

exploitative working conditions, families that suffer from induced separation, children of undocumented immigrants who are routinely farmed out to the overburdened foster care system, “dreamers” who are caught in legal limbo, and women who are subjected to sexual, physical, and psychological abuse. H. cleverly opens her chapters with excerpts from Martin Espada’s poem “Imagine the Angels of Bread,” quotations that lend esthetic character and eloquently set the stage for the academically rigorous content of each chapter.

Real life stories serve H. as both backdrop and support for her argumentation. Although the book might well have included a few more powerful stories and mentioned more real people to give life to the statistics, the book is nevertheless reasonably well grounded on human experience.

H.’s interdisciplinary method also results in a more comprehensive treatment without watering down the book’s ethical character: the sociological, economic, and political dimensions of immigration are ethically framed. Finally, I am most appreciative of H.’s person-centered approach. For her, human solidarity rooted in Christian anthropology and compelled by moral argument is key to a theological ethics of immigration, as relationality is constitutive of our humanity. As she cogently argues, we are all members of the household of God, and we are our brothers’ and sisters’ keepers no matter who they are, what country they come from, and how they may have come into their receiving countries. God’s great economy of salvation must find room and bread for everyone.

While H.’s central claim and argument for kinship are clearly discernible throughout the book, perhaps the concluding chapter, “Civic Kinship and Subversive Hospitality,” could have better fulfilled its role by beginning it with a more purposeful and systematic synthesis, or by recalling the key points on kinship presented in the preceding chapters before moving on to the policy implications. The sociological data presented in this chapter tend to divert the focus on kinship as the moral leitmotif. Ultimately, however, the book is a groundbreaking contribution toward a much-needed Christian ethics of immigration.

*Australian Catholic University, Melbourne*

GEMMA TULUD CRUZ

THE ECONOMY OF DESIRE: CHRISTIANITY AND CAPITALISM IN A POSTMODERN WORLD. By Daniel M. Bell Jr. *The Church and Postmodern Culture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012. Pp. iv + 220. \$19.99.

Bell presents a compelling moral and theological exploration and evaluation of capitalist economic life. The book proposes that the work of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, two leading French political philosophers, sheds needed “light on the postmodern economy of desire” (38).

With Foucault's writings on power, technologies of the self, and governmentality, as well as Deleuze's treatment of desire and capitalism, B. suggests it is possible to more adequately grasp in ontological terms the notion that "capitalism is not merely an economic order but also a discipline of desire" (38). B. expresses wisely grounded moral concern for "the true nature and supernatural end of our desire" (90). A central question throughout is, what does capitalism do "to the fundamental human power that is desire"? (91) B. examines "the practices, habits, and institutions that constitute our economic lives and shape our desire" (22). Drawing on Deleuze and Foucault, B. proposes that capitalism "forms a particular kind of human subject" (94). Capitalist economies risk seriously distorting the creative power that is human desire with an endless array of distractions. For B., "our desire finds its true home, its rest, its delight in communion with God" (168).

Chapter 2 carefully explores "how capitalism is a discipline of desire" (52). A central argument of B.'s study is that capitalist market life disciplines human desire—presenting many serious moral risks to individual persons and to social life. For B., desire has been conformed "to the capitalist axiomatic even as we proclaim that we are free" (78). B.'s treatment of "the theology implicit in capitalism" (93) explores the ways capitalism and Christianity reveal conflicting economies of desire. Christianity "does not *discipline* desire so that it is distracted and distorted from its true end but rather *heals* desire" (93). The divine economy involves "what God is doing here and now to heal desire" (210). Christianity and Christ's work in the world can liberate desire from the distortions of capitalism. Christ's work of atonement and offer of redemption incorporate human desire into God's divine economy of eternal generosity. B. does not suggest withdrawal or escapism but rather engagement in economic life as part of the church's mission. Importantly, the Christian "works of mercy" have great potential to reshape desire and renew human communion with God and others.

B.'s excellent study courageously explores the pressing questions concerning the conflicted relationship of Christian life to the economic sphere. A central insight of the book is that while capitalism overall "works" in practical terms and makes life materially better for many human beings, it can also seriously misdirect and confuse desire in persons, and this can in turn lead to misunderstanding and harm in the relationship of communion of "enjoyment and rest" with God and others (140). Desire misdirected by capitalism often leads rather to "endless dissatisfaction and toil" (140) and to unhappiness and unfulfillment of the true ends of human life.

Some readers may question aspects of B.'s understanding of the relationship between theology and capitalism. Seeking to avoid an escapist position for theology, B.'s nuanced perspective that "the market, and indeed the

discipline of economics, should be subordinate to theological concerns” (26) may raise questions for some. Yet, here B. rightly seeks to challenge the common view that economic life is value free or value neutral in moral terms. Others may pose questions about the metaphysical positions of Deleuze that appear to conceive of “being as desire” (42). B. acknowledges that many in the modern West would struggle with Deleuze’s perspective that “reality is constituted by desire” rather than “being” (42). B. does, however, offer a critique of “failed” understandings of Christianity by Deleuze and Foucault. Other readers might also raise questions about Deleuze’s well-known Marxist materialist metaphysical views (44). In places, the more technical philosophical treatment of the work of Deleuze and Foucault makes for dense reading. Yet, careful readers will discover that their efforts are well repaid.

This well-written and carefully argued work should be welcomed by all who are interested in the complex moral questions about economic life in our time. B.’s engaging theological and moral analysis also presents a wise and inspiring spiritual vision. The divine economy and B.’s focus on “what God is doing here and now to heal desire” (210) along with fostering Christian works of mercy, simplicity, solidarity, and the reordering of life “in accord with the common good and the universal destination of material goods” (211) point to a way forward in these challenging times.

*Fairfield University, CT*

FRANCIS T. HANNAFEY, S.J.

HIPPOCRATIC, RELIGIOUS, AND SECULAR MEDICAL ETHICS: THE POINTS OF CONFLICT. By Robert M. Veatch. Washington: Georgetown University, 2012. Pp. xiii + 242. \$29.95.

Veatch successfully provides a critical reading of the Hippocratic Oath in medical ethics. His volume, however, is more ambitious. Developing his 2008 Gifford Lectures on the ethics of medicine, he explores the relationship of professional medical ethics to the religious and secular sources of ethical reasoning and praxis.

On the one hand, V. challenges medical ethics by stressing the incompatibility of the Hippocratic approach with today’s medical practice and ethics. The Hippocratic Oath was the expression of a very particular philosophical group (Pythagorean-like); it resembles an initiation rite; it is highly paternalistic and individualistic; and it ignores the contributions of religious and secular ethics in articulating rights, duties, and norms. Hence, it should not be considered the foundation of medical ethics (chap. 1). V.’s historical study (chap. 2) is quite selective and interesting—despite not referring to Albert Jonsen’s insightful *Short History of Medical Ethics* [2000]—and it stresses the weak presence of the Oath throughout the centuries. Moreover,