

Marie E. Berry. *War, Women, and Power: From Violence to Mobilization in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2018. \$99.99 (hardcover), \$34.99 (paper).

Aliza Luft
University of California, Los Angeles

After President Trump's inauguration, the Women's March on Washington and its sister rallies across the country made history as the nation's largest single-day protest. Since then, more women have filed to run for office than ever before, and they have won an unprecedented number of primaries. Women in the United States are shattering so many political records that news outlets have labeled 2018 "Year of the Woman."

And yet, women's rights are under assault: the Violence Against Women Act is about to expire, antiabortion judge Brett Kavanaugh gained a seat on the Supreme Court, and the president, with many denigrating actions towards women, was caught on tape bragging about sexual assault. Female candidates report constant harassment and abuse. Why, despite these threats to their lives and livelihoods, are women mobilizing in record numbers?

Enter Marie Berry's remarkable book, *War, Women, and Power: From Violence to Mobilization in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Sure, it is about women's political participation in countries quite different from the United States, but I couldn't help but draw parallels and lessons from Berry's stunning analysis.

War, Women, and Power examines how mass conflict leads to profound social change, increasing women's political agency after war. The link between war and women's activism is not new: social scientists have noted that since the 1980s, post-war countries have experienced a rise in women's political representation. Yet Berry's book uniquely considers how war precipitates political engagement from the perspectives of women themselves. This is no small feat.

According to Berry, war produces demographic, economic, and cultural shifts that increase women's activism in informal politics. Further conditions, such as the introduction of a gender-sensitive regime, can then catalyze activism from the informal arena to the formal political one. These gains can simultaneously trigger a backlash. Via domestic political settlements that undermine women's unity, the occasionally problematic priorities of international humanitarian actors, and the revitalization of patriarchy, women who try to

institutionalize political leadership constantly risk being pushed back into the domestic sphere. It therefore remains to be seen just how much of an opening war can generate for lasting change.

To explain how war created opportunities for women but also setbacks, Berry interviewed 152 women in Rwanda and 109 in Bosnia and complements this fieldwork with more than 200 organizational reports from community groups and international organizations. She brings her experience running human rights education programs in Rwanda and Bosnia to bear on the analysis. In countries recovering from war, it is difficult for citizens to open up and let a foreigner into their world. But Berry's knowledge and expertise, combined with repeat visits to each country (three in Rwanda and five in Bosnia), enabled her to build trusting relationships. The result is a thoughtful book replete with intimate details about women's personal suffering and political reconstruction in the aftermath of violence.

For example, Berry quotes a Rwandan woman, Noémie, whose husband was killed in the 1994 genocide. After the violence, Noémie worked in a widows' organization for three years while having "to do everything . . . the same for [her] kids as when their dad was around." Noémie describes how she used to think "politics was just a bunch of lies," but after her colleagues encouraged her, she was appointed head of her sector, ran for mayor and won, and finally was elected into parliament (p. 82-83). Her story exemplifies a transition many Rwandan women have made since the genocide; today, Rwanda leads the world in female parliamentary representation. But Berry goes beyond statistics to give women voice about how it feels to take on these new roles.

As a result, *War, Women, and Power* reveals such transitions are not always easy—a fact often elided in discussions of the positive consequences of women's postwar activism. For example, Jacqueline, also widowed, states, "Even just survival at home is also another hassle. . . . My agreement with my husband was him taking care of me and my kid. . . . This is not what we agreed on" (p. 71). Intention led some into politics, but many, like Jacqueline, were pushed because they lacked alternatives. Thus, even when activism instills new confidence, it can feel hard to be responsible for repairing a broken society.

This brings me to another significant finding by Berry: women often merged their status as nurturing wives and mothers with political participation. They drew on cultural repertoires as peaceful actors to justify their public presence, especially in comparison to men, whom they blame

for wars. For example, *Screm do Mira* (“Through Heart to Peace”) began in a refugee camp as a hair salon and sewing group for women to make money for their children’s schooling and healthcare. When their hometown was incorporated into Republika Srpska, few wanted to return because of the violence that happened there and because former Serbian army leaders still dominated local government. But return they did, largely because *Screm do Mira* provided a framework to rebuild their lives, sidestepping government ire by labeling itself a humanitarian women’s group and working for refugee return, transitional justice, and rights for the displaced.

It would be easy to continue highlighting important insights from this book, from how women bridged ethnonational divides by emphasizing their identities as women against war, to their success securing INGO funding despite facing economic disadvantages prior to and during each conflict. I have not discussed how Rwanda’s quasiauthoritarian regime versus Bosnia’s rotating tripartite presidency has shaped women’s mobilization in each country, but suffice it to say that, as someone who has worked in Rwanda, Berry’s chapter on historical roots of mass violence in Rwanda and its contemporary consequences is one of the most precise accounts of the country’s past and present I’ve read in recent years. I trust experts on the former Yugoslavia will feel similarly about the parallel chapter on Bosnia.

Finally, lest I fail to mention the important discussion of the backlash women face for their political activism, allow me to state clearly that this problem is not unique to women in post-war contexts. If our current political situation is any indication, *War, Women, and Power* will prove insightful for a range of questions beyond Rwanda and Bosnia concerning women’s activism and the violence that manifests in their lives when they challenge the status quo. It is a landmark book set to shape the conversation on gender, conflict, and mobilization for decades to come.

Holly J. McCammon and Lee Ann Banaszak, eds. *100 Years of the Nineteenth Amendment: An Appraisal of Women’s Political Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2018. \$99.00 (hardcover), \$34.95 (paper).

Elisabeth S. Clemens
University of Chicago

The United States was founded on unprecedented political inclusion combined with multiple categorical exclusions. While “all men were created

equal,” full political rights were restricted to mostly white, adult, often property-owning men. This combination set in motion sustained demands for formal and substantive political equality that fueled major social movements: abolition, civil rights, and woman suffrage, to name only a few. Precisely because the categorical exclusions were so fortified in law and practice, so fiercely defended, one might expect that success at gaining political rights would be followed by major transformations in policy, politics, and law. Certainly, this was the expectation of many of those women who fought for the right to vote from the first women’s rights convention in 1848 to the ratification of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1920. Yet the impact of this successful case of popular constitutionalism has proven surprisingly elusive. Just what difference did the right to vote make for American women and for American politics?

In *100 Years of the Nineteenth Amendment: An Appraisal of Women’s Political Activism*, co-editors Holly J. McCammon and Lee Ann Banaszak have assembled a distinguished set of contributors to address to these questions. The volume has an impressively multidisciplinary range with many chapters linked to larger research projects. Consequently, the collection not only advances a debate about the character and consequences of women’s political participation, it also functions as a survey of current scholarship that introduces key concepts along with diverse methods and sources of evidence.

To address the question of what difference women’s enfranchisement did (and didn’t) make, several chapters focus specifically on voting and other forms of participation. Although the sight of women entering voting booths in the 1920s was no doubt a dramatic change for many, because ballots were secret, it was not obvious what difference their unprecedented participation made. Using statistical techniques to leverage a rare exception in Illinois, where the gender of voters was recorded, J. Kevin Corder and Christina Wolbrecht contend that the participation of these new voters actually reinforced the existing party system, suppressing the percentage of the vote that the 1924 insurgent progressive candidacy of Robert La Follette would have received in the absence of the Constitutional amendment. Contrary to the expectation that movement success will produce political transformation, this large expansion of the electorate moderated electoral change. This sense of woman suffrage as a nonevent was not unusual. As the immediate successors of the suffrage organizations gave way to more issue-oriented interest groups, women’s representatives testified before Congress on a shrinking number of

issues (Kristin Goss). Progress toward greater equality of representation came slowly at the level of both Congress and state legislatures (Jessica Lavariega Monforti; Susan Welch) and distinctively gendered patterns of partisan attachment and political participation developed slowly over the decades after suffrage. Now assumed by those handicapping electoral prospects, the gender gap in voting emerged long after women secured the formal right to vote. By the 1970s, women began to report voting at slightly higher rates than men, but it was only in the 2000s that their rates of participation in campaigns and campaign donations approximated—occasionally surpassed—those of male voters (Nancy Burns et al.).

The potential impact of the enfranchisement of women was muted, of course, by the fact that there was no singular set of circumstances or policy demands associated with gender. Even before the passage of the constitutional amendment, activists differed in their understanding of the how and what of political change. Laura Nelson reconstructs the transformative vision of one set of suffragists who foreshadowed the consciousness raising of second-wave feminism. Tracey Jean Boisseau and Tracy A. Thomas follow the extended conflict between proponents of an equal rights amendment and defenders of regulatory protections based on women's difference. These divergences on politics and policy have been further multiplied by differences of race and class, the interactions central to the core concept of intersectionality.

The gender gap itself is intersectional, as Heather Ondercin demonstrates, varying by cohort, region, educational level and race. In a compelling historical survey, Celeste Montoya traces the multiple ways in which both the regulation of voting and voting behavior are profoundly and simultaneously raced and gendered, highlighting the central role of women of color in constituting the contemporary gender gap in party affiliation and underscoring the divergent impact of contemporary efforts to restrict voting rights. These multidimensional patterns of participation, in turn, have powered the representation of women and others by women, including a small but growing number of women of color (see Monforti on Latina representatives and McCammon et al. on environmental activism.).

The activists who secured passage of the nineteenth amendment lamented the many decades required to include women in the claim that "all men are created equal." But the struggles continued. Initially, the organizational strategies developed in the mobilizations for and against woman suffrage enabled women to exert influence in legislatures (Goss) and social movements,

where women made a more distinctive mark on the Ku Klux Klan (Kathleen Blee) than on the progressive electoral insurgency of 1924 (Corder and Wolbrecht). Even in those movements most dedicated to transformative social change, women activists confronted durable inequalities of participation and recognition of their political contributions (Hearne and McCammon on civil rights lawyers; Gallo on nonviolence; Heather McKee Hurwitz and Verta Taylor on Occupy). Those continuing struggles, along with the slow shifts in women's political participation and partisan affiliations, point to the limitations of a model of political change that is delimited by the formal political realm of rights and rules. The passage of the Nineteenth Amendment undid one important element of categorical inequality, expanding opportunities to harness political action to challenge inequalities on other fronts. As these chapters make clear, that political victory was but prologue to ongoing projects of political engagement.

Donatella della Porta, Joseba Fernández, Hara Kouki, and Lorenzo Mosca. *Movement Parties Against Austerity*. Cambridge: Polity. 2017. \$69.95 (hardcover), \$24.95 (paper).

Jon Shefner
University of Tennessee

In this volume focused on European party resistance to austerity in the wake of the global financial crisis, Donatella della Porta and her co-authors add much to the discussion of anti-neoliberal politics. The authors' chronicle of party resistance owes much to the pioneering work of John Walton, who began writing in the 1980s on anti-IMF protests in the Global South. Since that time, anti-austerity protests and movements have proliferated, as neoliberalism itself has expanded its reach and hegemony. The authors' contribution is to bring together areas of study often left separate: the actions of parties and movements. Neoliberalism has created critical junctures for change by weakening pre-established parties while strengthening opportunities for new ones. The mechanism by which this occurs, of course, is to limit national economic policy to the singular logic behind austerity. Despite different roots of economic crisis, the answer must always be to marshal the state to protect investors' privilege by diminishing the state's welfare-provision capacity.

The authors document how the crisis brought on by unceasing allegiance to neoliberalism in Italy, Greece, and Spain added to the organizational weaknesses of many pre-existing

parties, and a decline in trust for institutional actors. The turn to new party organizing, following a period of strong protest, yielded little success in turning austerity around nation by nation. Distrust was rooted in histories of party corruption and in the acquiescence of traditional leftist parties to new impositions of austerity, but also in their failure to combat neoliberal initiatives before the crises.

In all three nations, traditions of social movement activity fed into anti-austerity party creation. Growth in popular support was important in all three cases, as activist parties appealed not only to the most disadvantaged, but also to middle-class citizens disaffected with the stands of traditional parties. At the beginning, activists held overlapping memberships in both parties and movements; popular support seemed to wane as parties institutionalized or failed to live up to their promises. Over time, the constituencies of the older leftist parties joined with those harmed by austerity to seek new alternatives. The authors also address the less well-documented case comparisons of Ireland and Portugal to understand why anti-austerity parties did not emerge elsewhere.

As important as this book is in its excellent chronicling of new political resistance to neoliberalism, it is an even more welcome addition in its comparison of the European context to electoral and party action in Latin America. In too much of the literature on European austerity following the 2008 crises, researchers ignore the 35-year history of austerity throughout the Global South, treating European cases as somehow emergent with no previous exemplars. There is a great deal to be learned from these comparisons, especially given the leftist shift in Latin America from the late 1990s into the 2000s.

As welcome as this inclusion is, the longer history of the transition in Latin America also points out an important issue unaddressed in this book. In examining the success of parties, the authors focus on whether parties took power, rather than whether they were successful in adopting the anti-austerity platforms on which they built their support. The short-lived transition tells us that the global coalition arrayed to maintain neoliberalism persisted regardless of Latin America's leftist transition, even though two-thirds of the population was governed by ostensibly antineoliberal parties. The authors briefly address the Greek case of the Syriza party, which went against the results of its own referendum that rejected bailout deals under conditions of more austerity. Yet why a party with such popular support turned its back on its own anti-austerity agenda was not answered. It is hard to cover all topics within one book, of course, but it would be

helpful to understand what is necessary for anti-austerity stances to be maintained in the presence of countervailing international pressures. The capacity of Ecuador, Bolivia, and—for a time—Venezuela to resist some of these pressures had a great deal to do with their continued ability to extract resources that fed their citizens' welfare needs. Focusing on the austerity outcome in places like Greece, where Syriza failed miserably to combat austerity despite significant popular support, would have added much to the book's already substantial contributions.

If we see more movements transition into anti-austerity parties, this will be a key question: What facilitates an anti-austerity party to follow such an agenda once in office? Can this be achieved in a global environment of pro-austerity power? This book suggests that holding to an anti-austerity agenda cannot be achieved without movements staying in the streets, even after the parties they generate have moved into the halls of power.

This excellent book raises another question: What are the lessons for the global battle against neoliberalism? It appears that the consistent fear of going further left is misplaced; supporters of fundamental challenges to neoliberalism seem to remain willing to maintain the challenge well after parties retreat. No real and complete alternative to neoliberalism has been successfully posed since the fall of the Soviet Bloc, but the growth of anti-austerity parties in Europe and Latin America suggests that energy and commitment exists to design such alternatives. The authors address this issue in a limited fashion, using the social movement concept of frames, and how various messages helped generate support and commitment. They demonstrate the clear importance of framing in party emergence. But the global opposition to neoliberalism begs the question of what kind of institutional infrastructure is needed to turn frames into a shared ideology that points out the massive failures that accompany the now 45-year history of neoliberalism and austerity. If this infrastructure can be built, the question then turns to what is also lacking among both movements and parties: a strategy to derail the class and institutionally based global powers that consistently deny that there are alternatives while working forcefully to preclude them.

Sonia E. Alvarez, Jeffrey W. Rubin, Millie Thayer, Gianpaolo Baiocchi, and Agustín Laó-Montes, eds. *Beyond Civil Society: Activism, Participation, and Protest in Latin America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2017. \$104.95 (hardcover), \$28.95 (paper).

Dolores Trevizo,
Occidental College

The authors of this important edited collection interrogate what they call the “civil society agenda” (p. 1), that is, the acceptable modes of political engagement in participatory institutions (usually) created by leftist governments since 2000 to consult with movements. While their assessments vary, most contend that these institutions discipline movements and, thus, hinder their effectiveness. Specifically, they argue that movements both represent and misrepresent their constituencies by working in participatory institutions. The book thus offers a sober analysis of the effectiveness and degree of political autonomy of movements working with Pink Tide governments or international organizations. It describes a variety of movements, from ones focused on health services, environmental protection, women, Afro-Colombian and indigenous people, to those demanding the right to provincial independence. As the anthology’s strength lies in its carefully researched cases, I offer brief summaries before concluding with my critique of the book’s call to rethink the concept of “civil society.”

Part I focuses on Brazil while Part II maps movements in South America. In the first empirical chapter, Baiocchi shows that participatory practices have a century-long history beyond budgeting, and that their accumulated experiences made them more effective, expanding the PT’s support. Andrea Cornwall’s chapter on Brazilian health councils, in contrast, points to clientelism as a potential trap. Benjamin Junge’s ethnography on uncivil women in Porto Alegre rounds out this section, arguing that because participatory institutions elicit gendered conflict, we must be attentive to all motivations for political action within them.

In Part II, Laó-Montes’s examines clashing histories of Black movements in Latin America. He identifies additional gray spaces beyond the participatory institutions of Pink Tide governments—for example, UN Conferences or Summits sponsored by USAID and the World Bank—and argues that these turned some grassroots movements into NGOs. In this process, groups splintered into “chosen” or radical Blacks (p. 129), to

the detriment of the community that often suffers most from Latin America’s inequalities. Likewise, Thayer analyzes the changing architecture of international aid regimes that restructure modes of action, essentially turning movements into NGOs. She describes a cultural economy of development by analyzing discursive commodities—those claims of working-class authenticity, social improvement, and social justice—that are exchanged for international aid. Thayer also examines how left-wing states in Latin America became the new paymasters when international aid decreased. Graciela Di Marco’s chapter shows how working-class women in Argentina confronted Catholicism by demanding *both* labor and sexual rights—including the right to abortion. Their movements transformed both men and women, creating a “feminist people” in the process. Also focused on Argentina, Graciela Monteagudo interrogates a four-year international blockade to protest a Finnish pulp mill along the shores of the Uruguay River. The movement proved successful because of its nonhierarchical power structure, its multi-class representation, and the early, if quiet, leadership of women.

Part III, “The Nexus of Civic and Uncivic Politics,” begins with Raphael Hoetmer’s analysis of local referendums on mining in Peru, which indigenous people used to protect the environment against the central government’s development plans. This chapter has broad implications given that Hoetmer identifies tensions of sovereignty at distinct geopolitical scales, from the community, to the national and transnational levels. The next chapter, by Kiran Asher, looks at the history of Black social movements in Colombia. If in the 1990s they demanded “identity, territory, and autonomy,” within a decade they were more defensive, given that drug traffickers and the guerrilla conflict displaced roughly two million Afro-Colombians. Next, Jeffrey Rubin suggests that if Brazilian women’s movements had embraced their differences, they would have had a better shot of creating “movement-in-democracy.” For her part, Amalía Pallares illustrates the success of the big-tent approach when examining a movement’s struggle for provincial independence in Ecuador.

Part IV, on movements and refoundational regimes, opens with Margarita López Maya and Luis Lander’s analysis of Venezuela. These authors trace three distinct stages of protests from the mid-1980s to 2012 to show how they shaped the current political system. Baiocchi and Ana Claudia Teixeira then examine the massive protests of 2013 in which millions of Brazilians took the streets, if for different reasons, and in the process exposed the limits of participatory democracy. Next, José Antonio Lucero focuses on the

monuments honoring the nonindigenous *ciudadanos* as well as the indigenous *campesinos* who died in political clashes in Bolivia. He argues that violence generates cultural struggles that, in turn, reinforce colonial ideas that categorize people as civilized or barbaric. In the last chapter, Alvarez stresses the need to move beyond the civil-society agenda by embracing both conflict and contention “within and without the participatory institutions” (p. 329).

Most authors in this interdisciplinary volume contend that both activists and scholars overestimated the power of actors in civil society to transform Latin America. The editors suggest that the messy politics of participatory institutions both limit the transformative potential of movements and transgress our scholarly concepts. Participatory institutions blur the boundary between state and civil society, sometimes turning movements into tools for good governance, thus suggesting, as the book’s title implies, that we go “Beyond Civil Society.”

I would argue, however, that existing scholarship idealizes neither movements nor their capacity to transform society. Nor does it assume that contentious movements cannot employ multiple tactics, including highly disruptive, confrontational, and even illegal ones. While the participatory institutions analyzed in this volume undoubtedly discipline movements, they do not eliminate people’s ability to take the streets—as we saw in Brazil in 2013, with the Workers’ Party in power. Further, as Leonardo Avritzer points out in the second chapter, analysts conceptualized civil society in terms of the degree of political autonomy that movements and organizations had relative to authoritarian states (pre-transition). This focus differs from questions about movement tactics, including their willingness to “overflow” existing institutions or patterns of contention. In short, the civil society concept remains useful if it distinguishes nonstate actors from those with the economic resources, political agendas, and might of state institutions, and does not preclude inequality or conflict in society itself.

Christopher Samuel. *Conform, Fail, Repeat: How Power Distorts Collective Action*. Toronto: Between the Lines. 2017. C\$27.95 (paper).

Joseph Ibrahim
Leeds Beckett University, UK

This book is engagingly complex and a pleasure to read, and not only for social movement scholars who seek to apply Pierre Bourdieu’s con-

cepts to pressing questions about social movements. Many prominent social theorists and social movement scholars interrogate how power operates in both overt and ostensible ways. Thus, Samuel draws on the work of Bourdieu but also Adorno, Butler, Foucault, Melucci, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly, to demonstrate the problems and differences between theory and the very real practice of social movements. Some of these problems include the noble aim of seeking justice, the sometimes necessary compromises social movements make, the way in which movement practice can fall short and even end up creating further domination and remarginalization, not to mention political defeats despite activists’ well-intentioned actions, and conflicts between activists who could be potential allies in the fight for social justice.

Chapter 2 provides a substantial treatment of social movement studies by drawing on Melucci’s definition of what a social movement is and how the discipline of social movement studies has evolved since the 1960s. The chapter moves from collective behavior, to rational-choice-informed resource mobilization theory, framing, and finally the political process approach. The deficiencies of the theories, including attempts by key scholars to overcome them, are outlined and linked to a long-standing debate in the social sciences and in social movement studies about objectivism and subjectivism: the structure/agency debate. That is, “how exactly culture interacts with rational assessments about changes in political opportunities, which indicates incomplete understandings of how social structures relate to individual agents” (p. 23).

As a way through this, Samuel draws on the work of Bourdieu, particularly his key concepts of habitus, field, and capital to offer answers to questions that social movements perplex us with: Why do social movements take the forms that they do? Why do they choose certain tactics and strategies over others? Why do social movements fail? Why do they have to compromise and conform to the wishes of more powerful forces? It comes back to the notion of power and how social spaces, which Bourdieu termed fields, have implicit and explicit rules governed by convention, agreed upon by the most powerful agents within the field—those who often possess the most resources (cultural and symbolic capital). Samuel argues, “the rules of the field are doubly inscribed in the social world: subjectively in the structured dispositions of the habitus-bearing agents and objectively in the social space itself” (p. 43). Within fields, agents recognize what is valuable—objectively, through the rules of any particular field, and subjectively, through their habitus. As such, they seek to capture the resources that are available.

In chapter 4 through a critique of the “It Gets Better” campaign, *Conform, Fail, Repeat* brings these concepts to bear on empirical reality. In particular, Samuel examines how LGBT activists mobilize cultural and symbolic capital to demonstrate how a desirable lifestyle is achievable for LGBT citizens. However, Samuel argues this type of campaign leads to a homonormative representation, which in turn leads to further marginalization of those LGBTQ activists who do not wish to conform to this collective identity.

The next case (ch. 5) on repertoires of contention during the anti-G20 protests in Toronto, Samuel demonstrates the importance of understanding the rules of the “protest field” and which tactics are deemed legitimate based on the symbolic power of those who set the rules in the wider political field. Here, distinctions are drawn between anarchists using Black Block tactics (radical) and the labor movement (reformist) using marches, demonstrations, petitions, and speeches in line with the rules of the liberal political field. Samuel’s analysis is that the anarchists possess the wrong (radical) habitus, with the wrong cultural capital (protest tactics) and, as such, have no legitimacy or recognition (symbolic value). As a result, symbolic violence is enacted against them during these protests. In empirical terms, this means they are unlikely to gain political success and are destined to fail.

The beauty of Bourdieu’s work, however, is that it is not deterministic. Although the above cases might make it seem so, this is far from the case. The habitus—the hinge between objectivism and subjectivism—is reflexive and generative. This is to say, the habitus can adapt and create new paths of direction, new understandings based on experiences, and, therefore, may change the structures of certain fields, especially through collective action. Samuel is aware of this, but rightly argues it requires attention to “movement reflexivity beyond practical debates toward awareness of how structures of domination infiltrate movement strategies and tactics” (p. 174), otherwise it could be suggested that domination could be reproduced in the “protest field.” He fleshes this out empirically with a section on Black Lives Matter Toronto and its conflict with Pride in the final chapter. Here he draws on a notion of symbolic democracy as a way to overcome the problem of reproducing power and domination. In this regard, there is a clear development of social movement theory drawing on the work of Chantal Mouffe and the notion of radical democracy.

Overall, the book offers a new analysis of power within the field of social movements by employing Bourdieu’s concepts to empirical foci. It will be very useful reading for undergraduate,

postgraduate, and academics wishing to learn more about how social theory can inform social movement research.

Benjamin Farrer. *Organizing for Policy Influence: Comparing Parties, Interest Groups, and Direct Action*. New York: Routledge. 2017. \$140.00 (hardcover).

Adam Howe
University of British Columbia

Organizing for Policy Influence brings together insights from political science and the sociology of social movements to shed new light on the study of political organizations and institutions. While the book focuses mainly on global environmental movement politics for methodological expediency, its insights surely translate to other cases.

Farrer’s theory of organizational choice proposes that, in the context of democratically representative political institutions, minority or niche interests are necessarily underrepresented. To be included in the political agenda, these groups must organize strategically since institutions can magnify the effects of groups organized in ideal ways and dampen the effects of groups that are not. Here, institutions are understood as “any set of [formal or informal] rules that structures human interactions” (p. 79). Farrer focuses on three key institutions that vary across countries: electoral rules (ranging from majoritarian to proportional), degree of political centralization (ranging from centralized national governments to decentralized subunits, e.g., regions, municipalities, and so on), and degree of corporatism (versus pluralism). Farrer leans heavily on the social movement literature (for example, literature on individual vs. collective incentives and political opportunity structures) to sketch this institutional landscape.

Farrer argues underrepresented groups form one of three organizational types: political parties, interest groups, and direct-action groups. Political parties are oligarchic hierarchical organizations that intervene early in the political “chain.” Since parties are focused on competing to win elections, they maintain very broad sets of interests. In contrast, interest groups have a relatively circumscribed set of interests and tend to be more “flat” and democratic, intervening later in the chain to influence politicians. Finally, direct action groups bypass the political chain altogether and are not concerned with influencing political power.

Forming interest groups or political parties signals to mainstream politicians that under-

represented groups are endowed with some measure of resources (public support, finances, volunteers, etc.) valued by politicians for political success. This influence may encourage politicians to push for policy outcomes favorable to underrepresented groups. Farrer presents this as a transaction between underrepresented groups and mainstream political parties that involves response costs (the forfeiture of mainstream political capital due to accommodating niche interests) and access costs (the individual or group level resources expended to organize and engage in politics). The nature of political institutions determines these costs for each organizational choice. Direct action occurs when the costs of forming parties or interest groups are too high or when the potential of signalling transactions is not propitious.

Farrer empirically demonstrates his theory by replicating a range of existing research related to political institutions and environmental politics, all of which focuses on one of Farrer's three key institutional variables. Farrer marginally improves upon these existing studies by incorporating aspects of his own theory, thus demonstrating its utility. In Chapter 5, he replicates previous studies focused on national party systems and new party entry across thirteen European countries, demonstrating that "for new party entry to occur, even if resources are present and electoral institutions are propitious, corporatism must also be present" (p. 162). Farrer zooms in with Chapter 6, replicating studies on public opinion toward environmental interest groups. He finds support for his argument that the institutions regulating interest groups also regulate parties and interact with one another in the process. In Chapter 7, Farrer replicates studies of policy success operationalized as government spending for environmental protections and finds some support for his assertion that "more policy influence is achieved when organizations and institutions interact optimally" (p. 197). Next, Farrer addresses the ecological fallacy (inferring individual motives and beliefs through inferences about aggregate data) by using a randomized survey experiment to study how activists' beliefs about optimal organizational choices are related to instrumental utility (the expected utility of the outcome of political behavior). Farrer finds that "instrumental utility is an important component of how individuals choose between different activist organizations" (p. 217).

The study, however, is not without criticism. Farrer operationalizes organizational "resources" either as the level of public support organizations attract via public opinion polls (which excludes financial or other physical resources from analysis), or the public's willingness to pay for

environmental protections (which measures the public's monetary valuation of the environment, rather than their political support for organizations). Farrer acknowledges this criticism, rationalizing his choice by underscoring the many thousands of organizations encompassed by his theory, and the difficulties in determining their financial or other physical resources.

Moreover, in eschewing one very important dimension of policymaking—social networks—the informal signaling process central to Farrer's theory is not made clear. Policy networks (sets of actors who interact with one another around policy issues) are the terrain for informal political negotiation, wherein people in similar structural locations (how central they are, and the pattern of their network ties to others) tend to share similar views and policy orientations. More importantly, one's structural location is related to one's ability to influence (or send signals to) others in the network. This presents a promising avenue for follow-up research. For example, scholars might build on Farrer's theoretical framework by surveying activists and politicians to study how their network location and policy orientations, and how influential they judge other network actors to be determines how they "use national institutions to predict the access costs and responses costs for different organizations" (p. 225).

These critical reflections aside, *Organizing for Policy Influence* represents an expansive, insightful, and engaging text that is both theoretically sophisticated and methodologically rigorous. Farrer's theory usefully problematizes orthodox determinism in social and political analyses and should be read by any scholar in these areas. Ultimately, this book challenges scholars of social movements and politics to reconsider how they conceptualize and study political institutions and social activism.

John Leveille. *Searching for Marx in the Occupy Movement*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. 2018. \$110.00 (hardcover).

Emily Brissette
Bridgewater State University

Occupy was crazy: it was an expressive movement "produced by the frustrations of life in postindustrial capitalism" (p. xxiv), namely the contradictory pressures on the self to be authentic while "increasingly subjected and controlled by external forces" (p. 31). This is the central thesis of Leveille's Frankfurt-School-inspired analysis of the Occupy movement, based on participant ob-

servation in Occupy Philly. Leveille argues that if we want to understand Occupy, we need a new epistemological approach. As he notes, much of the scholarship on social movements follows a natural science model, “premised on the conceptual lifting out of time and space the essential properties of reality” for which it then “seeks to establish empirically verifiable causes” (p. 6). This approach fails to appropriately historicize movements or to consider how macrosocial forces especially capitalism, that have shaped the emergence and nature of social movements. Moreover, Leveille argues that many social movement scholars fall into the trap of what Adorno calls “identity thinking,” which assumes that “there is a pure correspondence” between concepts and what they represent (p. 23). This, Leveille suggests, leads scholars to mistake their own analytical tropes for reality. He points to the natural history model, in which movements follow a sequenced life course from birth to death. Uncritically using this trope, he suggests, would lead researchers to define Occupy as “stillborn” (p. 266) and to misunderstand the movement. Leveille champions instead a dialectical approach to social movement studies, derived from Marx and particularly from Adorno. In his “rebooted Marxism,” Leveille recognizes that the “central dialectic of the contemporary age is that between humanism and capital” rather than capital and labor (p. 25). Based on these professed commitments, I expected the book to offer a careful historical-materialist account of Occupy’s emergence and a dialogic engagement with its animating visions and concerns.

Instead, Leveille maps the historical context of Occupy by highlighting macrostructural forces like marketization, rationalization, and post-industrial capitalism more generally. History here is writ large: big processes unfolding over significant stretches of time, with a focus on the tensions they produce. While the second half of Marx’s famous dialectic that “men make their own history, but not under conditions of their choosing” is apparent here, the first is much less so. Leveille never really considers how movements make history: how previous movements helped create conditions of possibility or forged tools that Occupy would deploy and, in the process, refashion. To be sure, he identifies the global justice movement and Arab Spring as “sources of inspiration” for Occupy (p. 100), but he does not trace the lived connections between them, nor recognize either as a source of experiential or oppositional knowledge. This is perhaps because Leveille’s own suggested trope for understanding Occupy—a volcanic eruption—obscures that social history. The volcano metaphor invokes the build-up of subterranean pressure, which when it

becomes too great, explodes in a spectacular outpouring of energy and mass. This metaphor renders movements the inevitable result of structural pressures, crazy in their unpredictability, but ultimately destined to dissipate. Most critically, it erases the work that organizers do to build relationships, develop skills, theorize, and more—whether during moments of intense movement activity or in lull periods, as Piven discusses in her 2012 essay, “Is Occupy Over?”

This erasure haunts Leveille’s discussion of Occupy’s organizational structure and politics. He suggests that the movement’s horizontalism and participatory democracy “could be seen as products of the internet era” (p. 76)—resulting from tectonic changes, rather than complexly rooted in movement histories and praxis. Leveille does not engage any of the literature on prefigurative politics, horizontalism, or the meaning and practice of democracy within movements. Here I’m thinking of the work of Polletta, Breines, Maeckelbergh Epstein, and Sitrin, among others (remarkably, only 6% of the book’s citations include women). Nor does he seriously consider Occupiers’ own extensive reflections on these issues, preserved in essays, anthologies, movement-published newspapers, blog posts, and more. Instead, Leveille apparently sees little reflexivity or intentionality among Occupiers. He critiques anthropologist and organizer David Graeber for assuming “that the protesters self-consciously share his sophisticated theoretical understandings and . . . act in a calculated manner driven by these understandings” (p. 88). In Leveille’s view, “much of the protesters’ actions should be seen not as intellectually formed and planned activity, but as . . . something more expressive. It is a classic mistake in social science for the analyst to impose his or her views . . . and to assume the observed are self-consciously enacting the analyst’s theory” (p. 88-9). While the caution here is important, Leveille does not convincingly demonstrate that Occupiers lacked nuanced understandings on questions of process, tactics, demands, or anything else. Nor does he consider how Occupiers’ understandings developed during the movement, in relation to material conditions and concrete problems.

Missing here, and from the field more generally, is a genuine and rigorous engagement with how movements themselves—their organic intellectuals and the scholar-activists deeply immersed within them—theorize their conditions of possibility and terrains of struggle, developing a praxis to realize their visions. I find an essential insight in Gramsci’s claim in his book *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* that “because strong passions are necessary to sharpen the intellect and help make intuition more penetrating . . . [o]nly the man

who wills something strongly can identify the elements which are necessary to the realization of his will” (p. 171). This is not to deny a place for the more disinterested observer of social movement processes, or to suggest that we cannot learn from those outside the exhilaration and exhaustion of a given movement. However, too many discount organic knowledge production within movements in favor of academic expertise, failing to dialogically engage with the often hard-earned insights of those most deeply committed. In reproducing this bias, Leveille’s book falls short of realizing the new epistemological approach we need.

Oliver Kaplan. *Resisting War: How Communities Protect Themselves*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2017. \$120.00 (hardcover), \$32.99 (paper).

Patrick G. Coy
Kent State University

If one wanted to investigate whether and how civil society and social movements can non-violently protect themselves and preserve community autonomy in the face of intractable violent conflicts between state, parastate and rebel groups, the case of Colombia may be a litmus test. Some researchers might shy away from Colombia for that or other reasons. Yet Oliver Kaplan did not, and for that choice, we can be grateful.

Kaplan’s multimethod study includes quantitative analysis of wide-ranging historical data he painstakingly compiled, complimented by extensive qualitative data generated through eleven months of fieldwork in Colombia distributed over four years in two-year cycles: 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013. As part of that fieldwork, Kaplan engaged in social observation and interviewed over 200 individuals both formally and informally. Many interviewees came from the five rural case villages that were at the core of this ambitious project. The rich and thick qualitative data takes the impressive statistical analysis to new levels, using scenarios, narratives, and the words of rural villagers to put human flesh on the bone of social science theory.

Kaplan’s interviewees tell the moving story of the life-and-death dilemma facing village council leaders along the Carare River. After having already suffered years of atrocities, they received an ultimatum from multiple armed groups with three choices: join us in the violent conflict, displace, or be killed. Community leaders met in secret to determine a way forward for their vil-

lages. After discussing the three presented options, as well as a fourth of taking up arms against the armed groups, they created a fifth approach: they would meet with all the groups, declare themselves wholly neutral, and stay in their home villages. They created an umbrella civil organization to carry out this fifth approach across the riverine villages. After months of discussions, their antagonists accepted the plan and the Peasant Workers Association of the Carare River (*Asociación de Trabajadores Campesinos del Carare, ATCC*) was born.

Notably, Kaplan’s statistical analysis shows that local civil society organizations like ATCC reduce violence, even while operating in contexts of continued threats, denunciations, and inter-group rivalries between armed parties. In the ATCC case, while 10% of the region’s population was killed in the twelve years prior to its founding, during the subsequent ten years there were no civilian deaths. In addition, Kaplan’s rich and extensive qualitative data—including 45 interviews of ATCC residents; ATCC archives with minutes of meetings between the ATCC, guerrilla, paramilitary and army; and ATCC governing council discussions—helps uncover and specify more precisely how the ATCC was able build community autonomy and individual agency and reduce civilian deaths in the process. Kaplan’s marshalling of far-reaching data and his sophisticated analysis of the ATCC case is far too exhaustive to capture here in detail.

Nonetheless, his argument centers on the ability of the ATCC and similar civil society organizations to meet three interlocking conditions. First, the civil society organization must develop potent investigatory capacities so that it provides trustworthy information and balanced signals to armed groups, particularly regarding potential neutrality violations by community members accused of collaborating. Second, the development of norms that privilege nonviolent action and community-based cultures of peace are important, though far from sufficient. Finally, civil society organizations must foster conditions and broker deals that create incentives for armed actors to cooperate with them. Kaplan’s analysis is complex and multifaceted, but one example may help demonstrate the nature of the condition. While denouncing violence by naming and shaming the responsible armed actor is a classic tactic in the human-rights promotion arena, the ATCC and other organizations gave up naming those responsible, even while denouncing the violence itself.

Kaplan does not just argue that civil society organizations focused on preserving community autonomy in armed conflict situations reduce violence and civilian deaths; he demonstrates that

these effects are highly qualified—not just on the community organization meeting the three conditions specified above—but by such factors as conflict intensity, types of armed groups and varieties of violence, degrees and types of community organization, and differences in time periods. Interviews with armed actors about the impacts of civil society organization on their strategic choices helped Kaplan both develop and strengthen these nuanced points.

Some readers may wish that Kaplan would bring the study into more direct, frequent and sustained dialogue with various literatures, including scholarship on zones of peace and on unarmed civilian peacekeeping and accompaniment, to cite a few examples. However, Kaplan's

research speaks in important ways to the literature on bottom-up, community-based, and locally controlled peacebuilding, which effectively pushes theory forward in this critical arena. His research shows that communities are far from powerless, even in the most enduring and intractable violent conflicts. Indeed, they collectively organize, they negotiate, they broker, and they create cross-cutting deals with multiple armed actors—all to perpetuate village autonomy and create community security, sometimes in novel ways. We now know not only how they do it, but much more about the meaning of autonomy and agency, and what they look like for civilian communities caught up in the multipronged civil wars that continue to bedevil our world.
