



# Critical Mass Bulletin

Newsletter of the Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements,  
American Sociological Association  
Volume 27 (1)  
Spring, 2002

## **Critical Mass Welcomes New Editor**

This issue is my last as editor of Critical Mass. When I came to the section and to its newsletter three years ago, I had three objectives. The first was to create new format that was pleasing to the eye and which could be produced entirely electronically from submissions to publication by ASA. Certainly the last part of this was achieved and judging from member feedback, CM's format has improved. I also felt, as did many of the section's leaders, that we needed to have far more discussion in CM of the issues which motivate us to be in the section in the first place. This has proven to be more difficult, given the amount of time necessary to solicit and edit even brief "state of the sub-field" articles. However, with the help of our chair and the publications committee, we are well on our way to institutionalizing the regular publication of such articles. Finally, I wanted to be sure that editorship of CM did not rest in my hands so long as to become a burdensome duty, and that new editorship, with new energy and new ideas after every 2-3 years would become a reality. I'm happy to report that our new editor, [Kathleen E. Hull](#), recently appointed assistant professor of sociology at the University of Minnesota, will be taking over as editor of CM beginning with the next issue. From our correspondence in the process of passing the baton, I'm confident that she will continue to improve CM as a forum for critical debates in collective behavior and social movements. See you all at Notre Dame and at the ASA in Chicago.

*Adam Flint, editor ex-officio, Critical Mass.*

## **Deadline for Fall 2002 Critical Mass Bulletin: October 15**

### **CBSM Workshop 2002: Authority in Contention**

Preparations for the section's workshop/conference have been proceeding at a quick clip in recent weeks. The conference, [Authority in Contention](#), will be held at the University of Notre Dame, August 14-15, 2002 (the two days prior to the ASA meetings). Notre Dame is about 90 minutes from downtown Chicago and therefore the conference should be a convenient addition to your summer conference schedules. Authority In Contention will focus on the general conceptualization of social movements as collective challenges to authority structures--broadly construed to include political, corporate, bureaucratic, civic, religious denominational, and cultural structures.

Papers and/or discussions include consideration of different types of authority structures, the array of collective challenges to them, differences and similarities among movements in response to different authority structures, and the implications of these observations for the various perspectives on social movements and for theorizing about social movements in general.

The conference will be made up of three different types of sessions: plenary sessions (when all conference participants will be together), concurrent paper sessions, and

topical working groups. Plenary sessions will address the fundamental themes of the conference and help to broadly set the agenda for discussions in working groups. Concurrent paper sessions will provide presentations on more specific research topics relevant to the conference theme. Working groups are intended to provide a more informal format in which participants interested in a particular topic area can react to plenary addresses, discuss related research ideas in early development phases, or take up a more detailed discussion of papers presented.

Much more information about the focus and structure of the conference (including a full schedule of sessions) is available at the conference website:

[www.nd.edu/~dmyers/workshop/](http://www.nd.edu/~dmyers/workshop/). As we near August, it is our hope that participants will also use the website to exchange ideas in preparation for the conference. To assist with that function, we have constructed a conference listserv and a listserv for each of the working groups. Individuals can post to these listservs through the website and can also view each listserv archive.

The conference website will also provide registration information and forms as soon as they become available. Due to generous support from a number of academic departments and institutes at the University of Notre Dame, the registration fees for the conference have been minimized (\$15 for students, \$25 for all others). To encourage the broadest possible participation, we have secured substantial funds to assist with travel expenses for international scholars and non-sociologists. We will also be subsidizing the lodging expenses for international scholars, non-sociologists, and graduate students. These funds are available on a first-come first-served basis and therefore we encourage you to examine the web page for additional information and encourage your colleagues and students to attend the conference.

-Dan Myers, Ann Mische, Dan Cress, Jeff Goodwin

## **CBSM Panels At ASA in Chicago**

### **Regular Sessions:**

- [From Environmental Injustice to Environmental Justice: A Critical Appraisal of the Environmental Justice Movement](#)  
*Jointly Sponsored by the sections on Collective Behavior and Social Movements and Environment and Technology.*

Organizers: David N. Pellow, University of Colorado at Boulder, Robert J. Brulle, Drexel University, Discussant: David N. Pellow; *"Social Movements, Identity, and Place: Environmental Justice as the Politics of Re-localization,"* Devon Pena, University of Washington; *"Mission Impossible? Environmental Justice Movement Collaboration with Environmentalists and Academics,"* Sherry Cable, Tamara L. Mix, and Donald W. Hastings, University of Tennessee at Knoxville; *"The Environmental Justice Movement: A Long Hard Road to Success,"* Bunyan Bryant, University of Michigan; *"The Half-Life of the Environmental Justice Frame: Innovation, Diffusion, and Stagnation,"* Rob Benford, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

- [Social Movements, Collective Creativity, and the Subversion of Hegemonies.](#)

Organizer: Elizabeth A. Armstrong, Indiana University; *"Ideas, Politics, and Cultural Change: Big Books and Social Movements,"* David S. Meyer & Deana Rohlinger, University of California-Irvine; *"The Cultural Influence of Social Movements: The American Indian Movement, Diffusion, and Reception,"* Timothy Kubal, University of Nebraska; *"The Academy as Free Space and Faculty as Transformative Intellectuals: Advancing the Cause of Racial Equality at Millsaps College and Tougaloo College,"* Maria Lowe, Southwestern University; *"Dilemmas of Collective Action: Searching for Agency in Social Movements,"* James Jasper.

- Refereed Roundtables

Organizer: Brian Donovan, Univ. of Kansas

1. Student Mobilization and Social Movement Theory

Presider: Jill Esbenshade, San Diego State Univ.; *"The 1961 Bowling Green Demonstrations: How the Students Won,"* Joseph Perry, Bowling Green State Univ., Norbert Wiley, Univ. of Illinois & University of California, Berkeley, Richard Carpenter, Bowling Green State Univ.; *"Politization of Youth on College Campuses: Thoughts about Theories of Youth Activism,"* B.C. Ben Park, Pennsylvania State Univ.

2. Movement Participation

Presider: Ed Collom, Univ. of Southern Maine; *"Protest Engagement in America: The Influence of Perceptions, Networks, Availability, and Politics,"* Ed Collom, Univ. of Southern Maine; *"From Movement Integration to Sustained Participation: El Salvador's Popular Movement, 1970-1981,"* Paul Almeida, Texas A&M Univ.; *"Explaining the Level and Diversity of Activism Among Leaders of the Republic of New Africa, 1968-1980: The Special Importance of Social Relations,"* Assata Richards, Pennsylvania State Univ.; *"Pulpits and Platforms: The Determinants of Political Participation and Protest among Black Americans,"* Scott Fitzgerald and Ryan Spohn, Univ. of Iowa.

3. Gay & Lesbian Movements and Countermovements

Presider: Kathleen Hull, Univ. of Minnesota; *"Untangling the Cultural from the Political: Opportunities for Christian Right Anti-Gay Mobilization,"* Kimberly Dugan, E. Connecticut State Univ.; *"Big Gay Organizations: Exploring the Development of LGBT Movement Organizations during the 1980s,"* Tina Fetner, Cornell College; *"Mainstream Politics: State Capacity, Mass Mobilization, and Gay-Rights Ordinances, 1974-1994,"* Regina Werum, Kathy Liddle, Emory Univ.; and Bill Winders, Georgia Institute of Technology.

4. New Directions in Framing Theory

Presider: Ira Silver, Wellesley College; *"Framing the Ballpark Debate: Community Planning in the Redevelopment Process,"* Caroline Lee, Univ. of Texas; *"Insiders, Outsiders, and Movement Brokers: Narrative Fidelity and the Indians of All Tribes Occupation of Alcatraz,"* Christopher Wetzel, Univ. of California, Berkeley; *"I Want You To See Me As a Person and Not As a Gang Member or a Thug: Young People Challenge the Language of Proposition 21,"* Fazila Bhimji, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

5. Violent and Nonviolent Movement Tactics

Presider: Patricia Steinhoff, Univ. of Hawaii; *"Perceptions of Social Actors and Violent Social Action: Government, Police Treatment and Civil Rights Leadership as Predictors of Riot Legitimacy,"* N. Walls, Univ. of Notre Dame; *"Insurgency and Political Outcomes: The Impact of Protests/Riots on Urban Spending,"* Arthur Jaynes, Ohio State Univ.; *"Nonviolence in Social Movements: Effects on Strategies, Resources, and Outcomes,"* Jack Ferrell, Northern Arizona Univ., Yuma; *"The Escalation of Violence in Protest Events: Comparing Accounts of the First Haneda Incident,"* Patricia Steinhoff, Univ. of Hawaii.

6. Social Movements in the International Political Context

Presider: Sukki Kong, Harvard University *"Toward a Robust Global Civil Society: Transnational Social Movements and Mobilization of Resources and Norms in Korea,"* Sukki Kong, Harvard Univ.; *"From Global Justice to Domestic Anti-War: Social Movement Spillover and Mobilization,"* Ion Vasi, Cornell Univ.; *"The Anti-Corruption Movement in Korea - Focusing on International Influence and Internal Political Context,"* Sangchul Yoon.

7. Social Movements and the State

Table Presider: Bayliss Camp, Harvard Univ.; *"Recreating A Movement*

*After Counter-Revolution: Solidarity in Poland After the Imposition of Martial in 1981,* Jack Bloom, Indiana Univ. Northwest; *"State-Directed Political Protest in US Capital Cities: Recent Trends, 1998-2000,"* Bayliss Camp and Matthew Kaliner, Harvard Univ.; *"Reclaiming Democratic Spaces: Civics and Politics in Post-Transition Johannesburg,"* Patrick Heller, Brown Univ.

8. Culture, Identity, and Emotions in Social Movements

Presider: Brian Donovan, Univ. of Kansas; *"Postmodernism, Lifestyles and Activism: An Investigation Of The Values and Actions Social Responsibility Movement,"* Ellis Jones, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder; *"Political Identity, Mobilization and Conflict in French-ruled Algeria,"* Lizabeth Zack, Rhodes College; *"The radical and the religious-social movements and the ideology factor,"* Tracey Kyckelhahn, Univ. of Texas.

9. Organizational Forms and Movement Mobilization

Presider: Jo Reger, Oakland Univ.; *"Activists for Others: Metaphors and Privilege in Alliance Movements,"* Susan Munkres, Univ. of Wisconsin; *"Grassroots Organizing in a Federated Structure: NOW Chapters in Four Local Fields,"* Jo Reger and Suzanne Staggenborg, Oakland Univ.; *"Seeing Beyond "Contentious Politics": Breast Cancer Activism, Education and Science,"* Jennifer Myhre, De Anza College; *"Organizational Failure: A Case Study of the Contested Process of Legitimacy,"* Ronda Copher, Univ. of Minnesota.

10. Political Opportunity Structures and Determinants of Movement Success

Presider: Leslie King, Univ. of Maine; *"Importing Rescue: Exploring the Impact of Opportunity Environment on Diffusing Tactics and Frames,"* Leslie King, Univ. of Maine, and Ginna Hustings, Boise State Univ.; *"Reform or Revolution?: Peasant Unrest in Northern Colombia,"* Cristina Escobar, Temple Univ.; *"Challengers, Private Targets, and Strategic Choices,"* David Kirchner, Millikin Univ.; *"The Development of the Civil Rights Movement: Relative Deprivation, Resources and Political Opportunities,"* Jon Agnone, Univ. of Washington.

11. Methodology & Social Movement Research

Presider: Dale Wimberley, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.; *"The Phelps Dodge and Pittston Mine Strikes: A Comparative Case Study for Teaching Social Movement Theory,"* Dale Wimberley, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Bradley Nash, Jr., Appalachian State Univ.; *"Methodological Strategies for Examining Populations of Social Movement Organizations,"* Bob Edwards, East Carolina Univ., and Kenneth Andrews, Harvard Univ.; *"Local Social Movements: An Ethnographic/Ecological Mapping Expedition,"* Richard Hutchinson, Weber State Univ.

12. Internet-Based Protest

Presider: Philip Howard, Northwestern Univ.; *"Internetworked Social Movements: Comparing the alternative globalization movement and terrorist networks,"* Douglas Morris, Loyola Univ.; *"Information Capital and Social Movements,"* Guobin Yang, Univ. of Hawaii.

## **The Importance of Modes of Discourse in Social Movements**

*Stephen Hart, SUNY-Buffalo*

Social movements have substantive political positions, values, and goals. This is the *content* found in their discourse. Content varies on the usual dimensions of political debate, such as left vs. right. But in addition, movements develop characteristic *modes* or *styles* of discourse, and these vary along different dimensions. Analytically, they are distinct from content dimensions and empirically, they often vary independently. Modes of discourse are politically consequential. Furthermore, they represent deeply held commitments more than instrumental choices. Studying them can strengthen our understanding of the cultural dimension of social movements. To make these

arguments, I'll use two examples, both from groups (broadly) on the left in which I did participant observation.

*The Cincinnati Area Coalition against U.S. Intervention.* At meetings of this group, which operated during the Gulf War, discussion was entirely on nuts and bolts. This was not an accident but an explicit choice. At a meeting in February 1991, when the end of the war was imminent, a draft political statement was brought up but put aside without discussion. Thus the group decided to refrain not only from taking a public position beyond demanding that the war end but also from any internal debate on the issues raised in the draft. A little later in the meeting, a member tried again to raise broader questions. What changes in our country, he asked us, should we seek given that we want it to make fewer wars? He argued that the goal of stopping the war didn't make sense any more because it was going to be over shortly. Instead, he said, we should think about our underlying purposes. He was, in a friendly way, ruled out of order. No such discussion as he proposed took place at that or any other meeting of this group.

What explains these outcomes? Practical explanations are implausible. Lack of time was not the issue. The next two hours were spent discussing, in mind-numbing detail, two elaborate proposals for the organizational structure of a group which was never to meet again. Nor did the constraints the group imposed upon itself come from concern to avoid alienating potential supporters, since the group restricted even its *internal* discourse. A third possible explanation, that the group was in danger of destructive internal conflict if discussion became broad or passionate, is also implausible, since the group was quite homogeneous politically.

Something deeper, some set of customs or rules appears to have been in play. There was an implicit rule that people's reasons for belonging and their ethical sentiments were an entirely private matter. Any discussion of topics beyond nuts and bolts was effectively embargoed. Connections between the immediate political issues at hand and general socio-political visions were not made. Nor were links forged between people's politics and general cultural traditions, such as religious and ethical values, to which they were attached. Furthermore, these activists expressed little passion, even though most of them were strongly committed to their cause.

This pattern, manifesting a highly *constrained* mode of public discourse, can be found among political groups of all stripes. Such styles are enduring patterns. Unlike the ones adopted by politicians under the influence of their consultants, they are usually not manipulated instrumentally. The operative rules expressed in these patterns are not just practical adaptations. Rather, they are ethically charged. They may be implicit or customary, but activists have a deep commitment to them. And in some groups, such as Amnesty International, one hears explicit, systematic, philosophical discussions about what style of discourse is best.

*Milwaukee Innerscity Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAHA).* MICAHA is an instance of congregation-based community organizing, which is happening in about 100 cities across the country. In some ways MICAHA, as I observed it in 1991-93, was similar to religious right groups (although it lacked the intolerance and strict cultural boundaries often found in such groups). It practiced a much more *expansive* mode of discourse than the Cincinnati antiwar group.

One difference is that religious faith was not just a private source of motivation, as it was for the people from the churches that I found in the antiwar organization and have seen in many other progressive groups, but a collective identity. At meetings, I found myself seated behind a manila folder bent into a simple name plate reading, "Steve Hart, St. Andrew's." Individual MICAHA activists, as this implies, were representatives of and links to religious communities. These communities were the "members" of MICAHA, committing themselves organizationally to confronting the corporate and governmental actions and inactions responsible for the woes of Milwaukee's less affluent

neighborhoods.

Another difference is that nuts and bolts consumed only part of the group's energy. Even routine business meetings included prayer and a short religious reflection period. More important, to be involved in organizing means that one is perennially being trained. MICAH people attended evening workshops, all-day training events, and a one-week training retreat. Training developed the ability of activists to connect their faith and ethical values to politics. It presented religious faith and scripture as having a strong public dimension, and melded a variety of religious social action traditions and the philosophy of community organizing developed by Saul Alinsky into a distinctive religio-political language which participants were encouraged to adopt. It challenged participants, often confrontationally, to "clarify [their] self-interest," which in practice meant taking ownership of their core purposes and making them a unified agenda for an integrated, intentional life. The actual religious content varied widely, but the ideal of connecting faith and activism did not. As an organizer in another city put it, "We do not expect a Unitarian to sound like an African American Baptist preacher, but maybe to be able to be as passionately connected to the substance and ground of their faith—whether it's Rilke or Jeremiah."

In short, MICAH's discourse was often passionate and transcendent, and persistently linked faith and values to political issues and public policy, forging connections between civil-societal cultural traditions and politics. Thus MICAH adopted different modes of discourse than the Cincinnati group. As in Cincinnati, this choice is not explicable simply on instrumental grounds (although organizers and leaders regarded a rich cultural life as good for the health of their groups). MICAH participants were far more committed to their religious communities and faith than to MICAH, and would have left the organization if they felt that anything other than a genuine religious impulse was at work.

In fact, they experienced their faith and activism as complementary. Participants frequently told stories about how they had learned, through involvement in organizing, to connect their faith to public life and become effective, engaged actors in the public arena. They often went on to tell of how, as a result, their spiritual life had deepened.

*Lessons from these examples.* Modes of discourse in social movements vary. The terms "constrained" and "expansive" capture some of the variations: instrumental vs. transcendent discourse, decoupling vs. linking of politics to cultural traditions, and so forth. Clearly choices of modes crosscut left-right differences. Yet it is also true that over the past generation conservative groups, on the whole, have engaged in more robust discourse than have progressive ones. As a result the right has often managed to seize the moral high ground when this was far from necessary or preordained. Adopting anemic discourse, in my view, has hobbled progressive politics in the recent period. Thus choices of discursive modes are politically consequential.

For social movement theory, these examples suggest that the cultural turn in our field manifest over the past decade or so could benefit by becoming even stronger. A generation ago, RM work normalized social movement organization and action, showing their continuity with similar activities in less contentious arenas. This work also demonstrated that mobilization was problematic, rather than resulting automatically from inequality or oppression. Organization and mobilization thus became independent objects of study. In Alexandrian terms, social movement theory became more multi-dimensional (except when the importance of cultural factors and sources of grievances was denied).

We are now moving toward giving a similar normality and independence to cultural factors, and need only complete that trajectory. This means, for instance, going beyond seeing the cultural life of social movements in social-psychological terms, as a factor contributing to participant commitment, or as part of the strategic work of movement

leaders. Rather, the symbolic-expressive dimension of movements needs to be studied in a way parallel to that sociologists in other fields use when studying religion, ideology, or popular culture as part of the life of whole societies. We also need to be looking at how movement discourse both draws upon and impacts other forms of discourse in the same society, and increasingly around the world, much as we now examine the exchange of resources between movements and other organizations and institutions. And finally, just as RM showed that organizational structure and mobilization were problematic and constructed, we need to avoid thinking of the values and perspectives of progressive movements as something natural or automatic. It's easy to think that the religious right is floridly cultural while the work of economic justice groups expresses interests and the stance of human rights groups stems from the *absence* of religious or irrational prejudices. This snare is especially tempting when such groups engage in highly constrained discourse. But the construction of progressive moral languages, for economic equality or human rights, in fact happens historically and through human effort. The cultural dimension of social movements is as important, politically and analytically, on the left as on the right.

*This article draws in part on material in the author's recent Cultural Dilemmas of Progressive Politics: Styles of Engagement among Grassroots Activists (Chicago, 2001). It also reflects discussions with other people studying movement culture, particularly Paul Lichterman and Nina Eliasoph. E-mail [sahart@buffalo.edu](mailto:sahart@buffalo.edu); home page [www.buffalo.edu/~sahart/](http://www.buffalo.edu/~sahart/).*

## **Transnational Feminist Networks and the Financing For Development Conference**

Valentine M. Moghadam  
Director of Women's Studies and Associate  
Professor of Sociology, Illinois State University  
2001-2002 Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars,  
[vmmogha@ilstu.edu](mailto:vmmogha@ilstu.edu)

The UN's International Conference on Financing for Development (FfD) took place in Monterrey, Mexico, in March 2002, and many non-governmental organizations, some of which may be deemed civil society organizations or social movement organizations, participated in the preparatory meetings as well as in the Monterrey conference itself. Among them were women's groups that I call *transnational feminist networks*. I coined this term to describe a new type of women's organization that I kept encountering in the 1990s, during my years as a United Nations staff member and researcher. Like many international non-governmental or advocacy organizations, TFNs are intertwined with the UN system.

TFNs bring together women from three or more countries – developed and developing alike – around a common agenda that typically pertains to women's human rights, reproductive health and rights, peace and anti-militarism, or a critique of economic policy. Whether they are fluid and loosely organized or more formal and professionalized, they evince both a utopian vision and a practical engagement with policy and international organizations. Most are very critical of existing political and economic arrangements, and bring a distinctive feminist perspective to bear on matters of global concern, such as human rights, the environment, and economic justice. At the same time, they conduct research, advocacy, and lobbying on public policies related to their agendas, and they engage with policies and institutions at the national, regional, and global levels.

TFNs are part of the family of transnational social movement organizations (TSMOs) that Jackie Smith and her colleagues have analyzed, or the transnational advocacy networks (TANs) that Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink have discussed. Indeed, they have taken part in broad coalitions and campaigns, such as Jubilee 2000, the campaign to end the Third World debt, and the global justice movement. Like other such

organizations and advocacy networks, they see themselves as change agents. But there are some differences, or rather some defining features of TFNs, which set them apart from other TSMOs or TANs. One pertains to their collective identities, that is, their identification as *global feminists*, while another pertains to their discourse, which is a call for *gender justice* as well as economic justice. A third distinctive feature lies in the supra-national or internationalist politics of TFNs; in this respect they differ from some other anti-globalization or economic justice groups that are more nationalist and protectionist in their orientations.

In recent years I have been studying six TFNs, in terms of their origins, structures, and strategies, and their relationship to the process of globalization, and I have been compiling documentary and interview data about them, as well as consulting secondary sources. Three of my sample took part in preparations for the Monterrey conference. They are DAWN (Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era), WIDE (Women in Development Europe), and WEDO (Women's Environment and Development Organization). DAWN is a transnational network of feminist activists and social scientists, almost all of whom live in developing countries, with branches in the Caribbean, Latin America, and South Asia. WIDE consists of 12 European women's organizations and is headquartered in Brussels, where it actively lobbies European Union institutions. WEDO is a more professionalized organization that is based in New York, but has board members and contacts in developing countries. All three networks offer a feminist critique of neoliberalism and seek to develop an alternative feminist economics framework. While each has its own structure and activities, they collaborate on specific projects. For example, they may jointly produce policy briefs or set up economic literacy workshops; they organize the women's caucuses of major UN-sponsored inter-governmental conferences; and they take part in other, issue-oriented networks such as the International Gender and Trade Network, the Women's International Coalition for Economic Justice, and Women Working Worldwide (which set up the women's caucus at the first Ministerial Conference of the WTO in Singapore in 1996).

What were some TFN activities around economic policy and the Financing for Development (FfD) Conference? For months, TFNs issued reports, policy briefs, and working papers on the FfD process, as well as on substantive issues such as gender and macroeconomics, gender and trade policy, the feminization of poverty, gender budgets, and the impact of economic liberalization on women farmers, entrepreneurs, and wage workers. Their newsletters have been devoted to exploration of the issues, and policy papers are posted on their websites. They have attended regional preparatory meetings and deliberated over the draft "consensus document". They joined with other NGOs to endorse the objectives of the September 2000 Millennium Summit, which included the goal to halve the percentage of people living in absolute poverty by 2015. Many of these activities were commissioned or funded by the UN's Development Fund for Women, which may be regarded as a "movement agency" and whose executive director is a founding member of DAWN.

An example from one European women's organization affiliated with two TFNs illustrates the way that TFNs engage with policies and institutions at national, regional, and global levels, almost simultaneously. Over several days in October 2001, the Danish women's organization KULU, which is associated with both WIDE and WEDO, organized an international conference entitled "Women in the Global Economy - Financing for Development - Investing in Women". A seminar on the impact of trade and the WTO on women in the framework of the FfD process also took place. In order to reach Danish politicians and the public alike, KULU arranged for the conference to be held at the Danish Parliament. Later, KULU took part in the European Network Meeting, where various NGOs exchanged information about ongoing activities, future strategies and evaluation of FfD activities. At this meeting, KULU pressed other organizations to help educate politicians regarding the gender aspects of trade and environment policies. A representative of KULU was part of Denmark's official delegation to the



Fourth Ministerial meeting of the WTO, which took place in Doha, Qatar, in November 2001.

Following the Monterrey conference, women's groups, including DAWN, WIDE, and WEDO, criticized the FfD final consensus document, arguing that it did not include the necessary commitments from industrialized countries to eradicate poverty. They also reject the document's affirmation of the current model of globalization as the strategy for reducing poverty, which they argue impedes the ability of states to carry out socio-economic development objectives. The United Nations has provided an important space for women to gain recognition of their rights and concerns, and many women attended the Monterrey conference. It was, however, perhaps inevitable that critical feminist perspectives would not be incorporated into the final consensus document, which was drawn up within the traditionally male, and currently neoliberal, preserve of finance. Nonetheless, the chief of the finance and development branch of the UN's Department of Economic and Social Affairs insisted that the consensus document affirms the need to "mainstream the gender perspective into development issues" by taking into account that men and women are affected differently by current economic models and development policies. [Cited in Laurence Patin, "Women's Groups Critical of Outcome at Monterrey", *Women's Enews*, 26 March 2001, via Internet.]

My research shows that TFNs, like other TSMOs and TANS, are shaping, and are shaped by, global governance and international organizations. They are in a dynamic relationship with states, the media, and intergovernmental organizations. TFNs use the global, inter-governmental arena to accomplish national priorities, such as the advancement of women's socio-economic welfare and rights. They challenge states and seek to enhance public awareness while also critiquing global forces and engaging with international policy. Through their research and communications activities they help to diffuse new ideas, norms, and frames, such as "engendering development", "feminization of poverty", "gender justice and economic justice", and "women's empowerment". Like other TSMOs and TANS within the global justice movement, TFNs promote social democratic policies, such as adoption of the Tobin Tax on speculative financial transactions, the implementation of socio-economic standards and rights, and the valorization of women's unpaid work, as well as the democratization of economic decision-making. Keck and Sikkink state that TANS "try not only to influence policy outcomes, but to transform the terms and nature of the debate. They are not always successful in their efforts, but they are increasingly relevant players in policy debates" (p. 2). This is equally true of transnational feminist networks.

## FELLOWSHIPS

The United States Institute of Peace invites applications for the 2003-2004 Senior Fellowship competition and the Peace Scholar dissertation fellowship competition in the Jennings Randolph Program for International Peace. The United States Institute of Peace is an independent, nonpartisan institution created by Congress to strengthen the nation's capacity to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict. **Senior Fellowships** are awarded annually to scholars and practitioners from a variety of professions, including college and university faculty, journalists, diplomats, writers, educators, military officers, international negotiators and lawyers. The Institute funds projects related to preventive diplomacy, ethnic and regional conflicts, peacekeeping and peace operations, peace settlements, post-conflict reconstruction and reconciliation, democratization and the rule of law, cross-cultural negotiations, nonviolent social movements, U.S. foreign policy in the 21st century, and related topics. Fellows reside at the Institute for a period of up to ten months to conduct research on their projects, consult with staff, and contribute to the ongoing work of the Institute. Projects which demonstrate relevance to current policy debates will be highly competitive. The fellowship award includes a stipend, an office with computer and voicemail, and a part-time research assistant. The competition is open to citizens of all nations. Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply. Application

materials must be received by September 16, 2002.

**The Peace Scholar program supports doctoral dissertations** that explore the sources and nature of international conflict, and strategies to prevent or end conflict and to sustain peace. Dissertations from a broad range of disciplines and interdisciplinary fields are eligible. Peace Scholars work at their universities or appropriate field research sites. Priority will be given to projects that contribute knowledge relevant to the formulation of policy on international peace and conflict issues. Citizens of all countries are eligible, but must be enrolled in an accredited college or university in the United States. Applicants must have completed all requirements for the degree except the dissertation by the commencement of the award (September 1, 2003). The dissertation fellowship award is \$17,000 for one year and may be used to support writing or field research. All application materials must be received in our offices by November 1, 2002.

For more information and an application form for either competition, please visit the Institute's website at [www.usip.org](http://www.usip.org), or contact the Jennings Randolph Program, U.S. Institute of Peace, 1200 17th Street, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036-3011, USA, phone: 202.429.3886, fax: 202.429.6063, e-mail: [jrprogram@usip.org](mailto:jrprogram@usip.org).

## **PUBLICATIONS**

- Jill Bystsydzienki & Steven Schacht, eds. 2001. "Forging Radical Alliances Across Difference: Coalition Politics for the New Millennium. Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.
- Michael Lounsbury and Marc Ventresca (eds.) 2002. Social structure and organizations revisited. Research in the Sociology of Organization 19 (JAI/Elsevier Science).
- Jackie Smith and Hank Johnston. 2002. Globalization and Resistance. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- Mark R. Warren. 2001. "Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy. Princeton Univ. Press.

## **Web site for Scholars of Japanese Social Movements**

[www.takazawa.hawaii.edu](http://www.takazawa.hawaii.edu) contains annotated bibliographies for a large collection of primary and secondary materials on Japanese social movements at the University of Hawaii. The collection contains 1800 books, more than 13,000 issues of a thousand different serial titles, a thousand pamphlets, extensive clipping files, manuscripts, legal documents, and miscellaneous other materials. They cover a wide range of Japanese social movements of the 1960s through early 1990s, primarily those connected to the New Left.

Although the materials themselves are in Japanese, the project was designed to support the needs of American students and scholars with an interest in these social movements. The items are annotated in English and searchable in English or Japanese. Sample covers are also posted for the serials and pamphlets. The bilingual search lists serve as glossaries for words relevant to Japanese social movements and SMOs. The site also contains annotated links to the Japanese websites of some of the organizations covered in the collection. More research aids for non-native speakers of Japanese who are interested in Japanese social movements will be developed in the future. A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities supported the cataloguing of the collection and development of the website. The collection does not circulate, but copies can be made of some materials, and academic visitors are welcome to use the collection at the University of Hawaii.

## **MOBILIZATION RANKS AMONG THE TOP JOURNALS IN CITATIONS**

*Hank Johnston, San Diego State University*

Lately, I have been told by several colleagues, Mario Diani, John McCarthy, and most recently Bob Edwards, that *Mobilization* does very well in terms of citations when compared with other top-ranking sociology journals. Below are the results of a brief search of the *Social Science Citation Index* forwarded to me by Bob Edwards (and jointly done with John McCarthy). *Mobilization* ranks eighth in citation rate, just below *Social Problems*, and above *Sociological Perspectives*, both well-known and respected journals in their own right. Both are published quarterly and both more than forty years old. *Mobilization* is only in its seventh year of publication, and until 2002 was published semiannually.

*Mobilization* began publishing in 1996 and was first cited in 1997, citations for other journals were counted as if they too had begun publishing in 1996. Thus, only citations of articles with 1996 or more recent publication dates were counted. Also, because *Mobilization* only published two issues per year and the others are quarterly and often contain more articles per issue, the analysis focuses on citations from 1996 to date per article published to control for these factors. By this metric *Mobilization* does very well. This analysis is dated as of November 2001. Even more impressive, until this year, *Mobilization* was not included in the SSCI, which is an important scholarly tool. With SSCI indexing, surely *Mobilization's* citations would have been even higher. With SSCI indexing to begin in 2002, and now that our journal is published three times a year, prospective authors can be assured that citations of their work will be even higher.

This ranking is good news to section members, and indeed to all members of the international community of social movement scholars. Back in 1996, *Mobilization* was begun to fill a need in the field for a specialty journal where researchers could have their work published in a timely way and in a medium that was widely distributed and read by other researchers in the field. At that time, there was not a publisher in sight that thought that such a journal was needed and worth risking even a small investment of time and promotional funds. ASA was not willing to either, although recently its policy has changed. With the help of a distinguished editorial board, we went ahead anyway on the conviction that a genuine niche existed and that a reasonably priced journal could make a go of it. That year, the first issue of *Mobilization* was published on a shoestring. One thousand copies were distributed to free of charge to ASA and APSA section members, and to members of ISA social movements research committees. Without the support of top scholars who supported *Mobilization* in those early issues with commitments to publish their research, the journal would have struggled like many others. Additionally, *Mobilization's* origins meant that it was *not* supported by deep pockets of a transnational publisher with 700 academic journals and exorbitant prices. Nor were there marketing funds for mass mailings and advertisements. Nevertheless *Mobilization* carved its niche. Two years ago, one large publisher's executive editor was surprised by our subscription base at the five-year mark. "That's better than most of our specialty journals do, and usually after 10-15 years at that," she told me. It is certain to me that the impressive citation rate in the table below is a reflection of high quality of *Mobilization's* articles, especially in the early issues, as well as the journal's consistent policy of rigorous peer review and our commitment to publishing only the most compelling research, clearly worded and argued. We have always asked a lot of our authors—simply put, it's in the best interest of our readers, and in the long-run it's in the best interest of our authors too as the journal's ranking rises. Last year our acceptance rate was eighteen percent. This was very tight for a semiannual journal and partly explains why *Mobilization* started publication three times a year in 2002. Space does not permit thanking each member of our editorial board by name, nor the hundreds of peer reviewers who have collegially lent us their expertise to evaluate manuscripts. Special thanks, however, go to David Meyer, whose tenure as book review editor made the book section a top *Moby* feature. Also, special thanks go to Heidi Swarts, whose sharp editorial eye has shaped some of *Mobilization's* best work.

Finally, *Mobilization's* success is also partly due to its global scope. Although the journal

is strongly linked to the CBSM section, there has always been an emphasis on contributions from international scholars in recognition of the growing globalization of grievances and social movement repertoires, and of the interconnectedness of social movement scholars. Today, one third of our subscriptions are outside the U.S. In the past 6 years, each issue has had important contributions from at least one—and many times several—researchers from Europe, Australia, and Asia. European Editor, Mario Diani has shepherded many of these articles to *Mobilization's* pages.

**Table 1. Journal Rankings by SSCI Citations.**

<b>Journal</b>	<b>Publisher</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Rate<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Articles<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Cites<sup>c</sup></b>
<i>American Sociological Review</i>	ASA	General	8.190	342	2801
<i>J. of Health &amp; Soc Behavior</i>	ASA	Specialty	7.951	144	1145
<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	UC	General	6.520	227	1479
<i>Social Forces</i>	SSS	General	5.110	191	976
<i>Demography</i>	ASA	Specialty	4.530	257	1165
<i>Sociology of Education</i>	ASA	Specialty	2.844	109	310
<i>Social Problems</i>	SSSP	General	1.682	173	291
<b><i>Mobilization</i></b>	<b>SDSU</b>	<b>Specialty</b>	<b>1.286</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>90</b>
<i>Sociological Perspectives</i>	PSA	General	1.195	200	239
<i>Sociological Quarterly</i>	MWSA	General	1.068	190	203
<i>Sociological Forum</i>	ESS	General	.717	272	195
<i>Sociological Inquiry</i>	AKD	General	.680	284	193
<i>Sociological Spectrum</i>	MSSA	General	.647	133	86
<i>Sociological Theory</i>	ASA	Specialty	.515	103	53

**Notes**

<sup>a</sup> Number of citations per article published (1996 - date).

<sup>b</sup> Articles, commentaries, replies (but not book reviews).

<sup>c</sup> Gross number of citations of anything published in each journal.