SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, 1768–2004

Charles Tilly

Paradigm Publishers
Boulder • London

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be transmitted or reproduced in any media or form, including electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or informational storage and retrieval systems, without the express written consent of the publisher.

Copyright © 2004 by Paradigm Publishers, LLC

Published in the United States by Paradigm Publishers, 3360 Mitchell Lane Suite E, Boulder, Colorado 80301 USA.

Paradigm Publishers is the trade name of Birkenkamp & Company, LLC, Dean Birkenkamp, President and Publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tilly, Charles.
Social movements, 1768–2004 / Charles Tilly.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-59451-042-3 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 1-59451-043-1 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Social movements. I. Title.
HM881.T55 2004
303.48'4—dc22
2003025659

Printed and bound in the United States of America on acid-free paper that meets the standards of the American National Standard for Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

Designed and Typeset by Straight Creek Bookmakers.

09 08 07 06
5 4 3

To Lionel Grossbard MD, Joseph G. Sweeting MD, Michael H. Wechsler MD, and their collaborators at New York Presbyterian Hospital, who sustained my life as I wrote this book

CONTENTS

	Preface	ix
1	Social Movements as Politics	1
2	Inventions of the Social Movement	16
3	Nineteenth-Century Adventures	38
4	Twentieth-Century Expansion and Transformation	65
5	Social Movements Enter the Twenty-first Century	95
6	Democratization and Social Movements	123
7	Futures of Social Movements	144
	References	159
	Publications on Social Movements by Charles Tilly, 1977–2004	176
	Index	179

"full-fledged social movement" or "the type of social movement that first emerged in Western Europe and North America at the end of the eighteenth century." It certainly simplified the text.

Fortunately for friendship and future collaboration, in the book that most resembles this one with respect to argument and content, my friend and collaborator Sidney Tarrow explicitly disavows undertaking the social movement's history (Tarrow 1998: 3). This book therefore picks up where Tarrow's splendid survey of social movements leaves off. *Social Movements, 1768–2004* provides a historical survey of social movements from their eighteenth-century origins into the twenty-first century, ending with speculations about possible futures for social movements.

In order to avoid encumbering the text with references to my own previous publications, I have borrowed evidence freely from my earlier work, mostly without citing it. I have adapted a few passages from *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), and *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650–2000* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), but at least 95 percent of the text is quite new.

For information, citations, criticism, and editorial advice, I am grateful to Lance Bennett, Vince Boudreau, Pamela Burke, Dana Fisher, Elisabeth Jay Friedman, William Ivey, Vina Lanzona, Daniel Menchik, Vicente Rafael, Sidney Tarrow, Cecelia Walsh-Russo, Lesley Wood, and Viviana Zelizer. I hope they will be pleasantly surprised by what they helped create.

1

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS POLITICS

"Building a strong pro-democracy social movement," editorialized Zimbabwe's *Harare Daily News* on 5 December 2002,

> is always the task of civil society when operating under an oppressive political environment. . . . A starting point would be to be able to define a social movement. As the name suggests, social movements are inclusive organisations comprised of various interest groups. Social movements will contain the significant strata of society such as workers, women's groups, students, youth and the intellectual component. These various interest sectors of society will be bound together by one common grievance which in most cases will be the commonly perceived lack of democracy in a specific political setting. This has been particularly the case within the last two decades of the South African antiapartheid struggle and more relevantly in the last four years in Zimbabwe. The only significant difference between the Zimbabwean situation and the antiapartheid social movement in South Africa is that the former tends to be less defined and less focused. In fact, in Zimbabwe people can sometimes be forgiven for thinking that the social movement has been split. (*Harare Daily News* 2002: 1)

Leaders of the opposition to Robert Mugabe's violent, vindictive regime in the Zimbabwe of 2002 deplored the splits that the regime's twinning of repression with co-optation had produced among their beleaguered country's suffering citizens. They looked to South Africa's earlier and more successful mass mobilization against apartheid as a model. They called for a larger, more effective social movement in opposition to tyranny and in favor of democracy. For the newspaper's presumption in giving the opposition voice, Mugabe's regime closed down the *Harare Daily News* in September 2003. On 17 September, regime forces arrested about one hundred people who dared to march through Harare protesting the newspaper's closing and calling for a new constitution (*Economist* 2003b: 46).

As the Zimbabwean opposition sought to solve a political problem by calling for a social movement, it had plenty of company elsewhere. In 1997, the Manchester-based socialist journal *International Viewpoint* called for a "European social movement" to back workers' rights as the European Commission moved toward cuts in social spending (*International Viewpoint* 1997). Through the following years, European activists—socialist and otherwise—continued to call for a genuine movement at a continental scale. A Europe-centered but worldwide network called Jubilee 2000 campaigned for eradication of Third World debt. According to one of its organizers:

> **A global social movement was built, united around this one issue.** By 2000, after just four years of campaigning, there were Jubilee 2000 campaigns, of varying strengths and character, in 68 countries. The national campaigns were autonomous but shared overall goals, symbols, and information—and a tremendous sense of solidarity. The campaigns were based in countries as diverse as Angola and Japan, Colombia and Sweden, Honduras and Israel, Togo and the United States. The ability to cooperate and coordinate our campaigning was greatly enhanced by use of the Internet. (Pettifor 2001: 62; emphasis in original)

By 2004, many Europeans were looking hopefully at mobilization against global capital as the movement that would redeem the dashed hopes of European workers and the troubles of Third World countries as well.

Latin America and Asia chimed in as well: In March 2002, the website of the Costa Rica–based antidiarrhea group Rehydration Project posted an article by Sabir Mustafa, associate editor of the Dhaka *Financial Express.* Mustafa titled his article "Diarrhoea Control Becomes a Social Movement in Bangladesh" (Mustafa 2002). The article reported that great numbers of Bangladeshi "schoolteachers, religious leaders, voluntary organizations, village doctors, rural groups and even local auxiliary police forces" are actively promoting antidisease measures (especially oral rehydration therapy) to save children's lives.

The hopeful appeal to social movements also rises across North America. In 1999, Canadian activist Murray Dobbin called for "building a social movement in Canada" to make sure that where the left-leaning New Democratic Party actually took office it did not abandon its constituency:

> The most basic understanding of state theory tells us that when a social democratic party wins "power" in an election it really does no such thing. Senior bureaucrats, virtually all of whom are now schooled in neo-liberal ideology, operate as a fifth column to sabotage progressive policies. As well, when transnational corporations threaten a capital strike, as they did in Ontario and carried out in BC [British Columbia], NDP governments don't have the "power" to stop them.
>
> That is where social movements come in. And if we can't get thousands of people into the streets (without having to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars and do months of organizing) we can expect NDP governments to cave in to the very real power of corporations, exerted with breathtaking ferocity and on a daily basis. When it comes to social movements effectively confronting corporate power we have failed almost as badly as the NDP. (Dobbin 1999: 2)

By the turn of the twenty-first century, people all over the world recognized the term "social movement" as a trumpet call, as a counterweight to oppressive power, as a summons to popular action against a wide range of scourges.

It was not always so. Although popular risings of one kind or another have occurred across the world for thousands of years, what the *Harare Daily News* described as "inclusive organisations comprised of various interest groups" existed nowhere in the world three centuries ago. Then, during the later eighteenth century, people in Western Europe and North America began the fateful creation of a new political phenomenon. They began to create social movements. This book traces the history of that invented political form. It treats social movements as a distinctive form of contentious politics—contentious in the sense that social movements involve collective making of claims that, if realized, would conflict with someone else's interests, politics in the sense that governments of one sort or another figure somehow in the claim making, whether as claimants, objects of claims, allies of the objects, or monitors of the contention (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly 2001).

Social Movements, 1768–2004 shows that this particular version of contentious politics requires historical understanding. History helps because it explains why social movements incorporated some crucial features (for example, the disciplined street march) that separated the social movement from other sorts of politics. History also helps because it identifies significant *changes* in the operation of social movements (for example, the emergence of well-financed professional staffs and organizations specializing in the pursuit of social movement programs) and thus alerts us to the possibility of new changes in the future. History helps, finally, because it calls attention to the shifting political conditions that made social movements possible. If social movements begin to disappear, their disappearance will tell us that a major vehicle for ordinary people's participation in public politics is waning. The rise and fall of social movements mark the expansion and contraction of democratic opportunities.

As it developed in the West after 1750, the social movement emerged from an innovative, consequential synthesis of three elements:

1. a sustained, organized public effort making collective claims on target authorities (let us call it a *campaign*);
2. employment of combinations from among the following forms of political action: creation of special-purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives, statements to and in public media, and pamphleteering (call the variable ensemble of performances the *social movement repertoire*); and

3. participants' concerted public representations of WUNC: worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies (call them *WUNC displays*).

Unlike a one-time petition, declaration, or mass meeting, a *campaign* extends beyond any single event—although social movements often include petitions, declarations, and mass meetings. A campaign always links at least three parties: a group of self-designated claimants, some object(s) of claims, and a public of some kind. The claims may target governmental officials, but the "authorities" in question can also include owners of property, religious functionaries, and others whose actions (or failures to act) significantly affect the welfare of many people. Not the solo actions of claimants, object(s), or public, but interactions among the three, constitute a social movement. Even if a few zealots commit themselves to the movement night and day, furthermore, the bulk of participants move back and forth between public claim making and other activities, including the day-to-day organizing that sustains a campaign.

The social movement *repertoire* overlaps with the repertoires of other political phenomena such as trade union activity and electoral campaigns. During the twentieth century, special-purpose associations and crosscutting coalitions in particular began to do an enormous variety of political work across the world. But the integration of most or all of these performances into sustained campaigns marks off social movements from other varieties of politics.

The term WUNC sounds odd, but it represents something quite familiar. WUNC displays can take the form of statements, slogans, or labels that imply worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment: Citizens United for Justice, Signers of the Pledge, Supporters of the Constitution, and so on. Yet collective self-representations often act them out in idioms that local audiences will recognize, for example:

- *worthiness:* sober demeanor; neat clothing; presence of clergy, dignitaries, and mothers with children;
- *unity:* matching badges, headbands, banners, or costumes; marching in ranks; singing and chanting;
- *numbers:* headcounts, signatures on petitions, messages from constituents, filling streets;
- *commitment:* braving bad weather; visible participation by the old and handicapped; resistance to repression; ostentatious sacrifice, subscription, and/or benefaction.

Particular idioms vary enormously from one setting to another, but the general communication of WUNC connects those idioms.

Of course all three elements and their subdivisions had historical precedents. Well before 1750, to take an obvious case in point, Europe's Protestants had repeatedly mounted sustained public campaigns against Catholic authorities

on behalf of the right to practice their heretical faith. Europeans engaged in two centuries of civil wars and rebellions in which Protestant/Catholic divisions figured centrally (te Brake 1998). As for the repertoires, versions of special-purpose associations, public meetings, marches, and the other forms of political action existed individually long before their combination within social movements. We will soon see how social movement pioneers adapted, extended, and connected these forms of action. Displays of WUNC had long occurred in religious martyrdom, civic sacrifice, and resistance to conquest; only their regularization and their integration with the standard repertoire marked off social movement displays from their predecessors. No single element, but the *combination* of repertoire and WUNC displays within campaigns, created the social movement's distinctiveness.

Some overlapping political phenomena also emerged in the time of social movements. As later chapters will show in detail, political campaigns with their parties and electoral contests interacted extensively with social movements at times yet developed their own bodies of rights, obligations, personnel, and practices. At various times in the nineteenth century, workers in capitalist countries generally acquired rights to organize, assemble, strike, and speak collectively, sometimes winning those rights by means of social movement campaigns, performances, and WUNC displays. Organized interest groups such as manufacturers and medical professionals similarly achieved special political rights to speak and act collectively, although rarely by social movement means. Mostly, groups that already commanded substantial resources, connections, and prestige acquired rights through direct negotiation with governments.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most states that had established churches conceded to new religious sects at least the rights to assemble and speak if not to enforce their doctrines or practices on members. Separatist communities—religious, political, or lifestyle—have sometimes emerged from social movements, although most regimes have either repressed or contained such communities energetically. Organizations participating in social movements, furthermore, sometimes moved into these other political spheres: conducting political campaigns, establishing labor unions, creating durable interest groups, becoming religious sects, or forming separatist communities. These overlaps should not keep us from recognizing that after 1750 a distinctive body of law and practice grew up around social movements as such.

Interpretations of Social Movements

In a book titled *History of the French Social Movement from 1789 to the Present* (1850), German sociologist Lorenz von Stein introduced the term "social movement" into scholarly discussions of popular political striving (von Stein 1959). At first it conveyed the idea of a continuous, unitary process by which the whole working class gained self-consciousness and power. When von Stein wrote, Marx and Engels's *Communist Manifesto* (1848) had recently adopted just such a meaning

in its declaration that "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interests of the immense majority" (Marx & Engels 1958: I, 44).

Nevertheless, political analysts also spoke of social movements in the plural; in 1848, the German journal *Die Gegenwart* [The Present] declared that "social movements are in general nothing other than a first search for a valid historical outcome" (Wirtz 1981: 20). Most nineteenth-century analysts of social movements differentiated them by program, organization, and setting. Engels himself adopted the plural in his preface to the *Manifesto*'s English edition of 1888, remarking that "Wherever independent proletarian movements continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down" (Marx & Engels 1958: I, 26). From the later nineteenth century, political analysts not only regularly pluralized social movements but also extended them beyond organized proletarians to farmers, women, and a wide variety of other claimants (Heberle 1951: 2–11).

Names for political episodes gain weight when they carry widely recognized evaluations and when clear consequences follow from an episode's acquisition of—or failure to acquire—the name. To call an event a riot, a brawl, or a case of genocide stigmatizes its participants. To tag an event as a landslide election, a military victory, or a peace settlement generally polishes the reputations of its organizers. When either happens widely, critics or supporters of disputed actions regularly try to make the labels stick: to label an enemy's encounter with police a riot, to interpret a stalemate as a military victory, and so on. As our reports from Zimbabwe, the European Union, Bangladesh, and Canada suggest, the term "social movement" has acquired attractive overtones across the world. Consequently, participants, observers, and analysts who approve of an episode of popular collective action these days frequently call it a social movement, whether or not it involves the combination of campaign, repertoire, and WUNC displays.

In the cases of episodes of which parts clearly do meet the standards, furthermore, three confusions often arise.

1. Analysts and activists often extend the term "social movement" loosely to all relevant popular collective action, or at least all relevant popular collective action of which they approve. Feminists, for example, retroactively incorporate heroic women of the centuries before 1750 into the women's movement, while for environmental activists any popular initiative anywhere on behalf of the environment becomes part of the worldwide environmental movement.
2. Analysts often confuse a movement's collective action with the organizations and networks that support the action, or even consider the organizations and networks to *constitute* the movement, for example by identifying the environmental movement with the people, interpersonal networks, and advocacy organizations that favor environmental protection rather than the campaigns in which they engage.

3. Analysts often treat "the movement" as a single unitary actor, thus obscuring both a) the incessant jockeying and realignment that always go on within social movements and b) the interaction among activists, constituents, targets, authorities, allies, rivals, enemies, and audiences that makes up the changing texture of social movements.

Inflation of the term to include all sorts of popular collective action past and present, conflation of the movement with its supporting population, networks, or organizations, and treatment of movements as unitary actors do little harm in casual political discussion. In fact, within social movements they often aid recruitment, mobilization, and morale. But they badly handicap any effort to describe and explain how social movements actually work—especially when the point is to place social movements in history. That is the task at hand.

Let me make my own claims crystal clear. No one owns the term "social movement"; analysts, activists, and critics remain free to use the phrase as they want. But a distinctive way of pursuing public politics began to take shape in Western countries during the later eighteenth century, acquired widespread recognition in Western Europe and North America by the early nineteenth century, consolidated into a durable ensemble of elements by the middle of the same century, altered more slowly and incrementally after that point, spread widely through the Western world, and came to be called a social movement. That political complex combined three elements: 1) campaigns of collective claims on target authorities; 2) an array of claim-making performances including special-purpose associations, public meetings, media statements, and demonstrations; 3) public representations of the cause's worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment. I am calling that historically specific complex a social movement. This book traces the history of that complex.

Despite incessant small-scale innovation and variation from one political setting to another, the social movement's elements evolved and diffused as a connected whole. In that sense, the social movement has a history. The social movement's history distinguishes it from the history of other political forms such as electoral campaigns, patriotic celebrations, displays of military force, investitures of public officials, and collective mourning. When this book refers to social movements, then, it does not mean all popular action, all the actions people ever take on behalf of a cause, all the people and organizations that back the same causes, or heroic actors that stand astride history. It means a particular, connected, evolving, historical set of political interactions and practices. It means the distinctive combination of campaign, repertoire, and WUNC displays.

By these exacting standards, do the Zimbabwean, European, Bangladeshi, and Canadian mobilizations with which we began qualify as social movements? Yes, mostly. In 2002 and 2003, Zimbabwe's opposition was using such procedures of social movement claim making as demonstrations, meetings, and press releases in the face of a regime that treated any such claims as subversive. The Bangladeshi rehydration campaign straddled the boundary between routine governmental

public health measures and popular mobilization through associations, marches, and meetings. Confronted with an increasingly powerful European Union and the internationalization of capital, European workers were conducting difficult experiments in the extension of familiar national social movement routines to an international scale, as European organizers involved themselves energetically in coordinating worldwide campaigns concerning Third World debt, AIDS, and hundreds of other issues. By the turn of the twenty-first century, Canadian activists—including wary supporters of the New Democratic Party—could look back on almost two hundred years of associating, demonstrating, meeting, and making WUNC-style claims. Across important parts of the world, the social movement has become a familiar, generally reliable vehicle of popular politics (Buechler 2000, Edelman 2001, Ibarra & Tejerina 1998, Mamdani & Wamba-dia-Wamba 1996, Ray & Korteweg 1999, Tarrow 1998, Wignaraja 1993).

Partly because of the social movement's unquestioned contemporary prevalence, students of particular social movements have shown little interest in the locations of those movements within the larger history of the social movement as a form of politics. On the whole, analysts of social movements treat them as expressions of current attitudes, interests, or social conditions rather than as elements of longer-run histories. True, students of such nineteenth-century movements as antislavery, temperance, and suffrage have had to place them in their historical contexts and follow their historical developments (see, for example, d'Anjou 1996, Buechler 1990, Drescher 1986, 1994, Eltis 1993, Gusfield 1966, McCammon and Campbell 2002, Young 2002). Self-styled histories of regional, national, or international labor movements often reach back well before the nineteenth century's glory days for precedents and frequently sweep in a wider range of social movements than those focusing specifically on workers' welfare (see Bogolyubov, R'izhkova, Popov, & Dubinskii 1962, Dolléans & Crozier 1950, Kuczynski 1967a, 1967b, Zaleski 1956).

Broad surveys of protest, violence, and political conflict likewise regularly transect the zone of social movement activity (see Ackerman & DuVall 2000, Botz 1976, 1987, Brown 1975, Gilje 1987, 1996, Grimsted 1998, Lindenberger 1995, McKivigan & Harrold 1999, Mikkelsen 1986, Tilly, Tilly, & Tilly 1975, R. Tilly 1980, Walton & Seddon 1994, Williams 2003). Nearby, the reflecting mirrors of an abundant historical literature on policing, surveillance, and repression often capture social movements at unusual angles (see Balbus 1973, Broeker 1970, Bruneteaux 1993, Earl, Soule, & McCarthy 2003, Emsley 1983, Emsley & Weinberger 1991, Fillieule 1997b, Goldstein 1983, 2000, 2001, Gurr 2000, Huggins 1985, 1998, Husung 1983, Jessen 1994, Liang 1992, Lüdtke 1989, 1992, Monjardet 1996, Munger 1979, 1981, Palmer 1988, Storch 1976, Wilson 1969).

Some particular social movement performances—notably French and Irish marches and demonstrations—have attracted first-rate histories (Blackstock 2000, Farrell 2000, Favre 1990, Fillieule 1997a, Jarman 1997, Mirala 2000, Pigenet & Tartakowsky 2003, Robert 1996, Tartakowsky 1997, 1999). Broader social and political histories, furthermore, commonly pay attention to social movements as

they trace their overall historical trends (e.g., Anderson & Anderson 1967, Cronin and Schneer 1982, González Calleja 1998, 1999, Hobsbawm 1975, 1988, 1994, Montgomery 1993). All these kinds of historical study will serve us well in later chapters. Even taken together, however, they do not provide a coherent history of the social movement as a political phenomenon parallel to, say, the histories of legislative elections, political parties, revolutions, or coups d'état.

For particular countries and periods, some general historical surveys of social movements as such do exist (see, for example, Ash 1972, Bright and Harding 1984, Burke 1988, Castells 1983, Clark 1959, Clark, Grayson, & Grayson 1975, Duyvendak, van der Heijden, Koopmans, & Wijmans 1992, Fredrickson 1997, Gamson 1990, Kaplan 1992, Klausen & Mikkelsen 1988, Kriesi, Koopmans, Duyvendak, & Giugni 1995, Lundqvist 1977, Nicolas 1985, Tarrow 1996, Wirtz 1981). In one of the sharpest available statements on the subject, John Markoff sets the explanatory problem deftly:

> Social movements as we know them today were beginning to flourish in England by the late eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century took root in Europe, North America, and elsewhere. To understand why, we need to consider many linked changes: a strengthened government but a weakened king; a people organizing themselves to assert claims on that government; a political elite prone to claim that it ruled in the name of the people; transportation improvements and commercial relations linking distant people; the beginnings of widespread literacy and new communication media leading people separated in space to feel themselves moving to a common rhythm. (Markoff 1996b: 45)

In general, however, such surveys subordinate the history to some other line of analysis, such as S. D. Clark's demonstration of divergence in the paths of Canadian and U.S. movements after the 1830s and William Gamson's investigation of whether American political opportunities narrowed during the twentieth century. Markoff himself subordinates his analysis of the formation and transformation of social movements to the spread of democracy. I draw on these surveys repeatedly, as well as on historical studies of particular movements. I give special attention to chronologies and catalogs such as Gamson's because they provide material for comparison and systematic evidence of change (Tilly 2002b). Still, the following historical analysis has required a good deal of interpolating, synthesizing, and borrowing from my own historical research.

Social movement history poses an acute version of a characteristic problem in political analysis. Social movements unquestionably have a distinctive, connected history. This book pursues just that history. The pursuit brings on two strong—and quite opposite—temptations. From one side beckons the seductive temptation to treat the social movement as a phenomenon sui generis, and to search for general laws of its operation. Similar temptations beset students of revolutions, strike waves, and election campaigns. The search for grand laws in human affairs comparable to the laws of Newtonian mechanics has, however, utterly failed.

Some such laws might conceivably exist (in the form, let us say, of evolutionary and/or genetic universals), but they surely do not operate at the levels of particular structures or processes such as churches, corporations, revolutions, or social movements. Anyone who wants to explain political structures and processes in the present state of knowledge does much better sorting out the more limited causal mechanisms that produce change, variation, and salient features of those structures and processes. The effort necessarily depends on turning away from "laws" of social movements toward causal analogies and connections between distinctive aspects of social movements and other varieties of politics (Goldstone 2003, Tilly 2001a, 2001b). Explanations of social movements and their history must mesh with explanations of other sorts of contentious politics.

That effort, however, calls up the opposite temptation: having noticed smaller-scale regularities in social movements, one may see social movements everywhere. Considered separately, campaigns, performances such as public meetings or petitions, and WUNC displays such as badge wearing and ostentatious sacrifice often occur outside of social movements: within churches, schools, corporations, intellectual communities, and elsewhere (Binder 2002, Davis, McAdam, Scott, & Zald 2005, Davis & Thompson 1994). Sometimes, by analogy, they even attract the label "movement." Take the so-called militia movement in the United States of the 1990s. Across the United States, hundreds of small, loosely connected groups wore military garb, conducted war games, distributed apocalyptic texts, declared their independence from U.S. jurisdiction including the obligation to pay taxes, and prepared for the Armageddon their leaders predicted for the year 2000. The Southern Poverty Law Center, which keeps tabs on such groups, counted 858 militias across the country at their peak in 1996, a number that shrank to 143 by 2003 (*Economist* 2003a: 22).

If such groups took up the full combination of campaigns, social movement performances, and WUNC displays, then they would enter the terrain of social movements properly speaking. If, on the other hand, some of them organized as the Militia Party, began running candidates in local or state elections, and started buying time on local television stations, they would have opted for yet another available form of public politics: the electoral campaign. In the absence of such unlikely shifts in strategy, instead of declaring that the activities of militias "really are" social movements, it forwards the work of explanation more effectively to recognize them as constituting another form of contentious politics. That recognition allows us to study their similarities to social movements but also to see what distinctive explanatory problems they pose.

The respectable worlds of science and medicine similarly generate analogies to social movements from time to time, but mostly without forming full-fledged social movements. Take just one example: recent disputes over water in the Klamath River Basin, near the California-Oregon border. The headwaters of the Klamath, including the desert-surrounded Upper Klamath Lake, supply irrigation for many dry-earth farmers in the uplands. But they also drain into the lowland region where salmon breed and where the Klamath Tribes insist on treaty rights to

fishing established by an 1864 settlement with the United States. In 2002, a report of the National Academy of Sciences concluded that there was "no sound scientific basis" for terminating irrigation flows in favor of sending more water to downstream fisheries. The scientists' statement satisfied neither side, including the biologists lined up with one group of water users or the other. "The report's conclusion," remarked *Science* magazine's reporter from Klamath Falls, Oregon,

> sparked an outcry in this small farming community that federal agencies are supporting "junk science," and it bolstered calls for reforming or scrapping the Endangered Species Act (ESA). But over the past year, it has also sparked another, more muted outcry, this one among fisheries biologists. They contend that the report's analyses were simplistic, its conclusions overdrawn, and—perhaps worst of all—that the report has undermined the credibility of much of the science being done in the region if not fueled an outright antiscience sentiment. (Service 2003: 36)

Opposing groups of advocates are clearly conducting campaigns and occasionally employing such performances as press conferences to publicize their claims. If the farmers, the biologists, or members of the Klamath Tribes started to combine public campaigns, social movement performances, and WUNC displays in sustained claims on federal authorities or the National Academy of Sciences, they would move their struggles onto the terrain of full-fledged social movements. They, too, could conceivably take up the public politics of electoral campaigns—or, for that matter, move in the direction of regularly constituted interest groups by creating lobbyists, Washington offices, and newsletters broadcasting their causes. In the meantime, however, we will understand their actions better if we recognize analogies and differences without simply treating the Klamath Basin controversy as one more variety of social movement. The same goes for analogous struggles within corporations, churches, schools, intellectual disciplines, art worlds, and neighborhoods (Davis, McAdam, Scott, & Zald 2005). In exactly that sense, the historical project of tracing the social movement's distinctive politics forms part of the larger program of explaining contentious politics at large.

Toward Historical Explanations

This project, therefore, has four interdependent aspects. First, we must trace the origins and transformations of the social movement's major elements: campaigns, repertoires, and WUNC displays. How, for example, did the now-familiar street demonstration take shape and even acquire an uneasy legal standing in most democratic countries? Second, we must uncover the social processes that encourage or inhibit proliferation of social movements. Given the significant but still incomplete correspondence of democratization and social movements, for instance, what causal connections explain that correspondence? Third, we must examine how

the elements of social movements interacted with other forms of politics. To what extent and how, for example, did industrial strikes, electoral campaigns, and social movements intersect and influence each other? Finally, we must show what causes important aspects of change and variation in social movements. Does the emergence of professional political brokers, for instance, help explain the formation of a specialized, connected sector of social movement organizations in leading capitalist democracies (Ibarra 2003, Meyer & Tarrow 1998)? Close historical analysis helps answer all four sorts of questions.

Following that line of inquiry, here are the book's main arguments.

From their eighteenth-century origins onward, social movements have proceeded not as solo performances, but as interactive campaigns. Like electoral campaigns, popular rebellions, and religious mobilizations, they consist of interactions between temporarily connected (and often shifting) groups of claimants and the objects of their claims, with third parties such as constituents, allies, rival claimants, enemies, authorities, and various publics often playing significant parts in the campaigns' unfolding. We will never explain social movements' variation and change without paying close attention to political actors other than the central claimants, for example the police with whom demonstrators struggled, collaborated, and codeveloped their strategies.

Social movements combine three kinds of claims: program, identity, and standing. Program claims involve stated support for or opposition to actual or proposed actions by the objects of movement claims. Identity claims consist of assertions that "we"—the claimants—constitute a unified force to be reckoned with. WUNC (worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment) performances back up identity claims. Standing claims assert ties and similarities to other political actors, for example excluded minorities, properly constituted citizens' groups, or loyal supporters of the regime. They sometimes concern the standing of *other* political actors, for example in calls for expulsion of immigrants or their exclusion from citizenship. Program, identity, and standing claims conform to partly separate codes built up from a regime's particular political history; Zimbabweans and Canadians do not—and cannot—signal collective worthiness in exactly the same way.

The relative salience of program, identity, and standing claims varies significantly among social movements, among claimants within movements, and among phases of movements. A good deal of negotiation within social movements, indeed, centers on the relative prominence the different claims will receive: do we, for example, present ourselves as a durable alliance of rights-deprived people who are currently lining up against this governmental program (but tomorrow might line up in support of another), or as a diverse cross section of the general population whose main connection consists of the harm that all of us will receive from this particular program and who therefore may never again join in making claims?

Democratization promotes the formation of social movements. By democratization, let us mean development of regimes featuring relatively broad and equal

citizenship, binding consultation of citizens with respect to governmental policy, personnel, and resources, and at least some protection of citizens from arbitrary actions by governmental agents (Tilly 2004). Democratization actually limits the range of feasible and effective popular collective action. Democratic institutions, for example, generally inhibit violent popular rebellions (Tilly 2003: chap. 3). But empowerment of citizens through contested elections and other forms of consultation combines with protections of civil liberties such as association and assembly to channel popular claim making into social-movement forms.

Social movements assert popular sovereignty. Although particular movements differ fiercely over who counts as "the people," the whole apparatus of campaign, repertoire, and WUNC displays embodies the more general claim that public affairs depend, and should depend, on the consent of the governed. The claim is not necessarily democratic, since ethnic, religious, and nationalist movements sometimes invest their powers in charismatic leaders rather than democratic deliberation yet still insist that those leaders embody the will of the people at large. Such movements, furthermore, often reject whole categories of the local population as unworthy of belonging to "the people." But the stress on popular consent fundamentally challenges divine right to kingship, traditional inheritance of rule, warlord control, and aristocratic predominance. Even in systems of representative government, as we will soon see, social movements pose a crucial question: do sovereignty and its accumulated wisdom lie in the legislature or in the people it claims to represent?

As compared with locally grounded forms of popular politics, social movements depend heavily on political entrepreneurs for their scale, durability, and effectiveness. The local routines of retaliation, rebellion, and resistance that prevailed across most of the world before the era of social movements drew on widely available local knowledge and existing interpersonal networks. The social movement combination of campaigns, WUNC displays, and coordinated performances, in contrast, always results at least in part from prior planning, coalition building, and muting of local differences. As we will soon see, smart political entrepreneurs figured in campaigns, social movement performances, and WUNC displays from the very birth of social movements. During the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, however, professional political organizers, brokers, and partly autonomous nongovernmental organizations took on increasingly prominent parts in promotion of social movements—to the dismay of populist critics. Ironically, a good deal of twentieth- and twenty-first-century social movement work therefore went into disguising the entrepreneurial effort in favor of images portraying the spontaneous emergence of WUNC.

Once social movements establish themselves in one political setting, modeling, communication, and collaboration facilitate their adoption in other connected settings. Transfers often occur within the same regime from the initial foci of social movements—more often than not claims on national governments—to other objects of demand or support such as local leaders, landlords, capitalists, or religious figures. Social movement strategies also transfer *among* regimes as political

organizers, exiles, and members of international religious groups collaborate across national boundaries and as rulers of authoritarian regimes (especially those that claim to rule on behalf of a coherent, united people) find themselves under pressure from other countries to concede something to their critics. Colonies of countries that already have established social movements provide inviting environments for infusion of social movement activity.

The forms, personnel, and claims of social movements vary and evolve historically. Three distinguishable but interacting sources of change and variation in social movements produce variation in time and space. First, overall political environments (including democratization and dedemocratization) alter in partial independence of social movement activity and affect its character. Second, within the interactions that occur in the course of social movements (for example, interactions between demonstrators and police), change occurs incrementally as a consequence of constant innovation, negotiation, and conflict. Third, participants in social movements—including not only activists but also authorities and other objects of claims—communicate with each other, borrowing and adapting each other's ideas, personnel, assistance, rhetorics, and models of action. They also borrow, adapt, and innovate as they compete with each other for advantages or constituencies. Sometimes the borrowing and adaptation take place over great distances and between quite disparate social movements (Chabot 2000, Chabot & Duyvendak 2002, Scalmer 2002b). Changes in political environments, incremental changes within the social movement sphere, and transfers among movements interact to produce substantial change and variation in the character of social movements.

The social movement, as an invented institution, could disappear or mutate into some quite different form of politics. Just as many forms of popular justice and rebellion that once prevailed have quite vanished, we have no guarantee that the social movement as it has prevailed for two centuries will continue forever. Since the social movement spread with the growth of centralized, relatively democratic states, for example, either governmental decentralization, extensive privatization of governmental activities, eclipse of the state by transnational powers, or widespread dedemocratization could all put the social movement as we know it out of business. Indeed, with the set of changes that people loosely call "globalization" occurring, citizens who count on social movements to make their voices heard must look very hard at the future.

This book follows these arguments through a straightforward historical analysis. Chapter 2 looks at the eighteenth-century invention of the social movement, concentrating on North America and England but looking briefly at other parts of Western Europe as well. Chapter 3 surveys the nineteenth century, during which extensive national and international movements grew up in the West and some also formed in European colonies. Chapter 4 moves up to the twentieth century, a time of worldwide proliferation in social movement activity. Chapter 5 follows up with the twenty-first century, focusing on the expansion of international communication and coordination among social movement activists.

At that point, the book's broadly chronological analysis ends in favor of pressing questions raised by the history. Chapter 6 analyzes what the previous chapters tell us about mutual influences of democratization and social movements: when, how, and why democratization promotes social movements, but also under what conditions and how social movements advance democratization or dedemocratization. Finally, chapter 7 draws together conclusions in the form of possible futures for the social movement. Between here and there we will see that social movements have a dramatic history all their own, one that today's participants in social movements almost never recognize and will gain handsomely from recognizing.