

**ZALD:** Let me introduce our speakers, and then I want to say a few words more of introduction. And then we'll turn it over to the speakers, who will each have about 20 minutes to speak. The three speakers today are Doug McAdam and Dave Snow and Erica Summers-Effler. I always start to turn it around, but I've got it right. Okay.

And I knew, and I think most of you knew Dave and Doug from their long association with the, and distinguished service in sociology. For me, they're my junior colleagues. Anybody under 70 is my junior colleague, and only a few of you who escape that.

But I did not, I must, so I'm not going to say anything more about Dave and Doug. They, you all know their work that's much more than just social movements. They're each known for a very distinctive contribution in the social movements literature, Doug, mainly, in the political opportunities, literature, and later on the and political process, later on contentious politics, Dave for framing and the immense growth of interest in frames and framing, the cognitive representation and transformation tied to ideology in some ways, but having its own life to the society and to the culture.

But I didn't know Erica's work. And so I immediately went to the started looking at it, and then I found out why he had, why Randy had asked her to serve, present. She represents the up-and-coming generation. She has a terrific new book that basically bridges a kind of organizational dynamic with both emotions and collective identify so that if you have a movement, or a movement organization is failing, that is pushes a certain emotional set of reactions, but then has further consequences for the life and commitment of the organization. This book came out in 2010, University of Chicago Press, and remind me of the title.

**SUMMERS-EFFLER:** *Laughing Saints and Righteous Heroes.*

**ZALD:** Did you all hear that?

**SUMMERS-EFFLER:** *Laughing Saints and Righteous Heroes.*

**ZALD:** Thank you. And so she really represents the unfolding, further unfolding of the discipline, kind of the new wave of not just taking a new concept, but seeing how it attaches to older concepts in the field. And it's a terrific book, and you will hear more about that in a little while.

I wanted to pick up a couple of the things that Randy said in his talk, in his letter, and just elaborate them a little bit. I want to give one anecdote from an unnamed assistant professor in 1970, whose name I don't want to mention because he didn't give me permission to tell the story.

So he was an assistant professor working at what I think most of us who have, who came into the new field, the redefined arena, as he was one of the, could be considered one of the founders of the new field of the resource mobilization branch collective action with a slightly rationalistic flavor, some people more formal in that rational connection than others.

And he was at a major Ivy League school, and whose chairman I know, I knew, who was a former president of the American Sociological Association and somebody I

had a great deal of respect for, told him that he should not be able to count on tenure at this school, but his work was too marginal to the effort. And so I think that was not unlike many people's view of collective behavior at that time.

And then I want to just give you a couple indicators of centrality. One intellectual is that there was a kind of break off, not full severing, but there is a movement away from the tie of collective behavior social movements as tightly integrated to a much more loosely integrated relationship to what had been collective behavior fields.

At the same time, because of developments in political sociology, there was a movement of the field much more towards a political view of movement than their connections. And then, at a later time, it becomes a little bit of a liability for some people. But, nevertheless, as that move then opened us up to almost any movement because every new social issue generates supporters and opponents and gets into a mobilization political process effort, and, therefore, it makes this, our work, central, more central.

Another indicator, one I'm proud of on the snob side of the scale, three vice presidents of the ASA, one president of the ASA, one member of sociology who had become, became a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and four members who became members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences were leading people in the new sociology of social movements. And that's quite a record, I think, for a growing field. These people made it and enhanced the field, and they are, they have been very important to our advancing.

I want to say a word about growth. It's astonishing, the growth of social movement interests. The number of papers that were given at the CBSM workshop this week, two days, in two days more papers were given than would have been given in four years, say in the years 1960 to '64. Just, and good papers, papers with all interesting titles, hard, well thought out papers. So on that side, the growth has been terrific.

There has been a terrific growth internationally. Early on, the closest connections were made to research in Europe, and so there's a very heavy American-Europe connection in the area of social movements, including a major annual conference in Manchester every year on social movements. New journals.

And then a growth that, for me, has been an enormous shock, I played some role in it, but I never thought I would see the day when the study of social movements was a major topic in business schools. And a little indicator of the quality of that is that the two most recent editors of the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, which is the lead organization studies journal, are both people who have made major contributions to the study of organizations, business, and social movements. So the outgoing editor is Hayagreeva Rao, known to many of you. The incoming editor is Gerry Davis, also known to many of you.

So that gives you a feel to where we've come. The field has continued. One other thing. The field has continued to do something that really shows kind of a scholarly growth. At the beginning, there was a lot of attempt to say which field, which approach is better, political process or resource mode or framing. And there were theory contests, you might say.

And that went on for a while, and those were interesting papers, and a lot of good research was done. Homelessness, Dave had a series of papers with Dan Kress and

others on homelessness and urban community differences. A lot of good, with a slightly retesting notion.

But one of the interesting things is the way things that were almost throwaway sentences in the early formulation, but important throwaway sentences, became serious topics in themselves. One of my favorites is the phrase from Chuck Tilly, repression works.

And that for, on the one hand, it's important that Tilly said that because until the new movement, I mean, it's kind of astonishing it feels now. But at the time that the new literature started taking off, there were no studies of repression. If you looked in the index of some of the old textbooks, you wouldn't see that the social control repression as a topic. And now there is a whole literature on when repression works, when it doesn't work, and even when repression creates more mobilization. And, of course, you've all been seeing some piece of that in contemporary Syria.

If you ever want to say repression fails, at least so far, it's only increased more mobilization. And another example, I could give dozens of these, is the whole area of coalitions in social movements. When McCarthy and Zald wrote we had throwaway line about how different kind of social movement industries leads to coalition amongst segments. And we waved our hand at that and gave a couple quick examples and moved on.

Now there has been very systematic, excellent work with Holly McCann(?) at Vanderbilt and Nella VanDyke editing a collection of terrific, and if you looked at our program today, there's another good session on coalition work. That stuff just didn't exist 30, 40 years ago.

Let me now turn it over to our speakers, and we'll go, I think, in the order of your sitting. And each of our commentators, our lecturers, will take about 20 minutes, and I will be holding up the sign. And let's go.

**MCADAM:** Thank you, Mayer. Mayer was incredibly important to me as a mentor trying to move into this area that really didn't exist. I'll comment on it, I'll say a little bit more about that later on. So it's wonderful to have Mayer up here on the podium providing that kind of context for the session.

I'm going to take a slightly different tack than maybe other panelists are in two senses. One, although there's lot's to celebrate as I look back on the growth of the field over the last 30, 40, 50 years, and I will acknowledge some of that, most of my remarks are going to be quite critical. I think there is a danger to the, in a sense, to the size of the field and to what I see as the increasing narrowness in the focus of much work on social movements. But I'll talk about that later. So that's one sense in which I will perhaps depart from convention, given the thematic focus of the session.

And the other is, at the very end I want to offer just a few findings from a research project that I've recently completed with a colleague, Hilary Boudet. I don't know if Hilary's here or not. The full report of this research project will be the project of a forthcoming book from Cambridge. That will be out in six months or so.

But I don't want to, I'm not this, I'm not using this to smuggle in sort of an advertisement for a coming attraction or something. I want to use the findings to illustrate some of the central what I guess are polemical themes in my talk. So that will come at the end as well.

But, again, I don't want to be exclusively negative here at all. Really, watching the field grow, evolve, change, over the last, say, 35 years, my reactions have been conflicted. On the one hand, I regard the growth of this field as incredibly important. And I want to come back and say some positive things about that.

On the other hand, I've also watched as the field, in my view, has grown narrower and narrower and more insular and movement-centric in its focus, and I want to elaborate on that a little bit as well. But let me start with the positives because there's lots to celebrate here.

When I went off to college as an undergraduate in 1970, that's how old I am, I was very active in the anti-war movement, and I really wanted, was interested in the topic of social movements, you know, as an academic subject. And I assumed there would be all sorts of courses on this terribly important phenomena.

And I looked in the political science department sort of catalog and found absolutely nothing. I didn't know anything about sociology, so I didn't look there. I sort of forgot about this search. And then halfway through my junior year I was taking kind of some kind of a required social science course, and I was taking the course abnormal psychology, and there I found social movements. That was a quarter of the course was devoted to the study of social movements.

That was the one corner of the academy, one quarter of the social sciences where the study of social movements had a little bit of leverage, a little bit of friction. So that was my introduction to the study of social movements.

When I went to grad school in 1974, there functionally was not a field of study in sociology, certainly not one that would have been characterized as the study of social movements. The section CBSM, Collective Behavior of Social Movements section of the association was only established in 1979, the year I left grad school. It is now, I think, the last time I looked, the sixth largest section in the association. There's about 50 sections, so it has grown dramatically within sociology.

More importantly, I think, is that it now has tremendous interdisciplinary resonance. Organizational studies, Mayer mentioned, even in the B school, geography, political science, education, it used to be when I would teach a graduate course in social movements, I'd have 10, 12 students perhaps, and they would all be from the sociology, our sociology doctoral program.

The last 2 times I've taught it, one time I had 42 students of whom 9 were from sociology, and there were 33 from other graduate programs around campus because the study of social movements has proven to be useful as a body of knowledge and theory for scholars in a wide range of fields. That, I think, is very exciting.

And as Mayer said, to me, the great single advance over the last 35 years is that most of the work, I'll be cautious here, but most of the work prior to, say, the mid-1970s that touched on social movements, lots of it was of the armchair theory variety. This commitment to a kind of systematic research program is what I really associate with the growth of the field. So we've amassed a very impressive body of systematic empirical work. We know lots more about this phenomena, certainly, than we did 35, 40 years ago, and that's all cause for celebration.

Now I will shift to the negative. As this field has grown as dramatically and quickly as it has, in my view, it has become much more insular, much more self-referential, more movement-centric in its focus. And, again, to borrow from the title,

to use the cosmological analogy, from its kind of Copernican origins, I think the field has grown more Ptolemaic in its focus. The focus is squarely, is substantially on movements as a single kind of political actor. And I think there are costs to that narrowing.

And I should say, I see these two kind of broad trends, the growth on the one hand and the narrowness on the other, as very much related. We have become so big, we now constitute our own audience. So we talk to each other more than we talk to political scientists, geographers, people in education, etc., who are also doing serious social movement scholarship.

And I think, again, there's two costs here. One is as we focus on each other's work, we are increasingly, I think, disconnected from very good work that's being done on very relevant, related subjects in other fields. And then, but the second cost to me is more important. And that is by making movement so central, the central object of theoretical and empirical attention, I think we distort the phenomena. I think we exaggerate the frequency of movements, and we probably exaggerate their causal significance.

It's, I mean, just as Ptolemy did, by centering the earth at that, locating the earth at the center of his cosmological system, he exaggerated its importance. And I think over time there's a risk to our field of doing very much the same thing by focusing overmuch on movements at the expense of other critically important actors who may also be shaping the dynamics of contention.

As I say, I think this is a far cry from the origins of the field. Oops, I don't want that one, don't want that one. I really, as . . . in grad school, as this work was starting to be produced, to me there were three very broad, important, discernable strands of work that came together to kind of create this new field of social movement studies.

One was the work I associate with Mayer and John McCarthy that, the focus on kind of a new organizational structure to American politics. I'm reminded of how broad their initial work was, that is, what this, I guess, the title of their very important '73 essay was *The Trend of Social Movements in America, Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*.

But they were interested in understanding this very significant broad change in the organizational structure of politics. Yes, in the United States, but really in the democratic West. It was that broad a vision, I think, and that's why it was so important. So they thought of this. They thought of social movements in a very broad organizational context.

Then there was the second strand of work, which was much more focused on the relationship between social movements and systems of institutionalized power. So that was Tilly's work and Jenkins and Perreault and Bill Gamson and so forth. So they were contextualizing movements, but against the backdrop of broad political systems, institutionalized power.

And then there was a third strand, which I thought was also very important and which has virtually disappeared, and that's, as I say, on the political economy of contention that putting movements or putting contention in the context, locating it in the context of very broad economic trends or structures. Jeff Page's work, Michael Schwartz work, Theda's work, Theda Skocpol's work.

The work was, in general, very broad, and a lot of that breadth, I think, has been lost over time. Not all of it, by any stretch of the imagination, but to a certain extent. Over time, I think, theoretically, the field has grown less interested in these broader connections to organizational trends, to broad political structures, and, certainly, to the broad political economy of contention and more and more attention to the internal sort of dynamics of movements, to mobilization, to movement actors, and to the things they do internal to a movement.

Believe me, there's lots of interesting questions focused narrowly on movements. I have no objection. There's lots of tremendous work being done on the internal dynamics of movements. It's the balance between that internal movement centric focus and broader questions that concerns me, makes me worry that we're, again, starting to be more Ptolemaic in our consideration of this important, complicated, empirical phenomena and less Copernican.

We compound that problem, I think, and I'm as guilty as anyone at this, by embracing research strategies that tend to select on the dependent variables. So we study successful movements, or we study activists. Again, we focus on those, I think, very, very rare instances of success, and we tend not to interrogate mobilization attempts or failed movements nearly as much as we should.

So by focusing, picking atypical, almost certainly nonrepresentative examples, that is successes, and focusing on internal movement dynamics, I think we come very close to producing this kind of Ptolemaic vision of movements. And I worry that, again, we distort the frequency and the causal significance of movements by doing that.

Don't believe me? Here's some data. So and this, to me, is the best single-volume reference volume in the field, *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. I did not cherry pick these. These are index categories, right? I went to the index, and I said, okay. Let me look at external topics, elections, six-page references, capitalism five. You guys can read that. But you see, and, again, I did not cherry pick. Those are the only ones that I considered external.

Internal gets lots more page citations because that's where the field has gone over time. And, again, there's nothing wrong with it. There's tremendous work that's reflected in the high index counts on the right-hand side of that slide. What worries me is the relative lack of page citations on the left-hand side and the kind of imbalance between a more Copernican view of contention and a more narrowly movement-centric view that I think has become broadly motile in the field.

I'm not the only one saying things like this. Andy Walder, my colleague at Stanford, wrote a terrific piece that appeared in last year's annual review on the narrow focus, critiquing what he sees as the narrow focus on mobilization in the social movement literature.

Jeff Goodwin, I think this piece is still unpublished. It's a spectacularly good article in which he talks about the disappearance of work on what I've called the political economy of contention. But he walks through it in much more detail, and it's a very, very smart analysis and critique of one important strand of work that's been virtually abandoned over the last 20, 30 years. There's tons of exceptions here. I list only a few people at the bottom, and there's many, many, many more than that. So there's lots of broad work that continues to go on. It's the balance, again, that concerns me.

Now I'll turn to this research project very briefly because, again, I think it may help to illustrate some of these polemical points I'm trying to make. This was a research project, again, I did with Hilary Boudet. And our cases were 20 communities that were earmarked as sites for very risky, environmentally risky, energy projects, big energy projects.

We selected the 20 cases at random from all cases that the EPA designated for environmental impact review between 2000 and 2005. There were, I don't remember, 110 or something big energy projects that were slated for environmental impact review. We picked 20 at random.

Our questions, three very basic questions. How much emergent opposition do we find across these communities? We're not selecting movements. We're selecting communities. Two, what accounts for variation in the level of opposition in these 20 communities? And finally, what, if any, impact does opposition have on the final project outcome? Are these rejected? Are these accepted? Are these eventually built, etc.?

And I think the important thing here is our unit of analysis. Again, we did not find a movement that opposed an environmentally risky energy project. We picked, in our terms, communities at risk for mobilization to see, well, how much mobilization is really out there when we look not at movements but at communities at risk for mobilization?

We did Reagan's, most of what we did was Reagan-style comparative case analysis, fs/QCA. I don't think I'll walk through this. It required us to do a lot of fieldwork, and we tried to be as efficient as possible in the way we did the fieldwork. And we think we realized some very interesting efficiencies in the way we conducted the fieldwork, but I won't go into that.

The, our cases, there were 13 LNG, that liquefied natural gas terminals, gas-powered plant, 1 wind farm, 1 hydro plant, and 2 nuclear. Those were the cases and how they distributed kind of across energy sectors. First question, how much mobilization emergent opposition did we see across our cases? Very, very, very little. We were stunned. We designed it this way because we thought the typical approach to studying successful movements exaggerates frequency, so we thought there would be less. We had no idea how much less.

Ten communities mobilized in some way, and you'll see just how minimal the mobilization is in most cases. Ten communities did not mobilize at all. Only one, there was only one case of what I think we would all kind of agree is a kind of was a social, became a social movement, one case that linked two communities against one project. Okay. I'm good. All right.

Evidence of non-institutional behavior, that is forms of collective action that really are, you know, not routinized, not institutionalized, not proper channels, ten cases, ten of our cases experienced protests. One, the movement that I spoke of, had ten of those instances of protest. There were nine other cases that had one protest, and these protests were really stretching the definition to call them protests. But 19 events, protest events, across our 20 cases, with 10 in the one case that we would characterize as a movement.

Community meetings not organized by company officials or elected officials, there were 13 cases. I'm not talking about 13 of our cases. I'm talking about 13 cases in which meetings were organized by some element in the community. Evidence of

disruptive forms of action that would be featuring arrests, violence, property damage, zero.

Evidence of institutional, more institutional forms of mobilization, letters, the median was 5.5 across our cases. These are letters that are written to, as part of the environmental impact review. EIS speakers, that's the same, environmental impact speakers, the median was about 15 across our cases, and there were 6 lawsuits. So there is some level of institutional response, and a very small amount of non-institutional response. But, in general, we're talking about communities that, in general, were very quiescent in the face of these projects.

That slide doesn't come off very well. It's sort of color-coded on my computer. But let me try to walk you through it. And this is the last thing I'm going to talk about. This is the, I've just given you evidence of how much mobilization there was across our cases. This is the last of the three questions. How much did opposition matter across our communities in terms of the outcome of the cases?

The interesting thing is opposition appears to matter even when it's fairly minimal. And here is a very crude rendering of that. Along the left-hand axis of that slide, you see different project outcomes built or under construction at the very top, and at the bottom it's rejected. The project was rejected.

Across the bottom you can't really see it. It's the level of opposition that runs from very or none all the way up to, again, these are fuzzy set scores in the fs/QCA method, but it runs all the way up to one, which represents fully in the set of communities that mobilized a lot, so more mobilization to the right-hand side. So that lower right-hand quadrant, you see a lot of negative outcomes from the company's point of view clustering where you get high levels, relatively high levels of mobilization.

And, conversely, the upper left-hand quadrant is where projects flew through, got accepted, and generally got built. And they tend to correspond to cases that saw very little or no mobilization. So the second surprise to us was not only, I mean, even though there's very little mobilized activity or emergent opposition here, it actually appears to be mattering.

But when we actually look at the recipes, the fs/QCA recipes to get a more, a richer multi-variant handle on what's going on, the mobilization does matter, but only in conjunction with market forces and the calculus of the sponsoring oil companies and/or strong state action, either in support of or opposition to the project. That's the recipe that accounts for almost all of our cases of built, that is projects that eventually were built.

And the recipe that the conjunction of factors that explain our built projects are no or low mobilization, no or little regional saturation of competing liquefied natural gas terminals, and for the company in question, no other irons in the fire. That is, they are not sort of tending two or three other proposed projects. When they're doing that, they're quite willing to abandon projects quite quickly if there's any level of opposition whatsoever.

So, yes, in this case, emergent opposition does seem to be part of a much more complicated, sort of contentious process, but with you have to build in the actions and calculus of the energy companies and state and local officials, actually federal officials as well, on both sides of the issue, to actually get explanatory purchase on the outcome of built.

I will stop, I guess, just by saying, you know, with a final plea for a little more balance in social movement research. Let a thousand flowers bloom. Let's just have a few, maybe 5, 499, maybe, back in a more Copernican direction. I, again, celebrate the extraordinary growth and the intellectual vitality in the field. I do think there is a risk in talking mostly to ourselves and focusing overmuch on movements, per se. Thank you.

**SNOW:** Good afternoon. Yesterday, when Randy accepted his distinguished scholarship award for his book on conflict and violence, he just said, very briefly, he said we're a scholarly community, and we kind of stand on each other's shoulders. And that reminds me of the first, you may or may not remember this, but the first ASA meeting I attended was in 1978 at San Francisco.

And I didn't know anyone, personally. I knew of lots of people, of course. And at that time, I was working on this article that was published in 1980, *Networks and Social Movements*. And, apparently, John McCarthy had visited a friend at the, Omar Galli(?), at the University of Texas. And I met with John and gave him this, and John apparently passed it on to Mayer.

And so I'm going down an escalator, just kind of stargazing, and I see Mayer coming up. But I dare not saying anything to him. If he wants to, I mean, I don't know why he would say anything to me. But he extends his hand as he's going up, and I'm going down and says, Dave Snow, he says, nice to meet you. I really enjoy this paper you're working on. And that's an example, kind of, of not just in this area, but any area of kind of how we grow together, and we build on each other's work.

But I do want just one correction to what Doug said. Yes, maybe we have become movement centric, but that doesn't mean all the people in the area agree. Doug and I have worked together on some things, but we've also thrown tepid punches from time to time. David, Mayer, and I teach a seminar at UCI together. And I think one of the things the students enjoy most is that we take some pretty good swings at each other. So there's friction within the . . . as well.

I was going to start with some comments about the growth of the field, but that's already been done. But just let me begin, first, with mentioning some factors that have contributed to the growth. And what I want to accent is it's really an interactive synergy. And I just want to mention five factors.

The first everyone is so familiar with, and that is the abundance and variety of social movements that flowered in various ways, not just in the '60s but also into the '70s. We all know the big ones, the anti-Vietnam War movement, the civil rights movement, women's movement, and the students' movement at peppered university campuses both in the U.S. and Europe during this area.

But I'd also include various religious, communal, alternative lifestyle, self-help movements that began to flower in the latter third of the '60s and continued flowering into the '70s. So this gave rise to an effervescence of scholarly interests that kind of emerged from this period.

The second factor contributing to growth, kind of corresponding with this, with the scholarship that began to develop. What I want to emphasize, though, it wasn't like a meteoric jump. It was more evolutionary. Maybe the first major book was Bill Gamsen's 1968-69 *Power and Discontent*.

And kind of the end, the two end books of the initial jump was Doug McAdam's 1992 *Political Process and Development of Black Insurgency*, and Sid Tarrow's 1983 *Struggling to Reform Social Movements and Policy Changes*, remembering that the two McCarthy's old pieces were in '73 and '77, and Tilly's first major kind of overview book on social movements, revolution, and political change was 1978.

And these kind of kind of coalesced to give rise to the initial development of kind of where we were and began to develop. And then since then, of course, other perspectives, not so much as alternative to replacement, but building on the holes and oversights. And so in the mid-'80s, framing, a bit later, emotions, more on sociology culture and then organization.

A third factor contributing to this, but the ongoing advances, the news media indexing and aggregation technology, we call this some of the earliest use of the *New York Times'* index was associated with social movement students at Stony Brook, such as Doug McAdam and Craig Jenkins, who used . . . data to produce some of the early social movement work on civil rights movements, farm workers movement.

Since then, media studies, the use of media indexes has escalated, and many people in this room have used these various indices. A fourth factor contributing to the development and the study of social movements is the kind of craft industry of the past 30, 40 years with the bridging of U.S. and European social movement scholars, principally within sociology and some political sociology, with Burt Klandermans playing the role of bridge . . . excellence. There were others involved too, but Burt was kind of the forerunner.

And, finally, there's this constantly running stream of events that courses through our everyday world, sometimes locally and sometimes globally, and it routinely provides not just movement scholars, but certainly movement scholars with concrete examples of social movements to study.

And what we have seen is the successive generation of young social movement scholars have glommed on to these movements and events, some for analytic reasons, some for personal reasons, and some for both. So no one set of factors account for the development of this field into a dynamic area of study. Rather, it's evolved through this synergistic interaction of these factors and, undoubtedly, others that I failed to mention.

But like Doug, there's some issues, some oversights that are of concern to me. And so rather than just praising the development, I thought it would be useful to air some of these concerns. Also, I must say, the events of 2011 have kind of rolled through the world from Tunisia and still be evolving, but I say prematurely named Arab(?) spring to the so-called Israeli summer to protest encampments and city centers from Athens to Barcelona and points further north to the recent riots in London, and, yes, to the still-steaming Tea Party here at home.

I find myself wondering if our bag of conceptual and theoretical tools is sufficient to fully understand all of this much less explain it. And I think that there's a good bit in that bag, but I also think we have to become more inclusive and elastic, conceptually and theoretically, which, of course, is consistent with which what Doug just mentioned. And so let me turn to some of these concerns.

I'm not going to get over this. These are, you know, there's a monitor down here, but with my eyes, I'm not so confident that I can read that that clearly. But in any case,

these are five caveats that kind of jumped out and five certainties. By the way, these caveats are not peculiar to the study of social movement.

The first one, beware of lumpings and splittings. The second beware of binary juxtapositions. The third, beware of concepts and principles used like childhood hammers. Fourth, beware of all-encompassing general theories of explanations. Fifth, be cautious about dismissing fully what has been swept into historical dustbins.

I'm only going to talk about the first two of these, and then for certainties, movements matter, strains and grievances matter, but in different ways. Axilar(?) threat and losses is potent to the prospect of gain, I'm not going to be talking about that, but so many of the movements we've talked about, and the big ones of the '60s focused on gain, but I think loss or the threat of loss is really operative right now in the world and works in a somewhat different fashion, obviously, from amazing ports of interpretive processes.

And the fifth is no single perspective or set of mechanisms, at least we haven't quite captured all of that, accounts for all forms of collective action and their dynamics and consequences. Let me turn to the first caveat, beware of lumpings and splittings. In his gem of a book titled *The Fine Line: Making Distinctions in Everyday Life*, and in a summary essay titled *Lumping and Splitting: Notes on Social Classification*, Eviatar Zerubavel notes that although the world in which we live is essentially continuous, we experience it as discreet chunks, stranger and acquaintances, fiction and nonfiction, business and pleasure, normal and perverse, and so on.

Constructing or assembling such diverse mental chunks he calls islands of meaning, which involve two controlling yet complementary cognitive acts, lumping and splitting. Lumping involves categorizing or grouping items or things together that are seen as similar in some fashion or another into a single category. Splitting involves the separation of the different clusters as if they are mutually exclusive and often diametrically opposed.

Examples of lumping and splitting are readily abundant in the study of collective action and social movements. Certainly, one of the most striking examples is the clustering of most everything written and published prior to the mid-1970s under the rubric of the umbrella of collective behavioral theory and the parallel juxtaposition of that presumably neatly bundled body of work to collective behavior or collection actions theory or the overlapping resource mobilization and political process examples.

One of the associated features of lumping and splitting is that differences are glossed over, in the case of the former and . . . in the case of the latter. So in the case of the collection behavior cluster, we have some of the following works lumped together, LeBon's, *The Crowd*, Freud's *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, Blumer's *Collective Behavior*, Hoffer's *True Believer*, Turner and Killian's text *Collective Behavior*, and Smelser's *Theory of Collective Behavior*.

Okay. This slide, and I'm not going to go into all of the detail of these, but these, at the top of the collective behaviors theory and the collective actions theory, and I have some scholars that are lumped into the collective behaviors theory, some, not all, into the collective actions theory. As with any, again, the problem with lumping and splitting, those that are lumped together, differences are glossed over. Those that are split from what's lumped together, the differences are accented.

The problem is is that the different, what presumes or the presumption about what holds a certain lump together, why something is one lump, glosses quite a bit. So beneath that we have another kind of clustering lumping that Turner and Killian had, contagion theory, convergence theory, and emerging norms theory.

If you look at the folks and their works in the collective behavior theory lumping, at first glance, it's hard to know what they had in common except that their works existed prior to the mid-1970s, and three of the works had collective behavior in the title. If you look more closely, you can clearly see that folks like LeBon and Freud and Blumer belong together because they have a contagion like explanation, but then other folks like Hoffer offer a convergence explanation.

And Turner and Killian said, well, we're not like any of them. We have an emerging norm explanation. And so not finding all of that . . . and there was still the question of what to do with Neil Smelser's work. And there it depended, again, what you selected out and focused on. If you focused on his notion of generalized belief as a necessary condition but not sufficient for collective action to emerge, that might move him into the same category, into the contagion like category or convergence.

On the other hand, if you focused on a number of other conditions like facilitating conditions and social control factors, which include repression, some of those could kind of saddle up into the political opportunity clustering. So, again, it depends part of what you focus on.

So Davis and I were not satisfied with either of these, so we suggested another one a couple of years ago where the Harvard school, the Chicago school, and the Michigan school. And if you look at these, there's difference, striking difference between just the collective behavior clustering and the collective action clustering. And, in fact, one might argue that most everything since then is kind of derivative of one of these different schools. I'm not going to go into that in any detail or comment about the different aspects of it, but just illustrative.

And then, going back here, just recently this year Steve Buechler comes out with a new book, kind of an historical view of social movement perspective, and the last one is his lumping. And it's the most diverse and the most expansive, and it's probably the least limited.

But my only point is how do you pick and choose? And I'm just saying the danger, there's a danger when we say all of this work is clustered here, all of this work is clustered here. Because what happens? We're always looking for shortcuts when we write journal articles and so forth. We can only cover so much of the literature, so we can dismiss a good portion of it and move on. And if that continues over generations, something is lost in the field. So I would argue that, certainly . . . good reasons to dismiss some of what was clustered into the collective behavior lumping. There is also good reason that some of that may still be relevant.

The other, I'm not going to get into, but the other one I wanted to mention was lumping is that the ongoing distinction between the study of social political movements and the study of religious movements. The study of social movements and religion kind of pass by each other like ships in a dark, moonless night. And I've never quite understood that, particularly as we look at what's going on around the globe and even in our own society. How do we understand politics without also understanding religion?

So I would, and this is consistent, really, with what Doug was talking about bridging, about bringing in other areas that we've neglected. Okay.

Binary juxtapositions, I just, there are a number of them. A few were mentioned there. I just want to say the problem with spontaneity and organization oftentimes is discussed as if they're opposite. I, the point I want to make, and I have a long discussion and a number of examples, but they're not. They often occur within the same moments. Of course, it depends on the kind of data you're looking at. I often do ethnographic research. And when you're at particular sites, you observe what's going on. You see spontaneity emerge. It's right in the context of organization.

And, again, I don't think we can understand the dynamics of collective action or protest events of riots without kind of a rediscovering and a reemphasis on spontaneity. I'll give you one quick personal example. A number of years ago, I was a research associate at the University of Akron next to Kent State, so this was 1970, about a week after the Kent State shootings. There was a free speech . . . at every university. Around noon, there was some rally going on and a talk. I took a couple buddies, said let's go.

At the end of the second talk, it didn't appear that anything was on the schedule. And so I said to one of my buddies, I said, watch this. And, of course, one of the battle cries across the campus was strike, strike, shut it down. And I yelled out. There was this pregnant pause. I yelled out at the top of my voice, strike, strike, shut it down. Of course, that's what Turner and Killian used to call a keynote. And most of them fall flat.

But within seconds, there were several hundred people strike, strike, shut it down. And within a few minutes they started moving towards the administration building. I said to my friend, we can go back to work. I've done my job. That's a moment of spontaneity. It wasn't planned. There was no script to go to the or plan to go to the administration building and shut it down. But it emerged within this organized context.

The other thing I wanted to talk about are historical examples, I mean, the movements matter. And, of course, there's a lot of research going on. And since Gamson's initial discussion of that, slowly but surely there's been an escalation. And now it's not, I don't think it's appropriate to start an article by saying there's not much research on the consequences of social movements. There's a lot of it. And the consensus, of course, is they do matter, not always in the same way, not always to the same degree, and sometimes with different dynamics.

But I'm sometimes puzzled. There was a conference here in Berlin this past summer. It was all about movement outcomes and consequences. And, you know, there's the typical type. Are the methods right? What kind of do we use inductive or deductive theory or what?

But not once was Communism or Nazism mentioned. And I don't know how one gets a handle on contemporary, modern Berlin without the intersection of those two movements. And in a way, they still hover over the city like a kind of shadow. In fact, my partner and I, Roberta, we visited five museums. Every one of them had special exhibits on some aspect of those two movements. And, yet, some people say, well, maybe movements don't matter.

The last two items, I can't get into. These are two ways in which movements can produce cultural effects. Cultural revitalization is an example. I was going to give, with

our friend Glenn Beck's discovery pulling out of the dustbins of history and culture, Cleon Skousen's work, moving up from a book to, which no one read to a book that was required reading for Tea Room gatherings. And in the course of six months from zero sales to 250,000.

And the other example I wanted to give and talk a bit about was Tacitus' book, *Germania*. It's another example of how social movement activists can reach back into history, resuscitate, revitalize, and create a fabrication that's of great relevance to a movement. Tacitus' book, *Germania*, is not Tacitus' most famous work. It's a very small book, but it talks about what he called the Germanic tribes that the Roman encountered.

The Nazi Germans discovered that, and just let me say one quote here, and I'll sit down, Mayer. Oh, yes, Heinrich Himmler wrote in his diary after reading *Germania*. It called forth a glorious image of the loftiness, purity, nobleness of our ancestors, prompting him to vow, thus, we shall be again. And so *Germania* became not only a book of cherished prominence in the Third Reich, but also an important framing resource. And, of course, it wasn't Tacitus' fault, but it was the way it was used by Nazi activist.

The final thing, then, is what would the consequential point of these examples of cultural revitalization and fabrication? First, they provide additional affirmation of the claims that movements matter because the central actors or agents in each of the cases are representative of the particular social movements or causes.

Second, they affirm the importance of historical materials, but not in the sense that they are obdurate, non-interpretal facts, but in the sense that they are malleable resources that can be used and framed in various ways in the service of contemporary cause or movements. And, third, they suggest two alternative processes or mechanisms for thinking about cultural change as affected by social movements. So here, again, we see that movements matter. Thank you.

**SUMMERS-EFFLER:** It says eight inches. Is that about eight inches? Can you hear me? Yeah. All right, first I want to thank Randy for inviting me to sit on this rock star panel of social movement. So I'm very honored. I think it's fair to say that emotions has been one of the richest recent areas in social movement research.

There's so much going on that I puzzled about how I could possibly capture the excitement of the area with only a few minutes. I decided to present eight stories about eight different emotional dynamics. I figured if I couldn't cover everything, I might as well give you something memorable, hopefully. After the short stories, I'll conclude with a few questions about the role of social movements, emotions in social movements.

I do light weights and high reps one activist said to another. Protestors stood in small groups. Friends were talking with friends and leaning on the upside-down sticks of their protest signs. Energy was low. It did not look good for this protest. I cringed in sympathy for the emcee when he began to walk to the front, but then he yelled confidently into the mic. Are we here to stop state killing? You can respond if you want. Yes. Are we here to end legal lynching? Yes. Boom, the crowd, right back at him. The call and response continued. The energy grew, and I was proven wrong.

So all right. So proposition one, emotional entrainment will generate much more emotional energy than if the same information was communicated without rhythm. The

emcee illustrates how collective rhythm has the power to generate massive amounts of emotional energy almost instantly. Right now, I'm referring to Randy Collin's *Notion of Emotional Energy*. It feels like enthusiasm, confidence, willingness to initiate interaction. It not only feels good but is the driving force in shaping our social motivations, not just in social movements but in social life in general. It got, it pulls us along, where our cultural and social capital guide us along.

Rhythmic patterns of chanting or music can generate such emotional energy as to enable actors to transgress very powerful norms. Many of you, I'm sure, have been in a situation where when you get swept up in rhythm, normally, law-abiding citizens are willing to do things like yell in the streets and get arrested. It seemed like a good idea when there are enough people and the rhythm is intense enough. Rhythm can be so effective that the substance of protests become far less important than the participation in the protest itself. So rhythm lends such an intensity of emotion that the protest, that participation is an end to itself.

I heard the actions at the art museum. I arrived for the protest and expected the bulging crowds I had seen before, but this crowd was scrawny. I overheard one person saying to another, I hear the action's at the art museum. And there did seem to be a steady flow of people in that direction.

Later that evening, I learned from the news that the activists had been right. While the protest I had attended had only a handful of people, the protest at the art museum had drawn a much larger crowd than expected . . . opposition too. Activists who belong to scenes rather than to one particular movement are more likely to follow the flow of emotional energy than the call of any particular ideological commitment.

Now long ago, there used to be research on the micro dynamics of protest participation, such as Blumer's theory about the role of milling and building excitement within crowds, other work as well. This has gone out of vogue. In recent times, however, there has been, as I said, little research on the role of the micro dynamics of protest participation.

With new micro theoretical tools and new access to technology, video cameras are becoming incredibly cheap, something that should no longer be a barrier for most people if they're interested in these micro dynamics. With this ever-increasing access to video recording technology, we can return to learning a lot from micro dynamics and emotions.

There are non-micro factors in terms of like determining who participates, like weather. When it's nasty, people tend not to show up. During the day, if it's during the day, during a weekday, you're going to lose a lot of participation, for example. But there are also intensely emotional factors that determine participation.

For example, in urban centers, participants tend to belong to scenes rather than to particular social movement groups. In these scenes, there's very little hierarchy of cause. Now this might seem sort of unanticipated because you would think that they'd be very ideologically committed. But they're ideologically committed to a whole constellation of issues. All right. So there's not much hierarchy of cause, but there's a lot of hierarchy of emotional energy.

So the perceptions of where the action is is shaped where activists participate within this scene. I've observed that new causes are likely to either end in bitter failure

or they become the hot new sites. Rarely are old scenes the hot new sites. They usually have to content with the fact that they are no longer the hot centers of action.

There's always an anarchist who ruins it for everyone. The crowd was bigger than expected, and it was shoehorned into the narrow perimeter around city hall. Police stood ready to arrest anyone who stepped into the street. While the crowd strained to hear the organizers over the bullhorn, the organizers were talking about organizing a way to get people to take the streets so that no one would be arrested.

They wanted to, they wanted this to be such a large incidence of civil disobedience that they would like, with commonness of rights movement, there would be too many people that would overwhelm the prisons, and, therefore, they would have to be allowed to get away with it.

So while people were listening intently to the bullhorns, a teenage-looking guy ran out into the middle of the street, yelled at the police, and attempted to block traffic by himself. As the police dragged the protester away, an older man near me shook his head and said, there's always an anarchist who ruins it for everyone. All right. So proper . . .

The larger, more heterogeneous protests are likely to be fraught with emotional tensions, especially compared to smaller, homogenous protests. So but the story is not about activists ruining protests. It's about differences in embodied practices can create tensions between activists who share similar goals.

Although gathered for the same cause, the styles of participation are what Jasper has referred to as taste and tactics varied widely among participants. In these cases, ideological differences associated with the various styles were easily articulated. But these differences were not necessarily the most immediately pressing differences. Differences in emotional state, age, dress, bodily movements, styles of interacting with others are all often more important and consequential than explicitly stated ideological differences.

In other words, we could draw on *voir dire* to say that deep differences between actors are often the result of differences in bodily hexes and habitus, and that this is instead of the reflects of political awareness. All right. So referring to bodily hexes and habitus as primarily dynamics that work below the level of conscious awareness, and when you ask activists to tell you why they're doing what they're doing, usually get not a description of these processes but a reflexive commentary on their more explicit political identities. All right.

And then we laid down and blocked the road. It was awesome. It was the worst sort of day for a protest. It was rainy, windy, and bitter cold. Even in the wet and cold, a very small group . . . to add to that because the weather did keep most protesters home. A handful of high school students seemed to be radiating heat and energy. I talked to one of these students. He jumped around and waved his hands wildly as he told me about the impromptu action he had participated in the day before. We were all around city hall with our signs yelling, and then someone yelled let's block traffic. And then we all laid down in the road. It was awesome. Okay.

So all right, proposition four. When planning protests, leaders must balance potentially overly excitable newcomers with an effort to maintain control during a protest. All right. So the roadblock may have been an emotional high point for the student, but the inexperienced protestors had blocked a main artery during rush hour.

The action created significant delays and infuriated motorists. It hardly inspired sympathy for the cause.

Now this isn't unusual. The least savvy activists are often the most excited and most willing to turn out for any particular protest. This creates a dilemma for leaders who are looking for these sorts of emotionally intense, high energy and highly committed activists. They must balance enticing these excitable newcomers with maintaining control over protests.

And a common example of how they attempt to do this is insisting that people receive training in participating in social, in civil disobedience before they're allowed to participate with a larger group. So it's sort of a hurdle to make sure that the new activists are somewhat disciplined. Okay.

I might go to England to work on a flower farm. Okay. The office manager sat on the floor looking glum. Her demeanor stood in sharp contrast to the organization's director. He was constantly on the go, meeting with local politicians, other activist leaders. More often than not, he was really fired up. The office manager, on the other hand, was slowly wearing down and burning out. As she talked about her distress, she told me I might go to England to work on a flower farm. That was the end of her pro-activist career. At least it appeared to be. That's proposition five.

When groups are focused on growing their size and influence, the margins of the organizations will offer higher emotional energy than the center. In some ways we can predict this, you know, if we think about it in terms of the strength of weak ties. But it also kind of counters the prevailing logic that actors operating from the margins of society or groups are disadvantaged.

The association between the margins and the disadvantage, this obviously bears out quite frequently. However, organizations focused on growth illustrate how this dynamic can be flipped. In such situations, those who focus their attention beyond the dense networks, the internal dense networks outside to the larger targeted audience, they enjoy the most emotional energy. And those who focus on the maintenance within the groups suffer the lowest emotional energy. So this is to say that external focus energizes the leader and the internal focus absolutely drains the staff, which is why, in this organization I studied, the turnover was rampant. Okay.

No napkin. How about a tissue? All right. There's no two ways about it. Catholic workers were weary of middle class, do-gooder types. Newcomers were treated with polite suspicion until they had proven that they'd gotten it. I was still in the polite suspicion stage when someone asked me to pass them a napkin. I looked around, but I couldn't find any. I responded no napkin. How about a tissue? At that, one of the leaders clapped her hands and boomed that was a very Catholic worker thing to do.

All right. So, proposition six. Sorry, this is a long one. In social movement communities focused on maintaining the group and its activities, shared gestalts are what Eliasoph and Lichter have referred to as group styles become more important for day-to-day life than shared demographic or ideological identities. This is why some of these groups are extremely hard to break in and break into because you can show up with a long history of being committed to the same sort of over political commitments, but this has very little to do with really finding your way into the group. Okay.

So paying attention to the micro dynamics of group style allows us to do three things. First, it allows us to go underneath the easily articulated ideological commitments. Second, it allows us to see how interactional processes become emotionally loaded, so how those random symbols such as a tissue can become incredibly emotionally meaningful. And, third, it allows us to see how emotional flows, born of successful interactions, are the glue that binds together activists.

This is one of my favorites. Are you waiting for God to get you a new refrigerator? I studied activists who were, who often experienced their material struggles as profoundly religiously moving. Timely donations of desperately needed funds were understood to be acts of God. The group, however, was aware that others, even sympathizers, might perceive them as daft. A threat of self-consciousness hovered around their mystical experiences, even as they were deeply moved.

One evening, a leader told the group that the basement refrigerator had been broken. Apparently, a new member, who meant to be serious, asked are you waiting for God to get you a new refrigerator? In spite of the fact this group often believed that God worked in just this way, the whole group broke out in irresistible laughter. Finally, the leader said, well, I have had a few discussions with St. Francis about it. And after choking this out, she was immediately consumed with laughter again.

We're almost there. I only have eight propositions, so, seven. Laughter is a particularly effective way to diffuse negative emotions and build solidarity in social movement groups. Now activists often hold the lease and act in ways that are outside the boundaries of wider norms. And Schiff(?) has explained this means that such groups might have to routinely manage self-consciousness and shame from time to time, regardless of how committed they are to living out those activities that produce the self-consciousness and potential for shame. Now laughter is an emotional release valve and a solidarity builder as well.

As I stated in the story just before this one, emotional processes are the glue that holds activists together. Laughter can be an anecdote to anger, self-consciousness, and shame. Thus, it tends to be one of the most important emotions comprising that glue that holds activists together.

The turkey is a sign from God. I couldn't figure out why there was a package of deli-sliced turkey in my refrigerator. My husband and I were vegetarians, and so was our good friend and extended guest. He was a full-time, religiously motivated activist, who stayed with us when he came to the city to protest. Curious, I questioned my friend about the turkey. He told me I found it under a car on the way home last night. The turkey is a sign from God. God wants me to stop being a vegetarian.

So proposition eight, embodied, emotional, religious experiences can be direct motivations for activism. My friend's explanation for the turkey reveals an important and neglected area in the study of social movements, religious sentiment. Mystical experiences regularly fueled my friend's political actions. This time it meant eating turkey. Other times, it meant doing jail time for civil disobedience. And probably at its most extreme, it meant being an unarmed bodyguard during the coup in Haiti.

So research of religion in social movements has focused primarily on recruiting and retaining participants through congregations or submerged religious networks. Some work has been done and is considering the role of religious ideology in motivating and sustaining participation and activism. However, in spite of this rich research,

there's still plenty of room for investigating how embodied religious sentiment plays a role in sustaining and motivating activist involvement.

All right. So to conclude, I'm going to conclude with three questions. Question one. There has been work like Debbie Gould's on the macro emotional dynamics for managing emotions both inside movements and the larger public. There is older work as well as burgeoning work on the micro dynamics of forming critical consciousness, participating in protests, and engaging in interactions in social movement groups.

Just as emotion is the glue that binds social movements together, I believe that activist networks are also, the emotion is also the glue that holds together activist networks. Clearly, empirical and theoretical research are needed for supporting this kind of claim, but I believe that we'll be able to develop fruitful insight into how micro and macro social movement processes are integrated by continuing to pose the question what are the relationships between emotions and social movement networks? Okay.

Question two. The story I told about the high school student's high from participating the night before illustrates how emotional energy can be carried from protest to protest. It's an important point. It's important to point out, however, that while emotional energy may be carried from protest to protest in the short run, activists are still very likely to suffer from burnout in the long run.

Now as Randy Collins explained yesterday during his talk, in order to understand both the diffusion of high emotional energy and the diminishing of emotional energy over time, we need to ask the questions, what are the half-lives of different types of emotions and different types or amounts of emotional energy?

I'll skip to three. No, okay. Actually, all right. And how does the durability of emotion shape social movement trajectories over time? All right. And third, finally researchers have recently identified mirror neurons. These neurons enable us to experience our own embodied reaction to experiences we observe. So the idea is the simple examples that were used when they first discovered these mirror neurons in monkeys was I was going to have a very clever slide of somebody doing telepathy with a monkey, but my brother was unavailable for cartooning.

But the idea was it started out very simply, like picking up a spoon. You know, if Mikey goes to pick up a spoon or an ape, and they recognize in another ape that it activates the same part of the brain as if they had picked up the, picked it up themselves, right? So this is really important. It's been revolutionary in understanding how the brain works, learning works, and emotion works.

So, for example, mirror neurons go a long way towards explaining the longstanding observation in social movements that emotions can be contagious. Now we know something about how and why. However, the relationship between mirror neurons and protest participation or social movement involvement has not yet been fully explored. Lots of room for research.

We need to ask who is more contagious and why? And this might help to explain charisma. How do the directions of emotional flow shape social movement dynamics? And I believe that this is also one of those questions that will help us to connect the micro dynamics of emotion with the more macro dynamics of emotion. Okay. With that, I'd like to thank you for your attention. Thanks.

**ZALD:** I can't see out there at all. We do have time for one or two questions, if there are any. Somebody's going to have to just speak.

**MAN:** Yeah, I have a question for Professor McAdam. I wanted to suggest an explanation about this negative turn that you've talked about in social movement studies from abandoning kind of the larger context toward this overextended focus on the internal dynamics, that that negative turn is partly rooted in the origins of social movement studies and sociology in that it was kind of a rejection or distancing from class analysis and political economy in the old labor movements. And in some ways, it's reflected in your, you know, your classic work, which I love. It was the first book I read in graduate school.

But I was always troubled by your, this kind of contradiction between arguing. You had this Marxist analysis of power, but then there wasn't a lot of class analysis of the movement. And you so portray this unified civil rights movement pre-'65, which, in fact, was riven with class divisions and struggle over defining goals. And then post-'65 you portray it, well, it's just fallen apart and it's to the battled nationalists who've hijacked the original goals of the movement, when, in fact, it represented a, you know, surfacing of these class divisions within the movement.

**MCADAM:** I'm not quite sure what the question is. I buy the critique, but what, so?

**MAN:** Well, rather that, well, it's a comment, but also a question whether you would agree with that analysis that part of this deviation from where you think social movement theory study should go that in some of this weakness is rooted in the origins of social movement studies in sociology.

**MCADAM:** Well, I think you're probably right about that. I do think there was a healthy strand of work, as I've tried to point out, of people who were trying to sort of integrate work on the study of contention broadly defined and a certain kind of class analysis. I wouldn't, you know, make extravagant claims for my own work in that regard, but I think of like Jeff Page or Michael Schwartz or someone like that.

So there was that strand of work at the time, and it really has substantially disappeared. And I do think you're right that some of that, the disappearance is a function of those kinds of topics that got picked up on and sort of got and became the defining focus of the subfield. And so I'm arguing that some of these broader issues did, in fact, get marginalized as the field developed and, I think, took this more movement-centric focus.

**ZALD:** I'd like to get in on that question too, but then we'll turn to . . . one of the things that's peculiar here is that you don't understand unless you've gone back to the history of collective behavior scholarship is that collective behavior scholarship had a very sociological social psychology origin.

If you go back to some of the early textbooks that called themselves collective behavior social movements, you'll often not even find. After all, this is in the 1930s that this stuff started growing right after, from Park through to Blumer is the development, and then on to Turner and Killian.

You'll sometimes, here's Blumer, who is the consummate labor mediator. I mean, he was in it. But the textbooks at the time never did talk about labor as a social movement. That was left to the economists or the historians to do. And so that he, and a lot of the books never mention socialism as a movement.

You know, and here's socialism at one time, in the period before the First World War, the party that got eight million votes. So it was part, but for because of the way we were cut off from political science and political sociology in this kind of open, first strand, we left out all of those things which were the kind of enduring class issues in that early turn.

And there are a lot of things in that early turn that are really, we ought to know, do more about. But that happens to be one of the things that got dropped out, only to be picked up a little bit more once we got the . . . and political sociology side of reintegrating the social movement literature. Yes, he has a question for you.

**SNOW:** Let me just say, quickly, if I were answering your question and writing a paper on lumping and splitting in social movements, I would incorporate that example and another example of what of the danger of lumping and splitting and what gets accented with splits and what gets accented with lumps.

**ZALD:** One more question.

**WOMAN:** Actually, more of a comment, and it builds on what you just said about lumping and splitting. I was thinking in juxtaposing what Doug had to say with what David had to say that if you look just, you know, within the last 30 years at the development of the social movements as an institutionalized field and what that means for graduate training, it means that, for example, students don't take broad exams in social organization. They don't even take the kind of doctoral exam that I did in political sociology, where social movements was incorporated in political sociology.

So you necessarily have to bridge between political economy, between this and that, and it is an example of lumping and splitting so that if you look at, for example, my school now is the University of Arizona, and we perpetually have these day-to-day discussions about, well, what should be on this doctoral exam as opposed to this doctoral exam with the consequence that a lot of the capacity for bridging gets lost.

And on the one hand, we all understand why that's necessary with increasing growth of the literature and specialization, but at some point, we have to be a multi . . . and pull our students out and say, you realize if you're working on this, you've got to know something about this other area. So I think that this is a constant tension as we lump and split organizationally in all our own departments in our graduate training.

**MCADAM:** I couldn't agree with you more. I mean, again, I really want to celebrate the fact that this field has developed as, you know, into the very large, vibrant area of work it is. We simply have to be aware that with size comes a certain kind of tendency towards insularity.

I've said this before. I feel enormously lucky to have gone to grad school when I did because I wanted to study the civil rights movement, and I did not have to imbed my work in a very well developed field that would have narrowed that work down. I read

Southern agronomy and demography and a lot of political science and a lot of history, a lot of work on the Black church, etc. I had to because there really wasn't any other way to situate my work. It was a Godsend, in that regard.

And now we have students who come, and they confront this very large, intimidating literature, and they feel they need to kind of grab a hold of an existing set of concepts or questions and narrowly imbed their work. And there's riches aplenty that they're sort of not aware of because we construct reading lists that narrow them down, and we teach courses that narrow that focus primarily on this field, this institutionalized field.

It's just attention, and we have to keep negotiating it. But this is a plea to try to keep focusing your attention, your students' attentions outward as well as narrowly on this, the field as it's come down to them.

**WOMAN:** Thank you very much.

**MAN:** Thank you.