



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Boekbespreking van: Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics

Beyers, J.

Citation

Beyers, J. (2002). Boekbespreking van: Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics. *Acta Politica*, 37: 2002(3), 337-339. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450903>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3450903>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

contributions and their conclusions, however, most of their discussions have already been presented in the individual case studies. Thus, some of a more pragmatic mind might find this intellectual tautology of (an otherwise exceptionally perceptive) volume somewhat onerous.

The analysis of the role played by external factors in the East European democratization process is underlined by "the simultaneity of democratisation and marketisation" (p. 2). In effect, the setting of the frame of individual transitions is sequenced by the choices that both external and domestic actors have to make in transforming the economy and the polity. The volume outlines four main variables for the role of external and domestic actors in regime change. The first one is the proximity to the West European values (something that smacks of a thinly-veiled 'primordialism'). Second, (and implied by the first one) is the relationship between nationalism and communism. The third one is the quality of 'stateness' (p. 3). And finally, the fourth one is the stage of democratic transition. Following from these variables, each case study looks at implications for inter/transnational factors on the process of democratization and democratic consolidation. The underlying motif of all country investigations is that although stability and security depend upon economic and political transformations in the long run, in the short term they may not be compatible. Moreover, the often mutually contradictory (or even when compatible) objectives of different Western projects, which were perceived in Eastern Europe as instances of the same project, introduced a sense of confusion rather than an awareness of purpose. This was reinforced by a sense of vulnerability deriving from a challenge to the concept of sovereignty through the promotion of liberal democracy and market economy. The cold war status quo was being challenged externally by (sub-) regionalization and internally by ethnicization of society. Unfortunately, some of the individuals who have traditionally been involved in the promotion of a civic culture in Eastern Europe – dissidents and intellectuals (or epistemic communities) – did not manage to initiate a grassroots process of democratization this time. Instead, they remained engrossed in the procedural dynamics of democratic consolidation, and in effect co-opted within the emerging partocratic elites. As a result, the process of democratization found itself with neither external nor domestic guarantees as to the direction (let alone purpose) of its democratic consolidation.

In such a way *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe* captures the major issues accompanying the transition period. The two volumes project not only a heightened sense of awareness of the democratization process in Eastern Europe at the end of 'a decade of change', but also a perception of its direction. The articles in this collection grapple with the possibilities of detecting frameworks in the theory and praxis of the post-cold war experience that would inform prospective decision-making. It is suggested that the establishment of an institutionalized setting of East European relations can contribute to the stability of the region. Its structure of rules- and norms-based patterned behaviour can involve both inter/transnational and domestic actors in a dialogue with the aim of solving the problems of the transition period. As the two volumes emphasize, the post-cold war period has been (and continues to be) a period

of deepening transition towards a more reflexive common European experience. Regardless of some of the weaknesses mentioned above, *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe* is an extremely valuable contribution to the study of post-1989 Eastern Europe (and, in fact, Europe as a whole). The erudite perspectives presented in the two volumes respond to a nascent requirement to initiate a process of evaluation of the experience from the democratic consolidation after the fall of communism. This provides a powerful insight into the process of institution building in the new democracies of Eastern Europe. Therefore, *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe* is going to be a very helpful repository for anyone who is studying the period of transition and who is looking for critical and well-informed perspectives on Eastern Europe's experience of democratization.

Emilian Kavalski

Ronald R. Aminzade, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth J. Perry, William H. Sewell, Jr., Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly, *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, ISBN 0-521-00155-2 (paperback), £ 15.95.

Among the vast amount of edited volumes existing in the social sciences very few tackle a common research problem by offering a set of comparable chapters that fit together and also talk to each other. Especially in a rich research field such as social movements research, the compilation of such a volume is rather unique. This book stands for a high quality, well-written volume, which has several interesting things to tell. It is likely to become a unique source of inspiration for future research. Yet, unfortunately, the book misses some opportunities or, to paraphrase its title, remains silent on some important topics.

Broadly speaking, the book can be characterized as a tinkering experiment by leading scholars in the field. Fortunately, the book does not offer yet another seemingly new approach or model. Rather, it seeks to give voice to silences in the contemporary literature on social movements and contentious politics. Borrowing extensively from other social science research traditions, such as anthropology, social geography, social psychology and political psychology, it explores how these gaps might be filled. In this regard, the book is also an attempt to synthesize existing literature, to promote interdisciplinary work and to foster communication among separate fields of research. Consecutively, the different thematic chapters deal with emotions, spatiality, temporality, leadership dynamics, threat, and, finally, demographic and life-course contexts. Most chapters contain very rich and fascinating case studies providing illustrations of the more general points raised. Nevertheless, more similarity across chapters would have improved the already existing communication among the chapters. For instance, by limiting the (in itself revealing) discussion on leadership to revolutionary leaders only (chapter 5) the authors may

have missed interesting aspects of leadership within non-revolutionary movements, such as the American Civil Rights movement discussed in chapter 4.

In the opening chapter Aminzade and McAdam argue that the contradiction between emotions and reason or rationality often tends to obscure things. This chapter shows that of all the themes discussed in this volume 'emotions' is the one that is most neglected and under-researched. Yet, it is probably also the most difficult to operationalize with mainstream social science methodological instruments. Especially the use of broad concepts such as 'emotional landscape' or the 'manufacturing of hope' confirms the suspicious reader's view that this is a field that still has to be discovered to a large extent. The second chapter (Sewell) offers a good presentation of space and spatial agency, applied to two fascinating illustrations (the student insurgency at Tiananmen square in Beijing and the French Revolution). The third chapter (McAdam and Sewell) extends the conventional conception of time beyond the notion of long-term change processes or protest cycles. With examples from the American Civil Rights Movement and the French Revolution it draws our attention to the importance of, and the interrelations between, transformative events and cultural epochs of contention. The subsequent chapter (Aminzade, Goldstone and Perry) concerns the effect of different leadership styles on the kind of social movements that will emerge and their outcomes. Examples of different American revolutions, the Chinese revolution and Tanganyikan independence serve to explore why some revolutions lead to stable democratic regimes while others install authoritarian or dictatorial systems. The next chapter (Aminzade and Perry) discusses the role of religion as a factor shaping contentious politics. Drawing from examples from Africa and China, it suggests that the boundary between secular and religious types of movements is constructed by dominant social science paradigms. In reality, however, this boundary is a blurring one. The seventh chapter (Goldstone and Tilly) proposes a model that separates 'opportunities' from 'threats'. This model, the authors claim, can be a helpful tool for explaining instances in which a condition of growing and severe repression leads to more protest, more risk-taking by activists, more radical and even violent demands. Given the title of the volume, it is strange that the authors did not relate their conceptualization to older insights on the interrelation between access, voice and loyalty: as Hirschman outlined, it is often the absence of an exit option that leads to the use of voice. In the eighth chapter (Goldstone and McAdam) the decomposition of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the American New Left serve to explore some neglected demographic factors. Although this chapter explores the effect of macro demographic processes, it tries to push us further by suggesting that social movements may have a significant effect on changes in life course patterns at the micro level.

By presenting their material in this way, the authors have clearly and convincingly succeeded in highlighting some important gaps in the current literature. The risk of their ambitious enterprise is, of course, as they acknowledge themselves, that in flagging so many research topics they tend to miss the opportunity to connect some of their very interesting insights with wider on-going research agendas or other existing

lacuna. Let me give some examples. First, concerning space or spatial agency, the argument would be stronger if it had been linked to the current literature and contemporary research concerning multilevel governance or the internationalization of social movements. In writing on the Jacobin club (pp. 84-85), the authors argue that actors systematically employ strategies of 'scale jumping', i.e., compensating for weak positions at one level by calling on networks that cross-cut different levels. Contemporary scholars on European or international politics often tend to assume that this so-called boomerang pattern is new or unique. It is revealing to observe that such patterns already played a role during earlier revolutionary processes. Second, the authors occasionally tend to take a rather broad conception of 'contentious politics'. Putting together examples as the crusade (p. 112), Mobutu's policies in former Zaire (p. 165) or a trade union strike (p. 1) together is fine for illustrative purposes, but it also implies, maybe implicitly, a blurring of existing boundaries, which may lead to rather holistic and underspecified views. Third, the concluding chapter correctly claims that most scholars study either routine forms of politics (e.g., lobbying and interest representation) or contentious politics (e.g., public protest, etcetera) and that greater integration is needed between the two fields (p. 230). Nevertheless, this highly relevant topic remains rather unexplored. It is certainly the case that routine and non-public forms of political action often concern salient and contentious issues. Of all the influence strategies carried out by social movements and more conventional or so-called institutionalized interests, many tactics are non-public and have a rather routine-like character. Therefore, most traditional analyses of public policies by political scientists hardly (and wrongly, I believe) take into account the public sphere, and focus on practices as bargaining, the exchange of expertise and knowledge in networks between societal interests and state representatives. In contrast, most studies on social movements do not pay attention to these more routine forms of politics and especially the interaction between the uses of routine practices with different public forms of political action remains under-researched. In this respect, there is a great need for additional and continued discussion.

Jan Beyers