

2016

# Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis by Donatella Della Porta

Dorothy Kidd

*University of San Francisco*, [kidd@usfca.edu](mailto:kidd@usfca.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.usfca.edu/ms>

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Dorothy Kidd, "Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis by Donatella Della Porta," *American Journal of Sociology* 122, no. 1 (July 2016). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/686050>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Media Studies by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact [repository@usfca.edu](mailto:repository@usfca.edu).

compromisingly inclusive (p. 107). The assumption throughout is that parties *should* seek to be integral, regardless of regime type and what they stand to accomplish politically. Riley is right to note, too, that stable hegemony does not (still) require a party's articulation (comparative attention to less actively transforming cases/periods might thus have been revealing). We might ask, too, what legacies prior articulations leave for subsequent efforts. For instance, in Egypt, is it something about the legacy of the Muslim Brotherhood that has prevented a new, more effective party from emerging, or has the longer history of parties in the United States and Canada sapped or changed their capacity for the sort of articulation described in earlier phases?

Overall, however, *Building Blocs* offers a thought-provoking and creative sociological rethinking of the role of political parties not just in politics but in society. The volume will be a useful addition for scholars of parties, identity, and mobilization and is appropriate for upper-level undergraduate or graduate courses on these issues. Moreover, the framework presented will help to spur and structure a continuing neo-Gramscian agenda in the social sciences, of exploring the nature of hegemony and the interplay of civil and political society in a comparative perspective.

*Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis.* By Donatella Della Porta. Malden, Mass.: Polity Press, 2015. Pp. viii+249.

Dorothy Kidd  
*University of San Francisco*

In *Social Movements in Times of Austerity*, Donatella Della Porta compares two left-wing protest movements in Western Europe: the antiausterity protests of 2011 and the earlier cycle of mobilizations of the global justice movement (GJM). Drawing on a plethora of empirical data from surveys, interviews, movement documents, websites, and participant observation, she examines the continuities and differences in the social base, identities, organizational forms, and demands of these two cycles of social movements. Emerging from the peripheries of the neoliberal capitalist project in the global south during the 1990s, especially Latin America, the GJM in Western Europe stressed solidarity with the excluded and the poor even as most participants were from the well-educated middle classes. They critiqued the turn to the dominance of the capitalist market and the neoliberal politics of deregulation, privatization, and cuts in social spending. Identifying as a network of heterogeneous transnational networks, with a plurality of forms of protest, they shared repertoires of on- and offline networks in mass street demonstrations and social forums and variously called for the international expansion of citizens' rights and social justice and the building of alternative, democratic institutions of global governance.

Following a parallel geographic trajectory, the 2011 wave of protests against austerity also began in the capitalist peripheries, this time in Tunisia and Egypt, and moved through the semiperipheries of southern Europe, finally cresting in the U.S. metropolis with the Occupy Wall Street and Occupy movements. These protests of “the squares” emerged during the waning of neoliberalism, after the global economic crisis of 2008, and the imposition of even greater austerity policies and national and individual debt. In contrast to the GJM, these protests represented a much broader cross-class and cross-generational alliance of the “precariat,” people who “perceived themselves as losers of neoliberalism and its crisis” (p. 213) through unemployment and underemployment and the reduction of public service jobs and social services. Della Porta describes the latter as “private Keynesianism,” neoliberal policies that encourage individuals to assume debt for the basic services of housing, education, and, in the United States, health care.

The social movements of 2011 were built with DNA from the GJM. However, rather than identifying as cosmopolitans, they called themselves citizens, persons, or the 99%, in the language of Occupy. Much like the earlier movement, they distrusted the political elite and protested the inability of the political classes to prevent inequality and people’s suffering. However, their political framing targets the immorality of corrupt and national, rather than multinational, institutions, and they called for national governments to reassert control over the banks and finance capital and to reestablish public goods and services. These social movements expanded on the earlier movements’ prefiguring of participatory, deliberative, and direct democracy by reducing ties with all political parties, using social media to aggregate groups and individuals, and building longer-term camps in public spaces for the exchange of “information, reciprocal learning, individual socialization and knowledge building” (p. 192).

*Social Movements in Times of Austerity* is an especially nuanced comparison of the forms of political protests and their changing conceptions of democratic organization and of their differences across movement cycle and cross-nationally. The volume would be valuable enough if Della Porta had stopped there. Instead, she engages in some much-needed theory building, reinserting the study of capitalist dynamics, and class cleavages, into social movement studies and opening her two data sets to a much more expansive geographical and historical enquiry. Combining some of the canonical theories of political economy and comparative politics (and especially Wallerstein, Rokkan, Polanyi, Negri, and Hardt) with secondary analyses of the movements of the 1990s in South America, she widens her analytical frame and considerably strengthens the analysis of the tension between structuration and agency. Teasing out Karl Polanyi’s conceptualization of the historical tension between market liberalization and social protectionism, she sets the two protest movements of this millennium against two earlier movements from the waxing and waning of fordist capitalism, the labor movement and the new social movements, putting all four under the lens of capitalist dynamics.

It is an ambitious project. Della Porta's goal is to activate "some theoretical concepts and approaches to better understand contemporary social movements," rather than to build a unified "big theory" or to test her empirical evidence against a specific theory (p. 211). Nevertheless, this results in a bulky narrative, as there are a lot of passes over the same material but with different conceptual frames. Sometimes it also led this reader to ask about the selection of theoretical frames: for example, why so little reference to anarchist theories, which were much in evidence in both contemporary movements, or to Sylvia Federici and Marxist feminist theories of social reproduction in the analysis of austerity, which reemerged in the Occupy and antidebt movements. Given that Della Porta's project is about bringing capitalism back into protest analysis, and she engages with Hardt and Negri's version of autonomist Marxism and their concepts of the struggles of the multitude, why is there no reference to autonomist Marxism's school of class composition, which has produced a number of enquiries based on the documentation of the dynamic relationship between capitalism and workers' and anticapitalist social movements since the 1970s? Nevertheless, writing from the center of the social movement literature, Della Porta has made a valuable contribution that I hope encourages others to "bring capitalism back" into social movement analyses and, as importantly, to bridge the silos existing between academic literatures, especially between European and American writers and those from the global south.

*Gaining Freedoms: Claiming Space in Istanbul and Berlin.* By Berna Turam. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2015. Pp. xiv + 250. \$27.95 (paper).

Paul Kubicek  
*Oakland University*

The 2013 Gezi Park protests were widely viewed as a democratic resistance movement against an increasingly authoritarian government. The protests spread across Turkey, drawing in over 2 million Turks from all walks of life: young and old, rich and poor, secular and Muslim. While the spirit of Gezi has receded with the renewed electoral success in 2014 and 2015 of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP), it remains potent evidence that many Turks are not resigned to being passive bystanders and are willing to stand up for their individual and collective rights.

This volume, while not principally about the Gezi events, can be read as its prequel, as Berna Turam chronicles developments that provided the "freedom-seekers" of Gezi with "rehearsal space" (p. 81). Drawing on seven years of ethnographic research, she documents contestations over public space among competing actors in and beyond Turkey. To be sure, the level of analysis is the neighborhood or college campus, not the country as a whole, and Turam is far