Collective Action, Social Movements, and Social Change 749 I first met Andy Bichlbaum and Mike Bonanno almost two decades ago when they came to speak at Yale University on “21st Century Investing Strategies.” As it turned out, the title was a tad misleading, as they actu-ally showed slides of the Barbie Liberation Organization, which they had sponsored to switch the voice boxes of about 300 G.I. Joe and Barbie dolls and then restock them on store shelves. They also spoke about their antic disruption of the upcoming 2000 presidential campaign. I would quickly get used to—and in fact embrace—their deceptive ways. Andy and Mike aren’t even their real names, so let’s call them the Yes Men, which is how they are now known. Their activism reinvented the tradition of political satire pioneered by Jonathan Swift in the eighteenth century. Over coffee after the lecture, we talked about their latest project: the co-optation of the Bush campaign website. I, in turn, told them about my idea for corporate criminal liability to go along with legal corporate personhood (bestowed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution—the very same amendment that guaran-teed equal protection to former slaves after the Civil War—and reaffirmed by the US Supreme Court’s controversial Citizens United decision). I further explained that each shareholder would have to serve time in jail propor-tionate to his or her ownership stake, for crimes such as 10,000 counts ofcriminal manslaughter in the case of the Union Carbide chemical disaster in Bhopal, India. They loved it, apparently; before I realized anything was afoot, I was asked to speak at a law school on account of my role as a “Bush adviser on corporate crime.” After a little digging around, I found that I had been made a consultant to the presidential candidate on his corporate “tough love” stance—at least in the Yes Men’s alternate universe. I panicked, asking them to expunge my name and university affiliation. And yes, I declined the law school invitation—something that Andy and Mike never do. But the damage was done without my assistance. The Bush folks pursued a cease and desist order against them, and in a public statement, Bush claimed that the website had gone too far in attacking him and that “there ought to be limits to freedom.” Although that ended my brief stint as a “culture jamming” hacktivist (see Chapter 3), the duo went on to impersonate the US Chamber of Commerce, the leadership of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and a host of other government and corporate officials. They even temporarily drove billions of dollars of stock value off the Dow Chemical company (which had acquired Union Carbide) by claiming on the BBC World Service television news that Dow was taking responsibility for the Bhopal disaster and would remunerate the affected families. The Yes Men went on to make two movies document-ing their stunts, and they still seek social change through impersonation and satire with web and other new-media tools that Jonathan Swift couldn’t have dreamed of back in his day. I smiled a bit when I opened the “special edition” of the New York Times that they handed out on July 4, 2009. In the business section, “Carlton Donally” was the author of an article describing Senator John McCain’s bold new plan to humanize corporations and get tough on corporate crime. Sometimes, you get swept up in a social movement whether you like it or not. Today they are still at it, taking on the latest issues of the day with their trademark techniques of impersonation and Swiftian irony. In a chat with Andy one summer afternoon, I mentioned that gun control used to be a Republican issue. In fact, as governor of California, Ronald Reagan wanted to impose stricter regulations. Why? Because back then there was a fear—especially in that state—of the armed Black Panther Party. Wouldn’t it change gun politics, I asked, if we had a modern-day Black Panther Party that patrolled white neighborhoods while openly carrying weapons? Lo and behold, a year or so later, I noticed this strange “NRA sponsored” website/ organization, “Share the Safety” (sharethesafety.org). The site reads: “You know how important it is to protect your family. But you may not know that some of America’s poorest citizens cannot afford to arm themselves against those who would limit their freedoms. That’s why the National Rifle Association is proud to partner with Smith & Wesson to Share the Safety.” The “program” buys a gun for someone in an “at-risk,” violent neighborhood when you buy a gun, co-opting the logic of many charities

at a Lutheran or an Episcopalian service, on the other hand, would again be considered deviance (or collective action, if you did it as part of a group). There are two main types of collective action: crowd collective action and mass collective action (Granovetter, 1978). In crowd collective action, you must be face to face with the other members of your group. Collective action can also occur when people aren’t physically together. Imagine the National Rifle Association asking all of its members to write letters to their senators protesting a particular law; such an initiative might produce tens of thousands of letters. This letter-writing campaign counts as collective action too, but because the people writing letters live in different towns and cities, it is known as mass collective action. If all these letter writers travel to Washington, D.C., to march on the Capitol, then mass collective action becomes crowd collective action. Theories of collective Action How does collective action come about? How do individuals decide to get together and violate social norms? Do they plan it on private Facebook groups or huddle in underground rooms late at night to plan their collective actions? Or does it happen spontaneously? Does collective action just erupt when certain people come together? How do they come to think of themselves as connected in some way? convergence theory theory of collective action stating that collective action happens when people with similar ideas and tendencies gather in the same place. Convergence Theory One theory of collective action, convergence theory, states that collective action happens when people with similar ideas and tendencies gather in the same place (Cantril, 1941). It doesn’t necessarily require planning. The setting isn’t particularly important, except that it attracts like-minded people. One example of convergent collective action is the riots that sometimes follow an English soccer (or, as the Brits call it, football) match. Who goes to football matches? Mostly zealous fans who are antagonistic toward their opponents (and who may have consumed a couple of pints of beer before and during the match). They probably don’t plan to riot at the end of the game, but the convergence of like-minded (and drunk) people causes this collective action. The main problem with convergence theory is that it’s often reduced to contagion theory theory of collective action claiming that collective action arises because of people’s tendency to conform to the behavior of others with whom they are in close contact. 752 the sum of its parts. If collective action results from drunken English foot-ball fans coming together, then why isn’t there a riot every time they come together? Sometimes they go home peacefully. Sometimes a fight or two breaks out. Other times enough people get angry that a rancorous riot erupts. Convergence theory doesn’t explain the inconsistency of group action. Contagion Theory A second theory of collective action, called contagion theory, claims that collective action arises because of people’s tendency to conform to the behavior of others with whom they are in close contact LeBon, 2002). The mechanism by which move-ments grow is similar to the spread of a disease—adherents spread their enthusiasm infectiously among close contacts, who then become infected themselves, and so it goes. If you’re peacefully protesting the city’s decision to bulldoze your apartment building and suddenly the protester next to you starts chanting, “Two-Four-Six-Eight, We Will Not Negotiate,” you’ll be more likely to start chanting, too. Before long, every protester will be imitating the others, chanting slogans to save the apartment building. You might never have thought that you’d chant in a public protest, but the actions of other people influenced your behavior. If you’ve never been involved in a public protest, imagine yourself at a rock concert. As a particular song starts playing, some people begin to jump up and down. Soon, everyone is jumping up and down, imitating nearby concertgoers. Or if you’re in the stands at an (American) football game and the fans start the “wave,” when the wave comes around to your section of the sta-dium, you might feel as if you have little choice but to stand and wave your arms like everyone else. Contagion theory sug-gests that the behavior of other people in groups is contagious, especially under the encouraging influence of a charismatic leader. Although contagion theory helps explain how collective action spreads from one person throughout the entire group, it downplays individual agency (or, as we call it in everyday life, free will) and treats individuals as mindless sheep, thoughtlessly following the actions of their neighbors. Also, like con-vergence theory, it doesn’t explain inconsistency. Why do some members of a group choose to chant, while others resist? Contagion theory doesn’t explain why some situations are more conducive to collective action and why some people are more prone to imitating their neighbors than others. Emergent Norm Theory The third theory of collective action, emergent norm theory (Turner & Killian, 1987), emphasizes the influence of “keynot-ers” in promoting new behavioral norms, especially in unusual situations for which already established norms are inadequate. Keynoters are not the same as leaders. They don’t have to stand on podiums, shouting into mega-phones. They can just be people whose actions become, either intentionally or not, the behavior copied by an entire group. Also, keynoters don’t neces-sarily have to be the people in charge but can be anyone from whom other people take cues in a given context. If you have to evacuate an airplane using the emergency exits, one of your fellow passengers might start directing people out of the plane in an orderly manner. Even though she wasn’t for-mally elected or appointed as the leader, people are taking cues from her in this situation, which is highly unusual for most passengers. Now, imagine you’re in a battalion of 800 soldiers, marching forward toward enemy lines. All of a sudden, a couple of soldiers in front start to scream and run back, which is uncharacteristic among troops who are trained not to defect. You’re not sure what, if anything, has happened up ahead, but you, too, start run-ning backward. Better safe than sorry, right? Those soldiers are the keynot-ers, and their actions influence everyone’s behavior as a new norm emerges on the battlefield. It isn’t just that your neighbor is running, so you run too—that would be an illustration of contagion theory. Rather, it’s that a novel situation has arisen in which collective behavior is determined, per-haps unwittingly, when the group copies the behavior of an individual or small group of individuals, possibly for no other reason than that these folks were the first to be forced to react. The handful of keynoters within the group may be recognizable leaders, but more often than not they’re just members of the group whose behavior sets the standard. Like contagion theory and convergence theory, emergent norm theory doesn’t explain collective action perfectly (Aguirre et al., 1998). It doesn’t always explain why particular people emerge as leaders. In some cases, like the soldiers in the battalion, it is fairly obvious, but in other situations why someone becomes a leader may not be so clear. In the airplane example, how did one woman emerge as the keynoter? Was it because she sat closest to the exit? Maybe the emergent leader had a particularly calm demeanor in the face of danger. Emergent norm theory says that new norms for behavior will emerge, but it doesn’t suggest why particular people set the terms for this new behavior. The theory also doesn’t explain why some actions emerge as norms within the group, whereas other actions don’t. In the battalion of soldiers example, why did running away become the emergent norm? Why didn’t the soldiers stay and fight, rather than turn away from their enemies? And why didn’t the battalion take its cues from the other members in the front of the squad who continued marching forward? Emergent norm theory doesn’t explain why one behavior rather than another emerges in collective action. It simply suggests that, in group situations, certain people in the crowd set the behavioral pattern that emerges as the norm for the group. Value-Added Theory Neil Smelser (1962) borrowed the term value-added from economics to explain how social movements increase in value in a series of progressive stages. Value-added theory establishes six conditions that are required for a movement to coalesce and achieve a successful out-come. First, there must be a social strain present that existing power holders are unable or unwilling to alleviate. In New York in the 1970s an increasing number of pets were fouling the sidewalk with poop. This was a problem city 754

leaders found rather trivial compared with all of the other troubles besetting the city. But pedestrians felt otherwise and they wanted action. The second requirement for a successful movement under the value-added theory is that folks must be able to agree on a definition of the problem. There was trouble early on in the movement for pooper-scooper legislation because only some people felt that the problem was a lack of public decency on the part of dog owners, who should be made to pick up after their pooches. Others (mostly dog owners themselves) felt it was a lack of commitment on the part of the Department of Sanitation and asked for more street sweeping. The third condition for value-added movements is that the folks must be free to act on their grievance. Awareness is nice, but the ability to act is critical. In the case of the aggrieved New Yorkers, severe budgetary constraints made it impossible to increase the duties of the Sanitation Department, which cur-tailed the activism of those who were lobbying for sidewalk cleaners to scoop up the mess. Fourth, there must be a spark that ignites the controversy. In the case of New Yorkers lobbying for a pooper-scooper law, they found their controversial episode when a young child was infected with a parasite found in dog poop. Too bad for the sick baby, but great for the movement, which could now “prove” that public dog poop threatened the eyesight of babies citywide. The fifth requirement is mobilization for action: People need to gather together in an organized fashion. For the pooper-scooper law activists, already established mothers’ groups took up the cause and later united with neighborhood groups on the issue of dog droppings. The sixth requirement necessary in the value-added theory is the failure of social con-trol by established power holders. In the case of the poop-scoop controversy, riots did not break out in the streets. In 1978, lawmakers maintained social control by passing a law requiring dog owners to scoop the poop or face a fine (Brandow, 2008). Had the law failed to pass, the steps of City Hall might have been lit up with flaming paper bags full of dog doo. (See Chapter 6 for more on social control.) Identity and collective Action In Chapter 5, we examined the relationship of individuals and groups and explored the way individual behavior is influenced by group behavior and vice versa. We also looked at network theory, examining how social net-works develop and expand throughout society. In this section, we will build on individual–group interaction to examine the effect of collective action on the creation of individual identities. Identity is simply a definition of who you are. How do you identify your-self? You might start by telling people that you’re a student and stating the name of your school. If they ask for more details about you, you might tell them your religion or maybe your race. If they continue asking for informa-tion, what other things could you use to identify yourself? The neighborhood where you live? Your political affiliations? Your sexual orientation? Your favorite baseball team? As we said in the chapter-opening paradox, what makes you an individual is your affiliation with multiple group identities. Perhaps you’re a white Catholic student at a particular university who lives in a particular neighborhood, is a Democrat, is straight, and is a Texas Rangers fan. To identify yourself, you have to refer to various group affili-ations. In this case, you’re associated with a group of Rangers fans, a group of students at a university, a group of people who are Catholic, and so on. Each of these groups contributes to your identity as an individual. If you add enough questions to this list (What high school did you attend? What sport do you play at your university? To what extracurricular clubs do you belong?), you’ll soon realize that you are probably the only person in the world who has that particular set of group affiliations. Your uniqueness as an individual comes from the collection of groups to which you belong. Sharing a group affiliation with another person helps us develop emo-tional attachments to that person. If two people are members of Students Against Destructive Decisions, their identity as members of that group instantly gives them a connection. If nothing else, each person knows that the other believes strongly in stopping drunk driving and other risky behav-ior. Both may have experienced a life-altering tragedy that brought them to the group. This shared affiliation gives them an emotional connection from which to build their relationship. Think about your best friend. Where did you meet him or her? Did you meet in a class at school or maybe on a sports team? Perhaps you met at a youth group or in your neighborhood? Unless you met randomly on the street and struck up a conversation, you probably met him or her in a context in which you already shared an affiliation, which became the basis of your current friendship. Thus our collective associations (such as church groups, baseball teams, and high-school clubs) become the foundation on which we form emotional relationships with other people. If you work the night shift at McDonald’s, you might identify your-self as a fast-food employee or as someone who works late at night. You probably didn’t start working at McDonald’s because you identified as a fast-food employee; rather, you identify as a fast-food employee because you started to work at McDonald’s. But you may have volunteered for the late shift because you already self-identified as a night owl. As you can see from these examples, not only does your identity determine the groups to which you belong but the groups to which you belong also determine your identity. This back-and-forth process of identity and group association is an important part of collective action. If you grew up in a Jewish family and throughout your life have self-identified as Jewish, this is a stable, or static, aspect of your identity. But if in your early twenties you embrace a new religion and start to practice it, your religious identity will have changed, or become dynamic. 756

In addition to having both static and dynamic identities, you also have multiple identities because you belong to multiple groups. Although you think the Texas Rangers are the greatest team in baseball, you’re more than just a Rangers fan. One of the difficulties of having multiple identities is that they can conflict with one another. If you identify as a Catholic but are also part of a pro-choice organization, you might find these identities difficult to resolve. As a result, one of the paradoxes of identity and collective action is that the lines between your multiple identities are often ambiguous and poorly defined. (Chapter 4 gives more information about role strain and role conflict for individuals in groups.) Social Movements Collective action describes an event or a particular behavior. A march to protect a woman’s right to make reproductive choices and a group of students spontaneously taking over a campus office to protest sweatshop labor are examples of collective action. But when this behavior becomes purposeful, organized, and institutionalized, collective action turns into a social movement. Social movements are not ritualized. They don’t simply happen every year, like a Memorial Day parade or the New Year’s Eve celebration in Times Square. Such rituals don’t aim to change something about society; rather, they seek to celebrate a tradition of some sort. Thus, according to David Meyer in his book The Politics of Protest (2007), social movements are “collective and sustained efforts that challenge existing or potential laws, policies, norms, or authorities, making use of extra-institutional as well as institutional political tactics” (p. 10). What this means is that social movements always have a goal, whether it’s something concrete, like repealing a specific law, or more abstract, like the acceptance of same-sex couples. Social movements are organized and intentional and are more than a one-off event: Protest activity must be sustained over time. Such movements can work both within and outside the rules of relevant institutions (e.g., protesters might call their elected representatives but also hold a sit-in at a town hall meeting). But sometimes it is hard to know where social movements begin and end, given that what appears to be spontaneous protest activity is usually somewhat organized, and protest events that seem to be singular happenings are often part of larger social campaigns. Social movements attempt to achieve their aims through conflict and action directed at particular opponents, not just through consensus and compromise. The participants in a social movement share a collective iden-tity, but though they organize meetings and coordinate action, the tie that binds participants together in a social movement is a shared commitment to social change. In the initial stages of social movements, individuals generally participate primarily through informal social networks. As the movement develops, the institutions grow more formal and structured. Even in later phases, the movement is united through a common commitment to social or political change. But as Doug McAdam, a sociologist who has spent years examining social movements, pointed out in an interview for this book, “I still believe that social movement scholarship tends to be movement centric [so it focuses on movements], and invariably we overrate the causal significance or agency of those movements. Organized collective action is necessary, but not sufficient to generate a successful movement. . . . Some new threat or perceived opportunity in the broader social environment is a crucial component” (Conley, 2009p). Keep that in mind as you read through the following theories social scientists have developed to explain how social movements emerge and take shape. Types of Social Movements Social movements come in different shapes and sizes. Four main types exist: alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary (Table 18.1). They are distinguished by the people whose behavior they seek to change and the extent of societal change they hope to achieve. Alternative social movements social movements that seek the most limited societal change and often target a narrow group of people. Alternative Social Movements Alternative social movements seek the most limited societal change; they often target a narrow group of people (Nicholas, 1973). They are usually issue oriented, focusing on a singular concern and seeking to change individuals’ behaviors in relation to that issue. #NeverAgain is such a social movement. Founded in the aftermath of the Parkland, Florida, high-school shooting in February 2018, it is a student-initiated movement to pressure politicians to back stricter laws to prevent gun violence in general and school shootings in particular. Among other actions, it sponsored national school walkouts later that year. Although #NeverAgain has garnered national attention, it remains to be seen how successful this movement will be in moving US or state policies on issues like semiautomatic weapons sales. Another example is Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), one of the

table 18.1 Types of Social Movements Target particular subgroups Target entire society Limited social change Alternative Reformative Radical social change Redemptive Revolutionary 758

most successful alternative social movements in recent history. It targets a relatively small group of people (people who drink and drive) and seeks a spe-cific behavioral change (getting people to stop drinking and driving). MADD was founded by a mother, Candy Lightner, whose daughter Cari had been killed by a drunk driver. Lightner founded MADD in her deceased daughter’s bed-room, where she started to gather information about other victims of drunk driving. The organization expanded rapidly; many families of drunk-driving victims contacted MADD to become involved in the campaign. Despite the narrow scope of the group’s efforts, MADD is largely responsible for the concept of the “designated driver,” which has helped reduce alcohol-related motor vehicle fatalities in the United States. Among its political successes, MADD was instrumental in raising the drinking age to 21 and lowering the legal blood alcohol content to 0.08 percent across the country. Redemptive Social Movements Like alternative social movements, redemptive social movements target specific groups; however, they advocate for more radical change in behavior. If you go to a specific organization—say, Covenant House—after you have run away from home and lived on the streets addicted to drugs, you’re joining a redemptive social movement. Covenant House attempts to do more than change one particular behavior (such as drug use); it tries to help you reorganize your entire life. The social workers at Covenant House might help new residents find employment and open a bank account. They might then provide them with drug addiction counseling and bring together people with similar concerns to talk through their problems. At Covenant House, you’d be put on a fixed schedule. You’d probably wake up at a particular time, eat breakfast at a certain hour, and leave for work at the same time each day. This structured routine is aimed at reforming all your daily practices, not just a single behavior. What makes Covenant House different from a bread-and-butter nonprofit serving a com-munity’s needs or, say, a prison (or other total institution that controls all aspects of its residents’ lives) is that it is an organization that seeks change through social organizing. For example, it sponsors a fund-raiser called “Sleep Out” in which volunteers spend a night outside, “so homeless kids don’t have to” (Covent House, n.d.). This type of redemptive social move-ment seeks to return people to the normal routine of day-to-day society. Redemptive social movements such as Covenant House are often, although not always, affiliated with a religious group. Reformative social movements social movements that advocate for limited social change across an entire society. Reformative Social Movements Reformative social movements advo-cate for limited social change across an entire society (DellaCava et al., 2004). You might think that America, for the most part, is doing fairly well but would be a better place if everyone ate organic vegetables and biked to work. You may be able to join a group in your community like Critical Mass, which advocates for more bicycle-friendly commuting. Critical Mass started with a group of bicyclists in Portland, Oregon, in 1992 who wanted to make cities safer for bicyclists (Maus, 2012). Since then chapters have started in many other cities, even as the earliest ones in Minneapolis and Portland have closed shop because thousands of miles of safe bike lanes have been introduced in those cities. That is, Critical Mass no longer needs to meet for monthly consciousness-raising rides in some cities because its original mission has been accomplished. Consciousness has been raised. Bike lanes and bike parking have been installed. Biking still isn’t safe in New York City, however; so Critical Mass still meets several times a month there. Critical Mass is not limited to small groups of bikers in a couple of liberal cities; rather, it aims to change the transportation behavior of most of the Western world one city at a time. The scope of change the group seeks is relatively minor (although its members might not agree). The group is not calling for a new system of government or an enormous change in people’s approach to social interaction. The scope of its proposed change is limited to adding a safer, more convenient bicycle commuting option, but members target many cities. Another movement that falls under the category of reformative social movements is the slow food movement, whose proponents believe that it is healthier for individuals, communities, and the environment if more people eat locally grown food. Instead of importing cherries from Argentina, avo-cados from Mexico, and apples from New Zealand, the movement believes, it is healthier to eat food grown in one’s own geographic region. The move-ment seeks to change a behavior across all of society, but the scope of that change is limited. The movement doesn’t want to revolutionize our land ownership system or overthrow the government; it just wants people to be more thoughtful about the implications of their eating behavior for the environment, community well-being, and personal health. However, both Critical Mass and the slow food movement may believe that if we alter one aspect of our daily behavior, the ripples through our social structures will be so huge as to result in revolutionary change (and they may be right). Revolutionary Social Movements Revolutionary social movements are the final category of social movements. They advocate the radical reorganization of society (Goodwin, 2006). One example of a revolutionary social movement was the one led by the Weather Underground during the Vietnam War. This group of students, a radical splinter group of Students for a Democratic Society, wanted to overthrow the American government through armed attacks. The Weather Underground bombed several govern-ment buildings (after issuing evacuation warnings), took part in jailbreaks and riots, and expressed solidarity with the Vietnamese who were experi-encing the impact of US military force. They believed that only revolution-ary means, not political parties or processes, could bring about change. After the Vietnam War ended, most of the Weathermen surrendered or were apprehended by the authorities, without having succeeded in their goals (Varon, 2004). A more successful revolutionary movement took place in South Africa, where a coalition of political and labor groups, the United Democratic Front (UDF), sought to overthrow the apartheid government. The apartheid system in South Africa classified South Africans based on four “racial” categories: white, colored, Indian, and black. The government passed laws treating each racial group separately—and unequally. Blacks weren’t allowed to enter cit-ies without government-issued passes and were forced to live in separate homelands. The antiapartheid movement sought to change these racist laws, and in the early 1980s, it coalesced around the UDF. After the primary antiapartheid political party, the African National Congress (ANC), had been banned, the UDF quickly became the main antiapartheid organiza-tion. It incorporated black, Indian, and colored South Africans into a single movement aiming to overthrow the apartheid system. When the ANC was recognized as legal in South Africa, it took over the antiapartheid struggle, and the UDF faded into the background. This revolutionary social movement succeeded in ending the apartheid system. South Africa held its first demo-cratic elections in 1994, electing as president the Nobel Peace Prize–winning Nelson Mandela, who had spent many years in prison as a political detainee under the apartheid regime. Thousands of social movements exist throughout society at the local, national, and global levels. There are historical social movements that have achieved their goals, such as the antiapartheid movement in South Africa, and recent social movements that have just started advocating for social change, such as the slow food movement. Two of the most famous recent social movements include the #BlackLivesMatter (BLM) movement and the Resistance (anti-Trump) movement. #BlackLivesMatter emerged in 2013 after George Zimmerman, a white man, was acquitted in the shooting of Trayvon Martin, a black teenager. The movement gained national notoriety, however, after the deaths of two more black men: the shooting of Michael Brown by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, and the strangling death of Eric Garner by a New York City cop. 762

Activists pointed to these deaths as examples of a broader system of violence and systematic racism and coined the tagline and hashtag Black Lives Mat-ter to decry how the criminal justice system devalues black peoples’ lives. The social media success was paralleled by many street protests and other actions. BLM is heralded as a new form of civil rights movement in a number of ways. First, it was (loosely) led by a group rather than a single charismatic individual such as Martin Luther King or Jesse Jackson. Second, it rejected traditional institutions for black social movement organizing—namely, the church and the Democratic Party. Third, it eschewed “respectability poli-tics”—namely, efforts to show one’s goals and values are compatible with those of the broader society (think gays fighting for marriage rights). While BLM is certainly focused on the main issue of racialized police violence, its loose structure has allowed its goals to broaden out to issues of criminal justice reform (such as mass incarceration or broken windows policing) and even to racial inequality more generally. While billing itself as an inclusive movement that is concerned with the lives of the undoc-umented, disabled, women, sexual minorities, and other marginalized groups, it has been criticized for being too narrowly focused. What’s more, its disruptive tactics have rankled some would-be allies in other parts of the progressive movement. For example, in 2015, BLM activists seized the microphone at a Bernie Sanders speech and called his supporters racists and white supremacists. Trump, in turn, engendered another social movement: the Resistance. Starting during his campaign for the presidency, the so-called Resistance really picked up when he was elected. The marquee event happened the day after his inauguration, when the Women’s March took place in cities around the world. This protest marked the single largest one-day march in history. About 2 million people attended in Washington, D.C., alone. Other actions have followed, including the first protest in outer space (by the Autonomous Space Agency Network) on April 12, 2017. The Resistance achieved such a great turnout for its Women’s March partly because participants were motivated by a wide range of grievances. Prior research had often pointed to a tension between intersectional iden-tities (i.e., the unique social location of a gay Latinx woman or a straight black man): How can a diverse set of actors be mobilized in a way in which everyone is highly motivated while not having to subjugate some aspects of his or her identity (say, race or sexual orientation) to others (say, gender or class position) in order to coalesce around a set of demands and strategies? Interviewing a sample of the Women’s March participants, sociologist Dana Fisher and colleagues (2017) found that each came with her own spe-cific agenda that tied to her identity. For example, Latinx marchers tended to be more concerned about immigrant rights, while white women focused on reproductive freedom. “One has only to review the expansive list of the organizational partners for the Women’s March to see how it aimed to mobilize people whose interests lie at the intersections of race, class, gen-der, sexual orientation, legal status, and other categories of identity, along with less identity-based sympathizers,” they write. “Although we find that individuals were often motivated by issues related to their own social iden-tities, we also find that individuals reported being motivated by reasons that extended beyond their social identities” (Fisher et al., 2017). What

This seems to be a great example of what David Snow and co-authors (1986) call “frame alignment”: “By frame alignment, we refer to the linkage of individual and SMO [social movement organization] interpretive orienta-tions, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary.” Mean-while, a frame—in the conceptualization of Erving Goffman—is a schema by which we organize our lives and see the world. “By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action, whether individual or collective” (Snow et al., 1986). Thus alignment between individuals’ worldviews (frame) and those of activists must take place for social movements to coalesce. This early success of the Women’s March has been parlayed into con-crete actions to change the US political landscape by recruitment of new candidates to challenge officeholders. The group Run for Something has helped get a record number of female candidates to run for everything from local school boards to the US Congress. In this way, the Resistance can hope to achieve broad political change while remaining inclusive and not focused on a single issue. Maybe the key is having a larger-than-life mutual enemy, such as Donald Trump, who provides a common frame in a way that individual police actions (or police racism more generally) have proven more difficult to do in the case of #BlackLivesMatter. In many ways, the Resistance has learned the lessons of two other recent movements: the Tea Party and Occupy Wall Street. Both could be con-sidered revolutionary social movements, though, of course, the way they wanted to transform society differed dramatically. The Tea Partiers sought to radically reduce the role of government in American society by slashing regulations and cutting taxes back to a bare minimum and/or by imposing socially conservative laws, such as antiabortion statutes. However, unlike most revolutionary movements, many Tea Party organizations were seeded with money from very wealthy, politically active conservatives (most nota-bly, the industrialist Koch brothers). As such, this movement has sometimes been called “Astroturf,” as in false grassroots, though there is no question that the passage of the Affordable Care Act health insurance reform law (aka Obamacare) precipitated a political uprising of sorts. The Occupy Wall Street movement (OWS)—also known as the 99-percenters—protested rising economic inequality. During the period in which they literally “occupied Wall Street” by camping out in Zuccotti Park in lower Manhattan, the participants went out of their way to make decisions through a deliberative process with no leadership cadre. This was, in fact, one of the reasons they never coalesced around a single message of change, though most 99-percenters would agree that marginal tax rates on the wealthy (the 1 percent) should be raised to address the needs of society and, independent of the revenue rationale, to lower inequality. SocialThe Tea Party focused more on the electoral process (and led the 2010 Republican “wave” election), while OWS showed more disdain for tradi-tional politics, finding it corrupted by the big money it was protesting. Thus many consider the Tea Party more successful than OWS in achieving its goals; however, this may be an oversimplification because OWS became the springboard for many other progressive political movements, including the Resistance. Stephen Duncombe, NYU professor and director of the Center for Artis-tic Activism, points out that OWS’s lack of organization was a big part of its failure to become a lasting social movement. In an interview he asked me to “think of Occupy as a burst. One of the problems with this sort of media spectacle activism is that often the idea of media exposure ends up being the goal as opposed to what it really is: a means to an end. That is, it’s great to be on the media because you get a wider dispersal of your message, but not if you don’t have a really good message” (Conley, 2015f). Just as important as having a clear message is having, as he put it, “an organization that can mobilize those passions and put them into some sort of effective political machinery . . . because creative activism can never stand alone.” Duncombe explained why he thought of some activist exploits as “ether activism” by pointing to the way consumer goods companies use advertising, a commercially oriented form of awareness raising. Advertising and the attention-grabbing char-digital.wwnorton.com/youmayask6 To see an interview with Stephen Duncombe, go to digital.wwnorton.com/youmayask6 acteristic of some activism may not be all that different, but, as he notes, “the advertising industry doesn’t get you all excited about a product and then say, ‘Oh, by the way, we’re not sure where you can buy it. We’re not sure if the product exists. You go find that product yourself.’ They are part of a much larger orga-nization of production, of distri-bution, and of sales. All of that has to be factored in to any form of activism as well. We tend to remember the moments—those bursts—but underneath any sustainable change is all of this organizational structure which takes those bursts, those emo-tions, and channels them into some sort of effective social change. I think the biggest prob-lem is ‘ether activism.’ It looks great up here but it doesn’t seem to bring any lasting significance down below.” 766

Both the Tea Party and Occupy movements faced a choice: If they defined key issues on which they sought change, then they would lose some of their revolutionary appeal and become targeted, reformative social movements. The risk of such a narrowing is both success and failure. If, for example, OWS focused on raising taxes on the rich to redistribute revenue to the poor and built a structure to channel and organize their efforts, likely by first selecting a leadership group, then those who joined because there were no leaders or explicit policy objectives would have quit. Moreover, if the 99-percenters were successful in altering tax policy, then their raison d’être would have disappeared, just like what happened with the Critical Mass biker activists in Portland and Minneapolis. But remaining devoid of concrete goals also posed challenges in the form of fatigue, frustration, and ineffectualness in getting anything changed. Why join a movement that isn’t moving? Models of Social Movements: How Do They Arise? The timing of the emergence of #BlackLivesMatter illustrates many aspects of social movement theory, considering it is not as if police mistreatment of African Americans were a new phenomenon in the United States. However, the ubiquitous presence of cell phone video footage has made its reality much more incontrovertibly and viscerally documented. But technological change can’t be the whole story, either: Back in 1992, riots broke out when Los Angeles police officers were not convicted of misdoing despite graphic video footage of them beating Rodney King during his arrest. Yet, a sus-tained social movement failed to emerge from the collective action that took place. What changed in two decades? Did the election of the first African American president shift the frame? Did Occupy Wall Street set the stage for a progressive movement? Or, perhaps, did the Tea Party cause a backlash? To explain the rise and sustenance of social movements, social scien-tists have developed several models. The earliest one is now known as the classical model and is based on a concept of structural weakness in society. This structural weakness results in the psychological disruption of individ-uals. When this disruption reaches a certain threshold, it gives rise to a social movement. Thus social movements are a collective response to struc-tural strain that has a psychological effect on individuals. In this model, political goals or achievements do not play a large role in the formation of movements. There are several variations of this basic account. That is, strain can arise from different sources, depending on the specific model. For exam-ple, society itself may create tension by engendering social isolation, which causes alienation and anxiety, thereby resulting in the form of discontent that leads to collective action and social movements. (Recall our discussion of capitalism and Marxism in Chapter 14.) Strain can also come from status inconsistency or when the rank orderings in society are somehow contradic-tory (e.g., when the new merchant class has economic power but not political clout). The result within the individual is what psychologists call cognitive dissonance; this condition, in turn, may spur people to take action. There are several problems with the classical model. How do we know what magnitude and type of systemic strain will give rise to a movement? Critics of this theory point out that strains of various types and impacts are always present in societies (McAdam, 1982). The theory cannot account for social movements arising in some circumstances and not in others. Another criticism is aimed at the way individuals are pathologized by this theory. In addition, the model completely removes the desire to attain specific, rational political goals while overemphasizing psychological tensions. Social scientists subsequently tried to work through the weaknesses of Resource-mobilization theory model of social movements that emphasizes political context and goals but also states that social movements are unlikely to emerge without the necessary resources. the classical model by demonstrating that social movements are collective phenomena rather than symptoms of individual discontent. These revisions led to the resource-mobilization theory, which emphasizes political context and goals (McCarthy & Zald, 1973, 1977) but also states that social move-ments are unlikely to emerge without the necessary resources—or, if they do, are unlikely to succeed. Discontent and the availability of resources are the key factors that determine if a social movement will coalesce. According to the entrepreneurial version of this model, actors (individuals or organi-zations) make a rational cost–benefit calculation about the relative costs and potential benefits in joining a social movement. If enough actors decide that it is a good bet, the movement will be more likely to succeed. But all actors are not equal; some bring more resources (money, time, moral argu-ments, organizational skills, power, and so on) to the table (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004). If well-resourced individuals do not commit, then the movement is not as likely to coalesce. From this perspective, it seems that the powerful or elite members of society have a greater chance of leading or contributing in other ways to a movement because they control more resources. Many theorists take issue with this account, because successful social movements, like the antiapartheid movement in South Africa, are often led by those who are relatively powerless and have few monetary resources. Usually, these are the people who have most at stake in the success of the movement and in change. Theorists also point out that the involvement of the elite classes in a movement often results in its decline and eventual demise. If a movement becomes dependent on external sponsors, organiza-tions within the movement can be easily co-opted by elite groups in cases of conflicting demands. Movements may have indigenous organizational strength (e.g., the local churches and student organizations that nurtured the civil rights movement, as discussed in Chapter 16). It is not clear whether resource-mobilization theory includes this type of resource. Furthermore, what constitutes the grievances that lead to insurgencies is unclear. The most dominant theory of social movements is the political process model, which focuses on the structure of political opportunities (McAdam, 1982). When these are favorable to a particular challenger, the chances are better for the success of a social movement led by this challenger. This model combines variables internal and external to the movement (e.g., indigenous organizational strength is internal to the movement, whereas the political context, such as the presence of political opportunities, is external). Three sets of conditions influence the development of insurgency according to this model: expanding political opportunities, indigenous organizational strength, and certain shared cognitions (e.g., beliefs of injustice suffered and sense of self-empowerment) among a movement’s proponents. Whether the movement is sustainable over time also depends on the responses of other groups in society. Some criticisms of this model point to its structural bias (it focuses on political or economic structures) that downplays cultural or emotional components, which can sometimes play a major role (Morris, 2004). For example, some work has emphasized how intersectional identities (e.g., being a black woman) form the bases for social movements that aim to change cultural norms first and foremost rather than policies and politics (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008; Melucci, 1989). No one model can predict movement outcomes in all cases. Why a movement succeeds or fails is not just about the resources available or how many political opportunities open up for movement participants. Some actors are better able to make use of the available resources and opportuni-ties than others. Strategic thinking enables certain actors to make more of a situation than others who do not have such skills (Ganz, 2004). Moreover, what constitutes a favorable outcome for a movement is not always clear. A movement could win enormous gains but then lose them all over time. An example of this is the temperance movement in America, which achieved its ostensible goal of turning America into a dry nation, but only for about 13 years. Today few people would advocate prohibition, and many people suggest that, over the long term, prohibition resulted in a more irresponsible drinking culture in the United States (Gusfield, 1986). What’s more, sociologist Edwin Amenta (2006) claims that the success or failure of a movement cannot always be so easily measured. Amenta uses the Townsend Plan movement as an example. Conceived in the early 1930s during the austere years of the Great Depression, this movement organized about 2 million elderly Americans into Townsend Clubs to place an unprece-dented and expensive demand on the government. They all wanted pensions. By 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed Social Security legislation to Congress, the force of the Townsend movement was palpable. The claims of the Townsend Plan’s proponents were finally recognized by the welfare state. What seemed to be an impossible request at the outset actually created conditions for later success. Emergence the first stage of a social movement, occurring when the social problem being addressed is first identified. 770 Three Stages of Social Movements Social movements are generally thought to evolve through three stages, assuming they survive long enough: emergence, coalescence, and routini-zation. The first stage, emergence, occurs when the social problem being addressed is first identified. As bicyclists realized that Americans’ reliance on automobiles to commute to work was unhealthy for the environment, they began to raise awareness of this social phenomenon. The problems of pollution and traffic congestion moved to the forefront, and bicycle com-muting emerged as a transportation alternative. Likewise, in the early 1980s, a new deadly disease emerged among gay men in the United States. The disease would later be known as HIV/AIDS, but in the early stages, people didn’t know what it was—they just knew that there was something askew within this particular community. Consciousness about this disease arose among a small population, and its members began raising awareness more broadly. In this early stage of social movements, a handful of people expend great effort merely to draw attention to a particular social issue that is oth-erwise not in the public consciousness. In the second stage, coalescence, resources are mobilized (i.e., concrete action is taken) around the problems outlined in the first stage. Through advocacy and education, more and more people become aware of the social problem. They organize meetings, start donating money, and begin lobbying elected political officials. New York bicycle advocates formed an organization called Transportation Alternatives and started encouraging their friends and co-workers to ride their bikes to work. They lobbied the city council for better laws and infrastructure to promote bicycle safety. Similarly, in 1981 advocates for HIV/AIDS awareness formalized an organization that started as a telephone hotline, the Gay Men’s Health Crisis, and began distributing information to medical professionals and at-risk populations. Because the formalization of organizations requires extensive resources, including money from donors and time commitments from members, some social movements simply fade away at this second stage. Social movement researchers disagree on the best ways to predict which social movements will make it through the second phase. Sometimes organizations achieve their objectives before becoming formalized. If a social movement begins to form on a college campus to encourage divestment from a particular country and the university decides to divest, then the social movement might disappear before it takes on a formal organizational structure. Other social movements fade away because of a lack of support. Imagine a social movement with the goal of getting every person in a city to work on Satur-days. That social movement would probably disappear quickly, because few people would support it. In the process of formalizing their organization, participants in social movements might adopt new goals and abandon old ones. If you begin a social movement to halt the construction of a building, you may broaden your goals to improve zoning laws, building regulations, or development rights in your entire city. The final stage in the formation of social movements is called Routinization or institutionaliza-tion the final stage of a social movement, in which it is institutionalized and a formal structure develops to promote the cause. routinization or institutionalization. In this stage, the social movement is institutionalized, and a formal structure develops to promote the cause. The organization may hire an executive director, a press secretary, and field organizers, for instance. It usually sets up a headquarters from which to organize its activities and coordinate its efforts. Social movements that have reached this final phase include NARAL (National Abortion Rights Action League) Pro-Choice America, a group that defends abortion rights, and Oper-ation Rescue, an antiabortion organization. As each movement became effective and expanded its membership base, it became institutionalized. Social Movement Organizations Social movement organization a group developed to recruit new members and coordinate participation in a particular social movement; these groups also often raise money, clarify goals, and structure participation in the movement. After social movements have been institutionalized, social movement organizations develop to recruit new members and coordinate participation. These groups also help raise money, clarify goals, and structure participa-tion in the movement. One type of social movement organization, a professional movement organization, has a full-time leadership staff dedicated to the movement and a large membership base that plays a minor role in the organization. The professional leaders speak on behalf of their constituency and often attempt to influence public policy through lobbying efforts. For example, NARAL Pro-Choice America is an influential professional organization that evolved from a single mother’s desire to effect change as a result of her own experi-ence. It was founded as the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws in 1969. In 1975, after the Supreme Court had preempted state law by declaring the right to abortion a part of the implicit constitutional right to privacy, the organization moved to Washington, D.C., to focus on national lobbying efforts in Congress. The organization is currently run by its pres-ident, Ilyse Hogue, and employs a full-time staff dedicated to organizing, lobbying, and communicating with its membership. The membership of NARAL Pro-Choice America plays a minor role in the organization other than financing personnel and activities. On occasion, however, members are called on to sign petitions, join marches, and contact their legislators about particular pro-choice issues. Another type of social movement organization is called a participa-tory movement organization. In these organizations, unlike professional movement organizations, the rank-and-file membership is directly involved. (Recall our discussion of organizations as social networks in Chapter 5.) Participatory movement organizations can be further divided into two sub-groups: mass protest organizations and grassroots organizations. A mass protest organization advocates for social change through protest and demon-stration. Although it lacks the organizational structure of a professional movement organization, it relies on high levels of member participation to achieve its goals. The protesters involved in global justice and antiglobaliza-tion movements have often been associated with mass protest organizations. Rather than attempt to effect social change through organized political channels or political lobbying, participants in global justice movements take to the streets to promote their cause. Critical Mass, the cyclist organization discussed earlier in the chapter, is another example of a mass protest organization. Once a month, hun-dreds of members of Critical Mass meet and ride their bikes through urban areas. Their goal is to disrupt traffic flow as a form of protest against the car-centered culture in cities. They aren’t highly organized—they don’t have an executive director or an official website. Instead, they rely on bloggers, tweeters, word of mouth, and high levels of on-the-ground participation: To disrupt the flow of traffic, hundreds of cyclists must participate. If only 15 cyclists participated, they wouldn’t be very effective at drawing attention to their cause. Other mass protests form in response to particular events. When Pres-grassroots organization a type of social movement organization that relies on high levels of community-based membership participation to promote social change. It lacks a hierarchical structure and works through existing political structures. ident Trump signed his executive order banning visitors from seven pre-dominantly Muslim countries in 2017, thousands of protesters converged on various airports across the nation to denounce the policy. To develop into a mass protest, individuals simply needed to agree on a meeting location—airports were an obvious one. There wasn’t a particular group that spon-sored, organized, and arranged these protests but rather a loose network of activists who coordinated their efforts. Similarly, many protests against Arizona’s draconian crackdown on illegal immigrants popped up in cities across the nation when the law passed in 2010. Although some professional organizations helped coordinate the protests, their success required large numbers of participants but very little organizational structure. A grassroots organization also relies on high levels of community-based membership participation to promote social change. Like a mass protest organization, it lacks the hierarchical structure of a professional movement organization. Unlike a mass protest organization, however, such a group works through existing political structures to promote social change. Grass-roots organizations are often involved in letter-writing campaigns and local political organizing to achieve their goals. They tend to focus on local issues and concerns, coordinating ideologically committed members through informal networks. Grassroots social movements often develop around specific projects in specific places. A common example of such a movement is NIMBYism (Not In My Back Yard), when local communities oppose the placement of undesirable facilities in their neighborhoods. Such facilities range from power plants and low-income housing to prisons and drug treatment centers. In Harpswell, Maine, a group of concerned residents protested an attempt by ConocoPhillips to construct a liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminal off the coast of central Maine. The community believed that the LNG plant would ruin the quality of the natural environment, as well as damage the delicate local economy based on the lobster industry. There wasn’t a formal organization to protest the terminal’s construction, but the residents of Harpswell organized on their own to protect their environment and lifestyle. The citizens of Harpswell produced materials protesting the LNG terminal and started a petition drive. They contacted television stations and local officials. Their organization was spontaneous, and their approach wasn’t radical. Nonetheless, they succeeded in stopping the construction of the LNG terminal, demonstrating the pow-erful potential of grassroots social movements. In Florida, NIMBY forces opposed the establishment of oil pipes and drilling that might damage sea-bottom marine habitats. But NIMBYism can often be hypocritical and selfish. For example, in Cape Cod in 2001, community dissent delayed the construction of a large wind farm in Nan-tucket Sound. Some members of the community made claims of ecological damage, but mostly they were unhappy about the farm’s likely obstruction of their very expensive views. (The protesters included the Wampanoag Indian tribe, which claimed that the wind turbines would violate their rights by interfering with their views of the sunrise in sacred ceremonies.) The Mas-sachusetts electorate generally votes in favor of wind power, but many Cape Cod residents opposed it when they would bear the aesthetic cost personally. Likewise, most Americans recognize the need for jails and homeless shelters, but they don’t want to live next to them. When each locality pursues its own interests, sometimes the greater good is lost in the shuffle and the results are suboptimal from the perspective of society as a whole. Social Movements and Social Change The aim of all social movements is to change society. Of course, change happens whether social movements cause it or not. The past hundred years in the United States provide several good examples of social evolution. The beginning of the twentieth century was a time of high immigration to Amer-ican urban centers. Garment factories in major cities like New York and San Francisco employed many new immigrants, whereas today the factories have moved abroad where salaries are lower. One hundred years ago, most of the immigrants to New York City came from Europe, but today most of the immigrants are from Latin America and Asia. Fifty years later, in the years following World War II, the American suburb started to develop rapidly. These were also the years of the baby boom, in which many families had larger numbers of children. (This blip in birth rates 50 years ago has had huge implications for society today.) Thiswas also the time when the civil rights movement emerged. And in 1965, the door to immigration was opened once again, remaking the demographics of the country. Our society has changed drastically even since the early 1980s, when the United States was still engaged in the Cold War with the now-defunct Soviet Union. Very few households had personal computers, and the internet hadn’t been invented yet. The car phone, a precursor to the cell phone, was introduced so people could make calls while on the road. As these examples show, society has changed in innumerable ways in the last 100, 50, or even just 25 years. Some changes in society affect the demographic structures of cities, states, and nations. According to the 1900 Census, for instance, the average American household had 4.60 people. By 1970, the average American house-hold size had declined to 3.14 people. In 2016, the average household size was recorded as 2.65 people (US Census Bureau, 2016g). This dramatic fall in the size of the average household in the United States represents a major change in society over the past century. Of course, the change in household size wasn’t the direct result of a social movement. Although many social movements did affect family size indirectly, such as the women’s rights movement and the movement to promote birth control and legalize abortion, there wasn’t a letter-writing campaign or a major protest march calling for fewer children to be born. Other social changes have political implications. Fifty years ago, African Americans faced widespread discrimination and segregation in public facili-ties across some parts of the country. Since the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, legalized, overt discrimination has largely been eliminated, although other forms of discrimination remain. The civil rights movement was one of America’s largest social movements, and one that effected major social change and has echoes into the present. In an interview, Andy Bichlbaum of the activist group the Yes Men explained how he provided activist consulting services to a local group of black rights activists who were angry about police racial profiling in New York. Bichlbaum worked with them to transform their anger and frustration into a clever, media-grabbing spoof partnership program between the NYPD and McDonald’s for free Happy Meals. The police were stopping and frisking people, mainly in neighbor-hoods like the Bronx for no reason at all, just as a matter of course, and finding very little [contraband] ever. Basically just racial pro-filing. So an activist group came to us, and we did this brainstorm with them and a number of students and batted around ideas for what we could do about this and how we could get some main-stream media attention. We came up with a bunch of ideas, but the one idea that we actually put into effect was the one that caused the biggest cringe from the organizer. She said, “No, we can’t do that.” That was proof it was a good idea. The idea was a McDonald’s website that offered vouchers for freebies as a partnership with the New York Police Department. It gave vouchers to people who were stopped and frisked and released without charge. If this happened to you, you would write down the officer’s badge number, your ethnicity, of course, date and time of stop, and all that. If it happened three times, you would get a free Happy Meal. This was so offensive and weird, and there was this fake corporate video that we made for McDonald’s explaining this won-derful program, with the voucher and pictures, and then, actually, the people who did it went into a McDonald’s with a voucher, filmed themselves secretly, tried to get the free Happy Meal, and they got it. (Conley, 2014h) The NYPD has reconsidered their stop-and-frisk policies, though it is impos-sible to measure the impact of this McDonald’s spoof on the NYPD’s policy change when we think of much larger movements such as #BlackLives-Matter. According to Bichlbaum, “We know that public outrage works, and protest works, people fighting works, rioting sometimes works . . . because we have the evidence that it works. . . . [For example,] we don’t have slavery anymore] . . . but what the steps are that you take to get there are a bit fuzzy.” This “fuzziness” is one reason we continue to study social movements—to better understand how they work and what kind of impact they have. When sociologists talk about To see an interview with Andy Bichlbaum, go to digital.wwnorton.com/youmayask6 social change, they are referring to transformations in social institutions, political organiza-tions, and cultural norms across time. Some changes are planned; others are not. The civil rights movement was a planned, orga-nized attempt to improve the way African Americans were treated in the United States. Hoping to implement social change, lead-ers and rank-and-file members of the movement organized events, planned sit-ins, and lobbied politicians. Smaller changes in society, such as changes in clothing fashion or hairstyles, are usually unplanned and simply happen. Social change can be major or minor. In the eyes of different folks, it can be either important or trivial. Most people would agree that the strides made by African Americans in the civil rights movement represented an import-ant social change, transforming social and political relations in the United States. On the other hand, the dwindling popularity of a particular brand of clothing is a trivial change, having little effect on people’s lives. Also, some social changes affect everyone in society, whereas others are limited to a specific group of people. Laws about putting your feet on the seats in New York City subway cars affect the residents there but probably have minimal effect on the residents of Seattle, Washington. Other social changes, such as changes in the federal tax code, may affect everyone in the United States. Premodern, Modern, and Postmodern Societies Whereas social movements and collective action both respond to and create societal changes across short periods of time, the terms premodern, modern, and postmodern refer to social change across longer periods. Unlike specific social movements, which may span 10, 30, or 50 years, these terms express more fundamental societal reorganizations across broader historical periods, and may not even refer to specific periods of time. Rather, they are meant to indi-cate particular ways of understanding, framing, and conceptualizing society. Premodern Societies Premodern societies are what used to be called “primitive” societies: Indi-viduals live in small groups such as tribes or villages, there is a low degree of literacy, there is not much division of labor, and technology is relatively undeveloped. According to the sociologist Georg Simmel, such premodern societies are characterized by concentric circles of social affiliation (Figure 18.1). The social positions of individuals were primarily ascribed by elements over which they had no control, like what families and towns they were born into as well as their gender and racial backgrounds. In this type of commu-nity, I am in the middle of my social world. Around me is my family; one circle beyond my family is my village; one circle beyond my village is my kingdom, perhaps. Each group is embedded—or set within—the groups around it: All the people in my family live in my village; all the people in my village belong to my kingdom. Because Simmel was concerned with social networks and affiliation, this model of concentric circles was useful to him for describing premodern social relations and the period of premodernity. In premodern societies, individuals are the source of authoritative knowledge. Villages may have a spiritual leader, who passes knowledge along from the gods to the people. Tradition is very important in premodern soci-ety; customs passed down through the generations help guide everyday life. Without science or technology, premodern societies rely largely on myths to explain the world around them. These myths or stories are also passed down through generations. Basically, any society that has not industri-alized or urbanized is living in a premodern mode, but in today’s interconnected world, it is difficult to find an entire society that is premodern—although some tribal cultures deep in the rain forest of South America or located in other remote rural areas still socially distant from the rest of the world might fill the bill. Figure 18.1 Modernity The term modernity is used in many fields, including art history, literature, and sociol-ogy, with little agreement about what it means. One relatively uncontested notion, however, is that the modern way of life replaced the premodern period with the rise of science and objectivity. Although it is impossible to pinpoint an exact transition from premodernity to modernity in the West, some scholars point to the early fifteenth century, the beginning of the Renaissance, as the origins of modernity; others use the Enlightenment, and still others point to the Industrial Revolution as the key moment. No matter when it started, modernism has generally been characterized as an era of rationality, bureaucratization, and objectivity. As scientific knowledge gained prominence throughout society, it competed with religion as the primary method of knowing, culminating in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. New political structures developed, with the rise of the modern nation-state and the process of urbanization. Tech-nological advances revolutionized agricultural production and forms of mass communication. Increased industrialization and the specialization of labor revolutionized economic production. For Simmel, modernity is characterized by the birth of the individual through a web of group affiliations (see Chapter 5). No longer does everyone in my family live in my village and everyone in my village share the same religion. As noted in our discussion of identity earlier in this chapter, each person is a unique combination of overlapping group affiliations (Figure 18.2).
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This happens by necessity when a society urbanizes, because city-dwellers often come from various parts of the country and live side by side although they do not have a common background or set of group affiliations. According to sociologist Max Weber, modernity emerged from the Protestant Reformation, which introduced concepts of rationality and bureaucracy. It established a legal-rational system as the basis for author-ity in society, and it concretized structures of bureaucracy throughout society (see Chapters 15 and 16). This rational, logical system extended to literature, architecture, and art. The rise of the novel in literature, for example, reflected these forces by imposing a logical, linear flow on the narrative. The modern affinity for linearity and order extends to public space as well. It was the modern era that saw the rise of urban planning as embodied by Pierre-Charles L’Enfant’s layout of Washington, D.C., and Georges-Eugène Haussmann’s planning of Paris. As these examples sug-gest, modernity refers to a mode of social organization, not just a period of time. A common theme in modernity is the notion of progress, itself a rational, linear notion of advancement in a single direction of betterment. And central to progress is humankind’s management of nature through technological innovation. Since the 1960s, many scholars have claimed that the modern period is drawing to a close. Some point to the demolition of the Pruitt-Igoe Houses in St. Louis, a symbol of modernity, as the end of the modern period. They were one of St. Louis’s largest public housing projects. According to many critics, they also demonstrated that the modern, bureaucratic approach to public housing that concentrated low-income communities in high-rise public projects had failed. In 1972, the city of St. Louis decided to demolish the 33 buildings. The towering brick structures (characteristic of mod-ern architecture) and the planned community of the projects (representa-tive of the modernist faith in rational, organized government solutions to social problems) came to destruction at the hands of the St. Louis Housing Authority. Postmodernism Since the 1980s, many academics have claimed that we have entered a period of postmodernity. In the modern and premodern periods, people believed that society was always progressing forward and each new invention built on previous inventions. History was driven by clashes between opposing forces—such as communism and capitalism—and always ended with one side emerging victorious. Society progressed along the victorious path toward some ultimate end point that was presumed to be better than what pre-ceded it. Postmodernity, in contrast, has been characterized by a questioning of this linear progression. The grand struggles (like communism versus capi-talism) that defined the modern period have been abandoned. In their place have arisen ideas about multiculturalism and the blending of different nar-ratives. Some people have said that the postmodern condition is embodied by the concept of pastiche, taking a little bit from one culture and a little bit from another to form a sort of collage. Like modernity, postmodernity is not a specific time period but a form of societal (dis)organization. In many ways, the postmodern period is a reac-tion against the modern period. Postmodern critics often suggest that sci-ence and logic, the cornerstones of modernist thinking, have failed to answer important questions and have been abandoned. You may have encountered postmodern art and architecture, which don’t follow the formal rigidities of modern art and architecture. Rather, they experiment with new mediums, new techniques, and new forms. Rap music, with its tradition of sampling rather than of sole authorship, is the archetypal postmodern music genre. Architect Philip Johnson’s Sony Building in New York City (completed in 1984) is often cited as a good example of postmodern architecture, because it uses a prominent ornamental feature borrowed from past architectural styles at the top of the building that modernist architects would have rejected as unnecessary decoration. A different postmodern strategy of revealing the inner workings of a building by placing them on the outside so they might be read as decorative may be seen in the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris, constructed in the 1970s. Simmel’s group affiliation model if adapted to postmodernity might look like a series of nonconcentric, nonoverlapping, and sometimes even contradictory identities and affiliations (Figure 18.3). The individual seems to have disintegrated into fragments and multiple, postmodern selves. The Causes of Social Change What drives social change, be it over 20 years or 2 millennia? What, besides social movements, that is? The short answer is that social change can result from technological innovation, the emergence of new ideas, changes in cul-tural identities, and conflict between social actors. Technology and Innovation Technological innovation has been a major contributor to social change. The invention of computers and the internet has brought about major changes in society. People can live in Milan, Italy, and hold a telephone conference with a company in San Francisco, California. Managers carrying smart-phones can communicate with their employees or clients 24 hours a day. People can work from home, so their homes may be farther away from their offices. Companies can locate their headquarters outside cities, where costs may be cheaper, because technology allows them to communicate instanta-neously. Technology has a huge influence on the organization of social and economic life. New Ideas and Identities The emergence of new ideas and information has also contributed to social change. For example, in recent years, researchers have presented studies suggesting that routine consumption of blueberries lowers a person’s risk of developing type 2 diabetes (Muraki et al., 2013). This information has changed some people’s behavior and therefore has brought about social change. Likewise, new information about the dangers of pollution, climate change, and global warming is altering people’s driving behavior, increas-ing the demand for hybrid cars in the United States. As fully electric cars gain in popularity and the dangers of climate change become clearer, this information may serve as a major source of social change. Finally, ideas from political leaders have caused social change in many societies. The rising importance of green parties in many European countries has shifted social behavior and attitudes. These examples all involve information flowing from experts to the Many social changes occurred in the wake of World War II, such as the founding of the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, and the conflict that resulted in the creation of Israel. general public who then make changes for themselves or their families. But change can also arise without the help of professional experts like scientists or politicians. Changes in the cultural identities of groups of people need not be the result of findings from research studies or political movements. The secularization of some Jewish communities in America has not been the result of a top-down plan within the Jewish community or any other expert opinion. Intermarriage rates between Jews and non-Jews have slowly ticked up as Judaism has come to be seen increasingly as an ethnicity and a religion, allowing nonreligious Jews to maintain a Jewish identity without strict adherence to religious doctrine. 786

Social change and conflict Other social changes are the result of conflict. The division of Germany in the aftermath of World War II was a direct result of the conflict itself. East and West Germany developed very differently during the postwar period, largely because of the political systems implemented at the end of the con-flict. World War II was also responsible for the Cold War, the establishment of the State of Israel, and the founding of the United Nations, just to mention a few of the enduring legacies of the global reorganization after the war. When ideas or institutions clash, new patterns of social organization emerge from their resolution. This version of history was originally championed by German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), who, in his theory of dialectics, argued that conflict was the motor of history. Each idea (or thesis) has an opposite (or antithesis). The thesis and the antithesis come into conflict, eventually resulting in their resolution (or synthesis). The synthesis, however, becomes a new thesis, which then evinces a new antithesis and eventually necessitates a new synthesis. This process of con-flict and resolution, according to Hegel, is how history proceeds. POLICY