Kerstin Jacobsson and Steven Saxonberg, eds. *Beyond NGO-ization: The Development of Social Movements in Central and Eastern Europe.* Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2013. $109.20 (Hardcover).

David Pettinicchio
University of Oxford

This edited volume brings together scholars interested in social movements, political participation, and civil society in Eastern Europe. The book's overarching objective is to situate Eastern European social movement mobilization, which takes place in particular institutional, normative, and cultural contexts, within existing theoretical frameworks. Since existing theories have largely developed from Western examples, this book, like the growing scholarship on mobilization in Latin America and the Middle East, asks questions about the extent to which non-Western examples challenge our understanding of social and political mobilization.

While the book acknowledges important differences between Eastern Europe and the west as well as variation among Eastern European countries, the editors preface the chapters by emphasizing similarities rather than differences. This might be due to the two related goals of the book reflected in the title and described by Jacobsson and Saxonberg in their introduction. First, differences in political mobilization and participation between Eastern Europe and the West are exaggerated. This has led scholars to conclude that collective action is suppressed due to a lack of civil society in turn ignoring the collective action and mobilization that has actually taken place. Second, the editors and individual contributors seek to dispel the so-called NGO-ization thesis especially that donor-dependency prevents the use of confrontational tactics. Thus, this book is about debunking certain myths regarding political/social mobilization in Eastern European countries. An important way the chapters address these myths is by applying existing theoretical frameworks to make sense of the collective action that has taken place in these particular institutional and cultural contexts stressing that Eastern Europe is not monolithic. As the chapters illustrate, there are important historical, cultural and structural characteristics within individual countries that shape both movement emergence and outcomes of mobilization across a variety of issues ranging from gay rights to home birthing.

The editors and contributors directly engage with existing social movement theories. They grapple with unresolved problems and tensions, ranging from the role of patrons in shaping organizational strategies to defining social movement success and failure. They situate their cases within a broader lens shedding important light on mobilization both within Eastern Europe and more generally. For these reasons, the book appeals not only to scholars of Eastern European politics but also to scholars interested in ongoing debates about the nature of political participation in contemporary societies.

No doubt, situating diverse forms of mobilization around a variety of Eastern European issues within existing theories of mobilization and participation is quite an ambitious goal (as the book's conclusion suggests). While this is clearly one of the book's strong suits, the inclusion of heterogeneous examples of mobilization within a variety of institutional and cultural contexts, coupled with theoretical ambiguities, leaves readers with unanswered questions, mostly related to the relationship between the cases presented in the book and existing social movement theories.

At times, contributors appear hesitant or vague in their discussion of contemporary theoretical debates in the social movement literature. Consequently, there is a tendency to overstate novelty or uniqueness about theoretical puzzles (for example, the relationship between protest coordination and organization building, resource flows and strategic choices, the role of political opportunities both nationally and regionally, organizational flexibility and isomorphism among SMOs and NGOs, social movement outcomes, grassroots mobilization versus institutional activism, etc.). This leads to a presentation of theoretical puzzles as though they are unique to Eastern Europe when in fact they are much more general (the example of professional advocacy and grassroots organizations in Russia is an example that comes to mind). The authors argue that indeed in most cases in Eastern Europe, organizations engage in a variety of actions (i.e., a repertoire of action), echoing existing work on organizational flexibility. But how do Eastern European cases tell us something new about social movement emergence and dynamics?

Taken together, the authors waver over whether Eastern European cases are different from western examples of mobilization and political participation, or whether they showcase the robustness of existing theories of political and social mobilization. Rather than tackling this issue head on, the authors tend to steer clear from making any assertions regarding the nature of these cases vis-à-vis theory. So while the volume attempts to link empirical examples using existing theoretical concepts, it is not always clear if authors are applying existing concepts or rather reformulating them to fit the empirics of their cases.

This leads to two related issues that require further specification. First, if Eastern European countries are to some extent qualitatively different from each other culturally and institutionally (as the book claims), is thinking about "Eastern Europe" even useful? Put another way, what is it about the group of Eastern European countries that make them unique from the West, while simultaneously taking into account that each country within this group is also different? The volume makes both claims—that they are similar yet different—but it is unclear how to make sense of these cases of mobilization in a broader sense.

Second, and consequently, the volume struggles over whether to treat these cases as theoretical anomalies or cases conforming to what we already know about movement emergence and dynamics. In terms of theory building, are cases of political and social mobilization in Eastern Europe (a) within the scope conditions of existing social movement theories, or (b) are they testing the limits of these scope conditions, or (c) are they completely outside the scope of existing theories, suggesting that new theories are necessary to account for these cases? Because the volume as a whole is unclear on this, it makes it difficult to disentangle theoretical claims from empirical claims resulting in a lack of clarity about how the cases presented in the volume relate and add to ongoing theoretical debates. Given that the editors and contributors outline existing theoretical and empirical tools used to study social movement dynamics and mobilization, a broader more involved discussion about current theoretical problems and developments would have been useful especially in setting up *a priori* how their empirical cases enlighten theoretical debates.

Despite some of these shortcomings, *Beyond NGO-ization* raises important empirical and theoretical questions about the ways in which scholars and activists understand movement emergence and dynamics and is an important contribution for students and scholars of political sociology and social movements.

Mary Bernstein and Verta Taylor, Editors. *The Marrying Kind? Debating Same-Sex Marriage within the Gay and Lesbian Movement.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. $25.00 (paperback).

Jo Reger
Oakland University

Same-sex marriage is such a flashpoint that, as I read this book, I came across a slew of cultural references to it. On my Facebook page the morning there was a video of a marriage proposal/ flash mob at a Home Depot store. In the carefully choreographed video a man enters the lumber aisle and has his family and friends appear lip syncing and dancing to the song *Somebody Loves You*. The man watches in wonder, smiling and laughing. Then his partner enters the aisle dressed in a suit and tie. Going down onto one knee, he asks for his hand in marriage, places a ring on his finger, they embrace, and the entire family celebrates. The couple later appeared on *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* and was given a free honeymoon to Australia. This video is evidence, as the authors of this edited volume note, that same-sex marriage has been a top priority in the lesbian and gay movement and is a focal point in our culture.

In the video, the marriage proposal is scripted out as it usually is—ring, bended knee, tears, family, and acceptance. By following this script, the Home Depot couple illustrates one of the core concerns of queer and feminist activists. That is the fear of homonormativity where lesbians and gays assimilate to heterosexual norms of relationship, family, and intimacy through marriage. In their cleverly titled book *The Marrying Kind?*, editors, Mary Bernstein and Verta Taylor, take on debates within the movement with the goal to "ease the tension over this issue that is taking place among activists on the ground" and "bridge the disconnect between theorists and activists" (p. ix). While this is their stated purpose, I would argue that the real contribution is the way in which several authors tease out important social movement dynamics by focusing on the lesbian and gay movement and the fight for marriage equality. This is not to suggest that a discussion of social movement debates is absent. In their introduction, Bernstein and Taylor offer a brief but comprehensive overview of the movement and identify key debates in the movement such as concerns over normalization and assimilation (i.e., homonormativity), the decentering of lesbian/ gay identity, and whether the focus on marriage is a misguided use of movement energy. It is the fear of homonormativity that repeatedly emerges in the chapters. Arlene Stein starts by noting that not all gays and lesbians want to get married (chapter 1, "What's the Matter with Newark?") and that race and class play a role in who seeks marriage as a goal. Adam Isaiah Green (chapter 11, "Debating Same Sex Marriage") concludes the book by taking an empirically grounded approach and finds that in interviews with same-sex (civil) married couples, marriage is reconstituted in ways that depart from and align with heterosexual models, making debates about the outcome of same-sex marriage more complicated. While these two chapters focus on the

broad debates, book-ended between them is a range of chapters that ask about the what, where, how, and why of pro- and antimarriage equality movement organizations and activists. Specifically the book addresses questions of social movement identity, outcomes, organizational continuity, decline, strategies and tactics, and several of the chapters stand out for their conceptual and empirical contributions.

A theoretical centerpiece of many of the book's chapters is Taylor, Kimport, Van Dyke and Andersen's reprinted *American Sociological Review* article (chapter 6, "Mobilization through Marriage") on the importance of understanding how symbolic and cultural activism influences movement mobilization. One example of using Taylor et al.'s framework is Katrina Kimport's interesting chapter, "Being Seen Through Marriage," (chapter 8) that examines the way in which hetereonormativity is challenged in lesbian wedding photographs.

In addition to addressing cultural activism, one of the relevant chapters to social movement scholars and activists is Amy Stone's (chapter 4), "Winning for LGBT Rights Laws, Losing for Same-Sex Marriage." Here, Stone address the difference between LGBT local and state campaigns and their outcomes and finds that internal factors (i.e., social movement organizing) and external factors (i.e. forces in the environment) influence why the LGBT movement "has become successful at defeating local referendums but not state-wide same-sex bans" (p.139). In this careful and extensive analysis, Stone illustrates how winning with one set of tactics at the local level does not necessarily translate into winning at the state level. Jeffrey Kosbie (chapter 3) also offers a thoughtful analysis on collective identity in "Beyond Queer vs. LGBT." Kosbie argues that instead of forming a collective identity in the fight for same-sex marriage, his interviewees connected in a community of "marriage supporters" who participated in a shared identity discourse which he defines as "an active project of building consensus on movement goals and managing tensions across multiple individual identities" (p. 104-105).

Moving away from the topic of mobilization, tactics, and identity, Kristen Olsen examines organizational continuity in her study of the Connecticut organization, Love Makes a Family, which closed its doors after the right to marry was won in the state (chapter 10). She finds that although resource dependency and the institutional models of continuity and decline offer some insight into why organizations shut down after accomplishing their goals, the identity model helps explain how activists assign meaning to their desired outcomes based on the identities they embrace. In the case of Love Makes a Family, the organization's goals were met and the group's activist identity did not find other issues as compelling or meaningful.

In all, this is a book that would be excellent in graduate-level social movements, gender, family, or public policy courses. In addition, advanced undergraduates would also benefit from several of the chapters. However, its greatest contribution is to social movement scholars engaged in a variety of questions about identity, outcomes, organizational continuity, decline, strategies and tactics.

Jocelyn Elise Crowley. *Mothers Unite! Organizing for Workplace Flexibility and the Transformation of Family Life*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013. $24.95 (Paperback).

Katrina Kimport
University of California, San Francisco

In *Mothers Unite!*, Jocelyn Crowley brings an academic lens to the questions: why isn't there a mothers' movement agitating for greater workplace flexibility? And, what would it take to have a mothers' movement? Using a combination of survey and interview data, Crowley studies the members of five mothers' groups throughout the U.S. to answer these questions. She posits that the primary impediment to a mothers' movement is that mothers do not realize they share grievances. Instead, media-constructed distractions like the so-called Mommy Wars that pit working moms against stay-at-home moms preclude mothers from recognizing their shared concerns. Crowley then illustrates how the mothers in her sample in fact do have shared desires around workplace flexibility. She sketches a road map for a mothers' movement, proposing unifying claims and emphasizing the importance of leadership. Basically, this book is meant to rouse a mothers' movement into being.

The five groups of Crowley's study are ideologically diverse, representing different orientations toward motherhood, from Mothers of Preschoolers (MOPS), which embraces Christian values, to MomsRising, an online community that takes a more progressive and activist stance. She surveyed over 3,000 members of the five groups as well as a sample of 800 randomly selected mothers who were not members of a mothers group, and conducted in-depth interviews with 125 members (25 per group). Through these data, Crowley shows that the variation in groups' ideologies manifests in members' political orientations, demographics such as age and number of

children, and current paid work status. Overall, about half the respondents worked for pay, ranging from a low of 34.4% among surveyed members of MOPS to a high of 84% of interviewed members of MomsRising. There was also a great deal of demographic similarity across the five groups: save for members of the group MochaMoms, which caters to African-American women, her respondents were almost uniformly white; respondents were generally highly educated and had enough class privilege that their families could survive on a single income; and nearly all respondents were married.

Following chapters exploring the formation of the five groups and the reasons women offered for joining and staying members, Crowley examines her data for evidence that women in mothers groups are inherently divided by their paid work status (i.e. working moms v. stay-at-home moms). Finding none, Crowley then turns to an investigation of what ideals and workplace preferences they might generally share in common, seeking a starting point for a mothers' movement. She finds similarities of interest in certain types of workplace flexibility across the sample, including flexible start and stop times, compressed work weeks, and advance notice of required overtime. Moreover, she reports that respondents were generally supportive of a government role in educating businesses about flexibility options and even offering incentives to promote flexibility. It is these findings of a shared desire for flexibility that Crowley uses to argue for the emergence of a social movement by and for mothers.

Crowley's data and analysis support her claims and serve her purpose. She admirably puts her money where her mouth is, offering an informed action plan for the development of a mothers' movement. However, Crowley's project of identifying consensus and fomenting a social movement also serves to discourage deeper critique. Parts of her data collection seem more akin to opinion research, gauging the relative popularity among respondents of specific kinds of workplace policies and seeking areas of agreement. In investigating mothers' experience and wants, she does not mine the gendered dynamics of family and work, areas likely to reveal significant ideological disagreement among her respondents, nor is there an engaged discussion of how economic class operates to foreclose the question of choice to work for many mothers. Crowley leaves unremarked the repeated pattern of respondents justifying their paid work-related decisions as what is best for the family, following a trend scholars of gender have documented of women/wives/mothers being expected to put family first and self second/last. By focusing on what (this sample of) mothers want from their workplaces, Crowley only addresses part of the issue. Unaddressed is how other institutions and culture shape their choices and decisions.

Crowley offers rich data and brings in relevant theory. Qualitative researchers will like the lengthy and meaty quotes she provides, although some, as I did, may see missed avenues of analysis in these extended quotes. Throughout the book, Crowley draws heavily on social movements literature. However, she generally engages this research to offer guidance for building a mothers' movement, not to challenge or extend existing theory. Scholars of social movements will be most interested in chapter 6, in which Crowley examines respondents' perceptions of themselves as activists and/or participants in a movement, illustrating some of the complexities of collective identity formation and movement building. Crowley finds that the majority of respondents did not identify as members of a mothers' movement and fleshes out variations in how respondents framed their rejection or affirmation of a movement affiliation.

In the end, Crowley poses an intriguing question: if you build it, will they come? That is, if you create flexible work policies, will mothers come to work? She marshals her data to assert this is the case—that mothers want to work at least some of the time, if the circumstances are right—and calls on mothers to make workplace flexibility universal. As an activist project, the book narrows and simplifies its content to drive toward this primary point. As a book from an academic press, however, it is not clear that the intended audience will include the women she seeks to inspire to advocacy. We are thus left with one more question: if you write the how-to book, will mothers unite?

Cristina Flesher Fominaya and Laurence Cox, eds. *Understanding European Movements: New Social Movements, Global Justice Struggles, Anti-Austerity Protest*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013. $143 (Hardcover).

Dana Williams
California State University, Chico

Understanding European Movements intends to decenter the scholarly preoccupation with North American movements. The editors suggest that European contributions to movement theory are underappreciated, especially by those of us in the US. Many Americans lack the awareness that social movements strongly influenced European social theory; thus, sociology is theoretically

shaped by one if its subareas. A possible source of the American myopic conception of movements, the editors allege, is the focus: European theory treats movements with a macrolevel analysis, while North Americans are more microfocused.

The editors argue the standard narrative about the development of social movement theory (progressing from collective behavior, relative deprivation, resource mobilization, to political opportunity) is more of a myth than an accurate historical accounting. The European "new social movement" (NSM) theory contribution to these developments does not seem to fit. NSM theories seem awkward because they are not what they seem to be. The theorists (Melucci, Habermas, Touraine) share little in common and do not "fit" well together. Labor movements and Marxism are not always separate from so-called NSMs. And, NSM theory constructs boundaries between scholarly and activist-created movement theories.

The book focuses upon three general categories of movements, understood in historical progression, including various NSM precursors to the global justice movement, the global justice movement (GJM) of the 1990s and early-2000s, and finally antiausterity movements of the "European Spring." This typology allows contributing authors to explore the origins of the contemporary GJM, which they locate in peasant farmer, antinuclear, antiroads, and autonomous movements over many decades. Given their centrality in global justice networks, France and Italy receive special attention. Many authors grapple with the ways in which past movements influence, contribute to, or evolve into new movements. Movement themes diffuse and spill-over from one country, movement, or time period to another.

Throughout, there is substantial support for Katsiaficas's *eros effect,* the emotive inspiration that activists have upon each other, even across time and space. Symbols, memes, protests, uprisings, and movements spread, virus-like, to infect others. This is likely one reason why so many common themes appear across chapters, even though most essays focus upon single country's movements. As chapter 6 notes, the GJM is not so much a brand new movement, as it is an adaptation from earlier forms; in comparison, environmentalists and leftists merged into the antinuclear movement. Likewise, the networks mobilized in the European Spring include some of the same that were active in the GJM.

The continental network of political squats is essential to many of these movements. The squatting movement has secured innumerable *centri sociali* (social centers) in Italy, which serve the interests and purposes of local activists and movements, and transnational activists who travel across Europe, using squats as temporary resources. Ya Basta! grew out of the *centri sociali*; these same activists were central European coordinators of Peoples' Global Action, and they provided resources for European Social Form (ESF) gatherings—all the while taking inspiration from the Zapatistas. The two chapters on squatting suggest a shifting focus in the study of social movements to the spaces in which they gather. This is relevant to not only the squats and *centri sociali*, but also the ESF and Reclaim the Streets (occupying conference and street space, respectively), as well as more recent climate justice camps and post-Arab Spring occupations, like the Spanish M15/Indignados movement. The book presents a growing recognition of the importance of space, public gatherings, face-to-face dialogue, points of organizing and mobilization, diffusion/distribution, and temporary autonomous zones from which movements resist.

The book acknowledges, sometimes only in passing, how movements have entered into conflict with other former movements, particularly Greens and various leftists (especially socialist and communist parties, like the Italian Communist Party). Even though there appears to be great overlap in values, ideology, and goals, many factions within the GJM have cautioned against political party collaboration, if not outright opposed parties' presence amongst movements (e.g., the Social Forums' prohibition against party participation). Instead, movements desired maintaining local control and autonomy.

Another emergent theme is how activists play with identity. Illustrations include, first, how French farmers (including José Bové) trashed a McDonald's and then reauthored themselves as Robin Hoods opposed to the WTO, globalization, and rich farmers. Second, Western movement frames imposed upon Eastern European activists (e.g., Romania and Hungary) demanded the East "catch-up" to the West politically, while others resisted this movement colonialism. Finally, *centri sociali* will rename their squatted building, forcefully asserting their politics and local identity.

A curious dissonance across these chapters pertains to the different labels used for the GJM. Although compatible, authors utilize numerous terms, displaying a lack of consensus on what to call this movement: global justice movement, alterglobalization, global justice and solidarity movement, counterglobalization, and the movement of movements. Maybe ambiguity is acceptable, given the postmodernist turn of movements and their analysts? Having different labels or identifiers for the same phenomenon might be acceptable, since these movements could vary depending upon one's conceptualization of them,

their objectives, positions, or constitution. Authors throughout clearly separate the movement from the Left, anticapitalist movements, and others. When overlapping, differences are not blurred, but analyzed.

A perennial problem with analyzing complex phenomenon like movements is that some things are conspicuously de-contextualized. The Greek crisis is detached from earlier moments of anti-capitalist resistance, particularly the unmentioned December 2010 rebellion following the police murder of a 15-year old Athenian student. Ultra-leftists immediately revolted, followed by Greek civil society, which broadened their critique to Greece's deepening economic problems. Militant tactics carried over to the later period, including labor unions' active participation and numerous general strikes. The December 2010 events pre-dated the Arab Spring, so, arguably, the Greek uprising may have influenced Tunisian events (although others influenced the Greeks in 2010, too). While regrettable, this does not detract from the chapter's compelling presentation of how Tunisia influenced Greece; many other chapters also make comparable connections. *Understanding European Movements* is a great resource that illuminates what is new about the most recent Arab Spring, antiausterity, and Occupy movements —and what is not.

Grace Yukich, *One Family Under God: Immigration Politics and Progressive Religion in America*. New York, Oxford University Press 2013. $24.95 (paperback).

Sara Nuzhat Amin
Asian University for Women, Bangladesh

What shapes public discourse on religion? How do religious activists aim to create religious change? How is religion shaped by political activism and other kinds of claims making? What role can religious activism play on seemingly secular issues such as immigrant rights? What challenges do interfaith movements face? In *One Family Under God*, Grace Yukich addresses these questions while providing clear and powerful insight into the emergence and evolution of the New Sanctuary Movement in the United States. Using ethnographic research from 2007-2009, Yukich makes a timely and important contribution to the literature on activism related to immigrant rights and progressive religion.

Narrated through stories of mixed-status families (where at least one parent is an undocumented immigrant) and the clergy who animate the movement, Yukich takes us on an intimate journey of the New Sanctuary movement. Readers become familiar with the motivations and rationales of the different actors in the movement and what drives them to participate in a movement that is about both creating immigration reform and changing religious discourse. This two-pronged purpose in the movement produces the driving research question in the book: What is the impact of having these multiple targets of religious change and political change?

Through the various chapters, Yukich shows how the presence of multiple targets shapes the emergence of the New Sanctuary movement, impacts its strategic and tactical decision making, effects the recruitment and commitment of participants, structures its organization, and contributes to its success and failures. In each part of her analysis, Yukich borrows from the various frameworks in social movement theory, while expanding on them to show how having multiple targets complicate our understanding of the mechanisms related to framing, recruitment, commitment and institutional impact. The result is effective. Yukich's insightful analysis of the New Sanctuary movement convincingly shows having multiple targets presents challenges to activists. In particular, she shows the difficulty that the movement faces in recruiting non-Christian actors and immigrants. She illustrates that while activists tried to learn from non-Christian and immigrant participants and attempted to reduce the racial, denominational and class biases, the movement remained predominantly white, Christian (mainline Protestant) and middle class. Thus while the movement was successful in transforming the religiosity of their own congregations, they were less successful in becoming the interfaith and ethnically diverse movement they wanted to be.

Yukich argues that her analysis of the New Sanctuary movement can constitute the basis of a research agenda on multitarget movements and aligns with Armstrong and Bernstein's multi-institutional politics approach (2008) have proposed. While *One Family Under God* is a powerful example of the kind of deep understanding that a multi-institutional politics approach can produce compared to utilizing only the political process framework, one weakness in Yukich's work is that all the concluding research hypotheses produced are comparative, while her work is focused on one-case study. She proposes five hypotheses: (1) Compared to other types of movements, multitarget social movements will emerge less frequently, although this does not mean that they will emerge infrequently; (2) the process of strategy selection in multitarget social movements will be longer and more contested than in other movements or organizations, since fewer crossover strategies exist; (3) a genuinely fitting

crossover strategy can produce a greater degree of change in each institutional arena being targeted by a multitarget social movement than would have been created in a single-target movement; (4) multitarget social movements will be more likely than other movements and movement organizations to develop innovative ways of framing causes and engaging with outsiders (whether effective or not); and (5) over time, multitarget social movements are likely to turn into something more like a single-target movement. Yukich does try in her conclusion to briefly examine the civil rights movement with these hypotheses in mind to give a sense of what may be the implications of looking at movements through the frame of multitarget movements and how this may lead us to look at existing data differently and/or understand decisions and outcomes in new ways. However, these comparative hypotheses point towards a difference in degree rather than in kind when thinking about mechanisms in social movement dynamics.

The book's greatest strength lies in how Yukich is able to demonstrate how religion can work both as a resource and constraint within a given movement. Yukich's work illustrates the potential of a multi-institutional politics approach to highlight the multiplicity of power, especially in cultural institutions such as religion, and the efforts of different actors to challenge multiple kinds of authorities. The rich ethnographic data, the ability of Yukich to analyze the dynamics of the New Sanctuary movement from emergence to evolution to outcomes, and the clarity with which it is written, make this not only an ideal text for use in undergraduate and graduate courses, but also make it accessible to a wider public.

Michael Trask. *Camp Sites: Sex, Politics, and Academic Style in Postwar America.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013. $21.12 (paperback).

Remy Cross
Webster University

In *Camp Sites*, Michael Trask examines the linkages between post-World War II academe and the emergence of social movements that immediately affected academic institutions in the 1960's. He focuses on the interplay between a burgeoning gay culture and how, as gays rights emerged and more and more men and women came out of the closet, this closely mirrored similar processes occurring within the academy over politics and political expression by both students and faculty. His ultimate argument is that both practices, out and open homosexuality and heavily critical political expression by academics, was constrained by a normative performance that disallowed certain types of expression, branding them as dangerously subversive, and which discouraged their practice as harmful to wider acceptance and political efficacy.

Drawing heavily on historical accounts and on literature and performances from the period, Trask argues that both the gay experience and academic life represented a sort of performance of expected behavior. In the case of homosexuality this was the interplay between closeted life, which required playing the role expected by society, and the more campy experience of openly out gay men and women who were seen as dangerous and uncontrolled.

Starting his account in the aftermath of the war, when the Red Scare was in full swing, Trask argues that academics—often seen as suspect—became increasingly focused on presenting the right kind of liberalism to the outside world, of enacting a sort of proscribed set of behaviors that allowed them to see themselves as academically free and critical, but without jeopardizing their privileged status by actually arousing the ire or suspicion of those outside of academe with the potential to curtail their freedoms. Trask then traces how this begins to unravel as the student and academic radials of the 1960's began to be more open in their challenges, yet they still couched their challenges in a sort of ritualized behavior, never deviating too far from their scripts, and excluding those who were believed to be too radical, or in danger of losing control of themselves and compromising the elaborate routine that had developed within the academy.

Camp Sites contrasts this with the emerging gay rights movements, which at the time was divided between those who were more closeted and those who were out, and often flamboyantly so, engaged in camp performances that were first seen as threatening to the more traditional closeted forms of homosexuality. It was these more outspoken activists which Trask argues often sought to find common cause with the academic radicals of the 60's, only to find themselves rejected out of fear that they were too out there, too radical in their aims and methods.

Trask argues that rather than offering a different sort of challenge, the academic radicals of the 1960's were enacting a sort of accepted role that actually was sanctioned by, and encouraged by the status quo they sought to challenge. By linking this argument about these performances to Goffman's ideas about the performance self, Trask locates his analysis on the edges of sociology. He also brings in Bourdieu, arguing that the type of *habitus* practiced by academics during

this period was heavily biased against certain types of people, typically women and gay men, and required that the subjects embrace the sort of Cold War rationality advanced by the natural and social sciences at the time which couched their opposition in the careful language of rationality and empiricism. Far from enabling criticism, Trask contends that this kind of *habitus* feeds into the interests of those in power and actually disables legitimate protest and radicalism.

However, his main focus is on the literary and historical accounts which make up the bulk of his evidence in supporting his argument. As a result he often blends first hand or other historical accounts of actual people with scenes from plays or novels written during the period as his evidence, which somewhat blunts to force of his argument by removing it from the grounded in experience truth of historical accounts to the more polished but potentially heavily fictionalized accounts of the artist.

Trask's account, while meticulously researched and bridging both historical narrative and literary criticism, is not something that connects well with most other accounts of movements. This results in the volume being something of limited value to most movement scholars. While certainly something that would benefit those interested in the emergence of student radicalism and the New Left, as well as the changing relationship between academe and gay rights, it is not the sort of volume that has much to say to movement scholars beyond these narrow areas. The complexity of the analysis also means it has limited usage in undergraduate movements courses, and the lack of general connections to wider movement scholarship also means it is probably less useful in even general graduate seminars than many other volumes that deal with these issues in a manner that is tied more closely to the wider body of social movement scholarship.

Jacquelien van Stekelenburg, Conny Roggeband, and Bert Klandermans, eds. *The Future of Social Movement Research: Dynamics, Mechanisms, and Processes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. $30.00 (Paperback).

Catherine Corrigall-Brown
University of Western Ontario

The Future of Social Movements Research brings together a diverse group of leading scholars to reflect on the changing nature of social movements. The volume originated in a 2009 conference organized to honor the work of Bert Klandermans, who has been instrumental in bringing a social psychological lens to social movement research. In honor of his bridging work, this book deftly combines sociology, social psychology, psychology, and political science perspectives to highlight the increasingly complicated mobilization of social movements in modern societies.

This volume is organized in a way that makes the reader feel that they were, in fact, at the conference on which it is based. It begins with an overarching introduction and ends with a synthesizing conclusion. There are four main sections: dynamics of demand (grievances and identities); dynamics of supply (organizations and networks); dynamics of mobilization; and the changing context of contention. Each section is introduced with an essay and ends with a discussion of the section's chapters. The synthesizing work of these introductions and discussions functions like we all hope a good conference panel will, to bring together ideas and push authors and readers to move to the next step. As a whole, the volume is comprehensive, provocative, and nuanced.

The first section of the book focuses on the dynamics of demand. Klandermans introduces this section by arguing that, while we understand the creation of mobilization potential, we do not tend to look at the processes whereby these potentials are turned into action. How do individuals come to act together and why do some grievances or identities lead to mobilization while others do not? Polletta et al.'s chapter focuses on the role of the internet and argues that this technology transforms the traditional calculus of individual participation and alters individual perceptions of the sociopolitical context. Taylor's chapter examines the cultural foundation of mobilization, particularly the performance of identity and the importance of tactics for the construction of a politicized collective identity. Finally, van Doorn et al. assess the conditions under which politicization occurs, focusing on the process of intragroup meaning making. The section concludes with van Zomeren's chapter that examines mobilization through the psychological processes of coping. This discussant chapter is an interesting example of the dialogue between sociology, social psychology, and psychology that permeates the volume.

Section II focuses on the dynamics of supply. Roggeband and Duyvendak introduce this section and argue that the rise of the internet, a shift from identity politics to issue-oriented politics, and the rise of globalization have changed the supply side of protest. There are four chapters in this section. Soule argues for the continued significance of organizations in social movement scholarship. Staggenborg uses the idea of social movement communities to conceptualize the diffuse nature of social movements and their changing struc-

tures. Diani focuses on systems of relations and networks in organizational fields. And, Rucht examines social movement structures and their role in social movement activities. The section ends with Minkoff's urging to locate social movements in their broader context. In particular, she calls on scholars to examine the rise of new technologies and macrolevel factors using comparative and longitudinal designs.

Section III examines dynamics of mobilization. Walgrave introduces this section and argues that the nature of mobilization is changing. Van Stekelenburg and Boekkooi's chapter focuses on mobilizing structures and argues that the boom of new media has shifted the burden of mobilization from organizations to individuals. Oliver assesses how mobilizing decisions are affected by the prevailing regime and the positions of other groups making claims. Snow examines the dilemma of multiple identities. He argues that mobilization is the consequence of an alignment between one of those identities and the grievances experienced or claims made by social movements. However, as interests have become multiple and fragmented in modern society, events are needed to activate and align identities. Finally, Hutter and Kriesi assess the role of electoral channels and interest groups and argue that social movement scholars need to look outside the protest channel in their work. The section ends with a discussion by Rootes, who examines how large-scale changes such as globalization, increased levels of education, and technological innovation have altered identity development and mobilization in modern societies.

The final section focuses on the changing context of contention. Koopmans begins by noting how the context for social movement activity has been affected by the uploading of responsibilities from the nation state to supranational organizations, the downloading to regional governments, and the offloading to nonstate actors and the market. The chapters in this section begin with McAdam and Tarrow who argue that elections and movements are mutually constitutive forms of politics and examine how electoral contention impacts social movement outcomes. Della Porta pushes us to examine the democratic functions of social movements. McCarthy et al. re-examine the social movement society (SMS) thesis and find mixed support, suggesting we might not be moving towards a SMS. Mayer's chapter examines contention in France and finds a high and rising level of protest in that country. The comparison of the McCarthy et al. and Mayer chapter illustrate the significance of context in assessing trends in mobilization. Ferree provides the discussion for this section and argues that change to states and its functions have fundamentally altered movement dynamics.

The book is concluded by Klandermans who summarizes and explores avenues for future research. As a whole, the volume provides an overview of the field that is thought provoking and illuminating. While some of these ideas are familiar to scholars of social movements, this is a valuable text that brings together an outstanding compilation of world-class scholars and provides a great summary of the state of social movement research. This would be a wonderful addition to a graduate course on social movements, political sociology, or contentious politics.

Colin Barker, Laurence Cox, John Krinksy and Alf Gunvald Nilsen, eds. *Marxism and Social Movements*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. $30.00 (paperback).

Michael J. Roberts
San Diego State University

Marxism and Social Movements will have a major impact on the field of social movement studies. Many of us think our field is ripe for a significant theoretical shake-up not unlike what happened after the civil rights movement and the global student movements of the sixties led scholars to reflect, in a critical manner, upon how academic discourse constitutes its objects of analysis. In our times, the global economic crisis, followed by the events of Arab Spring, the movements against austerity in Europe, and the globalized Occupy Wall Street protests, present a new occasion for theoretical innovations in our field. In short, the timing could not be better for the first sustained engagement between Marxist theories of collective action and social movement theory. Such an engagement has two trajectories: the first is the return of political economy to our field, and the second is to introduce Marxist theories of culture to social movement studies for the first time.

When I received this book for review, I had my fingers crossed because I was hoping to find that the kind of Marxism presented in the book would represent the very best of critical theory, political economy, labor history, and cultural studies. While I prefer the phrase "historical materialism" to "Marxism," due to the unfortunate history of dogmatic theory associated with figures like Kautsky and Stalin, I was pleased to see that in this volume mention was made of cultural theorists like Gramsci, Bakhtin, E.P. Thompson, Volosinov, and Lefebvre. It truly is a breath of fresh air to see those particular names mentioned in a book about social movements.

One must ask: are the caricatures of Marxist theory in the social sciences coming to an end?

Marxist theoreticians of culture are well-known and have been put to good use in literary criticism and cultural studies, but the "linguistic turn" in sociology and the move toward a focus on culture and identity formation in social movement studies largely ignored this tradition in Western-Marxist theory, much to the detriment of our field. As Cox and Blackledge demonstrate in their chapters, the work of Volosinov and Bakhtin on the issues of language and culture offers a potent alternative to both the use of Goffman's frame analysis, and new social movement theory, which together have dominated the approach to culture in our field in recent decades. Humphrys's creative application of Gramsci in her article, "Organic Intellectuals in the Australian Global Justice Movement," is another good example of expanding our understanding of the role of culture in social movements.

In addition to captivating theoretical chapters that constitute the first part of the book, there are numerous empirical chapters (too many to cover in a book review) that cover a wide range of topics that include class formation and the labor movement in China, South Africa's urban social movements as well as working-class formations and popular uprisings that link Cairo to Cochabamba. The wide range of empirical investigations is very impressive, but for me the theoretical innovations in this volume are what make it so valuable at this point in time for our field of study. Hesketh's chapter is one of the first academic treatments of social movements that uses the work of Henri Lefebvre, whose path-breaking book *The Production of Space* has had a transformative effect on the fields of geography and urban sociology.While Lef ebvre's work has been informing those fields for decades, it is quite refreshing to see his theoretical framework finally make its way into social movement studies. Hesketh's piece is a nice compliment to Martin and Miller's innovative article "Space and Contentious Politics," which was published by *Mobilization* back in 2003.

Arguably, the best chapters that address the central goals of this book are Hetland and Goodwin's chapter, "The Strange Disappearance of Capitalism from Social Movement Studies," and Blackledge's "Thinking About (New) Social Movements: Some Insights from the British Marxist Historians," both of which provide provocative critiques of NSM theory. Blackledge's main problem with NSM theory is that it has inverted the problem of crude materialism by "unhinging" language from the material world. The article explains how the important work of E.P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawn and Christopher Hill has been lost upon scholars in our field, in spite of important works like Piven and Cloward's *Poor People's Movements* and Tilly's *From Mobilization to Revolution*. What is ultimately at stake for Blackledge is not only a need to challenge the reduction of Marxism to crude materialism, but also a new theoretical approach that finds continuities between so-called "old" and "new" movements. Blackledge's intervention is precisely what our field needs today, as we work toward making sense of the new global movements against neoliberalism.

Goodwin and Hetland's article is perhaps the most provocative, since it asks us to reflect on an unfortunate development in our field; namely, the disappearance of political economy. In an analysis of article titles and abstracts, they reveal that since the founding of *Mobilization* in 1996, the word "capitalism" appears once, while the word "economy" appears just three times. The phrases "class struggle" and "class conflict" are completely absent. What is even more interesting is how they challenge the taken-for-granted wisdom that new social movements have little to do with either capitalism or class struggle. On the contrary, they demonstrate that "new" social movements like the LGBT movement have been profoundly shaped by the *history of the changing social relations of production and reproduction in capitalism*, a topic that has been exiled from social movement studies in recent decades. For example, proletarianization processes diminished the economic importance of the family in Western capitalist economies, which in turn undermined the heterosexual norms in the cultures of those countries.

This is just a taste of what this book offers in terms of deconstructing the dualism between old and new social movements that has become a theoretical barrier to understanding the new global social movements of our times.