other reform options for reinventing welfare, such as changing or increasing the revenues of pension systems and expanding the general public pension scheme's coverage to the self-employed and civil servants. From a sociological perspective, more information about 'social sustainability', such as inequality and poverty in old age in different pension schemes with different benefit calculations and funding modes, would offer evidence of whether the Austrian pension system is—compared to that of other countries—worth its price.

Overall, the main value of the book is its contribution to discussions about pension reforms and about alternatives to excessive welfare states with high levels of inactivity and to privatised welfare schemes resulting in high levels of inequality and poverty. Furthermore, the elaborate content of the chapters includes the most recent demographic considerations (beyond the standard old-age dependency ratios) and contributes new pension benefit calculations, suggestions on how to improve equality for disabled persons, and ways of achieving greater gender equality by carefully balancing the strengths and weaknesses of various practical instruments. As such, anyone—and not only in Austria—interested in public pension reform should read this book.

Tobias Wiß
Johannes Kepler University, Linz
tobias.wiss@jku.at

References

Ebbinghaus, B. (ed.) 2011. *The Varieties of Pension Governance—Pension Privatization in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holzmann, R. and E. Palmer (eds.). 2006. *Pension Reform. Issues and Prospects for Non-financial Defined Contribution (NDC) Schemes*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Immergut, E. M., K. M. Anderson and I. Schulze (eds.). 2007. *The Handbook of West European Pension Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniel Innerarity: *The Future and Its Enemies: In Defense of Political Hope* **(trans. Sandra Kingery)**
Stanford, CA, 2012: Stanford University Press, 134 pp.

Modern Western societies do not take good care of the future. The future is just the dumping ground for the explosion of today's problems, or it is simply imagined as a continuation of some on-going present, or it is just not really thought about terribly much at all. As Daniel Innerarity says, we have a poor relationship with the future. His book is a strong call for the relationship to be improved. If it is not, there will just be a 'societal drift' from one crisis to another, and nothing to inspire hope. If a better relationship with the future is not established, our prospects are grim. According to Innerarity, 'our current political crisis corresponds to a crisis of the future and its growing indecipherability' (p. 2). Politics today is in crisis because it is too focused on the short term and forgets about long-term possibilities and consequences. It lacks a sense of responsibility. Politics is not providing a guidebook with which the future might be read.

The solution to this dual crisis, of politics and the future alike is identified by Innerarity in the constitution of a more democratic politics that will not tie the future to the demands of the present. For him, politics is 'the attempt to civilize the future … to reject the colonization of the future by a determinate past, to impede its ideological monopoly or its abandonment to simple administrative inertia' (p. 118). He talks about the need for a new type of politics, one which has moved away from the old style of cognitive model-making and which instead seeks to create space for new knowledge through the acceptance of uncertainty and disagreement: 'Politics should be viewed as a space celebrating the provisional, the experimental, and recognized discord.' (p. 104) This is politics as ideal-typical democracy.

Innerarity shows how the future has declined as a horizon through an impressive sociology which moves from pension policy to the complexity of globalisation. The most insightful part of the sociology is almost certainly the excellent discussion of 'chronopolitics'. He talks about the pluralisation of time in contemporary social life, and links this to the freedom created by the collapse of tradition. Different times co-exist, and where they come together there can be conflict. For example, 'the time of fashion does not coincide with the time of religion, nor does technological time coincide with legal time, nor economic with political time, not the time of the ecosystem with the time of consumption' (p. 82). This keen awareness enables Innerarity to point towards a sociology of time that is far more nuanced and interesting than the flatter account offered by Giddens. Indeed, when reading the sociology in this book it is hard not to be reminded of Giddens, although Innerarity draws more explicitly on the likes of Luhmann and, it must be said, offers something rather more subtle.

One example of Innerarity's insight comes with his proposition that if the hypotheses on time which he offers are valid, it might be necessary to rethink the meaning of exclusion. At the very least it might be necessary to add a consideration of time to the analysis of exclusion. The 'new outsiders' Innerarity proposes are those who do not have control over their own time: 'Being excluded means not being allowed to coordinate one's time with a public time in which vital opportunities, such as power, employment, or recognition, are negotiated. A marginalized person is not on the spatial periphery, but is literally living in another time.' (p. 80) The management of time can be a tool of inclusion and exclusion: time itself therefore can be a site of social contestation. This is a profound insight, one of exceptional sociological, moral, and political importance.

Yet this sociology sits side by side with a demand for a new democratic politics. Consequently, it is no surprise to find Innerarity moving to identify the wider context in which such a politics is to be practised. The context is defined by globalisation. Innerarity takes the meaning of globalisation for granted and he talks about it most powerfully when he considers what a left politics of the future might look like. For Innerarity, any left politics must avoid the simple rejection of globalisation and must instead go about the task of 'understanding the positive effects globalization can have on the redistribution of wealth, the emergence of new actors, or the change in the rules of the game in power relationships' (p. 117). For Innerarity, globalisation offers cautious hope because it opens up possibilities. Here the ghost of Giddens seems to ride again, this time accompanied by another apologist for globalisation as it is—Tony Blair.

Innerarity's understanding of politics is tied to an almost functionalist systems theory. Politics better enables society to 'civilize the future' because it creates opportunities to confront contingency and thus learn from uncertainty. Politics is not about the imposition of a plan to be achieved at some bright new dawn. Rather, politics is about the reproduction of a system of governability able to move forwards through its ability to learn and therefore take responsibility for the future. In this schema everything can make the governability of the present and the future more responsible, more 'civilised': 'The political system's ability to configure is not realized in spite of its limitations but because of them. We could say that the resistance that societies and objects have against being governed constitutes a source of learning for politics and a guarantee against irrefutable leadership.' Totalitarian democracy? But for the learning to be truly democratic, '[p]olitics must pursue an alternative method of intervention that is no longer hierarchical

and domineering, but horizontally inclined, meaning it can successfully engage social, economic, and cultural agents' (p. 120).

This last quotation highlights the tension which runs through this book and which it is completely incapable of overcoming. This is because the tension actually cannot be overcome. On one hand, Innerarity offers a subtle and insightful sociology of the present and its problems with the future. On the other hand, he does this in order to recuperate a normative understanding of democratic politics that is tied to a functionalist systems theory. On one hand, he seeks to understand the world, on the other, he knows what the system needs if it is to function in and for the future.

Innerarity is extremely fond of statements about 'what is needed', what 'we must' do, and so on. From the point of view of the functioning system, these normative claims make sense. Furthermore, Innerarity's much used category of 'we' does not need to be specified or even conceptualised because it is presumed to be self-evidently identical with the constituency of those who are agents within the system. There is no outside. The problem is that it is quite impossible to identify any basis upon which 'what is needed' or what 'we must' do might possibly be realised. The only basis Innerarity can identify is a 'reasonable hope' (p. 124) that we might learn to treat our future reasonably and 'beneficially' (p. 123). Presumably, the 'beneficial' is to be defined as 'that which is of assistance to the futurity of the reproduction of the functioning system'.

Innerarity is able to avoid any full confrontation with the problem of how the 'what is needed' might achieve the transition to the 'what is done' because he is concerned with democracy as the ideal-typical politics of a functional system. Accordingly, questions of power, economics, interest, mendacity, and corruption are simply ignored. In the contemporary situation, he says, politics has 'the function' of 'the civi-lized management of disagreements regarding the concerns and conceptions of public interest' (p. 94). From a normative point of view, this claim is understandable. It is indeed the foundation of an impeccably democratic politics. Unfortunately, it is a politics unlikely ever to be practised. In the conditions of neo-liberalism, politics is about state-corporatist hegemony (where the state provides the coercion to defend the corporatist common sense) in the service of the management of the extraction of private profit from public goods.

Keith Tester
University of Hull
K.Tester@hull.ac.uk

Clare L. Stacey: *The Caring Self: The Work Experiences of Home Care Aids*
Ithaca, NY, 2011: Cornell University Press, 199 pp.

Employed carers providing care in people's own homes are usually covered in a shroud of invisibility because of their gender, relative low-earnings, and social status. The duties they perform are often seen as menial and take place within the confines of the walls of the houses of the people they care for. It is this shroud of invisibility that in *The Caring Self* Clare Stacey aims to unclothe by giving a voice to those working in the home care sector. The book is the result of an analysis of 33 in-depth interviews with workers at three home care agencies, one public and two private for-profit, in the US states of California and Ohio and the close observation of their working conditions and relationships with users.

Stacey begins by depicting the life trajectories or paths of carers: how they came to perform these tasks. For the most part, interviewed carers came from disadvantaged backgrounds and their care trajectories are a tale of constrained choices, often linked to ingrained social norms that still