

James M. Jasper & Jan Willem Duyvendak (eds.), *Players and Arenas: the interactive dynamics of protest* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2014) 322 p. ISBN: 978-90-8964-708-5.

The collection of articles brought together by Jasper and Duyvendak in 'Players and Arenas' shows the broad spectrum of sociological research on the world of social movements. This branch of sociology has acquired its own abbreviations, like SMO for 'Social Movement Organizations' and SMI for 'Social Movement Industries'.

In the introduction entitled 'Playing the game', Jasper outlines his program for this specific research. He states that although we now live in times with much protest, the phenomenon is not new. Formerly it was studied in relation to vast theories about 'modernity', 'nation-building' or 'urbanization', but this has lost its appeal, as have the big narratives. Narrow cultural analyses focused too much on social movements and the motives of the participants themselves. The trend in this kind of research is from macro- to micro studies. The studies are cultural and interpretative; they are not materialistic and certainly not structuralist. Individual subjects, not collectives, figure. At this point the perspective of 'players' and 'arenas' is introduced. The players can employ three types of strategic means: they can pay to achieve their goal, they can persuade, and they can use force. Jasper compares the ability of movements to reach their goal with what Bourdieu calls 'capital'. Social movements can range from fairly closed, with rules and staff and security personnel, to completely open. The players meet in one or more arenas. Arenas have rules and resources, and players play different roles in different arenas. 'Arenas are where politics occur' (14). Arenas come, like players, in a wide variety: weakly institutionalised, large or small public, etc. Jasper allocates arenas the role of 'structure' in older theories. Arenas can be changed by players or abandoned. Sub arenas can emerge.

Without necessarily agreeing with postmodern theorists that individuals are sites for internal conversation and conflict, Jasper stresses again and again the absence or weakness of solid structures in social movements. Rather he focuses on the fluidity and motility of the activities in them. And not only there, but outside of the movements the players are as agile as can be. This is the case especially with law enforcement agencies opposing the advances of activities of the protesters. Jasper concludes that it is essential to analyze the players in the arenas as reciprocal moving targets. Traditional structuralist and culturalist studies are stuck in static models, but strategic models are necessary.

The contributors to this volume received a fixed list of questions to guide them in this diverse area of phenomena. To name a few: how do players operate? What do players want? What means do they have? What barriers do they face? The 12 cases more or less follow the questions. They are divided in three parts dealing

with a) the balance between inside- and outside-players b) players and the market c) the role of experts, intellectuals and media in the world of social movements. Here I will examine one from each part.

Christian Scholl analyses the complex interaction between counter globalisation organisations and government-, police- and media agencies during summit protests. Government and police are on the winning side, in his opinion. After the tactical innovation of 'swarming', protests have not explored new tactics. Scholl uses the word 'repertoire' here: this term figured prominently in nearly all previous literature on social movements.

In part two, Philip Balsiger explores the anti-sweatshop movement in France. Interestingly boycotts and 'buycotts' in specific consumer markets are relatively effective and at the same time create alternative markets through idealistic labelling. The word 'repertoire' also appears and he uses the Bourdieu-an word 'field' mixed with his 'players and arenas' perspective.

Nicholls and Uitermark open part three with an article on the role of intellectuals in immigrant and LGBT movements. In this contribution the 'Power of Representation dilemma' is central and Foucault feels very much present. To avoid 'symbolic violence', a term from Bourdieu, intellectuals need to thoroughly scrutinize their own role.

In the concluding chapter Duyvendak and Olivier Fillieule follow up on Jasper's call in his introduction and add a different perspective, which finds its own abbreviation, with SIP for 'Strategic Interactionist Perspective'. In this part, the authors extensively determine their position vis-à-vis the concept of 'the field' as coined by Bourdieu. In their opinion, some aspects are not covered with this concept, in particular the non-dominant ones.

Although they mention the risk that SIP too much focuses on the 'hic et nunc', they state that historical dimensions need to be addressed. For social and economic historians who consider 'path dependency' the alfa and omega of their trade, the relative freedom a SIP allows players, including those in the past, can be an eye opener. The 'players and arenas' perspective can offer historical research a rich yield, if only we keep in mind that it is the metaphor that produces it.

Huub Sanders, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam