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Preface and Acknowledgments

Our enterprise began with a failed coup. In 1995, friends, students, and collaborators of Chuck Tilly organized a gathering in Amsterdam that was supposed to ease Tilly into retirement. He failed to get the message. As second best, McAdam and Tarrow decided to divert Tilly temporarily from his other projects into one that would minimize the evils he might otherwise inflict on the world. This book is the result.

Uncertain of their ability to coerce Tilly into compliance with their schemes, the two conspirators plotted to expand their cabal. Wouldn’t it be great, they mused, if scholars from the related fields of social movements, revolutions, nationalism, and democratization could find a venue in which to explore the possibilities for synthesis across these nominally distinct subfields? That conversation led to a proposal to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences for a one-year Special Project to be devoted to the kind of exploration and synthesis they had in mind. After enlisting Tilly as co-conspirator, a proposal was drafted, ably vetted by Phil Converse and Bob Scott (then Director and Associate Director of the Center), and approved by both the Center’s Advisory Committee on Special Projects and its Board of Trustees. The plot had thickened!

Once the Special Project began, our broader enterprise took a fateful turn. Realizing faster than we did how excessive were our aims, Bob Scott encouraged us to seek support that would allow us to stretch the project over a longer time frame. At his suggestion, we made application in 1995 to the Mellon Foundation’s Sawyer Seminar Series, seeking support for a three-year seminar series organized around the broad topic of Contentious Politics. To our delight and surprise, Mellon granted our request. Our thanks go to Harriet Zuckerman for the vision – and the patience – to have encouraged this unusual variation on the Sawyer Seminar format and to
Neil Smelser (Phil’s successor as Center Director) and Bob for agreeing to host it at the Center. We also thank the Center staff for their patience and good humor as they faced the onslaughts of the “contentious crowd” over the years of our association.

But we now faced a new challenge: finding the right core faculty around whom to build that conversation. We were fortunate to attract four colleagues who joined us in founding what came to be called the “Invisible College of Contentious Politics”. With Ron Aminzade, Jack Goldstone, Liz Perry, and Bill Sewell, we worked as a team for three years to fashion a more interactive approach to contentious politics. One fruit of that effort appears in a companion volume to this one, *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. Others, we hope, will soon join the first two volumes. Our own book profited tremendously from interaction with these friends and colleagues and we thank them warmly.

Our debts go beyond the core faculty of the Contentious Politics group. Though neither the Center nor our Mellon sponsors required us to do so, the seven of us agreed immediately to involve graduate students – and not just our own – in the project. Who better to offer fresh perspectives on important topics than promising young scholars not wedded to disciplinary boundaries or subfield conventions? To the five voices of that first graduate cohort in 1996–1997 – Lissa Bell, Pamela Burke, Robyn Eckhardt, John Glenn, and Joseph Luders – were added nine others over the next two years: Jorge Cadena-Roa, David Cunningham, Manali Desai, Debbie Gould, Hyojoung Kim, Heidi Swarts, Nella Van Dyke, Heather Williams, and Kim Williams. They not only helped to enrich the larger project but also made more contributions to *Dynamics of Contention* than they can know. We thank them warmly and hope that their association with us was as rewarding for them as it has been to us.

Still others helped. In each of the Mellon project's three years the seven core faculty members and their junior associates organized three small conferences, each focused on a specific topic relevant to a general understanding of contention. Among the topics explored were religion and contention, emotion and contention, the globalization of contention, identity and networks in contention. Each of these conferences featured participation by two or three invited experts. We owe thanks to Mark Beissinger, Craig Calhoun, Bill Gamson, Jeff Goodwin, Roger Gould, Susan Harding, Michael Hechter, Lynn Hunt, Jane Jenson, Arthur Kleinman, Hanspeter Kriesi, Marc Lichbach, John Meyer, Ann Mische, Aldon Morris, Maryjane Osa, Gay Seidman, Kathryn Sikkink, Verta
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Taylor, Mark Traugott, Paul Wapner, and Tim Wickham-Crowley for their collaboration.

Our debts go even further. During year three of the project, while we were in residence at the Center, our colleague Ron Aminzade joined us in organizing a general seminar on the topic of contentious politics for interested Center Fellows. We were lucky to enjoy the participation in this seminar of an unusually large and talented group of our fellow Fellows. These included: Jerry Davis, Jane Mansbridge, Rob Sampson, Carol Swain, Ed Tiryakian, and Katherine Verdery. We thank them for their willingness to take part in our sometimes contentious conversations.

Away from the Center, we had to defend what we had learned to the many experts who helped us on our paths to some knowledge of their areas. They will have to judge whether we have expanded their knowledge as well as our own. We received precious advice, criticism, information, and technical assistance from Paloma Aguilar Fernández, Benedict Anderson, Ron Aminzade, Ramón Adell Argilés, Mark Beissinger, Richard Bensel, Valerie Bunce, Jorge Cadena-Ruiz, Lars-Erik Cederman, Ruth Collier, Maria Cook, Donatella della Porta, Rita di Leo, Rafael Durán Muñoz, Neil Fligstein, Jonathan Fox, Carmenza Gallo, Miriam Golden, Jack Goldstone, Roger Gould, Davydd Greenwood, Ernst Haas, Judy Hellman, Steven Kaplan, Peter Katzenstein, Mark Kesselman, Bert Klandermans, Gerry van Klinken, Ruud Koopmans, Hanspeter Kriesi, Hyeok Kwon, David Laitin, Peter Lange, Vina Lanzona, Marc Lerner, Mark Liebbach, James Mahoney, David S. Meyer, Jose Ramón Montero, Reynaldo Yunuen Ortega Ortiz, Elizabeth Perry, Hayagreeva Rao, William Roy, Hector Schamis, Cathy Schneider, Jane Schneider, Peter Schneider, William H. Sewell Jr., Vivienne Shue, Jack Snyder, Bo Strath, Yang Su, Andrew Walder, Elisabeth Wood, Barry Weingast, Thomas Weskopp, Viviana Zelizer, and members of the Columbia University Workshop on Contentious Politics.

As our project drew to a close, the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences offered still another opportunity to refine our work. A Summer Institute with twenty lively young scholars pitted their own intellectual steeds against our manuscript in the summer of 2000, with McAdam and Tilly in the saddle and Tarrow briefly running alongside. Enthusiastic thanks to Kenneth Andrews, Joe Bandy, Neal Carter, David Cunningham, Christian Davenport, Bob Edwards, Gautam Ghosh, John Guindry, Frederick Harris, Peter Houtzager, Jason Kaufman, Deborah
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Martin, Byron Miller, S. Mara Pérez-Godoy, Kurt Schock, Paul Silverstein, Jackie Smith, David Stone, and Deborah Yashar for thoughtful, probing comments on our book.

All books are learning experiences as well as attempts to communicate knowledge to others. Writing this one – perhaps more than most – was an intense learning experience. This was the case for three reasons. First, our program called for analysis of many episodes that lay outside our previous areas of geographical and historical expertise. Second, the program demanded constant learning in the course of assembling our materials. For if – as we will maintain in what follows – the same processes and mechanisms of contention recur across wide bands of territory and different forms of contention, what we learned from one episode could not be neatly partitioned off from the others. Each foray into new territory caused a return to familiar terrain for new interrogation of once-comfortable understandings. Third, because no single one of us possessed sufficient authority to exercise a veto power over the others (“Just let him try!”), discussions over content and interpretation were vigorous – often contentious. Our working sessions proceeded like rotating seminars, with roles of teacher, student, and kibitzer revolving dizzyly around the table.

Where does the resulting book fit into the rapidly expanding field of contentious politics and into social science as a whole? Like other scholars and teachers, in our book we work through incessant dialogue with previous ideas and findings, including our own. Hardly a paragraph has taken shape without reflection or debate on the relation between what the paragraph says and earlier work: This confirms X, that contradicts Y, Z made the same point somewhat differently, and so on. The book’s first two chapters identify scholarly literatures on which we have drawn extensively, but they do not pinpoint the book’s location with respect to other writings. Earlier versions included much more painstaking specifications of origins for particular ideas, disagreements with competing accounts, and identifications of work that paralleled our own. Spurred by complaints from readers of those earlier drafts, we recognized that such references to relevant work were obscuring our arguments while producing a lengthy, ponderous tome.

In rewriting, we eliminated almost all detailed discussions of previous work. In general, we restricted explicit mentions of other authors to distinctive ideas and findings on which our arguments directly depend. Specialists in the various fields the book traverses may sometimes feel that we
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have given insufficient credit to relevant work by others or insufficient attention to contrary views. On balance, nevertheless, we think that most readers will gain from considering our analyses without being distracted by ostentatious finger-pointing toward adjacent literatures.

We hope that the resulting sparseness of references to other people's analyses will not suggest disdain for the ideas and efforts of our respected colleagues. We have not hesitated to relate our arguments to other work on contentious politics in separate publications, both joint and individual (see e.g., McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 1997; McAdam 1999; Tarrow 1998; Tilly 2001). It will soon become clear, in any case, how much this book depends on dialogue and respectful engagement with recent investigations of contentious politics.

Students of contentious politics may want to decide where we stand on current controversies among structuralists, culturalists, and rationalists. If they look for evidence of the kind of paradigm warfare that often rages across the pages of learned journals, they will be disappointed. If our frankly syncretic view has a label, it would have to be “relational.” While acknowledging the crucial contributions of rationalists, culturalists, and structuralists, we think the area of contentious politics will profit most from systematic attention to interaction among actors, institutions, and streams of contentious politics. Our program starts from this perspective to explore a variety of areas of contention using the comparative analysis of mechanisms and processes to do so.

How should students of contentious politics who find the book's program attractive proceed? Plenty of previous analyses actually identify robust causal mechanisms and use them to explain salient features of contentious episodes. Such analyses should continue to provide practical models for future work. Many of the questions, and some of the answers, posed by analysts in what we distinguish roughly as structuralist, culturalist, and rationalist approaches remain important guides for the next round of inquiry. Instead of burning their manuals and junking their toolboxes, we hope that skilled users of existing intellectual tools will invent new ways of wielding them. We hope they will attempt seriously to refute, challenge, modify, extend – now and then, even verify – our book's arguments.

Ithaca, New York
September 23, 2000
Abbreviations

ANC
African National Congress

BANAMERICA
Bank of America (Banco de América)

BANDILA
The Nation United in Spirit and Mission (Bayan Nakiisa sa Diwa at Layunin)

BANIC
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<table>
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