Interview findings mostly support the descriptive survey findings and provide interesting anecdotal information about the trends outlined in the survey analyses. One key difference is that survey findings indicate that a majority of households (64 percent [p. 60]) report not being part of a kin-based resource-sharing network. In contrast, interviews highlight the multiple ways that families support each other, ways that definitely form a resource-exchange network. As with the chapters describing the survey results, the interview findings were written by various combinations of research team members, and the findings are not presented in a standard way, with varying levels of quality.

If a reader would like to quickly understand the ways in which households survived the economic insecurity of the post-Soviet period, I would recommend going directly to Chapter Five. It provides a succinct, yet detailed synthesis of data described in the previous chapters. Chapter Five outlines a typology of six varieties of household economic strategies based on the survey and interview findings. The team divides the sample into “poorer, middle, better off” households and differentiates strategies for each category in rural and urban settings. To support their typology, the authors present vignettes of three households that represent each of the six categories. As this chapter was written by a single set of research team members, the key areas of variation are consistently described across types, allowing for a clearer understanding of the differences between cases.

The final chapter provides a general conclusion. It brings back into the conversation the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach framework and nominal references to types of capital presented in the first chapter of the book. The title of the chapter refers to a bold claim that the kinship-based resource-sharing networks used by families to survive the post-Soviet transition form a new “variety” of capitalism. The claim is tentatively argued, with reference to the need for more study (p. 437). As discussed above, the majority of respondents in the survey (N=451) identified being in a closed nuclear household that did not exchange anything with other households, while many of the interviews (N=151) described the large role that family networks played in household economic strategies.

The large volume of detailed descriptive information about multiple aspects of household economies in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan lends itself to being most useful as a reference for specialists of the former Soviet region. There is very little theoretical grounding or application that would make it more interesting to a general audience. Only Chapter Five, the succinct summary of six types of households, would be of interest to a general audience. Overall the text is cumbersome to read, and the non-standard coverage of findings across cases is frustrating to navigate. It should be mentioned that the research team and editorial staff have generously offered an open-access version in Russian.
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*Breaking Down the State: Protestors Engaged* is the companion volume to editors Jan Willem Duyvendak and James Jasper’s *Arenas and Players: The Interactive Dynamics of Protest*. The volumes represent the editors’ and contributors’ effort at forging a new model of social movement analysis. Briefly, movements and the entity “formerly known as the state” (p. 9) both are broken down into players who engage in strategic interaction with other diverse players in structured arenas. The contributors to this volume—an international group of scholars—are extending recent work that approaches movements and states as heterogeneous, multi-interested, and often internally contentious. Going further, the model offered in *Breaking Down the State* also takes into consideration players that may be members of other organizations, even in opposing camps; players that may have ambitions to...
leave the movement and join “the state,” or vice versa; and players that are ambivalent about their position as state functionaries. Action and interaction take place in structured arenas of many types and forms; and players can be viewed as arenas, since the meeting of movement and state players is always a matter of strategic interaction. In other words, in every interactive meeting or confrontation, movement and state players are making strategic decisions regarding winning advantage and attaining goals.

In terms of the state, the major point and goal is de-reification of the “unified state,” as theorized by many sociologists, from Weber to Skocpol. Instead, according to the present authors, the state should be seen as “a web of sub-players—bureaus, legislatures, executives, police forces, military, etc.—tied together by a set of rules . . . that purport to govern their relationships” (p. 11). It is not a unified state that gets things done; it is state players in sub-units, each with certain capacities and strategic actions, who achieve the functions of the state. Furthermore, strict distinctions between what is inside and what is outside the state need reconsideration, because many arenas of the state—such as courts, elections, and so forth—involve participation of both state and non-state players who determine outcomes.

Jasper lays out this model in the introductory chapter of the book, and it’s a daunting model for a social movement scholar. There are so many players, arenas, relationships, forms of interaction, strategic decisions, and so forth that must be considered! Fortunately, the contributors and their chapters do an excellent job demonstrating how different players and arenas of the state can be broken down in analysis of social movements. The volume is organized by state sub-units: courts, political parties and legislators, local government, the police, the military, movement infiltrators, repression, and international organizations. (Surprisingly, elections per se are not included.) There is not enough room here to discuss each excellent chapter (Jack Goldstone’s concluding chapter in the volume does a fine job of this, though), so I’ll present three exemplars, which admittedly reflect my own research interests.

Brian Doherty and Graeme Hayes’s chapter “Criminal Trials as Strategic Arenas,” analyzing criminal trials of European and American environmental activists, explores a state arena in need of more inclusion in social movement studies. The players are numerous—social movement activists, defense attorneys, prosecutors, judges and juries—and the court arena is dynamic. The players, especially the activists on trial and the lawyers for both sides, are constantly making strategic and tactical decisions as they interact with other players. For example, do the activists desire acquittal, or do they plan on using the trial as an arena in which to publicize their cause? Whatever the goal, how might it be attained, considering the decisions and actions of other players? Are the prosecutors going for conviction and punishment; does the judge plan on keeping activists and their lawyers from engaging in political discourse? Doherty and Hayes demonstrate well how criminal trials of activists, and by extension other legal proceedings, “are complex processes which cannot a priori be reduced to simple imposition of authority by a unified state” (p. 48) and how they produce outcomes stemming largely from the strategic choices made by players as they interact in the courtroom.

Imrat Verhoeven and Christian Bröer’s chapter, “Local Governmental Players as Social Movement Actors,” offers an analysis of how local government players can act like social movement actors in episodes of contentious policy implementation. Analyzing two cases of contentious governance in the Netherlands in which “lower tiers of government mobilize against policy plans advanced by regional or national authorities” (p. 96), Verhoeven and Bröer illustrate how different, opposing governmental players mobilize public support, or more often discontent and protest, for or against governmental policy in provinces. Significantly, the authors focus on the symbolic, discursive strategy governmental “claimants” use—developing slogans, organizing mass public meetings, poster campaigns—to draw citizens into movements in support of their cause.
Analyzing another state unit especially important to analysis of historical social movements, Ian Roxborough looks at the British military’s response to the armed struggle of Irish nationalists in his chapter, “The Mutual Determination of Strategy in Ireland, 1912–1921.” Right away we learn that in Ireland many organizations constituted the British military presence: the British army, the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the “Black and Tans” and Auxiliaries, and the intelligence service. How could a comparatively small group of Irish rebels confronting British power in the form of these military groups finally bring an end to British domination in 1921? By examining “the different cognitive frames and strategies of the various police and military organizations of the British state” (p. 133), Roxborough fleshes out the organizational incoherence and inability to coordinate strategy that contributed to the failure of British counterinsurgency in Ireland. It’s a fascinating exposition of how the state is not a unified, and sometimes not even a rational, actor.

Whether one accepts the model of the state proposed by Duyvendak and Jasper and the contributors to this volume, Breaking Down the State is a welcome and timely challenge for social movement theorists and analysts. Most of the individual chapters are so well written that they will be useful in both undergraduate and graduate social movement courses. I will be turning to it often.
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