States, Parties, and Social Movements

Studies of social movements and of political parties have usually treated them as separate and distinct. In fact, they are deeply intertwined. Social movements often shape electoral competition and party policies; they can even give rise to new parties. At the same time, political parties and campaigns shape the opportunities, personnel, and outcomes of social movements. In many countries, electoral democracy itself is the outcome of social movement actions. This book examines the interaction of social movements and party politics since the 1950s, both in the United States and around the world. In studies of the U.S. civil rights movement, the New Left, the Czechoslovak dissident movements, the Mexican struggle for democracy, and other episodes, this volume shows how party politics and social movements cannot be understood without appreciating their intimate relationship.
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This volume arose from a unique collaborative project that began in the early 1990s and stretched into the new millennium. Ultimately, the project involved twenty-one core participants and a host of others who attended one or more of the nine mini-conferences that structured the project. In form and function, the project resembled nothing so much as an extended collaborative conversation concerning the nature and dynamics of “contentious politics.”

Motivated by a shared concern that the study of social movements, revolutions, democratization, ethnic conflict, and other forms of nonroutine, or contentious, politics had grown fragmented, spawning a number of insular scholarly communities only dimly aware of one another, the project was committed above all else to exploring possible lines of synthesis – empirical and theoretical – that might transcend some of the scholarly conventions that still largely divide the field. Among these conventions are persistent theoretical divisions between rationalists, culturalists, and structuralists; putative differences between various forms of contention (e.g., social movements, revolutions, peasant rebellions, industrial conflict); and the long-standing assumption of area specialists that any general phenomenon – such as contentious politics – can only be understood in light of the idiosyncratic history and cultural conventions of the locale in which it takes place. While respectful of these conventional distinctions, the project has been committed to exploring their limits and embracing promising new approaches and topics in the study of political contention.

A bit of history: The project began in 1993 with a casual conversation between Sid Tarrow and me, in which we found that we shared a deep ambivalence regarding the proliferation of work on social movements. On the one hand, we were delighted that a topic long regarded as peripheral by...
political scientists and sociologists alike had come to be seen as a legitimate subject of so much academic work. On the other hand, we were concerned about the increasing narrowness of the field and its disconnect from other proximate fields of study. Wouldn’t it be great, we mused, if scholars from these separate fields could together explore the possibilities for synthesis across these nominally distinct subfields? In turn, the conversation led to a concrete suggestion: Why not submit a proposal to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences to convene a one-year Special Project to be devoted to the kind of exploration and synthesis we had in mind? Why not, indeed! After we enlisted Chuck Tilly as a third coconspirator, a proposal was drafted, ably vetted by Phil Converse and Bob Scott (then director and associate director, respectively, of the Center), and in 1994 approved by both the Center’s Advisory Committee on Special Projects and its board of trustees.

Once the Special Project was secured, the enterprise took a fateful and felicitous turn. Knowing how ambitious – yet amorphous – our aims were, Bob Scott encouraged us to seek the additional monetary support that would allow us to stretch the project over a longer time frame. At his suggestion, we applied 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.

The challenge now centered on finding the right core faculty around whom to build the ongoing conversation. Eventually, we were lucky enough to attract four other colleagues for the project: Ron Aminzade, Jack Goldstone, Liz Perry, and Bill Sewell. We could not have asked for a more qualified and generous group of conversationalists. (Speaking personally, the opportunity to interact with all six of these colleagues over the life of the project has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my career. None of them can possibly know just how much I have learned and continue to learn from them.)

Though neither our Center nor the Mellon sponsors required us to do so, the seven of us agreed immediately that we wanted to involve graduate students in the project. Who better to offer fresh perspectives on important topics than promising young scholars not wedded to disciplinary boundaries and subfield conventions? The model we hit on for facilitating student involvement in the project was a yearly competition to select five graduate Fellows drawn from applicants solicited nationally from across a range of social science disciplines. The results of our first competition confirmed the
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approach. The voices of the five members of that first graduate cohort – Lissa Bell, Pamela Burke, Robyn Eckhardt, John Glenn, and Joseph Luders – blended so seamlessly into the conversation that, in the end, they forced us to revise our plan to limit the fellowships to one year and to approach Mellon for funding to enable us to retain all graduate Fellows for the life of the project. Mellon came through for us a second time. Nine more talented students – Jorge Cadena-Roa, David Cunningham, Manali Desai, Debbie Gould, Hyojoong Kim, Heidi Swarts, Nella Van Dyke, Heather Williams, and Kim Williams – joined us over the next two years, bringing the total number of graduate Fellows on the project to fourteen. It is a number of these younger scholars whose path-breaking efforts have produced this volume.

These younger scholars have more than fulfilled our hopes for fresh approaches to the study of contentious politics. Their many interventions, provocative queries, and fresh takes on familiar topics enlivened our discussion and taught us new ways of seeing social movements and social change. The essays in this volume crash through any barriers that once separated the study of institutional politics, social movements, political parties, and revolutionary change. Embracing topics as widely divergent as the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, the foundation of communist parties in India, the development of democracy in Mexico, the New Left and civil rights movements in the United States, and local politics in U.S. cities, these essays nonetheless share a common focus on demonstrating how political change emerges from the complex interplay of states, parties, and social movements. Far from being separate spheres of activity, the essays in this volume repeatedly demonstrate that social protest and institutional politics have been deeply intertwined, both in advanced democracies and in developing countries.

In addition, these brave scholars have taken on the standard shibboleths of social movement theory. Drawing on their rich empirical research, they show that our conventional view of social protest as rooted in political opportunities, sympathetic framing, and mobilization networks is far too simple to embrace the dynamics of protest and institutional change. Again and again, these essays show that political opportunities interact with specific issues, elite alignments, and the choices of movement and political party leaders to generate diverse outcomes. Framing is not an autonomous process of conceptualization, but is mediated by the path-dependent experiences of activists and movement organizations. And while mobilization networks are crucial to protest activity, these scholars repeatedly
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demonstrate that the results of protest are not simply related to the scale or intensity of mobilization and protest activity. Interactions with political leaders and agendas, as well as shifting state, public, and elite responses, can either produce dramatic changes from relatively modest mobilization or frustrate even widespread popular protest activities.

In short, we have much to learn from a new generation of research on the dynamics of social movements and political institutions. We are proud and delighted that the scholars who have given us so much during the Mellon project have allowed us to present the first fruits of their research in this volume.

Menlo Park, CA
April 20, 2000
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