of the new manual that reads like a sociology textbook—a rather good one, at that. But admonitions to study the local society and to behave with cultural sensitivity will not work if the fundamental sociological assumptions underlying counterinsurgency doctrine are flawed. The misguided notion that providing material benefits will increase government legitimacy and thereby erode support for the insurgency remains at the heart of current thinking.

Counterinsurgency continues to be seen as a popularity contest rather than as a competition for control between two (or more) forces that claim to be the effective government. The inherent complexity of armed conflict is reduced to a simple dichotomy of "insurgency" versus "civil war." The notion of deeply rooted group antagonisms remains a taboo area. The micro-foundations of nation-building are poorly understood. The upshot of this accumulation of conceptual errors and blind spots is that the contemporary American military is like a blind boxer, swinging wildly, hoping to land a lucky punch. Counterinsurgency is hard; it is made still harder by the inability of the military to transcend an analysis that is as mistaken now as when it was first written 40 years ago. Dusting off old books is not the same as learning.

Recommended Resources

David Galula. 1964. *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice* (Praeger). Written by a French officer with considerable experience in combating insurgency, this book has been widely read by American military officers in recent years.

Jeff Goodwin. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945–1991* (Cambridge University Press). The best sociological survey of modern insurgencies.

Stathis Kalyvas. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War* (Cambridge University Press). Exhaustive survey of violence and political control in civil wars and insurgencies, with a tightly argued theory and a case study of Greece.

Jeffrey Race. 1972. *War Comes to Long An: Revolutionary Conflict in a Vietnamese Village* (University of California Press). A detailed study of insurgency and counterinsurgency in a Vietnamese province near Saigon.

D. Michael Shafer. 1988. *Deadly Paradigms: The Failure of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy* (Princeton University Press). A clear exposition of American military thinking about counterinsurgency, focusing on Greece, the Philippines, and Vietnam.

Roger Trinquier. 1964. *Modern Warfare: A French View of Counterinsurgency* (Pall Mall Press). Another French book newly popular with U.S. military officers.

Part X

What Changes Do Movements Bring About?

Introduction

Social movements have a number of effects on their societies, some of them intended and others quite unintended. A few movements attain many or all of their goals, others at least manage to gain recognition or longevity in the form of protest organizations, and many if not most are suppressed or ignored. But whereas scholars used to talk about the success or failure of movements, today they are more likely to talk about movement "outcomes," in recognition of the unintended consequences. Some movements affect the broader culture and public attitudes, perhaps paving the way for future efforts. Others leave behind social networks, tactical innovations, and organizational forms that other movements can use. At the extreme, some movements may simply arouse such a backlash against them that they lose ground. (The far-right mobilization against the U.S. government which led to the Oklahoma City bombing probably inspired closer surveillance and repression of their groups than had previously existed.)

Radical Flank Effects Most social movements consist of diverse organizations and networks that disagree on strategy and ideology. Often, a more radical wing emerges that is more likely to use disruptive or illegal tactics and which develops a more pure (and less compromising) distillation of the movement's guiding ideas. The existence of a "radical flank"—more threatening to authorities—can have diverse effects on a movement. In some cases, it undermines public tolerance for the movement as a whole, making it easier for its enemies to portray it as undesirable. Authorities may decide to repress the entire movement, not just its radical wing. In other cases, the radical flank is threatening enough that the forces of order take the movement more seriously, often making concessions. The moderate flank can present itself as a reasonable compromise partner, so that authorities give it power in order to undercut the radicals (although the moderates must distance themselves from the radicals to garner these benefits). If nothing else, radical flanks, by creating a perception of crisis, often focus public attention on a new set of issues and a new movement. In many cases, radical flanks have a combination of negative and positive effects on the broader movement. See Haines (1988).

Even if we concentrate on movement goals and success for a moment, we see that most movements have a range of large and small goals. They may try at the same time to change corporate or state policy, transform public attitudes and sensibilities, and bring about personal transformations in protestors themselves. What is more, within a given movement different participants may have different goals, or at least a different ranking of priorities. And these goals may shift during the course of a conflict. Goals may expand in response to initial successes, or contract in the face of failures. When a movement faces severe repression, mere survival (of the group or the literal survival of members) may begin to take precedence over other goals. We have seen that movements have different audiences for their words and actions, and we can now add that they have different goals they hope to accomplish with each of these different audiences. A group may launch a campaign designed to prove its effectiveness to its financial backers, its disruptive

capacity to state officials, and its willingness to compromise to members of the general public. It may not be possible to succeed on all these fronts at once; there may be tradeoffs among goals.

Even a movement's goals with regard to the state and its many agencies can conflict with one another. Burstein, Einwohner, and Hollander (1995) contrast six types or stages of policy effects alone: access to legislators and policymakers, agenda-setting for legislators, official policies, implementation and enforcement of those policies, achievement of the policies' intended impact, and finally deeper structural changes to the political system. And this does not even include effects on repression—in other words, a movement's relationship with the police or armed forces.

Success in the short and the long term may not coincide. In some cases, these even conflict with each other, as when a movement's initial successes inspire strong countermobilization on the part of those under attack. This happened to both the antinuclear and the animal-protection movements (Jasper and Poulsen 1993). Efforts that are quite unsuccessful in the short run may have big effects in the long, as in the case of martyrs who inspire outrage and additional mobilization.

Overall, researchers have managed to demonstrate relatively few effects of social movements on their societies. In part this is due to their concentration on direct policy effects or benefits for constituencies. A large number of movements have met with considerable repression. Others have attained some acceptance for their own organizations without obtaining tangible benefits for those they represent. Still others have found government ready to establish a new agency or regulator in response to their demands, only to conclude later that this agency was ineffectual or unduly influenced by the movement's opponents. Scholars of social movements would like to believe that the mobilizations they study affect the course of history, but usually they have had to assert this without much good evidence.

A brief excerpt from William Gamson's classic, *The Strategy of Social Protest*, is an important statement of the meaning of success, reflecting a combination of mobilization and process perspectives. The stability and institutionalization of the protest group is as important as the benefits it achieves for its constituency. The assumption behind this approach seems to be that there is a pre-defined group ready to benefit, a group whose spokespersons have been excluded in some way from full participation in politics. In a later part of the same chapter, not included here, Gamson lists consultation, negotiation, formal recognition, and inclusion as signs of the protest group's acceptance. In the 53 groups he studied, 20 received a full response and 22 collapsed, while only 5 were subject to co-optation and only 6 pre-emption (Gamson 1990:37).

The piece by David S. Meyer reviews how movements have mattered for public policy, political institutions, and activists themselves. The personal consequences of activism are further explored in the chapter by Darren E. Sherkat and T. Jean Blocker. The activist identity is itself an important effect of social movements, just one of many cultural effects of movements. These cultural effects are perhaps the hardest movement impacts to study, yet they may be some of the most profound and longest-lasting outcomes. Many movements help articulate new ways of thinking and feeling about the world. Thus animal protectionists developed widespread sympathy for nonhuman species into an explicit ideology of outrage. Other movements raise issues for public debate, forcing informed citizens to think about a topic and decide how they feel about it. A majority may reject the movement's perspective, but it can still cause them to think more deeply about their own values and attitudes. Even those who disagree with anti-abortionists

have still had to decide *why* they disagreed. Still other social movements inspire scientific research or technological change, as the environmental movement has.

Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison have addressed some of these cultural effects in their book, *Music and Social Movements* (1998). They generally view culture as the arts. Art affects a society's collective memory and traditions, its "common sense" of how the world works. Culture is thus a bearer of truth, as they put it. They are keen to insist on the independent effects of culture in political life, on how our beliefs about the world affect our sense of what is possible and desirable.

One of the effects that Eyerman and Jamison mention is that movements create the raw materials for future movements. In their case, these are songs that movements may share with one another; the civil rights movement for instance generated a number of songs now associated generally with protest. Movements also create new tactics and other political know-how that future protestors can use. They also leave behind social ties that can be used to ignite new efforts in the future. The women's movement of the early twentieth century, for example, left a legacy of personal networks and organizations (as well as values and ideas) that the new women's movement of the 1960s could draw upon (Rupp and Taylor 1987; Taylor 1989).

There may be even broader cultural effects of social movements. On the one hand, they give people moral voice, helping them to articulate values and intuitions that they do not have time to think about in their daily lives (Jasper 1997). This is extremely satisfying for most participants. On the other hand, social movements can also generate extremely technical, scientific, and practical knowledge. They engage people in politics in an exciting way—rare enough in modern society. Unfortunately, some movements may go too far, when instead of trying to be artists they try to be engineers, telling others what is good for them rather than trying to persuade them.

The final excerpt by David Naguib Pellow and Robert J. Brulle discusses the achievements of the movement for environmental justice (EJ). They end by expressing their hope and concern for the future. The EJ movement has had many successes, but current and future challenges seems more daunting than ever. This is perhaps an appropriate note on which to end this volume. The world we live in is undoubtedly a better place thanks to past social movements (although some have certainly made us worse off). Yet current and emergent social problems—many associated with "globalization"—suggest that we need movements more than ever. Clearly, social movements will not soon disappear. We hope this volume has provided the reader with some ideas to understand them better.

Discussion Questions

1. What kinds of effects do social movements have on their societies?
2. What are the main institutional arenas in which protestors hope to have an impact?
3. Under what circumstances, or in what kind of movements, should we consider it a form of success for movement organizations to gain recognition, simply to survive?
4. How can movements contribute to a society's culture or knowledge, including its self-knowledge?
5. What kinds of unintended effects can a movement have?
6. What seem to be the main personal consequences of political protest?
7. What have been the main successes and failures of the environmental justice movement? What challenges will this movement face in the years ahead?