain a deeper understanding of religious identity, I wondered why he did not engage more with literature on Jewish identities or scholarship on exit from other strict, totalizing religious groups, like the Old Order Amish. These literatures seem to offer clearer parallels to the ultra-Orthodox case. Moreover, since Newfield appears keenly aware of theoretical insights that can be drawn across different subfields within the discipline and the multidimensionality of ultra-Orthodox identities, I further questioned why he did not attempt to draw from the vast field of research on immigrant assimilation, which has long investigated the blending and reshaping of immigrants’ identities in their new communities.

While Newfield’s limited engagement with this research does not detract from his primary finding that exiting ultra-Orthodox communities is a long-term process involving a sense of in-betweenness, engaging further with these other bodies of literature could have offered inroads to deeper theoretical insights regarding the multidimensionality of religious identities. For example, Newfield categorizes exiters into types and their narratives into groups. He also identifies their varying habits of thought and action along with strategies for managing liminality—although only among hybrid exiters. Yet, Newfield rarely discusses how these varying exiting types, narratives, habits, and strategies relate to one another. Because Newfield’s primary focus is on challenging the binary approach to religious identity, he expends most effort on demonstrating the presence of liminality in his interviewees’ lives. He

does not examine patterns in these varying dimensions of liminality. Readers are left to wonder about the fuller picture that could be drawn from the connections that may exist across these multiple dimensions.

In addition, Newfield provides deep, thoughtful, reflexive reflection on his methodological approach to his interviews, yet he offers only minimal discussion of his analytical methods in an appendix, where he notes his grounded theory approach. This lack of discussion creates uncertainty regarding some of his findings. Most notably, it is unclear how he arrives at his three-category typology of hybrid, trapped, and disconnected exiters, since he provides no quotations from his interviewees' narratives to explain this categorization. Readers, then, are left to puzzle out these categories' meanings and their roles in exiters' lives.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, Newfield's book offers a deep, descriptive accounting of the experiences of exiters from ultra-Orthodox Judaism. In so doing, it contributes substantial insight into ultra-Orthodox communities. It also provides clear evidence of liminality in the lives of ultra-Orthodox exiters, as they navigate between their worlds of origin and their new communities. Furthermore, Newfield's concept of liminality can undoubtedly provide a useful starting point for future studies of religious exit so that they may expand beyond binary approaches to more deeply examine the forces that shape individuals' religious identities. I highly recommend this book for scholars and graduate students of religious identity, religious exit, and Jewish Studies.

Bans, Walls, Raids, Sanctuary: Understanding U.S. Immigration for the Twenty-First Century, by **A. Naomi Paik**. Oakland: University of California Press, 2020. 184 pp. \$18.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520305120.

EMINE FIDAN ELICIOGLU
University of Toronto
 fidan.elcioglu@utoronto.ca

A. Naomi Paik has gifted readers with a truly remarkable piece of public sociolo-

gy. *Bans, Walls, Raids, Sanctuary: Understanding U.S. Immigration for the Twenty-First Century* is a short, accessibly written critical history of the three executive orders—authorizing the Muslim *ban*, the construction of a U.S.-Mexico border *wall*, and ramped up immigration *raids*—that would set the tone for the Trump administration's immigration policy. The book is also a hopeful (but realizable) roadmap for the struggle ahead. Paik's main argument is as straightforward as it is powerful: "The problem is not Donald Trump," she writes. "The problem is the United States of America" (p. 131). With the precision of a historian and the urgency of a seasoned activist, Paik shows how the political, economic, and legislative basis for these executive orders was put in place long before Trump assumed power. The corollary of this analysis is clear: even if a Democrat captures the next presidency, "organizing must go on. . . . There is no waiting it out" (p. 131).

In the Introduction, Paik pulls back the veil on a set of familiar, even cherished myths: that America is a nation of immigrants, that it is a democratic society that cherishes equality, and that the Trump administration's assaults on the foreign-born represent an un-American aberration. The tougher truth, Paik writes with incisive clarity, is that the United States is a settler colonial nation. It was built with the labor and lives of enslaved African-descended people on land stolen from and held through the genocide of Indigenous peoples. The state has always violently policed who can stay and how they may participate in society. This founding impulse toward excluding and exploiting "others" is still alive today. Indeed, in a global economy shaped by neoliberal capitalism and ravaged by its cascade of consequences, Paik argues, capital has grown increasingly reliant on coercive and ideological forms of exclusion. The criminalization of different groups (including racialized immigrants) is a convenient way to discipline labor and conceal the neoliberal roots of social problems. The pain and misery flowing from austerity measures, the offshoring of wealth and power, the rising cost of living, and the steady destruction of the environment are transmuted into