themselves, as in the Algeria, Chechnya, and Kashmir assassination campaigns, among others.

Sadly, the U.S.-led war on terrorism may inadvertently benefit the Islamists. This is the great debate among scholars of Islamic studies in the months since September 2001. Do the United States and its allies appear hypocritical in supporting autocrats in Muslim-majority countries while claiming to defend human rights and democracy? Will Muslims perceive the war on terrorism as evidence of Western hostility toward Islam? Will military action stoke Islamist radicalism or extinguish it?

In the short run, the war on terrorism has not generated the massive negative reaction among Muslims that some observers expected. Yet there is evidence to suggest that Islamism is gaining in popularity. Gallup polls of nine Muslim societies at the end of 2001 found that a majority considered the United States and the West to be hostile to Islam and Muslims. Since the beginning of 2002, Israel's military operations in Palestinian territories, with Western acquiescence, may have further radicalized Muslim attitudes.

Longer term approaches to the war on terrorism also face ambivalences. The modernization of Muslim societies, promoted by the United States and its allies as a buffer against traditionalism, may wind up fueling Islamism. Modern schools produce Islamists as well as liberals; modern businesses fund Islamist as well as other causes; modern communications can broadcast Islamist as well as other messages. Western culture, we are learning, is not the only form that modernity may assume.

Recommended Resources

Abou El Fadl, Khaled. *Rebellion and Violence in Islamic Law.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001. A thorough critique of Islamists' misuse of sacred sources as justification for terrorism.

Eickelman, Dale F., and James Piscatori. *Muslim Politics.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996. A valuable globe-trotting overview of variation in contemporary Muslim politics.

Ernst, Carl W. *Following Muhammad: An Introduction to Islam in the Contemporary World.* Boston: Shambala, 2002. A sensitive and insightful introduction to historical and contemporary developments in Islam.

Kurzman, Charles (ed.). *Liberal Islam: A Source-Book.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. An anthology of 32 influential writings, mostly late 20th century, by Muslims favoring democracy, multireligious coexistence, women's rights, and other liberal themes.

Kurzman, Charles (ed.). *Modernist Islam: A Source-Book, 1840–1940.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. An anthology of 52 influential writings by Muslims in the 19th and early 20th centuries favoring constitutionalism, nationalism, science, women's rights, and other modern values.

Lawrence, Bruce. *Shattering the Myth: Islam Beyond Violence.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998. A highly readable examination of key issues in contemporary Islamic debates.

Lubeck, Paul. "The Islamic Revival: Antinomies of Islamic Movements Under Globalization." In *Global Social Movements*, ed. Robin Cohen and Shirin M. Rai. New Brunswick, N.J.: Athlone Press, 2000. A provocative analysis linking economic globalization with global Islamic activism.

Wickham, Carrie. *Mobilizing Islam: Religion, Activism and Political Change in Egypt.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. The definitive work on Islamists in Egypt, documenting the methods through which secular university students are drawn to Islamist activism.

Wiktorowicz, Quintan. *The Management of Islamic Activism: Salafis, the Muslim Brotherhood, and State Power in Jordan.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001. A path-breaking study of radical Islamist groups in Jordan, based on extensive interviews with activists in illegal cells.

Part IV

Who Remains In Movements, and Who Drops Out?

Introduction

Recruiting activists and supporters is one obvious challenge that movements confront. Keeping these recruits active within the movement is quite another. Meeting this challenge is important because most movements need to work for many years or even decades to bring about desired changes. A movement that constantly needs to replace recruits who have dropped out is not likely to be very effective. And, of course, if too many people drop out and cannot be replaced, then the movement will decline or disappear altogether, an issue we take up more directly in part IX.

The reasons that people remain active in movements may be very different from the reasons they became involved in the first place. Recruits may greatly enjoy (or come to dislike!) their lives with other activists or movement supporters. The movement or movement organization may head in a direction that supporters either applaud or reject. Why people remain committed to a movement for some significant period of time, then, is a different question than asking why they joined in the first place; likewise, why some people drop out of movements is a different question than asking why some never joined in the first place.

> **Mass Society** Before the 1960s, most scholars took a dim view of protest. They preferred politics within normal institutional channels. They usually argued that people protested because they were swept up in irrational crowds, or because they had personality flaws for which they were trying to compensate. One popular theory claimed that people joined social movements when they had lost other organized contacts with the main institutions of their society, like clubs or churches. This makes them susceptible to demagogues like Lenin or Hitler. (The theory was heavily influenced by fears of communism and fascism.) In today's "mass society," people watch television as individuals, the argument goes, rather than going out and joining bowling leagues and volunteer groups. Few scholars still accept this argument, having shown that protestors are usually well integrated into their communities and social networks. See Kornhauser (1959).

Despite their importance, these questions have received less attention from scholars than the recruitment issue, but they have not been neglected altogether. The issue of commitment to a cause was taken up years ago by Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1972) in her study of nineteenth-century communes like Brook Farm and Oneida—communities that share a number of characteristics with social movements, including voluntary membership, idealism, and a rejection of certain aspects of the larger society (see also Hall 1988). Kanter emphasizes that commitment to a cause or group is simultaneously cognitive, affective, and moral—it involves people's beliefs, feelings, and moral judgments. Kanter catalogues a variety of "commitment mechanisms" that helped to keep people in the communes she studied, some of which lasted for many decades. Communes were more successful, for example, when they did not have to compete for their members' loyalties. The opportunities and temptations of the "outside world" would often pull people out of communes (just as they pull people out of movements), so they tried to insulate themselves in various ways,

sometimes geographically. Radical movement groups, which generally demand a lot from their members, also typically try to limit members' relationships with outsiders. Of course, the heavy time commitment that some such groups require of their members has the same practical effect, although activists notoriously "burn out" if too much is demanded of them for too long.

Another threat to commitment which Kanter found came from within the communes themselves, namely the possibility that members would spend too much time with family, friends, or people to whom they were romantically or sexually attracted, neglecting their obligations to the larger group. To prevent this, communes often separated family members, raised children communally, and prohibited monogamous marriages. Movements also face the potential threat of "dyadic withdrawal," as when movement activists meet, fall in love, and gradually withdraw from public activities for the pleasures of a more private life (Goodwin 1997).

> **Leaders** Research tends to focus on networks, organizations, and groups, but individuals matter to mobilization in many ways. Some social movement "organizations" are actually the work of a single person, even though she may be able to mobilize others for specific events. In more complex organizations, decisions at various levels are often made, in the end, by one or a few individuals. Some individuals become leaders because they are effective **brokers**, bringing together previously unconnected groups and organizations. In addition to these "influential" individuals, there are "symbolic" ones. A person such as Martin Luther King Jr. or Nelson Mandela may come to embody the aspirations, indignation, and other ideals of a movement in a way that can inspire members—or arouse opponents. This is one source of charisma.

Kanter also found that communes lasted longer the more they engaged in collective activities that forged a strong group identity and *esprit de corps*. Working, eating, singing, playing, praying, and making decisions together—all these activities, which movements also practice, helped to develop strong affective bonds among commune members as well as a strong moral commitment to their common enterprise. The reading by Eric Hirsch similarly emphasizes how collective "consciousness-raising" discussions and collective decisionmaking helped to build solidarity among members of a student movement opposed to university investments in South Africa. (Consciousness-raising groups were first popularized by the women's movement, especially its more radical wing, during the late 1960s and early 1970s.) Hirsch also argues that polarization and the escalation of conflict may build group solidarity as outside threats induce members to turn inward for mutual support and protection (intellectual, moral, and sometimes physical). The resulting "ideological purity" binds activists together, although it may also prevent them from understanding potential allies or making compromises (see the selection by Jane Mansbridge in part V).

The reading by Nancy Whittier explores how some women in Columbus, Ohio, continued to identify themselves as radical feminists, and remained committed to radical feminist principles, even though the women's movement as a whole had declined. They sustained their radical feminist identity through a number of mechanisms that overlap with those stressed by Hirsch: collective activities, including consciousness-raising groups and protest itself; interactions among a dense network of like-minded friends and acquaintances; the use of feminist language; and, interestingly, the ritual telling of "cautionary tales" about women who have "sold out" their feminist principles. These and other factors establish group boundaries between radical feminists and others.

Whittier suggests, however, that while group boundaries often become rigidified and exclusive when movements are in decline, the boundaries drawn by the radical feminists whom she studied generally became more permeable. Radical feminists became more accepting of and emotionally open to non-feminists and men, especially gay men.

In contrast to "nice" movements like these, Janja Lalich has written about cults that demand the full commitment—sometimes even the lives—of participants. Rescuing the idea of a "true believer" from older crowd and mass-society traditions, she shows that people become true believers, not because of their own personality flaws, but through group processes that remake people's views of the world, pressure them to obey charismatic leaders, and limit their perceived options. Although she discusses extreme types of groups, the same kinds of pressure for conformity are present in milder forms in all groups that depend on a serious time commitment by members.

Finally, Bert Klandermans explores why people disengage from movements, whether passively and unobtrusively or actively and loudly. Again, a variety of factors may push people to disengage, depending upon the movement they are in and their level of commitment to it. Unlike Hirsch, Klandermans suggests that polarization can lead people to pull out of a movement, rather than deepening their commitment to it. Sometimes people receive negative reactions from their "significant others" about their political commitments. (This is why communes and some movements try to limit contact with such people.) Disengagement often results from bad relationships—or few contacts at all—with fellow members. Activists often "burn out" from time-consuming and stressful work. People may withdraw from a movement organization when its strategy and tactics seem ill advised, although some then may jump to another group with a different strategy or tactics. Changes in the political environment may convince people that their enthusiasm for certain causes was misplaced or unrealistic.

Social scientists still have a lot to learn about why people stay in or pull out of movements, but the readings in this section make a good start.

Discussion Questions

1 What type of collective activities might help to sustain commitment to a particular movement? Might some such activities seem too demanding?
2 How might the escalation of a conflict between a movement and its opponents reinforce the solidarity of that movement? When might an escalating conflict lead people to disengage from a movement?
3 How do people sustain their commitment to a cause that has fallen upon hard times?
4 What traits and actions make a leader charismatic? Why do people follow him or her?
5 Why do activists "burn out"? What might movements do to prevent this?