The structure of social protest, 1961–1983 *

Peter S. Bearman

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

Kevin D. Everett

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

The inherent duality of protests — the fact that groups protest on issues — is exploited to model the social structure of group to group relations for all groups which protested in Washington DC over five periods, 1961–63, 1967–68, 1971–73, 1976–78, and 1981–83. The structural positions of groups are identified over time, and we show that a group's position influences the protest repertoire employed. Central groups in all periods define which repertoires are most dominant, and more peripheral groups appear as innovators. Using the structural positions of groups as a test of their salience, some of the predictions of the new social movement theory — that identity has replaced interest as the determinant of social protest, and that organized labor's role has declined — are tested. We find support for the first claim, and falsify the second. While new social movement groups have become more central in the world of social protest, the role of labor has not changed relative to its position in the early 1960s. Finally we develop some of the implications of the modeling strategy employed. Basic is the recognition that movement scholars be more sensitive to the context in which protests occur. This context is the structure of social protest.

Introduction

Social movement organizations and other groups organize and take part in protest demonstrations on issues that they believe are salient

Correspondence to: Peter S. Bearman, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Sunbelt Social Networks Conference, VIII. Many people have contributed to the research reported below, and we thank them, especially: Kent Redding, Pamela Oliver, Glenn Deane, and Harrison White. Funding to the senior author from the University Research Council and the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences at UNC–Chapel Hill is gratefully acknowledged.

to their interests. Protest is a form through which groups challenge the polity (Gamson 1975; Tilly 1978). Some of these groups challenge tangible social policies, such as the allocation of economic benefits, seeking redress for job discrimination, the development of new weapon systems, or the use of nets while tuna fishing. Other groups challenge a whole frame — social justice, inequality, capitalism — which embraces many smaller issues. And still others pursue the absurd, demanding legislation that will designate a happy hour for press agents, an Elvis commemoration, and “hate rides”. Taken together, protest demonstrations provide a window into the polity — a view of the array of interests, and identities, which induce political culture and drive politics.

Protests are also a resource (Lipsky 1968; Goldenberg 1975) employed by organizations to signal, as an “identification move” (Oberschall 1973: 308–310), the emergence of a movement and its particular concerns. And protests are a means towards achievement of a tangible end — gaining more power relative to the target of the demonstration (Wilson 1961). To achieve these ends, protest groups protest. The way they protest, the repertoires they employ, change in response to new opportunities (Tilly 1978; 1979) and the prevailing image of what constitutes a protest. We focus on repertoire as well, following the work of others that provides evidence that the innovation and diffusion of protest repertoires has played a central role in movement outcomes (Oberschall 1989; Morris 1981; McAdam 1983).

Gamson (1975) has shown that movement success is independent of the number of groups active at one time. This simple finding, among others, led to the development of the resource mobilization model, which stresses the internal constitution of groups, and their external sources of support, as the central determinants of movement success (Gamson 1975; McCarthy and Zald 1973; Morris 1981; Jenkins and Perrow 1977; Staggenborg 1988; Oberschall 1973). While generally sympathetic to this approach, we show that by shifting the frame of reference, and focusing on compositional effects, that structural shifts in the social protest sector can be seen to have implications for group repertoires, strategies, and the articulation of group interests. We model the structure of social protest over time and show that the structural position of groups shapes movement outcomes.

The basic idea is to exploit the inherent duality of protest — the fact that named groups protest on named issues — and thus induce

models of group to group relations defined by intersecting issues. We explore this idea by modeling protest events that took place in Washington DC over five intrinsically interesting time periods: 1961–1963, 1966–1968, 1971–1973, 1976–1978, and 1981–1983.

Our first goal is largely descriptive. We seek to model the social structure of protest over time. A second, more substantive, goal is to test aspects of the “new social movement” theory. We focus on two related arguments; first, that identity has largely replaced interest as the central determinant of protest group activity, and secondly, that labor’s role in social protest has declined markedly over time. Our models provide support for the first claim, while the second is falsified. Finally, we focus on the repertoire of protest and show that the dominant repertoires of each period are associated with the most central groups in the protest world. Shifts in the dominant repertoires of protest over time are associated with the mobility of groups across structural positions. These themes are the focus of the following sections. Below we describe the data and methods we use.

Data and Methods

National protest events occurring in Washington DC over five periods are analyzed. Beginning with the first period, 1961–1963 (p1), each subsequent period begins five years after the previous period started. Thus we focus on protest events from 1966–68 (p2) 1971–73 (p3), 1976–78 (p4), and 1981–83 (p5). This periodization reflects substantive interests; the emergence of the civil rights movement (1961–63), the expansion of the civil rights movement’s agenda under the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) (1966–68), the anti-war movement (1966–1973), the rise of the moral and conservative movements (1976–78), and coalitions which challenged the broad contours of conservative domestic, and foreign, policy in the early 1980s.

Our data consist of the 397 national protests which involved named groups in Washington DC from May to September ¹ (inclusive) in 1961–63, 1966–68, 1971–73, 1976–78, and 1981–83 and which were

¹ A small number of protests reappear at times which fall out of our sample frame — Roe vs Wade protests in January, Earth Day protests in April — but the vast majority of demonstrations take place in the summer. Blockmodels of the group structure of social protest using January and April protests for period 4 (1976–1978) and period 5 (1981–1983) yield images comparable to the models in which only summer protests were included.

reported in the *Washington Post*. Reported by the *Washington Post* were characteristics of the event, the target, issue, repertoire, size, arrests (if any), and other information which readers might find interesting. 485 different protest events were reported over the sample frame. Our models are restricted to events in which a group name was reported (397). Protests for which groups were not named tended to be very small. Over 300 groups protested at least once, only 100 different groups protested in more than one time period, and only a few were active across all five periods.

Issues varied widely as well. Some issues appear across more than one or two periods. We tend to think of them as "movements": the anti-nuclear movement, the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the anti-war movement, among others. But the majority of named issues appear only once or twice. Even within consistent movements, the issues motivating individual protests are rarely the same over the whole time frame. Thus, within the anti-nuclear movement, we observe protests against A-bomb tests, against arms exhibits, against MX missiles, and in commemoration of Hiroshima, to mention only a few of many. While they share a common issue domain, each event "discovers" a new concern, and each may draw support from a different group.

More than one group may protest at a single event and groups may protest on more than one issue. Consider the groups concerned with the rights of animals. The fate of dolphins caught in a web of fishing interests may at one time provide a spring for protest and activity, as might the issue of civilian review of government sponsored scientific research, or even army budgets which include allocations for training animals as agents of defense. Fish nets may not grab others and our group would protest by itself. In the second case, our group may find itself in an unholy alliance with fundamentalists who oppose all forms of federally funded research and in the third, with hippies who also happen to think that pets should run free and chase frisbees. Successful protests are those which enhance the salience of issues, by casting a wide net which allows others, ordinary people, as well as protest organizations, to resonate with the issue. Successful groups protest on issues which are salient to others.

While groups may reject coalitions with others whose values are offensive to their basic aims, only fools consistently reject opportunities for action made possible by other groups' protests. Marginal

groups may strive to gain legitimacy by riding the coattails of more established groups. Orthodox groups may find their new friends undesirable. In the mid-1970s, fundamentalist groups found themselves sharing issues in common with neo-Nazi groups, a "friend" most wished they didn't have. Conversely, the larger, more established groups often sought out the participation of smaller, emergent groups as a way of bolstering protest size and accessing potential new constituents.

Beyond shared participation in a given protest event, groups often protested around similar issues. Groups protesting against nuclear bomb tests, and allocations for the MX missile project, protested at different times. The named groups may have changed across each protest, yet we recognize that these protests cluster into larger frames or movements. We define groups as tied if they participate in protest events which share an issue domain. While groups that jointly share an event are necessarily tied, groups may be linked to other groups on the basis of issue homophily.

Duality of groups and issues

For the protest events which we analyze, the *Washington Post* reported the named groups that participated, and the issue which motivated a protest, for example, MX missile funding, opposition to budget allocations for reproductive counseling, housing or job discrimination, and so on. Issues were aggregated into 24 larger issue domains, listed in the appendix. Aggregation of issues into domains was relatively simple: all protests centered on women's reproductive rights were assigned to one domain, protests concerned with human rights of dissidents in foreign countries were assigned to another domain, protest events against the war in Vietnam were assigned to a third domain, those for recognition of gay rights a fourth, etc. Some "issues" evaded classification; support for a mandated happy hour, protests which were in favor of people with a high IQ, a demonstration against a new Park Service restriction on the size of signs that could be used in other protests, and so on. These odd events were assigned to a residual issue domain and were not included in our analysis.

A rectangular group by issue matrix was constructed for each period, such that a "1" in cell ij indexed the presence of a bond

between group i and issue j . If group i did not protest on issue j , we report a "0", thereby indicating the absence of a bond. By convention we call this adjacency matrix the GI matrix, reporting ties between groups and issues. It is easily shown, following the work of Breiger (1974), that, with ordinary (inner-product) matrix multiplication of the GI matrix and its transpose (GI'), one yields a group to group (GG) matrix. Likewise, multiplication of the 'GI and the GI matrices induces an issue to issue matrix (II) (Breiger 1974).

Many groups and few protests yielded group to group matrices far too sparse to generate robust models of structure, especially in the later periods, from 1976–1983. The fact of sparse matrices required an a priori aggregation of both groups and issues, if a robust image of social structure was to be obtained. Following the basic strategy for the aggregation of the listed issues into issue domains, we aggregated low activity groups into larger group categories. For example, the *Washington Post* identified 31 anti-war (Vietnam) groups active from 1966–1973. These groups — the Ad Hoc May 3rd Unity Committee, Spring Mobilization for Peace, People's Mobilization, Project Air War, REDRESS, Ad Hoc Committee for July 2nd Emergency Mobilization, etc. — appear only a couple of times, and are easily aggregated into a miscellaneous anti-war category. Likewise, groups such as the Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, the Disabled Liberation Front, etc., were collapsed into a "handicapped" group.

For many groups such as those involved in the Gay Liberation movement, the movement for women's rights, organized labor, among others, classification into aggregate categories, was relatively straightforward. For instance, the Jews for Social Justice, the Lancaster Committee to Save Soviet Jewry, Club Shalom, the Jewish Defense League, the American Jewish Association, Board of Rabbis, Cantors Association, and so on (19 unique groups), are classified as Jewish Groups. They all claim identity as Jews, independent of the issues which motivated their protest.

While the vast majority of named protest groups were easily classified, aggregation of groups into larger categories was not without difficulty. Often groups claimed identity on more than a single dimension. Thus, the Paralyzed Veterans of America claim identity on two bases, as handicapped and as veterans. Likewise, the D.C. Coalition of Black Gays, the National Congress of Negro Women, and the Christian Feminists, all identify themselves with respect to two — often

incongruent — identities and thus posed similar classificatory problems. All groups were assigned to only one aggregate category. In cases where a group's nominal identity suggested dual membership, we defined the adjective modifying the noun as the secondary identity. Thus, "Christian Feminists" were classed as Feminists (women's movement); "Black Gays" as Gay, and "Paralyzed Veterans" as Veterans.

Less problematic, was classification of protest groups whose nominal identity failed to provide a guide to their constituency, or focus. The Washington Blades (Black Power), Fair Education Foundation (fundamentalist), Committee for True Democracy (Radical Left) and West Virginians for a Better Society (community) fell into this class. The composition of each group, its lineage with respect to key members, and its stated aims determined the group to which a protest organization was assigned. We were unable to locate data of sufficient quality to allow classification of 23 groups; these were assigned to a residual category and not analyzed.

Identifiable groups with a consistent protest profile, SCLC, CORE, NOW, SNCC, NAACP, WSP, were not combined with other groups. Thus, the categories are heterogeneous with respect to the number of groups which compose them; 31 anti-war groups compose the anti-war (misc) category, 23 left-wing groups compose the radical left category, 6 neo-Nazi groups compose the Neo-Nazi category, and so on. In contrast some aggregate group categories consist of only 1 or 2 groups active in many periods.

In sum, both groups and issues were aggregated to form large categories, issue domains on the one hand, and "movements" on the other hand. As with all aggregation, data are lost along the way. The trade-off is that the blockmodels we obtain are robust — they are not distorted by insignificant ties, as are models drawn from sparse matrices. While the structural positions of tiny groups are lost as the result of aggregation, we retain the ability to model shifts in the positions of the substantively important movements and groups over the twenty-three years from 1960–1983.²

² A complete list of all groups and issues assigned to each of the aggregate categories is available upon request.

Selectivity

Newspapers selectively report events. Newspaper coverage of protest demonstrations is influenced by editorial policies (Mann 1974), production practices of the newspaper (Franzosi 1987) and by characteristics of the protest — its size, repertoire and the incidence of violence or arrest (Snyder and Kelly 1977). Newspaper coverage also reflects broader cycles of attention (Downs 1972); protest events at the start of an attention cycle are more likely to be reported than those at the end of a cycle (Tarrow 1989a). Selectivity in reporting protests may have implications for our findings on repertoires of protest. Innovative protests, those in which a new repertoire is tried out, may be more “interesting” to editors than those using more orthodox strategies. Protest events which draw politicians, artists, or other celebrities may attract more attention than those involving ordinary people.

Organizers understand too well the determinants of newspaper coverage and they work hard to ensure that their protest event is covered by the media (Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Greenberg 1985). Organizer efforts drive repertoire innovation. Their efforts also drive a numbers game in which size emerges as a basic determinant of event success (Everett 1992). While protests that brought more than 3000 people to Washington were huge in the period from 1961 to 1963, marches and rallies which today fail to bring out 30000 people are considered failures by organizers and the media alike. All groups recognize, with more or less skill, the prerequisites for media coverage; and all try to get in the paper (Kielbowicz and Scherer 1986). They adjust their repertoires accordingly, since they understand that protests which are not reported by the media are meaningless. While selectivity bias skews our observations to those events reported by the newspapers, the skew is substantive. Our data consist of all protest events — which took place within our sample frame — that mattered.

While newspapers do not capture all protests, other sources of data provide even less reliable coverage, and suffer from more serious selectivity biases. In Washington, Park Service permits were not issued systematically until 1967, and all police permit data fail to identify protests which were, strategically, carried out without a permit. Groups protesting without a permit tended to be more heterodox, and the repertoires they used were more innovative. Beyond this, permit data are extremely limited. The characteristics of the protest are not known

at the time the permit is issued, and so data on repertoire, size, violence, and arrests are missing. And for network models of group structure, permit data which report only the group(s) requesting permission to protest, fail to report the majority of bonds between groups. It is these bonds, of course, which form the basis of our models of social structure. Confronted by similar problems, others have also relied on newspaper accounts for data on collective action events (McAdam 1983; Burstein and Freudenburg 1978; Snyder and Tilly 1972; Olzak 1990; Etzioni 1970; Tarrow 1989b; Eisinger 1973).³

Selective identification

The majority of protests enumerated are events in which the *Post* reports only one or two participating groups. But for large protest demonstrations which brought together many organizations the *Post* often identified over 10 or 20 groups. While many groups are identified, across multiple stories, as taking part in larger protests, we know from experience that the *Post* does not identify all of the groups one observes as present.

This has implications for our coding of group participation. We control for selective identification by coding the presence of a tie between an aggregate group and issue domain in binary form. In constructing the GI matrix, we define a tie between groups and issues as present if one or more groups that compose an aggregate category participated in the protest event. For example, if some of the veterans' groups that participated in an anti-war protest were not enumerated by the *Post*, we would report a tie as present if one was. Likewise, if more than one group within an aggregate was enumerated by the *Post*, we treat the resulting group to issue tie as binary, and report a "1" in the appropriate cell.

Given selective identification of groups, binary coding acts to enhance the off-diagonal cells, relative to the main diagonal, in the group-group matrix. This induces more connectivity between groups than might otherwise be observed if we only focused on the frequency — rather than the pattern — of inter-group relations. It is worth

³ Newspaper indexes seriously under-report stories on protests covered. Our data are drawn from a complete reading of the entire paper for the 75 months covered (6885 days) in the sample frame. Kevin Everett collected all of the data reported in this paper.

noting that the images of structure we induce reflect an unanticipated lack of structure in a number of periods despite a coding convention which maximizes the opportunity for a rich and dense structure of inter-related groups.

Models

We define social structure as constituted by the dual group–group and issue–issue networks which are a byproduct of the basic fact of protest; that protest groups protest on issues. We code a relation between an aggregate group and issue as present, if one or more named groups which compose the aggregate group are listed in the newspaper. The group to group matrices for each period are analyzed with CONCOR (Breiger et al 1975), a frequently employed algorithm for detecting the structural equivalence of actors in a population. In all the models reported the cut-off was defined as 0.95. In the image matrices, a “1” is reported when the density of ties in cells l, j was twice the expected density. This is a more stringent criterion than that used in other blockmodeling studies, where cell frequencies exceeding chance distribution are reported as a tie. For data where known selectivity effects and our coding enhance the value of off-diagonal frequencies, it made sense to define a tie as present by a stricter measure than simply beating the null.

Centrality of groups was computed using the Bonacich (1987) algorithm. Beta was set to 0.01 for all models. Centrality scores were standardized, so that group categories, active in more than one period, could be directly compared. Programs were written in APL, and are available upon request from the senior author.

The structure of social protest over time

In this section we describe the structure of the group–group network induced from the group–issue (GI) matrix for each period. Block-model images provide the central referent. Our interest lies in identifying the structural positions groups occupy. Centrality scores of groups (Bonacich 1987) complement the structural models presented.

Table 1
The structure of group relations, 1961–1963

P1	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	1	1	1	0
2	1	1	1	0	0
3	1	1	0	0	0
4	1	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0

Block 1 = Quaker

Block 2 = Labor, Congress On Racial Equality, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee

Block 3 = Women, Catholic, Jewish, Fraternal and Service, Misc Civil Rights, Protestant, Community, Inter-Denominational, Black Power

Block 4 = Radical Left, Anti-Nuclear, Anti-Interventionist, Women Strike for Peace, Students, Civil Liberties

Block 5 = Neo-Nazi

In subsequent sections we focus on the role centrality plays in determining repertoire.

Period 1: 1961–1963; The early civil rights movement

Table 1 reports the blockmodel of the group–group matrix for the first period and the associated graph representation. The GG matrix is necessarily symmetric as it is the product of $GI \times GI^t$. In the graph representation, 1-blocks are represented by an arrow (identity) directed to the block itself. Ties between blocks are the product of shared issues. Blocks are composed of groups which are structurally equivalent in the GG matrix; that is, they share the same pattern of ties.

We identify two dominant movements active during the period from 1961–1963: the civil rights movement, associated with Block 2, and the

anti-nuclear and peace movement, associated with Block 4. These movements were largely decoupled. While federal domestic and foreign policies were challenged by many groups, only Quakers (Block 1) articulated and acted on a broader critique integrating the civil rights and peace movements. By the second period, SCLC, under King, was to develop another unified critique — also based on non-violence — explicitly linking the struggle for domestic civil rights to domestic economic policy and to US involvement in the Vietnam war. However, in our first period, Quaker groups were alone in bridging the gap between the domestic and foreign issue domains.

Groups which emerge as central actors in subsequent periods are peripheral in this period. Neither the radical left-wing nor the student groups, very active on the domestic front by the 1966–1968 period, were tied to the civil rights movement during its formative years. Church groups, community groups, and groups that were to become associated with the nascent women's movement, were largely marginal actors riding the coattails of the civil rights movement. All of these groups are assigned to Block 3. Note that this block has identity only in relation to other movements, and is not itself a cohesive clique.

The blockmodel suggests the critical role played by labor in the early civil rights protests. Organized labor is structurally equivalent to the central groups associated with the civil rights movement during its formative period — SCLC, CORE, NAACP, and SNCC. Table 2 reports standardized centrality scores for each group by period. Organized labor's centrality in the first period ($C = 1.32$, column 1) was quite high.

Block 4 is composed of those groups who protested on foreign policy issues alone. Groups in Block 4 — Women Strike for Peace (WSP), communists, students, anti-interventionists protesting against the Bay of Pigs fiasco, SANE, and others — protested against related policies. But they were unable to unify the disparate issues that motivated their protests to form a cohesive group. Again, it was the Quakers with a method for protest (non-violence) who brought these issues, and the groups which carried them, together.

The neo-Nazi movement was relatively active during the early 1960s, but the issues which they protested against bore no relation to the issues motivating other groups, and as a result, neo-Nazis groups emerge as structural isolates. This is the general pattern found in all periods — with the exception of period 4.

Table 2
Standardized centrality scores for group categories

Category	Per 1 61-63	Per 2 66-68	Per 3 71-73	Per 4 76-78	Per 5 81-83
Traditional Groups					
1 Radical Left	0.13	3.47	0.58	0.90	1.75
2 Neo-Nazi	0.57	0.03	0.01	0.78	0.00 *
3 Student	0.06	2.07	0.88	0.49	0.63
5 Quaker	3.44	5.74	4.46	0.00 *	0.28
6 Community/Consumer	0.44	0.35	0.29	0.20	1.53
7 Protestant	0.44	0.15	0.00	0.50	0.49
8 Fundamentalist	0.00	0.10	0.05	3.22	0.54
11 Veteran	0.00	0.75	1.70	0.10	0.59
12 Labor	1.32	0.87	0.33	1.00	3.22
13 Catholic	0.44	0.19	1.39	1.69	0.52
14 CORE	4.85	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00 *
15 SCLC	1.76	2.64	1.40	0.00	0.90
16 NAACP	1.76	0.35	0.00 *	0.00	0.67
17 Misc. Civil Rights	0.44	0.77	0.00 *	0.00	0.67
18 Fraternal or Service	0.44	0.00	0.00 *	0.00	0.06
19 Poverty Rights	0.00	1.52	1.20	0.00	0.00
20 Peace Coalitions	0.00	0.37	3.07	0.00	0.00
22 SNCC	1.76	1.33	0.01	0.00	0.00
24 Inter-Denomination	0.88	0.46	0.00 *	0.00	0.87
25 Misc. Anti-War	0.00	4.75	4.74	0.30	0.52
27 Jewish	0.44	0.16	0.12	0.15	0.67
29 Civil Liberty	0.00 *	0.19	0.00 *	0.40	0.43
31 WSP	0.15	3.33	0.85	0.59	0.00 *
33 Non-Interventionist	0.19	0.00	0.01	0.99	2.74
Mean Centrality	1.03	1.34	0.92	0.75	0.91
New Social Movement Groups					
4 Environmental	0.00	0.00	0.00 *	0.00	0.35
9 Gay or Lesbian	0.00	0.00	1.40	0.44	2.16
10 Women's	0.44	0.30	1.43	1.19	1.22
21 Senior Citizen	0.00	0.00 *	0.00 *	0.10	1.02
23 NOW	0.00	0.16	0.03	1.59	1.27
26 Handicapped	0.00	0.00	0.00 *	0.34	0.82
28 Native American	0.00	0.03	0.00 *	2.42	1.16
30 Anti-Nuclear	0.15	0.77	0.00 *	1.59	0.54
32 Black Power	0.88	0.15	0.86	2.05	0.87
Mean Centrality	0.490	0.236	0.413	1.214	1.045

* denotes that the category protested during period.

Period 2: 1966–1968; Integrating peace and civil rights

Martin Luther King was assassinated at the start of our third year. Before his death, he led the SCLC and elements of the civil rights movement in a new, more radical direction by linking black civil rights to broader economic and foreign policy concerns. The broader critique advanced by King and SCLC, coupled with the rise of black nationalist groups, fractured the civil rights movement. The central groups active in the formative years of the movement, CORE and NAACP, split away from SCLC to pursue a somewhat more conservative agenda.

During the second period (1966–1968), the anti-war (Vietnam) movement was consolidated. By the end of our period, in Chicago, the movement had succeeded in gaining the attention of the whole world. Both new groups, students, and the more traditional peace groups (Women Strike for Peace, the radical left, Quakers), took leading roles in the anti-war movement. But other protest groups, many active in the protests of the first period, found themselves sliding to the periphery. Just as many of the core groups in the civil rights movement split from King and SCLC, elements of labor experienced dissonance with the anti-war movement. Labor's role in domestic protest became fractured; heterodox unions continued to press for civil rights, while many of the more orthodox unions (AFL-CIO) withdrew from active protest.

This tension within the labor and civil rights movements, as well as the consolidation of the anti-war movement, are reflected in the blockmodel of this period's group-group structure reported in Table 3.

Blocks 1 (SCLC, Quakers, miscellaneous anti-war groups), and Block 2 (students, WSP, and the radical left) are tightly coupled cohesive movements. Block 3, linked to both the students in Block 2 and SCLC in Block 1, contains the younger elements of the civil rights movement (SNCC), as well as Veterans, church, peace groups and organized labor. An element of the conservative civil rights movement — NAACP — is isolated in Block 4 without ties to other groups. While retaining the support of Jewish and Catholic groups they are completely marginalized. Block 1 is tied to the domestic protest groups in Block 5, which also contains many of the groups later identified as new social movements — NOW and other women's

Table 3

The structure of group relations, 1966–1968

P2	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1	1	1	0	1	0
2	1	1	1	0	0	0
3	1	1	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0

Block 1 = Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Poverty Rights, Misc. Antiwar, Quaker

Block 2 = Student, Women Strike for Peace, Radical Left

Block 3 = Labor, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Peace Coalitions, Anti-Nuclear, Misc. Civil Rights, Veterans, Inter-Denominational

Block 4 = National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Jewish, Catholic

Block 5 = Black Power, National Organization for Women, Congress On Racial Equality, Community, Civil Liberties, Senior Citizen, Native American, Protestant

Block 6 = Fundamentalist, Neo-Nazi

groups, senior citizens and Native Americans. These new movements never protest on foreign policy issues — in a context where the most central groups are precisely those who rejected the decoupling of foreign and domestic protest.

Again the neo-Nazi groups occupy a marginal position. A new, fundamentalist group occupies the same marginal position — both groups protest on issues which are not salient to others and thus are structural isolates.

The Quakers remain most central ($C = 5.74$), but new actors — anti-war groups ($C = 4.75$), Women's Strike for Peace ($C = 3.33$), the radical left ($C = 3.47$), and student groups ($C = 2.07$) — emerge as key participants during the 1966–1968 period. Other groups move to the periphery. The most dramatic declines are experienced by main line, conservative civil rights groups. Labor's centrality score falls from $C = 1.32$ to $C = 0.87$, NAACP's centrality declines relative to the first

period from $C = 1.79$ to $C = 0.35$, and CORE's centrality falls from $C = 4.85$ to $C = 0.05$. These groups were caught unaware by the broad critique of American society proffered by SCLC, and the student left, which linked domestic and foreign policy. Entrapped by their traditional support of federal foreign policy, these and other conservative challenger groups were largely elided by the sudden shift in the structure of relations which the new critique of American society induced.

Period 3: 1971–1973; Coupling and decoupling

Coupling and decoupling is the central theme of this period. As with the earlier periods, we represent the structure of social protest during the period from 1971–1973 as an image matrix in Table 4. Consolidation of the anti-war movement coupled together an array of groups — assigned to Blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4 — in a tight and cohesive cluster. On the other hand, older groups were pushed to the margins, and became increasingly peripheral to the central anti-war movement. Most of these groups are assigned to Block 7, a heterogeneous collection of groups which are equivalent solely because of their marginality. In this period, we begin to observe the emergence of an organized women's movement. Although most of the women's groups are actively involved in anti-war efforts (B1) (Freeman 1975), NOW's isolated, though self-identifying, position in Block 6 foreshadows the emergence of a more cohesive women's movement, captured in our models for the fourth and fifth periods (1976–1983).

Blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4 each contain elements of the anti-war movement. Block 3 is linked by conservative elements of organized labor to the fundamentalist and fraternal organizations. In turn, fraternal and fundamentalist organizations share some issues with the marginal groups in Block 7. The ties between conservative and fraternal groups and the marginalized groups center on competing claims of identity. None of the groups in Block 5 or 7 are active on foreign policy issues.

Consolidation of the anti-war movement yields decoupling and a lack of structure for protest groups not locked into the anti-war movement. Note that the gay liberation movement, which first emerges in this period, is embedded in the anti-war movement. The gay movement propelled itself into national recognition by riding the coattails of a larger, more organized, movement. It appears central

Table 4

The structure of group relations, 1971–1973

<i>P2</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
3	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
4	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Block 1 = Quaker, Gay and Lesbian, Women, Peace Coalitions, Misc. Anti-war

Block 2 = Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Poverty Rights

Block 3 = Radical Left, Labor, Student, Veterans

Block 4 = Women Strike for Peace, Community, Black Power, Catholic

Block 5 = Fundamentalist, Fraternal and Service

Block 6 = National Organization for Women, Civil Liberties

Block 7 = Neo-Nazi, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Congress On Racial Equality, Jewish, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Native American, Anti-Interventionist, Misc. Civil Rights, Environment, Inter-Denominational, Senior Citizen, Handicapped, Anti-Nuclear

because the groups it protested with were central. On the other hand, most of the new social movements were unable to make use of the anti-war movement and remained marginal — despite the fact that they protested frequently.

The consolidation of the anti-war movement in period 3 (1971–1973) accounts in large part for its success. By 1973, the war was ebbing to a formal end, and with it, came the collapse of the groups and constituencies which formed the anti-war movement. The subsequent breakdown of the broadly based and cohesive opposition to federal policies made possible the sudden salience of the new social movements, which emerged as full-blown mature movements in the late 1970s.

Period 4: 1976–1978; The breakdown of consensus

From 1976–1978, the left-liberal coalition which had dominated the social protest sector since the late 1960s, disappeared. In its wake emerged the fundamentalist movement oriented towards the moral restructuring of civil society. Fundamentalist groups, and there are many — The Society for the Prevention of Sex Education in Schools, the Christian Defense League, The Freedom Leadership Foundation, the Concerned Citizens for God and Country, to name a few — are the most central protest groups in this period. Linked to conservative labor groups and community organizations oriented towards repeal of busing programs, drug abuse, and the sense that “community” was disappearing, the fundamentalists mobilized whole sectors of the American population not previously involved in the social movement sector.

At the same time, the period from 1976–1978 is marked by a phenomenal growth of new movements based on achieved lifestyle, rather than ascribed characteristics derived from their position in civil society. In many respects, both the fundamentalist and the new social movements which appeared in the late 1970s share an essential similarity. Both sought moral solutions to perceived threats to identity, and both demanded state protection for their lifestyle. Neither the fundamentalist groups, nor the new social movements, demanded that the state redistribute values in order to reduce inequalities derived from civil society. On the other hand, both the new movements, and the fundamentalists, saw state policies as differentially legitimating cultural values and lifestyles. Both sought to ensure that their style of life was protected (Melucci 1989; Offe 1985; Page and Clelland 1978).

Both movements are derived from the same macro-level changes which have appeared to blur the distinction between the public and private spheres. Fundamentalists and the new social movements have different interpretive frames for making sense of this shift, of course. While the new social movements want the public to make the private possible, fundamentalists recall a world in which the “private” was public.

Table 5 reports the structure of group relations for period 4, 1976–1978. The striking image is one of disaggregation of the social structure. Groups protest, but the pattern of group-group relations lacks an observable structure. But disaggregation makes sense in a

Table 5

The structure of group relations, 1976–1978

<i>P4</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Block 1 = Native American, Black Power, Radical Left

Block 2 = Fundamentalist, Labor, Community

Block 3 = Women, National Organization for Women, Civil Liberties

Block 4 = Misc. Anti-war, Anti-Nuclear, Jewish, Catholic

Block 5 = Women Strike for Peace, Anti-Interventionist, Student, Protestant

Block 6 = Quaker, Veterans, Senior Citizen, Gay and Lesbian, Handicapped

Block 7 = Neo-Nazi

context largely defined by movements which seek simply to articulate difference, and to claim legitimacy on the basis of their unique lifestyle.

There are elements of the old world present in the new world and they remain relatively cohesive. Block 5 (a 1-block) contains the remnants of the anti-war coalition, and the neo-Nazi movement is back in its usual position of isolation. Present, but isolated from the peace movement, are Quaker groups whose discomfort with the sanctuary movement contributes to their peripheral position.

Labor remains hopelessly split. Elements of organized labor protest with fundamentalists, while elements share redistribution issues with radicals in Block 1. It is worth noting that Block 1 continues the tradition established by SCLC of explicitly linking domestic struggles for civil rights to the broader social justice agenda. Left-wing groups, Native American groups (Trail for Self-determination, AIM, and

Table 6

The structure of group relations, 1981–1983

P5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Block 1 = Radical Left, Quaker, Labor, Anti-Interventionist, Inter-Denominational

Block 2 = Gay and Lesbian, Women, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, National Organization for Women, Senior Citizen

Block 3 = Civil Liberties, Environment, Black Power, Community, Native American

Block 4 = Misc. Anti-war, Student, Veterans, Anti-Nuclear, Women Strike for Peace, Handicapped, Protestant, Catholic

Block 5 = National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Misc. Civil Rights, Jewish, Congress On Racial Equality

Block 6 = Fundamental, Fraternal and Service

Block 7 = Neo-Nazi

Indians for Democracy), along with black power groups, found in South Africa an evocative metaphor, during this period, for addressing race discrimination at home. Finally, we see a complete reversal of the Jewish and Catholic protest movements, which shifted from domestic civil rights struggles, to involvement in foreign policy. By the end of the fourth period it seems clear that the civil rights movement is observably an empty shell.

Period 5: 1981–1983; Labor strikes back

Two process are apparent from the blockmodels of the group to group relations for the fifth period: the traditional protest groups (labor, Quakers, SCLC, NAACP) returned with strength, and the new social movements discovered the common framework that had eluded them

five years earlier. On the flip side, the meteoric rise of fundamentalist protest evidenced as sudden a decline. The main reason is that the goals which they sought to achieve in the Carter years were being implemented by the Reagan administration. The structure of group relations for period 5, 1981–1983, is reported in Table 6.

Three blocks, blocks 1, 2, and 5 are 1-blocks. The old civil rights movement emerged as unified (Block 5) for the first time since the late 1960s. New social movements, Gays, Women, Senior Citizens, NOW, along with SCLC compose Block 2. Organized labor, the most central group (3.22), dominates the traditional left — which remains active on both the domestic (ties to Blocks 2 and 5), and foreign policy fronts (ties to Block 4). Block 4 contains the old anti-war coalition, now strengthened by handicapped and veterans' groups. Isolated on the margins are the fundamentalists and neo-Nazis.

In this period, all of the tensions which split elements of the heterodox challenge to both domestic and foreign policy from the late 1960s on, appear resolved. Given the previous models it seems improbable that this structure can be sustained.

The new social movements

Table 2 reports centrality scores for groups identified with the new social movements over time. These groups, as noted above, pursue claims to legitimacy of lifestyles, largely decoupled from the (class) positions they occupy in civil society. They are the movements of the new classes, and theorists have argued that the emergence of these movements has transformed the polity, towards a politics of style over a politics of class (Offe 1985; Kriesi 1989; Melucci 1985; Cohen 1985; Touraine 1985). A component of this argument is that labor's role in social protest has declined markedly over time.

It makes sense to evaluate these claims by focusing on roles occupied by new social movements, rather than frequency counts of activity. The blockmodels discussed in the previous section offer one way of measuring the salience of new social movements, and it is clear that we observe the new movements occupying increasingly important roles in the group to group structure over time. By the fifth period, the new social movements, which had previously been marginalized, are indistinguishable from more traditional protest groups. A basic

Fig. 1. Movement centrality: Washington DC: 1961–1983.

claim of the NSM theorists — these movements are salient and shape the protest domain — is sustained by our data. Not supported is the associated claim that the role of organized labor has fallen dramatically. Figure 1 reports centrality scores over time for labor, new social movements, traditional movements, and fundamentalist groups. Note how, by the fourth period, the position of the new movements (represented by a darkened triangle) is largely indistinguishable from the old (represented by a darkened square). Fundamentalists' fortunes (represented by a darkened cross) are mixed; while one of the most central groups in the fourth period, they were most often marginal. Likewise, while the organized labor movement (represented by an asterisk) loses ground in the third period (during the anti-war movement's heyday), it occupies a more central position than both the traditional and new movements, in three of five periods over our sample frame.

Repertoire shifts

By the end of the fifth period, the blockmodels of group to group structure revealed cohesion within the protest world — an apparent sewing together of the major cleavages which cross-cut challenger groups' critiques of American society. A basic cause of cohesion was the general perception among protest groups that the Reagan admin-

istration was eroding many of the gains achieved by earlier protests. This sense generated the massive, labor-led, coalitions against Reagan which explicitly incorporated the newer lifestyle demands with broad economic demands for a restructuring of civil society. It is not accidental that in the fifth period we observe the incorporation of the new social movements into the old challenger structure, for over time a new measure of movement success — size — began to drive organizers to search for groups from which to mobilize people to protest. Organizers were, in the early 1980s, locked into the “march” as the way to protest. This was not always the case.

Table 7 reports the relationship between structural position and repertoire. Blocks of structurally equivalent groups are the units of analysis. The cell entries report the ratio of observed use of a repertoire over the expected distribution. For example, Block 1 in period 1 was three times more likely to picket, and eight times less likely (0.12) to march than expected. The overall pattern, from 1961–1983, suggests routinization of protest — towards marches and rallies, and away from pickets and sit-ins. Other forms of protest more common in the early periods — the vigil and symbolic protest — were so rare by the end that we have not bothered to report them. But below routinization are some interesting patterns.

Some groups never change. Neo-Nazi groups which are usually completely marginal, and consistently assigned to Block 7, always rally. They have a limited repertoire. Groups occupying the more marginal blocks pick repertoires which the leading movements have rejected. For example, groups assigned to Block 6 consistently do exactly what the more central blocks, Blocks 1 and 2, are not. In periods 2 and 3 they rally, while the two central blocks innovate with the sit-in. In periods 4 and 5, Block 6 groups picket, while the central groups march. Marginality induces the search for new repertoires not employed by the central actors.

Drawing from Everett's (1992) work on the demography of protests in Washington, DC, we associate each period with a dominant repertoire. Not counting events with repertoires other than those identified in Table 7, since they are too rare and heterogeneous, Everett shows that in the first period, over half of all protests were pickets, that the proportion of sit-ins and marches tripled and doubled respectively in the second period, and that more than one half of all protests in the third period were rallies or sit-ins. In the fourth and fifth periods,

Table 7
Repertoire by structural position

Period	Mean Centrality	Sitin	Picket	Rally	March
1961–1963					
Block 1	3.439	5.5 *	3.0	0	0.12
Block 2	2.293	0	0.62	0.62	1.3
Block 3	0.539	0	0.32	0	1.6
Block 4	0.113	0	1.3	0	1.1
Block 5	0.570	0	0	6.7	0.21
1966–1968					
Block 1	3.616	2.0	0.85	1.1	0.84
Block 2	2.956	0.42	1.1	0.73	1.2
Block 3	0.758	0	0.89	0.81	1.3
Block 4	0.233	0	1.2	0.93	1.1
Block 5	0.154	0.63	1.6	0.36	1.1
Block 6	0.104	0	0.89	2.0	0.90
Block 7	0.029	0	1.3	3.0	0.45
1971–1973					
Block 1	3.016	1.3	0.39	0.75	1.1
Block 2	1.301	2.2	0	0.73	0.58
Block 3	0.871	0.77	2.3	0.33	1.3
Block 4	0.847	1.1	2.1	0.28	1.1
Block 5	0.026	0	1.0	2.2	0.81
Block 6	0.015	0	0	3.7	0
Block 7	0.013	1.0	0.64	1.4	0.80
1976–1978					
Block 1	1.789	0	0	0.75	1.4
Block 2	1.472	2.7	0	0.83	0.87
Block 3	1.057	0	0	0.74	1.4
Block 4.	0.929	3.3	0	0.77	0.81
Block 5	0.642	0	0	2.0	0.52
Block 6	0.195	1.7	10.2 *	0.78	0.81
Block 7	0.784	0	0	1.8	0.63
1981–1983					
Block 1	2.172	1.4	1.2 *	0.98	1.5
Block 2	1.314	0.89	0.79 *	1.0	1.0
Block 3	0.865	0	0	1.0	1.1
Block 4	0.514	2.1	0	1.3	0.88
Block 5	0.500	0	0	0	1.5
Block 6	0.299	0	6.8 *	1.1	0.74
Block 7	0.000	0	0	4.4	0

* indicates that these repertoires have an $N < 5$

pickets and sit-ins largely disappeared as a repertoire, replaced by rallies and marches that together accounted for over 85% of all protests (Everett 1992).

As a rule, across all five periods, the most central blocks are those who define the dominant repertoire for that period. It is important to note that this finding is not artifactual — the ratios, reporting repertoire choice by block, control for expected frequencies which are driven by the level of activity. Quakers in Block 1 during the first period picketed; SCLC and Quakers in the second period employed sit-ins and rallies; the radical left initiated the move to the march in the third and fourth periods, and so on.

There is an interesting exception to this rule which may be a foreshadowing of future developments. Fundamentalist groups in the fourth period shifted from their earlier protest repertoire, rallies and marches, to the sit-in — precisely when they were at their peak. In the fifth period, fundamentalist groups (Block 6) were on the periphery of the social protest world, and yet while there, they experimented with the picket. While many of the older challenger groups have remained firmly wedded to the traditional march and rally, the fundamentalist protest repertoire since 1983 has continued to expand. Operation Rescue, in Kansas, is but one of a number of examples of this shift. Their success manipulating older protest repertoires may drive further repertoire innovation — especially by those on the periphery — and as a result change our expectations of a protest. These data suggest that we should anticipate a shift back to older repertoires associated with the early civil rights movement. If this happens, the large coalition of interest groups and new social movement (identity) groups that reached their height in the fifth period, from 1981–1983, will face great difficulties — for the commitment needed to mobilize for or a sit-in is quite different from the commitment necessary to spend a beautiful Sunday marching in the park.

Discussion

In this paper, we focused on only one side of the structure of social protest — the group to group network which is induced by the duality of protest. In other work, we have inter-related the issue to issue networks with the group to group networks that are modeled here, and show that asymmetries in the dual networks have implications for

movement success. But here the goals were different. We show that by shifting one's frame of reference away from individual-level accounts of protest groups or movements, it is possible to model positions groups hold in a network of other groups — and to show that these structural positions matter.

We test a popular theory — the new social movement theory — using our models of the social structure of protest and show that it is correct to argue that the new social movements are more and more important. Whereas most new social movement theory runs off frequencies, our model runs off positions. We identify new social movements, but show that, despite their frequent protests, it was not until the late 1970s and early 1980s that they occupied a central position in the world of social protest. But in contrast to the new social movement theory, our models report an important role for labor. While the frequency of labor protests decreases over time, the centrality of organized labor does not.

We focus on repertoire and suggest that, while organizers are always searching for better ways to protest, their searches appear to be constrained by the positions they occupy. We observe groups on the periphery “innovating” with repertoires left behind by the leading groups. We are sure that their experimenting with these repertoires is the result of organizer's agency; narratives of group careers would report such decisions as weighty. But our models suggest the agency one might observe is constrained by the repertoires of the leading groups in the world of social protest. To understand strategy, one has to understand context.

Finally, resource mobilization models of social protest have contributed enormously to our understanding of protest and social movements. We identify, from data on protest events, a new way of thinking about the context in which protest occurs. While knowing that a critical context is endogenous — the structure of groups, their leadership, membership, and incentives — we show that the exogenous context of groups, defined here as the social structure of group relations, carries important implications for the groups who protest, shaping their strategies, and possibly their success or failure.

References

Bonacich, Phillip

- 1987 “Power and centrality: A family of measures.” *American Journal of Sociology* 92 (5): 1170–1182.

- Brieiger, Ronald L, S.A. Boorman, and P. Arabie
1975 "An algorithm for clustering relational data, with applications to social network analysis and comparison with multidimensional scaling". *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 12: 328-383.
- Breiger, Ronald L.
1974 "The duality of persons and groups." *Social Forces* 53 (2): 181-190.
- Burstein, Paul and William Freudenburg
1978 "Changing public policy: The impact of public opinion, antiwar demonstrations and war costs on senate voting on vietnam war motions". *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (1): 99-122.
- Cohen, Jean L.
1985 "Strategy and identity: new theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements." *Social Research* 52 (4): 663-716.
- Downs, Anthony
1972 "Up and down with ecology — the issues-attention cycle." *Public Interest* 28: 38-50.
- Eisinger, Peter K.
1973 The conditions of protest behavior in american cities." *American Political Science Review* 67 (March): 11-28.
- Etzioni, Amitai
1970 *Demonstration Democracy*. New York: Gordon and Breach, Science Publishers.
- Everett, Kevin D.
1992 "Professionalization and protest: changes in the social movement sector, 1961-1983." *Social Forces* 70 (4).
- Franzosi, Roberto
1987 "The press as a source of socio-historical data: Issues in the methodology of data collection in newspapers." *Historical Methods* 20: 5-16.
- Freeman, Jo
1975 *The Politics of Women's Liberation*. New York: David McKay Company.
- Gamson, William A. and A. Modigliani
1989 "Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1): 1-37.
- Gamson, William A.
1975 *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Goldenberg, E.W.
1975 *Making The Papers*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Greenberg, Donald W.
1985 "Staging media events to achieve legitimacy: A case study of britain's friends of the earth." *Political Communication and Persuasion* 2 (4): 347-362.
- Jenkins, J. Craig and C. Perrow
1977 "Insurgency of the powerless: Farm worker movements (1946-1972)." *American Sociological Review* 42: 249-268.
- Kielbowicz, Richard B. and C. Scherer
1986 "The role of the press in the dynamics of social movements." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 9: 71-96.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter
1986 "New social movements and the new class in the Netherlands." *American Journal of Sociology* 92 (1): 64-90.
- Lipsky, Michael
1968 "Protest as a political resource." *American Political Science Review* 62 (December): 1144-1158.

Mann, Leon

- 1974 "Counting the crowd: Effects of editorial policy on estimates." *Journalism Quarterly* 51: 278-285.

McAdam, Doug

- 1983 "Tactical innovation and the pace of insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48: 725-753.

McCarthy, John D. and M.N. Zald

- 1973 *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Melucci, Alberto

- 1985 "The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements." *Social Research* 52 (4): 789-816.

Melucci, Alberto

- 1989 *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Morris, Aldon

- 1981 "Black southern student sit-in movement: An analysis of internal organization." *American Sociological Review* 46 (December): 744-767.

Oberschall, Athony

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

Oberschall, Anthony

- 1989 "The 1960 sit-ins: Protest diffusion and movement take-Off." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 11: 31-53.

Offe, Claus

- 1985 "New social movements: Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics." *Social Research* 52 (4): 817-868.

Olzak, Susan

- 1990 "The political context of competition: lynching and urban racial violence." *Social Forces* 69: 395-422.

Page, Ann L. and D.A. Clelland

- 1978 "The kanawha county textbook controversy: A study in the politics of life style concern." *Social Forces* 57 (1): 265-281.

Snyder, David and W.R. Kelly

- 1977 "Conflict intensity, media sensitivity and the validity of newspaper Data." *American Sociological Review* 42: 105-123.

Snyder, David and C. Tilly

- 1972 "Hardship and collective violence in france, 1830-1960." *American Sociological Review* 37: 520-532.

Staggenborg, Suzanne

- 1988 "Consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement." *American sociological Review* 53: 585-606.

Tarrow, Sidney

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

Tarrow, Sidney

- 1989b *Democracy and Disorder*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tilly, Charles

- 1978 *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Tilly, Charles

- 1979 "Repertoires of contention in America and Britain, 1750-1830." In Zald and McCarthy (eds) *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control and Tactics*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.

Touraine, Alain

1985 "An introduction to the study of social movements." *Social Research* 52 (4): 749-785.

Wilson, James Q.

1961 "The strategy of protest: problems of negro civic actions." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 5: 291-303.

Appendix

Aggregated Categories Of Social Protest Organizations

1: Radical Left	18: Fraternal and Service
2: Neo-Nazi	19: Poverty Rights
3: Student	20: Peace Coalitions
4: Environmental	21: Senior Citizen's
5: Quaker	22: Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)
6: Community and Consumer	23: National Organization for Women (NOW)
7: Protestant	24: Inter-Denominational
8: Fundamentalist	25: Misc. Anti-War
9: Gay and Lesbian	26: Handicapped
10: Women's	27: Jewish
11: Veteran's	28: Native American
12: Labor	29: Civil Liberty
13: Catholic	30: Anti-Nuclear
14: Congress on Racial Equality (CORE)	31: Women Strike for Peace (WSP)
15: Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)	32: Black Power
16: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)	33: Non-Interventionist
17: Misc. Civil Rights	

Aggregated Categories Of Protested Issues

1. Labor
2. Environmental
3. Animal Rights

4. Marijuana Legalization
5. Abortion and Birth Control
6. Women's Domestic
7. Native American
8. Gay and Lesbian
9. White Supremacist
10. Veterans
11. Senior Citizen
12. Handicapped Citizen
13. Human Rights
14. Welfare and Poverty
15. Conservative
16. Anti-Nuclear Weapons
17. African American Civil Rights
18. Anti-War
19. Domestic Economic
20. Jewish Human Rights
21. Foreign Policy of Other Countries
22. US Foreign Policy
23. Misc. Civil Rights
24. Other