Re-Conceptualizing “Social Movements?”

“Revolt is first of all the acknowledgement of an impossible situation.” –Albert Memmi

Rudolf Heberle, in his classic statement on social movements in the *American Sociological Review*, defines a social movement as an organization that “aims to bring about fundamental changes in the social order, especially in the basic institutions of property and labor relationships” (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 14 (1949): 346-357).

(What is limiting about this definition?)
Doug McAdam and David A. Snow, in *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics* (Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997: XVIII), argue that any definition of “social movements” should contain five (5) elements:

1. Collective Action
2. An Orientation Toward Change
3. A Degree of Organization
4. A Degree of Temporal Continuity
5. Non-Institutional Action (i.e., Protesting in the streets) and/or Institutional Action (Voting, Lobbying, etc.)
Collective action implies that social movements are *social* in nature. Social movements require *collective unity* and *social solidarity* among people who share a common grievance. A movement may be initiated by a single individual, but it **must** garner support if it hopes to become a successful *social* movement.
The pursuit of social change - either preventing it or promoting it - is the *sine qua non* of all social movements. Some social movements seek to stop (or reverse) social change (Pro-Life Movement), some seek to promote social change (Marriage Equality Movement), and some simply want to maintain the status quo (Moral Majority Movement).
All social movements must have some level of organization. Organization is required in both the movement’s bureaucratic structure (i.e., leaders, organizational configuration, etc.) and its action orientation (i.e., methods and rules of protest, fundraising enterprise, media strategy, etc.).
Social movements have to “stick around” for some time if they hope to be successful. Indeed, the most successful movements of the 20th Century were “long-movements:” Civil Rights (beginning with Reconstruction in the 1880s), Women Rights (beginning with the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention in New York, 1920s Suffrage, and 1960s 2nd Wave Feminism), and Gay Rights (Mattachine Society in the 1940s).
Social movements use a combination of non-institutional forms such as street protests and marches, letter writing campaigns, and civil disobedience (sit-ins, smoke-ins, kiss-ins, etc.) as well as institutional forms (lobbying, voting, creation of political interest groups, etc.). kiss-ins:  
http://www.salon.com/2013/01/25/russia_poised_to_pass_sweeping_anti_gay_law/
Carrie Amelia Nation [a.k.a. “Carry A. Nation” 1846-1911] (Prohibition/W.C.T.U Movement activist from Kiowa, Kansas who used a rather unique form of institutionalized vandalism (“Hatchetations”)...
The Constituents of Social Movements: Four Stakeholders
Key American Social Movements

American Indian Movement (AIM)
Animal Rights Movement (PETA)
Anti-Abortion Movement
Anti-Apartheid Movement
Anti-Busing Movement
Anti-Drinking and Driving Movement (MADD)
Anti-Globalization Movement
Anti-Gun Control Movement (N.R.A)
Anti-Nuclear Weapon Movement
Anti-Pornography Movement
Anti-War Movement
Anti-Smoking Movement
Anti-Tax Movement / Tea Party Movement
Black Power Movement
Buy Nothing Day Movement (Anti-Overconsumption Movement)
Civil Rights Movements
Disability Rights Movement
Equal Rights Amendment Movement
Equal Marriage Rights Movement (Gay Marriage Rights)
Environmental Movement (i.e., Green Peace, Global Warming Movement)
Farmer Workers Movement
Feminist Movement
Free Speech Movement
Gay Rights Movement
Gun Control Movement
Gun Rights Movement (a la N.R.A.)
Healthcare For All Movement (Universal Healthcare Movement)
Homeless Rights Movements
Housing Rights Movements (Affordable Housing Movement)
Human Rights Movement
Immigrant Rights Movement (Immigration Rights)
Jubilee Movement
Labor Rights Movement / Anti-Labor Union Movement
Marijuana / Drugs Legalization Movement
Mythopoetic Men’s Movement
New Right Movement
Prisoner Rights Movement
Pro-Choice (Abortion Rights) Movement
Sex Workers Rights Movement (C.O.Y.O.T.E)
Public Education Reform Movement
Women’s Health Movement (“Our Bodies, Ourselves”)
Religious Movements (Promise Keepers, Moral Majority)
Slow Food Movement
Suffrage Movement
Slut Walk Movement (Anti-Rape Movement)
Temperance Movement
Utopian Movement (Communal Living Movement)
Vegan/Vegetarian Movement (i.e., PETA, Environmental Movement, etc.)
Welfare Rights Movement
White Power Movement
Zero Population Growth Movement
Natural History of Social Movements
(Armand Mauss’ Ideal Type Description)

(a) **Incipience Stage:** The *general* or initial stage where a threat/problem is recognized by the general public.

(b) **Coalescence Stage:** The *formation* of ad hoc committees and formal/informal organizations that have strong sympathies for the problem/condition. Some examples include ACT-UP, NARAL (National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League), NRA, NOW, TEA-Party, etc.

(c) **Institutionalization:** Official recognition of the social problem/condition by power elites (politicians, corporate leaders, military officials, etc.). After recognizing the problem, the power elites then take steps to address the crises or respond to the agitations of SMOs. Media recognition of the problem is a partial index of institutionalization.

(d) **Fragmentation:** All successful movements eventual fragment into various factions and smaller SMOs. These splinter groups might go on to address other related issues that are natural outgrowths of the movement’s master frame. For instance, the Free Speech Movement of the early 1960s eventually splinted into various student-led organizations like Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other counter-cultural and anti-war organizations.

(e) **Demise:** Normally conceptualized as “success,” the demise stage occurs when the movement’s goals have been adopted or co-opted by the power-elites (new laws enacted or new rights and privileges secured). The “success” of the environmental movement in the establishment of the E.P.A on December 3, 1970 ironically meant the *decline* of the green movement’s influence. (“Why do we need a ‘movement’ to protect the environment when we have the EPA?”)
Strategic Co-optation: UAW President’s election to the Chrysler Board on May 13, 1980 was a sagacious method that Lee Iacocca used to win concessions from unionized auto workers. Another common strategy is naming a leading environmentalist to head the E.P.A., which in turns, weakens the voice of the environmental movement.

Protest Absorption: Enact the aims of the movement into law without substantive reform efforts (i.e., Johnson enacting Civil and Voting Rights Legislations in 1964 and 1965, but failing to enact the programmatic arm of these reforms in his proposed Great Society Program which would have guaranteed universal healthcare, public education reform, and living-wage legislation.

Discredit the Leadership: Find a flaw with the SMO’s leadership and commit character assassination in the media (through rumor and innuendo). [The FBI tried to discredit Dr. Martin Luther King’s leadership over the SCLA and his perceived “moral stature” by leaking his alleged affairs with women to the media.]

Repression/Suppression: The use of various state apparatuses of repression (arrests and imprisonment of protesters, police beatings, mob lynching, deportation, killings/assassinations, etc. [The Marxist leaders of the Black Panther Party were systematically arrested, imprisoned, and/or KILLED after the J. Edgar Hoover, then FBI director, called the group “the greatest threat to the internal security of the country.” The FBI instigated a “gang war” between BPP and US Organization that resulted in the deaths of several members. Moreover, many Panthers died violent deaths in various encounters with police officers.]
Reform Movements: Seek limited changes to the social system. [Instrumental]

Revolutionary Movements: Seek to change the entire social structure/system. [Instrumental]

Alternative/New Age Movements: Communal Movements that seek social change by transforming the individual values/lifestyle of its members in sheltered communities. [Expressive]

Conservative/New Right Movements: Seek to maintain traditional values and protect society from changes that are seen as dangerous or immoral. [Instrumental]

Resistance/Reactionary Movements: Seek to return society to an earlier period that is viewed as more desirable, or movements that attempt to resist progressive social changes in society. [Instrumental]

Expressive Movements: Seek to enhance the self-perceptions of its members, focusing on issues of identity-pride, group esteem, and re-claiming a stigmatizing labeling. [Expressive / Emotional]

Cultural Revival Movements: Seek to revive and protect cultural traditions that are in decline, cultural traditions that are key to the group’s identity. [Expressive]

Redemptive / Religious Revival Movements: seek personal and social transformation through religious revivals/social crusades. [Expressive]
Sociological Theories on Social Movements have attempted answers to several key “why” and “how” questions on social movements:

1. Why do people turn to collective social action (in the form of social movements) to address their grievances rather than “going it alone”?
2. Why are some individuals more likely than others to join social movements and participate in public protests?
3. How do individuals come to believe that social movement activity is the only way to achieve the change they desire?
4. How is it that some societies come to have more social movement organizations and social protests than other societies?
5. How do social movement participants come to decide on the particular type of protest tactics to address their complaints? How do they deal with the problem of violence?
6. How do movements select their ideological frames, and how do they propagate their values to non-social movement actors?
7. How do social movement organizations address the challenge of counter-movements and counter-frames that are in direct opposition to their goals?
8. Why do some social movements fail to achieve their objectives? (How do social movements define “success”?)
9. How do social movements maintain long-term interest in protesting for social change over the (long) passage of time? How do they contend with the “free-rider” problem?
10. How do social movements deal with the media? How do they “get their message out” amidst the noise from multiple media sources (television, radio, internet, worldwide web, print, etc.)?
11. How do social movements attend to the issue of emotions in public protests among activists?
12. How do social movements create, sustain, and manipulate aspects of culture (art, music, poetry, narrative, photography, etc) to draw and maintain support from the general public?
Conflict theory envisions social conflict as the catalyst of all social change and “progress.” The progenitor of this perspective is Karl Marx (1818-1883). Marx was concerned about the problem of entrenched poverty among the working class, the so-called proletariat, and the increasing power and influence of the Bourgeoisie, the class that owned the “means of production” (factories, banks, etc.) and who controlled the “means of mental production” (printing presses, media, universities, etc.). Marx saw the origins of conflict as rooted in the social structure of capitalism and its advocacy of “private ownership of property.”
“Class Conflict: ” The Four Great Social Classes

- **Bourgeoisie**: Owners of the means of production & the means of mental production.
- **Petite Bourgeoisie**: Class of middle managers, bourgeois intelligentsia, & entrepreneurial capitalists.
- **Proletariat**: Laborers, Industrial workers, or people who sell their bodies/labors to the bourgeoisie/petite bourgeoisie.
- **Lumpenproletariat**: The marginal dregs of society who were typically homeless and deviants: the unwanted class: The Lumpenproletariat is “a recruiting ground for thieves and criminals of all kinds, living on the crumbs of society, people without a define trade, vagabonds, people without heart or a home.”

The Class Struggle in France (1850), pg. 155
Marx’s “Conflict Equation”

**Power Differentials** (Private Ownership of Property)

**Domination** (Proletariats Suffer Low Wages, Alienation, etc.)

**Resistance** (Proletariat Social Movements)

**Conflict** (w/Bourgeoisie)

**Social Change** (Socialism or the “Dictatorship of the Proletariats”)
Class conflict, according to Marx, was inevitable because of the greed and self-interest of the industrial class or capitalists (bourgeoisie). Self-interest among capitalists would eventually lead to the downfall of capitalism. What facilitates the downfall of capitalism is the “new” awareness (class-consciousness) among the working classes (proletariats & lumpen-proletariats) that the ultimate result of industrial production under capitalism was alienation and estrangement. Until then, the working classes were characterized by a situation of false consciousness.
Why did the proletarians get involved in social movements according to Karl Marx/Frederich?

Karl Marx & Frederich believed that the ruling class under capitalism (Bourgeoisie) had undue influence over the affairs of the state: They controlled the state:

“The more it becomes the organ of a particular class, the more it directly enforces the supremacy of that class. The fight of the oppressed class against the ruling class becomes necessarily a political fight, a fight first of all against the political dominance of this class.”  
—F. Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of the Classical German Philosophy.
“Class consciousness,” for Karl Marx, is the possibility that the lumpen-proletariats and the proletariats will come to a (re)cognition of their miserable social condition and class interests; namely, the realization that capitalism (and private ownership of property) was/is creating the conditions for their exploitation –a **Klasse-fur-sich (class-for-itself)**. But workers existed in a state of **“False Consciousness” (Klasse-an-sich or class-in-itself)** by understanding **neither** the value of their own labor or how they were being exploited.
“In the factory we have a lifeless mechanism independent of the workmen, who becomes its mere living appendage. The miserable routine of endless drudgery and toil in which that same mechanical process is gone through over and over again, is like the labor of Sisyphus. The burden of labor, like the rock, keeps ever falling back on the worn-out laborer.” –Karl Marx (Marx/Engels Reader pg. 409)
“A forcing-up of wages (disregarding all other difficulties, including the fact that it would only be by force, too, that the higher wages, being an anomaly, could be maintained) would therefore be nothing but better payment for the slave, and would not conquer either for the worker or for labor their human status and dignity... Wages are a direct consequence of estrange labor, and estranged labor is the direct cause of private property. The downfall of the one aspect must therefore mean the downfall of the other.” –Karl Marx (Marx/Engels Reader, pg. 80)
Karl Marx ultimately sees economic inequalities based largely on the private ownership of property as the preeminent source of social conflict. Social Movement Theorists (SMTs) who take a conflict theory perspective tend to focus on the class structure of capitalism and how it generates economic and social strains (low wages, poverty, poor health, failing schools, etc.) for some groups, namely the working classes, while producing extraordinary benefits for the petite bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie. The strains produced by the unequal distribution of wealth, both locally and globally, is the very catalyst that produce labor movements and encourage the growth of unionization and political activity among proletariats.
Writing in the book *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (1998: 11), Sidney Tarrow levies a most sagacious critique of Marxist approaches to the formation of social movements:

“Marx and Engels seriously underrated the resources needed to engage it [proletarian revolution], its cultural dimensions, and the importance of politics.”
Another critic of the Marxist paradigm on social movements, Roberta Garner (1996: Contemporary Movements and Ideologies, pg. 46), notes the following:

“Marxist theories sometimes do not give enough attention to the way capitalism brings about movements that are not class conscious—movements like religious fundamentalism or nationalism.”
A major limitation or “scope condition” with Marxist theories on social change is that they tend to focus rather narrowly on the problem of economic inequalities as the sole (or paramount) cause of social movement activity in late-modernity. Moreover, the tendency to reduce all social conflicts to an economic motive belittles the struggles for racial equality (Civil Rights), for gender equality (Women’s Movement), disability rights, gay/lesbian rights, and environmental activism. These aforementioned struggles were not primarily –or even mostly- about economic issues, but rather “life space” and human dignity interests.
Emile Durkheim’s project was to understand the forces that held society together in stasis. In this case, the biological metaphor, using the living body, was a most apt simile: a pathology in any one of the organ systems would lead to pathology (sickness) in the entire body since the body cannot live without the heart, lungs, kidneys, etc. Similarly, for society to experience homeostasis or order, all of its subparts must be healthy or functional –all of its parts must be perfectly integrated. Social Movements, then, are a symptom of social disintegration and/or anomic disruption (the condition of normative breakdown). The immediate response to a breakdown and sudden transformation in tradition and traditional social norms is the emergence of social movements. Social disconnection, social isolation, and social loneliness lead people to form and to join social movements. The most reliable sign of societal anomie is increasing increases in social deviance, crime, suicide, and social movements. Societies that lose their moral compass will experience social pathologies and social movements-at troubling rates. Anomic disruptions are the cause of not only crime, suicide, and family & community disintegrations—but also social movements.
Extremes of Social Integration and Social Regulation: Durkheim’s Integration Theory
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Significant Anomic Disruptions

1. Shift from an agrarian society to an industrial one: The Industrial Revolution (1750).
2. The shift from an Industrial Society to a Post-Industrial one: The Cybernetic Revolution (1960- Present).
“[Man] is governed not by a material environment brutally imposed on him, but by a conscience superior to his own, the superiority of which he feels. Because the greater, better part of his existence transcends the body, he escapes the body’s yoke, but is subject to that of society. But when society is disturbed by some painful crisis or by beneficent but abrupt transitions, it is momentarily incapable of exercising this influence; thence come the sudden rise in the curve of suicides which we have pointed out above.” (Suicide, pg. 252)
According to William Kornhauser’s Mass Society theory, the antecedent to all social movements in mass society is widespread social isolation and disconnection: excessive (egoistic) individualism. The starting point for this theory is the concept of “mass society” – a state or condition that produces rife disengagement and isolation among individuals in late-modernity. These individuals then use social movements as a proxy for [their “need” for] social connection or integration. Longing for a deeper sense of connection to abate the increasing alienation of late-modernity and modern cities, isolated people are drawn to social movements where they find a sense of belonging and an alternative community to their disconnected ones.
“Mass society is a situation in which an aggregate of individuals are related to one another only by way of their relation to a common authority, especially the state... A population in this condition is not insulated in any way from the ruling group, nor yet from elements within itself... Social atomization engenders strong feelings of alienation and anxiety, and therefore the disposition to engage in extreme behavior to escape from these tensions. In mass society there is a heightened readiness to form hyper-attachments to symbols and leaders... People become available for mobilization by elites when they lack or lose an independent group life... The lack of autonomous relations generates widespread social alienation. Alienation heightens responsiveness to the appeal of mass movements because they provide occasions for expressing resentment against what is, as well as promises of a totally different world. In short, people who are atomized readily become mobilized. Since totalitarianism is a state of total mobilization, mass society is highly vulnerable to totalitarian movements and regimes.” – William Kornhauser. (1959, The Politics of Mass Society, The Free Press)
The theory of collective behavior argues that social movements are a response to major interruptions in the natural operation of society. Writing on the origins of social movements under this paradigm, Gusfield (1970: 9) writes the following: “We describe social movements and collective action as responses to social change. To see them in this light emphasizes the disruptive and disturbing quality which new ideas, technologies, procedures, groups migration, and intrusions can have for people” (Protest, Reform, and Revolt, New York: John Wiley).

Social changes engenders strains on the population, and social movements is one way that people cope with the uncertainty and angst of rapid and unexpected alterations in social patterns according to Neil Smelser.
The “Relative Deprivation” assumption of collective behavior theory assumes that a social movement is likely to develop when people perceive a gap between what they feel their situations should be, and what their situations actually are. Feeling deprived, people are more likely to form or join social movements. And these feelings of deprivations are punctuated by the strain of sudden, unexpected, and/or undesired social change. (See James Davies. 1962. “Toward a Theory of Revolution.” American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, No. 1: 5-19 for a discussion of the J-Curve Theory. This theory argues that when an insufferable social condition improves but then looks like it might revert to its original state, the populace is more likely to take up collective behaviors –like social movements- to prevent this setback. Social movements, then, are the result of expectations that are rising too fast.)
“The history of social movements abounds with agitations on the part of groups who experience a real or apparent loss of wealth, power, or prestige. For example: (1) farmers’ movements have arisen in periods of depression and declined in periods of prosperity. (2) Dissatisfactions over land distribution have also been at the root of numerous agrarian movements. (3) As we have seen, the revival of old movements and the initiation of new ones of among American laborers in the nineteenth century was closely related to their changing economic fortunes. (4) Movements to regulate speculation have been stimulated by the financial losses and market disorganization occasioned by financial crises. (5) The movement which culminated in the rise of the Progressive Party in the early twentieth century was based in large part on the apprehension that big business was acquiring too much economic and political power. (6) In the 1820s, many of the supporters of the anti-Masonry movement –among whose objectives was to prohibit Masons from holding public office –came from the ranks of ministers who felt their own religious influence waning and who resented the Masons’ religious appeal.” (Neil J. Smelser. 1962. The Theory of Collective Behavior, The Free Press)
Collective behavior are social actions, like social movements or public riots, that are a response to unstructured, ambiguous, or unstable situations. Neil Smelser, in his theory on the conditioning affect of structural strain(s) (Theory of Collective Behavior (1962), argued that collective behavior will emerge under these six conditions:

- Structural conduciveness (pre-existing conditions that make action likely)
- Structural strain (conditions that cause people to feel anxious)
- Generalized beliefs (beliefs about their & appropriate actions)
- Precipitating factors (incident that triggers collective action)
- Mobilization for actions
- Failure of social control
Resource mobilization theory emerges in direct opposition to the idea that deprivation and/or strain are the antecedents to collective social actions such as social movements. These theorists argue that strains are not a reliable explication of social action because at any given time in society there are manifold deprivations that do not reliably contribute to any protest or collective actions. (Consider, for example, the enormous strain of wealth inequality and poverty in America today, and the relative lack of social activism around the obscene distribution of income and assets.) The keys to collective actions such as social movements are the individual and collective motivations to start a movement, and the resources (human, social, and monetary capitals) to sustain a movement for the long-term. But the most important resource, according to the proponents of this perspective, is a prosperous nation-state: robust economic expansions and prosperity are the most important ingredient for social movements in late-modern societies.
What Are The Main “Resources” for Social Movements?

Key Resources for Social Movements:

1. Money, Money, –And *More* Money)
2. Organizational/Management Resources (Both People & Money)
3. Media Strategies / Ideological Framing Strategies
4. Leadership (Every movement needs a good leader –or a few “good leaders.”)
5. Willing Participants / “True Believers” (People who are willing to march and hold signs in subzero weather.)
S.M.S: Social Movement Sector ("The Social Movement Sector (SMS) consists of all SMI's in a society no matter to which social movement they are attached." – McCarthy and Zald (1987))

S.M.I: Social Movement Industries (Social movements that specialize in a particular type of arenas such as Civil Liberties (Civil Rights Movement, Gay Rights Movement, etc.) Women Liberation Movement (Pro-Choice Movement, Equal Right Amendment Movement, etc.).

S.M.O: Social Movement Organization (i.e., Civil Rights Movement, Feminist Movement, Prohibition Movement, Temperance Movement, etc.)
“A social movement organization is a complex, or formal, organization that identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement those goals. If we think of the recent Civil Rights Movement in these terms, the social movement contained a large portion of the population that held preferences for change aimed at “justice for black Americans” and a number of SMOs such as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). These SMOs represented and shaped the broadly held preferences and diverse sub-preferences of the movement.” –McCarthy and Zald (1987)
Hypothesis 1: “As the amount of discretionary resources of mass and elite publics increases, the absolute and relative amount of resources available to the SMS increases.”
Hypothesis 2: “The greater the absolute amount of resources available to the SMS, the greater the likelihood that new SMIs and SMOs will develop to compete for resources.”
Hypothesis 3: “Regardless of the resources available to potential beneficiary adherents, the larger the amount of resources available to conscience adherents [active participants] the more likely the development of SMOs and SMIs that respond to preferences.”
Hypothesis 4: “The more an SMO is dependent upon isolated constituents, the less stable will be the flow of resources to the SMO.”
Hypothesis 4(a): “The more dependent an SMO is upon isolated constituents, the greater the share of its resources that will be allocated to advertising.”
Hypothesis 4(b): “The more an SMO depends upon isolated constituents to maintain a resource flow, the more its shifts in resource flow resemble the patterns of consumer expenditures and marginal goods.”
Hypothesis 5: “An SMO that attempts to link both conscience and beneficiary constituents to the organization through federated chapter structures, and hence solidarity incentives, is likely to have high levels of tension and conflict.”
Hypothesis 6: “Older, established SMOs are more likely than newer SMOs to persist throughout the cycle of SMI growth and decline.”
Hypothesis 7: “The more competitive an SMI (a function of the number and size of the existing SMOs), the more likely it is that new SMOs will offer narrow goals and strategies.”
Hypothesis 8: “The larger the income flow to an SMO, the more likely that cadre and staff are professional and the larger these groups are.”
Hypothesis 9: “The larger the SMS and the larger the specific SMI, the more likely it is the SM careers will develop.”
Hypothesis 10: “The more an SMO is funded by isolated constituents, the more likely that beneficiary constituent workers are recruited for strategic purposes rather than for organizational work.”
Hypothesis 11: “The more an SMO is made up of workers with discretionary time at their disposal, the more readily it can develop transitory teams.”

The political process theory, which was developed as an alternative to the dominant Resource Mobilization Perspective, rests on the idea that social movement participants are individuals who possess limited power in society and thus seize the opportunity, through a cycle of contention (or punctuated periods of protest and revolt among disaffected masses) to use social movements to champion their grievances during periods of abrupt social changes when the state’s authority might be weakened. McAdam’s political process theory is heavily influenced by Karl Marx’s view on power, as stated in his own words: “...The political process model is more compatible with a Marxist interpretation of power. Marxists acknowledge that the power disparity between elite and excluded groups is substantial but hardly regard this state of affairs as inevitable. Indeed, or orthodox Marxists, that which is inevitable is not the retention of power by the elite but the accession to power by the masses.” –Doug McAdam. 1982. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Writing on political process theory as conflated perspective, Doug McAdams said this:

“The political process model represents an alternative to both the classical and resource mobilization perspectives. Rather than focusing exclusive attention on factors internal or external to the movement, the model describes insurgency as a product of both. Specifically, three sets of factors are identified as shaping the generation of insurgency. It is the confluence of expanding political opportunities, indigenous organizational strength, and the presence of certain shared cognitions within the minority community that is held to facilitate movement emergence. Over time these factors continue to shape the development of insurgency in combination with a fourth factor: the shifting control response of other groups to the movement.” —Doug McAdam. 1982. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [The confluence of movements in the decade of the 1960s following on the heels of the Civil Rights Movement is a case in point.]
Once the political opportunity is optimal for protest, social movement organizations (SMOs) have what Charles Tilly calls a limited “repertoire of contention.” This refers to the restricted modes of protests available to non-violent social movement organizations and their activists. The current repertoire of contention include mass demonstrations, sit-ins, letter-writing campaigns, circulating petitions, encouraging referenda for elections, candlelight vigils, strikes, the commandeering of public buildings and public spaces sustained protests, worker slow-downs, and planned boycotts. [Can you think of other actions in the “repertoire of contention”?]

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umXIFPIU25s&feature=results_video&playnext=&list=PL204718FA631DF20A
New social movement theory argues that most social movements today are international and largely concerned about *life-space issues* (a la Jurgen Habermas) such as privacy rights. These movements focus on the global ecology, the social standing of women internationally, and the rights of gay people, animals, and reducing the risk of war. New social movements are often **Global** as opposed to **Local**. Moreover, new social movements tend to focus on cultural and social issues, as opposed to economic rights as those of the past (i.e., labor movement). Lastly, new social movements tend to draw support largely from the middle and upper-classes. New social movements’ critics have argued that there is really nothing “new” about these social movements in terms of tactics or in terms of ideological inducements. New social movements are heavily invested in the Internet and the world wide web as a principal “site” for protest and contention.
“Individuals and groups are allocated increasing amounts of information resources with which to define themselves and to construct their life spaces. At the same time, however, these same processes are regulated by a diffused social control that passes beyond the public sphere to invade the very domain where the sense of individual action takes shape. Dimensions that were traditionally regarded as private (the body, sexuality, affective relations), or subjective (cognitive and emotional processes, motives, desires), or even biological (the structure of the brain, the genetic code, reproductive capacity) now undergo social control and manipulation. The technoscientific apparatus, the agencies of information and communication, and the decision-making centers that determine policies wield their power over these domains. Yet, these are precisely the areas where individuals and groups lay claim to their autonomy, where they conduct their search for identity by transforming them into a space where they reappropriate, self-realize, and construct the meaning of what they are and what they do. Conflicts are carried forward by temporary actors who bring to light the crucial dilemma of society. The conflicts I describe here, which do not exhaust the range of social conflicts, concern the production and the appropriation of resources that are crucial for a global society based on information. The same processes generate both new and forms of power and new forms of oppositions: Conflicts only emerge insofar as actors fight for control and the allocation of socially produced potential for action.” —Alberto Melucci. 1994. “A Strange Kind of Newness: What’s “New” in New Social Movements?” In New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity. Edited by Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. Temple University Press.
New Social Movements and the Colonization of the “Lebenswelt”

Jurgen Habermas, German sociologist par excellence, writes about the colonization of the LIFE WORLD (Lebenswelt), a phrase he borrows from the phenomenology of Alfred Schutz. For Alfred Schutz, the LIFE WORLD referred the world of common sense knowledge; the everyday world of the mundane; for Habermas, the world of everyday interpersonal communication. The Lifeworld includes our own private domain (family life and neighborhood life) and the community’s public domain, or the domain of community centers, community spaces, & community media: i.e., in essence, “spaces” that are public and open. Many “New Social Movements” are particularly concerned about how corporations are increasingly encroaching upon the lifeworlds of individuals. Examples of these social movements are (1) Buy Nothing Day, (2) Anti-Globalization Movements (particularly those that focus on the W.T.O (World Trade Organization), and (3) European movements to limit the reach of advertising to children. Said Habermas: “The Lifeworld forms a horizon and at the same time offers a store of things taken for granted in the given culture from which communicative participants draw consensual interpretative patterns in their efforts at interpretation. The solidarities of groups integrated by values and the competences of socialized individuals belong, as do culturally ingrained background assumptions, to the component of the lifeworld.” —Jurgen Habermas, The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures (1995), pg. 298.
Sociological Theories on Social Movements have attempted answers to several key “why” and “how” questions on social movements:

1. Why do people turn to collective social action (in the form of social movements) to address their grievances rather than “going it alone”?
2. Why are some individuals more likely than others to join social movements and participate in public protests?
3. How do individuals come to believe that social movement activity is the only way to achieve the change they desire?
4. How is it that some societies come to have more social movement organizations and social protests than other societies?
5. How do social movement participants come to decide on the particular type of protest tactics to address their complaints? How do they deal with the problem of violence?
6. How do movements select their ideological frames, and how do they propagate their values to non-social movement actors?
7. How do social movement organizations address the challenge of counter-movements and counter-frames that are in direct opposition to their goals?
8. Why do some social movements fail to achieve their objectives? (How do social movements define “success”?)
9. How do social movements maintain long-term interest in protesting for social change over the (long) passage of time? How do they contend with the “free-rider” problem?
10. How do social movements deal with the media? How do they “get their message out” amidst the noise from multiple media sources (television, radio, internet, worldwide web, print, etc.)?
11. How do social movements attend to the issue of emotions in public protests among activists?
12. How do social movements create, sustain, and manipulate aspects of culture (art, music, poetry, narrative, photography, etc) to draw and maintain support from the general public?
Mancur Olson, in his 1965 book, *The Logic of Collective Action*, proposed that social movements suffer from an intractable conundrum which they must address: the “Free-Rider Problem.” A free-rider is someone who enjoys the benefits of a social good (i.e., a new freedom like Civil Rights or a pristine new highway) without contributing to the efforts that led to that social good (i.e., not participating in the Civil Rights Movement or refusing to pay taxes). Deriving personal benefit from a social good is not, in and of itself, enough of an incentive for people to make a personal contribution to that social good (people are mostly rational (self-interested) as opposed to mostly moral (driven by the norm of abnegation and selflessness).

Olson suggests that in order to encourage investment in that social good, organizations (like social movements or local governments) must offer “selective incentives” (namely, material incentives) to potential participants to encourage their “rational choices” to participate. In essence, if people can enjoy the benefits of a good/a service/a new law without contributing their time/money/emotions, most will make a rational choice not to participate and simply receive the benefit w/o personal cost or sacrifice. The challenge for all social movements is to address and overcome the free-ride problem. But how?
“But it is not in fact true that the idea that groups will act in their self-interest follows logically from the premise of rational and self-interested behavior. It does not follow because all of the individuals in a group would gain if they achieved their group objective, that they would act to achieve that objective, even if they were all rational and self-interested. Indeed, unless the number of individuals in a group is quite small, or unless there is coercion or some other special device to make individuals act in their common interests, rational, self-interested individuals will not act to achieve their common or group interests. In other words, even if all of the individuals in a large group are rational and self-interested, and would gain if, as a group, they acted to achieve their common interest or objective, they will still not voluntarily act to achieve that common or group interest. The notion that groups of individuals will act to achieve their common or group interests, far from being a logical implication of the assumption that the individuals in a group will rationally further their individual interests, is in fact inconsistent with that assumption.” – Mancur Olson, The Logic of Collective Action (1965).
How do social movements contend with the “free-rider” problem?
One way social movements can attend to the “free-rider” problem is to offer <tangible> incentives for participation. Where Olson made the case for “material incentives,” other theorists have focused on “solidarity incentives” (conscience collective), and “purposive incentives” (sense of accomplishment one gets from contributing to the common good). (See Suzanne Staggenborg’s *Social Movements* pg. 32)
One of the leading American theorists on social movements and former A.S.A President, William “Bill” Gamson, in his 1990 book *The Strategy of Social Protest* which studies 53 social movements on the questions of movement strategies and successes, argues that social movements become successful after they receive a measure of long-term stability/longevity and *institutionalization*. A protest group becomes as success -or institutionalized- when we can identity four (4) key features:

1. Consultation
2. Negotiation
3. Formal recognition
4. Inclusion
“It is useful to think of **success as a set of outcomes**, recognizing that a given challenging group may receive different scores on equally valid, different measures of outcome. These outcomes fall into two basic clusters: one concerned with the **fate of the challenging group as an organization** and one with the distribution of **new advantages to the group’s beneficiary**. The central issue in the first cluster focuses on the **acceptance** of a challenging group by its antagonists as a valid spokesman for a legitimate set of interests. The central issue in the second cluster focuses on whether the group’s beneficiary gains **new advantages** during the challenge and its aftermath.” –William Gamson
Herbert H. Haines, in his 1988 analysis of the Civil Rights Movement, Black Radicals and the Civil Rights Mainstream, 1954-1970 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), makes the argument that a movement’s extreme wing might actually have a “radical flank effect.” In the Civil Rights Movement, Dr. Martin Luther King represented the non-violent, civil disobedience side: an approach that had broad public support because of its non-violent tactic. On the other hand, Malcolm X and the NOI (Nation of Islam), through their advocacy of self-defense and the use of violence to fight back against the most virulent forms of racism, represented the extreme side of the Civil Rights Movement. Other examples of this potentially dangerous—and violent approach— to Civil Rights included the Marxist (1) Black Panther Party and (2) Stockely Car michael’s Black Power Movement. The existence of these [potentially violent] extremes made the moderate demands of Martin Luther King’s SCLC and the student Freedom Riders more attractive to the nation. In this case, the existence of a “Radical Flank” actually buttressed the nation’s advance toward racial equality.


Ceteris Paribus: The extremes define the moderates!
“All too frequently, the anti-apartheid movement is presented as a victory for peaceful protest, as if the movement directly paralleled the mainstream American civil rights movement of the late 1950s. The truth, of course, is very different: South Africa’s visible popular movement was deeply entwined with a clandestine guerrilla struggle. The anti-colonial movement for national self-determination as a civil rights movement working within an existing legal framework. In South Africa, the armed struggle played a key role: it attracted popular support to the anti-apartheid movement, it demonstrated the persistence of resistance to white supremacy despite repression, and it served as a complicated badge of commitment for anti-apartheid activists. Social movement theorists tend to treat armed struggle either as the unproblematic extension of ordinary social movement process, or conversely, as a pathological effect of competition or decline within social movements. Several recent studies of clandestine movements in industrialized countries see the shift to armed struggle as both cause and symptom of movement decline, as isolated small networks of activists move away from their communities and become distant from above-ground activists. Even when social movements analysts consider the possibility that clandestine activists might sustain links to above-ground social movements, they generally suggest that the very fact of working underground prompts activists to privilege military concerns over popular mobilization, thereby undermining the possibility that clandestine activists could retain leadership positions in open movements.” —Gay Seidman’s Armed Struggle in the South African Anti-Apartheid Movement

A.N.C (African National Congress: Multiracial) ↔ P.A.C (Pan-Africanist Congress: “Africa for Africans”)
In the book, *Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1968), Franz Fanon argued that violence in anti-colonial movements can be a tactic that can lead to negotiation and compromise (violence forces the powerful colonial power to negotiate with less power ‘subjects’). According to Vigilant & Williamson’s (2003) article, what do the following ‘great’ world leaders have in common?

(a.) **Gerry Adams** (Former statesman from the Republic of Ireland)
(b.) **Nelson Mandela** (Former prime minister of South Africa)
(c.) **Yasser Arafat** (Former leader of the Palestinian Authority)
(d.) **Yitzhak Shamir** (Former Prime Minister of Israel)
Answer: “At one point in their political lives, they were all considered terrorists, anathema of nations such as the United Kingdom and the United States, who championed the liberation of their constituencies through terrorist organizations that employed acts of extreme violence and death. This point underscores the difficulty of arriving at consensus on who exactly should be considered a terrorist.” –Vigilant & Williamson (2003) On the Role and Meaning of Death in Terrorism.
William Gamson’s (1990) meta-analysis research on the role of violence in social movements found that the use of violence, or “constraints,” on the part of social movements or from authority structures, is associated with movement success. His meta-analysis of 53 SMOs concludes in this way:

“The results on arrests and other constraints seem to parallel those on violence very closely. Unruly groups, those that use violence, strikes, and other constraints, have better than average success. Of the 21 groups that use some form of constraint, fully two-thirds win new advantages and 71 percent win acceptance. Among the ten groups that use no constraints but receive either violence or arrests, none is successful on either criterion. The 22 groups that neither experience nor use constraints fall in the middle, 54 percent (12) win new advantages and half win acceptance.” -William Gamson. 1990. “The Success of the Unruly.”


http://www.salon.com/2012/10/02/video_madrid_on_the_brink/
In his 1984 book, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* (New York: The Free Press), Aldon Morris makes the claim that the **sit-in** was one of the most widely and frequently used tactic of Civil Rights protesters. Why was the “**sit-in**” so successful for civil rights activism?
“On February 1, 1960, four black college students initiated a sit-in at the segregated lunch counter of the local Woolworth store in Greensboro, North Carolina. That day has come to be known as the opening of the sit-in movement. Civil rights activist, however, had conducted sit-ins between 1957 and 1960 in at least sixteen cities: St. Louis, Missouri; Wichita and Kansas City, Kansas; Oklahoma City, Enid, Tulsa, and Stillwater, Oklahoma; Lexington and Louisville, Kentucky; Miami, Florida; Charleston, West Virginia; Sumter, South Carolina; East St. Louis, Illinois; Nashville, Tennessee; Atlanta, Georgia; and Durham, North Carolina...The early sit-ins were initiated by direct action organizations...The NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), primarily its Youth Councils, either initiated or co-initiated sit-ins in nine of the fifteen cities. CORE (Congress on Racial Equality), usually working with the NAACP, played an important initiating role in seven. The SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference) initiated one case and was involved in another with CORE and FOR (Fellowship of Reconciliation). Finally, the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs, working with the NAACP, initiated sit-ins in Durham. From these data we can conclude that the early sit-ins were a result of a multifaceted organizational effort.” –Aldon Morris The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement (1984).
Alinski’s 13 Tactical Rules of Protests

“Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.”
“Never go outside the experience of your people.”
“Whenever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy. Here you want to cause confusion, fear, and retreat.”
“Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules.”
“Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon. It is almost impossible to counterattack ridicule. Also it infuriates the opposition, who then react to your advantage.”
“A good tactic is one that your people enjoy. If your people are not having a ball doing it, there is something very wrong with the tactic.”
“A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag. Man can sustain militant interest in any issue for only a limited time, after which it becomes a ritualistic commitment, like going to church on Sunday mornings.”
“Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.”
“The treatment is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.”
“The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition. It is this unceasing pressure that results in the reactions from the opposition that are essential for the success of the campaign.”
“If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside; this is based on the principle that every positive has its negative. We have already seen the conversion of the negative into the positive, in Mahatma Gandhi’s development of the tactic of passive resistance.”
“The Price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative. You cannot risk being trapped by the enemy in his sudden agreement with your demand and saying “You’re right—we don’t know what to do about this issue. Now you tell us.”
“Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.”
One way social movements can sustain interests over the long term is to employ “Critical Events” to showcase the SMO’s goals. Suzanne Staggenborg (Social Movements, pg. 39) notes, “There are various types of critical events, including large-scale socioeconomic and political events, natural disasters and epidemics, accidents, policy outcomes, and strategic initiatives of movements, such as demonstrations. Some types of critical events are completely outside of movement control, while others are orchestrated by movements...For example, anti-nuclear power activists used the threat and publicity created by the 1979 accident at the nuclear power plant at Three Mile Island near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, to attract many new supporters to their movement.” –Staggenborg (2011: 39)
Over the long passage of time, a social movement will experience many “critical events” that can potentially bring attention to the movement’s objective. Over the long passage of the Civil Rights Movement’s time, there were several critical events that were pivotal to its success. Over time, every movement will have critical events that can work for or against their stated goals and aims.
1896: The United States Supreme Court affirms the “Separate But Equal” legal principle setting the stage for the de jure apartheid of the races.
1905: The American Sociologist W.E.B Du Bois forms the Niagara Movement as a challenge to the de jure segregation America.
1948: President Harry Truman abolishes de jure segregation in the American Armed Forces.
1954: Brown v. Board of Education Topeka strikes a major blow to the constitutionality of Plessy, ruling that “separate but equal” is unconstitutional.
1955: The lynching of Emmitt Till (and the international publication of his open-casket photographs).
1955: Montgomery Bus Boycott begins.
1957: Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. assumes leadership of the newly formed SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference), the “head” of the Civil Rights Movement.
1960: SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee) formed; the emergence of the “sit-in” as the preeminent protest tactic.
1963: Medgar Evers, Mississippi NAACP president, is gunned down in front of his house. President John F. Kennedy is assassinated.
1963: Four (4) African American girls are killed in a terrorist bombing of Birmingham’s 16th Street Baptist church.
1963: March on Washington; MLK’s “I Have A Dream” speech.
1964: “Freedom Summer’s” Mississippi voter registration drive. Murder of three (3) Civil Rights workers; MLK receives the Noble Prize. Johnson signs the Civil Rights Act into law.
1965: Malcolm X is assassinated; President Lyndon Johnson signs the Voting Rights Act into law, removing centuries of Southern voting restrictions on Blacks.
1968: Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is assassinated.
1961: Commission on the Status of Women commences its work by authority of President John F. Kennedy.


1964: Title IV of the Civil Rights Act signed into law. Title IV forbids gender discrimination in hiring.

1965: Griswold v. Connecticut lifts the ban on the use of contraceptives.

1966: National Organization of Women (NOW) is formed. Betty Friedan is elected as the organization’s first president.

1968: Shirley Chisholm becomes the first black women elected to congress.

1971: The United States House of Congress passes the ERA (Equal Rights Amendment).

1972: President Richard Nixon signs into law Title IX. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm runs for president of the US.


1974: Susan Brownmiller writes the seminal book on sexual violence against women and girls, Against Our Will, shifting the paradigm on rape.

1974: The Equal Opportunity Act is signed into law. It bans marital status and sex discrimination.

1979: “No Fault Divorce,” a major victory of 2nd Wave feminists, becomes the law in the vast majority of states in the nation.

1982: The proposed ERA amendment to the constitution fails. It needed thirty-eight (38) states to ratify the bill, but only thirty-five did.
("I like your frame, girl")
How do social movement organizations (SMOs) propagate their values to non-social movement actors?
Select One: “Option A” or “Option B”

- **Option A** saves the lives of 200 people.

- **Option B** has a 33% chance of saving all 600 people and a 66% possibility of saving no one.

(Which **option** would you choose?)
Select One: “Option C” or “Option D”

- if you select **Option C**, then 400 people die.

- if you select **Option D**, then there is a 33% chance that no people will die and a 66% probability that all 600 will die.

(Which option would you choose?)
In Tversky and Kahneman’s 1981 “prospect theory” experiments, they found that 72% of participants initially selected Option A and 28% of participants selected Option B. However, when a different set of participants received the same scenario, but framed slightly differently, the results were essentially opposite.

In scenario 2, 78% of participants selected Option D (which is equivalent to Option B), and 22% of participants selected Option C (which is equivalent to Option A). Tversky and Kahneman (1981) concluded that the apparent inconsistency in choices between the two options is the “framing effect.” The first scenario presents a frame that emphasizes lives saved, whereas the second scenario presents a frame that emphasizes lives lost.

Ideological Frames: A frame is an ideological device that is used to garner—and expand—support from potential constituents and current stakeholders on contentious political and social issues. An ideological frame ultimately reflects the worldview(s) of the person or group that is employing it. Framing involves the use of powerful stories and personal narratives, symbols, catchwords and phrases, poetic slogans, talking points, and artistic devices (potent photographs, paintings, songs, etc.). Social movements often contend with each other through ideological “framing wars” to win support for their worldviews, their goals, and their change-agendas. A frame is also a media talking point, that allows spokespeople for SMOs to stay-on-point when debating contentious issues in public forums (i.e., in newspaper, internet, or magazine articles and television & radio interviews).

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hyMp8f0rGf4
“Like a picture frame, an issue frame marks off some part of the world. Like a building frame, it holds things together. It provides coherence to an array of symbols, images, and arguments, linking them through an underlying organizing idea that suggests what is essential –what consequences and values are at stake…

(1) Facts take on their meaning by being embedded in frames, which render them relevant and trivial. The contest is lost at the onset if we allow our adversaries to define what facts are relevant...

(2) People carry around multiple frames in their heads. We have more than one way of framing an issue or event...

(3) Successful reframing involves the ability to enter into the worldview of our adversaries. A good rule of thumb is that we should be able to describe a frame that we disagree with so that an advocate would say, ‘Yes, this is what I believe’...

(4) All frames contain implicit or explicit appeals to moral principles.” -Charlotte Ryan and William Gamson (2006)
(a) **Injustice Component**: The recognition of a problem that leads to a sense of moral indignation or outrage, both at the problem itself and those who are believed to be responsible for the condition.

(b) **Agency Component**: The recognition that something needs to be done about this injustice/condition: “We can/must do something about this profound injustice!”

(c) **Identity Component**: The recognition that “Our values and worldviews on this problem/condition makes us different.” Accepting an “action frame” on the issue confirms one’s identity within –and support of- the movement, its goals and its protest tactics.
One of the most successful uses of an **ideological frame** came early in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Wave of the American Women’s Movement. It began with the death of a young, 28-year-old mother of two (2) children in 1964: **Geraldine “Gerri” Santoro.** Mrs. Santoro died of a botched abortion in a hotel room. At the time of her death, she was estranged from her husband because of domestic violence, but she was carrying the child of her adulterous lover who she had meet at her job. Ms. Santoro’s lover carried out the 2\textsuperscript{nd} trimester abortion (in the 6\textsuperscript{th} month of pregnancy) using a medical book on abortions that he had gotten from a friend. During the procedure, Mrs. Santoro had a rupture and her lover, in panic, left her alone to die. Her naked and bloodied body was discovered a day later by a hotel staff. The **photographs** of the crime scene was made public after her lover was sentenced to *a year and one day* in prison for manslaughter. Nine (9) years later, **Ms. Magazine**, the preeminent feminist publication of the day, used those pictures as a **potent ideological frame** to consolidate support for passage of national **abortion rights legislation** and to urge the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold a woman’s right to choose **safe & legal abortions** over “**back alley abortions**”. The pro-choice movement had unexampled success using the “**Safe and Legal Frame**” and the “**My Body, My Choice Frame**” in the struggle for abortion rights.

“I believe abortions should be **safe, legal, and rare.**” —Hilary Clinton during the 2008 Presidential campaign.
Photographic Symbol of the “Abortions Should Be Safe and Legal” Frame
(This photo appeared in Ms. Magazine April 1973 issue)
Pro-Choice Symbols Representing the Two (2) Main Frames of “My Body/My Choice” and “Safe and Legal”
For almost two decades, the “Safe and Legal” Frame on abortions enjoyed overwhelming support from women and the general public. But the tide in the abortion debate shifted suddenly and violently in the year 1988 when a young pro-life activist came up with an idea that is heralded as a sagacious critical event in shifting support to the pro-life frame. Monica Migliorino Miller, now a professor of theology, had an idea of getting hold of aborted fetuses, photographing them, and then performing funeral and burial rites as a public spectacle to win attention to the pro-life cause. What sounded like a strange publicity spectacle was actually a turning point in pro-life activism. In 1988, Ms. Miller and other pro-life activists discovered that a certain pathology laboratory was the final destination or “dumping ground” for the “aborted babies”/“fetuses” of 12 abortion clinics. “Medical wastes” would be brought-in and thrown out regularly—along with the medical records of the women who had these abortions. Ms. Miller would secretly dumpster dive through an enormous amount of medical waste from these abortion clinics. She estimates that her group collected over 4,000 “aborted babies”/“fetuses” between February and August of 1988, and with the purchase of a very expensive camera lens that allowed her to take pictures from a few millimeters away, she was able to show incredible details: the fingers and fingernails, and toes and toenails of developing “babies”/“fetuses.” After photographing each “aborted baby”/“fetus,” the Archbishop of Chicago (Cardinal Joseph Bernardin) performed a public funeral mass for them, and they were buried in a local cemetery. It is estimated by the New York Times and Ms. Monica Migliorino Miller herself, that approximately 50% of the pictures of aborted “babies”/“fetuses” that appear at anti-abortion rallies and protests (on posters and in various print publications) today are from her clandestine photographic activism.

The “Abortion stops a beating heart frame” is certainly winning the framing war on this controversial issue.
Photographic Symbol of the "Abortion Stops a Beating Heart Frame"
Symbolic Frame: “It’s not a Fetus; It’s a Baby!”

Michael Clancy’s Photograph of the Fetal Surgery of 21 Weeks-Old Samuel Armus in 1999
Michael Clancy’s photograph was a powerful emotive frame in winning passage of the twice failed “Partial Birth Abortion Ban” legislation that the Republican Congress passed in December 1995 and again in October 1997 (but was ultimately vetoed –both times- by Democratic President William Jefferson Clinton). November 5, 2003 was the first major legislative victory (on the federal level) for the “Pro-Life Movement.” On this day, President George W. Bush signed into law the partial birth abortion ban. The law prohibits elective abortions in the second trimester, between the 15th and 26th week of pregnancy, and outlaws the practice of “Intact Dilation and Extraction” except to save the life of the mother. One of the seminal photographic frames that led to widespread public support to ban this abortion procedure was Samuel Alexander Armas’s successful spina bifida fetal surgery to fix a lesion in the 21st week of his mother’s pregnancy. The photograph of [baby/fetus] Samuel grabbing the hand of the lead surgeon, Dr. Joseph Bruner, was christened the “Hand of Hope.”
Pro-Life/Anti-Choice Frame

Liberal Compassion at 36 weeks
Which Side is Winning the “Framing War” on Abortion?

With respect to the abortion issue, would you consider yourself to be pro-choice or pro-life?

% Pro-choice % Pro-life

GALLUP POLL
“Some progressives threw up their hands in dismay and frustration when polls showed that most Bush voters in 2004 believed there was a connection between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The “fact” was clear that no connection had been found. If these voters did not know this, it was either the news media had failed in their responsibility to inform them, or they were too lazy and inattentive to take it in. But suppose one frames the world as a dangerous place in which the forces of evil—a hydra-headed monster labeled “terrorism”—confront the forces of good. This frame depicts Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda as two heads of the same monster. In this frame, whether or not agents actually met or engaged in other forms of communication is nitpicking and irrelevant... Not long ago, a reporter at a rare George Bush press conference asked the president why he keeps talking about a connection between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda when no facts support it. When the president responded, ‘The reason why I keep talking about there being a connection is because there is a connection,’ he was not lying or being obtuse and stupid, he was relying on an unstated frame.” —Charlotte Ryan and William A. Gamson, “The Art of Reframing Political Debate,” Context, Vol. 5, No. 1: 13-18
Question: “How many Americans were victims (via injuries or death) of Iraqi terrorism between the years 1991 – 2001?”
Answer?
According to Donald A. Schon and Martin Rein (1994. Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies. New York: Basic Books) one way that ‘framing’ works in appealing to the masses is through the use of “Generative Metaphors” (Schon & Rein 1994: viii). Generative metaphors create an instantaneous image in the minds of potential constituents that capture the frame’s central position or ideological worldview.
2. “No Child Left Behind” Frame
3. “The Liberal Media” Frame
4. “Tax Relief” and “Taxpayers’ Money (Republican) / “Tax-the-Rich” (Democrat) Frames
5. “War on Terror” Frame
In the struggle for gay rights, scientific research has played a key role in shifting the public’s perception about homosexuality. Prior to the use of medical and social science research on homosexuality, the dominant frame for understanding homosexuality—and gay persons—was a religious one on “Moral Perversion.”
The [Biblical / Koranic] “Moral Perversion Frame”

From Torah
1. Leviticus 18:22 (“Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.”
2. Leviticus 20:13 (“If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.”)

From the New Testament
1. Romans 1: 18-32 (“...For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error...”[Verse 26]
2. See also: 1 Corinthians 6: 9-11; Galatians 5:19; Colossians 3: 5-7; Jude 7.

From the Qu’ran
1. Sura XXIX: 28-35 (The story of Sodom and Gomorrah’s destruction because of homosexuality...) “What! Do you approach men? (or Do you commit sexual acts with men?) and stop folks on the highway? And approach in your assembly sin?’ but the answer of his people was only to say, ‘Bring us God’s torment, if thou art of those who speak the truth!’ [Verse 29]
The transformation from the dominant—and pervasive—“Moral Perversion” frame to the “Homosexuality as Sickness” frame began with the publication Richard von Kraff-Ebing’s 1886 work *Psychopathia Sexualis*. In the chapter, “Homo-Sexual Feeling as Abnormal Congenital Manifestation,” this Austrian Psychiatrist argued that “inversion” (i.e., homosexuality) was a condition driven by uncontrollable mental pathology. Kraff-Ebing noted that: “[T]he consciousness of the condition is wanting. The majority [of homosexuals] are happy in their perverse sexual feeling and impulse, and unhappy only so far as social and legal barriers stand in the way of the satisfaction of their instinct toward their own sex.” For close to a century, this was the dominant [medical] frame on homosexuality: “sickness.”
Alfred Kinsey’s 1948 study, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, and his follow-up 1953 study on women, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female, which drew on over 10,000 interviews with human subjects, argued that homosexuality was more pervasive and common than originally thought. Kinsey argued that sexuality existed along a continuum, that 10% of men were predominantly homosexual, and that as many as 37% of his male subjects had one homosexual encounter that led to orgasm.
One of the key scientific studies that led to the normalization of homosexuality in the minds of psychiatric/psychological practitioners was psychologist Evelyn Hooker’s 1957 seminal study in the *Journal of Projective Techniques* – “The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual.” Hooker’s methodology involved administering a battery psychological tests to 60 male subjects: 30 “overt homosexual” and 30 heterosexual subjects. Hooker then had three independent psychiatrists analyze the results without knowing the subjects’ sexuality. The three evaluating psychiatrists were not able to tell the two groups apart in terms of level of psychiatric disorders AND they concluded that most of the subjects in both groups (gay and straight) were psychologically healthy! This scientific study was a key reason why the American Psychiatric Association’s Board of Trustees voted to de-list homosexuality from DSM (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*) in 1973. The American Psychological Association now asserts, in their commonly cited mantra, that “Being gay is just as healthy as being straight.”
In 2012, British psychologist, Michael Lamb, published the results of a large scale meta-analysis of the psychiatric/psychological research from the last 30 years (over 100 studies) on the health of children in same-sex unions. Lamb’s meta-analysis was featured prominently in the 2013 SCOTUS cases that struck down the federal provisions of D.O.M.A (Defense of Marriage Act) and found “No Standing” in the California Anti-Gay Marriage case (a.k.a “Prop. 8”). Lamb’s oft-cited conclusion: “[T]he children and adolescents of same-sex parents are as emotionally healthy, and as educationally and socially successful, as children and adolescents raised by heterosexual parents.” (Dr. Michael Lamb. 2012. “Mothers, Fathers, Families, and Circumstances: Factors Affecting Children’s Adjustment,” Applied Developmental Science.)
Abeyance structures are organizational “safe spaces” where social movements can recline during periods when reforms have been achieved or during periods of declines in social activism. However, when the cycle of contention is renewed, these organizational “safe spaces” can act as a key force in reviving activists’ networks for social movement mobilization.
The modern American labor movement has been crippled by the threat of corporate off-shoring of labor: When workers agitate for higher wages, corporations can threaten to leave for greener pastures (read: countries with low wages and no unionization). One response to this quandary is for SMOs and labor unions to develop “Transnational Advocacy Networks”. As defined by Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998: 2): “A transnational advocacy network includes those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services.” According to these authors, transnational advocacy networks “are most prevalent in issue areas characterized by high value content and informational uncertainty.” What is preventing labor unions for developing these international networks? (“Transnational Advocacy Networks in the Movement Society,” in David Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (Editors) The Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century. Boulder, Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield.
In his study of the environmental movement in Italy, Mario Diani (1995) introduced the concept “Connective Structures.” Connective structures describe the relative strength of a SMO’s ability to link together the various parts of its network organization while working for social change. Connective structures include the coordination between SMO leaders and their constituents, between the various parts of the movement organization (headquarters and periphery), and the coordination with other SMOs that can join together to create and strengthen transnational advocacy networks. One of the best examples of connective structures in social movements is the Civil Rights Movement. (See Mario Diani. 1995. *Green Networks: A Structural Analysis of the Italian Environmental Movement*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.)
Religions Head

**SCLC** (Southern Christian Leadership Conference): Christian pastors, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, were the principal status group in the SCLC.


Petersburg Improvement Association (PIA): Petersburg, Virginia’s direct action SMO for Civil Rights lead by the Reverend Wyatt Walker.

Nashville Christian Leadership Council (NCLC): The Nashville affiliate of the SCLC.


Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA): A coordinating civil rights organization that was headed by Dr. King for two years in the 1950s.

Inter Council of Tallahassee (ICT): A coordinating civil rights organization from Tallahassee headed by Reverend C.K. Steele.

Citizens Coordinating Committee (CCC): A coordinating organization for local civil rights organization in Alabama.

United Christian Movement, Inc. (UCMI): A civil rights organization from Shreveport, Louisiana founded in 1956 and lead by a board of 26 members who were mostly Christian ministers.

New Orleans Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance (NOIMA): A group led by Reverend A.L. Davis.

United Defense League (UDL): A coordinating organization from Baton Rouge, Louisiana focused on civil rights.

Women’s Political Council (WPC): An organization of professional black women from Montgomery, founded in 1949, and whose focus was voters registration drives in the black community.

Legal Arm of the Civil Rights Movement

NAACP (National Association of the Advancement of Colored People): Lawyers were the principal status group in this SMO.

CORE (Congress On Racial Equality): Founded in Chicago in the year 1940 by James Farmer, CORE was an inter-racial organization that focused on civil rights issues in the Northern States.

FOR (Fellowship of Reconciliation): A British SMO that established a U.S. branch in 1915, and trained social movement participants in pacifist methods of social protest. James Farmer received training from FOR.

Educational Foot Soldiers of the Civil Rights Movement

SNCC (Student Non-Violence Coordinating Committee): University students (both black & white initially), were the principal status group of this SMO.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare (SCHW): An interracial and progressive Alabama civil rights SMO founded in 1938 that focuses on labor and racial concerns.

Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF): An education-focused SMO organization from Alabama and affiliated with the SCHW.

Freedom Riders: Interracial group of activists (students, religious leaders, & ordinary citizens).
Background:

On Saturday, 21st May, 2011, the Republican led Minnesota House voted 70-62 to put a proposed constitutional amendment defining marriage as a union between one man and one woman on the 2012 November ballot. Voters will decide whether to permanently enshrine heterosexual, monogamous marriage as the sole constitutionally binding definition of matrimony in the state. You, a renowned expert on social movements, have been hired as a consultant to one of the following social movement organizations (SMOs):

(a.) **People for the Protection of Traditional Marriage (PPTM):** An inter-religious social movement coalition of conservative Christians, Jews, and Moslems who want to protect the traditional definition of marriage as between one man and one woman.

(b.) **Marriage Equality for All People (MEAP):** A progressive social movement organization of mostly gay & lesbian families and their advocates who are trying to expand the definition of marriage to include homosexual couples.

Assignment:

Your task as a consultant (let’s assume you’ve had the past 18 months to work with your group on its movement strategy) is to offer advice—and extensive rationale for each recommendation—on the following points:

1. What type of collective action frame(s) will your movement adopt, and how will this unique frame connect to other master frames already in existence?
2. What repertoire of protest tactics and collective action strategies should your movement adopt to achieve its ends, and why?
3. How will your movement go about recruiting potential adherents (both beneficiary constituents and conscience constituents)? Moreover, how will your movement sustain adherents’ interest in protesting for this cause?
4. How will your movement frame its media strategy for winning support from the general voting populace?
5. How will your movement address the powerful symbolic politics of the “All American Family” in its counter-framing campaigns?
6. How will your movement attend to the need to mobilize resources (money, time, networks, etc.) for a successful campaign?
7. Finally, how will your movement shift its focus during its abeyance period should it lose the argument come election day November 6, 2012?

Grading:

In keeping with the *collective* spirit of social movements, your midterm is a **group meditation**, so you will be graded as a unit (minimum of five (5) members per group). Your “consultant’s report” should be a minimum of 10 pages in length with each of your names on the cover page. You will be graded on grammar, syntax, and spelling errors. But most importantly, your final grade will reflect how well you integrate material from the following sources: Alinsky’s *Rules for Radicals*, Staggenborg’s *Social Movements*, Arsenault’s *Freedom Riders*, and Dr. Vigilant’s *Lecture Notes*. Limit your group to no more than four (4) members. The final report comes due at that beginning of class on **Friday, October 19, 2012 at 10:30 a.m.**. Late reports will be assessed -15% penalty.
Background:

On Tuesday, November 6, 2012, eligible citizens in the state of Washington will vote on the I-502 Initiative which imposes a system of regulation and taxes on the production, distribution, and sale of marijuana statewide. You, a renowned expert on social movements, have been hired as a consultant to one of the following social movement organizations (SMOs):

(a.) People Against Marijuana Legalization (PAML): A coalition of mostly civic groups (like MADD and DARE), law enforcement constituencies, and parents who are against the legalization of cannabis.

(b.) Washingtonians Organized for the Reform of Marijuana Statutes (WORMS): A coalition of mostly college students, ex-hippies, political progressives/libertarians, and farmers hoping to capitalize on the hoped-for windfall that legalization will bring to Washington’s agricultural sector.

Assignment:

Your task as a consultant is to offer advice—and extensive rationale for each recommendation—on the following points (let’s assume you’ve had the past 18 months to work with your group on its movement strategy):

(1) What type of collective action frame(s) should your movement adopt, and how will this unique frame connect to other master frames already in existence?

(2) What repertoire of protest tactics and collective action strategies should your movement adopt to achieve its ends, and why?

(3) How will your movement go about recruiting potential adherents (both beneficiary constituents and conscience constituents)? Moreover, how will your movement sustain adherents’ interest in protesting for this cause over the long run?

(4) How will your movement frame its media strategy for winning support from the general voting populace?

(5) How will your movement address the powerful symbolic politics of the “War Against Drugs” and its counter-framing campaigns?

(6) How will your movement attend to the need to mobilize resources (money, time, networks, etc.) for a successful campaign?

(7) Finally, how will your movement shift its focus during its abeyance period if it should lose the argument come election day November 6, 2012?

Grading:

In keeping with the collective spirit of social movements, your midterm is a group meditation, so you will be graded as a unit (maximum of five (5) members per group). Your “consultant’s report” should be a minimum of 10 pages in length with each of your names on the cover page. You will be graded on grammar, syntax, and spelling errors. But most important, your final grade will reflect how well you integrate material from the following sources: Alinsky’s Rules for Radicals, Staggenborg’s Social Movements, Arsenault’s Freedom Riders, and Dr. Vigilant’s Lecture Notes. The final report comes due at the beginning of class on Friday, October 19, 2012 at 10:30a.m. Late reports will be assessed -15% penalty.
Assignment

Select a protest song/poem/artwork that is associated with an extant or historical social movement (or a social cause). In a one-page (typed) summary, tell us about the implicit ideological frame and its intended audience. Additionally, tell us what the lyrical content says about the contentious politics around this issue? Does your song/poem/artwork connect to other master frames (or is it anathema to status quo master frames)? Finally, why did you choose this particular protest song/poem/artwork, and what does it say about your “worldview”? (Come prepared to share your reflection with the class.)

Due Date: Monday, 22\textsuperscript{nd} October, 2012

(Hand in a one-page response to the above query.)
Dr. Vig’s selection of protest songs…

**Civil Rights Movements**
“Lift Every Voice and Sing” by James Weldon Johnson
“Strange Fruit” by Billie Holiday
“We Shall Overcome” – Zilphia Horton
“Ain’t Gonna Let Nobody Turn Me ‘Round” – Negro Spiritual
“Say It Loud, I’m Black and I’m Proud” by James Brown
“Mississippi Goddam” by Nina Simone
“Pride (In the Name of Love)” by U2 (Live Version)

**Anti-Colonial / Political Corruption Movements**
“Sonny’s Lettah (Anti-Sus Poem)” by Linton Kwesi Johnson
“Redemption Song” by Bob Marley
“Get Up, Stand Up” by Bob Marley
“Zombie” by Fela Kuti and Afrika
“White Riot” by The Clash
“American Idiot” by Green Day
“Sleep Now In the Fire” by Rage Against the Machine
“All I Need Is One Mic” by Nas

**Anti-Poverty / Urban Movements**
“The Message” by Grandmaster Flash
“Fight the Power” by Public Enemy
“The Revolution Will Not Be Televised” by Gil Scott-Heron
“All I need is one mic” by Nas

**Environmental**
“Little Boxes” – Malvina Reynolds

**Feminism / Women’s Movement**
“Just A Girl” by No Doubt (This should be the post-feminist anthem!)
“Respect” by Aretha Franklin
“Sisters Are Doin’ It For Themselves” by Aretha Franklin and Annie Lennox
“You Oughta Know” by Alanis Morissette
“Unity” by Queen Latifah
“Man! I Feel Like A Woman” by Shania Twain (Yes, that’s right, Shania Twain!)

**Pro-Choice / Anti-Abortion Movement**
“A Consistent Ethic of Human Life” by Derek Webb
“Pretty Girls” by Neko Case

**Gay Rights / Identity Movement**
“I Was Born This Way” by Carl Bean
“Relax” by Frankie Goes to Hollywood

**Labor/Union Movements**
“Which Side Are You On?” by Florence Reece
“Pastures of Plenty” by Woody Guthrie

**Anti-War Movements**
“Masters of War” by Bob Dylan
“I Ain’t Marching Anymore” by Phil Ochs
“The Times They Are Changing” by Bob Dylan
“For What It’s Worth” by Crosby, Stills, and Nash
“I Feel Like I’m Fixin’ to Die Rag” by Country Joe and the Fish
“Give Peace a Chance” by Plastic One Band
“Ohio” by Crosby, Stills, Nash, and Young