

force people to reassess their relationship with nature and adopt more ecocentric politics. “Wildfires,” she writes, “show us that every one of us—rich or poor alike—must embrace a relational positionality with the natural world that is bound by respect and interconnection if we want to avoid our own extinction” (134).

Global Burning is a manifesto against extreme-right politics and a resolute call to save our planet before it is too late. Eve Darian-Smith makes an impassioned plea for more democratic politics to regulate extractive industries and mitigate wildfire impacts. She offers familiar critiques of neoliberalism, patriarchy, anthropocentrism, and environmental racism. However, the book also makes at least three novel contributions.

First, Darian-Smith warns that rising authoritarianism will exacerbate the climate crisis and result in more catastrophic wildfires. Other scholars have shown that antidemocratic leaders use law pragmatically to cooperate with other state leaders in both democracies and autocratic regimes (Ginsburg, 2020; Scheppele, 2018). But *Global Burning* suggests that authoritarian cooperation on climate will never happen. Antidemocratic partiality for ultranationalism and complicity with extractive industries will inevitably hamper struggles to address the climate crisis. Mitigating climate change requires cooperation and governance beyond borders. *Global Burning* clarifies that it also requires democracy.

Second, Darian-Smith makes a compelling case that antienvironmentalism has become a signature policy of the extreme-right. Comparing the policies and public statements of Australian Prime Minister Scott Morrison, Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro, and U.S. President Donald Trump, she convincingly argues that far-right politicians routinely endorse disinformation campaigns to deny environmental science and work against national and global conservation efforts.

Finally, Darian-Smith encourages readers to think *with* fire. Her chapter metaphors expose fundamental relations shaping the climate crisis, including relations between human activities and climate change, between profit-maximizing logics and environmental harms, between far-right politicians and corporate recklessness, and between tragic wildfires and racialized suffering. Thinking *with* fire offers a valuable conceptual framework for scholars and policymakers alike.

REFERENCES

- Ginsburg, Tom. 2020. “Authoritarian International Law?” *American Journal of International Law* 114(2): 221–260.
Scheppele, Kim Lane. 2018. “Autocratic Legalism.” *University of Chicago Law Review* 85(2): 545–584.

DOI: 10.1111/lasr.12667

The myth of the community fix: Inequality and the politics of youth punishment. By Sarah D. Cate. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. 268 pp. \$99.00 hardcover

Reviewed by William S. Bush, Department of History, Texas A&M University-San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA

In March 2023, the suicide of 16-year-old Joshua Keith Beasley at the Travis County State Jail in Austin, TX, joined a tragically long list of preventable deaths in American youth prisons. Incarcerated at age 11 for kicking a school safety officer, Beasley over a multiyear period was bullied, beaten, placed in restraints, pepper sprayed, and placed in excessive isolation, before finally being transferred to adult jail. Within 6 months, he was dead.

Beasley’s case exemplifies the horrors of youth incarceration that have fueled a national movement in recent years to replace state-run youth prisons with smaller facilities or noninstitutional programs located nearer to the home communities of adjudicated youth. This “community-based reform movement” forms the subject of *The Myth of the Community Fix*, which examines juvenile justice

reforms in three bellwether states: Pennsylvania, California, and Texas. As the title suggests, the book focuses mainly on the politics surrounding the policymaking process in each state, the administration of state-level reforms, and their outcomes. Drawing from an extensive array of legislative, legal, social scientific, and journalistic sources, author Sarah Cate offers one of the first comprehensive analyses of this important yet understudied reform movement.

Cate's top-line conclusion is that juvenile justice reform has failed to live up to its lofty promises in all three states, and that it is best understood as a product of the neoliberal policymaking that has produced welfare reform, privatization of public goods, and mass incarceration. Juvenile justice resources reallocated to local governments have expanded rather than reduced imprisonment and punitive surveillance, while providing few of the noninstitutional programs evoked in the idealistic-sounding rhetoric of community-based reform. "Devolution, not decarceration" (39) over the last 30 years has occurred amid austerity budgets forcing cash-strapped local governments to turn to private sector providers for everything from regional detention facilities to mental health assessments. The former has nurtured the reopening of shuttered state prisons as private youth detention centers, some under the auspices of the Geo Group and Corrections Corporation of America, with more abuse and less oversight than before. Indeed, as Cate notes, the notorious "Kids for Cash" scandal in Pennsylvania was uncovered not by a government inspector but thanks to a tip to the nonprofit Juvenile Law Center.

Meanwhile, large nonprofit foundations led by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation have been the main drivers (and sometimes the authors) of reform legislation, providers of assessments and services, and sponsors of state and local level nonprofit advocates and providers. While foundations can bring critical expertise to bear, they represent no constituency and lack democratic accountability, particularly to the populations most directly affected by the policies they promote. This argument echoes that of Geoff Ward's pathbreaking book *The Black Child-Savers: Racial Democracy and Juvenile Justice* (Ward, 2012, 1–16). Cate locates the roots of this more insidious form of privatization in the federal and foundation-led community action projects of the 1960s, arguing that elite, foundation-led reforms have perpetuated a misguided focus on changing individual youth instead of the structural and social inequities that shaped them. Cate identifies the latter-day version of this in the vogue of "evidence-based" programs, designed to alter an adjudicated youth's behavior, improve academic performance, teach "marketable" or "interpersonal skills," and discourage drug use. In her view, these interventions focus narrowly on limiting recidivism while ignoring factors such as inequality in housing, schooling, health care, transportation, and policing (136).

Here, and elsewhere, Cate implies an "either-or" approach in weighing the individual and structural causes of delinquency, although some of the actors she describes seemingly adopt what James Forman, Jr., has described as an "all of the above" approach (Forman, 2017, 12–13). To that end, Cate might have probed further into the discussions of the various state-level lobbyists, advocacy groups, and elected officials who jockeyed over reform legislation. For example, Cate rightly notes that national foundations and local reformers consistently have promoted community-based programs' supposed cost savings to legislatures from both major parties, in both liberal California and conservative Texas, a promise that aligns with budget austerity imperatives while sidelining what should be the central focus—the best interests of youth. To what extent did political pragmatism, rather than ideological conviction, drive these appeals for disparate reformers? The criticism is deserved, but if we are to learn from past failures, they must be described in all their nuance. Similarly, greater inclusion of the words and actions of youth themselves and their families might have added to this study.

One of the book's fundamental criticisms of the latter-day reform movement is that it privileges age as a basis for its failed promises to protect and treat individual youth. For Cate, this focus exemplifies the separation of "curable" or more deserving from "violent and serious" juvenile offenders (148), extended to age-specific and successful campaigns to end the juvenile death penalty and juvenile life without parole while ignoring adult offenders. This argument would have benefited from more attention to the Progressive-era juvenile court movement, whose leaders based their entire case for a separate system on the vulnerability, immaturity, and plasticity of children and

adolescents. This wider historical context would have enriched Cate's otherwise spot-on analysis of the failures of the contemporary community-based reform movement.

While I concur with Cate's concluding recommendations for greater investment in publicly run, and publicly accountable, juvenile justice programs, I remain skeptical of her suggestion to re-invest in youth prisons. At this moment, Texas is poised to adopt legislation that will do just that, investing \$200 million to build new state-run youth prisons while making it easier to transfer misbehaving youth into the adult prison system—the very thing that resulted in the youth suicide that led this review. Despite these criticisms, Cate has made a major contribution to the literature on juvenile justice, particularly as scholars from a range of disciplines reassess it against emerging scholarship on the carceral state.

REFERENCES

- Forman, James, Jr. 2017. *Locking Up Our Own: Crime and Punishment in Black America*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Ward, Geoff K. 2012. *The Black Child-Savers: Racial Democracy and Juvenile Justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DOI: 10.1111/lasr.12668

Justice in Lyon: Klaus Barbie and France's first trial for crimes against humanity. By Richard J. Golsan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2022. 330 pp. \$39.95 paperback

Reviewed by Katelyn Arac, Post-doctoral researcher in the Office of the Associate Vice President Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

In 1987, 74-year-old Klaus Barbie stood before an Assize Court in Lyon, France and pled 'not guilty' to charges of crimes against humanity. The trial of the former SS lieutenant and Gestapo chief was France's first trial for crimes against humanity and attracted international attention. Various works about Barbie have been published, from monographs to documentaries and movies. However, these works tend to focus on Barbie the man, his deeds during the Second World War, his devotion to Nazism, his postwar work for American intelligence, and his later life in South America. Golsan's *Justice in Lyon* is the first comprehensive book on the trial itself and its impact on French society. With this focus, Golsan is able to analyze the judicial practices and procedures of the trial, provide insight into the various actors who took part in the event, and show how the trial was impactful in refining the definition of crimes against humanity. Golsan grapples with the legal complexities of the trial by discussing how the French court and various interested parties interpreted crimes against humanity, which was incorporated into French law in 1964, the crimes it encompassed, and who should be classified as victims under the specifics of this legislation. Golsan notes the complexity of the trial from its outset, due to the large contingent of civil party lawyers each presenting their own, often competing, historical narratives based on their clients' experiences. He also deftly communicates how these competing narratives were presented in the court proceedings and provides a compelling examination of the various subtleties and complexities present throughout the trial. *Justice in Lyon* is an important addition to the field of Holocaust studies and our understanding of law and society.

Golsan builds his argument across several chapters that each focus on a different element of the trial. *Justice in Lyon* begins with a detailed discussion of the controversy marking the trial. For example, it was seen as a political trial by some with ideas about victor's justice. The monetary cost of the trial was also critiqued. Reviewing the controversy, Golsan positions the trial as important to advancing understandings of the definition of crimes against humanity. Golsan shows how the trial served justice, arguing that Barbie was prosecuted fairly and that his defense was given every latitude—to