

Zakiya Luna. *Reproductive Rights as Human Rights: Women of Color and the Fight for Reproductive Justice*. New York: New York University Press. 2020. \$99.00 (hardcover), \$35.00 (paper).

Benita Roth
State University of New York, Binghamton

Zakiya Luna's *Reproductive Rights as Human Rights* is a timely contribution to the literature on activism of women of color working at the nexus of late twentieth century movements in the United States: the reproductive justice movement, women of color feminisms, women's health organizing, African American civil rights activism, and the international movement for universal human rights. Using historical and archival data, participant observation, and interviews, Luna tells the story of a key organization, SisterSong, where activists decided to frame their fight for reproductive justice as a fight for the human rights of women of color. Luna argues that SisterSong's decision to do so, even though a U.S. audience was largely unfamiliar with the human rights concept, was a result of the organization's deep commitment to a "larger vision of liberation." (p. 212).

SisterSong, founded in 1997, is a coalition of women of color groups focused on reproductive justice; it says that its "mission is to strengthen and amplify the collective voices of women of color and indigenous women to achieve reproductive justice by eradicating reproductive oppression and securing human rights" (209). Reproductive justice, Luna writes, has this basic definition: "the right to not have children, the right to have children, and the right to parent" (p. 1). As a movement, it counters what Luna calls the White, "mainstream" liberal feminist movement's emphasis on reproductive rights (p. 54). From the standpoint of women of color, the mainstream movement's emphasis on the right to abortion was and is reductive and insufficient to ensure the well-being of women of color. Instead, reproductive justice activists argued for an acknowledgment that women of color in the U.S. were and are subjected to attacks on their ability not just to access abortion, but to have children through eugenics-based forced sterilizations, the curtailment of welfare and thus the means to parent, as well as higher rates of maternal mortality.

SisterSong activists' decision to use a human rights frame to think about reproductive justice is what Luna calls a "revolutionary domestication" of human rights discourse (p. 4) because it countered American exceptionalism by insisting that international human rights standards are relevant

in the domestic political context, insofar as human rights emphasized the right to substantive well-being in all matters of living, including reproductive health. Luna contrasts reproductive justice advocates' "revolutionary domestication" of human rights with the U.S. government's "restrictive domestication" (p. 4) of human rights discourse. Luna argues that when the U.S. government conflates human rights with civil rights, it avoids the more radical notion that human rights guarantees substantive well-being. As Luna notes, SisterSong participants saw reproductive justice as consonant with universal understandings of human rights. This consonance was an active political process whereby activists familiarized themselves with visions of human rights abroad, and brought these framings back home to bolster and describe their own activism. Much of Luna's book is focused on how SisterSong's central players came to understand the reproductive justice struggle as one where human rights were the central issue, and how they became committed to spreading the idea of reproductive justice as human rights to others in the reproductive justice community.

Reproductive Rights as Human Rights is a necessary contribution to the scholarship on the reproductive justice movement and the reader will come to understand the movement through Luna's work. My critiques of the book are minor. First, I wish Luna had addressed social movement coalitions more systematically. SisterSong is a coalition, and a rather broad one at that—a form not easy to sustain. Luna does note that coalitions are difficult to maintain, and that activists weighed the costs to their own organizations of entering and maintaining coalitions. I'll just note that from the early 1980s on, Black feminist activists like Bernice Johnson Reagon have spoken and theorized about what coalition formation should look like, and that in social movement studies, coalitions have been the subject of much scholarly concern; certainly, the topic has not been exhausted. Second, regarding Luna's presentation of her material, it would have been helpful to include a chart showing the relationships among the various organizations in the study. It would also have been useful to feature a timeline for organizational founding dates and other significant events covered in the book. Lastly, in the early chapters of *Reproductive Rights as Human Rights*, which cover the history of the United Nation's pivotal role in conceptualizing human rights, Luna's narrative rushes on at breakneck speed. I seldom wish for books to be longer, but I feel the reader needed a little more space to appreciate the historical changes that the international push for human rights wrought.

Still, my critiques are small given the contributions Luna makes to movement studies in this

book. I urge those interested in matters of reproductive justice in the U.S. to read it, but I also urge those interested in how, when, and if transnational streams of discourse are observed and used by U.S.-based activists to read the book. Too many times, studies of women's activism are corralled into a space where they are considered examples of explorations into identity politics, rather than cases to be understood as significant to the general study of movements. Luna's work in *Reproductive Rights as Human Rights* should be read by those interested in how movement organizations survive, thrive, and make themselves relevant to broader audiences and new generations.

Christopher Chase-Dunn and Paul Almeida.
Global Struggles and Social Change: From Prehistory to World Revolution in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2020. \$29.95 (paper).

John Markoff
University of Pittsburgh

If you're looking for help in situating the huge movements for social transformation so evident in diverse countries in 2020 within a large geographic and temporal context, *Global Struggles and Social Change* will be very welcome.

Scholars of social movements sometimes take a long view. In 2015, Spanish historian Juan Sisinio Pérez Garzón published a fine overview of his country's movements "from prehistory to the present day." Christopher Chase-Dunn and Paul Almeida stake out their own long view but extend the geographic breadth by addressing struggles that transcend the boundaries of nation states, and in a briefer book to boot, drawing on both authors' previous extensive research. Certain geographically distant and uncoordinated struggles are importantly, but indirectly, connected because they are triggered by some common large transnational process. Empires used to readily produce such indirect movement connections, as challenges in one zone subject to imperial rule opened opportunities or generated threats in other places. (We might add that the clash of rival empires could generate such indirect connections among movements across imperial boundaries as well.) Especially in recent decades, however, activists may deliberately forge crossborder alliances to work for a common purpose.

One of this book's themes is the long-term continuities in collective action, so it opens with a chapter addressing "prehistory" and hopes to challenge familiar notions that social movements are of far more recent vintage. But the lion's share of

the analyses in *Global Struggles and Social Change* deals with the small bit of human history following the dissolution of the Europe-centered empires. From experience of augmented state economic controls during the two catastrophic world wars and the Great Depression, state management of economies became widely accepted—even celebrated. First the post-World War I USSR, then the post-World War II Soviet Bloc, had their state-controlled industrializations. Then, the wealthy capitalist countries tried to undercut the threat of revolution by developing social safety nets and dampening the downside of business cycles; this occurred while what was known as the Third World developed state-managed industrialization projects around import-substitution, tariff barriers, and some protections for organized workers. The neoliberal mission was to dismantle all of this.

But the era of state-fostered economic management and economic development also had built institutions that provided a base for challenging newer, neoliberal practices. The social safety nets of the previous era created expectations for rights of social citizenship that would not be easily surrendered. And the succeeding neoliberal globalization itself provided key tools for coordinated border-crossing contestation, triggered by the injuries that accompanied the new economic models. New communications technologies not only facilitated long global supply chains and just-in-time inventories that fit neoliberal dreams of untrammelled movement of capital, but also gave activists new tools for connecting, allying, and coordinating on a truly global scale to fight against these latest developments in the long history of global capitalism. Dominant socioeconomic models (in Wallersteinian terminology, Centrist Liberalism) are currently countered by ideologically diverse diagnoses and proposed remedies. Since activists are increasingly inclined to organize across national borders, we may now speak of a global left and a global right, although the degree of coordination and common vision within either camp are very much in question—a theme to which this book gives much attention, particularly on the left.

One of the most salient themes of this book is that social movements act under circumstances whose global character needs to be understood, whether those movements operate transnationally, nationally, or even locally, and activists are increasingly likely to think about these contexts. Chase-Dunn and Almeida develop many splendid analyses spun around this framework. I will point to three. First, to show the ways in which the institutional legacy of the developmentalist era facilitated challenges to the neoliberal practices that followed, they offer a valuable, multistranded analysis of protest in the Global South (with an especially close look at Costa Rica). This analysis

reveals that (a) participants were heavily drawn from several sectors hard hit by austerity measures: teachers, people in public administration, and students—all more numerous because of public sector expansion; (b) expanded access to schools and public health services created a sense of a common social citizenship, something to be defended against neoliberal technocrats' efforts to make everything leaner; (c) state-built roads made it easier for mass demonstrators in towns to block these roads, which became a common disruptive tactic; and (d) protest triggers included reduced subsidies for food or fuel, free trade policies, and growing corporate control of essential resources, especially when these threatened established lifestyles of indigenous peoples.

Second, we get a valuable brief history of the emergence of Global Days of Action, in which some institution or event that is emblematic of global neoliberalism (e.g., a global finance meeting) becomes a focal protest site accompanied by coordinated parallel protests in sometimes large numbers of cities around the world, mobilizing multitudes. There is evidence that this tactic for transnational organizing grew with experience, as activists drew lessons from Seattle's 1999 WTO protests and subsequent mobilizations and were able to apply them to new issues.

Third, a survey of participants in several iterations of the US Social Forum reveals the large number of themes dear to participants and the network of connectedness among these themes. This provides some empirical grounding for speculation about fruitful possibilities for future transnational cooperation on the left, likely to develop when pushed toward concerted action by global problems, particularly the deepening climate catastrophe or the growing global strength of the right.

If anyone still needs convincing that understanding what is happening on a very broad geographic scale helps us comprehend what is going on in particular locales, this timely, stimulating book, with its profusion of insights, offers important arguments, and evidence.

Reed M. Wood. *Female Fighters: Why Rebel Groups Recruit Women for War*. New York: Columbia University Press. 2019. \$105.00 (hardcover), \$35.00 (paper).

Güneş Murat Tezcür
University of Central Florida

Women's participation in armed movements has been attracting considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Research on the topic challenges conventional images of women as passive victims of political violence and advances theo-

retical explanations of their mobilization as combatants in civil wars. Reed M. Wood's *Female Fighters: Why Rebel Groups Recruit Women for War* is a significant contribution to this growing literature and aims to specify the conditions under which armed movements decide to actively recruit women as combatants. Wood develops a set of hypotheses to explain why some movements are more likely to recruit female combatants than others, as well as the implications of women's recruitment on both external and domestic support for these movements. He then pursues an eclectic empirical strategy that combines three illustrative case studies (the PKK in Turkey, the ZANLA/ZIPRA in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe and the LTTE in Sri Lanka), and with a large-N statistical analysis of more than 250 rebel groups and an experimental survey with U.S. respondents.

The core theoretical insight of the book is based on a puzzling observation: why do some rebel leaders openly defy prevailing patriarchal norms by recruiting women into their ranks and risk societal backlash? Wood addresses this question—called the “female recruitment dilemma,” (p. 41)—by focusing on two factors. The primary one concerns the severity of armed conflict. When rebel leaders face dwindling human resources in the face of intense conflict, they are more likely to recruit women to sustain their struggle against typically superior state forces. Under such circumstances, they are willing to face the potential costs associated with women's recruitment. The second factor is the rebel group ideology, which plays a mediating role in the impact of the severity of conflict on the recruitment of women. For example, leftist groups are more likely to recruit women. On the other hand, fundamentalist religious groups rarely mobilize women as fighters, even during exceptionally serious battles. Accordingly, it would be methodologically appropriate to include a case study where conflict intensity has not necessarily resulted in significant increases in women's recruitment (e.g., the IS in Iraq and Syria).

Wood also studies the implications of women fighters for the success of rebel groups. His tentative findings suggest that mixed-gender insurgencies are more likely to elicit international sympathy (i.e., images of women fighters being important propaganda material) and manage to attract a greater number of fighters (i.e., the presence of women fighters shaming men of the community into action). At the same time, such benefits do not necessarily influence the decision of rebel leaders to recruit women but emerge subsequently.

Several aspects of *Female Fighters* deserve critical reflections. First, a fundamental issue in Wood's theoretical framework involves the causal sequence between the severity of armed conflict

and women's participation in the rebel ranks in large numbers. Wood argues that participation follows intensity and presents some evidence from his case studies to that effect. However, neither these case studies, which are largely based on secondary sources, nor the large-N study, which lacks a temporal dimension, have enough empirical details to flesh out the precise causal sequences. Another plausible argument is that insurgencies that recruit women become more formidable and pose a serious military challenge to state forces. As such, armed conflict becomes more severe only after women join the insurgent ranks. In fact, in the case of the PKK, my recent article in *Perspectives on Politics* has shown that women's mobilization in large numbers preceded the intensification of conflict in the mid-1990s by several years. The success of the PKK in mobilizing young women and men in Kurdish cities and villages was a key factor contributing to its ability to wage a protracted war against the Turkish state, which responded with heavy-handed counter-insurgency operations. A more meticulous form of process tracing that utilizes primary sources would make it possible to specify such temporal dynamics in other cases.

A related issue concerns a woman's decision to take arms. Wood's theoretical framework deliberately prioritizes the agency of rebel leaders at the expense of women fighters and suggests that "existing theories of mobilization apply to female fighters as well" (p. 12). This parsimonious approach enables Wood to develop a general explanation of rebel leader behavior but tends to ignore how women with different backgrounds may have distinctive reasons to pursue violent mobilization. While rural women with limited life prospects join armed insurgencies to escape oppressive societal relations, educated and urbanized women may do so because of their previous political activism. Consequently, statistical analyses that show a negative relationship between fertility rate—an indicator of gender inequality—and women's mobilization obscure the diversity of women's motives to fight. Future scholarship should aim to develop multilayered theoretical explanations that focus systematically on the agency of both rebel elites and fighters.

Wood's notion that the "female recruitment dilemma" complicates the relationship between a rebel group and its constituency is a valuable approach that explicitly recognizes the role of patriarchal values in hampering women's mobilization. It would be even more insightful to discuss the specific strategies pursued by rebel groups to overcome this dilemma. For instance, the PKK almost never actively recruited married women, especially in rural and provincial areas where conservative gender relations prevailed. Unlike

other rebel groups, such as the EPLF in Eritrea and the RUF in Sierra Leone, the PKK also banned all kinds of romantic relations among its fighters and projected an image of women fighters as asexual beings dedicated to the nationalist struggle. These important compromises limited the scope of societal backlash and facilitated the PKK's ability to recruit women in large numbers over an extended period of time.

These critical remarks aside, *Female Fighters* presents a well-structured theory of rebel leaders' decision to mobilize women fighters and offers a multimethod empirical strategy to identify why some groups have a higher number of women than others. It will remain an important reference for scholars studying civil wars, contentious politics, and the politics of gender for years to come.

Craig B. Upright. *Grocery Activism: The Radical History of Food Cooperatives in Minnesota*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 2020. \$100.00 (hardcover), \$25.00 (paper).

Michael A. Haedicke
University of Maine

Food has become a burgeoning area for research on activism and social movements, and the field of books about organic agriculture and food production is quite crowded. However, *Grocery Activism: The Radical History of Food Cooperatives in Minnesota* offers a novel contribution by focusing on food cooperatives, a set of alternative retail organizations that developed in relationship with the larger organic foods and farming movement. As Craig Upright explains, these co-ops placed social change goals at the heart of their organizational missions, and they have worked to hold onto those goals even as the market and regulatory environment related to organic food has changed around them. The book asserts that co-op leaders' commitment to cultivating "intentional consumerism," (p. 7) or an ethic of consumption that encourages shoppers to think broadly about the upstream and downstream impacts of their purchases, has been a central part of their continuing relevance.

The book's focus is on the community of co-op stores in Minnesota, the Midwestern state that was the epicenter of cooperative organizing during the 1970s. It was also where co-op founders built infrastructures of cooperation between stores and institutionalized dialogues with other progressive movement communities to an extent rarely seen at the time. So, while the experiences of Minnesota co-ops offer a window into the national trends

shaping cooperative organization, the state also provides Upright with a limiting case of sorts: Minnesota was a place where the activist character of co-ops developed further than it did in other parts of the country, thus revealing both the potential and the challenges of this approach to seeking social change.

Upright's analysis is primarily historical, drawing from archival materials created by co-ops and industry-level media sources to investigate the first decade of organic food co-op organizing (1971-1980). He supplements these materials with interviews with a handful of key figures in Minnesota's co-op scene, many of whom played pivotal roles in creating the state's first organic food co-ops. The book's first two chapters provide context for the analysis with a respectable, if not groundbreaking, historical survey of the organic foods movement and of early twentieth century co-op organization in the United States. The third chapter narrows the focus to Minnesota's organic food co-ops and describes the methodological challenges that Upright faced in assembling a reliable data set about a community of "minimalist organizations" (p. 94) that were often in existence only for a short period of time and left few records of their activities. Based on this data set, Upright divides these co-ops' first decade into two phases: an initial wave of organization founding centered in urban areas, and a later period of co-op diffusion to smaller communities around the state. The dynamics of this organizational history occupy the remainder of the book.

Perhaps the most intriguing analysis in the second part of *Grocery Activism* concerns the relationship between community progressiveness and the first phase of co-op founding. As Upright notes, there is a good deal of anecdotal evidence that suggests that co-ops tended to emerge in neighborhoods that were politically left-of-center, particularly those with anti-war and New Left activist groups. He puts this folk theory to the test, using precinct-level votes for 1972 presidential candidate George McGovern as a proxy for anti-war sentiment and progressive political leanings—and demonstrates that, in fact, a neighborhood's political attitudes were more closely associated with its likelihood of supporting a co-op than other economic or educational characteristics. Upright also asserts that this relationship did not hold true in the second phase of co-op founding, when the diffusion of co-ops to smaller communities was often guided by a community's prior history of co-op organization rather than local political cultures. This is a revealing finding but, unfortunately, the book provides few details that would allow a reader to assess the strength of the analysis or much discussion of why this relationship might exist.

In addition to his population-level findings, Upright also makes use of archival and interview data to explore the experiences of co-op pioneers during the 1970s. These sources yield a range of insights, including some about co-op founders' perceptions of the links between co-operatives as a form of organization and organic farming as an approach to food production. Upright also provides a vivid description of the "co-op wars" that briefly threw Minneapolis co-ops into turmoil by pitting a Marxist faction of co-operators against advocates of organic food (although, he correctly notes that this episode was presented in greater detail in an earlier book by Craig Cox). Finally, Upright's choice to include reproductions of photographs and archival materials throughout the book was an excellent one, since these materials provide a glimpse into the lived experiences of co-op founders and patrons in the movement's early years.

Overall, this book is a valuable resource for readers interested in the origins of today's co-op stores and in the connections of organic food advocacy with other progressive political movements in the late-twentieth century. No book can please all audiences, though, and readers looking for an analysis informed by contemporary theoretical developments in social movements research are likely to be disappointed. *Grocery Activism* is driven mainly by its author's interest in the subject and engages with social movement theory sparingly. Many of the references are to works in organizational studies that reach in the direction of movement analysis; core ideas in social movements theory are not really considered. While this may limit the book's readership amongst social movements scholars, the work of historical excavation that Upright has done is nonetheless valuable.

Sidney M. Milkis and Daniel J. Tichenor. *Rivalry and Reform: Presidents, Social Movements, and the Transformation of American Politics*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2019.
\$105.00 (hardcover), \$35.00 (paper).

Paul Burstain
University of Washington

Milkis and Tichenor begin *Rivalry and Reform* with a claim that seems perfectly reasonable: collisions and uneasy alliances between presidents and social movements have been central to some of the most important developments in American politics and government. Indeed, this seems obvious. But it's not. There is a vast amount of research on the presidency, and a similarly vast amount on social movements, yet, as Milkis and

Tichenor write, rarely do these two worlds of scholarship meet. Many political scientists study the presidency, and a few study social movements; many sociologists study social movements, but very few study the presidency. So, we don't actually know how social movements and presidents interact to influence American politics; this is the important gap in our knowledge that Milkis and Tichenor intend to fill.

They present extended case studies of two broadly conceived movements that have been important for much of American history. The first is what might be described as the movement to bring African Americans to full participation in American life. Chapters 2-4 examine Lincoln and the abolitionist movement, presidents, and civil rights from 1901-1945, and Lyndon Johnson and the civil rights movement. Milkis and Tichenor's narrative is very well done, providing a broad overview of links between presidents and relevant social movements, with enough detail to make the presentation feel real and convincing—but not so much that the narrative bogs down.

The second movement studied is what Milkis and Tichenor calls the "Protestant Rearguard" (chapter 5) and the New Christian Right (chapter 6), with particular emphasis on Ronald Reagan's role as a critical ally who sometimes co-opted the Christian Right without giving them nearly as much as they wanted.

Rivalry and Reform is especially enlightening because it considers one set of movements on the political left and another on the right, showing how similarities and differences between the two were affected by who their supporters were and how difficult it was to gain access to presidents. Milkis and Tichenor break down boundaries not only between subdisciplines, but between the study of seemingly very different movements as well.

The book is not as helpful as it could be, however. For one thing, Milkis and Tichenor do not review what we already know about the relationship between presidents and social movements. They do not cite a single article published in either *Mobilization* or *Social Movement Studies*, nor do they refer to the works of the many major researchers who study the relationship between movements and the state, for example: Amenta, Earl, Gamson, Giugni, Johnson, King, McCammon, Olzak, Santoro, and Soule. The two worlds of scholarship they refer to may meet only rarely, but Milkis and Tichenor do not tell us what we can learn from those meetings. Because Milkis and Tichenor do not systematically describe what we already know, they cannot say what is new and important about their book.

What we do know is that they are not contributing to theories about social movements. Works on social movements and the presidency need not be theory-driven, but Milkis and Tichenor give us some reason to think that theory matters to them; their first chapter is titled "Presidents, Social Movements, and Contentious Change: Some Theoretical Foundations." Even so, they never refer to any particular social scientific theory.

The way Milkis and Tichenor think of social movements presents a problem as well. In the study of movements, social movement organizations (SMOs) play a critical role, articulating activist goals and acting to achieve them; presidents interact with SMOs, not with social movements in the abstract. Yet Milkis and Tichenor never use the terms "social movement organization" or "SMO;" they therefore can say nothing about what research on SMOs contributes to their work, or what their work contributes to our understanding of SMOs.

The authors conclude with bold claims about the importance of the connections between social movements and presidents. "The relationship between presidents and social movements," they write, "has often held the key to change in an American polity laden with inertial forces. . . ." (p. 317). This claim is plausible, but it's fair to ask what it means. Milkis and Tichenor describe instances in which the relationship between social movements and presidents has been important, but they can't say how often this generally occurs. Given their approach, which involves detailed case studies, it's unreasonable to expect them to study many more. But further examination must be done before we can decide how often the movement-president interaction really matters. At most, Milkis and Tichenor show us that the relationships between movements and presidents *sometimes* matter.

This need for continued analysis makes it worthwhile to study additional movements, and *Rivalry and Reform* provides a helpful roadmap for doing so. As things stand, though, the authors claim far more than they have shown.

Nonetheless, Milkis and Tichenor point us in a useful direction. If we want to build on what they say, we need to review relevant literature on social movements and the presidency, treat their case studies as models for how to proceed, and decide how best to move forward, studying movements whose relationship with presidents cannot be taken for granted. Only then can we determine how often the relationship between presidents and social movements holds the key to political change in the U.S.

Jeffrey C. Alexander, Trevor Stack, and Farhad Khosrokhavar, eds. *Breaching the Civil Order: Radicalism and the Civil Sphere*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2019. \$99.99 (hardcover).

Dana Williams
California State University, Chico

The contributors to *Breaching the Civil Order: Radicalism and the Civil Sphere* argue that analysis of social movements and political radicalism aids in the elaboration of the civil sphere concept: institutions—not necessarily or only the state—that provide societal stability. The volume’s case examples include the Zapatistas, leftist Colombian college students, Black Lives Matter, the Arab Spring and European jihadists, French media after the 2015 Charlie Hebdo attack, Germany’s far-right Pegida, Irish Republicanism, and the 2011 English riots. Some critics have interpreted civil sphere theory (CST) as pro-status quo, as if what presently exists should remain so in perpetuity. The contributors to *Breaching the Civil Order* instead point to the actively constructed nature of the civil sphere and suggest it may fall far short of its aspirational, ideological claims. Thus, movements often attempt to wedge open the civil sphere, fighting for greater inclusion of historically excluded groups (e.g., poor indigenous Mayans, Black Americans, Muslim refugees, Northern Ireland Catholics, or the British working class).

What constitutes the civil sphere? And where is it likely to be found? Arguably, it’s more likely to exist within constitutional democracies, embedded in regulatory institutions, parties, legal systems, voting, mass media, public opinion, and civic associations—intersecting with the state, but not necessarily the state in total. The book’s various contributors claim centrality for different institutional actors. According to Tognato, universities are formative institutions, while Luengo and Ihlebæk present the media as the “heart” of the civil sphere because it symbolically performs society’s “vital center” (p. 126). However, institutions are always in a process of change, rearticulation, and social construction. Thus, they react to radical challenges differently.

Radicalism is not necessarily violent or illegal (although it can sometimes be either or both). CST does not deem all radicalism illegal or illegitimate; in fact, some is necessary, while other radical challenges (e.g., civil disobedience) may fit within liberal democracy’s expectations (i.e., breaking laws that violate widely held societal values). Yet radicalism is often central to move-

ments and presumably exists in contradiction to civil order. Stack and Alexander argue radicalism rejects the civil sphere and can be understood as antinormative. Radical acts can be progressive (expanding the civil sphere) or regressive (not expanding it). Progressives seek to open the civil sphere to outsiders (e.g., Zapatistas, Black Lives Matter), while reactionaries seek to close or abolish it (e.g., jihadists or Pegida).

The principal methods of radicals illustrate the gap between an ideal and the actual civil sphere by attempting to “wedge open” its establishments. Breaches—like radical protest—serve as opportunities to understand its dynamics. One positive breach outcome is potential reconciliation or civil repair. Since the civil sphere is not guaranteed to be emancipatory, it may require wedging open from movements to live up to its professed values. According to Cooke, it’s important to accept that the civil sphere is often corrupt and nonemancipatory, despite being “civil.” Thus, radical challenges—even when very disruptive (e.g., the IRA or 2011’s UK urban uprising)—can be interpreted within the CST framework.

Perception is important for CST. Governments feel obliged to *appear* to consider those claiming civil sphere support; consequently, the Zapatistas attempted to stay in its favor. Social movements often make universalistic demands and communicate a broader vision. Most movements also orient themselves toward the state and the media, mobilizing persuasion rather than force. But some movements and radicals are uncivil in form. How does one interpret which fights are against the civil sphere? Such opponents are not permitted within it (e.g., fundamentalism is generally incompatible with the civil sphere). CST has thus mostly overlooked reactionary movements, such as Pegida or jihadism. The “uncivil sphere” may emerge as a response to structural inequality: the 2011 UK riots were a reaction against classism, racism, and police brutality. Rioters found solidarity during an uprising against a civil sphere offering empty democratic promises; they belonged to an underserved population desiring inclusion, but with few means to join the civil sphere.

A major strategy for disrupting systems of domination is civil disobedience. According to Cooke, such disobedience is the ethical assertion of values to intervene within or against the civil sphere. Civil disobedience discourse justifies otherwise uncivil acts as ultimately civil, and remains committed to democracy and norms of equality, inclusion, interconnectedness, and self-determining agency. Arguably, freedom develops best under these conditions. Civil disobedience aims to close the gap between these values of democracy and the civil sphere itself. Conse-

quently, it is a form of reconstitutive power that may contribute to remaking the civil sphere. Reaching agreement on what is ‘the good life’ is more an ethical problem than a political problem; thus, civil disobedience is a value-based practice to modify norms within the democratic project’s framework.

My limited criticisms stem from questions about CST itself. For example, the state’s role in the civil sphere is unclear. Is the state an actor *in* the civil sphere, since elections, political parties, and regulators are state based? Should we simply assume that radical movements either appeal to or join states? Relatedly, if, as Weber famously argued, the state holds a monopoly on violence, the treatment of radical violence appears somewhat underformulated. What exactly is violence—and why is “violence” against property considered equivalent to violence targeting people? The state’s violence is far greater than that of the movements, and it acts with the force of legality, if not legitimacy, even within the civil sphere. Similarly, what is deemed “radical” is slightly underconceptualized. Is “radicalism” only anti-normative, or is it based on fundamental values (i.e., to get to the root)? The chapters here seem to diverge significantly in how the word “radical” is used. The radicalism of fascists, indigenous autonomists, and cultural nationalists may certainly be more united by their ideological purism than anti-normativity.

Finally, what is the nature of the civil sphere, according to challenging movements: something to be resisted, joined and changed, or abolished? A potential test to further extend CST might be anarchist movements, which are antistate, revolutionary (but opposed to wanton violence), and based on progressive antiauthoritarian values of freedom and justice.

In sum, *Breaching the Civil Order* is a goldmine for social movement students seeking ways to theorize about institutions that movements oppose, as well as movements’ corresponding visions.

Thea Riofrancos. *Resource Radicals: From Petro-Nationalism to Post-Extractivism in Ecuador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2020. \$99.95 (hardcover), \$26.95 (paper).

Patricia Widener
Florida Atlantic University

By linking arms with an established cadre of activists and scholars inside and outside Ecuador, Thea Riofrancos’s *Resource Radicals: From Petro-Nationalism to Post Extractivism in Ecuador* cap-

tures a time when the leftist movement transitioned into positions of power, while fracturing into pro-extraction and anti-extraction camps. To analyze the intra-leftist conflicts over the extraction of petroleum and minerals, the author conducted participant observation and examined records on the very public and well-documented collision between Ecuador’s president and street-wise social movement over leftist-style practices and policies. Activists saw a post-neoliberal state as an end to extractive capitalism, but the leftist state interpreted extraction for export as a way to expand state power.

Both flanks, as well as their allied intellectuals, rejected rightwing ideologies and sought to reduce poverty and improve the quality of life for the country’s poorest and most marginalized. However, they diverged strongly in how to achieve those ends. With a heavy hand guided by then-President Rafael Correa, the state chose a prolonged and expanded national dependency on large-scale, export-oriented extraction as a means to support community investments and social services, including healthcare, education, and monthly cash transfers to the lowest-income households. These benefits were meant to legitimize the continuation of extraction yet were provided without an exit or transition plan to an alternative economic model that would serve the nation’s poor, rural, and Indigenous people.

Outside the doors of government, activists, including Indigenous, rural, community, and environmental leaders, sought a truly transformative project with a “post-extractive vision” (p. 60). In contrast to the state, they rejected extractive activities as a means to achieve *sumak kawsay* and *buen vivir*—a good and full life for and by local communities through some version of collective and socio-ecological well-being. Their competing interpretations of a post-neoliberal transition led to struggles in the streets, within state agencies, and across universities, even though both needed the other to elevate and secure their ideals.

Resource Radicals is expansive in explaining the entanglements between leftist leaders, while also drilling down on two specific flashpoints: revising the constitution and defining public consent. Riofrancos provides a step-by-step account leading up to and after the rewriting of Ecuador’s Constitution in 2008, including how both sides competed in its interpretation, application, and legitimization, or what Riofrancos refers to as the “circulating discourse” (p. 91) for a “mobile document” (p. 113).

The second focus is on the meaning of public consent. To this point, Ecuadorians joined communities around the world affected by hydraulic fracturing or offshore oil exploration when they first attended a public consultation and discovered

their subordination to the state or industry. Adding to scholarship on these processes in wealthier nations, Riofrancos strengthens our understanding of competing leftist interpretations in a lower-income nation. The activist faction understood consent or consultation as the right to community input in decision-making processes and community possession of veto power. However, and like elsewhere, the state and the oil and mining sectors interpreted consultation as informing the public about an existing or impending project. If the state declares a project to be of national interest or significance, directly affected communities have the right to be told of the project, and little else. In this way, right-wing and leftist states protect and advance their power.

In contrast, social movement leaders interpreted Ecuador's Constitution as supportive of direct participation. To demonstrate the distinction, they ran a community-run deliberation and model election, in which 93% of the participants voted against a mining activity. While the activists sought open forums for a deliberative democracy of local decision making and community-based determination, the state narrowed participation and consultation to mean the "dissemination of information" (p. 105), dismissing the compelling protest vote.

For the state, leftist leadership meant a stronger state apparatus overseeing and collecting revenues from the extraction of oil and minerals. Yet the state lacked both the technological and scientific expertise to understand and monitor the risks, write and exert state regulations, and disseminate its own information; thus, it remained dependent on multinational corporations for technical and regulatory knowledge, along with information exchanges with the public. To activist leaders, the state's dependence on the industry for expertise and revenues undermined the projected strength of Correa, who was more of a strongman with activists than international lenders and corporations.

From beginning to end, Riofrancos analyzes the realization by social movement leaders that leftist politics would not reflect their ideals or be as inclusive and ecologically sound as envisioned. However, this discovery should not come as a surprise to movement scholars or seasoned activists. While Riofrancos documents a wave of leftists rising, it is one wave in a long history of resistance in Ecuador and throughout Latin America. Before and after the timeline of this case study, few would expect the complete suite of grievances to be resolved, even after major strides. The leftists rode in on Indigenous, campesino, labor, and environmental justice movements; and additional pro-people and pro-ecosocialist waves will follow. Likewise, the privileged elite will

counter and advance their own political and economic mobilization activities or attacks.

Riofrancos brings to life how divided leftist leaders during a post-neoliberal uprising mobilized to articulate and animate their grievances and proposed solutions. She also describes how leftist practices may not be as transformative or as radical as leftist theories when translated into policies by state leaders who remain governed by the monetary rewards from extracting a country's oil and mineral resources for export. A compassionate and hopeful yet frustrated participant-observer, Riofrancos ends her study reminding those across the spectrum of the left that the corresponding mobilizations of rightwing ideologues are far greater threats to communities and the environment than internal disputes. Finally, because she only hints at the impacts of climate change and the ascending role of China in Ecuador's national debt and economic activities, she leaves much room for greater assessment of these issues. Though each conflict represents mounting concerns across Latin America, it remains unclear whether leftists in their representative circles are responding to or ignoring these troubles for now.

Cristina Flesher Fominaya. *Democracy Reloaded: Inside Spain's Political Laboratory from 15-M to Podemos*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2020. \$99.00 (hardcover), \$29.95 (paper).

Josep Lobera
Autonomous University of Madrid (Spain)

Several protests have disrupted the second decade of this century, testing our previous understanding of social movements. Some of them, such as city square movements, forged unconventional mobilization structures. Fominaya's latest book, *Democracy Reloaded: Inside Spain's Political Laboratory from 15-M to Podemos*, provides a comprehensive theoretical review of what these movements have meant based on their most significant case: Spain's 15-M. It is an ambitious book, offering a continuous vision of the 15-M protests that integrates their context and precedents, as well as their crystallization into new political formations. The bottom line is to understand that protests do not have definitive limits in either their beginnings or their dissolutions; they contain moments of singularity.

The singularity of 15-M—and perhaps also its most defining moment—was the encampment (*acampada*) phase. Fominaya insists the encampment had a specific internal logic. It was both a "chrysalis," a protected stage of development

within which the 15-M movement was born, and a “crucible,” a container in which old and new elements could be fused (p. 86). Thus, she explains, in a situation of exceptional emotional intensity, something new was produced: “a more consolidated ethos and political culture, as well as new sets of social relations that would go on to generate a broad network of interrelated assemblies, collectives, events, and political projects, all organized around a collective identity and a political culture referred to in Spain simply as 15-M” (p. 87).

In the first part of *Democracy Reloaded*, the author provides a theoretical, analytical, and empirical framework to understand the emergence of the 15-M movement and its central challenge to dominant conceptions of Spanish democracy. By linking with previous scholarship, Fominaya highlights the counterhegemonic reflective work 15-M did to change the way people understood democracy and austerity. She argues that the ability of movements to project counterhegemonic narratives is essential to explain why an effective response took place in Spain, but not in other countries similarly hit by the crisis, such as Ireland.

Likewise, the book includes the role of the media and digital tools in the creation of new organizational logics of collective action, as well as key aspects of the autonomous assembly movement’s culture that profoundly influenced the organizational form and orientation of 15-M. It analyzes the 15-M network that arose after the camps which had served as support and fuel for the mobilization ended. This analysis focuses on three manifestations of this network: the PAH (anti-evictions platform), the 15MpaRato (citizen platform against corruption) and Juventud sin Futuro (Youth Without Future).

But the book doesn’t stop there. Fominaya also addresses the “electoral turn” of the protest movement (p. 221). Her approach is broad and breaks with the traditional frontier of social movement research. Certainly, the Podemos case has sparked an unusual academic revitalization of the oft-forgotten interrelationship between political parties and movements in the spirit of McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly’s *Dynamics of Contentions*; a fundamental interrelation about which *Democracy Reloaded* offers its own analysis. How do the founders of Podemos convince 15-M activists to participate in electoral politics? Fominaya looks at

the delicate passage between movements and partisanship, identifying the main arguments of political persuasion: the integration of the political culture of 15-M in the party, including autonomy, feminism, and hacker ethics.

Fominaya asks: Can the logic of the movement and the party be compatible? The book explores the central tension between movements and parties by analyzing internal and 15-M-based criticisms of the party and the challenges it faced to maintain grassroots support. The author reviews critiques of Podemos since its inception, taking note of conflicts between 15-M activists, the Anticapitalist Left (Izquierda Anticapitalista), and the leadership of Podemos even before it became a political party. She also analyzes the inescapable divisions caused by the estrangement of activist leaders Pablo Iglesias and Íñigo Errejón. She succeeds in her analysis of these strains, giving a central role to inherent problems for political parties formed from social movements: the tensions between horizontality and verticality, and street-based versus institution-based ideas.

In the concluding chapter, three points are central. The first is that the logistics of autonomous networks, against all odds, can build and sustain strong movements in the absence of formal and professionalized organizational structures. The second conclusion qualifies the connective analyses of mobilization. There is no doubt that the appropriation of digital tools by movements has transformed the organization and identity of collective action; however, the author shows how the logic of collective action continues to feed autonomous networks in the digital age.

Finally, *Democracy Reloaded* evaluates the impact and importance of the 15-M movement and the potential of autonomous movements to renew democracy in times of crisis. Fominaya frames her argument with previous scholarship, but goes one step further to show “the crucial role that internal prefigurative praxis played in shaping the movement’s impact on the wider political field, impacts most commonly understood in terms of factors external to movements, particularly political opportunities” (p. 307). Connecting with previous research, Fominaya convincingly shows how the practices, imaginaries, and internal collective identities of movements can symbolically and materially transform a broader political landscape.
