# The outcomes of social movements: A review of the literature

Giugni, Marco

# CSSC

Center for Studies of
Social Change

New School for Social Research

**The Working Paper Series**

Working Paper No. 197

**THE OUTCOMES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Marco G. Giugni

# The outcomes of social movements: a review of the literature[1]

Marco G. Giugni

*Center for Studies of Social Change*
*New School for Social Research*

October 1994

[1] I would like to thank Doug McAdam and Florence Passy for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

## I. Introduction

Social scientists often have difficulties finding consensus on many aspects of their collective enterprise. The same is obviously true for the smaller group of students of social movements. They often disagree about the causes of social protest, its developement over time, its fate, and also the focus and methods of analysis. Yet, they all seem to agree on the fact that the study of the outcomes of social movements has largely been neglected. For instance, Berkowitz (1974: 69), referring to black social protest, stated that "we already know a great deal about the causes of protest, about their dynamics, their frequency, and their participants", but that "we know much less about their *effects*, about what actually happened as a result of the protests"[2]. Some years later, Gurr (1980: 238) affirmed that, between 1965 and 1980, "a modest body of empirical findings on conflict outcomes has accumulated", but that "theoretically, however, the subject is almost as primitive as it ever was". Specifically, "no consensus can be discerned on how to conceptualize and categorize outcomes" (Gurr 1980: 238). More recently, McAdam et al. (1988: 727) described the effectiveness of social movements' actions as a "neglected topic in the study of social movements", pointing out that "rarely (...) have movement scholars sought to assess how effective movements are in achieving their ends" and that "nor have researchers been any better about studying the impact of collective action on society as a whole". Finally, even more recently, Tarrow (1993: 580) has pointed out that "we still know little about the impact of social protest on policy change" and that "few scholars have looked systematically at the effects of movements on reform". Such neglect is quite astonishing, especially so if the ultimate goal of (most) social movements is to bring about social change. The failure of social scientists to systematically analyze the consequences of the presence and action of social movements stems, above all, from several methodological problems, which I shall briefly review below.

The field is, as I shall show, not as empty as several observers have pointed out. A fairly large amount of works on the outcomes of social movements is available in the literature. Nevertheless, only a few of them attempt to assess empirically the determinants and conditions of such outcomes, and even fewer do so by relating the empirical findings to general theoretical arguments. In other words, many have talked about the successes, impacts, consequences, or outcomes of single movements as part of a larger study, some have tried to test empirically the impacts of certain aspects of mobilization - above all, violence -, but very few have made an attempt to include evidence in a theory of the outcomes of social movements.

To be sure, in this paper I shall not try to fill this gap. My aim is much more modest: to make an up-to-date review of the literature on the outcomes of social movements[3]. The studies I shall mention differ strongly as to their relevance to this topic: some of them are explicit and systematic attempts to analyze social movement outcomes, while others are only marginally concerned with this question, the majority standing probably in between. As far as possible, I will try to give more space to what I think are the major works in this respect. I will certainly forget some studies. My purpose is not to mention all works that deal with social movement outcomes, but rather to show the general trends in the literature by discussing some of the major works and by giving additional sources (generally in footnotes).

The remainder of the paper is organized into two major sections. The first, most substantial section consists of a review of the existing literature. In this summary, I shall pay special attention

---

[2] Italic in the original text.

[3] Apart from some exceptions, I shall focus on English-written works.

to William Gamson's *Strategy of Social Protest* (1975), which, as McAdam et al. (1988: 727) have pointed out, remains "perhaps the most systematic attempt to isolate the effects of organized social movements". Six years later, I think this statement still holds, at least as far as book-length works are concerned. In the second section, I shall try to draw some lessons for further research from the review of the literature. Specifically, I shall discuss some crucial methodological problems faced by those who want to study the outcomes of social movements, as well as some major shortcomings found in the existing works. These mainly relate to the definition and measure of outcomes, to the question of causality, as well as to the research design used to study them. As far as the latter aspect is concerned, I will argue that the lack of an approach that is, at the same time, dynamic and comparative has prevented many studies from going beyond an impressionistic picture of the impacts of a single movement or beyond "middle-range hypotheses" poorly motivated or informed by a general theory.

## II. What has been done

If we want to review the literature on the outcomes of social movements and protest, we face at least two difficulties. The first one is that not all works treat this subject matter with the same weight. Instead, they range from marginal references to systematic empirical assessments of social movement consequences. If few studies of the latter type are available, an enormous amount of work at least mentions the subject. In the following sections, I shall focus on the studies that, explicitly or implicitly, are centered around this question or, at least, see it as a major interest. In some cases, I shall also mention works that do not do so, but that have something substantial to say about it. The second difficulty stems from the multiple possibilities of classifying the literature. We may do so according to various criteria. Here, I shall classify studies into five groups: studies centered on Gamson's (1975) seminal work, those dealing with the impacts of violent or disruptive protest (including strike outcomes), those relating to the question of whether the characteristics of challengers or of the larger context are the decisive determinants of social movement outcomes, those showing the effects of specific movements or cluster of movements, and those concerned with broader conflicts such as revolutions. Of course, since this is not a systematic criterium, several works fall into more than one category. I shall treat such works in relation to what I think is their most important feature or, sometimes, repeat them[4].

### 1. Gamson and his critics

The first group of studies that I would like to consider include works related to William Gamson's *Strategy of Social Protest* (1975). These studies are most interested in assessing the role of a series of internal features of social movements for their outcomes or in assessing the relative importance of internal, protester-controlled variables versus external, situational variables. Gamson's work is, to my knowledge, the first and most systematic attempt. The book is basically

[4] An excellent review of the literature, although focusing on the outcomes of violent conflict, has been made by Gurr (1980). Other useful reviews can be found in Amenta et al. (1992), Burstein et al. (1991), Jenkins (1981), McAdam et al. (1988), Mirowsky and Ross (1981), and Schumaker (1978).

a critique of the pluralist perspective about American society (see, in particular, Dahl 1967). Gamson, through the analysis of the careers of 53 American challenging groups that have acted between 1800 and 1945, questions the permeability and openness of the American political system. Specifically, the author aims at answering several questions: "How can we account for the different experiences of a representative collection of American challenging groups? What is the characteristic response to groups of different types and what determines this response? What strategies work under what circumstances? What organizational characteristics influence the success of the challenge?" (Gamson 1990: 5). In fact, the latter question emerges as the focus of the analysis, whereas the question of the circumstances under which specific strategies work becomes secondary in the book.

Gamson's mostly empirical study is based on a simple and straightforward typology of challengers' success, which is conceived of as a set of outcomes that fall into two basic clusters: the "acceptance of a challenger group by its antagonists as a valid spokesman for a legitimate set of interests" and the fact that "the group's beneficiary gains new advantages during the challenge and its aftermath" (Gamson 1990: 29). Then, by combining these two dimensions, the author defines four possible outcomes of a challenge: full response, preemption, co-optation, and collapse. Unfortunately, this typology is not really used in the empirical analyses, which remain for the most part confined to the distinction between acceptance and new advantages. Gamson has tested the impact of a series of organizational variables on the success or failure of the sampled challenging groups. Although, in one chapter, he takes into account the effect of time as a historical context variable on the challenges' outcomes, Gamson is most concerned with challenger-controlled variables.

What are the main results of Gamson's study? First, he found groups with single issue demands to be more successful than groups having multiple issue demands. Second, the use of selective incentives was positively correlated with success. Third, the use of violence and, more generally, radical tactics was associated with success, while the receipt of violence made it more difficult. Fourth, as far as the role of some organizational variables is concerned, successful groups tended to be more bureaucratized, centralized and to escape factionalism. Finally, among the context variables, time did not matter much, but political crises seemed to have an effect on the challenging groups' outcomes. The results concerning the organizational structure of the challenging groups and, above all, their use of constraints (violence) represent the core of the analysis.

Gamson's pathbreaking study has raised a number of critiques, most of them directed at methodological issues. In an excellent review essay, Zelditch (1978: 1517-1519) underlines the book's four main problems, which are theoretical and methodological. First, he questions the independence of the cases and points out that, for instance, a group's success may depend on the fate of other groups in the sample. The second problem has to do with the attribution of causality. The effectiveness of challenging groups does not depend only on its internal characteristics or tactics, but on external forces as well. Moreover, group-controlled variables and external factors may interact, leading to success or failure. Third, no distinction is made between the mobilization by challengers and that by members of the polity, hence producing a gap in the results that have important theoretical implications with regard to legitimacy, which is a key concept in the book. Finally, like other critics, Zelditch points out the limits of the tabular method of analysis, particularly the weak variable control, primitive measurement, and small number of cases.

Other authors have criticized Gamson's study mostly on methodological grounds. Webb et al. (1983: 318-325) distinguish four major areas of criticism. First, they point out the limits of Gamson's bivariate tabular analysis, which does not allow us to assess the relative impact of different explanatory variables and to differentiate between various kinds of relationships (Goldstone 1980a; Gurr 1980; Snyder and Kelly 1979; Zelditch 1978). Second, Gamson's static research design has been criticized, as well as the lack of attention to time-related variables (Snyder and Kelly 1979; Gurr 1980). Third, some have criticized Gamson's treatement of the outcomes of the challengers' actions (Goldstone 1980a; Gurr 1980; Snyder and Kelly 1979; Zelditch 1978), particularly his choice of indicators, the absence of a distinction between objective and subjective perceptions of success, and the problem of relating outcomes to the challengers' actions. Finally, they criticize Gamson's choice of the units of analysis (Goldstone 1980a; Zelditch 1978), specifically with regard to the large proportion of trade unions in the sample and to the problem of identity[5].

Despite these objections, Gamson's study has provoked other authors to reanalyze his original data, since he has had the openmindedness to include the complete dataset on the 53 challenging groups. Four contributions are directly relevant in this respect[6]. Steedly and Foley (1979) repeated Gamson's analysis using more sophisticated techniques. Specifically, they have tried to avoid the first of the four criticisms mentioned above by employing multivariate statistical techniques such as factor analysis, multidimensional scaling, multiple regression, and discriminant functional analysis. They produced results supporting some of Gamson's findings: group success was related, in order of relative importance, to the non-displacement nature of the goals, the number of alliances, the absence of factionalism, specific and limited goals, and the willingness to use sanctions. Furthermore, the authors developed predictive equations that allow for generalization. Mirowsky and Ross (1981) have undertaken a similar task, but with a slightly different purpose. They aimed at finding the locus of control over success. In other words, their study addresses the question about which three sources of success is the most important: the protest group (beliefs, goals, organization), third parties (social support, social control) or the situation (context, dynamic interaction). By means of factor analysis and path analysis techniques, the authors have elaborated on Gamson's findings, especially those concerning the effect of violence, but basically agreed with him. In general, they found that protester-controlled factors are more important than the support of third parties or than the situation for a successful outcome. Of these protester-controlled factors, the organization and, above all, the beliefs and goals are crucial for that success. A more recent reanalysis of Gamson's data has been made by Frey et al. (1992). By means of multivariate techniques, they have also tried to assess the relative importance of organizational and environmental variables for success in terms of new advantages. To do so, they created three different samples: a sample including Gamson's original data set, one that takes into account the changes suggested by Goldstone (1980a)[7], and another one including their own changes. Their results point to the importance of not having displacement goals and group factionalism in obtaining new advantages. Thus, Gamson's central argument stressing internal variables and resource mobilization as determinants of group success found further support. At the same time, the authors, on the basis of some of Goldstone's insights, called for a model "that

---

[5] See Frey et al. (1992) for another overview of the criticisms addressed to Gamson's study.

[6] In addition to the four contributions reported here, other research using Gamson's data can be found in Weisburd (1979).

[7] See below.

incorporates both strategy and structural constraints" (Frey et al. 1992: 383), thus suggesting a synthesis of the two perspectives.

The strongest threat to Gamson's results has come from Goldstone's (1980a) reanalysis. On the basis of a series of methodological criticisms of Gamson's study[8], Goldstone challenged his main conclusions as well as the central theoretical tenet. The author found that the organizational and tactical characteristics had no effect on group success. Instead, by means of a stochastic model, he has shown that the timing of success is independent of the challengers' organization and tactics. Finally, he suggests that the resource mobilization model be replaced by a model that stresses the crucial role of broad, systemwide national crises for the success of social movements. Goldstone's study has set in motion a wave of debates between Gamson and himself, also involving other authors (Foley and Steedly 1980; Gamson 1980; Goldstone 1980b)[9]. This disputation was mostly concerned with methodological issues, but went "beyond the substantive arguments in *Strategy* to show contrasting approaches to general issues of sociological theory, methods, and practice" (Gamson 1990: 181)[10].

A final study, which does not reanalyze Gamson's data but is built on his work, has been conducted by the Conflict Research Group of the European Consortium for Political Research (see Webb et al. 1983). They intended to be innovative in three ways: it was a cross-national study, in that it treated outcomes of political protest in a comparative manner; it was dynamic insofar as it looked at conflict interactions through time; and it dealt with the causes, correlates, and consequences of groups' strategic repertoires. This study shows, among other things, the usefulness of Gamson's work and, more generally, how further research on social movement outcomes can be built on previous works[11].

## 2. The outcomes of violent protest and insurgency

In addition to the research and debates about Gamson's seminal study, other scholars have tried to assess the role of certain group characteristics in social movement outcomes. Major attention has been paid to the effect of violence or other constraints used by challengers. In an attempt to specify some effects of violence on group success, Gurr (1973) has made a number of propositions linking the use of violence to social movement outcomes. Some years later, the same author has distinguished between three types of outcomes of violent conflicts: impacts on the group fate, policy changes, and societal or systemic effects. He also suggests that group changes and systemic changes be seen as ultimate outcomes that take place through policy changes, which, in turn, are the proximate result of violent conflicts (Gurr 1980)[12]. This is, to my knowledge, one of the first - and few, for that matter - attempts to link different social movement outcomes.

Whereas Gurr's contributions are theoretical, several works have tried to test empirically the role of violence in the outcomes of social movements. In this regard, Snyder and Kelly (1979)

---

[8] See above.

[9] See also Gamson (1989).

[10] As we will see below, this debate partly opposes partisans of resource mobilization and political process models.

[11] See Marsh (1982a) for the field manual that includes the operational procedures. A number of pilot studies have been conducted by the research team (Aish 1982; Marsh 1982b; Mironesco 1982; Walston 1982; Webb 1982).

[12] Later in the text, the author adds power realignments to policy changes as the key intervening variables between group fate and societal effects.

have tried to single out a number of strategies for the empirical study of the impacts of violent collective action. Empirical research has, in the first place, focused on the effects of strikes. Taft and Ross (1969: 361-362), for instance, on the basis of a study of violent labor conflicts in the United States through 1968, conclude that "the effect of labor violence was almost always harmful to the union" and that "there is little evidence that violence succeeded in gaining advantages for strikers". Similar results have been obtained by Snyder and Kelly (1976), who have addressed the question of the determinants of violence and its consequences. The latter point is of interest here. By analyzing quantitative data on strikes that occurred in Italy between 1878 and 1903, the authors test the relative importance of contextual variables versus the characteristics of individual strikes, such as group size, strike duration, and multiple-issue demands, on violence and on the outcomes of strikes. The results point out that the characteristics of individual strikes are more important than the contextual variables in explaining both violence and outcomes. Furthermore, violent strikes have been found to be less successful than peaceful ones. These results contradict those obtained by Gamson (1975) about protest in general as well as by Shorter and Tilly (1971) in their study of strikes in France. These authors suggest that there is a positive relationship between the use of violence and strike outcomes. Additionally, the same authors have studied in greater detail the effect of urban and industrial growth, as well as of organizational variables, on the outcomes of strikes, using the French case as an empirical case (Shorter and Tilly 1974). They made a useful distinction between success, compromise, and failure. Their analysis shows, among other things, that numerous strikes were slightly more successful than few ones, and that high levels of unionization tended to lead to compromise. Furthermore, Conell (1978) has shown that union sponsorship had a positive effect on the duration and success of strikes in late nineteenth-century Massachusetts. Nevertheless, the latter two studies do not focus on the role of violence in strike outcomes. Thus, the study of strikes and industrial relations in general has not only focused on violence, but has examined a larger set of phenomena[13].

The relationship between the use of violence by social movements and their outcomes, especially their success, has been analyzed thoroughly through the urban riots of the 1960s in the United States. Most of these studies deal simultaneously with the effect of violence and of the movement as a whole on policy changes or other outcomes[14]. Among those particularly concerned with violence is Hahn's (1970) "reappraisal of Kerner commission data". The author shows how the political organization of the community - i.e., the structure of the municipal government - affected the authorithies' ability to respond to civil disorder with programs that alleviated ghetto conditions. McClurg Mueller (1978) is also concerned with the relationship between violence during the black riots of the 1960s and protest outcomes, measured by symbolic reassurance and

---

[13] Besides violent strikes, of course, there are peaceful and legal strikes, of which there is a sizeable literature. In addition to Shorter and Tilly's (1974) work, other contributions on the immediate results of industrial conflict can be found in Forchheimer (1948), Goetz-Girey (1965), Hiller (1928), Knowles (1952), and Peterson (1938). Studies of the results of work stoppages that provide a model of strike outcomes are available as well (Forchheimer 1948; Griffin 1939; Knowles 1952; Peterson 1938). All these references are cited by Snyder and Kelly (1976). The latter four studies "agree that work stoppages are more likely to end favorably for workers when they are frequent, well organized, large in size, and short in duration" (Snyder and Kelly 1976). The same source also mentions two studies that deal with the conceptual and methodological problems that one has to face when trying to assess the relationship between violence and social change (Bienen 1968; Skolnick 1969), as well as a speculative study about the link between violence and successful collective action (Nardin 1971).

[14] Reviews of the literature on the racial riots of the 1960s can be found in Gurr (1980) as well as in Isaac and Kelly (1981).

long-term committment to the black community. She argues that riot violence had a different effect and the changing historical context had an opposite effect on the two outcomes. Isaac and Kelly (1981), although they discuss broader theoretical questions, are also interested in linking protest outcomes to racial violence and insurgency in general. Like many others, their study is related to Piven and Cloward's (1971) influential thesis on the impact of disruptive protest on the welfare state, which I shall discuss below. Kelly and Snyder (1980) inquire about the outcomes of racial violence, suggesting that there is no causal relationship between the frequency and severity of violence displayed in American cities during the 1960s, and the distribution of black socioeconomic gains at the local level, either by income level or by employment and occupational changes.

The most comprehensive study about the political impact of the riots that occurred during the 1960s is probably that of Button (1978). The main focus is on the effect of violent protest. In this empirical study, Button (1978: 174) mentions five "general conditions under which private internal violence is conducive to political and social change": 1) "when those in power have relatively plentiful public resources available to meet the basic demands of the partisans of violence"; 2) "when the episodes of violence are not so severe or frequent as to cause massive societal and political instability, yet are severe enough to be noticed by those in political power and to threaten to escalate in intensity and number if basic demands are not met"; 3) "when a significant number of those in political power and a proportion of the public are generally sympathetic (or at least not unsympathetic) to the goals of the perpetrators of violence, and when the destructive tactics employed are not so severe as to undermine these feelings of sympathy"; 4) "when the goals or demands of those who carry out the violence are relatively limited, specific, and clear to those in political power"; 5) "when it is utilized in conjunction with other, non-violent, conventional strategies as a means of asserting the demands of the politically powerless" (Button 1978: 174-176).

Other works have examined the effects of the urban riots of the 1960s, yet without putting specific emphasis on violence. For instance, Feagin and Hahn (1973), in their monograph on ghetto riots, assert that the latter led, at best, to limited reform and mostly to changes in police policies. Nevertheless, the authors do not provide systematic evidence for their assertion. This has been done by Berkowitz (1974), who looked at socioeconomic changes at the neighborhood level brought about by ghetto riots between 1960 and 1970. The author found no differential improvement for riot tracts, arguing against a "positive" effect of the riots. Welch (1975) has also provided quantitative data showing that the riots led to an increase in urban expenditures for control and punishment of rioters, and much less in their favor[15]. Colby's (1975) findings contradict Welch's in some ways, because, by comparing states, he found that riots had a positive influence on state redistribution policy (increase in AFDC recipients and payments) and no influence on regulatory policy. Jennings (1979), also comparing states and taking into account time, found some support for a positive correlation between the number of riots and the increase in AFDC recipients[16].

---

[15] This author also cites three case studies of policy impacts of urban riots (Aberbach and Walker 1973; Eidison 1971; Sears and McConahay 1973).

[16] On racial violence in America during the 1960s, see also Levitan et al. (1975). Besides this one, Kelly and Snyder (1980) cite several studies that deal with the changing economic conditions of blacks in that period, but they are for the most part not concerned with the relationship between protest and those changes. The comparison of "American and Israeli response to urban ethnic protest" made by Iris (1978) is also relevant in this respect.

Jennings considered his study as a test of Piven and Cloward's (1971) well-known and very influential thesis about the functions of public welfare. Here is their main argument: "Relief arrangements are ancillary to economic arrangements. Their chief function is to regulate labor, and they do that in two general ways. First, when mass unemployment leads to outbreaks of turmoil, relief programs are ordinarily initiated or expanded to absorb and control enough of the unemployed to restore order; then, as turbulence subsidies, the relief system contracts, expelling those who are needed to populate the labor market. Relief also performs a labor-regulating function in this shrunken state, however. Some of the aged, the disabled, the insane, and others who are of no use as workers are left on the relief rolls, and their treatment is so degrading and punitive as to instill in the laboring masses a fear of the fate that awaits them should they relax into baggery and pauperism. To demean and punish those who do not work is to exalt by contrast even the meanest labor at the meanest wages. These regulative functions of relief, and their periodic expansion and contraction, are made necessary by several strains toward instability inherent in capitalist economies" (Piven and Cloward 1993: 3-4). Thus, according to these authors, welfare systems serve two important functions: to maintain a supply of low-wage labor and to restore order in periods of civil turmoil. The second of these two regulating functions has important implications for research aiming at assessing the impacts of insurgency on public policy. As Jennings (1979: 739-740) has remarked, Piven and Cloward (1971), as far as the urban riots in the 1960s are concerned, "suggest that three factors account for the expansion of welfare rolls: (1) widespread rioting and civil disorder by blacks in our urban areas; (2) the response of white politicians to increasingly important black constituencies; (3) pressures generated by Federal programs for inner cities, particularly the activities associated with Community Action Agencies".

Piven and Cloward's study is important here not only because it yields useful insights about social movement outcomes, but also because it has triggered a fair amount of work, most of which is concerned with the urban riots of the 1960s, and subsequent debates. Some papers aiming at evaluating Piven and Cloward's book from a historical perspective has been published in a single volume (Trattner 1983)[17].

Beside the works concerned with Piven and Cloward's (1971) thesis, other studies have tried to test empirically the role of radical tactics for the outcomes of social movements. In an important article, Schumaker (1975) argues, among other things, that militancy is generally not conducive to success[18]. Specifically, the author, on the basis of a comparative empirical analysis of the urban riots that occurred in the United States during the 1960s, concludes that his three hypotheses are confirmed: 1) protester-controlled variables are less important than social support

---

[17] These and other works related to this debate are cited by the authors in a chapter added to an updated edition of the book (Piven and Cloward 1993). Some of them deal with the relief expansion of the thirties (Domhoff 1983; Jenkins and Brents 1989; Kirbo and Shaffer 1992). See also Valocchi (1990). Most of them are concerned with the responses to the urban riots of the 1960s (Betz 1974; Jennings 1979, 1981, 1983; Isaac 1983; Isaac and Kelly 1981, 1982; Griffin et al. 1983; Hicks and Swank 1983; Swank and Hicks 1984; Schram and Turbott 1983a, 1983b; Chamblin 1992; Sharp and Maynard-Moody 1991; Colby 1982; Gronbjerg 1977; Albritton 1979; Durman 1973; Piven and Cloward 1974, 1979a). See also Kelly (1977), who, in this context, has found weak support for the link of disorder and welfare payments. See further Gordon (1988), Hicks and Swank (1984, 1991), Swank (1983), and Piven and Cloward (1988, 1992) (all cited by Piven and Cloward 1993).

[18] According to the author, the purpose of the paper is to synthetize, systematize and test various explanations about the responsiveness of political systems to protest groups. In this regard, he cites several studies (Lipsky 1970; Downs and Greene 1973; Von Eschen et al. 1969; Lammers 1969; Crain et al. 1969; Wilson 1961; Lovak 1972; Mollenkopf 1973). See also Schumaker (1973, 1974).

variables to obtain policy responsiveness; 2) the attitudes of officials, media and the community are also important in this respect; 3) protest groups are less successful if they are militant. O'Keefe and Schumaker (1979), on the basis of a study of official responses to sixty protest incidents that occurred in the Philippines, Malaysa and Thailand between 1960 and 1977, have found that the use of violent constraints (militancy) had negative effects on the protesters' outcomes, except when the protest group was large, because a repressive response was more likely.

As can be seen, the results of the studies dealing with violence and radical tactics are often contradictory[19]. This shows the lack of consensus about the links between violence, militancy, or the use of constraints, on the one hand, and the outcomes or success of protest, on the other hand. To avoid such contradiction, one has to specify the conditions and circumstances under which violence or the use of constraints lead to success. Schumaker (1978) has tried to give an answer to this question by comparing a situation where there is a two-player conflict model to one where an N-player game is implied. The latter case occurs when third parties enter the conflict that takes place between protesters and the political regime. His results confirmed his two main hypotheses: 1) "When a political conflict is confined to the protest group and their target (when the scope of conflict is narrow), the use of constraints will usually enhance the chances of a successful outcome for the protest group"; 2) When the public is involved in the resolution of a political conflict (when the scope of conflict is broad), the use of constraints will usually reduce the chances of a successful outcome for protest groups" (Schumaker 1978: 173). Here, success is conceived of as policy responsiveness. Thus, the author has stressed two conditions for the effectiveness of the use of constraints: when there are direct confrontations between protesters and their targets, and when there are confrontations between protesters and a hostile public, which is likely when challengers have zero-sum demands. Yet, he also says that the use of constraints and zero-sum demands trigger public hostility and, consequently, will be less effective[20].

### 3. Internal versus external explanations of social movement outcomes

Schumaker's (1975, 1978) studies lead us to abandon the specific issue of violence and constraints to talk about the broader question of whether the challengers' internal characteristics or the external context are decisive in shaping their success and outcomes. Indeed, these studies, like others that I have previously mentioned - above all, Gamson (1975) and some of the reanalyses of his data, as well as Snyder and Kelly (1976) - tackle such a question. As Schumaker (1975) has

---

[19] Other empirical studies that deal with the effect of violence or radical tactics on social movement outcomes include the comparative analysis of collective action in France, Italy and Germany between 1830 and 1930 made by Tilly et al. (1975), who conclude with some general remarks on the subject; Crain's (1969) comparative study of school desegregation in ten American cities; the comparative work by Astin et al. (1975) on American colleges and universities between 1968 and 1971; a case study by Smith (1968) on the effect of disruptive protest in three incidents in New York City during the 1960s; Garrow's (1978) case study about the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and the work by Iris (1978) which includes an analysis of the responses of the Israeli government to two episodes of disruptive protest. All these references are cited by Gurr (1980).

[20] To show the contradictory nature of the study of the outcomes of violent protest, this author also mentions three studies reporting evidence that protest groups utilizing constraints are more effective (Astin et al. 1975; Gamson 1975; Tilly et al. 1975), one study replicating these findings (Welch 1975), and three works reporting findings that contradict them (Crain 1969; Schumaker 1975; Snyder and Kelly 1976).

remarked, the question of the effectiveness of protest groups has been articulated at the theoretical level within the broader pluralist-elitist controversy. While pluralists view protest groups as effective and the political system as responsive to external demands to the extent that these groups do not stray too far from "proper channels" (see, above all, Dahl 1961), elitists see them as seldomly effective and the political system as unresponsive (see, e.g., Parenti 1970, and Bellush and David 1971). Generally, the pluralist ideal of the permeability of the political system - especially the American political system - has been challenged theoretically as well as empirically (see, in particular, Bachrach and Baratz 1970; Edelmann 1964, 1977; Gamson 1975; Lowi 1969, 1971; Schattschneider 1960; Shorter and Tilly 1974).

Within the narrower field of social movements and political protest, this controversy has been translated into a perspective that has stressed the importance of the concept of bargaining in protest activity and the success of challenging groups (Burstein et al. 1991; Lipsky 1968, 1970; Wilson 1961). The most elaborated theoretical perspective in this regard has probably been made by Lipsky (1968). In an important article, this author makes clear that - quoting Wilson (1961) - "the problem of the powerless" is that, to be successful, they have to activate "third parties" to enter the bargaining arena. Indeed, in his view, such social and political support is the essence of political protest. Among such third parties, he mentions the reference publics of target publics and the interest groups. By stressing the important role played by third parties, the media and target groups, he points out that "relatively powerless groups cannot use protest with a high probability of success" (Lipsky 1968: 1157), because they lack organizational resources. Public officials are likely to respond to reference publics, while giving mostly symbolic reassurances to challengers (see also Edelmann 1964, 1977). He thus concludes that the acquisition of stable political resources that do not rely upon third parties is an essential condition for challengers to obtain long-run success. These theoretical ideas have been illustrated in a book about rent strikes and housing policies in New York City (Lipsky 1970), as well as in a co-authored book about racial violence and race-related riots in America, in which the authors argue that "the typical political response to such events has been to create riot commissions or other official investigations" (Lipsky and Olson 1977: 437).

Thus, at this level, the controversy is between authors who think of social movements as being capable of obtaining certain results independently of external support and those who see the latter as a necessary condition. Barkan (1984) argues that this opposition respectively divides the resource mobilization model and the political process model. The former would conceive of social movements as being weak and lacking indigenous resources to be successful on its own, while the latter suggests, on the contrary, that they have enough resources and disuptive potential to induce social change. This is particularly true for the McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977) version of resource mobilization theory, which seems to depict social movements as dependent on elite support. Yet, within the circle of resource mobilization theorists, we find the same division. As we have seen, the work of Gamson (1975) and those of his "supporters", as well as that of Snyder and Kelly (1976), have pointed to the crucial role of organizational, group-controlled variables in affecting protest group outcomes.

Schumaker (1975) cites several speculative and qualitative studies that link responsiveness to the nature of the demands, the organization, the leadership and the strategies of protest

groups[21]. Brill's (1971) "story of a rent strike" puts particular emphasis on organizational variables. The author is interested in determining the factors that lead to oganizers' failure and his view is made clear by the very first sentence of the book and the very last words of the conclusion: "Truth may not be power, but political organization is" (Brill 1971: 1); "only organizing builds power" (Brill 1971: 180). Between these two statements there is an empirical study of a public housing rent strike organized by four black militants that lasted fourteen months. It attempts to show that "to say that the poor must develop political power essentially means that they must build permanent political organizations capable of effective action" (Brill 1971: 2) and that, in the specific instance, "the organizers failed to build an effective organization" (Brill 1971: 140)[22].

In contrast, Gamson's (1975) critics - above all, Goldstone (1980a) -, as well as Lipsky (1968, 1970) and Schumaker (1975), have stressed the importance of the political environment and the context of social support. Jenkins and Perrow (1977), in a well-known article on farm worker movements, underline the link between changes in the political environment that offer social resources, on the one hand, and the rise and success of farm worker insurgents, on the other hand. According to the authors, the conducive environment in this respect was represented by the government (especially the federal government) and a coalition of liberal support organizations. Ultimately, the success of the "powerless insurgents" is due to the combination of sustained outside support, and the disunity and/or tolerance of the political elites, which gave the movement crucial resources. Thus, the authors stress the importance of the way the polity responds to insurgent demands.

Whereas Jenkins and Perrow (1977) have highlighted the role of social support for the outcomes of social movements, other authors have focused on the movements' opponents. Barkan (1984), for instance, distinguishes between two models of control of civil rights protest in the South, which led to two opposite fates of the campaigns: a legal response that provoked the campaign's failure and a violent response that brought it success. This was possible because police violence triggered a federal intervention in favor of the movement. Indeed "the major success of the movement would not have been possible without inappropriate tactical choices by Southern officials" (Barkan 1984: 563). Thus, this study suggests the importance of the legal system (legal control) for social movement success. In another study of the civil rights movement, McAdam (1982) similarly underlines the social support and the political environment for its success. In his analysis of the interaction between the movement and its opponents, he stressses the weaknesses and the lack of leverage of the civil rights movement for inducing federal intervention in the

---

[21] Schattschneider (1960) for the demands, Von Eschen et al. (1969) for the organizational size, Alinsky (1969) for the organizational stability, Lipsky and Levi (1972) for another view regarding the latter aspect, Ladd (1966) for the leadership, and Etzioni (1970) and Wilson (1961) for unconventional protest actions.

[22] Other studies concerned with the effect of internal and organizational variables on social movement outcomes can be found in Staggenborg (1988) on "the consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement"; Clemens (1992) about the effect of what she calls "organizational repertoires" on institutional change; Fowler and Shaiko (1987) about the effect of grass roots lobbying tactics by American environmental activists on Senate roll calls; Milbrath (1970) about the "impact of lobbying on governmental decisions"; and Metz (1986) about the impact of populist strategies and tactics by the American anti-apartheid movement. Yet, perhaps except the first one, these studies are more concerned with interest-group politics than protest politics. In this respect, Jackson (1974), Kingdon (1981), and Smith (1979) have examined the influence of lobbying and leadership on congressional action, while Songer and Sheehan (1993) have studied the success of interest groups in the courts.

absence of public violence (McAdam 1983). Similarly, Browning et al. (1984) think that "protest is not enough" for blacks and hispanics to attain equality in urban politics.

Other works have paid special attention to the behavior of a movement's opponents in shaping its chances of success. This has been done, for instance, in a study that stresses the degree of organized opposition for the success of a widely supported but unorganized social movement (Turk and Zucker 1984) and in one that underlines the amount of support by the general majority for minority effects on majority (Turk and Zucker 1985). Gibson (1989) has inquired into the relationship between political intolerance (opinion) and repressive public policies in American college campuses during the late 1960s and early 1970s. He has shown that this relationship is not simple and direct as one might think, since, curiously enough, political tolerance led both to repression and policy tolerance, because it "planted the seeds of repression by legitimizing dissent" (Gibson 1989: 29). Jasper and Poulsen (1993) warn us about the role of targeted organizations for the outcomes of protest campaigns. According to them, scholars have not paid sufficient attention to the characteristics and responses of nonstate organizations that are under attack by protestors. Specifically, they underline three factors: the preexisting vulnerabilities of targeted organizations, their strategic responses (blunders), and countermobilization (countermovements).

Several studies have stressed the effect of the larger social and political environment by following the political process model. For instance, Kitschelt (1986), in his famous comparison of the anti-nuclear movement in four western democracies, makes a strong case for the structural determinants of social movement success. The author argues that the success of the anti-nuclear movement strongly depends on political opportunity structures. Another interesting approach to social movement success in a political process perspective is provided by Rochon and Mazmanian (1993). These authors distinguish between three arenas of movement success: policy changes, changes in the policy process, and changes in social values. In their view, the inclusion of social movements in the policy process - i.e., gaining access - is the most effective path to policy outcomes. The authors illustrate such long-term impacts of social movements by comparing the nuclear freeze movement and the movement to control hazardous wastes (toxics movement) in the United States.

The importance of social movements' larger environment for their outcomes is also acknowledged by Piven and Cloward (1979b) in their book on "poor people's movements". They show, through research on the unemployed workers' movement, the industrial workers' movement, the civil rights movement, and the welfare rights movement[23], that the impacts of protest movements, as well as their emergence and the forms of their mobilization, are delimited by the social structure. Specifically, the authors point to the importance of the features of institutional life, which shape opportunities for action, model its forms and limit its impacts. Furthermore, these impacts are generally indirect: "*the most useful way to think about the effectiveness of protest is to examine the disruptive effects on institutions of different forms of mass defiance, and then to examine the political reverberations of those disruptions*. The impact of mass defiance is, in other words, not so much directly as indirectly felt. Protest is more likely to have a seriously disruptive impact when the protestors play a central role in an institution, and it is more likely to evoke wider political reverberations when powerful groups have large stakes in the

[23] See also Whitaker (1970) for a work that looks at the determinants of social movement success on the basis of a case study of the National Welfare Rights Organization.

disrupted institution" (Piven and Cloward 1979b: 24)[24]. The electoral-representative system is, following the authors, a major factor mediating the political impact of institutional disruptions: "the political impact of institutional disruptions depends upon electoral conditions" (Piven and Cloward 1979b: 31). According to these authors, thus, social movements can succeed insofar as they act disruptively and the political circumstances lead the political leaders to make concessions. Yet, the impact of mass defiance is generally limited and "*protesters win, if they win at all, what historical circumstances has already made ready to be conceded*" (Piven and Cloward 1979b: 36)[25]. Moreover, movement leaders and organizers seldom realize such institutional contraints and, trying to reinforce organization instead of escalating the momentum and impact of disruptive protest, they end by failing[26].

Finally, there are studies that, like others that I have previously mentioned (see, e.g., Schumaker 1978), try to contextualize the relationship between social movement mobilization and social movement outcomes. Dorff and Steiner (1987), for instance, study specific decision cases from several European countries and test a number of hypotheses for explaining the degree of success of environmental groups. They argue that the victory of environmental groups is best understood by means of an additive model that includes variables pertaining to the resource mobilization, the definition of issues, the context of the decision and the decision process itself. Kowalewski and Schumaker (1981) have inquired into protest outcomes in the former Soviet Union. By comparing their data with theory and findings in the existing literature, they maintain that two distinct patterns can be discerned. While in polyarchies (open pluralist systems) the support by third parties is a crucial determinant of political protest outcomes, in hegemonies (closed monistic systems) this factor is less relevant. Instead, in such societies the internal strength of protest groups and their characteristics such as size and constraint-utilization are the most important determinants of their effectiveness This is because the conflict is basically a 2-player game in hegemonies, whereas it is an N-player game in polyarchies. In an interesting article, Amenta et al. (1992) put forward what they call a "political mediation model", which combines organizational strength and political conditions. The authors argue that "the political context mediates the impact of movement organization and action on its goals and sets the range of possible outcomes", and that "to take advantage of openings, movements must back political action with organizational strength" (Amenta et al. 1992: 309). On the basis of the example of the Townsend movement and using a revised version of Gamson's (1975) typology of success, they test different models of social movement success and find that the political mediation model, which places political opportunity structure as a factor that mediates the relationship between social movements and their success, offers the best explanation. Ultimately, then, the state and the political party system determine whether social movement mobilization and action win benefits for constituents and acceptance (recognition) for a given organization.

---

[24] Italic in the original text.

[25] Italic in the original text.

[26] Piven and Cloward's emphasis on disruption as a winner and organization as a loser has provoked a number of harsh criticisms, especially from those who think that social movements, to be successful, have to reinforce their organizational structure and act accordingly. These criticisms were published in general journals (Beatty 1977; Bernstein 1978; Brightman 1978; Harrington 1977; Hobsbawm 1978; Starr 1978) (all cited by Piven and Cloward 1979b) and in specialized journals (Gamson and Schmeidler 1984; Roach and Roach 1978, 1980; see also the rejoinders by Piven and Cloward 1978, 1980, 1984; see further Piven and Cloward 1992) (all cited by Piven and Cloward 1993).

## 4. Outcomes of single movements or clusters of movements

Another group of studies deals with the outcomes of single movements or clusters of movements. Few works have discussed the larger theoretical question of social movement outcomes, although texts concerned with social movements at the general theoretical level usually have something to say about their outcomes. Yet, this is done to a varying extent. For instance, as we have seen, some studies treat outcomes as one of the central issues (Piven and Cloward 1979b), some treat them explicitly and quite systematically (Tarrow, 1983, 1989a, 1994), while others deal with them by focusing on specific types of impacts such as revolutionary outcomes (Tilly 1978), and still others pay little attention to the crucial topic of social movement outcomes (Oberschall 1973), only to mention the most famous works[27].

One author who has given space to the study of social movement outcomes is Tarrow (1983, 1989a, 1994). Like Piven and Cloward (1979b), Tarrow offers a theory that accounts for the rise of social movements, their development over time, and their outcomes. In his view, social movements often act within cycles of protest, i.e., periods of mass mobilization which are set in motion by an opening up of political opportunities, extend over the whole social movement sector, and, once triggered, have their own internal logic. The fact that protest cycles are bound to end, but have important consequences, is of interest for the present purpose. In his study of the Italian cycle of protest that took place between 1965 and 1975 (Tarrow 1989b), the author shows that this period of disorder has had a crucial impact and a positive legacy on Italian democracy by promoting reform, expanding the political arena, giving autonomy to Italian voters and, above all, expanding the repertoire of the legitimate forms of political participation. Thus, Tarrow, by analyzing social movements at the macro-level, establishes a link between two broad phenomena: the emergence, development and decline of a cycle of protest, on the one hand, and political, institutional and cultural changes, on the other hand, where the former plays a crucial role in bringing about the latter. It is also interesting to remark that Tarrow shares the idea put forward by many of the authors mentioned above about the possibilities and conditions for social movement outcomes. Although he acknowledges the essential role of disruption and mass protest, he also thinks that social movements usually fail, at least as far as policy changes are concerned, and that their success usually rests on the convergence of their demands with the interests of allies within the political system.

In a recent article, Tarrow (1993) has applied his theoretical insights to the protest wave that occurred in France in 1968, yet focusing on the effects on policy making. The author draws three implications: first, protest waves do not only take advantage of political opportunity structure, but become a component of it and, hence, provide a window for reform; second, protest waves are not sufficient to produce significant reforms, but need the presence and entrepreneurship of well-placed reformists; third, waves of mobilization can produce temporary coalitions for reform, but are often too brief, divided and multivoiced to give sustained support to reformists when the fear of disorder disappears[28].

---

[27] See Ash (1972) for an overview of "social movements in America" which pays attention to their outcomes. Unfortunately, the author does not always distinguish between the outcomes of social movements and their transformation. In this regard, see also Zald and Ash (1966).

[28] Tarrow (1993) mentions other studies that look systematically at the effects of movements, which he views as exceptions (Astin et al. 1975; Burstein and Freudenberg 1978; Button 1978; Gamson 1990; Gurr 1980; Piven and Cloward 1979b; Tarrow, 1989a, 1989b). Another work about reforms, this time initiated by the Swedish labor movement has been made by Pontusson (1993), who has compared two cases of success with two cases of failure.

Tarrow's (1989b) work, like Piven and Cloward's (1979b), treats both the theoretical determinants of social movement outcomes and the empirical outcomes of specific movements. This is obviously true for many other works mentioned above. Here I shall briefly cite further studies that are particularly concerned with the outcomes of specific movements or clusters of movements. From a theoretical point of view, Melucci (1982, 1989) has proposed a conceptual framework that includes the consequences of social movements in general and of new social movements in particular. According to him, the study of social movements has to be linked to broader issues within modern complex societies. Although, to my knowledge, the author has made no systematic attempt to assess the impacts of (new) social movements, we can discern at least three such impacts: advancing new cultural codes and forms of actions, broadening and transforming political participation, and contributing to the democratization of society and everyday life.

From a more empirical angle, Button (1989) studies the impacts of the civil rights movement. Following a resource mobilization approach, the author has compared three cities of the New South to three cities of the Old South in Florida to show that the civil rights movement succeeded in increasing political participation of blacks, harnessing black political power, and changing the living conditions of blacks in the South, hence having a significant impact on the liberation of southern blacks. Specifically, his comparison led him to stress the relevance of political culture in explaining variations in local responses to the movement and to show that the specific situation in the New South allowed the movement to have a major impact on black political participation (voting), as compared to the Old South. The author has shown, for instance, that there is a curvilinear relationship between increasing black voting power and black gains. Furthermore, by comparing public-sector policies with private-sector policies, he concluded that the movement was more successful in the former than in the latter.

Wright (1991) and Lawson (1991) are also concerned with the impact of the civil rights movement. Wright is interested in the "economic consequences of the southern protest movement", while Lawson shows how the movement reshaped national politics. Nichols (1987) points to the marginal role of the American anti-nuclear movement in changing nuclear power policy. Fainstein and Fainstein (1974), on the basis of case studies of what they call "urban political movements", conclude their study with some general remarks about the functions of political movements. According to the authors, "there are three principal interrelated activities through which a movement carries out its functions" (Fainstein and Fainstein 1974: 258): as agent of political socialization, interest articulation, and the creation and utilization of power. Their approach is informed by public policy theory (see also Fainstein and Fainstein 1972). Another work that looks at social movement outcomes from a social policy and social work perspective is provided by Sanders (1973). It is a case study of policy changes in the amendments to the Social Security Act and related policy issues from 1935 to 1954. Among other objectives, the author seeks to assess the role of six reform movements and organizations in influencing policy changes in social insurance: the labor movement, the Townsend movement, the women's social reform movements, the American Association for Social Security, the American Public Welfare Association, and the American Association of Social Workers[29].

---

For a special issue on comparative reform politics, see Keeler (1993), although not all contributions focus on the role played by social movements.

[29] The latter, to be sure, is more an SMO than a social movement.

While several studies address the question of outcomes or successes of specific social movements, or the relationship between social movements and social change, they often remain descriptive or are only marginally concerned with outcomes[30]. Some monographs on specific social movements or action forms, though interested in different aspects of the movement, deal with its outcomes in a chapter, often placed at the end of the book (Freeman 1975; Perrot 1987[31]; Price 1982). A relevant work in this regard is Burstein's (1985) analysis of "the struggle for equal employment opportunity in the United States since the New Deal". This author has pointed to the role of public opinion, social movements, and conventional politics in shaping legislation. He summarizes some of his results as follows: "Equal employment opportunity legislation was adopted as the result of social changes that were manifested in public opinion, crystallized in the civil rights and women's movements, and transformed into public policy by political leaders. Once adopted, the legislation provided an enforcement mechanism through which the struggle for EEO could be pursued, and it may thereby have contributed to further changes in American society" (Burstein 1985: 125). Thus, the author has stressed the interactive roles of public opinion, movement activity and congressional action in provoking policy changes with respect to discriminated groups. In particular, he has pointed to the influence of public opinion on congressional action[32].

Another work that pays special attention to social movement outcomes is provided by Gelb and Palley (1987). In a study of the American women's movement, the authors look at their success in six policy areas: credit, education, abortion, pregnancy, economic equity, and new issues[33]. The authors argue that success is most likely when an issue is perceived in terms of role equity rather than role change. The notion of legitimacy is particularly emphasized. In this regard, the authors stress four rules to be followed by an emergent group if it wants to influence public policy: the group must be perceived as legitimate, focus on incremental issues, stress the provision of information and concentrate on mobilizing their allies, and engage in a struggle over the definition of the situation. A central insight of this study is that "feminists have achieved most when they have stressed the technical nature of an issue and have sought to contain conflict within clear bounds" (Gelb and Lief Palley 1987). Other book-length studies of specific movements treat their outcomes among other aspects, yet do not devote a specific part of the book to them (e.g., Gelb 1989; Jasper and Nelkin 1992; Joppke (1993), Nelkin and Pollak 1981; Rochon 1988; Rüdig 1990).

The works cited in the last paragraph, of course, are only examples drawn from a body of literature that would need many more pages to be reviewed. They vary considerably in the extent

---

[30] Some examples in this respect can be found in Mitchell (1981) on the anti-nuclear movement; Justice and Pore (1981), and Simon and Danziger (1991) on the women's movement; Beckford (1986) and Wilson (1981) on religious movements; Marty and Appleby (1993) on fundamentalisms; Singh (1985) on the Indian national movement; Rock (1993) on the Argentine nationalist movement; and Kriesberg et al. (1988) on social movements in general. The latter book is a collection of contributions on the relationship between social movements and social change, although only few of them explicitly address social movement outcomes.

[31] This work was originally written in French (Perrot 1984).

[32] Other studies regarding the impact of public opinion on legislation include Burstein (1979a, 1979b, 1979c), Burstein and Freudenberg (1978), Carmines and Stimson (1989), Clausen (1973), Costain and Majstorovic (1994), Miller and Stokes (1963), Page and Shapiro (1983), and Weissberg (1976). Lawson (1976), Oberschall (1973), and Orfield (1975) have examined the impact of the Civil rights movement on public opinion as well as the relationship between the movement, public opinion, and congressional action.

[33] The last two policy areas were added in the second edition of the book. The first edition (Gelb and Palley 1982) included only four.

to which they examine the outcomes of the movements studied. Moreover, they usually are case studies, hence yielding few insights as to the determinants and conditions of social movement outcomes in general[34]. Comparative studies can be more useful in this respect. For instance, Bush (1992), by comparing women's movements in the United States and India, shows that gender is a fundamental basis for state response to social movements, thus pointing to the fact that the implementation of policies demanded by social movements is shaped by a state's response, which is, in turn, is short-circuited by ideology. Burke and Lubeck (1987), in their comparison of "social movements in two oil-exporting states", provide another example of an assessment of social movement outcomes by means of a comparative analysis.

Finally, I mention some studies concerned with the impact of social movements on specific aspects of social and political life[35], including changes in the perceptions of mass publics (Gusfield 1981a, on the movement against drinking and driving; Troyer and Markle 1983, on the antitobacco movement)[36], the effects on political behavior (Mueller 1984, on the women's movement), the effect on the diffusion of tactical models (Marx and Wood 1975) and of "repertoires of contention" (Tilly 1979), the creation of cohorts committed to activist careers (McAdam 1988, on the civil rights movement; Rupp and Taylor 1987, on the feminist movement[37]), and the creation of countermovements. Other examples: Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) look at the effects of movements on media coverage; McAdam (1989) examines the short-term as well as long-term political and personal consequences of high-risk activism[38]; Rohrschneider (1993) analyzes the "impact of social movements on European party systems"[39]; Burstein (1985, 1991), Handler (1978), and Sabatier (1975) explore how social movements can achieve greater impacts by pursuing goals in administrative agencies and courts once they have achieved policy responsiveness (outputs).

## 5. Outcomes of revolutions

To conclude our review of the existing literature on the outcomes of social movements, I would like to mention several studies that deal with the impacts of broader conflicts, particularly revolutions. These works, in general, are not directly concerned with the effects of social

---

[34] Remarkable exceptions are Gelb (1989), Joppke (1993), Nelkin and Pollak (1981), and Rochon (1988), since they all adopt a comparative perspective. A collective book including contributions specifically devoted to social movement outcomes can be found in Katzenstein and McCluerg Mueller (1987).

[35] The following seven studies are cited by McAdam et al. (1988).

[36] These authors have dealt with policy outcomes as well.

[37] See also Taylor (1989).

[38] There is a specific literature on the micro or individual level consequences of activism. In addition to McAdam's (1988, 1989) studies, there are certain works that deal with the personal consequences of movement participation. McAdam (1989) has cited some of these follow-up studies of activism: Abramowitz and Nassi (1981), Demerath et al. (1971), Fendrich (1974, 1977), Fendrich and Krauss (1978), Fendrich and Lovoy (1988), Fendrich and Tarlau (1973), Jennings (1987), Jennings and Niemi (1981), Maidenberg and Meyer (1970), Marwell et al. (1987), Nassi and Abramowitz (1981), and Whalen and Flacks (1980). See also DeMartini (1983). See also Gusfield (1981b), and Pierce and Converse (1990).

[39] This author cites three sources that deals with the influence of social movements on political parties (Raschke 1983; Sartori 1976; Ware 1987).

movements. Nevertheless, if we assume that revolutions are the result of efforts by revolutionary movements to bring about change, we must say something about this subject.

As far as revolutions are concerned, we can distinguish two different sets of problems. First, drawing on the distinction between a revolutionary situation and a revolutionary outcome (Tilly, 1978, 1993), one could conceive of the latter as the result of the efforts by social movements for change. Hence, the question is under what conditions insurgency from below leads to the seizure of power by revolutionary movements and to a radical transformation of the power balance through the use of force. Of course, the literature on the origins of revolutions is very large, and it is not my purpose to provide a list of references on this subject[40]. In addition to a number of strategic works, we find early writers on revolutions such as Marx, Tocqueville, and Weber, more recent general theories or comparative studies of revolutions, and studies of specific revolutions. Other works have focused of the role of specific factors in revolutions. Few of these studies deal explicitly with social movement outcomes, especially when the theory neglects the relevance of mobilization from below in bringing about radical structural changes (see, e.g., Skocpol 1979). Nevertheless, some consensus seems to have appeared recently as to the importance of popular uprisings in explaining revolutions, alone or in combination with structural factors such as state weakness as well as conflicts between states and elites.

The second group of studies of revolutions is concerned with the consequences of the seizure of power by revolutionaries. Sometimes these works are interested in the success of revolutionary movements. In this regard, Dunn (1977) has looked at the question of how to judge the success of revolutionaries. Other works deal specifically with the impacts of revolutions on subsequent policies and socioeconomic trends. Here, again, although some authors have remarked that the consequences of revolutions have largely been neglected (Eckstein 1964; Greene 1974), the literature is enormous, and I will give only some examples[41]. Early works about the consequences of revolutions include Burke's writings on the subject[42], Brinton's (1930) theory of the postrevolutionary process and Brogan's (1951) assessment of the cost-benefit ratio of revolutions. There are important comparative studies about the role of revolutions in societal development[43]. Other authors have tried to apply sophisticated empirical methodologies to the study of revolutionary outcomes (Chong-Soo Tai 1974, 1979; Lampton 1978, 1979; Echols 1980). The quasi-experimental approach of Lewis-Beck (1979) is interesting in this respect, because it is a dynamic analysis and a test of three competing models of revolution, which the

---

[40] A guide to reading about revolutions can be found in Goldstone (1994). Gurr (1980) has reviewed the literature on the outcomes of revolutions.

[41] To review the following studies about revolutionary outcomes, I have consulted Gurr (1980). This author also cites a number of works about the outcomes of the popular revolution that occurred in Bolivia in 1952, as an example of the "vast descriptive literature on the formulation, implementation, and impact of policies formulated in the aftermath of specific twentieth-century revolutions" (Gurr 1980: 284). See, e.g., Malloy (1970, 1971). He also cites several studies about the outcomes of coups d'état, but these are not of interest here, since they are not concerned with social movements. Also, I can add a collective book that deals with "the impact of the Russian revolution", published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs (1967).

[42] See Freeman (1978) for a synthesis.

[43] See, e.g., Eckstein's (1975, 1976, 1982) comparisons of revolutions in Latin America and their socioeconomic effects; Eisenstadt's (1978) analysis of the connections between social change and revolution; Moore's (1966) analysis of the effect of class coalitions on the English, French, Russian and Chinese revolutions; Kautsky's (1975) comparison of Mexico and the Soviet Union and their "modernizing revolutions"; Skocpol's (1979) structural analysis of the French, Russian and Chinese revolutions; and Trimberger's (1978) study on the outcomes of "revolution from above" in Japan, Turkey, Egypt and Peru.

author calls Conservative, Marxist, and Thermidorian. The conclusion is that all these models do not do a good job of explaining the economic effects of the Cuban revolution, which, unlike the models' predictions, has had short-run benefits and long-run costs. Finally, several studies on the outcomes of revolutions have led to the conclusion that the latter depend very much on the conditions and habits of people before the revolution, and that they are not linear and predictable by the revolution's leaders or supporters[44].

## III. Drawing some lessons for further research

As can be seen, the literature on social movement outcomes is, at the same time, enormous and tiny. It is enormous insofar as most of the authors who have written about social movements have at least mentioned their potential or actual consequences. It is tiny to the extent that few have made an attempt to systematically analyze their impacts as well as to study the conditions and circumstances under which different types of outcomes may occur. Moreover, there is a great void of work addressing the outcomes of certain important contemporary social movements such as the new social movements.

Two main methodological problems have hindered research that addresses the question of social movement outcomes: the definition and measure problem, on the one hand, and the problem of causality, on the other hand. Furthermore, even when ingenious solutions for these problems have been found, two additional deficiencies have often led to ungeneralizable results and few insights to the question of social movement outcomes in general: the lack of comparison and a static approach. In the remainder of this paper, I would like to devote time to these four methodological issues.

### 1. Defining and measuring social movement outcomes

The difficulty of measuring different types of outcomes has led most scholars to focus on policy changes. These are most easily measured, for instance by looking at legislative changes. The latter, in turn, have often been considered as an indicator of social movement success. Yet, as we all know, social movements have a much wider range of consequences. Several authors have tried to provide a typology of social movement outcomes. Gamson's (1975) distinction between acceptance and new advantages remains a landmark of such efforts. Many authors, such as those who have reanalyzed his data, have relied on his distinction, while others have provided a revision of it (e.g., Amenta et al. 1992). Similarly, Rochon and Mazmanian (1993) have picked up Gamson's distinction and added a third type of impact, hence defining three arenas of movement success: policy changes, changes in the policy process and changes in social values. All these typologies are conceived of as measurements of social movement success. This means that the observed changes are related to the demands of challengers in an attempt to determine whether they succeeded or failed to obtain what they were claiming. This is also the perspective followed

[44] See, e.g., Kelley and Klein (1977), Edeen (1960), and Whyte (1975) on inequality and stratification; and Skocpol (1976), Walt (1992), and Eckstein (1982) on industrialization, war and social welfare. All these works are cited by Goldstone (1994).

by Shorter and Tilly (1971), as well as by Perrot (1984, 1987), when they talk about success, compromise, or failure.

Determining if social movements succeed or fail with respect to their demands is certainly a fascinating and crucial issue. Yet, it is one that presents some pitfalls. First, such a perspective assumes that social movements are homogeneous entities. Thus, success or failure are attributed to an entire movement. This may be true in some cases, but often there is little agreement within a movement as to what goal must be pursued. In other words, social movements are composed of heterogeneous sets of actors who may have different goals. Hence, a given change is not necessarily perceived as a success by all sectors of a movement. Second, to concentrate on success raises the problem of subjectivity. Briefly stated, success cannot be assessed in a unique manner by everyone. While social movement success has an objective side, it is in large part subjectively assessed. Movement participants and external observers may have different perceptions of an action's success. Moreover, the same action can be perceived as successful by some participants, while being judged as a failure by others. Similarly, the extent to which an action has been successful may be perceived differently. Third, to talk about success is probematic because it overemphasizes the intentionality of movement participants. While it is certainly true that social movements are rational efforts aiming at social change, their consequences are often unintended and are not always related to their demands. Furthermore, such consequences may be positive - representing success - as well as negative for a given movement.

Thus, the notion of success (or failure) is problematic in several respects. Several scholars have avoided talking about success and, instead, have used other typologies of social movement outcomes. For instance, Gurr (1980) has distinguished three types of outcomes of violent conflicts: impacts on the group fate, policy changes, and societal or systemic effects. The advantage of this typology is that it makes a clear distinction between internal impacts on the movement and external impacts on the policy or the larger society. Schumaker (1975) has defined social movement outcomes in terms of the responsiveness of the political system. Specifically, he has distinguished five criteria of responsiveness: access responsiveness[45], agenda responsiveness[46], policy responsiveness, output responsiveness, and impact responsiveness (Schumaker 1975: 494-495)[47]. Although this typology replaces the notion of success with one of responsiveness, it does not seem to avoid some of the problems mentioned above. In fact, responsiveness is conceived of as related to a movement's demands and does not acknowledge unintended or negative consequences.

Burstein et al. (1991) have picked up this typology, pointing out that it addresses aspects of the political process that have been left out by Gamson's (1975) typology. These authors have added a sixth type of government responsiveness: structural impacts. In their view, access, agenda, policy and output responsiveness are part of the bargaining process, while impact and structural responsiveness are consequences of that process[48]. Yet, like Schumaker (1975), these

---

[45] See Eisinger (1973).

[46] See Cobb and Elder (1972).

[47] Sharkansky (1970), from whom Schumaker has probably drawn part of his typology, has distinguished four dimensions of the policy process: public policy, policy outputs, policy impacts, and environment. Schumaker's typology has been used, for instance, by Rüdig (1990) in his overview of the nuclear movement worldwide.

[48] To be sure, the authors do not mention access responsiveness, but they seem to imply that it belongs to the bargaining process.

authors are ultimately concerned with success and, hence, fail to avoid some of the related problems.

Structural impacts have been stressed by Kitschelt (1986), who has distinguished three types of social movement impacts: procedural impacts, corresponding to Gamson's acceptance; substantive impacts, similar to Gamson's new advantages; and structural impacts, which imply "a tranformation of the political structures themselves" (Kitschelt 1986: 67). This typology has the advantage of allowing for a link between social movement outcomes and their political context. Specifically, according to the author, certain features of political opportunity structures of a given country facilitate or hinder each of the three types of impacts. Thus, this typology is useful for cross-national research aiming at stressing differences or similarities due to political factors.

From the same perspective, Kriesi (1991) has further distinguished two types of substantive impacts: reactive impacts imply the prevention of "new disadvantages" for a given movement; proactive impacts imply the introduction of "new advantages". This distinction is important, because it allows us to link social movement outcomes to the state's strength[49].

All these typologies, of course, are useful for empirical studies of social movement outcomes, yet none of them seem to take into account two important points. First, in general they all maintain a narrow view of social movement outcomes which focuses on movement success or failure and, hence, fail to avoid the related problems. Second, apart from some exceptions (e.g., Gurr 1980; Rochon and Mazmanian 1993), they do not include links between types of outcomes. Instead, they treat them as independent and, therefore, sometimes do not allow us to fully understand how a certain outcome actually occurs. Of course, studying social movement success alone or looking only at single outcomes is absolutely legitimate and may yield very important findings, to which many of the works cited above attest. Nevertheless, our knowledge of the consequences of social movements would improve very much if scholars analyzed different types of outcomes, in addition to success, and linked them.

## 2. The problem of causality

Determining causality is probably the main difficulty hindering empirical research on social movement outcomes. This is, indeed, a major methodological problem. Simply put: How can we be sure that an observed change is the result of a social movement's mobilization? How can we eliminate the possibility that such change would not have taken place anyway, as a product of other social forces or as the result of a broader protest cycle? How can we determine whether the observed outcome is the product of movement activities or of reformist political elites?

Of course, in the final analysis it is impossible to give a definite answer to these questions. It is, nevertheless, possible to limit the problem by making a certain number of methodological choices. The first, and most obvious, choice is to gather data not only about a given movement and its alleged consequences, but about the actions of other actors as well. Four such actors seem to be particularly relevant in this respect: established political forces such as parties, interest groups, and political elites, as well as the media. By doing so, although one cannot address the above problem, one can control for other actors and, hence, better assess the movement's actual role in bringing about the observed change. In other words, this means analyzing an "interactive

[49] Empirical analyses that make use of this distinction have been conducted (Kriesi et al. 1992, 1995).

conflict chain", which includes all relevant actors and events, and studying the links between such chain and its outcomes. A second choice consists of looking not only at potential movement-related explanatory factors, such as levels of mobilization, strategies, or organizational strength, but at other variables as well, such as political opportunity structures or socio-demographic factors. Third, one should set up a comparative research design. By comparing similar movements in different contexts or different movements in similar contexts, one can improve the chances of finding a correlation between the movement's activities and a given outcome. I shall return to this point below. Fourth, one has something to gain from a perspective that views social movement outcomes as processes. In other words, by analyzing the link between a given movement and some of its alleged outcomes in a dynamic manner - i.e., over time -, one has a greater chance of singling out the mechanisms through which the movement has had an impact. This point will also be discussed more in detail below. Finally, a fifth methodological choice that may improve our knowledge of the link between social movements and their outcomes consists of looking not only at cases in which a given movement's action has led to a change, but at situations in which no outcome can be observed. As far as the outcomes related to social movement demands are concerned, this means studying failure in addition to success.

These are only suggestions which may help limit the problem of causality and make the study of social movement outcomes somewhat easier. Some of them have already been put forward by Gurr (1980: 246) with regard to the study of the outcomes of violent conflict: "In general, three things should be accomplished by an analytic scheme. First, an observable set of outcome variables must be specified. (...) Second, it is essential to consider what outcomes follow from different forms and properties of violent conflict. (...) Third, (...) it is necessary to specify as fully as possible the kinds of variables that influence the linkages between violent conflict and its problematic outcomes". Despite this enumeration, the author does not mention what, in my opinion, are the two main methodological options to be followed: setting up a comparative and dynamic research design.

## 3. Comparisons

Given the difficulty of determining linkages between social movement action and outcomes, all analyses that are not comparative yield ultimately few insights about social movement outcomes in general. Let me be clear: this is not to say that all case studies on movement consequences, many of which have been reviewed above, are useless. On the contrary, case studies are worthy because they can advance our theoretical knowledge of how social movement outcomes come about. The value of case studies relies on the fact that they allow us to examine in detail the processes through which social movements contribute to bringing about certain changes. This kind of study is particularly useful when one is interested in showing the consequences of a given movement more than in determining what characteristics of the movement have led to a given outcome and what factors ultimately account for such outcome.

However, case studies are much less useful when one is concerned with the question of social movement outcomes in general. Moreover, they are not very convincing when providing empirical evidence to test certain hypotheses. In such situations, a comparative approach seems to be the only viable solution. Comparisons can help to reduce the problem of causality and is better suited for providing generalizable answers to the question of social movement outcomes. Only a

comparative approach can ultimately tell whether, and under what conditions, certain movement characteristics, such as the use of violence, lead to a given outcome. Only comparisons allow us to test specific hypotheses in different contexts and, hence, to assess the role of different variables for social movement outcomes. Only by means of comparisons one can provide generalizable results about social movement outcomes.

To adopt a comparative perspective means to shift from the study of the determinants and causes of social movement outcomes to the conditions and circumstances of their occurrence. In my view, research on social movement outcomes should look at the specific conditions under which a given type of outcome is possible when protest arises. Underlying this perspective is the idea that social change is the result of the interplay between social movement activities and other social forces. Such perspective has been adopted, for instance, by Burstein (1985). Therefore, one has to look at the circumstances in which such interplay leads to certain changes at different levels: within the movement itself, in legislation, in the structure of the political system, in the society at large, and so on.

If social movements are conceived of as rational, political efforts aimed at social change, the political conditions of the occurrence of certain changes become central to the analysis of social movement outcomes. The crucial role of political factors appears, for instance, in the political mediation model proposed by Amenta et al. (1992). In particular, research would improve by comparing movements in different political contexts. As can be discerned by the above review of the literature, most comparative studies have been intra-national - i.e., at the local level -, for example by comparing outcomes of riots in several cities. This kind of comparative study can bring about important results, yet sometimes it cannot single out the role of variables located at another level, such as the the national level, or the effect of factors that are constant at the local level. In the case of the urban riots of the 1960s in American cities, for instance, the role played by federal intervention or the relevance of different political cultures have not always been examined in depth. To avoid such problems, cross-national comparisons seem more appropriate than intra-national ones. By comparing different countries, one can look at variations in social movement outcomes as a result of different social and political contexts. In particular, it is possible to link social movement outcomes to political opportunity structures that characterize those contexts. Variables such as the institutional structures of a given country, the responsiveness of the political authorities or the alliance structures, then, become central to the analysis of social movement outcomes. However, comparisons should not be limited to the context in which social movements act, but should include the movements as well. In other words, cross-movement comparisons should complement cross-national comparisons to determine the role of the movements and their internal characteristics for their outcomes. In the end, the usefulness of the analysis would increase by comparing different types of movements whithin as well as across countries.

While a comparative research design looks for generality, it does not fully acknowledge complexity (Ragin 1987), since it has to be parsimonious. In other words, if comparisons allow us to generalize about certain results of social movement outcomes, case studies have the advantage of illustrating the complex mechanisms through which these outcomes arise. Fortunately, these are not mutually exclusive methods. A combination of both methods may take into account generality and complexity at the same time. Such an alternative to the classical split between case-oriented and variable-oriented approaches is the "qualitative comparative method" proposed by Ragin (1987). It broadly consists of making rich, detailed historical case studies and comparing them. Even if one does not make use of the Boolean approach based on combinatory logic put

forward by Ragin (1987), the idea of comparing detailed descriptions of "interactive conflict chains", established on the basis of an analytical model that focuses on certain explanatory factors is certainly an important insight for research on social movement outcomes. Although this approach has been adopted, for instance, by Amenta et al. (1992), it is generally absent from the literature, in which case studies and comparisons has often been opposed to each other.

## 4. Studying social movement outcomes over time

As I pointed out in the above discussion, research on social movement outcomes should include cross-national as well as cross-movement comparisons. Is this enough? The problem of causality may also be limited by looking at social movements in a dynamic way. By doing so, one can analyze the processes through which social movement outcomes occur. The need for a dynamic perspective derives naturally from the comparative case approach stressed above. If one studies social movement outcomes through comparisons of detailed case studies, time necessarily enters the analysis.

Studying social movement outcomes over time is important for other reasons as well. As I mentioned, some of Gamson's (1975) critics have pointed to the issue of movement success. They have stressed, for instance, the need to include time-related variables in the analysis and a dynamic research design (Snyder and Kelly 1979; Gurr 1980). Goldstone (1980a), in particular, has shown empirically that the timing of success is independent of the challengers' organization and tactics. Moreover, he has shown that not taking time into account may lead to critical mistakes in assessing the challengers' success.

Another reason for adopting a dynamic perspective is that the conditions of the occurrence of certain outcomes may change over time. Society is constantly changing and, therefore, the social and political environment of social movements is unstable and subject to change. This may be due to the movements' actions as well as to other social forces. Some aspects of political opportunity structures often allow for important changes over time, including the alliance structures, the configuration of power, the occurrence of political crises, and so on. If one does not study social movement outcomes over time, one cannot take into account these shifting elements. For instance, assuming that a powerful ally within the party system is open to policy changes related to a given movement's demands, a major shift in the configuration of power, such as new party coalitions, will probably reduce the movement's chances to have an impact. Thus, taking time into account allows us to see how such changes affect social movement outcomes.

Another reason to insist on a dynamic perspective is to focus on interaction. Social movements are more of a motion picture than a photograph. In other words, they are more of a process than a static phenomenon. Their outcomes, therefore, are the result of such processes which involve a number of actors and a series of actions. Instead of looking at a protest event or a series of protest events and linking them to some observed outcomes once they have ended, one should follow the process of mobilization and the underlying conflict as well as their ongoing outcomes. The focus on interaction, moreover, is justified by the fact that social movements may provoke changes in the social and political environment or in political opportunity structures.

Finally, a crucial reason to study social movement outcomes from a dynamic perspective is to examine links among types of outcomes. This constitutes a major gap in the existing literature insofar as social movement outcomes, in general, have been treated as if they were independent.

This is too simplistic a picture, though a practical one for empirical research purposes. Social movement outcomes are linked to each other and only a few authors have acknowledged this. For instance, Gurr (1980) has pointed out that impacts on the group fate and societal or systemic effects take place through policy changes; Rochon and Mazmanian (1993) have suggested that the inclusion in the policy process is the best path leading to policy impact. Thus, in order to study the interdependence of different social movement outcomes, a dynamic perspective is needed.

## IV. Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the existing literature on social movements for those interested, not only in the emergence of social movements and in their development over time, but also - or above all - in their outcomes. The study of social movement outcomes, as many authors have pointed out, is one of the most neglected aspects in the literature on social movements and collective action. While there is an enormous amount of work that deals with this aspect as a part of a larger study, there is a striking lack of work that aims at defining, specifying, and assessing the conditions under which social movements can produce certain outcomes.

The literature includes work that address the topic to a varying degree, from simply mentioning that social movements produce or may produce certain outcomes to systematic empirical research. The latter has mostly been concerned with social movement success, following the lead of Gamson's (1975) seminal study. During the 1970s, a large number of empirical studies were conducted on the urban riots that struck American cities in the previous decade. Many of these have explored Piven and Cloward's (1971) influential thesis about "the functions of public welfare". Several studies, either on the urban riots or other protests, have sought to determine the impact of certain movement features, above all the use of violence or other kinds of constraints. One of the main concerns of these studies, as well as of the literature on social movement outcomes in general, has been to establish whether the internal characteristics of the movements or the larger environment ultimately determine their outcomes. Other works examine the outcomes of single movements or clusters of movements and outcomes of broader conflicts such as revolutions. Few of these have been specifically interested in the question of social movement outcomes nor have they undertaken empirical analyses. Of course, I cannot review all the literature on social movement outcomes, and some relevant studies may be absent or underemphasized. My purpose was not to provide an exhaustive list, but to show the trends in the literature.

The review of the literature has uderscored some of the methodological difficulties that have hindered research on this topic. The definition and measure problem as well as the critical problem of causality are two major obstacles to generating research on social movement outcomes. The focus on movement success, moreover, has prevented a more extensive view of all possible movement outcomes. The lack of a comparative and dynamic approach has prevented students of social movements from producing generalizable results that yield important insights about the conditions under which certain social movement outcomes occur. Thus future research agenda on social movement outcomes should be aware of and try to solve such methodological problems. I have suggested that this may be done by adopting a "qualitative comparative method" (Ragin 1987), which acknowledge both generality and complexity, and by undertaking a "pooled"

analysis, which takes into account cross-national, cross-movement and over-time comparisons. Such an enterprise, ultimately, is crucial to a better understanding of social movement outcomes and, hence, how social change is fostered.

**References:**

Aberbach, Joel and Jack L. Walker 1973. Race in the City. Boston: Little, Brown.

Abramowitz, Stephen I. and Alberta J. Nassi 1981. "Keeping the Faith: Psychological Correlates of Activism Persistence into Middle Adulthood", Journal of Youth and Adolescence 10: 507-523.

Aish, Anne-Marie 1982. Volksunie: 1958-1980. Pilot study presented to the ECPR Conflict Research Group, Aahrus, Aarhus, Denmark, March.

Albritton, Robert B. 1979. "Social Amelioration Through Mass Insurgency? A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis", American Political Science Review 73, December.

Alinsky, Saul 1969. Reveille for Radicals. New York: Vintage Books.

Amenta, Edwin, Bruce G. Carruthers and Yvonne Zylan 1992. "A Hero for the Aged? The Townsend Movement, the Political Mediation Model, and U.S. Old-Age Policy, 1934-1950", American Journal of Sociology 98: 308-339.

Ash, Roberta 1972. Social Movements in America. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

Astin, Alexander W., Helen S. Astin, Alan E. Bayer and Ann D. Bisconti 1975. The Power of Protest. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bachrach, P. and M. S. Baratz 1970. Power and Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barkan, Steven A. 1984. "Legal Control of the Southern Civil Rights Movement", American Sociological Review 49: 552-565.

Beatty, Jack 1977, The Nation, October 8.

Beckford, James A. (ed.) 1986. New Religious Movements and Rapid Social Change. London: Sage Publications/Unesco.

Bellush, Jewell and Stephen M. David (eds.) 1971. Race and Politics in New York City. New York: Praeger.

Bernstein, J. Barton 1978, The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 27.

Betz, Michael 1974. "Riots and Welfare: Are They Related?", Social Problems 21, 3.

Berkowitz, William R. 1974. "Socioeconomic Indicator Changes in Ghetto Riot Tracts", Urban Affairs Quarterly 10: 69-94.

Bienen, Henry 1968. Violence and Social Change: A Review of Current Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brightman, Carol 1978, Seven Days, January.

Brill, Harry 1971. Why Organizers Fail. The Story of a Rent Strike. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brinton, C. 1938. The Anatomy of Revolution. New York: Vintage Books.

Brogan, D. W. 1951. The Price of Revolution. New York: Harper.

Browning, Rufus P., Dale Rogers Marshall and David H. Tabb 1984. Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Edmund and Paul Lubeck 1987. "Explaining Social Movements in Two Oil-Exporting States: Divergent Outcomes in Nigeria and Iran", Comparative Studies in Society and History 29: 643-665.

Burstein, Paul 1979a. "Equal Employment Opportunity Legislation and the Incomes of Women and Nonwhites", American Sociological Review 44: 367-391.

Burstein, Paul 1979b. "Public Opinion, Demonstrations, and the Passage of Anti-Discrimination Legislation", Public Opinion Quarterly 43: 157-172.

Burstein, Paul 1979c. "Senate Voting on the Vietnam War, 1964-1973", Journal of Political and Military Sociology 7: 271-282.

Burstein, Paul 1985. Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics. The Struggle for Equal Opportunity in the United States since the New Deal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burstein, Paul 1991. "Legal Mobilization as a Social Movement Tactic: The Struggle for Equal Employment Opportunity, American Journal of Sociology 96.

Burstein, Paul, Rachel Einwohner and Jocelyn Hollander 1991. Political Movements and Their Consequences: Lessons from the U.S. Experience. Paper prepared for presentation at the 86th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Cincinnati, OH.

Burstein, Paul and William Freudenberg 1978. "Changing Public Policy: The Impact of Public Opinion, Anti-War Demonstrations and War Costs on Senate Voting on Vietnam War Motions", American Journal of Sociology 84: 99-122.

Bush, Diane Mitsch 1992. "Women's Movements and State Policy Reform Aimed at Domestic Violence against Women: A Comparison of the Consequences of Movement Mobilization in the U.S. and India", Gender and Society 6: 587-608.

Button, James W. 1978. "Black Violence. Political Impact of the 1960s Riots. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Button, James W. 1989. Blacks and Social Change. Impact of the Civil Rights Movement in Southern Communities. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carmines, Edward and James Stimson 1989. Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chamblin, Mitchell B. 1992. "Intergroup Threat and Social Control: Welfare Expansion among States during the 1960s and 1970s", in Social Threat and Social Control, edited by Allen E. Liska. Albany, NY: State of New York Press.

Clausen, Aage 1973. How Congressmen Decide. New York: St. Martin's.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1993. "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920", American Journal of Sociology 98: 755-798.

Cobb, Roger W. and Charles D. Elder 1972. Participation in American Politics. The Dynamics of Agenda Building. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Colby, David 1975. "The Effects of Riots on Public Policy: Exploratory Note", International Journal of Group Tensions 5: 156-162.

Colby, David 1982. "A Test of the Relative Efficacy of Political Tactics", American Journal of Political Science 26, 4.

Conell, C. 1978. Was Holding Out the Key to Winning Strikes? Massachusetts, 1881-1894. Working Paper No. 187. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Social Organization.

Costain, Anne, N. and Steven Majstorovic 1994. "Congress, Social Movements and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights Legislation", Political Research Quarterly.

Crain, Robert L. 1969. The Politics of School Desegregation. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books.

Dahl, Robert 1961. Who Governs? New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dahl, Robert 1967. Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

DeMartini, Joseph R. 1983. "Social Movement Participation: Political Socialization, Generational Consciousness and Lasting Effects", Youth and Society 15: 195-233.

Demerath, N. J., Gerald Marwell and Michael Aiken 1971. Dynamics of Idealism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Domhoff, G. William 1983. "The New Class War", Social Policy, Winter.

Dorff, Robert and Jürg Steiner 1987. "Decision Cases in Western Democracies: A Data Bank", Comparative Political Studies 20: 160-173.

Downs, Bryan and Kenneth Greene 1973. "The Politics of Open Housing in Three Cities", American Politics Quarterly 1:215-243.

Dunn, J. M. 1977. "The Success and Failure of Modern Revolutions", in Radicalism in the Contemporary Age, Vol. 3: Strategies and Impact of Contemporary Radicalism, edited by S. Bialer and S. Sluzar. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Durman, Eugene 1973. "Have the Poor Been Regulated? Toward a Multivariate Understanding of Welfare Growth", Social Service Review 47, September.

Echols, J. M. 1980. "The Comparative Impact of Socialism on Racial and Ethnic Inequality, Comparative Political Studies 13.

Eckstein, Harry 1964. "Introduction: Toward a Theoretical Study of Internal War", pp. 1-31 in Internal War: Problems and Approaches, edited by Harry Eckstein. New York: Free Press.

Eckstein, Susan 1975. "How Economically Consequential Are Revolutions? A Comparative Study of Mexico and Bolivia", Studies in Comparative International Development 10: 48-63.

Eckstein, Susan 1976. The Impact of Revolution: A Comparative Analysis of Mexico and Bolivia. Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Sociology, No. 06-106. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Eckstein, Susan 1982. "The Impact of Revolution on Social Welfare in Latin America", Theory and Society 11: 17-42.

Edeen, Alf 1960. "The Soviet Civil Service: Its Composition and Status", in The Transformation of Russian Society: Aspects of Social Change since 1861, edited by Cyril E. Black. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Edelman, Murray 1964. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Edelman, Murray 1977. Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail. New York: Academic Press.

Eidison, Betty 1971. "White Public Opinion in an Age of Disorder", in Cities Under Siege, edited by David Boesel and Peter Rossi. New York: Basic Books.

Eisenstadt, S. N. 1978. Revolution and the Transformation of Societies: A Comparative Study of Civilizations. New York: Free Press.

Eisinger, Peter K. 1973. "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities", American Political Science Review 67: 11-28.

Etzioni, Amitai 1970. Demonstration Democracy. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Fainstein, Norman I. and Susan S. Fainstein 1974. Urban Political Movements. The Search for Power by Minority Groups in American Cities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fanstein, Susan S. and Norman I. Fainstein 1972. The View from Below. Urban Politics and Social Policy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Feagin, Joe R. and Harlan Hahn 1973. Ghetto Revolts: The Politics of Violence in American Cities. New York: Macmillan.

Fendrich, James M. 1974. "Activists Ten Years Later: A Test of Generational Unit Continuity", Journal of Social Issues 30: 95-118.

Fendrich, James M. 1977. "Keeping the Faith or Pursuing the Good Life: A Study of the Consequences of Participation in the Civil Rights Movement", American Sociological Review 42: 144-157.

Fendrich, James M. and Ellis M. Krauss 1978. "Student Activism and Adult Left-Wing Politics: A Causal Model of Political Socialization for Black, White and Japanese Students of the 1960s Generation", pp. 231-256 in Social Movements, Conflict and Change, edited by Louis Kriesberg. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fendrich, James M. and Kenneth L. Lovoy 1988. "Back to the Future: Adult Political Behavior of Former Political Activists", American Sociological Review 53: 780-784.

Fendrich, James M. and Alison T. Tarleau 1973. "Marching to a Different Drummer: Occupational and Political Correlates of Former Student Activists", Social Forces 52: 245-253.

Foley, John W. and Homer. R. Steedly 1980. "The Strategy of Social Protest: A Comment on a Growing Industry", American Journal of Sociology 85.

Forchheimer, K. 1948. "Some International Aspects of the Strike Movement", Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics 10: 9-24.

Fowler, Linda L. and Ronald G. Shaiko 1987. "The Grass Roots Connection: Environmental Activists and Senate Roll Calls", American Journal of Political Science 31: 484-510.

Freeman, Jo 1975. The Politics of Women's Liberation. A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process. New York: David McKay Company.

Freeman, M. 1978. "Edmund Burke and the Theory of Revolution", Political Theory 6: 277-297.

Frey, R. Scott, Thomas Dietz and Linda Kalof 1992. "Characteristics of Successful American Protest Groups: Another Look et Gamson's Strategy of Social Protest", American Journal of Sociology 98: 368-387.

Gamson, William A. 1975. The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Gamson, William A. 1980. "Understanding the Careers of Challenging Groups: A Commentary on Goldstone", American Journal of Sociology 85: 1043-1060.

Gamson, William A. 1989. "Reflections on the Strategy of Social Protest", Sociological Forum 4: 455-467.

Gamson, William A. 1990. The Strategy of Social Protest. Second edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Gamson, William A. and Emilie Schmeidler 1984. "Organizing the poor", Theory and Society 13: 567-585.

Gamson, William A. and Gadi Wolfsfeld 1993. "Movements and Media as Interacting Systems", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 528: 114-125.

Garrow, David J. 1978. Protest at Selma. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.

Gelb, Joyce 1989. Feminism and Politics. A Comparative Perspective. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gelb, Joyce and Marian Lief Palley 1982. Women and Public Policies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gelb, Joyce and Marian Lief Palley 1987. Women and Public Policies. Second edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gibson, James L. 1989. "The Policy Consequences of Political Intolerance: Political Repression During the Vietnam War Era", Journal of Politics 51: 13-35.

Goetz-Girey, Robert 1965. Le mouvement des grèves en France, 1919-1962. Paris: Sirey.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1980a. "The Weakness of Organization: A New Look at Gamson's The strategy of Social Protest", American Journal of Sociology 85: 1017-1042, 1426-1432.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1980b. "Mobilization and Organization: Reply to Foley and Steedly and to Gamson", American Journal of Sociology 85.

Goldstone, Jack A. (ed.) 1994. Revolutions. Theoretical, Comparative, and Historical Studies. Second edition. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Gordon, Linda 1988. "What Does Welfare Regulate?", Social Research 55, 4.

Greene, Thomas H. 1974. Comparative Revolutionary Movements. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Griffin, John I. 1939. Strikes: A Study in Quantitative Economics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Griffin, Larry J., Joel A. Devine and Michael Wallace 1983. "On the Economic and Political Determinants of Welfare Spending in the Post-World War II Era", Politics and Society 12, 3.

Gronbjerg, Kirsten A. 1977. Mass Society and the Extension of Welfare, 1960-1970. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gurr, Ted R. 1973. "The Revolution-Social Change Nexus: Some Old Theories and New Hypotheses", Comparative Politics 5: 359-392.

Gurr, Ted R. 1980. "On the Oucomes of Violent Conflict", pp. 238-294 in Handbook of Political Conflict, Theory and Research, edited by Ted R. Gurr. New York: Free Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981a. The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking and Driving and the Symbolic Order. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. "Social Movements and Social Change: Perspectives of Linearity and Fluidity", pp. 317-339 in Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change, Vol. 4.

Hahn, Harlan 1970. "Civic Responses to Riots: A Reappraisal of Kerner Commission Data", Public Opinion Quarterly 34: 101-107.

Handler, Joel 1978. Social Movements and the Legal System. New York: Academic Press.

Harrington, Michael 1977, The New York Times Book Review, December 11.

Hicks, Alexander and Duane H. Swank 1983. "Civil Disorder, Relief Mobilization and AFDC Caseloads: A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis", American Journal of Political Science 27, November.

Hicks, Alexander and Duane H. Swank 1984. "On the Political Economy of Welfare Expansion: A Comparative Analysis of 18 Advanced Capitalist Democracies, 1960-71", Comparative Political Studies 17, 1, April.

Hicks, Alexander and Duane H. Swank 1992. "Politics, Institutions, and Welfare Spending in Industrialized Democracies", American Political Science Review 86, 3, September.

Hiller, E. T. 1928. The Strike: A Study in Collective Action. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1978, The New York Review of Books XXV, 4, March 28.

Iris, M. 1978. Systems in Crisis: American and Israeli Response to Urban Ethnic Protest. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University.

Isaac, Larry and William R. Kelly 1981. "Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: Local and National Level Evidence from the Postwar United States", American Journal of Sociology 86: 1348-1386.

Isaac, Larry and William R. Kelly 1982. "Developmental/Modernization and Political Class Struggle Theories of Welfare State Expansion: The Case of the AFDC "Explosion" in the States, 1960-70", Journal of Political and Military Sociology 10, 2, Fall.

Jackson, John E. 1974. Constituencies and Leaders in Congress. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jasper, James M. and Dorothy Nelkin 1992. The Animal Rights Crusade. The Growth of a Moral Protest. New York: Free Press.

Jasper, James M. and Jane Poulsen 1993. "Fighting Back: Vulnerabilities, Blunders, and Countermobilization by the Targets in Three Animal Rights Campaigns", Sociological Forum 8: 639-657.

Jenkins, J. Craig 1981. "Sociopolitical Movements", pp. 81-153 in The Handbook of Political Behavior, Vol. 4, edited by Samuel L. Long. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Charles Perrow 1977. "Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Worker Movements (1946-1972)", American Sociological Review 42: 249-268.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Barbara Brents 1989. "Social Protest, Hegemonic Competition, And Social Reform: A Political Struggle Interpretation of the Origins of the American Welfare State", American Sociological Review 54, 6, December.

Jennings, Edward T. 1979. "Civil Turmoil and the Growth of Welfare Rolls: A Comparative State Policy Analysis", Policy Studies Journal 7: 739-745.

Jennings, Edward T. 1981."Urban Riots and Welfare Policy Change: A Test of the Piven-Cloward Theory", in Why Policies Succeed or Fail, edited by Helen M. Ingram and Dean E. Manns. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Jennings, Edward, T. 1983. "Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: A Critical Comment and Reanalysis", American Journal of Sociology 88, 6.

Jennings, M. Kent 1987. "Residues of a Movement: The Aging of the American Protest Generation", American Political Science Review 81: 367-382.

Jennings, M. Kent and Richard G. Niemi 1981. Generations and Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Joppke, Christian 1993. Mobilizing against Nuclear Energy. A Comparison of Germany and the United States. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Justice, Betty and Renate Pore (eds.) 1981. Toward the Second Decade. The Impact of the Women's Movement on American Institutions. Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod and Carol McClurg Mueller 1987. The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe. Consciousness, Political Opportunity, and Public Policy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kautsky, J. H. 1975. Patterns of Modernizing Revolutions: Mexico and the Soviet Union. Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics, No. 01-056. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Keeler, John T. S. (ed.) 1993. "The Politics of Reform in Comparative Perspective", special issue of Comparative Political Studies 25, 4.

Kelley, Jonathan and Herbert S Klein 1977. "Revolution and the Rebirth of Inequality", American Journal of Sociology 83: 78-90.

Kelly, William R. 1977. Collective Violence and Social Change: An Empirical Analysis of American Racial Disorders in the 1960s. M.A. thesis, Indiana University.

Kelly, William R. and David Snyder 1980. "Racial Violence and Socioeconomic Changes among Blacks in the United States", Social Forces 58: 739-760.

Kingdon, John 1981. Congressmen's Voting Decisions. Second edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Kirbo, Harold R. and Richard A. Shaffer 1992. "Lower Class Insurgency and the Political Process: The Response of the U.S. Unemployed, 1890-1940", Social Problems 39, 2.

Kitschelt, Herbert 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies", British Journal of Political Science 16: 57-85.

Knowles, K. G. J. C. 1952. Strikes: A Study in Industrial Conflict. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kriesberg, Louis, and Bronislaw Misztal and Janusz Mucha (eds.) 1988. Social Movements as a Factor of Change in the Contemporary World. Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, Vol. 10.

Kriesi, Hanspeter 1991. The Political Opportunity Structure of New Social Movements: Its Impact on Their Mobilization. FS III 91-103. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak and Marco G. Giugni 1992. "New Social Movements and Political Opportunities in Western Europe", European Journal of Political Research 22: 219-244.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak and Marco G. Giugni, 1995. The Politics of New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis. Forthcoming.

Kowalewski, David and Paul Schumaker 1981. "Protest Outcomes in the Soviet Union", Sociological Quarterly 22: 57-68.

Ladd, Everett C. 1966. Negro Political Leadership in the South. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lammers, Cornelis J. 1969. "Strikers and Mutinies: A Comparative Study of Organization Conflicts Between Rulers and Ruled", Administrative Science Quarterly 4: 558-572.

Lampton, D. M. 1978. "Performance and the Chinese Political System: A Preliminary Assessment of Education and Health Policies", China Quarterly 75: 509-539.

Lampton, D. M. 1979. "The Roots of Interprovincial Inequality in Education and Health Services in China since 1949", American Political Science Review 73: 459-477.

Lawson, Steven F. 1976. Black Ballots: Voting Rights in the South, 1944-69. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lawson, Steven F. 1991. "From Boycotts to Ballots: The Reshaping of National Politics", pp. 184-210 in New Directions in Civil Rights Studies, edited by Armstead L. Robinson and Patricia Sullivan. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.

Levitan, Sar A., William B. Johnston and Robert Taggart 1975. Still a Dream: The Changing Status of Blacks since 1960. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S. 1979. "Some Economic Effects of Revolution: Models, Measurement, and the Cuban Evidence", American Journal of Sociology 84: 1127-1149.

Lipsky, Michael 1968. "Protest as a Political Resource", American Political Science Review 62: 1144-58.

Lipsky, Michael 1970. Protest in City Politics. Rent Strikes, Housing and the Power of the Poor. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Lipsky, Michael and Margaret Levi 1972. "Community Organization as a Political Resource", in People and Politics in Urban Society, edited by Harlan Hahn. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipsky, Michael and David J. Olson 1977. Commission Politics. The Processing of Racial Crisis in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Lovak, Richard 1972. "Urban Renewal Controversies", Public Administration Review 32: 359-373.

Lowi, Theodore J. 1969. The End of Liberalism. New York: Norton.

Lowi, Theodore J. 1971. The Politics of Disorder. New York: Basic.

Maidenburg, Michael and Philip Meyer 1970. "The Berkeley Rebels Five Years Later: Has Age Mellowed the Pioneer Radicals?" Sevenpart series, Detroit Free Press.

Malloy, J. M. 1970. Bolivia: The Uncompleted Revolution. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Malloy, J. M. (ed.) 1971. Beyond the Revolution: Bolivia since 1952. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Marsh, Michael, M. 1982a. Field Manual: Groups and System Response. Mimeo, Trinity College, Dublin.

Marsh, Micheal M. 1982b. Irish Farmers Association: 1965-1980. Pilot study presented to the ECPR Conflict Research Group, Aahrus, Aarhus, Denmark, March.

Marty, Martin E. and R. Scott Appleby (eds.) 1993. Fundamentalisms and the State. Remaking Polities, Economies, and Militance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marwell, Gerald, Michael Aiken and N. J. Demerath 1987. "The Persistence of Political Attitudes among 1960s Civil Rights Activists", Public Opinion Quarterly 51: 359-375.

Marx, Gary and James Wood 1975. "Strands of Theory and Research in Collective Behavior", Annual Review of Sociology 1: 363-428.

McAdam, Doug 1982. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, Doug 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency", American Sociological Review 48: 735-754.

McAdam, D. 1988. Freedom Summer. The Idealists Revisited. New York: Oxford University Press.

McAdam, Doug 1989. "The Biographical Consequences of Actvism", American Sociological Review 54: 744-760.

McAdam Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald 1988. "Social Movements", pp. 695-737 in Handbook of Sociology, edited by Neil J. Smelser. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCarthy, John D. and Meyer N. Zald 1973. The Trends of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory", American Journal of Sociology 82: 1212-1241(39).

McClurg Mueller, Carol 1978. "Riot Violence and Protest Outcomes", Journal of Political and Military Sociology 6: 49-63.

Melucci, A. 1982. L'invenzione del presente. Movimenti, identità, bisogni collettivi. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Melucci, A. 1989. Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society. London: Hutchinson Radius.

Metz, Steven 1986. "The Anti-Apartheid Movement and Populist Instinct in American Politics", Political Science Quarterly 101: 379-395.

Milbrath, Lester 1970. "The Impact of Lobbying on Governmental Decisions", pp. 360-381 in Policy Analysis in Political Science, edited by Ira Sharkansky. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

Miller, Warren and Donald Stokes 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress", American Political Science Review 57: 45-56.

Mironesco, Christina 1982. G.A.K.: 1973-1976. Pilot study presented to the ECPR Conflict Research Group, Aahrus, Aarhus, Denmark, March.

Mirowsky, John and Catherine Ross 1981. "Protest Group Success: The Impact of Group Characteristics, Social Control, and Context", Sociological Focus 14: 177-192.

Mitchell, Robert C. 1981. From Elite Quarrel to Mass Movement", Society 18: 76-84.

Mollenkopf, John H. 1973. On the Causes and Consequences of Neighborhood Mobilization. Paper presented at the 69th annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, LA.

Moore, Barrington 1966. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mueller, Carol 1984. Women's Movement Success and the Success of Social Movement Theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, TX.

Nardin, Terry 1971. Violence and the State: A Critique of Empirical Political Theory. Sage Professional Papers, Comparative Politics Series, Vol. 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Nassi, Alberta J. and Stephen I. Abramowitz 1979. "Transition or Transformation? Personal and Political Development of Former Berkeley Free Speech Movement Activists", Journal of Youth and Adolescence 8: 21-35.

Nelkin, Dorothy and Michael Pollak 1981. The Atom Besieged. Extraparliamentary Dissent in France and Germany. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nichols, Elizabeth 1987. "U.S. Nuclear Power and the Success of the American Anti-Nuclear Movement", Berkeley Journal of Sociology 32: 167-192.

Oberschall, Anthony 1973. Social Conflict and Social Movements. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

O'Keefe, M. F. and P. D. Schumaker 1979. Violence and Protest Effectiveness in Southeast Asia. Paper read to the Southwestern Political Science Association.

Orfield, Gary 1975. Congressional Power: Congress and Social Change. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Page, Benjamin and Robert Y. Shapiro 1983. "Effects of Public Opinion on Policy", American Political Science Review 77: 175-190.

Parenti, Michael 1970. "Power and Pluralism: A View from the Bottom", Journal of Politics 32: 501-530.

Perrot, Michelle 1984. Jeunesse de la Grève: France 1871-1890. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Perrot, Michelle 1987. Workers on Strike. France 1871-1890. Leamington Spa: Berg.

Peterson, Florence 1938. Strikes in the United States, 1880-1936. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Pierce, Roy and Philip E. Converse 1990. "Attitudinal Sources of Protest Behavior in France: Differences Between Before and After Measurement", Public Opinion Quarterly 54: 295-316

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1971. Regulating the Poor. The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Vintage Books.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1978. "Social Movements and Societal Conditions: A Reply to Roach and Roach", Social Problems 26, 2.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1979a. "Electoral Instability, Civil Disorder, and Relief Rises: A Reply to Albritton", American Political Science Review 73.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1979b. Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail. New York: Vintage Books.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1980. "Doctrine in Command of Politics: A Reply to Roach and Roach", Sociological Quarterly 21.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1984. "Disruption and Organization: A Reply to Gamson and Schmeidler", Theory and Society 13.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1988. "Welfare Doesn't Shore Up Traditional Family Roles: A Reply to Linda Gordon", Social Research 55, 4.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1992. "Normalizing Collective Protest", in Frontiers in Social Movement Theory, edited by Aldon Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1993. Regulating the Poor. The Functions of Public Welfare. Second edition. New York: Vintage Books.

Pontusson, Jonas 1993. "The Comparative Politics of Labor-Initiated Reform: Swedish Cases of Success and Failure", Comparative Political Studies 25: 548-578.

Price, Jerome 1982. The Antinuclear Movement. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Raschke, Joachim (ed.) 1983. Bürger und Parteien. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Roach, Jack L. and Janet K. Roach 1978. "Organizing the Poor: Road to a Dead End", Social Problems 26, 2.

Roach, Jack L. and Janet K. Roach 1980. "Turmoil in Command of Politics: Organizing the Poor", Sociological Quarterly 21.

Rochon, Thomas R. 1988. Mobilizing for Peace. The Antinuclear Movements in Western Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rochon, Thomas R. and Daniel A. Mazmanian 1993. "Social Movements and the Policy Process", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 528: 75-87.

Rock, David 1993. Authoritarian Argentina. The Nationalist Movement, Its History and Its Impact. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rohrschneider, Robert 1993. "Impact of Social Movements on European Party Systems", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 528: 157-170.

Royal Institute of International Affairs 1967. The Impact of the Russian Revolution 1917-1967. The Influence of Bolshevism on the World outside Russia. London: Oxford University Press.

Rüdig, Wolfgang 1990. Anti-Nuclear Movements. A World Survey of Opposition to Nuclear Energy. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Rupp, Leila and Verta Taylor 1987. Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to 1960. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sabatier, Paul 1975. "Social Movements and Regulatory Agencies", Policy Sciences 6: 301-342.

Sanders, Daniel S. 1973. The Impact of Reform Movements on Social Policy Change: The Case of Social Insurance. Fair Lawn, NJ: R.E.Burdick, Inc., Publishers.

Sartori, Giovanni 1976. Parties and Party System. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schattschneider, Elmer E. 1960. The Semi-Sovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schramm, Sanford F. and J. Patrick Turbott 1983a. "The Welfare Explosion: Mass Society versus Social Control", Social Service Review 57.

Schramm, Sanford F. and J. Patrick Turbott 1983b. "Civil Disorder and the Welfare Explosion: A Two-step Process", American Sociological Review 48.

Schumaker, Paul D. 1973. The Power of Protest Groups: System Responsiveness to Citizen Demands. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Winsconsin-Madison.

Schumaker, Paul D. 1974. Protest Actions and Policy Responsiveness: Some Alternative Models. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

Schumaker, Paul D. 1975. "Policy Responsiveness to Protest-Group Demands", Journal of Politics 37: 488-521.

Schumaker, Paul D. 1978. "The Scope of Political Conflict and the Effectiveness of Constraints in Contemporary Urban Protest", Sociological Quarterly 19: 168-184.

Sears, David and John McCanahay 1973. The Politics of Violence. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sharkansky, Ira 1970. "Environment, Policy, Output and Impact: Problems of Theory and Method in the Analysis of Public Policy, pp. 61-79 in Policy Analysis in Political Science, edited by Ira Sharkansky. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.

Sharp, Elaine B. and Steven Maynard-Moody 1991. "Theories of the Local Welfare Role", American Journal of Political Science 35, 4.

Shorter, Edward and Charles Tilly 1974. Strikes in France 1830-1968. London: Cambridge University Press.

Shorter, Edward and Charles Tilly 1971. "Le déclin de la grève violente en France de 1890 à 1935", Le Mouvement Social 79: 95-118.

Simon, Rita J. and Gloria Danziger 1991. Women's Movements in America. Their Successes, Disappointments, and Aspirations. New York: Praeger.

Singh, Shiva B. 1985. Impact of the Indian National Movement on the Political Development of Nepal. New Delhi: Marwah Publications.

Skocpol, Theda 1976. "Old Regime Legacies and Communist Revolution in Russia and China", Social Forces 55: 284-315.

Skocpol, Theda 1979. States and Social Revolution: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skolnick, Jerome H. 1969. The Politics of Protest. New York: Ballantine.

Smith, B. L. R. 1968. "The Politics of Protest: How Effective is Violence? Pp. 113-130 in Urban Riots: Violence and Social Change, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, edited by R. H. Connery.

Smith, Richard 1979. Lobbying Influence in Congress. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

Snyder, David and William R. Kelly 1976. "Industrial Violence in Italy, 1878-1903", American Journal of Sociology 82: 131-162.

Snyder, David and William R. Kelly 1979. "Strategies for Investigating Violence and Social Change: Illustrations from Analyses of racial Disorders and Implications for Mobilization Research", in The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Tactics and Social Control, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Songer, Donald R. and Reginald S. Sheehan 1993. "Interest Group Success in the Courts: Amicus Participation in the Supreme Court", Political Research Quarterly 46: 339-354.

Staggenborg, Suzanne 1988. "The consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement", American Sociological Review 53: 585-605.

Starr, Paul 1978, Working Papers, March/April.

Steedly, Homer R. and John W. Foley 1979. "The Success of Protest Groups: Multivariate Analyses, Social Science Research 8: 1-15.

Swank, Duane 1983. "Bteween Incrementalism and Revolution: Group Protest and the Welfare State", American Behavioral Scientist 26, 3.

Swank, Duane H. and Alexander Hicks 1984. "Militancy, Need, and Relief: The Piven and Cloward AFDC Caseload Thesis Revisited", in Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change, edited by Richard Ratcliff. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Taft, Philip and Philip Ross 1969. "American Labor Violence: Its Causes, Character, and Outcome", in Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, edited by Ted R. Gurr. New York: Praeger.

Tai, Chong-Soo 1974. The Effects of Revolution: A Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Six Revolutions. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University.

Tai, Chong-Soo 1979. "Linkages between Revolution and Change in Korea", Asian Profile 7: 25-36.

Tarrow, Sidney 1983. Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Western Societies Program Occasional Paper No. 15.

Tarrow, Sidney 1989a. Struggle, Politics, and Reform: Collective Action, Social Movements, and Cycles of Protest. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Western Societies Program Occasional Paper No. 21.

Tarrow, Sidney 1989b. Democracy and Disorder. Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tarrow, Sidney 1993. "Social Protest and Policy Reform: May 1968 and the Loi d'Orientation in France", Comparative Political Studies 25: 579-607.

Tarrow, Sidney 1994. Power in Movement. Social movements, Collective Action and Mass Politics. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Verta 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance", American Sociological Review 54.

Tilly, Charles 1978. From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, Charles 1979. "Repertoires of Contention in America and Britain, 1750-1830", in The Dynamics of Social Movements, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Tilly, Charles 1993. European Revolutions, 1492-1992. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly and Richard Tilly 1975. The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Trattner, Walter I. (ed.) 1983. Social Welfare or Social Control: Some Historical Reflections on "Regulating the Poor". Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Trimberger, Ellen Kay 1978. Revolution from Above: Military Bureaucrats and Development in Japan, Turkey, Egypt, and Peru. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Troyer, Ronald J. and Gerald E. Markle 1983. Cigarettes: The Battle over Smoking. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Turk, Herman and Lynne G. Zucker 1984. "Majority and Organized Opposition: On Effects of Social Movements", pp. 249-269 in Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change, Vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Turk, Herman and Lynne G. Zucker 1985. "Structural Bases of Minority Effects on Majority-Supported Change", Social Science Quarterly 66: 365-385.

Valocchi, Steve 1990. "The Unemployed Workers Movement: A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis", Social Problems 37: 191-205.

Von Eschen, Donald, Jerome Kirk and Maurice Pinard 1969. "The Conditions of Direct Action in a Democratic Society", Western Political Quarterly 22: 309-325.

Walston, James 1982. C.I.S.A. and Italian Civil Rights Reform, 1973-1981. Pilot study presented to the ECPR Conflict Research Group, Aahrus, Aarhus, Denmark, March.

Ware, Alan 1987. Political Parties: Electoral Change and Structural Response. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Walt, Stephen M. 1992. "Revolution and War", World Politics 44: 321-368.

Webb, Keith 1982. The National Front: 1967-1980. Pilot study presented to the ECPR Conflict Research Group, Aahrus, Aarhus, Denmark, March.

Webb, Keith, Ekkart Zimmermann, Michael Marsh, Anne-Marie Aish, Christina Mironesco, Christopher Mitchell, Leonardo Morlino and James Walston 1983. "Etiology and Outcomes of Protest: New European Perspecives", American Behavioral Scientist 26: 311-331.

Weisburd, David 1979. Unity, Conflict, and the Necessity of Reciprocal Causation in Conflict Theory. Mimeo, Department of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Weissberg, Robert 1976. Public Opinion and American Democracy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Welch, Susan 1975. "The Impact of Urban Riots on Urban Expenditures", American Journal of Political Science 29: 741-760.

Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks 1980. "The Isla Vista 'Bank Burners' Ten Years Later: Notes on the Fate of Student Activists", Sociological Focus 13: 215-236.

Whitaker, William H. 1970. The Determinants of Social Movement Success: A Study of the National Welfare Rights Organization. Ph.D. dissertation, Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University.

Wilson, Brian (ed.) 1981. The Social Impact of New Religious Movements. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press, Inc.

Wilson, James Q. 1961. "The Strategy of Protest: Problems of Negro Civic Action", Journal of Conflict Resolution 5: 291-303.

Wright, Gavin 1991. "Economic Consequences of the Southern Protest Movement", pp. 175-183 in New Directions in Civil Rights Studies, edited by Armstead L. Robinson and Patricia Sullivan. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.

Whyte, Martin King 1975. "Inequality and Stratification in China", China Quarterly 64: 684-711.

Zald, Mayer N. and Roberta Ash 1966. "Social movement organizations: growth, decay, and change", Social Forces 44: 327-341(40).

Zelditch, Morris 1978. "Review Essay: Outsiders' Politics", American Journal of Sociology 83: 1514-1520.

**CENTER FOR STUDIES OF SOCIAL CHANGE**
**NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH**
**64 UNIVERSITY PLACE, SUITE 400**
**NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10003**

**Telephone Number: (212) 229 5312 Fax Number: (212) 477 5409**

## WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Center for Studies of Social Change is a facility of the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research. Its chief mission is to facilitate the research of faculty and graduate students who are involved in the New School's program in Historical Studies. CSSC Working Papers report current research and reflection by affiliates of the Center; many of them are published later elsewhere after revision. Working Papers are available from the Center for the fees listed below.

1. **"Historical Studies at the New School"** by Charles Tilly and Louise Tilly (Revised) September, 1985. $1.40

2. **"Women and Family in Western Europe, 1700 to the Present: A Bibliography"** by Nancy S. Horn, Tessie Liu, and Louise A. Tilly, (Revised) April, 1986. $2.70

3. **"Women in the United States, 1600 to the Present: A Bibliography"** by Rebecca Skinner and Louise A. Tilly, January, 1985. $3.50

4. **"The Geography of European Statemaking and Capitalism Since 1500"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1985. $1.60

5. **"Neat Analyses of Untidy Processes"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1985. $1.50

6. **"Connecting Domestic and International Conflicts, Past and Present"** by Charles Tilly, February, 1985. $1.50

7. **"The Effects of Ethnicity in the Work Place on Blacks, Italians, and Jews in 1910 New York"** by Suzanne Model, March, 1985. $1.90

8. **"The Complexity of Popular Collective Action"** by Charles Tilly, March, 1985. $1.80

9. **"Interests in the Making of American Military Policy toward Europe in 1948"** by Lynn Eden, February, 1985. $1.90

10. **"Models and Realities of Popular Collective Action"** by Charles Tilly, March, 1985. $1.90

11. **"Modernisation, Development, and Autonomy: A Conceptual Framework for Studying Social Change"** by Maria Kousis-Lekakis, May, 1985. $1.60

13. **"A Bibliography on Statemaking, Capitalism and Contention in France, 1600-1985"** by Charles Tilly, May, 1985. $3.00

14. **"The Tyranny of Here and Now"** by Charles Tilly, June, 1985. $1.30

17. **"Space for Capital, Space for States"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1985. $1.30

18. **"GBS + GCL = ?"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1985. $2.30

20. **"Social Movements, Old and New"** by Charles Tilly, August, 1985. $1.60

21. **"The Legal Context of Collective Action. A Chronology of Events in Great Britain, 1700-1834"** by Maria Emilia Correa, August, 1985. $1.60

22. **"Grandpa and Grandma"** by Charles Tilly, September, 1985. $1.20

23. **"Why Document Dinosaurs?"** by Charles Tilly and David K. Jordan, October, 1985. $3.80

24. **"Family History, Social History, and Social Change"** by Charles Tilly, March, 1986. $1.40

25. **"The Parliamentary History of Great Britain: A Chronology of the Debates and Proceedings of Both Houses of Parliament (for twenty selected years: 1758-59, 1768-69, 1780-81, 1785, 1801, 1807, 1811, 1819-20)"** by Hyun Kim, March, 1986. $2.90

26. **"Linkers, Diggers and Glossers in Social History"** by Charles Tilly, March, 1986. $1.10

27. **"Writing Wrongs in Sociology"** by Charles Tilly, April, 1986. $1.00

28. **"The Social and Geographic Roots of American Bureaucracy"** by Elizabeth Sanders, July, 1986. $1.60

30. **"Putting Demography Into History and Vice-Versa"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1986. $1.00

32. **"Catalogs of Contention in Britain, 1758-1834"** by Nancy Horn and Charles Tilly, August, 1986. $9.00

34. **"Women's History and Family History: Fruitful Collaboration or missed Connection?"** by Louise A. Tilly, August, 19[illegible] $1.50

35. **"Transplanted Networks"** by Charles Tilly, October, 1986. $1.40

36. **"Structural Change and Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834"** by Charles Tilly, November, 1986. $2.40

37. **"Violent Events in France, 1830-60 and 1930-60"** by Raúl Zambrano and Charles Tilly, January, 1987. $3.10

38. **"Selected Readings on Communities, Cities, and Urbanisation"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1987. $2.50

39. **"Social Change and Contention in Lancashire, 1820-1840."** by Anuradha Seth, April, 1987. $3.20

40. **"Bibliography On State Class Relations In Norway."** by Thorvald Gran, March 1987. $1.30

41. **"Warmakers and Citizens in the Contemporary World"** by Charles Tilly, March, 1987. $1.50

42. **"How War Made States and Vice Versa"** by Charles Tilly, June, 1987. $2.00

43. **"Social Conflict"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1987. $1.75

44a. **"Solidary Logics: Introduction"** by Michael Hanagan, July, 1987. $1.50

44b. **"The State and the Making of the Working Class. France and the United States, 1880-1914"** by Gerald Friedman, July, 1987. $1.50

44c. **"The Local Roots of Solidarity"** by Carol Conell, July, 1987. $1.50

44d. **"Labor Organisation and Class Alliance: Industries, Communities, and the Knights of Labor"** by Kim Voss, July, 1987. $1.50

44e. **"Ethnic Particularism and Class Solidarity: The Experience of Two Connecticut Cities"** by Oliver Carsten, July, 1987. $1.50

44f. **"Solidarity Logics: Conclusions"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1987. $1.50

45. **"Social Change and Contention in Berkshire, 1820-1840"** by Radhika Lal, July, 1987. $1.75

46. **"State Organisation and Class Interest in Norway: Social Democratic Administration of the Kings Bay Coal Mines"** by Thorvald Gran, July, 1987. $1.25

47. **"Social Change and Contention in Norfolk, 1820-1840"** by Hyun Kim, June, 1987. $1.75

49. **"Building CSSC: 1986-87 at the Center for Studies of Social Change"** by Charles Tilly, September, 1987. $1.00

50. **"Did the West Rise or Did the East Fall? Some Reflections From the 13th Century World System"** by Janet Abu-Lughod, August, 1987. $1.00

51. **"Cities and States in Europe, 1000-1800"** by Charles Tilly, October, 1987. $1.50

52. **"Twenty Years of British Contention"** by Charles Tilly, October, 1987. $2.25

53. **"Social Change and Contention in the County of Devon, 1800-1840"** by Fred Murphy, December, 1987. $2.75

54. **"Towards an Ecology of Associations"** by Karel Davids, November, 1987. $2.75

55. **"Social Change and Contention in Edinburgh, 1820-1840"** by Diane Poland, December, 1987. $2.75

56. **"Collective Violence in European Perspective"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1988. $2.00

57. **"Future History"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1988. $1.00

58. **"How--And What--Are Historians Doing?"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1988. $2.00

59. **"The Big Pictures"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1988. $1.00

60. **"War Settlement, State Structures, and National Security Policy"** by Arthur Stein, October, 1986. $1.00

61. **"War Settlement in Norway, 1945"** by Thorvald Gran, October, 1986. $1.50

62. **"War Settlement and State Structure: The Case of China and the Termination of World War II"** by Steven Levine, April, 1986. $1.00

63. **"The French State in the Era of the Second World War: A Look at the Recent Scholarship"** by Herrick Chapman, August, 1985. $2.15

64. **"The British State and the Second World War"** by James E. Cronin, October, 1986. $2.00

65. **"Korea and the War Settlement in Northeast Asia"** by Bruce Cumings, October, 1986. $1.55

66. **"Japan: Legacies of a Lost War"** by John W. Dower, October, 1986 $1.05

67. **"Society, State, and Military Apparatus in Germany, 1945-1955"** by Michael Geyer, October, 1986. $2.85

68. **"World War II and American Politics"** by Lynn Eden, August, 1985. $2.35

69. **"The Impact of World War II on Soviet State and Society"** by Condoleezza Rice, August, 1985. $1.25

70. **"Social Change and Collective Action in Warwick, 1800-1840"** by Rebecca Skinner and Carlos de la Torre, March, 1988. $2.00

71. **"Latin American State Formation in Regional Context: The Case of Argentina in the Triple Alliance"** by Fred Murphy, May, 1988. $3.25

72. **"Farmers, Workers and State Expansion in the Progressive Era"** by Elizabeth Sanders, July, 1988. $4.25

73. **"Gold, Greenbacks, and Reconstruction: The Political Economy of Finance Capital in the Post-Civil War Era"** by Richard Bensel, August, 1988. $3.10

74. **"Legislation, the Republican Party, and Finance Capital during Reconstruction"** by Richard Bensel, August, 1988. $3.60

76. **"Disposition is Not Action, The Rise and Demise of the Knights of Labor"** by Kim Voss, July, 1988. $3.50

77. **"A Selected Bibliography of European Urbanization since 1500"** compiled by Charles Tilly, revised version of September, 1983. $3.00

79. **"State and Counter-Revolution in France"** by Charles Tilly, November, 1988. $1.15

80. **"Changing Forms of Revolution"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1989. $2.45

81. **"History, Sociology, and Dutch Collective Action"** by Charles Tilly, February, 1989. $1.30

82. **"The Making of the 'Third World': A Bibliography"** by Hyun Kim, February, 1989. $1.80

83. **"Inequality and Labor Processes"** by Mark Granovetter and Charles Tilly, February, 1989. $3.00

84. **"Social Change and Occupational Sex Typing in New York Public School Administration, 1880-1950"** by Diane Poland, June, 1989. $1.80

85. **"Cities, Bourgeois, and Revolution in France"** by Charles Tilly, September, 1989. $2.65

87. **"The Institutional Conditions of an Instrumentalist Presidency: Contrasting Threads of Reform in American Political Development"** by Elizabeth Sanders, August, 1989. $1.30

88. **"Cities and Immigration in North America"** by Charles Tilly, September, 1989. $1.60

89. **"Social Change at the New School: CSSC report for 1988-1989"** by Eloise Linger and Charles Tilly, October, 1989 $.80

90. **"State and Collective Action in Japan and France, 1600-1800"** by Charles Tilly, November, 1989. $2.10

91. **"Urban Transport, Dependent Development and Change: Lessons from Mexico City's Subway"** by Diane Davis, December, 1989. $1.50

92. **"Palestine and Jewish History"** by Jonathan Boyarin, January, 1990. $ .60

93. **"States and Military Control in the Contemporary World"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1990. $3.30

95. **"Hegel's Zionism?"** by Jonathan Boyarin, April, 1990. $1.75

96. **"The Comparative Study of State Transformation"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1990. $1.65

97. **"How Much in How Little? Dutch Revolution in Comparative Perspective"** by Wayne Ph. te Brake, July, 1990. $1.20

98. **"Where Do Rights Come From?"** by Charles Tilly, July, 1990. $1.90

99. **"What Good Is Urban History?** by Charles Tilly, July, 1990. $1.75

101. **"Capital, Coercion, and Contention in Japan and France, 1590-1870,"** by Eiko Ikegami and Charles Tilly, September, 1990. $2.85

102. **"Farmers, Railroads and the State: A Political Economy Perspective,"** by Elizabeth Sanders, September, 1990. $3.15

103. **"CSSC RENEWED AND REVIEWED: Report of the Center for Studies of Social Change, New School for Social Research, July 1989 to June 1990,"** by Charles Tilly, October 1990. $4.15

104. **"Beyond Educational Inequality in Czechoslovakia,"** by Petr Mateju, November, 1990. $2.75

105. **"Rebellion, Repression, and State-Making in South Korea, October, 1946,"** by Hyun Kim, December, 1990. $3.60

106. **"Ethnic Conflict in the Soviet Union"** by Charles Tilly, January, 1991. $1.10

107. **"Domination, Resistance, Compliance ... Discourse,"** by Charles Tilly, February 1991, $1.10.

108. **"After the Goldrush. Organised Labor and Chinese Exclusion in California and Eastern Australia in the Late 19th and Early 20th Century,"** by Thomas Faist, February 1991, $2.30.

109. **"From Mutiny to Mass Mobilisation in Great Britain, 1758-1834,"** by Charles Tilly, March 1991, $4.60.

110. **"Reading Exodus into History,"** by Jonathan Boyarin, March 1991, $2.10.

111. **"Class Conflict, Taxation, and Political Instability: Bolivia 1900-1952,"** by Carmenza Gallo, March 1991, $1.75.

112. **"War and States in the Middle East"**, by Charles Tilly, March 1991. $0.90

114. **"European Economic and Social History in the 1990's"**, by Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly and Richard Tilly, April 1991. $3.50

115. **"Gender and Industrialisation: New Perspectives"**, by Louise Tilly, May 1991. $1.50

116. **"Humanity, Ethnicity, Nationality: conceptual and comparative perspectives on the USSR,"** by John L. Comaroff, May 1991. $1.80.

117. **"Ethnic Conflicts in the Context of Democratising Political Systems,"** by Algis Prazauskas, May 1991. $1.45.

118. **"Ethnic Conflict in the Transcaucasus: The Case of Nagorno-Karabakh,"** by A.N. Yamskov, May 1991. $1.80.

119. **"The Soviet Empire Before and After Perestroika,"** by Valery A. Tishkov, May 1991. $1.80.

120. **"Nationalities Problems in the Soviet Union: A Crisis of Institutions or A Crisis of Values?,"** by V.M. Sergeev, May 1991. **"Towards An Improved Analysis of Soviet Ethnic Relations,"** by Lee Walker, May 1991. $1.15.

121. **"Beyond Perestroika: A comment on the Articles by Algis Prazauskas, Valery A. Tishkov and A.N. Yamskov,"** by Andrus Park, May 1991. **"Comments on Soviet Papers for THEORY AND SOCIETY,"** by Gail W. Lapidus, May 1991. $1.20.

122. **"Space, Time and the Politics of Memory"**, by Jonathan Boyarin, June 1991. $2.00.

123. **"Politics and Interest in Post-Communist Societies: New Patterns of Interest Formation in Poland"**, by David Ost, April 1991. $1.10.

125. **"The Logic of Charity: The Functioning of Poor Relief in Pre-Industrial Europe"**, by Marco H.D. van Leeuwen, July 1991. $3.10.

126. **"War in History"**, Charles Tilly, August 1991. $1.20.

127. **"Revolution, War, And Other Struggles in Great Britain, 1789-1815."** By Charles Tilly, September 1991. $3.70.

128. **"States and Nationalism in Europe since 1600."** by Charles Tilly, October 1991. $1.20.

129. **"Prisoners of the State."** by Charles Tilly, October 1991. $1.60.

130. **"Europe's Changing Revolutions, 1492-1992."** by Charles Tilly, October 1991. $2.00

131. **"Social Change and Revolution in Europe."** by Charles Tilly, October 1991. $2.50.

132. **"Shoehorns, Shoestrings, and Bootstraps-Annual Report of CSSC."** by Eloise Linger and Charles Tilly, November 1991. $1.00.

133. **"Foreign Influence and Political Conflicts in the Post-Colonial Caribbean."** by Perry Mars, March 1992. $2.10.

134. **"History and Sociological Imagining."** by Charles Tilly, March 1992. $1.50.

135. **"War and the International System, 1900-1992."** by Charles Tilly, March 1992. $1.20.

136. **"Selected Readings on Political Change: 1992 Version."** by Charles Tilly, 30 May 1992. $4.75.

137. **"Ruins, Mounting Toward Jerusalem."** by Jonathan Boyarin, June 1992. $1.10.

138. **"Singular Models of Revolution: Impossible but Fruitful."** by Charles Tilly, June 1992. $2.90.

139. **"Inequality and Stratification "** by Charles Tilly, June 1992. $1.00.

140. **"Selected Papers, 1963-1992, From the Study of Social Change and Collective Action."** by Charles Tilly, June 1992. $2.35.

141. **"Contentious Repertoires in Great Britain, 1758-1834."** by Charles Tilly, June 1992. $3.25.

142. **"Blanding In."** by Charles Tilly, June 1992. $1.00.

143. **"The Role of Diffusion Processes in New Social Movements: Some Conceptual Clarifications."** by Marco G. Guigni, July 1992. $1.50.

144 **"Schema Documentation for the Great Britain, Geography of Contention in London, and Companion Studies."** by Raúl Zambrano, August 1992. $9.15.

145. **"Working Bibliography on New York, Chicago and Los Angeles."** Prepared by Janet Abu-Lughod and Christopher Mele, August 1992. $2.35.

146. **"Futures of European States."** by Charles Tilly, August 1992. $1.20.

147. **"The Decline and Disappearance of the Classical Food Riot in France."** by Louise A. Tilly, August 1992. $2.40.

148. **"Industrialisation and Gender Inequality."** by Louise A. Tilly, August 1992. $5.00.

149. **"A Bibliography of European Revolutions."** by Charles Tilly, September 1992. $3.80.

150. **"How to Detect, Describe, and Explain Repertoires of Contention."** by Charles Tilly, October 1992. $3.00.

151. **"Revolt and Religious Reformation in the World of Charles V, 1516-1555."** by Wayne Te Brake, October 1992. $1.75.

152. **"Of Oilfields, Lakes, and Democracy."** by Charles Tilly, November 1992. $2.30.

153. **"Capitalist Work and Labor Markets."** by Chris Tilly and Charles Tilly, November 1992. $5.15.

154. **"Brit SPSS/PC System Files."** by Raúl Zambrano & Charles Tilly, November 1992. $4.80.

155. **"European Revolutions, 1492-1992."** by Charles Tilly, December 1992. $1.60.

156. **"Revolution, Restoration and Legitimation: Ideological Problems of the Transition from State Socialism."** by Andrew Arato, October 1992. $ 3.00.

157. **"A Bibliography on Third World Revolutions."** by Maria Vina A. Lanzona, January 1993. $1.92.

158. **"Collective Violence in Early Modern Europe."** by Charles Tilly, February 1993. $1.00.

159. **"Useful Durkheim."** by Mustafa Emirbayer, April 1993. $2.00.

160. **"Repression and Facilitation in Great Britain, Ireland and the United Kingdom, 1750-1835."** by Carmen Espaillat and Vina A.Lanzona, April 1993. $6.00.

161. **"Jews, Indians and the Identity of Christian Europe."** by Jonathan Boyarin, April 1993. $1.30.

162. **"Social Movements as Historically Specific Clusters of Political Performances."** by Charles Tilly, June 1993. $1.40

163. **"Perspectives on Nationalism and War."** John L. Comaroff and Paul C. Stern, eds., June 1993. $12.70.

164. **"State, Class and Contention in Great Britain."** by Charles Tilly, July 1993. $2.65.

165. **"Political Memories in Space and Time."** by Charles Tilly, July 1993. $1.25.

166. **"Network Analysis and Historical Sociology: The Problem of Agency."** by Mustafa Emirbayer and Jeff Goodwin, July 1993. $2.30.

167. **"Selected Readings on Political Change: 1993 Version"** by Charles Tilly, July 1993. $6.65.

168. **"To Explain Political Processes"** by Charles Tilly, July 1993 (Revised January 1994). $1.40.

169. **"The Logic of War: Military, State and Revolution in Contemporary Spain"** by Rafael Cruz, August 1993. $1.30.

170. **"Contention and the Urban Poor in 18th and 19th Century Latin America"** by Charles Tilly, September 1993. $1.60.

171. **"Mechanism of State Formation and Collective Action"** by Ruud Koopmans and Sopuie de Schaepdrijver, September 1993. $2.00.

172. **"The Time of States"** by Charles Tilly, October 1993. $1.40.

173. **"In the Vicinity of CSSC, 1991-1993"** by Charles Tilly, October 1993. $1.00.

174. **"Making Time: Historic Preservation and the Space of Nationality"** by Marshall Johnson, December 1993. $3.10.

175. **"Future Social Sciences"** by Charles Tilly, December 1993. $1.20.

176. **"Courting the Workers' Vote: Rhetoric and Response in a Philippine Hacienda Region"** by Rosanne Rutten, December 1993. $2.00.

177. **"State-Incited Violence, 1900-1999"** by Charles Tilly, December 1993. $1.85.

178. **"Britain Brushes Revolution, 1828-1834"** by Charles Tilly, December 1993. $3.50.

179. **"Integrative Complexity of Political Discourse in American-Soviet Relations"** by Philip E. Tetlock, January 1994. $1.50.

180. **"Security Discourse in the Cold War Era"** William A. Gamson and Paul Stern, eds., January, 1994. $6.00.

181. **"Reflections on Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834"** by Charles Tilly, February 1994. $2.70.

182. **"Globalisation Threatens Labor's Rights"** by Charles Tilly, March 1994. $2.30.

183. **"Rural Transformation and Political Violence in Colombia, 1953-1990. A Comparative Study of Intra-Regional Change in a Non-Exporting Zone"** by Mauricio Romero, March 1994. $3.00.

184. **"From Real War to Imaginary War: The American State, Civil Defense Plans, and the Home Front, 1946-1952"** by Andrew Grossman, April 1994. $2.70.

185. **"Democracy is a Lake"** by Charles Tilly, April 1994. $1.60.

186. **"Parliamentarisation of Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758 - 1834"** by Charles Tilly, May 1994. $3.60.

187. **"Transactional Analyses of Work and Labor Markets"** by Chris Tilly and Charles Tilly, June 1994. $5.00.

188. **"Nation, State, and Language: An Invented Unity"** by Frída Thórarinsdóttir, June 1994. $3.75.

189. **"Softcore Solipsism"** by Charles Tilly, June 1994, $1.10.

190. **"Social Movements and Democratic Development"** by Sidney Tarrow, July 1994, $2.10.

191. **"Projects, Identities, and Social Networks: Brasilian Youth Mobilisation and the Making of Civic Culture"** by Ann Mische, July 1994. $2.00.

192. **"Selected Readings on Political Change: 1994 Version"** by Charles Tilly, July 1994, $8.00.

193. **"Democratic Change?"** by Anthony W. Pereira, August 1994. $1.80.

194. **"Caves, Crossroads, and CSSC"** by Kenyalyn Makone and Charles Tilly, September 1994. $1.75.

195. **"Stein Rokkan et les Identités Politiques"** by Charles Tilly, September 1994. $1.25.

196. **"Reconstructing the History of Popular Politics"** by Wayne te Brake, September 1994. $2.00.

197. **"The Outcomes of Social Movements: A Review of the Literature"** by Marco Giugni, October 1994. $3.10.