

*ASA's Collective Behavior and Social Movement
Section 2015 Book Award Winner*

Katrina Kimport. *Queering Marriage: Challenging Family Formation in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2014. \$25.95 (paperback).

Kathleen E. Hull
University of Minnesota

Remember the “Winter of Love?” The phrase refers to the four-week period in February-March 2004 when newly elected Mayor Gavin Newsom boldly issued marriage licenses to same-sex couples at San Francisco City Hall. Hundreds of same-sex couples joined lines that stretched for blocks to be part of history. The scene immediately became a major national media event, exposing millions of Americans to images of marrying same-sex couples. The marriage licenses were ultimately invalidated by the California Supreme Court, but the “Winter of Love” had dramatized the issue of legal recognition of same-sex marriage in a fresh and lasting way.

In *Queering Marriage*, Katrina Kimport interrogates the meaning of the “Winter of Love” for its participants, for the same-sex marriage movement, and for the institution of marriage. The book holds particular interest for social movement scholars because it provides insight into the processes of meaning making among participants in an event that had elements of a political protest, even though most couples did not see their participation exclusively through a political lens. The central question that animates the book concerns the impact of this collective action on heteronormativity. Although many participants saw their behavior as a challenge to heteronormativity, Kimport argues that in some respects their embrace of marriage may have had the unintended effect of strengthening heteronormativity.

Kimport’s study is primarily based on interviews with 42 members of same-sex couples who obtained marriage licenses during the winter-of-love period. Kimport asked her interviewees why they pursued legal marriage in this context, despite considerable uncertainty about whether the marriages would remain legally valid. She had them describe the experience of lining up at City Hall, waiting there with other like-minded couples, and interacting with bystanders and city hall staff. She then invited them to reflect on how this experience affected them, individually and as a couple.

Kimport finds that interviewees articulate a mix of reasons for participating in the “Winter of Love.” Most frame their participation as a political act. Many also point to the concrete legal benefits of marriage, as well as the social legitimacy it confers. Some describe their participation as an expression of love and commitment. Describing the impact of their participation, many reported feeling different after marrying, taking their relationship more seriously, feeling a sense of stability and security, and sensing that others treat them differently and their relationship becomes more legible to others. Many also describe a strong emotional reaction to the moment of marrying, a response they did not anticipate.

Kimport deftly conveys the couples’ multi-dimensional emotional experiences. Not only did marrying couples experience a high level of emotion at the moment of marrying, they also experienced a kind of collective effervescence resulting from their participation in a mass action that had a clear political message. Interviewees described feelings of joy, solidarity, support and security as they waited in line, exchanging stories with other couples and supportive strangers. As one interviewee put it, “This was just high energy where everyone was smiling at each other, talking to each other, cheering for each other, sharing their stories. It was like a giant family reunion. Just something very different and very, very unique” (p. 33). Couples also described the feelings of anger, depression, marginalization and powerlessness they felt later that year when they learned the marriages had been invalidated.

Clearly, many of these couples had a conscious political motivation for marrying. But Kimport gives an ambivalent assessment of the effect that this collective action has on heteronormativity, i.e., the symbolic and material privileging of heterosexuality. Legal marriage has unquestionably been significant in the creation and reproduction of heteronormativity. Thus, many of the interviewees saw same-sex marriage as helping to dismantle heteronormativity, but Kimport is skeptical. She asserts that same-sex couples participate in legal marriage without fundamentally changing it, and their participation in the normativity of marriage may ultimately strengthen heteronormativity. In my view, this argument suffers from some conceptual slippage, insofar as it equates the normativity of marriage with heteronormativity. Same-sex couples’ participation in marriage certainly bolsters the normativity of marriage, but one must assume that marriage is inherently heterosexual to make the leap that bolstering marriage in turn fortifies heteronormativity.

Instead, one might argue that same-sex marriage strikes a blow against heteronormativity by severing the linkage between marriage and heterosexuality. Kimport concludes, “The consequences of SSM [same-sex marriage] for heteronormativity depend on the accounts we give of what marriage means. The disruption of heteronormativity can take place only when (same-sex) marriage is accompanied by an articulated critique of hegemonic heterosexuality” (p. 158). But the entrance of same-sex couples into legal marriage represents a fundamental reconfiguring of a core institutional support of heteronormativity, and this redefinition of marriage occurs whether or not it is accompanied by “articulated critiques” of heteronormativity. Actions can speak louder than words in their effect on how people perceive the social world and assign meaning to various practices and identities.

One of Kimport’s interviewees provides a wonderful illustration of the expressive power of practical action when he recalls how City Hall staff temporarily stopped taking applications for marriage licenses so that they could change the application form on the computer, to replace “bride and groom” with “applicant 1 and applicant 2.” I would argue that this moment represents in microcosm how same-sex marriage alters heteronormativity. From that point forward, all people applying for licenses would fill out a form that no longer reified the idea of marriage as heterosexual. The arrival of same-sex marriage alone will not dismantle heteronormativity, but the “queering” of a key institution of heteronormativity through practice is consequential; the practice is the critique. Ultimately, we will need different studies to assess the long-term impact of same-sex marriage on heteronormativity. In the meantime, Kimport’s book provides a valuable record of the on-the-ground perspectives of participants in an iconic historical moment.

Caroline W. Lee. *Do-It-Yourself Democracy: The Rise of the Public Engagement Industry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. \$29.95 (paperback).

Kathleen M. Blee
University of Pittsburgh

Analyzing a listserv of democratic-deliberation consultants, Caroline Lee notes that its practitioners regard “handling outrage [as] as a sophisticated skill.” The paradox of an industry that manages away public anger in the name of democratic processes is just one of the important

revelations in Lee’s book, *Do-It-Yourself Democracy*. Taking a fresh look at the heavily studied terrain of civic engagement, Lee provides a profound and original argument about the nature of politics today.

The public-engagement industry includes a variety of professionally managed processes, from thousands of displaced residents of New Orleans deliberating how their community should develop after Hurricane Katrina, to a handful of coworkers talking about how to better market their company’s commitment to an organic future. By one estimate, one-quarter of adults in the U.S. have participated in these processes. Many public engagement events have similar forms, blending professional guidance with the elements of New Age spirituality, alternative dispute resolution, modern politics, and workplace participation practices (a combination of disparate logics and discourses which, Lee smartly notes, is a general feature of modern life). They feature circle sharing, art production, inspirational poetry, celebrity endorsements, instant polling, and well-healed sponsors. They also have similar results, according to Lee. Although participants often find the process energizing, such top-down efforts to create grassroots engagement tend to tighten individual reliance on the very institutions that are failing them. And, to the extent that they expand civic participation, this is short term. The public deliberation industry is part of a broader contemporary trend in which, according to Lee, “activism now looks a lot like big business.” What appears to be a movement to empower grassroots citizens is, much like the large-scale professional lobbying organizations that replaced local citizen protest, essentially disempowering. In Lee’s words, it uses “deliberation for non-deliberative goals.”

Do-It-Yourself Democracy takes a 360-degree look at the public engagement industry, examining this complex world through the perspectives of its professional practitioners, clients, industry, and the wider political context. These multiple analytic views allow Lee to go far beyond the standard literature, which tends to celebrate the progressive potentials of involving people, especially from marginalized groups, in the political process. She finds that democracy facilitators are genuinely concerned to make decision making more broadly democratic and participatory. Indeed, they often located their passion for democratic deliberation in their history of progressive and confrontational activism in social movements of the 1960s, now tempered with a pragmatic belief in more incremental change. Yet despite their good intentions, these facilitators need to operate within the logic of their clients (often government officials

or corporations), who aspire to more structured and contained forms of participation from below. Governments find democratic deliberation a handy way to involve citizens in designing how to respond to increasingly constrained state budgets. Businesses turn to deliberative processes when they need their employees to be aligned with directions that will affect them negatively, such as downsizing staff or cutting benefits. In these contexts, people are urged to take ownership of the effects—but not control of the process or benefits—of increasing economic and social inequality. As Lee notes, the promise of added political equality masks the reality of diminished equality in other realms. Moreover, the insistence of democracy facilitators that professional intervention is needed to safeguard democracy has the effect of undermining other ways—including mobilization into social movements—that ordinary citizens themselves can create social change.

There are too many insights in this book to be captured in a short review, but one of my favorites is Lee's concept of *selfing*, which she defines as "seeing all others as on an equally compelling journey to personal authenticity and heart-based self-fulfillment." Democracy facilitators engage in selfing as they do self-effacement, shrug off credit for their accomplishments, and deny their own power as examples of the path they encourage others to follow. Selfing captures perfectly the liminal position of deliberation practitioners who are genuinely well-meaning and committed to the democratic participation of a diverse population, exceeding self-critical about their work, but ultimately oblivious to the actual dynamics of power and inequality they are facilitating.

Lee's book moves effortlessly from the details of deliberation management to broader understandings of the nature of modern political culture. She notes how new business discourses, widely diffused throughout society, have replaced older ones of profit-first and unrestrained growth in favor of a more complex logic in which business takes a role in creating positive social change and novel forms of citizen empowerment. In an era of state retrenchment and unbridled corporate power, managed citizen deliberation is a useful way to produce activism and change within boundaries. Civic benefits come at the expense of questioning the need for restraints in employee benefits or state action. Indeed, the expansion of citizen participation is integrally tied to accepting these as unquestionable realities of modern corporations and governments. In fact, civic engagement can substitute for what it being lost. As one participant in a deliberation listserv put it, agencies "are having to make huge cuts in staff. . . . Paying for process to get community engaged is cheaper than paying for staff."

Do-It-Yourself Democracy takes a hard look at processes of public engagement that can easily be regarded as promising new ways that ordinary people can influence state action and shape their own futures. As Lee reflects, it is not easy to take a critical stance toward political phenomena that are widely considered authentically democratic and progressive. That she is able to make such a convincing case for the limitations and political dangers of this popular form of civic deliberation is a tribute to Lee's careful analysis. This is a groundbreaking book that deserves to be read by all scholars of social movements and politics.

Valerie Sperling. *Sex, Politics, and Putin: Political Legitimacy in Russia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. \$23.70 (paperback).

Courtney Doucette
Rutgers University

At a press conference in 2002 held jointly with leaders of the European Union and Russian Federation, a journalist critically asked Russian President Vladimir Putin about civilian deaths in Chechnya. Putin responded that his critic seemed so sympathetic to the Chechens that perhaps he should convert to Islam and be circumcised. "I will recommend that [specialists in this area] do the operation on you in such a way that nothing will grow back," he stated (p. 30). This is just one of many examples showing that gender and sexuality are at the very core of contemporary Russian political discourse. In *Sex, Politics, and Putin: Political Legitimacy in Russia*, Valerie Sperling compiles numerous intriguing examples from the Putin period (loosely, the year 2000 to the present), and offers an astute, accessible analysis of their meaning. Her central argument is that normative notions of gender and sexuality thoroughly pervade Russian politics because they are key to political legitimization.

Sperling points to three factors to explain why political legitimization in Russia depends on norms of gender and sexuality. First is the weakness of feminism in Russia today. Second is the relatively recent rupture in Russian politics, namely, the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The third and most interesting factor is international politics. Sperling argues that Putin's hypermasculine image is a backlash against international political discourses that feminized Russia in the 1990s, as well as a direct response to American politics. Bare-chested photos of Putin on a Siberian fishing trip appeared only

after his early encounters with U.S. President George W. Bush, who was frequently photographed clearing brush on his Texas ranch and saltwater fishing on the family resort in Maine (p. 77). Sperling uses the similarity in American and Russian political imagery to point out how discourses on gender, sexuality, and politics intersect not only in Russia: the three are profoundly entangled everywhere.

The central chapters of this book offer two case studies that closely look at how gender and sexuality function in the language of Russian politics. Chapter three examines political youth groups, including three pro-Kremlin and three anti-Kremlin groups. Chapter four focuses on patriotism, military conscription, and pronatalism. Both case studies show that sexist and homophobic language pervades Russian politics, regardless of their relationship to the Kremlin. That is, all political activists use this language to assert their positions, or, as Sperling states, they operate “in the same political field” (p. 91).

The final two chapters examine the current state of Russian feminism. Chapter five analyzes a variety of political actors’ attitudes towards sexism today, demonstrating that there is no correlation between awareness of sexism and whether one is pro- or anti-Kremlin. In this chapter Sperling discusses several difficulties facing the feminist movement in Russia today, emphasizing a generational divide among activists. Chapter six turns to specific examples of current Russian feminist groups. While shining a hopeful spotlight on the budding online forum Feministki and other activist groups, Sperling shows through an analysis of the public response to Pussy Riot’s well-known 2012 performance in Moscow’s Christ the Savior Cathedral that feminist ideology has been so discredited in Russia that the word “feminist” is frequently equated with “hooligan” and “fascist.”

For Sperling, the weakness of Russian feminism and the countless challenges it faces to barely survive constitute a grave tragedy. The author sees feminism as the only potent counterweight to sexist and homophobic language that pervades Russian political discourse. To her, the stronger sexism and homophobia are, the less inclusive and self-empowering is the political system. In Sperling’s words, “in the long run, making use of sexualization and gender norms in political legitimization reinforces traditional notions of gender and the subordination of women to men, restricting people’s personal and political freedom and undercutting democracy more broadly” (p. 28).

While Sperling’s investment in the survival of democracy in Russia is admirable, it poses several problems to her analysis. In some ways, it

echoes the very undemocratic sentiments of many Western observers of post-Soviet Russia who, in the aftermath of the Soviet dissolution in 1991, were eager to impose their own political vision on what they perceived as an ideological vacuum. The argument also does not look close enough at the lived experience of the expressions of gender and sexuality that shape political discourses. An example that continually comes up in the book is a calendar students at Moscow State University’s prestigious journalism department made with photos of themselves in scanty clothes and bikinis, which they gifted Putin on his birthday. For Sperling, the calendar is, among other things, a sign of how the female body must be sexualized for Russian politics. But the women were not forced to make the calendar; it appears that they very much wanted to make it. It seems that a political system that is truly inclusive must make room for these kinds of expressions too.

Despite these shortcomings, *Sex, Politics, and Putin* presents a goldmine of examples of how discourses on gender and sexuality are an integral part of contemporary Russian politics. This book is a must read for scholars of Russian politics and an engaging and accessible read for anyone interested in why bare-chested photos of Putin have become so popular.

Christian Davenport. *How Social Movements Die: Repression and Demobilization of the Republic of New Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. \$32.99. (paperback).

Caroline W. Lee
Lafayette College

Does state repression work to silence social movement organizations? Or do they fail on their own terms? These questions are the subject of political scientist Christian Davenport’s new book analyzing state repression and organization response in the case of the Republic of New Africa (RNA), a Detroit-based black nationalist movement. From its founding in March 1968 to its fracturing in 1971, the group gained some media attention—and much scrutiny from local, state, and federal authorities—for its secessionist ambitions. A prolific scholar of comparative quantitative research on state repression around the world, Davenport turns his attention to a fine-grained analysis of five key moments in the RNA’s history, using a trove of over 10,000 pages of historical documents including both government surveillance files and internal minutes of the group meetings.

The multiple perspectives this database allows are ideally suited to Davenport's argument, which is that understanding the impact of state repression requires investigating how internal dynamics in social movements interact with external repression in complex and unexpected ways. Covert surveillance is paradoxically most effective at destabilizing when movement members are aware it is occurring; violent raids may promote public sympathy and legitimacy in a fragile organization but divide members internally over how to regroup. To understand why movements survive or struggle under repressive tactics, we must look at their everyday activities in long-term contexts, seeking the past experiences of repression that lead activists to anticipate and attempt to counter future repression in particular ways, while government agents in turn try to overwhelm or outwit activists in counter-countermeasures. These interactions continue, usually until they are resolved in the state's favor.

In the case of the RNA, an organization founded at the end of, and in response to, a long period of movement activity, activists had vivid experiences of overt repressive activity in non-violent civil rights protests and formed elaborate defensive strategies to literally arm themselves against violent authorities. But they did not anticipate the covert surveillance that, when they finally became aware of it, substantially weakened the group as it responded to such repression and faced new threats. Despite extensive use of their reports, the informants themselves remain ciphers in this activity.

Successive chapters analyze the four month period around each critical juncture to point out the many problems the group faced on its own merits and without any government intervention: leadership challenges, disputes about strategies, difficulty garnering resources. In analyzing path dependence, the conclusion considers a number of counterfactuals—a bit less convincingly than the careful triangulation of different sources on repressive dynamics that has gone before. Instead, I would have loved to see the book conclude by developing the intriguing suggested parallels to contemporary instances of state violence and surveillance further.

Davenport is scrupulously measured in describing the limits of studying this unique case as representative of its time. This prevents him from using research on the peculiar frailties of secessionist and exodus movements that seek international recognition, which might have better contextualized the enormous challenges the RNA faced and the mobilization successes they were able to claim. At times, the book has a plodding pace as the RNA's demobilization unfolds—but the repetition could be an advantage for orienting

those who seek to dip in to select chapters, as Davenport recommends in the introduction.

Certainly, *How Social Movements Die* will be a provocative read on an understudied movement for subscribers and contributors to this journal, many of whom are cited in the book. The pacing will make it a bit challenging for classroom adoption, but it should become an outstanding resource for discussion of methodological strategies in studying contention—particularly given Davenport's argument for using documents (even those from hostile organizations) over retrospective interviews. The result of a legalistic movement intersecting with a highly refined government surveillance bureaucracy, the RNA yielded “a perfect storm of data release and discovery (i.e., lawsuits, hoarding, and systematic archiving)” (p. 13). Chapter 4, Record Keeping and Data Collection, is an absolutely fascinating—and bracing—read in the post-Snowden, “big data” era.

Finally, the historical detail will make this book compelling for a wider audience seeking long-term perspective at a time of violent contention and state repression against African Americans, from Ferguson to Baltimore. The RNA was very much of its time, but it is impossible to look at a flyer comparing “JUSTICE 1916?” and “JUSTICE 1971?” (p. 284) following a devastating final raid of RNA headquarters in Mississippi, and not think of #BlackLivesMatter today. Davenport's “general lessons” for challengers on p. 304 might be a useful place for seasoned organizers to start, but the newly galvanized will find much of interest regarding survival and sacrifice in this powerful narrative.

Sandra R. Levitsky. *Caring for Our Own: Why There Is No Political Demand for New American Social Welfare Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. \$24.95. (paperback).

Stephanie L. Bradley
Florida State University

Caregiving poses more challenges in the 21st century than ever before. The Great Recession and political emphasis on fiscal responsibility have made it more difficult for caregivers to find institutional support, while women's labor force participation has lessened the availability of familial caregivers. As institutional and familial supports constrict, the population of citizens needing care expands. This resource-need gap turns many families towards private solutions, such as paid care providers, rather than catalyzing

a broad demand for expanded public support. Sandra R. Levitsky's impressive book, *Caring for Our Own*, soundly assesses this puzzling lack of public demand for social programs dedicated to long-term care support.

There is no shortage of literature analyzing the presence of social movements and the actors who shape political outcomes. Levitsky, however, expands what is currently known about the nature of social movements by assessing the absence of collective action in a context that theoretically should produce demands for new forms of state support. Levitsky presents data from caregiver support-group meetings, peer group discussions, and caregiver and social service provider interviews in California. Drawing on theoretical frameworks from sociological and social movement literature, Levitsky finds that social policies with the potential to assuage the dilemma of long-term care actually reify cultural norms that place care responsibilities with the family thereby reducing the prospect of political action.

Much of the book focuses on three essential dimensions of politicization. First, to raise political consciousness, individuals must conceptualize private matters as public issues, identifying themselves as part of a collective. In the case of long-term care, this conceptualization proves difficult because expectations regarding familial care responsibilities persist. Individuals often become eligible for government intervention—such as California's Medicaid program, Medi-Cal—once they have no family resources, reaffirming the family's role as primary care provider. Though cultural norms and political programs promote the family's role in caregiving, some caregivers come to see their role as more than just that of a compassionate family member. Levitsky shows that caregivers with support-group participation are more likely to identify with a group caregiver identity than those with no participation. Ultimately, this collective identification allows some caregivers to acknowledge systemic problems that make long-term care provision difficult.

Second, individuals must be able to imagine solutions to the unmet needs of care provision. Levitsky coins the term "grievance construction" to represent the process of transforming passive acceptance to active protest. Here, the focus turns to collective action frames that have long allowed social movement scholars to catalog the evolution of feelings about unfortunate circumstances into motivated beliefs about unjust conditions. In Levitsky's research, calls for expanded state intervention to assuage the unmet needs of long-term care consistently delegated care responsibilities first to the family and only secondarily to public support systems. In California, the Medi-Cal system preserved this family-state hierarchy

and acted as an ideational resource for caregivers to imagine remedies to their long-term care dilemmas. Although grievants may seek expanded social support, their solutions again looked first to the family as the primary care provider.

Third and finally, individuals must be willing and able to engage in political demand making. The willingness to participate politically is often born from a feeling of entitlement or deservingness of something better. Traditional perceptions of welfare suggest that "deserving" middle-class individuals usually receive support from contributory social insurance programs like Social Security, while "undeserving" poor individuals access means-tested public assistance programs like Medi-Cal. Counter to traditional perceptions, though, non-poor caregivers recast Medi-Cal as an entitlement for hardworking taxpayers in need of support. Despite Medi-Cal being recast as an entitlement, the pool of caregivers propelled toward political action became shallower at each stage of politicization. In becoming an activist, those who saw their caregiving dilemma as a public issue also needed to both imagine systematic remedies to their dilemma and be willing to engage in the political process.

What barriers do aggrieved caregivers face in becoming activists? Social movement research finds the system of overlapping memberships in relevant groups (i.e., organizational fields) to be a key component in mobilization. Levitsky suggests that social movement scholars take for granted the role of organizational fields; she explains that where there is a "push" toward political participation, movement scholars often assume there is also a "pull" into organized activity. However, she argues, much social movement research focuses on periods of widespread political protest during which groups were prolific and group ties developed easily, fostering fluid transitions from expressions of grievances to mobilization. During years of less movement activity, one cannot expect such a fluid connection between political participation and organized activity despite potential activists' integration in relevant organizational fields. In this study, some caregivers developed a collective awareness that public support was necessary to attend to their unmet needs, but they were not extended the information and tools to translate their grievances into political demands for policy reform. Though contemporary advocacy organizations increased the technological efficiency with which they communicated with individuals in a quest to secure resources, they neglected to "pull" on potential caregiver-activists who were prime targets for recruitment.

Caring for Our Own provides a novel contribution in understanding the process of political

demand making in the absence of a formalized social movement. By studying the lack of political demand for expanded welfare support for long-term care, Levitsky informs an understanding of the multilayered path toward mobilization. Despite the important contributions of this book, scholars who long to understand how social location affects political (in)activism may want more. Race and class were rarely mentioned in the context of study participants' lives and mobilization trajectories. Regardless, an interdisciplinary field of scholars interested in welfare state development and collective action will like this book, and its findings can help social movement organizations identify factors that contribute to the mobilization of future activists.

Todd Wolfson. *Digital Rebellion: The Birth of the Cyber Left*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014. \$30.00. (paperback).

Didem Türkoğlu
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

The revolution will be tweeted!
The revolution will not be tweeted!
#ThisBookIsNotAboutThatDebate.

I use this quote to frame Todd Wolfson's new book, an ethnographic study of what he calls the *Cyber Left*. Wolfson defines "cyber" as "the novel set of processes and practices within twenty-first century social resistance that are engendered by new technologies and in turn have enabled new possibilities for the scale, strategy, and governance of social movements." The Cyber Left, then, refers to "a new stage in left-based social movements, enmeshed with the changing nature of new digital technologies and the globalizing economic order" While many readers may be familiar with the discussions of the Old Left's decline, the broken promises of the New Left, and, perhaps, even disillusioned with the study of the new social movements, there is a great deal to like about Wolfson's analysis of the Cyber Left. For example, in a novel move, he draws upon Marcuse to examine the problematics of being positioned between the *deprived* ("those most materially oppressed by capitalism") and the *discontented* ("those alienated by the terms and conditions of capitalist society").

Like other scholars, Wolfson attempts to organize digital activism into periods. Wolfson begins the journey in the 1990s with the emergence of the alternative media centers influenced by Zapatistas. He starts in Chiapas with a dis-

cussion of the movement against the neoliberal restructuring. Wolfson gives due attention to the Marxist and Mayan roots of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN), but primarily highlights that the formation of Indymedia was response to EZLN's call to forge "a collective network of resistance against neoliberalism." Wolfson skillfully demonstrates the connections between institutions of the Cyber Left and the Zapatistas. More importantly, he argues convincingly that EZLN tactics were only partially adopted by the Cyber Left, which had important consequences for its future.

Next, Wolfson turns his analytical attention to the Battle of Seattle. After outlining its historical roots, he uses a combination of virtual and traditional ethnography to map Indymedia's network. In doing so, Wolfson shows the reader that the battle's frontlines were primarily staffed by white middle-class activists. He highlights the connections of local activists to an international community, and outlines the paradox of local autonomy and networked autonomy. Finally, Wolfson brings the reader home with a discussion of the broader implications of this trajectory for progressive movements that adopt similar logics and strategies. Reading *Digital Rebellion* is an enjoyable journey. There is an interesting view of historical details and theoretical debates, all of which benefit this ethnographic study.

Wolfson's conclusions are interesting as well. He outlines how the rejection of the Old Left might influence the Left in the twenty-first century. This rejection both enables and limits certain options for the movements. Additionally, he argues that the Cyber Left is characterized by a "multiscalar network structure," a global application of participatory democracy, and a strategy of using new media technologies to link local autonomous movements. While these characteristics allow the Cyber Left to effectively organize people, it has key limitations. Among them is "a retreat from class and capitalism as analytic and political categories" (Wolfson 2014: 188), a rejection of institutionalization, a distinct lack of leadership development, and possible technological determinism. This, Wolfson argues, ensures that activists are largely white, middle-class, and discontented. This ultimately keeps the movement disconnected from the minorities, the poor, and the working class. For movements that are purported to work on behalf of social justice this is a very serious criticism, indeed.

Given the recent economic and electoral turmoil globally, it remains to be seen whether the Cyber Left will retreat from class and capitalism be a trait of leftist movements in the twenty-first century. The recent mobilization in the U.S. at the intersection of race and the criminal justice

system might suggest that there is a change in the landscape in the movements that are part of the Cyber Left. I look forward to seeing the work that Wolfson's meticulously written book inspires.

Nella Van Dyke and David Meyer (eds).
Understanding the Tea Party Movement.
Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
\$29.99. (paperback).

Nelson Pichardo Almanzar
Central Washington University

The Tea Party movement (TPM) was bound to attract the attention of social movement researchers. The sudden rise and early successes of the movement were sufficient to ensure this attention. However, it quickly became apparent that current theorizing on movements could not explain the TPM, largely because of its conservative ties. As noted by several contributors, movement theories were largely developed by studying progressive movements. Naturally, the rise of the TPM presented an opportunity for scholars to amend their theoretical approaches in light of this conservative mobilization.

There has already been a fair amount of work on the TPM. This volume serves as a point of reflection by summarizing this literature and a point of expansion by applying a variety theoretical foci to the movement. Part I analyzes the pacing and timing of the movement by focusing on the role of the political structure and resources.

Rory McVeigh's chapter argues that neither resource mobilization nor the political process models can explain TPM dynamics. Applying his "power devaluation" model, McVeigh notes that conservative movements differ in terms of participants, preexisting organizational resources, grievances, interpretive frameworks, and political opportunities. Thus, the TPM, much like the KKK in the 1920s, was constituted of white middle-class Americans primarily motivated by a perceived loss in political, economic and/or social statuses. The TPM frames itself using racial terminology, and takes advantage of pre-existing organizations, resources, and political opportunities.

Echoing McVeigh, Tina Fetner and Brayden King note that the current conceptualizations of resources assume that social movements "emerge under conditions of scarce resources" (p. 37). This is not true of the TPM, which emerged "at a time when corporations and other elites infused the right-wing sector with resources" (p. 37). To understand the role of resources in the TPM, they

posit the existence of "three-layer movements," a dynamic governed by connections to elite funders as well as a grassroots base. Fetner and King detail the various components of these layers relative to the TPM noting the organizational, material, and ideological support by conservative actors and groups and the cultural support provided by Fox News.

Paul Almeida and Nella Van Dyke argue that the TPM is best understood as an instance of "social movement partyism," or a situation in which an oppositional political party manifests behavior similar to what we characterize as social movement action. They posit that the infusion of resources from groups and individuals of a Republican stripe, but not of the Republican Party itself, provided material, cultural, socio-organizational, and human resources that enabled the rapid formation and spread of the TPM. However, this conceptualization runs counter to other formulations of the TPM, and does not adequately account for its grassroots dimension. Further, the Koch brothers are treated as Republican insiders, a claim that is difficult to sustain.

In the section's final contribution, David Meyer and Amanda Pullman use a "social movement society" perspective to understand the TPM. This perspective directly challenges the premise of many of the essays in this volume by asking whether the character of the TPM represents anything new or whether the repertoires of movements have become standard fodder for all sociopolitical groups in the post-World War II era. Meyer and Pullman believe that "different groups turn to protest from different structural conditions, specifically: movements of people generally excluded from political influence would depend on openings, whereas movements composed of people used to institutional access would respond to policy provocations and political exclusion" (p. 80). This goes to the underlying motivations of the participants (loss of entitlement or threats to same), movement identity (a privileged identity of "whiteness"), the alliances sought and the tensions therein (big business, libertarians, and the grassroots), and the strategies employed (violence).

Part II focuses on who the TPM mobilized and why by exploring the roles of ideology, identity, and emotions. Abby Scher and Chip Berlet provide an overview of the ideological strains that animate the movement. TPM supporters constitute approximately 11% of the U.S. population. Surveys consistently show its supporters to be older, white, wealthier, and more educated than the average American. Despite the homogeneity, there is significant ideological variation among supporters. Fiscal conservatives, libertarians, the Christian right, white racial antagonists,

onists, patriot movement supporters, and conspiracy theorists jockey for ideological primacy, creating power struggles that affect the Republican Party.

Deana Rohlinger and Jesse Klein examine how emotions in the TPM are managed through internet communications technology (ICT). ICTs, they argue, afford movements opportunities to cultivate and manage emotions with greater effect than before. They find that the choice to use Facebook for organizing allowed leaders to manage the range of potential emotions that mobilize people to action. Further, they find that control needs to be consistent or the emotions stirred up can have unintended effects. Before the election, leaders steered discussions away from potentially divisive issues. After the election, many of the issues that were suppressed came to the fore. Since the site creator was no longer moderating the online discussion, emotional claims ran rampant and dissension emerged.

In the final chapter, Ruth Braunstein details the construction of the we-the-people identity undergirding “The Patriot” sector of the TPM. She finds that the identity is multidimensional functioning on “two different (and sometimes conflicting) identity fields” (p. 166). The Patriots see themselves as citizens in a struggle to reclaim their rightful democratic authority, an identity that potentially includes all Americans. They also see themselves as opponents of governmental overspending and as members of the “productive” class (the givers), as opposed to the “takers.” These fields are mapped, but adherents also develop means to navigate between these identity fields and to reconcile them.

This volume provides much needed insight into the applicability of social movement theory mobilizing around conservative claims. At the same time, it provides an interesting look into the TPM and provides different ways of understanding its often contrary and confusing nature.

Della Porta, Donatella (ed). *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. \$35.30. (paperback).

Sharon M. Quinsa
University of Pittsburgh

Since the turn of the decade, we have witnessed diverse forms of mobilization in different parts of the world as students, workers, marginalized communities, and ordinary citizens confront the vagaries of power. Starting with the demon-

strations and protests from 2010 to 2011 in the Middle East and North Africa that ushered in the fourth wave of democratization, to the acts of resistance and rebellion against police brutality towards black men in Ferguson and Baltimore in 2014, scholars have a unique opportunity to reflect upon the changing landscape of contention. The rapid growth and transformation of social movements in the last ten years have necessitated a diversity of methods that, not only can adapt to these changes, but also give the researcher multiple understandings of the complex social world where these mobilizations transpire. Such is the goal of Donatella Della Porta’s collection, *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*.

This 471-page compendium is a collaboration of faculty, researchers, and students who are mostly with the Center on Social Movement Studies at the European University Institute in Florence. The book consists of seventeen chapters covering a variety of methods. These include grounded theory, quantitative comparative analysis, comparative historical analysis, historical methodologies, mixed methods, discourse and frame analysis, participant observation, fieldwork in violent conflict and authoritarian regimes, in-depth interviews, protest event analysis, and online research. Each chapter follows a structure that begins with a brief background on the evolution of the method. It progresses to a detailed discussion of the main stages—from design to data collection and analysis—using the author’s research for elaboration. The concluding chapter of the edited volume focuses on ethical issues. It weaves common threads from each chapter on the academic and social roles and responsibilities of scholars in knowledge production. It poses questions related to the relevance of research, risks, power, and accountability that every researcher of political dissent must grapple with.

Although the stated objective of the book is to introduce the “main methods of data collection and data analysis as they have been used in past research on social movements” through a “how-to-do-it” approach (p. 1), it is not for beginners in social movement research. Della Porta builds on earlier conversations about the advantages of different methods, for example, from Diani and Eyerman’s 1992 *Studying Collective Action*, and Klandermans and Staggenborg’s 2002 *Methods of Social Movement Research*. In della Porta’s introduction, she argues for the further advancement of this methodological pluralism as opposed to a hegemonic approach. She cautions against rigidity based on distinctions between positivist and interpretive methodologies or between quantitative and qualitative techniques since “most methods have been used within various onto-

logical and epistemological preferences” (p. 5). Della Porta characterizes the study of mobilization as problem-oriented, rather method-oriented, which means it should be open to different research techniques. A key practice within this pluralist tradition is dialogue among scholars across and within methods to encourage collective innovation. This theme runs throughout the chapters.

For instance, in “The Potentials of Grounded Theory in the Study of Social Movements,” Alice Mattoni discusses the usefulness of a “family of methods” that is still marginalized in social movement research despite its breadth and flexibility. She contends that grounded theory can be combined with other research designs such as case study and survey to provide “thick descriptions” of cultural elements of social movements such as perceptions, identities, and emotions using a range of data collection techniques—from participant observation to archival research. Mattoni asserts that with interaction of methods, qualitative researchers of social movement can go beyond analytical descriptions by using grounded theory to develop explanatory abstractions.

While grounded theory remains at the periphery in social movement studies, protest event analysis (PEA) and its offspring have dominated research on mobilization. This is largely due to the emergence of the method within the field itself. Swen Hutter traces the evolution of this popular method. Since the initial efforts in the 1980s to develop indicators for a large number of countries, PEA has come a long way. Scholars from various fields, guided by different traditions, have contributed to its refinement. Hutter recognizes that although the ultimate goal is to transform “words to numbers,” interpretive work is still needed, especially in unpacking the relational aspects of political contention and in analyzing framing strategies. In essence, PEA promotes a mixed method approach.

A new, but burgeoning method in the field that was not included in previous methodological collections is online research. The method has gained much attention in recent years due to the role that information and communications technologies played in the Occupy and Arab Spring movements. Lorenzo Mosca discusses two main challenges in conducting a systematic study of online content: the volatility of the medium and gatekeeping issues. He provides strategies on sampling and tips on how to automatically and manually archive web data. Mosca strongly advocates the interdependence and synergy of online and offline research because “we need offline data to interpret online social and political dynamics; but it is equally true that offline phenomenon would be impossible to understand

without seriously studying the online environment” (p. 413).

Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research is a much-needed resource for social movement researchers looking for a book that synthesizes past and recent knowledge on each method. The authors possess hands-on expertise and the chapters provide detailed and practical advice, rather than mere theoretical wisdom. A minor shortcoming of the book is the limited cases from the global South, especially Asia and Africa, that could offer insights into the challenges of using certain methods in peculiar contexts. This, however, is less important, given what the authors and editor have achieved in this excellent collection.

Hein-Anton van der Heijden (ed.). *Handbook of Political Citizenship and Social Movements*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2014. \$290.00. (hardback).

Swen Hutter and Jasmine Lorenzini
European University Institute

This new handbook edited by Hein-Anton van der Heijden systematically presents the literature on social movements and citizenship. It provides a valuable resource for scholars working in both fields, and is useful for faculty and students alike. Most importantly, by bringing together key authors from both fields, this edited volume encourages research linking the two fields, and thus it could provide the basis for a new research agenda that bridges the focus on the microlevel in citizenship research with the meso- or macrolevel foci typical of the social movement literature. The development of research building on reflections about citizenship and social movements would benefit greatly to the study of contemporary political involvement of citizens at various levels, on multiple issues, and through various means.

The handbook includes four sections. The first section on political citizenship consists of eight chapters, which, after an introduction by Russell Dalton, discuss how the concept is studied in specific fields on topics such as gender, multiculturalism, ecology, or Europe. The second section includes seven chapters that outline the main lines of theoretical reasoning on social movements including political opportunities, resource mobilization, and recent developments regarding emotions and new information technologies. The third section presents research on six specific social movements. The final section

touches upon citizenship in the Global South and social movements, and consists of chapters on China, India, Africa, and the Arab world.

The book covers a breadth of research on both citizenship and social movements. In so doing, it provides a useful resource for researchers who are not familiar with one or both fields. The chapters critically summarize the state of the respective subfields, present useful distinctions and typologies (e.g., there is an innovative take on mechanisms of resource access is presented by Bob Edwards and Melinda Kane), and suggest avenues for further research (e.g., Helena Flam sketches an interesting agenda on emotions and social movements focusing on transformative and “nagging” protest events). The in-depth coverage of different types of citizenship and theoretical approaches in social movement research are valuable in itself and the book would work well in the classroom. The drawback of the handbook’s structure is that the two fields of research remain rather separate in many instances.

Some chapters do link both fields of research. For example, the chapter on “Citizenship, Gender, and Sexuality” (by Surya Moro and Diane Richardson), as well as the ones on multicultural (by Narzanin Massoumi and Nasar Meer) and urban citizenship (by Patricia Burke Wood) go beyond the separate presentation of citizenship and social movements in order to open research agendas linking the two. The chapter on urban citizenship does a great job of linking the theoretical idea of urban citizenship to emerging empirical research on this issue and the study of social movements. Similarly, David Meyer and Erin Evans present the key features of the political process approach by emphasizing the manifold and complex relationships between social movements and the various dimensions of citizenship. The most important empirical link between the two research fields is provided by the four chapters on social movements and political citizenship in the Global South. As Lei Xie’s chapter on China convincingly argues, the concept of citizenship (as membership and civility) might offer “a powerful means of understanding Chinese social movements that are characterized as being both constrained and mobilized within the boundaries of established political institutions.”

The concept of citizenship, as defined in the introduction of the handbook, implies a focus on the *political* dimension of citizenship. This choice narrows the concept to the study of rights and responsibilities, the social rights dimension, or the territorial anchorage of citizenship. The benefit of this narrow focus is it corresponds with two broad types of political participation—

institutional and protest politics. In fact, in his chapter, Russell Dalton highlights two types of participatory citizenship—the dutiful and the engaged—which correspond roughly to institutional and noninstitutional participation. In this way, both (narrow and broad) understandings of citizenship offer venues for expanding the scope of social movement research, either by considering the importance of rights and responsibilities or by considering the relationship between different forms of participation.

For example, Moro and Richardson’s chapter on “Citizenship, Gender and Sexuality” highlights the importance of full membership in the political community “for different genders.” More precisely, they point to the struggles for inclusion in the polity by women, homosexuals, and transgendered citizens that took different forms—a fight to access suffrage, to be represented, and to be able to run for election without being disqualified based on one’s sex, gender, or sexual orientation. These struggles have taken the form of protest, but are aimed at institutional participation. Similarly, in their chapter on multicultural citizenship, Nazanin Massoumi and Nasar Meer historically trace the issue of partial inclusion. They argue that political struggles around citizenship are designed to overcome the cleavages that limit citizens’ access to rights. These struggles may draw upon social movement repertoires to gain access to any sanctioned form of political participation.

In short, this volume takes the contributions of citizenship research and applies them to the study of social movements, thereby moving scholarship beyond divisive distinctions between institutional and noninstitutional participation.

Sven Hutter. *Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe: New Cleavages in Left and Right Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. \$25.00. (paperback).

Edward Walker
University of California, Los Angeles

The conceptualization and investigation of political cleavages, once considered a central topic in both political sociology and in research on collective action, has largely fallen out of favor, especially in the U.S. This may be due, as some have argued, to American sociology’s general inattention, in recent years, to the importance of understanding public opinion (Manza and Brooks 2012); this territory, somewhat surprisingly, has

been almost entirely ceded to political scientists.

This change has been less pronounced in Europe, but hardly absent. Scholars working in the tradition of Stein Rokkan, most notably Hanspeter Kriesi and his students, have continued to highlight the importance of cleavages for understanding both contentious and conventional politics, both within and across countries. Still, perhaps reflecting the (somewhat disciplinary) historical division between research on social movements and electoral politics, it has been rather rare for scholars to consider the interplay of cleavage dynamics between the institutional political process and the efforts of political outsiders like activist groups.

Sven Hutter's *Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe* is refreshing on these counts. Investigating both protest dynamics and electoral politics in six countries—Austria, Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland—from 1975-2005, Hutter's book returns to the question of cleavage dynamics to examine how the European political space has shifted over the course of a generation. Animating the book's investigations is the question of how the politics of these six countries have moved from the left-libertarian politics of the '60s and '70s to the greater emphasis on right-populist politics today. The book creatively combines a variety of methods: newspaper-based protest event analysis, content analysis of political party platforms, and broader meta-analyses using comparative indicators of the state strength and democratic participation.

A core contribution of the book is the extension and evaluation of Kriesi's concept of an "integration-demarcation cleavage," which focuses around how the forces of globalization have, since the 1990s, redrawn the lines of political conflict such that new relationships of economic, cultural, and political competition have become prominent (pp. 10-11); these create new sets of "winners" and "losers" who are, respectively, benefiting from or being harmed by globalization. Economic competition has transformed from class-based to sector-based (and education-based) antagonisms. Cultural cleavages are being reshaped by immigration, ethnic diversity, and religious pluralism. Finally, political configurations shift by the waning of national autonomy in light of increasing global governance (p. 13).

Returning to the original term, Hutter's formulation is that "integration" is favored by those on globalization's winning side, and "demarcation" is linked to those on the losing end (p. 14). This is set in contrast to his "reverse new politics" explanation that contemporary cleavages follow the same logic as the left-libertarian politics of Western European countries during the 1960s

and 1970s, through an inversion in which the new social movements of that period spawned counter-movements of the populist right.

The book is structured in two parts. Part I provides three chapters offering conceptual background. Part II includes four chapters that engage directly in empirical analyses to understand protest and electoral cleavages. Following an initial chapter introducing the integration-demarcation argument outlined above, the chapter two argues for a return to features of the political process approach that explicitly conceptualize the relationship between protest and electoral politics. Hutter argues that this relationship could be conceptualized in three ways: (1) as one of congruence; (2) as one of counterweight, namely, that greater contestation around an issue in the electoral domain means less protest related to it; or (3) of different logics, e.g., challenges from the left versus the right are incorporated differently. In the third chapter, Hutter introduces a new index to understand state strength across the six countries in the analysis, then crossclassifies this with the state's degree of inclusiveness or exclusiveness.

In Part II, chapter four examines the protest waves across countries over this period, including its degree of transnationalization. Chapter five strikingly finds that, although there is generally more protest surrounding immigration and European integration in the recent wave of protests, levels of right-populist protest remain relatively low; left protest on issues surround cultural liberalism remain dominant. Chapter six finds that after the 1990s, traditional class cleavages became relatively decoupled from the politics of cultural liberalism, and chapter seven returns to the arguments about the relationship between conventional and contentious politics, finding in favor of the "different logics" thesis: protest on the right tends to decline with greater electoral support, whereas protest on the left rises and falls in tandem with success at the polls.

The book should be commended for making an ambitious effort to integrate multiple data sources to understand how the politics of Western Europe have been shifting in both the protest and electoral domains. The book is creative in its use of these data sources, attentive to the limitations of protest event analysis data (see the careful discussion of selection bias issues, for instance, in appendix A), and is thoughtful about the linkage between macrolevel state structures and mesolevel processes.

At the same time, a limitation of the book is that, for all of its talk about cleavage structures, the data it assembles is sometimes not up to the task of differentiating the altered coalitions that characterize contemporary protest and electoral politics. Much of the richness of protest claims is

aggregated into blunt aggregate categories. The book also comes up somewhat short in developing theory to help interpret the empirical findings. For instance, it remains unclear precisely why protest incorporation into electoral politics looks so different on the right versus the left, and one wonders about the scope and generalizability of such a finding.

On the whole, Hutter's *Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe* represents a useful contribution for students of social movements, comparative politics, and global studies. The book offers a helpful example of how protest event analysis can be incorporated into a multi-method research agenda.