a substantially new contribution to the study of bureaucratic institutions and public policy.
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In *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*, Jennifer Earl and Katrina Kimport survey how online environments have influenced social movements in the twenty-first century, and they offer compelling arguments as to why “the Web can allow more than the simple augmentation of protest: innovative uses of the Web can transform protest” (p. 19).

To fortify this essential contention, the book works through various aspects of what they call a new “digital repertoire of contention.” They work through this development by way of “affordances” along two main tracks: *reduced costs* (dominating considerations in Chapters Four and Five) and *reduced need for co-present action* (taken up centrally in Chapters Six and Seven). Ultimately, Earl and Kimport posit that lowering transaction costs for protest action, and enhancing the ability to engage in collective action in the absence of physical togetherness provide key advantages for organizing and participation in social movement activities.

To reach these conclusions, the authors gathered data from websites in 2004 to examine affordances in four forms: petitions, letter writing campaigns, email campaigns, and boycotts. While noting that these actions and activities pre-date web activity (particularly noted in Chapter Three), Earl and Kimport “focus on these four tactical forms, or ‘e-tactical forms’...because they are new, dynamic, and interesting, offering compelling examples of how protest occurs online and how tactical forms with offline progenitors operate in the online arena” (p. 17). They place a central critical gaze on the dynamics of “e-tactics,” which are argued to take up a middle ground in a continuum of online activism (between “e-mobilizations” where virtual organizing facilitates offline protest action, and “e-movements” where all actions take place online).

Among strengths in this contribution is their bold and explicit methodological approach to what is undoubtedly a dynamic, decentralized, and distributed subject of study. While the data are unavoidably dated due to the rapidity of developments in these spaces (such as Twitter’s influence in sparking the 2011 “Arab Spring”), the authors do well to make explicit their data collection processes. These efforts—particularly in the appendix—add tremendous value to potential future research in sociology, environmental studies, politics, and cultural studies. While the scope of the book does not include considerations of Facebook, Google+, and Twitter because they arose after the data collection for this book, the methodological foundations here enable these inquiries to follow.

In addition, through this work Earl and Kimport push readers to consider contemporary organizing with greater nuance, as they challenge the connections often assumed between protest, contention, and social movements (especially in Chapter Seven). They write, “we question whether organizing even needs to be collective at all” and pose the question, “Can innovative uses of Internet-enabled technologies reduce the necessity of collective organizing altogether?” (p. 147). Such provocation in the book is largely productive, as it draws out questions regarding how “parties of one” or “lone-wolf organizers” can spark social change via digital technologies, in ways not before possible.

Yet, while the authors opened up spaces for these considerations, they failed to take them further analytically in two main ways. First, they limited inquiries to questions of
sufficient conditions, without fully evaluating potential degrees of successes and failures of digital activism. The authors flatly state, “this work is not able to assess success” (p. 95), but it was not clear why this was the case. They add, “centrally, we are studying people’s uses of the Web for protest, just as other scholars of protest focus on what people are doing” (p. 201). Yet an analysis of what these online actions achieve would have improved the value of the contributions made. Second, the authors stopped short of examining political, social, economic, or cultural effects of such organizing, particularly in terms of potential counter-movement strategizing. In the case of climate change (with which I am most familiar), contrarian “astroturf” organizations who have been found to have ties to carbon-based industry interests—such as “Americans for Prosperity”—have worked to harness the power of web-based organizing in order to create an appearance of grassroots resistance to climate legislation at the U.S. federal level. Moreover, when Earl and Kimport did consider effects, the spectrum of consideration here—from “supersizing” to “theory 2.0”—was all rather optimistic. In their appraisal, they stated, “the more the affordances are leveraged, the more transformative the changes are to organizing and participation processes...the less these affordances are leveraged,” the more superficial the changes (p.13). But costs were given short shrift. For example, how might these forms of organizing—sometimes deemed “arm-chair activism”—run the risk of displacing co-present commitments? How might instant gratification from online actions possibly diminish the perceived value of Rudi Dutschke-inspired “long marches”? Examples of low-accountability virtual organizing and actions, quickly fading from the public view, abound. Yet discussions of these pitfalls were limited to and labeled in Chapter Four as the “Skeptics Corner.” Earl and Kimport seemed to attempt to skirt costs by rhetorically asking, “whether there is some meaningful middle ground between skepticism and faithful optimism” (p. 95). But, all researchers are (or at least should be) skeptics.

Essentially, in this book, the authors interrogate claims that tools of digital technology enable a new era of social movement possibility. They assert that their work here informs ongoing and needed scholarship, as “uses of the Web may change what we know about protest” (p. 173). Overall, Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age does well to provide guidance for ongoing research to further explore the contours of social change in the time of burgeoning uses of new social media technologies around the world.
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Electronic mail and social media have opened up new frontiers for circulating information and ideas—including false-but-powerful information and ideas. These rumors are the subject of a humanities/social science collaboration taken up in The Global Grapevine. The book catalogs a variety of rumors, their morphology and diffusion, and why they matter.

Specifically, the book claims, “globalism” gives rise to a series of anxieties about international flows of people and money. These anxieties show up in the form of rumors that gain widespread distribution and belief. The book lists four kinds in particular: rumors about terrorism, immigration, international trade, and tourism. These four are obviously connected by their thematic role connecting global flows to implicit dangers; they also encourage those who receive and believe them to maintain and expand fear of outsiders.

A real strength of this book is its careful attention to specific rumors: early forms, ways they change as they make their way around the world, and how they are received. The first chapter, for example, traces rumors about the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. These include rumors about miraculous rescues and survival but also more sinister “truth-claims” about responsibility. For