

University of Groningen

**The Revolution That Wasn't: How Digital Activism Favors Conservatives. By Jen Schradie
Smit, Rik**

Published in:
American Journal of Sociology

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Smit, R. (2020). The Revolution That Wasn't: How Digital Activism Favors Conservatives. By Jen Schradie. *American Journal of Sociology*, 126(2), 504-506.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

encouraging and exciting to see a wave of Latina historians emerging, especially at this moment in the United States where anti-Latino sentiment is heightened. Books like Rosas's help to fill an enormous void in both the urban and historical literatures where historical communities of color are often described too simplistically, or by caricature rather than archival data. In addition to undergraduate and graduate courses on race, *South Central Is Home* would be a wonderful addition to any course on urban history, urban sociology, or Latino studies. The book would also be a great way to introduce undergraduates, especially students enrolled at Los Angeles-area institutions of higher education, to the fields of sociology and history. It is a rare example of a book in which undergraduate black and Latino students, particularly from Southern California, can see themselves and the older generations of their family in a historical text.

Overall, *South Central Is Home* is a very well written urban history that should be a starting point and guide for all future work on the history of South Central and should be mandatory reading for undergraduate and graduate students in both introductory and higher-level social science courses.

The Revolution That Wasn't: How Digital Activism Favors Conservatives. By Jen Schradie. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2019. Pp. xv+388. \$29.95.

Rik Smit
University of Groningen

In the final paragraph of her book, *The Revolution That Wasn't: How Digital Activism Favors Conservatives*, Jen Schradie writes, "The age of digital utopianism seems to be in its twilight. In the long night ahead, activists of all stripes will try to seize the internet's potential for their cause" (p. 279). In the second decade of the 21st century, she shows that it was conservatives who most effectively seized the digital tools at their fingertips. Like a peat fire burning undetected for a long time, right-wing individuals and groups were able to develop and formulate a clear ideology surrounding such concepts as Freedom and Truth while honing their digital media skills. This happened outside the gaze of popular pundits and academics alike. Partly explaining why experts missed what was smoldering on the web was that they focused on more liberal and charismatic social movements and protests around the world, ranging from the Arab Spring to Black Lives Matter. Thus, Schradie focuses her analysis of digital activism on a more sober, yet important, struggle: that for union rights in North Carolina. Her book, which focuses on both ends of the U.S. political spectrum, not only informs in detail on this topic and the work that goes into (digital) activism but also partly explains the largely unforeseen (by the same pundits) results of the 2016 U.S. elections.

Avoiding both utopian and dystopian talk about social media and their democratizing potential, Schradie argues that the efficacy of digital activism depends on the socioeconomic class, levels of organization, and ideological unity of activists. She demonstrates that a “digital activism gap” exists between those groups with high levels of digital literacy, material and human resources, and organizational structure and those without. This goes against the popular (scholarly) view that leaderless and spontaneous social movements consisting of networked individuals dominate the public sphere and institutional politics. Also interesting in this light are Schradie’s ideas about digital activism on the individual level. Those who participate actively in digital activism have *access* to digital technology and the *skills* to work it and feel *empowered* and have the *time* to do so, hence her acronym ASET. Those on the right side of the political spectrum have, individually, more ASET and, collectively, more resources and a better organizational structure than those on the left.

To come to these insights and conclusions, Schradie applies a blend of classic and innovative social science methods. The bulk of her data consists of interview material, field notes concerning the various meetings she attended, and social media posts, all gathered between 2011 and 2014. She also devised an instrument to measure what she calls a “digital activism score.” This score is calculated by adding a group’s digital development score (Did the group build a website? Did it make a Facebook page or Twitter profile?), architecture score (Did the group design its sites for participation?), and participation score (Do people engage with the group’s sites). This methodological tool is a creative addition, which can be applied to other case studies as well. Reflection, validation, and justification of these methods are all bundled in a neat methodological appendix at the end of the book, which makes the development of the general argument and “story line” of the book highly readable. The research design of Schradie’s study is done in a way to counter dominant research into social movements: “Analyses of digital activism often use hashtags and other online data as prime data sources, which has brought efficiency to research but has limited our understanding of what happens offline, particularly the role that organizations might play” (p. 246). Schradie, therefore, aims to avoid the numerous traps such research can fall into, ranging from technological determinism to biased data sets.

The book’s preface and introduction might spark some agitated scribbling in the margins from those readers raised on a steady diet of Manuel Castells and Lance Bennett. Schradie’s arguments start to convince in the book’s vivid and nuanced empirical parts, which are laced with theoretical observations. Nevertheless, a question Schradie leaves unanswered in her, at times polemic, critique of the existing research on the intersections of social media and social movements is what we *can* take (seriously) from it. At times, her book reads as if it throws the baby out with the bathwater, and she defines some key terms but skips over others. What, for example, counts as digital activism and is it the same as social media activism (another widely

used term in the field)? What counts as conservatism? What makes a movement a movement and when does something become activism? In her focus on the North Carolinian and U.S. political and media landscape, how generalizable are her findings? What is lost and not covered in her focus on human practices and agency, instead of the internal mechanics and politics of platforms? Some of these questions can be picked up by future research. However, these are important, because they concern the wider applicability of Schradie's methodological and theoretical approach.

Conservatives know how to use the Internet to digitally evangelize their Truth, whereas left-wing groups "gather everyone's opinion, constantly negotiating with the various members as to what [is] acceptable to project and publish" (p. 221). In Schradie's terminology, left-wing groups are compromising, whereas conservatives are "informationalizing," virally spreading information that confirms existing beliefs. Contrary to the right-wing groups she studied, groups on the left "could not—and would not—keep up online: their ideas, strategies, and institutions were not as united as those on the right" (p. 214). Freedom, conservatives' rallying flag, is not as freely floating a signifier as Fairness is for left-leaning activists. It is this entanglement of ideological stance and social media logic that drives conservative success in online (and off-line) spheres, "regardless of the historical moment" (p. 207). Conservatives "tend to have more classed resources and power, more organizational infrastructure by the nature of their philosophies against horizontalism, and their freedom-oriented ideology fits into the digital activism project. On top of that, in capitalist societies, their efforts align well with the corporate owners of online social media platforms" (p. 207). As Schradie demonstrates, having a clear message and united and uniting ideological stance is essential for digital activism to be effective in the short, and, more importantly, long run. In social media language, #freedom is more effective than #fairness in terms of political mobilization and cohesion.

Religious Parenting: Transmitting Faith and Values in Contemporary America. By Christian Smith, Bridget Ritz, and Michael Rotolo. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2020. Pp. vii+299. \$35.00.

Torkel Brekke
Oslo Metropolitan University

The aims of this book are, first, to understand how religious parents in the United States approach and reflect on the transmission of religion to their children and, second, to use new insights into religious parenting to better understand culture. To explore the first question about religious parenting the authors have collected data in the form of interviews with 215 religious and 20 nonreligious parents from a number of different religious congregations across the United States. In an appendix the authors give helpful insight into their sampling strategies and other methodological choices (pp. 279–96).