View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Left History (E-Journal - York University)

son, *American Heathens,* 2012; Smith, *Freedom's Frontier*, 2013).

Despite several references to Franz Boas, Lawrie's written account lacks a coherent discussion of the decline of biologically-based notions of race and the rise of more cultural explanations for group difference. Vile movements such as eugenics can arise, of course, in one area of society precisely as their foundations are being eroded in other spheres, as Lawrie notes. But a brief look toward the Second World War and the long civil rights movement, instead of (or at least in addition to) Lawrie's mention of Black Lives Matter in the book's epilogue, might have helped readers trace some changes in thought and action across the twentieth century without suggesting any inevitable, easy, or irreversible arc toward racial egalitarianism.

In an epilogue, Lawrie's villain, the driving force behind these racist labour taxonomies, appears: it is "the many headed hydra that is American capitalism." He's on safe ground here, for history departments on average lean sharply to the left. And of course he is at least partly correct: that African American bodies have been worked, mocked, and violated by whites for profit and masochistic pleasure is beyond dispute. But Lawrie has surely uncovered lessons that might also make the left uncomfortable. Yesterdays' capital-p Progressives aren't today's lowercase ones, but similarities do exist: a sometimes heavy-handed desire to engineer a frictionless social world springs to mind.

That Lawrie's impressive exploration of the black worker in Progressive thought provokes such criticisms, questions, and musings is further evidence of its importance.

Brian Shott
Temple University

Joshua Clover, *Riot. Strike. Riot: The New Era of Uprisings* (London: Verso, 2016). Cloth $23.95.

It seems like there are lots of ways that the have-nots try to stand up for themselves and protect their interests, including seizing food, assembling in public squares, or destroying machinery. Every dramatic event is a story—tragic, heroic, emblematic, or idiosyncratic—as regular people try to make history, albeit in circumstances they did not create. These tales are unpacked, analyzed, and sometimes celebrated in narratives, songs, or poems:

In 1347, crowds seized ships ported in Bristol, appropriating and distributing the grain on board with no concern for profit—one of several food riots scattered across England that spring.

In 1819, 60,000 protesters assembled peacefully at St. Peter's Field in

Manchester to demand parliamentary reform. With swords drawn, cavalry passed through the crowd, wounding hundreds and killing fifteen. Shelley celebrated the courage of the protesters in a terrible poem intended for the working man, envisioning the deceased claiming a moral victory posthumously.

Mass demonstrations and occupations of public space swept across the world in 2011, erupting in confrontation with police and local authorities that varied in vigor and violence. In Oakland, California, the Occupy effort was accompanied by a mass march to the port, which disrupted commerce every bit as much as the effort in Bristol hundreds of years earlier.

These stories are appropriately the subject of histories that detail the organization of the activists, the political and economic contexts they faced, the varied responses of authorities, and the contingencies of outcomes. But do the stories cumulate to produce a deeper understanding of the developing politics of contention?

Poet and critic Joshua Clover presents an ambitious aim, to find and explain the patterns of contention in the street. He builds on twin foundations of Marxist theory, which explains contention in reference to the development of capitalism, and more contemporary social science, which counts and classifies events based on media accounts. Clover is committed both to finding patterns and recognizing contingency and human agency. Incorporating vastly different analytical approaches and ranging across centuries and continents in a brief and vigorous book, the line of argument is necessarily highly stylized, identifying more or less distinct historical periods which, Clover recognizes, bleed into one another.

Collective action before the development of industrial capitalism (and strong states), took the form of riots directed at immediate redress of grievances. Hungry people massed and took food, confronting those who would hoard, trade, and profit from commodifying it. In this way, what social scientists call the "repertoire of contention" was direct, local, limited, and, as Clover notes, focused on consumption. Influence and redress were direct—and limited.

Over long periods of time, the repertoire changed in response to changes in political economy. Industrial capitalism, by creating the proletariat and centralizing production, was vulnerable to collective action in a way that agricultural production was not. Representing people as labour rather than consumers, the strike came to supersede riots as the predominant form of struggle. In the factory, strikes addressed wages and working conditions with some successes. At the same time, states developed the capacity to intervene, protecting and constraining the interests of large capital. In the streets, however, Clover persuasively argues that the general strike was more of an anarchist fantasy than an effective political strategy.

Labour struggles and strikes dominated contentious politics, Clover claims, for about 150 years—although there is some unavoidable sloppiness in

marking periods, as different tactics and struggles persist for distinct constituencies. In the latter part of the twentieth century, however, the conditions of production and distribution changed, and the leverage that people had as workers diminished. Moreover, exploitation developed a clearly racial edge, and riots returned as a major form of contention.

The more contemporary riots, however, operate with a different dynamic than the granary seizures of centuries ago. From at least the 1960s onward, urban riots are provoked and targeted at the authorities people actually encounter: police. Collective action offers little respite from the grievances of day-to-day life for the economically and politically marginalized. Clover terms the new kind of struggle "riot prime." In this current period, the state is the proximate target of collective action, but analysis of the economy—much less effective engagement with it—is distant, effectively insulated from popular influence. The distance from effective influence encourages contemporary contenders to become unduly obsessed with the character of their efforts, rather than their impact. The Occupy encampments directed much of their energy to maintaining themselves, and to perfecting their hyper-democratic processes. General Assembly meetings committed to inclusion became interminable, as the mass was effectively unable to strategize or innovate. Challenges recede.

Clover's bold effort to update and expand Marx reflects extensive reading in more than a century of criticism and theoretical contention across several disciplines. Again, the breadth of his ambition makes for a highly stylized argument with brief appearances by a range of characters including Rosa Luxembourg, Georges Sorel, Alain Badiou, and Frantz Fanon. Readers familiar with the range of earlier debates will be engaged by Clover's scope and facility, but others may have to retreat to the library—or at least Wikipedia—to catch up with the contours of his argument.

It is, however, a very important argument. Clover puts political economy in the center of the analysis of contention, encouraging his readers to attend to the ways in which the global economy creates not only the grievances people face, but also the organizational assets, cognitive resources, and leverage points they can access. The effort simultaneously strips the romance from the global Occupy-ish movements of the past decade while underscoring their critical urgency.

David S. Meyer
University of California, Irvine