The final section of this book — that of 'metaphors as mutineers' — includes four diverse chapters regarding the transformative potential of these tropes in global debates. For example, Sullivan presents what she considers to be the most mutinous and inspirational metaphors for understanding our global world; among these are Deleuze and Guattari's notion of a 'rhizome', and Bohm's 'holoflux'. This is followed by a chapter by Szeman who ponders the role of literary studies in a world where the writer is no longer accepted without question as 'the guardian of the good and true', and one by Shah which examines the place of the 'Cosmopolis', 'Empire', 'Multitude', and 'Network society' metaphors in a an emerging geographic space where traditional conceptions of sovereignty are being challenged. The final mutineer chapter involves Falk's questioning of the present-day metaphors found in the UN's efforts at reform; here he advocates a shift to 'horizon' metaphors as a source of change.

The final two chapters of the book include a commentary by Fierke and one by the three editors. These closing contributions highlight the central value of this work to all scholars which is to suggest that academic debates around specific issues are best appreciated as a construction full of tensions and contradictions, which when reflected upon critically will help guide our analysis of the past, present and future of our disciplines. These concluding chapters urge those within international studies to remain reflexive about the metaphors they globalize by, as the backgrounds, assumptions and practices in which these metaphors are embedded, circulated and contested, ought to be investigated.

The core insights of this book will certainly not be novel to those comfortable with either the epistemological and ontological discussions of the science and technology community, or with the insights of postmodern/poststructuralist theorists. What is new are the sorts of metaphorical examples presented to support the anti-positivist and anti-essentialist position of this work. Readers who have yet to think about the powerful and problematic terms circulating in the current discussion of globalization will likely be surprised by the sorts of metaphors that are raised by the authors because they are so often taken for granted ('global village', 'Empire', 'network society', 'global marketplace', 'multiculturalism' etc.). Moreover, the analytic triad which opens this work — metaphors as mirrors, magicians, or mutineers — is a unique way of organizing and conceptualizing the debates about what metaphors do, thereby addressing a topic which had fascinated scholars across disciplines since the time of Aristotle. This collection will, however, be disappointing for someone seeking specific methodological guidance about how best to conduct a metaphor analysis, as all of the chapters are broad in scope, and lack precise details about how to accomplish the type of reflexive work being promoted.

In sum, those looking for a primer on the metaphors of globalization and the role of metaphors in these debates will find this book essential reading. However, those wanting any sort of methodological program about how to incorporate the insights of these authors into their own practice will have to look elsewhere.

Charting a course for bioethics

Mark B Brown

***Progress in Bioethics: Science, Policy, and Politics*, edited by Jonathan D Moreno and Sam Berger**
MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2010, 308 pages, US$29.00 (cloth), ISBN 0262134888.

Mark B Brown is an associate professor in the Department of Government, California State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6089, USA. Email: mark.brown @csus.edu.

During eight long years of a conservative presidency, the liberals that dominate mainstream bioethics in the United States struggled to find an effective response. A new president is in office, but the 'conservative bioethics' that emerged during the Bush years remains prominent, and the liberal struggle continues. The volume under review pursues the dual task of settling accounts with the Bush administration and exploring the contours of a distinctly 'progressive' approach to bioethics. The first task lends a polemical tone to some of the chapters, whilst the second generates valuable reflections and instructive disagreements on the professional identity of bioethics and its relation to politics, science, and religion. The introductory chapter by editors

Jonathan Moreno and Sam Berger offers a nuanced discussion of the historical sources, political promise, and potential pitfalls of progressive bioethics. For the editors, progressive bioethics is committed to practical results rather than rigid principles, experiment rather than ideology, a hopeful rather than pessimistic stance toward the future, and a focus on concerns of the powerless rather than elites. They also write that progressivism includes a commitment to democracy, but they repeatedly invoke the 'shared values' that should guide public policy without discussing how these shared values might be established or maintained (pp 5, 6, 9, 16, 20). This raises an interesting question: despite their genuine differences, how much does progressive bioethics share with its ostensible rivals?

One answer to this question appears in several authors' reflections on whether or not bioethics should be explicitly political. Richard Lempert argues that progressives hold distinctive beliefs and 'ultimately they justify a separate label' (p 37). But he also writes, 'I still am made uneasy by the term "progressive bioethics", because I believe that what so-called progressive bioethics stands for is, for the most part, nothing more than sound bioethical analysis' (p 41). Lempert thus echoes a longstanding view of bioethics as politically neutral. Similarly, Eric Meslin writes that US bioethics commissions have long been progressive, insofar as they have been 'pragmatic, policy focused, and ideologically neutral' (p 146). For John Evans, in contrast, bioethics has never been truly neutral, because it has excluded religious conservatives, who comprise about half the US population (p 126). At any rate, as Arthur Caplan points out, the politicization of bioethics results from its success in shaping policy, and it may now be unavoidable: 'the days of hanging on the fringe and offering commentary solely in a prophetic mode are over' (p 223).

Indeed, several of the chapters inveigh against conservative bioethics. Kathryn Hinsch surveys the landscape of conservative bioethics groups, not to evaluate their arguments or seek common ground, but to urge resistance. Laurie Zoloth recounts her initial sympathy for the Bush administration's President's Council on Bioethics, but then caricatures the concerns it raised about the medicalization of society (pp 93–102), even though those concerns have been voiced by authors from across the political spectrum, including Paul Root Wolpe in this volume. Moreover, rather than seriously engaging with conservative critiques of biotechnology, many of the authors psychologize them. For conservatives, biotechnology causes 'worries' (p 13) and 'offends public sensibilities' (p 47). Conservatives are driven by 'fear of social change wrought by technological innovation' (p 56), and they recruit those who are 'confused and afraid' (p 78). Progressives, in contrast, bravely oppose the 'fear that drives so much of conservative bioethics' (p 95). These characterizations undermine the conciliatory tone of the volume's afterword, where the editors note that 'concerns about many new biotechnologies cut across traditional political lines … potentially leading to unexpected cooperation between normally opposing political camps' (p 274).

This ambiguity about conservative bioethics reappears in the book's treatment of science. Alta Charo insists on a 'divide, between those who celebrate the transformative power of science and those who fear it' (p 57). James Hughes offers a useful ideological map of contemporary bioethics, and then defends a libertarian view of science, dismissing 'vaguely defined ill effects on the family or on social solidarity' (p 185). The volume editors, in contrast, argue for 'efforts to constrain and shape' biomedical technologies 'and, at times, to prohibit them' (p 19). Daniel Callahan notes that 'the American infatuation with medical progress and technological innovation' is a major obstacle to controlling health care costs (p 254). And Marcy Darnovsky argues against a 'mythic' view of science as value free. 'It is far less meaningful to ask whether one is for science than to ask what kind of science one is for' (p 193). Although we should avoid 'the inappropriate *politicization* of science,' Darnovsky argues that 'we need to find ways to *democratize* it'. We need to ask, 'Who will profit, who will lose, and who will survive in the biotech century? … And who will decide?' (p 196).

Does democratizing biotechnology require the inclusion of religious voices? Mainstream bioethics has tended to relegate religion to the private sphere. But Zoloth calls for 'a religious voice in the very middle of the public square' (p 97), and Michael Rugnetta notes that Roman Catholic theology 'contains as much potential for progressivism as it does for conservativism' (p 238). Similarly, although the US Constitution prohibits the use of religion to justify public policy, William May argues that it does not ban people from drawing on religion to motivate their political positions, nor from explaining those motivations to others (p 265).

Creating space for religious voices in progressive bioethics would presumably give increased prominence to 'big questions' about the basic purposes of biotechnology. Evans presents progressive bioethics as 'the inheritor of the mainstream public bioethics tradition', which has tended to avoid big questions (p 131). But Zoloth offers three such questions for progressive bioethics: 'What does it mean to be human? What does it mean to be free? What must I do about the suffering of the other'? (p 103). And Callahan offers an answer to such questions by way of arguing that biomedical research ought to eschew efforts 'to enhance our nature beyond the ordinary standards of good health' (p 245). These questions and concerns echo those of conservative bioethics.

Perhaps the most important and distinctive claim of progressives is that bioethics should devote more attention to problems facing the world's most vulnerable. Zoloth calls for focusing on situations of actual suffering both at home and abroad, rather than

the more fashionable threats of human cloning and designer babies, which remain largely imaginary. Darnovsky expresses similar concerns about the economic, racial, and gender inequalities perpetuated

or created through an emerging market-driven eugenics. Anyone committed to addressing such issues, regardless of political persuasion, will find much to discuss in this valuable book.

Myths of technology: innovation and inequality

Camille D Ryan

***The Myths of Technology: Innovation and Inequality*, edited by Judith Burnett, Peter Senker and Kathy Walker**
Peter Lang, New York, 2008, 246 pages, US$99:95, ISBN 9781433105203 (hardback), ISBN 9781433101281 (paperback).

In *The Myths of Technology: Innovation and Inequality*, Burnett, Senker and Walker present an edited volume on the complex myths that develop around technology in the fields of information and communications technologies (ICT), nature, society and biotechnology; mythic ideas and ideals that shape society's perceptions and expectations of technology. The editors assert that the 'boundaries between myth and knowledge are at times slippery' (p 1). This edited volume offers contributions from a wide variety of disciplinary perspectives and examines the boundaries between subjects and objects of technologies.

> … myths appear in all systems of thought serving civilizations and ordinary people in everyday life. (p 4)

> … they offer characterizations and explanations of human life. (p 6)

This book groups myths around two polarized perspectives on technology and attempts to offer a balanced perspective between them:

- technology is the answer to all of our social, economic and political problems
- technology will be the downfall of millions and '… is the harbinger of the destruction of civilization …' (p 11)

Dr Camille (Cami) D Ryan is a professional research associate with the Department of Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics at the College of Agriculture and Bioresources, University of Saskatchewan, 51 Campus Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A8, Canada; Email: cami.ryan@usask.ca.

Section I (Myths about technology and inequality) is comprised of three chapters that focus broadly on the dominance of capitalism and capitalism's continuous promotion of myths in order to legitimize its role in world economies.

In Chapter 2, de Miranda suggests that technology as promise or a fix for complex social problems is used to advocate partisan ideologies and to promote particular policies. Technological determinism is viewed as an ideological weapon – a 'quasi neutral force' independent of human choice and action. Its mythical status as a 'techno-utopia' thereby perpetuates a socio-economic divide.

In Chapter 3, Sharpe explores the powerful myth of 'free and open access' within the knowledge-based economy. Sharpe criticizes this perspective suggesting that this seemingly idyllic flow of knowledge (in the form of copyright, patents, and trademarks) merely results in new and more property issues of ownership creating boundaries between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. Gaps are magnified particularly between developed countries and those that are less developed in this global knowledge-based economy.

In Chapter 4, Kahane explores waves of technological development in ICT, nanotechnology and biotechnology and how they shape society through 'momentum and/or social disruption' (p 53). Kahane refers to mythological figures that embody notions of new technology and development and its impact on the world in the form of chaos and controversy (i.e. Prometheus, Frankenstein, the Golem and Dracula) and suggests that, in spite of the differences in technologies, they share commonalities which can largely be generalized. Kahane also acknowledges the power of key actors (policy-makers, companies, researchers, users, and the media) that serve to influence new technology waves through advocacy for complex mixtures of scientific and technological knowledge.

In Part II (Myths about ICT), Sharpe's account (Chapter 5) of ICT (electronic brain, the electronic office, etc.) suggests that the myths surrounding ICT are constantly evolving and that these myths are intended to resonate with policy-makers, investors, and