not openness to alternative lifestyles, predicts their success. But again, this finding seems to derive from a partial treatment of the original theory: Florida's "three T's" model does highlight tolerance via his "gay" and "bohemian" indices, but also recognizes the role of talent via educational attainment.

Seeking to offer a small-city alternative to these large-city theories, Norman develops the notion of "glocal" places to make sense of successful small cities. He contends that the driving force behind glocal places is geography, "but not in the way that some scholars have posited. Glocal places are father away from larger metro areas, and this may have helped them become the most important and desirable place in their local region" (p. 133). That is, small cities thrive when they operate outside the shadow of a metropolis and can cultivate dominance on a regional scale. But this idea is precisely how many scholars, from Walter Christaller to Otis Duncan, have argued cities find success. Norman's glocal place concept may help us understand small cities in the contemporary United States, but whether it pushes our understanding beyond the central-place theory of the 1930s or Otis Dudley Duncan and colleagues' *Metropolis and Region* from 1960 (Johns Hopkins Press) is less clear.

Ultimately, Norman's *Small Cities USA* takes an important step toward reminding urban scholars of the importance of smaller cities. It is a welcome alternative to the deluge of global cities research and offers a clear and concise point of entry for those wanting to explore this neglected side of urban studies. Pedagogically, alongside the extensive demographic and economic data presented on these places, Norman takes the time to provide straightforward explanations of the methods he employs—for example, the 90:10 inequality index, location quotients, and fixed-effects regression—that will be invaluable to students. And theoretically, the book presents an opportunity to reconsider some old (e.g., central place) and new (e.g., global cities) theories in a new light.

Strangers at the Gates: Movements and States in Contentious Politics. By Sidney G. Tarrow. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xii+260. $26.99 (paper).

Brayden King
Northwestern University

The analysis of social movements has cohered as few research areas in sociology have. Scholars in the subfield share a high level of consensus about key problems and concepts. Sidney Tarrow's career has spanned the development of this field from the 1970s until now. Tarrow helped to articulate the political process model—a perspective that emphasized how so-

cial movements draw upon resources and repertoires of collective action in response to shifting political opportunities. Over time, Tarrow and other leading scholars, partly due to critiques made about the overly structural angle of the political process model, began to drill down analytically to explore the micro mechanisms that accounted for these structural patterns of contentious politics. At the same time, Tarrow became more interested in movements that transcended national boundaries and that had global designs.

Strangers at the Gate is an account of both Tarrow's intellectual journey and of the shifts in the conceptual terrain of social movement theory. Each chapter covers a different empirical study from Tarrow's past research and can be treated as a stand-alone paper. *Strangers* tracks two of the most important themes of Tarrow's work. The first theme is that movements and the modern state are causally and historically connected. Even if the movement in question is not engaged in conventional politics, social movements intersect with state institutions in critical ways. One of the most obvious ways in which the state shapes contentious politics is in providing political opportunities for mobilization. As is typical of Tarrow's work, his analysis of movement-state interaction focuses on the historical contingencies and processes that lead to dramatic changes and waves of mobilization.

Tarrow's second theme—the importance of mechanisms to explaining dynamic processes of mobilization—has been developed in his most recent work. Tarrow, along with fellow travelers Charles Tilly and Doug McAdam, began articulating a mechanisms-oriented approach to understanding social movements. This view rejected the idea that large macrohistorical changes in political structure alone account for movement mobilization and instead focused our attention on the mechanisms that occur during ongoing interactions between various actors engaged in contentious activities. The shift to a mechanisms-based approach was seen by many movement scholars as a radical and controversial change when Tarrow and his colleagues first began promoting the idea (and seems to directly refute much of Tarrow's earlier analyses). You can read this book as an explanation of the thought process that led him and other scholars to adopt this approach. Throughout the book Tarrow tries to link the structural view with the microanalysis of mechanisms, demonstrating how we can better understand the links between state structure, conventional politics, and movements by engaging more deeply with a mechanisms-based approach.

Tarrow divides the book into five parts. In the first two sections he revisits some of his earlier political process studies to show how contentious politics evolve in tandem with state building. He begins from a top-down view, examining how particular state structures facilitated the French Revolution or shaped the types of movements that arose in the early United

States and then pokes holes in these overly deterministic structural accounts to illustrate why a dynamic, mechanisms-based approach provides a richer understanding of the mobilization process. For example, in his chapter about the French Revolution, he extends Tilly's earlier analysis by arguing that revolutions, like other forms of contentious politics, occur after elites prove incapable of suppressing or unwilling to suppress a challenging coalition, and that this may set off rapid countermobilization and diffusion of conflict. In turn, this coalition building among challengers creates a new sociopolitical infrastructure that becomes the basis for new state-building efforts. Tarrow reiterates in other chapters that the boundaries between contentious and conventional politics often blur and feed into one another.

In the third section of the book Tarrow promotes the value of doing "eventful" analysis of social movements. Focusing on particular events of contentiousness allows the scholar to more carefully identify the processes and mechanisms that made those moments possible and led history down a certain path. In the fourth section Tarrow turns to the outcomes of movements. In addition to the policy outcomes of movements, Tarrow raises the possibility that contentious politics also shape language and culture through the diffusion of different movement tactics (e.g., consider how the term "boycott" has shaped our understanding of consumer behavior).

The fifth section of the book deals with transnational movements. Tarrow might have saved this section for last because, at least on their surface, these movements are the least connected to the state. Some have even claimed that the emergence of transnational movements indicates a shift to a stateless society. Tarrow, however, argues that like other movements, transnational movements are best understood as manifestations of local interactions and grievances. Although the targets of transnational activists are often external to their local communities, many of them still use community resources, organize at a local level, and frame their grievances around domestic concerns. Similar mechanisms underlie both state-oriented contentious politics and transnational activism.

Due to the retrospective nature of the book, readers familiar with Tarrow's work will not find much new here. *Strangers* is clearly a continuation of his *Dynamics of Contention* collaboration with Charles Tilly and Doug McAdam (Cambridge University Press, 2001). Skeptics of the mechanisms-based approach will still find much to quibble with in the chapters in which Tarrow disaggregates historical events of contentiousness into their constituting elements and mechanisms. When used in this way, it is not clear if the purpose of analyzing mechanisms is to advance theory or if it to merely deconstruct and reinterpret historical events in a more sociologically descriptive language. The greatest value of the book is to see the connections that Tarrow makes between the various stages of his theoretical progression, helping the reader see how the mechanisms-based approach

may actually complement, rather than contradict, a structural account of movements. For a subfield that values theoretical coherence as much as social movement theory does, this is an important sense-making exercise.

Union Voices: Tactics and Tensions in U.K. Organizing. By Melanie Simms, Jane Holgate, and Edmund Heery. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2013. Pp. x+189. $69.95 (cloth); $22.95 (paper).

Gregor Gall
University of Bradford

What can unions in the United States learn from the experiences of unions in Britain, given their differing industrial and political union traditions, as well as significant variation in the institutional setups unions have to operate within? Do common threads exist over and above any differences and that put unions in a subordinate position? Or have a series of factors like Britain's movement toward the liberal-market type of capitalism pioneered by the United States and the influence of the organizing approach of the Service Employees' International Union (SEIU) on the biggest union in Britain (namely, Unite) meant that the "distance" across the "big pond" is lessening?

This perspective would presumably be the most obvious that readers of this journal would bring to a study of attempts by unions in Britain to renew and revitalize themselves through the application of the approach and tactics of "union organizing." By any definition, union organizing (U.O.) is quintessentially about the members becoming more involved in the agenda setting of their workplace union and pursuit of that agenda by various collective means. Such organizing should, thus, be about more than membership recruitment or even retention because it is concerned with increasing union effectiveness and union democracy.

Union Voices, the result of a 13-year research project undertaken by Melanie Simms, Jane Holgate, and Edmund Heery, seeks to evaluate how unions have fared in interpreting and implementing U.O. The undertaking found considerable weaknesses in the intention, process, and outcomes of U.O.—meaning that its promise was not realized. Indeed, *Union Voices* does demonstrate that unions prioritized recruitment above other goals, that the goal of almost self-sustaining workplace unionism was seldom achieved, and that various tensions existed, inter alia, between "generalist" union officers and specialist "organizing" officers and between the latter and more senior union officers.

The training for the union organizers was based upon practical skills outside of a motivational framework-cum-worldview of something like social democracy. The questions should then become whether this was a