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The CBSM section is an 800+ person-strong section determined to understand how people try to change their communities, nations, and the world. At least in my lifetime, we have never been needed more. It is an honor to lead the section this year and to try to support the work of our members as much as I can during that time. Although I will have more substantively to say in my next column, in my first Chair’s Column for the CBSM newsletter I wanted to reflect on a few goals I have as Chair this year, provide some updates, and also invite your feedback.

My first goal sounds routine but is actually quite important. I want to leave the section like I would leave a campsite: better off than I found it. My second goal is a process-based one: open up processes to the membership and work as transparently as possible. My third goal is an outcome-focused goal: promote the work of younger members and promote an inclusive section. With these goals in mind, I am working with the other section officers, council members, and committee members on a number of initiatives.

First, following my campsite metaphor, Andy Andrews (past-Chair), Jocelyn Viterna
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(Secretary/Treasurer), and I have been working to build a historical archive of CBSM-relevant documents that can help future councils and chairs and ensure that fundamental documents—like our bylaws—are well curated. Alex DiBrano has been doing a great job of updating the website, making sure that our membership and others also have access to accurate and updated information.

In terms of openness and transparency, as you hopefully read through the section listserv, I opened up the session planning process by inviting proposals for panels through an online form and then worked to maximize the number of CBSM sessions and also facilitate junior scholars organizing panels. Finally, I shared a detailed discussion of the selection process with the section through the listserv.

Third, the Membership, Diversity, and Inclusivity (MDI) Committee worked on a successful membership drive to keep us over eight hundred (allowing us to retain the same number of ASA sessions as we had last year). Given a new ASA policy that only allows gifted student memberships to be counted toward annual meeting totals if they are gifted in the first half of the year, MDI will also be doing a spring membership drive, which is much earlier than is usual. MDI is also collaborating with the Mentoring Committee to revitalize and expand their efforts and help inclusivity animate our programs more broadly. I hope that we will have more to share with members about this in the early new year.

In other committee updates, the Nominations Committee has fielded a great slate of candidates, setting up our Spring elections. The Call for Awards is also ready. The Publications Committee has been operating on a number of fronts, including working on a social media strategy and also a discussion listserv. Stacy and Daniel, our new newsletter editors, are also a great addition to the Publications team.

Council has also held a follow-up teleconference to our meeting at the ASAs. We agreed on some broad budget priorities and also to try out a new process that may help our council and future CBSM councils better forecast our financial needs and resources. We began a discussion of CBSM Workshop locations and are going to continue to work with the Workshop committee on their recommendations about our next preconference.

This has all been a lot of work, but it has been made much lighter by the effort of many hands. Heidi Reynolds-Stenson has been integral to helping me keep things on track as Chair, for which I am deeply grateful. All of the officers, Council members, and committee members have been so responsive and dedicated. Members have also been quite involved, sending in lots of proposals and ideas and also volunteering to help wherever possible. Thanks to all!

In closing, our section is critical to understanding how we make change together. In a time where change seems so hard to come by on the one hand, and so present in campaigns like #MeToo on the other hand, facilitating CBSM research is integral. I hope to count you all as continuing members in 2018 so that we can continue this important work together. I invite your feedback to me via email at jenniferearl@email.arizona.edu.

---

In Memoriam: Greg Maney

By Pamela Oliver, Lynne M. Woehrle, and Patrick G. Coy

The CBSM section, along with many other people and groups, mourns the untimely death of Gregory M. Maney on September 2, 2017, after a long illness. In his relatively short life and even while battling cancer, Greg accomplished much more than most.

He developed a passion for social justice as a young person in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He graduated magna cum laude with a degree in international relations from Brown in 1989, earned a master’s in labor studies from the University of Massachusetts Amherst in 1994, and completed his PhD at the University of Wisconsin in 2001. Right from the start, he was a scholar-activist who devoted significant energy and
commitment to social justice campaigns while also moving his own research forward and establishing an early habit of publishing high-quality research that met all the external standards of academic quality. As a graduate student, he contributed to research on news coverage of protests while pursuing his own research on peace movements in Northern Ireland and small studies of labor movements and transnational movements in Latin America.

In 2001 he was hired by Hofstra University and built a career there that continued to combine an energetic commitment to doing original research and bringing it to publication with a deep passion for helping social justice organizations achieve their goals. He was beloved at Hofstra for being an inspirational teacher who was named a Distinguished Teaching Professor, for his leadership in faculty governance, and for building bridges between the University and the local community. He worked to build the Hofstra Center for Civic Engagement to involve students in community research and devoted substantial efforts to numerous projects, including the Lifeway network to study human trafficking in the New York area, the Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives, the Long Island Immigrant Alliance to respond to hate crimes, the Workplace Project on human rights issues for day laborers, and the Greater Uniondale Area Action Coalition, which advocated for residents around foreclosure crises and community development issues.

He received awards from a number of community-based organizations for his efforts. These included an award from the Uniondale Community Council for his efforts to organize and unite Uniondale residents at the grassroots level, a Kairos Award from the Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives, and an award from the Central American Refugee Center for his human rights research and advocacy on behalf of the immigrant community on Long Island.

Greg’s work occupies a large space in the academic study of social movements and peace studies. He studied peace movement discourses, the dynamics of ethno-nationalist contention, transnational influences in ethno-national conflicts, the strategic waging of nonviolent conflicts, and strategies for sustaining peace processes. All of Greg's work was characterized by robust research and sophisticated analysis that detailed how complex the processes of intergroup conflict could be. Much of his work centered on Northern Ireland, where he showed the mixed effects of the Irish Catholic diaspora on the conflict and, more broadly, how transnational connections sometimes hurt rather than helped social movements. Another part of his Irish studies work revealed how violent and nonviolent conflict fed each other. As he maintained his connection with Ireland and spent several stints as a Visiting Research Professor at Queens University in Belfast, he continued his research on Irish movements and mural arts in West Belfast. Greg also drew comparisons between the conflicts and peace processes in Ireland and the Middle East.

Beginning in the 2000s, in collaboration with Lynne Woehrle and Patrick Coy, Greg published a book and a series of articles about how peace movement activists were shaping antiwar discourses to address concerns about patriotism and supporting troops. After the mid-2000s, while keeping up publications about ethno-national violence and peace movement discourses, Greg also began writing papers that drew on his community-oriented research, including papers about movement-based research, NIMBYism, and other community issues.

Greg received grants from the American Association of Colleges and Universities, the American Sociological Association, the National Science Foundation, the Sociological Initiatives Foundation, and the United States Institute of Peace and published in high profile journals and edited collections.

Greg also served on the editorial boards of the Journal of Irish Sociology and Sociological Compass. While building his academic career and engaging in substantial community leadership, Greg also dedicated himself to his family.

Greg was a generous mentor to younger scholars and gave significant service to both the Collective Behavior and Social Movements section and the Peace, War and Social Conflict section where he
served on many committees, on the Council for each section, and as Chair of the PWSC section.

When diagnosed with brain cancer, Greg turned his considerable research skills to the problem, creating a novel diet designed to starve the cancer cells. He adopted a 360-degree approach to positive living and affirmative attitudes, all while remaining dedicated to his wife, Mary Coyle, and their son Enzo, and while maintaining a robust scholarly life.

Greg will be long remembered for his brilliance, generosity, energy, and compassion as a scholar-activist. The three-hour long memorial service in his honor at Hofstra University in October amply attested to his broad scholarly reach, the rich collaborative relationships he had built with local community organizations, and the depth of love that many held for him. Gregory Maney contributed enormously to the fields of social movements and peace studies, and to our world. By so many he will be missed.

(Some of this material was drawn from a proposal to nominate Greg for a distinguished career award. Michelle Gawerc, Lee Smithey and Lisa Leitz also contributed to that proposal.)

---

**Why Can’t We All Just Get Along? Factionalism in Animal Rights**

*Corey Wrenn, Monmouth University*

As a long time vegan, I often use the Nonhuman Animal rights movement as a case study in my collective behavior research. My identity as an activist-scholar means that I am often in a position of bearing witness to the frustrations of activists who are often not aware that the barriers they face in mobilization efforts are actually rather ubiquitous to collective behavior.

Many activists bemoan the heavy divisions that have emerged within the Nonhuman Animal rights movement, specifically as it has developed and transformed over recent decades (Wrenn 2016). In the 1970s and 1980s, the movement has been divided between factions that advocate direct action and structural change (such as the infamous Animal Liberation Front) and those that advocate institutional reform (such as the Humane Society of the United States). More recently, conflicts have emerged over aims to either reform or abolish Nonhuman Animal use. Rather than seeing these divisions as healthy growing pains, they are most often viewed as a serious liability. Indeed, many movement leaders point specifically to factionalism as a primary reason for limited movement success.

Factionalism is not unique to advocacy on behalf of other animals. In fact, factionalism and the manifestation of radical offshoots tend to be characteristic of social movements. As a social movement organization increases in size and becomes more dependent upon member contributions (and thus more reliant on appealing to a larger constituency), organizational goals tend to dilute. This professionalization process encourages the manifestation of more radical splinter groups (Koopmans 1994, Wrenn 2016, Zald and Garner 1987).

Factionalism is also facilitated when resources are more plentiful (Soule and King 2008). This often happens when a movement professionalizes, as professionalization entails a specialization in attracting contributions. This is certainly the case with welfare-oriented moderate organizations in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement (Pendegrast 2011). As groups amass resource wealth, resource-hungry factions sprout up intent on implementing their own approaches.

Zald and Garner (1987) have also suggested that factionalism is more likely to manifest when a movement is especially hostile to authority and when short-term goal attainment is less likely. Achieving
Nonhuman Animal liberation is certainly a long-term goal, meaning that schism is likely to form across generations and different demographic groups. This movement could also be categorized as potentially “hostile” to authority, as it challenges entrenched power and systems of oppression. Indeed, Nonhuman Animal rights activists have been targeted as a leading domestic terrorist threat in the United States. While this is understandably discouraging to anti-speciesists, other social movements have shared similar experiences. Social movements of all kinds often share predictable patterns of growth and professionalization that facilitate radical factionalism. Unbeknownst to many activists, this is rather typical movement behavior.

Social movement researchers have established the normalcy of factionalism, but whether or not factionalism is detrimental to goal attainment is still under debate. Many social movement theorists and advocates argue that infighting among factions damages public credibility (Benford 1993), diverts resources (Benford 1993, Miller 1999), leaves the movement vulnerable to countermovement attack (Jasper and Poulsen 1993), or even leads to its demise (Gamson 1990). Others, however, argue that factionalism can work to the benefit of the movement. This can be accomplished when factions draw attention to the cause with radical tactics and claimsmaking (Haines 1984). Movement infighting can work positively to penetrate across multiple class and cultural boundaries (Benford 1993, Gerlach 1999, Reger 2002), minimize overall failures, and increase solidarity for specific groups (Benford 1993). It can also fuel positive competition, motivate participation, and inspire tactical innovation (Gerlach 1999). Factions also act as a mechanism for managing conflict and thus promote continued collective action (Reger 2002). In short, factionalism increases movement adaptability.

Factionalism forces a movement to engage in critical reflection. Radical factions in particular function to create an ideal towards which the movement might aspire. Radical advocates in favor of abolishing (rather than reforming) Nonhuman Animal use serve this purpose by imagining a critical vegan utopia where species inequality and exploitation are rejected (Wrenn 2011). The vegan abolitionist faction offers an alternative vision, motivates participation, and promotes a fundamental paradigm shift that is integral to reaching the goal of Nonhuman Animal liberation. Factionalism does not necessarily push a movement into decline (Rochford 1989), and a movement that survives factionalism can emerge stronger and more focused.

Moderates in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement often promote dominant welfare-oriented organizations as necessary for member recruitment. However, it is more often the case that a moderate stance is maintained to attract and maintain highly impersonalized public membership and external monies from conservative funding sources (McCarthy and Zald 1973, McCarthy and Zald 1977). As an organization becomes mainstream, it often becomes decreasingly committed to social change and more focused on organizational survival. These large organizations can become less interested in attracting new activists and more concerned with attracting paying members who will have no obligation to participate beyond financial donations. When organizational framing exchanges emphasis on social change for an emphasis on advertising, the important role played by radical factions becomes much clearer (Schwartz 2002).

Activists in my field regularly plead for the various factions to overcome their differences and work together. Whether animal lover or animal user, vegan or meat-eater, moderate or radical, we’re all supposed to be on the same page if we care about the well-being of other animals. Generally, it has been my observation that the ones making these pleas for cooperation in the movement are those who identify with the professionalized regulationist organizations that dominate the Nonhuman Animal rights space. From this perspective, factionalism might be
denounced as part of a strategy to encourage radicals to forgo their critical, utopian stance and retreat back into the more profitable moderate approach.

Factionalism is known to drain resources, but its presence is integral. The dominant regulationist paradigm in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement has failed to seriously reduce the reification and exploitation of nonhumans, and radical activists make this point central to their claimsmaking. As the movement professionalizes and large regulationist charities increasingly compromise goals and tactics, the role of radical abolitionism becomes critical in offering an alternative vision, motivating activism, and advocating a necessary vegan paradigm shift. It is my hope that the stigma surrounding factionalism might be reduced in the service of more effective social justice advocacy and social movement research. At the very least, increased awareness to factional patterns could alleviate the stress felt by radicals who are disproportionately burdened, ostracized, and sanctioned by a movement’s displeasure with factional tension.

Memory Activism: Reimagining the Past for the Future in Israel-Palestine

Yifat Gutman, Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Using cultural practices like tours and testimonies for the purpose of influencing public debate and political discourse is not new. Using such practices to strategically commemorate a contested past is a relatively new phenomenon, one that is part of a surge in memory of a difficult past among civil society and grassroots groups around the world in the last two decades. In my new book, Memory Activism: Reimagining the Past for the Future in Israel-Palestine, I term this activist strategy “memory activism.” After conducting extensive ethnographic fieldwork among Israeli and Palestinian peace activists since 2000, I found that collective memory can be used as a “weapon of the weak” for political change.

From 2000-2011, I followed three groups of peace activists, both Jewish-Israeli and Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel, who have been remembering pre-state Palestinian life and their loss and displacement in the 1948 war. This history is known as Al Nakba (the catastrophe, in Arabic). More specifically, these activists borrowed practices of touring and testimony from mainstream Israeli culture and infused them with counterhegemonic messaging in the context of the prolonged conflict. Memory practices of Palestinian citizens, primarily return visits, also appear in this activist memory work, and the meeting between the two sets of national memory practices is intriguing.

Similar to other peace activists, the memory activist groups in Israel sought a nonviolent resolution to an ongoing conflict, yet they also differed from peace activist movements in their temporal approach to political change. Peace activists are traditionally future-oriented and often make an effort to bracket a contested and polarizing past in order to highlight common ground. Memory activism, when employed as a strategy of peace activism, is oriented toward the past, and thus brings in different temporal relations as the foundation of its model for political change: first the past, then the present and future. The aim of memory activism is to disconnect the hegemonic linear link between a particular past, a present that is indicated as resulting from this past, and a projected future. Activists construct a different trajectory by creating an alternate understanding of the past that brings a new understanding of the present and a new vision for the future.

In the state utilization of tours for national education in Israel, the hegemonic connection is drawn between the biblical past of the Jewish people and the present (and future) settlement of Jews in the land of Israel as part of the renewal of the Jewish people after its near
annihilation in the Holocaust. The thousands of years that Jews spend living with non-Jews in diasporic communities are left out of this temporal trajectory, as well as the life that flourished in the land of Israel in the Diaspora period: primarily those of Palestinians and Mizrachi Jews of the “Old Settlement” (Raz-Krakotzkin 2001). Today, the counterhegemonic activist tour enacts and performs the latter part of the history of the territory that was left out of Israel’s Zionist collective memory. It concerns Palestinian life in the territory before the establishment of the state and their loss in the 1948 war.

Hegemonic tours traced biblical past in order to create a sense of belonging and cultivate a new Hebrew culture and identity in the present as a story of redemption and celebration (Katriel 1996). In the activist tours, the Palestinian past is traced and documented in order to estimate the degree of its destruction and loss, particularly through the displacement and dispossession that Palestinians experienced in the 1948 war. That Palestinian displacement is meant to be connected to the underprivileged and discriminated position of Palestinians today and the present state of the conflict through a causal connection. Going back to the pre-state life and understanding “what went wrong” is a first step toward imagining an alternative future to today’s escalating conflict (Coy et al. 2008).

The political motivation behind memory-activist initiatives varies, and they can be used to advance less peaceful and democratic aims. Yet I trace the surge in activist commemoration of a difficult past historically to a temporal shift in international politics since the 1980s that is underlined by an effort to “come to terms” with violent histories in order to advance peace and reconciliation (Barkan 2000, Olick and Coughlin 2003, Torpey 2003, among others). Much of the current backlash and attempts to block critical memories and revisionist national histories responds to this wide-spread discourse.

Memory activism opens a window to the meaning and nature the political. In the case of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, I found that using cultural memory as a means for political change entails a process of de-politicization rather than a formal and explicit claim for power. In interviews, activists characterized their work as non-political, although remembering the Nakba in Israel seems to be extremely “political”—i.e., controversial and illegitimate in the larger society and one that expands the schism between the activists and state ideology. I argue that there is a strategic logic to articulating memory activism around the Nakba as a nonpolitical issue in Israel. In articulating nuanced distinctions among four different definitions of the “political” that activists use, I argue that the real political work done by memory activism of Israelis and Palestinians is not simply building political support for Palestinian statehood, but is also a pervasive strategy for raising consciousness among Jewish Israelis through a depoliticization that is potentially followed by a repoliticization and taking a moral and political stand.

**CriticalMass**

ASA 2017: Paper Session on Leadership, Strategy, and Organization in Social Movements

*Alex DiBranco, Yale University*

When the Leadership, Strategy, and Organization in Social Movements session convened on Saturday morning at the ASA annual meeting, participants remarked with pleasant surprise on the extent to which the papers were in conversation with one another. Organized by University of California, Santa Barbara political science professor Hahrie Han, the panel sought to draw the discipline’s attention to the influence of leaders and organizations on social movements and to evaluate the factors that contribute to these actors’ strategic choices and decisions.

Jean Yen-chun Lin, a postdoc at Stanford University, kicked things off with an analysis of the effect of differing NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) protest strategies on state response in Chinese environmental activism. Her charting of movement trajectories
indicated the significance of early tactical decisions by activists, finding that even if movement leaders make an about face in strategy down the line, those initial protest characteristics still influence the ultimate state response—such as repression.

As the presentations proceeded, a complementarity emerged that had not been evident in the paper titles listed in the program: three of the five working papers looked at Occupy Wall Street. This unexpectedly provided a shared case that attracted the interest of audience members and encouraged participants to converse on the shared subject matter during the question and answer period. Professors Zeynep Tufekci (North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Adam D. Reich (Columbia University), and Marshall Ganz (Harvard University)—presenting on behalf of himself and co-author Elizabeth McKenna, a sociology Ph.D. candidate at University of California Berkeley—brought expert perspectives to the analysis of the Occupy movement in its online and offline dimensions.

Tufekci’s presentation promised a tweak to the concept of “leadership,” considering the Occupy movement’s attachment to “leaderlessness.” Her presentation interrogated the role of digital technology and social media, with an eye to their benefits as well as their pitfalls, a subject discussed further in her 2017 book, *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. Later, Reich took a unique approach to assessing outcomes, providing a network analysis of how participation in Occupy Wall Street changed the relationships between local New York social movement organizations.

Moving to the opposite side of the political spectrum, Yale University Ph.D. candidate Alex DiBranco shifted attention to the U.S. New Right movement of the 1970s and 1980s. She argued for the importance of looking at the relationships between the grassroots and the institutional infrastructure, such as think tanks, to accurately assess how the conservative movement developed and thrived under the influences of charismatic leaders and serial entrepreneurs. Yet whether looking at progressive or conservative movements, the papers spoke especially well to each other also in that they largely drew from—and critiqued—a similar theoretical pool. Political scientist and women’s rights activist Jo Freeman, for instance, and her theory of the “tyranny of structurelessness,” appeared in a majority of the presentations.

Following the final presentation, for which Ganz and McKenna set the charge of “Bringing Leadership Back In,” audience members and panel participants jumped into a dynamic Q&A. In a conversation given extra urgency by the current political climate, audience members sought further insight into the reasons behind social movement successes and failures. The panel indicated that the subject of leadership, strategy, and organization in social movement studies offers a rich and hopefully growing area for further academic study. As the audience response demonstrated, research that can help those inside and outside of the academy better understand contemporary social movements and political outcomes has great value today.

**ASA 2017: Paper Session on Consequences of Social Movements**

*Kenneth (Andy) Andrews, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

CBSM organized a panel on the consequences of social movements at the 2017 ASA meetings with talks by Kenneth (Andy) Andrews, Brayden King, Katrin Uba, and Nella Van Dyke. With a large body of research, panelists focused on questions about directions for the next generation of scholarship in this core area of the field.

King led off by arguing that social movement scholars have convincingly documented that movements influence the policymaking process, cultural outcomes, and market dynamics. However, he pointed to at least two important limitations: 1) we study a limited array of movement tactics, which leads to a sort of selection bias and 2) many
outcomes we care about (e.g., such as the substantive implementation of policies) are difficult to observe and are therefore understudied by movement scholars. Movement scholars should diversify the types of tactics we study and focus as much on policy implementation as we do on policy adoption.

Katrin Uba highlighted two important aspects for analyzing the political consequences of social movement mobilization, counterfactual arguments and time, and she proposed one new aspect to consider. The first refers to the importance of accounting for the situations where there was a policy change without any mobilization. Such cases allow us to notice potential confounding factors. Secondly, accounting for time is crucial for any analysis of social movement outcomes and especially for policy changes, which tend to take time. Finally, Uba suggested that we look more at the arguments used by activists, as in some contexts the alternative solutions proposed by the activists and the style these arguments are presented, might be crucial for the political power of the movement.

Nella Van Dyke’s presentation focused on the cultural outcomes of social movements. She argued that we have falsely dichotomized cultural and political outcomes, and that political outcomes are actually a type of cultural outcome. Using same sex marriage as an example, she argued that political and cultural outcomes of movements are often inseparable. She also based her argument on the fact that policies and laws are ideational elements of culture, and that research shows that consistent factors influence both cultural and political outcomes of movements.

Finally, Andy Andrews discussed three main points to move scholarship forward. First, scholars should continue to innovate in our efforts to gauge the causal significance of movements. Progress can be made by borrowing from other disciplines and sub-fields such as the use of field experiments. Second, Andrews pressed for greater attention to the targets of movements, including their conceptions of movements and strategic logics. Finally, he argued for efforts to build theoretical synthesis by focusing on distinct mechanisms of movement influence including cultural, disruptive, and organizational pathways.


**Other Publications**


2017 CBSM Section Awards

Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Dissertation Award

Yang Zhang’s “Insurgent Dynamics: The Coming of the Chinese Rebellions, 1850-1873.”

From 1850 to 1873, about 30 million people were killed in the Taiping Rebellion and the sprawling challenge to China’s Qing dynasty that followed, perhaps the bloodiest political conflict in human history. Yang Zhang seeks to explain these rebellions. Why did they emerge when they did? Why did some elite militias repress the rebels while others came to rebel against Qing authority, some switching sides? How can the unusual ethnic and religious dynamics be explained? Zhang conducted extensive research in national and local archives, mining voluminous Qing government records for overarching patterns and examining local gazettes and personal ephemera for orienting details of important micro-episodes.

Zhang finds structural theories emphasizing relatively enduring macro arrangements such as class structure and state capacity insufficient to account for either the initial emergence of the rebellion or its spread. Similarly, path dependent theories cannot explain the varied evolving patterns of participation and their short-term causes. Zhang’s approach is close to eventful sociology, but he argues that an eventful approach is too contingent and cannot explain the regular patterns that emerge over the course of the rebellions. He proposes a “dynamic” theory of politics, to explain the patterns of rebellion with respect to the changing relations of organizational actors. This approach allows Yang to account for how structure matters, and for historical contingency, while drawing out regular patterns across spatial and temporal comparison.

Small-scale feuds between local militia, secret societies, martial arts clubs, and armed escorts militarized the unorthodox Christian Taiping, then concentrated and politicized, generating the initial challenge. The national oppositional framework this generated was not structurally determined. But once it developed, it set the basic reference for the struggles to come. The course of history developed on an ever-changing terrain as revolutionary actions drove political splits within the ruling regime, polarized group identities, and shifted political alignments. Revolutionary actions also forged new political actors and drew foreign involvement. For Zhang, none of these developments was determined by structural conditions. Nor were they contingent. Instead, Zhang’s theory of history resides in the ways that organizational actors relationally respond to preceding events, continually reshaping the structural context as they go.

The scope and nuance of Zhang’s empirical analysis is astounding. His theoretical exploration is erudite and lucid. The book that comes out of this project will undoubtedly shape not only understandings of one of the largest violent conflicts in history, but the way social scientists study large scale rebellion for years to come.

Joshua Bloom, University of Pittsburgh

Mayer N. Zald Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award


I want to thank my fellow committee members Ziad Munson, Lee Ann Banaszak, Marcos Perez, and Han Zhang. We were fortunate to receive 22 outstanding submissions, which we narrowed to a short-list of 8 finalists. Our discussions of the papers lead us to unanimous support for awarding Anya Galli the 2017 Mayer Zald Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award for her Mobilization article, “How Glitter Bombing Lost Its Sparkle: The Emergence and Decline of a Novel Social Movement Tactic.”
CriticalMass

Galli’s excellent article examines the rise and fall of glitter bombing, which was a short-lived but novel protest tactic in which protesters threw glitter on unwitting targets. First used in May 2011 against Newt Gingrich to support the LGBT rights movement, the tactic went on to be used by transgender and prochoice activists, among others. However, as Galli shows using interviews and media coverage data, the tactic failed to find a permanent place in the contemporary repertoire of contention. Although its lack of connection to SMOs had initially encouraged the tactic’s adoption, this also ensured its more ephemeral place in the social movement repertoire. While successful at gaining media coverage, its broader cultural spread, including onto the network television show, Glee, “diluted the political power of activists’ claims,” contributing to its demise as a social movement tactic. Increasing repression, among other factors, also undermined its diffusion and consolidation as a tactic.

Galli’s article is well-written and brings timely questions and data into conversation. It makes a clear contribution to the literature given how little we know about how and why tactics fail to catch on. We also found the argument to be straightforward but compelling: the same conditions that allowed the tactic to grow rapidly contributed to its downfall. A combination of specificity, lack of organizational support, broader cultural appropriation, and repression caused glitter bombing to “lose its sparkle,” but we are confident that this article will not lose its sparkle over time!

Jennifer Earl, University of Arizona

Charles Tilly Award for the Best Book in Collective Behavior and Social Movements


Erica Simmons’s book, Meaningful Resistance: Market Reforms and the Roots of Social Protest in Latin America, is the winner of the 2017 Charles Tilly Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award. Simmons’s central argument concerns the significance of grievances for the origins and dynamics in movements. Specifically, she traces the way that economic goods connected to subsistence or livelihood become the centerpiece of mass movements. Meaningful Resistance argues and shows how cultural and emotional processes—meaning making—are central to whether and how grievances fuel mobilizations. Simmons draws on extensive fieldwork in Mexico and Bolivia, examining mobilization around corn and water, respectively. The book stands out for its original argument about the links between material and ideational forces in mass movements, rich comparative case studies, and integration of strong traditions in sociology, political science, and anthropology. In addition to its focus on grievances, the book brings questions about inequality to the forefront in movement studies. Finally, Meaningful Resistance is beautifully written, and we expect will reach a broad audience in movement studies and beyond.

Kenneth (Andy) Andrews, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Best Published Article Award


Following Emirbayer’s and Goodwin’s (1994) insight that culture has an “analytically autonomous” influence on structure, the authors show the effects of cultural contexts on the capacity of social networks and social status to influence individual economic decisions. Analyzing the period prior to and during the peak of the British Abolition movement between 1740 and 1807, they employ a rich array of archival
Ingram and Silverman compare the relative influence of social networks and various status positions on individual decisions to enter or not enter the slave trade during the peak of the Abolition Movement and during more fragmented times. Even before the rise of the Abolition Movement, there was a tension between Britain’s identity in support of liberty and its acceptance of slave trading. They conclude that depending on the cultural context, that is either a low Abolitionist Culture or a High Abolitionist culture, networks and status positions do not exert the same influence on actors. As opposed to the fragmented period, at the peak of the Abolitionist movement that garnered wide public support, non-slave traders with ties to both pro-slave trade and anti-slave trade networks were significantly more likely to engage or disengage from slave trading. However, anti-slave trade networks were much more influential on the non-slave traders than their pro-slave counterparts. This suggests that the saliency of public opinion may influence the capacity of social networks to influence potentially culpable actors. Further, status does not operate the same way in all contexts. Gentlemen were significantly more likely to become slave traders at the peak of the Abolitionist movement than were merchants. The authors argue that those with middle-status as opposed to high or low status are more willing to breach social norms. Similarly, those individuals who belonged to private social clubs with pro-slavery ties were also more likely than those in publically observable investment networks to enter the slave trade at the peak of the Abolitionist movement. Thus, the private nature of the clubs provided protection against public disapproval of the decision to join the slave trade.

The paper is theoretically innovative and speaks not only to classic questions of social movement influence but broader questions of sociological theory on how culture influences the capacity of networks and social status to influence individual decisions about whether or not to defy the cultural shifts that were inspired by social movements.

**Honorable Mention**


This is a well-written and finely detailed paper. Through a study of mutinies on Royal Navy ships from 1740-1820, the authors make an important contribution to the social movements literature by showing the importance of specific grievances for high-risk collective actions. More specifically, using an original data set from archival sources, the paper shows that the combination of structural and incidental grievances contributed to the emergence of high-risk collective action during the late 18th and early 19th century. The paper has important implications for social movement scholars and policymakers interested in predicting the emergence of rebellion and violence.

Belinda Robnett-Olsen, University of California, Irvine  
Edward Walker, UCLA  
John Krinsky, The City College of New York  
Bogdan Vasi, University of Iowa

**Deadline for the Spring 2018 Issue of CriticalMass Bulletin:** April 15th
CALL FOR PAPERS
CBSM Sessions at ASA 2018 Annual Meeting
Philadelphia, PA, August 11th-14th

Beyond the Civil Rights Paradigm: Inter-sectional Dynamics in Movements for Racial Justice
(Cosponsored with Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities)

This panel brings together scholarship exploring theories, methods, case studies and comparisons of race-centered and minority-led protests. A Civil Rights paradigm of movement inquiry that explores movement trajectories in an inter-racial context has taught us much about the political and organizational dynamics shaping mobilization. But the distinctive dynamics within movements for racial justice led by persons of color has yet to be explored. We invite papers that explore how inter-sectional dynamics among and between movement actors of color shape differential pathways and experiences to mobilization. These issues can be explored in movements at the local, national, or international levels of organization, and survey the intersection of movement actor status and resources, opportunities, cognitive and cultural mobilization processes. We will pay close attention to papers that examine movements led by Indigenous, Black and Immigrant activists. This session is co-sponsored with the Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities.

Session Organizers:
Gilda Zwerman (SUNY Old Westbury)
Selina Gallo-Cruz (College of the Holy Cross)

Methodological Advances in Research on Social Movements

This session focuses on methodological advances in the study of social movements. Papers using innovative methodological approaches with empirical findings, as well as papers considering the implications of methodological conventions for social movements research would both be of interest. Presentations on the use of digital and/or big data for studying social movements and methodological approaches that seek to measure and conceptualize time (temporal experiences and horizons in activism, novelty and repetition in social movements, as well as more familiar issues such as waves, generations, and events) in social movements would be especially welcome.

Session Organizers:
John Krinsky (The City College of New York)
Misty Ring-Ramirez (University of Arizona)

Non-State Opposition to and Suppression of Social Movements

Conflict between opposing movements seems to be on the rise, exemplified most dramatically by clashes between alt-right and antifa demonstrators. This is a reminder that it is not always the state, but sometimes another movement, that is the most formidable foe of a social movement. The literature on movements and countermovements has framed itself in terms of opposition rather than repression or suppression. The literature on social movement repression remains focused on the state as the principle, if not only, actor engaged in repression of movements. This has left the phenomenon of non-state suppression of movements woefully undertheorized. In this session, we work to move beyond state-centric understandings of opposition to and suppression of social movements by more critically examining the dynamics of counterprotest and other ways that non-state actors work to oppose, stop, or silence their opponents. One goal of the session is to prompt a consideration of the similarities and differences between opposition to a counter-movement and attempts to suppress a counter-movement. Submissions of papers exploring topics such as the following are invited: the causes and consequences of counterprotest; the ways that counterprotest is similar (in it causes, dynamics, or its effects) or different from state repression of movements; and the relationship between counterprotest and state repression, including how
the presence of counterprotesters shapes state response and how this state response then shapes these opposing movements. Other papers focusing on this central issue from another vantage point are also welcome.

Session Organizer:
Heidi Reynolds-Stenson (University of Arizona)

Revisiting Threats and Grievances in the Trump Era
Threats and grievances have made a resurgence in social movements research in recent years. Although this research has focused on understanding mobilization in historical and repressive contexts, it may also be useful for understanding mobilization in more contemporary contexts. This panel will explore the relevance of this theoretical work—or cases building on related topics—in understanding the rapid expansion of social movement activity in the US, especially in response to the campaign, election, and policies of President Donald Trump. For instance, how threats and grievances may drive movements to revisit established tactics, devise innovative tactics, forge new coalitions of movement actors such as #Resist, renew public enthusiasm for participation in politics and activism, or, conversely, set off substantial counter-mobilization efforts in response to these trends.

Session Organizers:
Anya Galli Robertson (University of Maryland)
Thomas Maher (Purdue University)

Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements Refereed Roundtables (1 hour)
The CBSM roundtable session invites papers from new and established scholars whose work fits within the Section’s focus on social movements, protest, activism, and collective behavior. Papers may focus on any number of specific topics in this area. Session will be one-hour in length, followed by the Section’s 40-minute business meeting.

Session Organizers:
Bryant Crubaugh (Pepperdine University)
Aliza Luft (UCLA)

**Submission Deadline:** January 11, 2018, 11:59 PM EST. For more information, see the official Call for Papers on the ASA website.

**CALL FOR PAPERS**
Alternative Futures and Popular Protest Conference

*Manchester, UK, March 26th and 28th*

From 1995 to 2017, Manchester Metropolitan University hosted a series of very successful annual international conferences on 'ALTERNATIVE FUTURES and POPULAR PROTEST'.

We're very happy to announce that the Twenty Third AF&PP Conference will be held between Monday 26th and Wednesday 28th March 2018.

The Conference rubric will remain as in previous years. The aim is to explore the dynamics of popular movements, along with the ideas which animate their activists and supporters and which contribute to shaping their fate.

Reflecting the inherent cross-disciplinary nature of the issues, previous participants (from over 60 countries) have come from such specialisms as sociology, politics, cultural studies, social psychology, economics, history and geography. The Manchester conferences have been notable for discovering a fruitful and friendly meeting ground between activism and academia.

We invite offers of papers relevant to the conference themes. Papers should address such matters as:

* contemporary and historical social movements and popular protests
* social movement theory
* utopias and experiments
To offer a paper, please contact either of the conference convenors with a brief abstract:

EITHER Colin Barker, email: c.barker@mmu.ac.uk
OR Mike Tyldesley, email: m.tyldesley@mmu.ac.uk
(Please use email, especially as both Colin Barker and Mike Tyldesley are now retired gents.)

CALL FOR PAPERS
The Second Mobilization Conference:
Race, Ethnicity, and Radicalism
San Diego, CA, May 4-5, 2018

The conference at San Diego State University is planned as an informal and friendly gathering to present your current work, discuss it with others, network, and, generally, ponder the directions in which the field is heading. It is organized by Mobilization: An International Quarterly, and sponsored by the Hansen Foundation for Nonviolent Resistance. Plenary sessions will focus on strategies, tactics, and nonviolent approaches to confronting racial/ethnic divisions and injustice. This is a compelling topic in the current political climate, and we look forward to an engaging conference this year.

For open-call paper sessions, submissions on a range of topics are invited, and will be assigned to thematic sessions such as:

- Radicalism in contemporary movements
- Tactical variation and movement outcomes
- Strategies of nonviolence
- Social movements and collective identity
- Trends in social movement theory/critical perspectives
- Violent versus nonviolent strategies
- Contemporary movements and popular protest

- Social media, digital technologies, and repertoire shift
- Cross-national and historical analysis
- And more, depending on submissions

The last year’s conference was a great success: 140 attendees, 123 presenters, 34 paper sessions, and 3 plenaries. We invite all our colleagues in the CBSM section to attend. Hotel rooms are available in historic Old Town San Diego, an easy trolley ride to the university and a 10-minute ride to San Diego’s scenic harbor, Seaport Village, microbreweries, and Gas Lamp Quarter. Information about housing, registration, and submitting your abstracts is available at http://sociology.sdsu.mobilization_conference/

Abstracts and registration are due January 15, 2018. For questions, contact Mobilization.Quarterly@sdsu.edu

Additional Opportunities
Nominations Sought for CBSM Section Awards

Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements Mayer N. Zald Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Student Paper Award

Anyone without a PhD in 2016 is considered a student, and any paper (published or unpublished) written in 2017 by a student or students (i.e., no PhD coauthors) is eligible. A previously submitted paper may be resubmitted only if significantly revised. Authors may submit their own work, or nominations may be made by section members. No lengthy nominating letters please, and please send all questions to the committee chair. $500 will be awarded. Send a copy of the paper electronically to each of the committee members by March 1, 2018. Winners will be notified by June 1, 2018.

Mayer Zald Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award Committee:
Jo Reger (Chair), reger@oakland.edu
Neal Caron, neal.caren@gmail.com
Lisa Leitz, leitz@chapman.edu
Anya Galli Robertson, anyagalli@gmail.com

Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Article Award

Articles and chapters from edited books with publication dates of 2017 are eligible. Authors may submit their own work, or nominations may be made by section members. No lengthy nominating letters please, and please send all questions to the committee chair. Send a copy of the article electronically to each member of the prize committee by March 1, 2018:

Best Published Article Award Committee:
Kenneth Andrews (Chair), kta@unc.edu
Amin Ghaziani, amin.ghaziani@ubc.ca
Ziad Munson, munson@lehigh.edu
Paul, Ingram, pi17@gsb.columbia.edu

Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements Charles Tilly Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Book Award

Section members, authors, or publishers may nominate books with publication dates of 2017. Authors may submit their own work, or nominations may be made by section members or publishers. No lengthy nominating letters please, and please send all questions to the committee chair. Send or have publishers send a copy of the book to each member of the prize committee by March 1, 2018:

Charles Tilly Award for Best Book Committee:
Jennifer Earl, (Chair), jenniferearl@email.arizona.edu (School of Sociology, Social Sciences 400, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721)
Edward Walker, walker@soc.ucla.edu (Department of Sociology, UCLA, 264 Haines Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095)
John Krinsky, jkrinsky.ccnv@gmail (Colin Powell School for Civic and Global Leadership, City College of New York, Office NAC 4/138B, 160 Convent Avenue, New York, NY 10031)
Erica Simmons, essimmons@wisc.edu (University of Wisconsin–Madison, 110 North Hall, 1050 Bascom Mall, Madison, WI 53706)

Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Dissertation Award

Any doctoral dissertation completed (i.e., successfully submitted, defend, and approved) in calendar year 2017 is eligible. Only nominations from the student’s dissertation chair or co-chair will be accepted. Nomination letters should not exceed two typed pages in length. The nomination letter should be accompanied by the dissertation in electronic form. Please direct all questions to the committee chair. $1,000 will be awarded. Send a copy of the nomination letter and dissertation to each committee member by March 1, 2018:

Outstanding Dissertation Award Committee:
Kyle Dodson (Chair), kdodson2@ucmerced.edu
Deana Rohlinger, drohling@fsu.edu
Alison Adams, alison.adams@ufl.edu
Yang Zhang, yangz@american.edu

Research Position

Dissent in the Design Professions: investigating political mobilization for social justice in architecture, planning, and engineering

Call for student researchers
Architects, planners, and engineers mobilize to make their work more just, their institutions more
equitable, and their governments more accountable. This is a call for a PhD student or postdoc to help lead an investigation of ways built-environment professionals mobilize to shape political power. We will investigate forms of dissent including advocacy, activism, protest, and other means to political empowerment. The project is an ethnography of design and engineering professionals that includes a study of social media as a space of formation and dissemination of discourses of dissent. More on the project and the opening can be found at https://www.shawhinroudbari.com/openings.
Mobilization is one of the best specialty journals in the social sciences. It uses a simple formula: publish high quality research articles and edit them well. This is why Mobilization is so widely read and cited across many disciplines.

John McCarthy, Pennsylvania State University

In a recent conference I don’t think there was a single paper that didn’t reference an article published in Mobilization. At this point the field of contentious politics and protest studies would be inconceivable without Mobilization.

Kevin O’Brien, University of California, Berkeley

Mobilization: An International Quarterly is the leading research review in social and political movements, riots, insurrections, revolutions and other forms of collective action. Citation rankings place it among the top sociology and political science journals in North America.

For library subscriptions, contact the publication office at MobilizationQuarterly@sdsu.edu

Charge my credit card (Visa, MasterCard, Amex) for an individual subscription: $49.50 ($59.50 outside US).

I enclose a check payable from a US bank.

Credit Card #__________________________Exp. Date__________________________

Name (please print)____________________

Signature______________________________

Mail Copies to________________________

______________________________ZIP________________________

Fill out the order form, take a picture, and send it to MobilizationQuarterly@sdsu.edu or text it to 858 776 0392. You may also fax it to the publication office at San Diego State University: 858 673 8402. Or mail to: Mobilization: An International Quarterly, San Diego State University, San Diego CA 92182-4423. Contact the publication office with any questions: MobilizationQuarterly@sdsu.edu