

there simply have not been the kinds of conflicts that bring forth the tensions between legal and political mechanisms of integration. As the chapter nicely illustrates, religious freedom and First Amendment rights are constantly renegotiated in legal decisions and the legal accommodation of Islam largely extends from these decisions. However, the Canadian case could have benefitted from a stronger analysis and review of the existing literature of the Ontario Sharia law debate and the Bouchard-Taylor report that the book focuses on. The authors do not fully capture the varied landscape Canadian Muslim engagement with legal and political questions—for example, taking the virulently anti-Islam Tarek Fatah and his small but vocal organization, the Muslim Canadian Congress, as the voice of liberal Muslims in Canada. Similarly, the religious accommodation debate in Quebec needs to be read in light of the larger issue of Quebec's minority nationhood. The conclusion turns to different questions than those raised in the introduction and furthers arguments regarding the limits of multiculturalism in liberal democracies.

While their book is a tremendous achievement in the depth with which they analyze relevant legal mechanisms and processes (particularly in the French and German cases), the book's overall argument that the four countries they focus on have largely succeeded in accommodating Islam also falls short in some important ways. In particular, the authors' decision to focus solely on legal and formal political negotiations and not on how these are perceived by those who practice Islam means that they pay only limited attention to the influence that these legal and political processes have on Muslims' own sense of belonging as well as their actual practices of participation. To be fair, the authors acknowledge this focus in their work. Nonetheless, by ignoring the ways in which legal accommodations affect the communities being accommodated, Joppke and Torpey limit the reach of their argument because they lose sight of an important element of integration: the perception of inclusion and exclusion communicated through legal and formal political decisions.

*Putting Social Movements in Their Place: Explaining Opposition to Energy Projects in the United States, 2000–2005.* By Doug McAdam and Hilary Schaffer Boudet. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii+266. \$28.99.

Elizabeth Long  
*Rice University*

A collaboration between Doug McAdam, a founding father of the contemporary field of social movements, and Hilary Boudet, an enterprising

junior scholar, promises to result in an interesting project. Such is indeed the case for *Putting Social Movements in Their Place*.

The authors examine 20 cases of communities at risk for proposed energy facility sitings. All of the projects posed potential environmental and safety issues for the surrounding communities, and in every case all were on the brink of approval and eventual construction. The 20 cases provide a large enough base number effectively to use Charles Ragin's fuzzy sets (fs/QCA) method to address several research questions through qualitative comparative analysis.

The authors also examined the U.S. census and the American Community Survey and conducted online research, interviews, and brief field visits. The variables they develop (such as community wealth, civic capacity, presence of similar industry, and previous oppositional experience) give them both a structural and a dynamic picture of the communities under consideration.

Several research questions animate the study. How many of the communities witness mobilization in opposition to these energy projects—and at what level? What factors explain the presence and level of opposition? What (if any) influence does the level of opposition have on both the final approval of each project and whether it was actually built? Under what conditions does opposition to liquid natural gas (LNG) facilities become regional in nature? The authors refer to this research perspective as a “Copernican revolution” in the study of social movements because it breaks with the “movement-centric” model of conceptualizing and examining social movements and instead begins with communities who might or might not mobilize in the face of threat.

Taking this perspective yields some extremely interesting findings. For example, it shows how uncommon it is for communities to reach even quite a low level of mobilization. Of the 20 cases they studied, only 10 showed a quite minimal level of mobilization, and only one “true” social movement emerged. In regard to level of opposition, factors such as community wealth and civic capacity are significant predictors of mobilization, but even lacking these conditions, prior oppositional experience can help launch community opposition to problematic energy projects.

Explaining why the field has tended to give short shrift to questions about how social movements contribute to social change, the book makes another significant contribution by using the case studies under analysis to carefully address the question of outcomes empirically. The authors show that the absence of local opposition to energy projects was “generally enough to ensure project approval.” (p. 108) Even though the relatively low levels of opposition they found did not always block project approval, local opposition if combined with outside forces appears to be a powerful “recipe” for project rejection.

The authors also comment astutely on the process by which social movements develop from a Not in My Back Yard (NIMBY) orientation to what one might call a NIABY (Not in Anyone's Backyard) outlook. They isolate factors that are critically important to achieving this "scale shift": frame expansion or frame bridging, brokerage by movement actors to link unconnected sites, relational diffusion of tactical, strategic, or framing innovations, and certification, or the legitimation of the movement by external authorities.

All in all, *Putting Social Movements in their Place* makes significant contributions to the field. Eschewing the internal study of one movement for a more community-based and holistic appraisal of where and why movements begin is a fruitful move. Beginning not with rights-based national movements but with local contention allows the authors to produce a nuanced discussion of not simply movement mobilization, but also of movement success and of transitions that can take movements to a regional level. The role of national environmental organizations and other "brokers" who are well placed (sometimes within governmental bureaucracies) to encourage local groups to cooperate in building regional organizations becomes clear. This book is valuable and often compelling and should generate other important research.

There are, of course, some issues that merit mention. First, because proposed LNG facilities so outweigh the other energy projects both in the case studies and also in the discussion of how movements become regional, a singular focus on LNG might have made the book more powerful. Also, a thorough "Copernican" investigation of contention focused on LNG could then be compared with contention around other alternative energy or unconventional carbon-based energy infrastructures.

Second, the boundaries the authors draw between who are inside actors and who are outside influences may not always be analytically helpful. The energy corporations appear as actors within the frame of local contention, yet in certain regards they are as much outsiders as are the national environmental organizations who sometimes intervene. Celebrities may be local citizens, but are also people who draw regional, national, or even international attention to issues, so in some senses figure as both insiders and outsiders. Further, the web of relationships linking 21st-century governmental bodies, corporations, and NGOs is extremely complex and impinges on community-level contentious politics. The authors' mixed methods of data gathering, which often generate extensive knowledge of the cases under discussion, sometimes result in very sophisticated appraisals of this kind of interaction, but I often wished for more.

Third, I think that outcomes are often broader than the book's analytic frame. Social movements not only have specific local outcomes and affect change in broader politics but also change the sociocultural landscape in

ways that go beyond politics or policy changes. These cultural outcomes are harder to measure than are those in the formal political sphere, but may be equally important.

And finally, one of the strengths of the book is also somewhat narratively problematic—the frequent reviews of the literature. These discussions are especially helpful for nonexperts. But at times they are oddly haunted by the presence of the senior author, Doug McAdam, who is sometimes indicated as responsible for early and important insights that have been lost, or as the author of disciplinary tendencies that this book calls into question. For example, McAdam is rightly cited on page 64 as having proposed the “political process model” of mobilization. Then the authors say that the key subjective/cultural dimension of this model (“cognitive liberation”) was largely forgotten, leaving a truncated model of change. But if McAdam was responsible for the political process model, he was also an active player in the field when “cognitive liberation” was written out of most analyses, and he might have been in a position to keep that analytic dimension alive in social movement scholarship through his writing.

*Putting Social Movements in Their Place*, with its fine-grained empirical analyses and thoughtful conceptual work, makes several important interventions to the field and promises to inform subsequent research in very productive ways.

*The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics.* By W. Lance Bennett and Alexandra Segerberg. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+240. \$29.99 (paper).

Brayden G King  
*Northwestern University*

One of the most significant changes to social movements is activists' use of digital technology and media—from mobile phone texting to Facebook and Twitter. The Arab Spring and the Occupy movement brought these technologies' transformative potential to the public eye. Observers praised activists who relied on digital media to coordinate collective action, to resist authority, and to broadcast their claims to a global audience. Despite the important functions such media have played in movements, sociologists who study social movements have been slow to address their role in activism. W. Lance Bennett and Alexandra Segerberg's *The Logic of Connective Action* is a welcome introduction to the topic and should, I hope, convince more sociologists that our theories of movements should consider social media as a distinctive resource, one that transforms the way people engage in activism rather than simply augmenting traditional communications.