6

Resources and Social Movement Mobilization

Bob Edwards and John D. McCarthy

Resource: 1a: a new and or reserve source of supply or support: a fresh or additional stock or store available at need: something in reserve or ready if needed. (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged*)

Mobilization is a process of increasing the readiness to act collectively... (William A. Gamson, *The Strategy of Social Protest*)

Introduction

The assumption that resource availability enhances the likelihood of collective action is generally taken for granted by contemporary analysts of social movements (see Zald 1992; Cress and Snow 1996). Human time and effort along with money are the most widely appreciated kinds of resources that are more or less available to collective actors. But the simple availability of resources is not sufficient; coordination and strategic effort is typically required in order to convert available pools of individually held resources into collective resources and to utilize those resources in collective action. When movement activists do attempt to create collective action (fielding protests, creating social movement organizations, and the like) through historical time and across geographical locations their successes are consistently related to the greater presence of available resources in their broader environments.

A rich research literature has focused upon a diverse set of movements, times, and places to illustrate this regularity including collective action among the US homeless (Cress and Snow 1996; Snow et al. 2001), shantytown residents in Chile (Schneider 1995), Mexican teachers under the PRI (Cook 1996), liberation theology (Smith 1991) and guerilla movements in Latin America (Wickham-Crowley 1989), the Nicaraguan women's movement (Isbester 2001), the struggle against apartheid in South Africa (Marx 1992), African-American environmental justice mobilization in the US (Edwards 1995), local environmental action in the Czech Republic (Carmin forthcoming), and a cross-national campaign against corporate

livestock production in Poland (Juska and Edwards forthcoming). Resource availability has affected the rate and spread of protest (Minkoff 1997; Soule et al. 1999), the founding and mobilization of national women's and minority organizations (Minkoff 1995), environmental organizations in the US (McLaughlin and Khawaja 2000) and Western Europe (Dalton 1994), state-level suffrage organizations in the nineteenth century (McCammon 2001), local Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) groups in the 1980s, as well as participation in transnational social movement organizations (SMOs) in 2000 (Wiest et al. 2002), and the organization of movement music festivals in Western Europe and the US (Eder et al. 1995; Lahausen 1996). These cases provide strong empirical support for the general claims of early research mobilization theorists (McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Jenkins 1985).

In what follows we provide a comprehensive perspective on the nature and role of resources in the mobilization of collective action. First, we want to strongly reemphasize to students of social movements how unequally distributed many kinds of resources are among social groups. Durable patterns of resource inequality in the broader society shape the differential availability of those resources to particular social groups. Efforts by agencies of the state, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals to alter prevailing patterns of resource stratification and redirect resources serve to channel substantial resources to social movements. Nevertheless, middle-class groups remain privileged in their access to many kinds of resources, and, therefore, not surprisingly social movements that resonate with the concerns of relatively privileged social groups predominate and the mobilizations of the poor groups are quite rare in advanced industrial democracies.

Second, we turn to a discussion of resource types. Until the last decade, movement analysts who made resources central to their thinking about mobilization neglected to specify in much detail the concept of resources, and, especially, they developed no clear specification of resource types (McCarthy and Zald 2002). We now have some stronger guidelines for conceptualizing resource forms (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; Lin 2001) and specifying their primary types among social movements (Oliver and Marwell 1992; Cress and Snow 1996; Lahausen 1996). By synthesizing past work we develop a fivefold typology of moral, cultural, social-organizational, human, and material resources.

Third, clearly defining and specifying resources is a necessary step before theorists and researchers can approach the issues of their use-value to social movements, transferability among groups, and the extent to which access to them can be controlled. Thus resource fungibility and proprietarity is our third line of analysis. While a broader range of resource attributes could be considered, these two are important in analyzing the mobilization of resources from within resource rich social groups, but they are especially important to the processes that shape the transfer of resources between organized social groups. The traditional concern of social movement analysts with movements of the downtrodden, underprivileged, and unrepresented, combined with the importance of resources and the reality of their unequal distribution, brings the analysis of forms of access to resources to central attention.

Fourth, we take up the issue of how social movement actors gain access to crucial resources and the longstanding debate over the extent to which social movements

Sources

receive material resources from external rather than indigenous sources. This line of analysis inevitably raises the question of the kinds of effects those exchange relationships have on movement goals and activities. We argue that social movements and SMOs rely on multiple means of gaining access to needed resources and discuss specifically four predominant modes: movement self-production, resource aggregation, resource appropriation, and patronage. The four modes of access are discussed in conjunction with the five resource types we specify, and we proceed to argue that longstanding debate over financial patronage represents just one among many distinct exchange relationships by which social movements and SMOs access resources.

Finally, we take up four key resource mobilization processes. Two of them, the mobilization of money and the mobilization of labor, are heavily contingent upon a third, the creation of movement structures, or organization building. This is true because, in general, the most important factor in accounting for whether individuals will contribute money or time and effort to collective enterprises is whether or not they are asked to do so (Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Klandermans 1997). SMOs provide constituents and adherents opportunities to contribute money and labor, resources that would quite likely remain individual unless they were transformed into collective resources through the agency of representatives of SMOs.[1] Lastly, we discuss collective action itself, the deploying of repertoires, as a resource mobilization process. Movement constituents and adherents who take part in movement efforts in turn are more likely to contribute other kinds of resources, and many forms of collective action themselves are resource generating at the same time that they are resource expending. Collective action itself, then, can generate new resources.

Social Movements and the Distribution and Redistribution of Resources

Resource Inequality

Even the "simple availability" of resources is actually more complicated, since, in order to be available for use, resources must be both present in a specific sociohistorical context and accessible to potential collective actors. This brings to the fore an assumption implicit in much resource mobilization scholarship. The resources crucial to the initiation or continuation of collective action are unevenly distributed within societies and among them. Moreover, within a society the control of resources varies from one social group to another as it does among the various members of each group. Not all social groups control the same types and amounts of resources, and not all individuals within a given social group have equal access to group resources. It is not our intent, however, to develop a general theory of social stratification. Instead we want to emphasize that the presence of resources and thereby their potential to be mobilized by specific social movement constituencies varies over space, through time, and across constituency. Resource mobilization theory is at root aimed at better understanding how groups are able to overcome prevailing patterns of resource inequality in their efforts to pursue social change goals.

Spatial Variation in Movement Mobilization

Crucial resources are concentrated in core areas and tend to be scarcer and to diffuse more slowly into peripheral zones. This is the case within states and among them. As a consequence, resources important for the mobilization of social movements are more readily accessible to potential collective actors in core zones than is the case in the periphery. Recent research bears this out for transnational SMOs that were founded earlier and at a faster rate in wealthy industrial democracies (Smith and Wiest 2003). A similar dynamic operates within nations like the US between large metropolitan areas and rural ones. Numerous studies have found movements to be more likely to emerge in metropolitan areas as well as large counties where potential activists are in closer proximity to a wide range of resources (Lincoln 1978; McCarthy et al. 1988). The social problems of urban and more recently suburban areas have long commanded more media, philanthropic, and political attention than their rural counterparts. In general, then, we expect the spatial distribution of movement mobilization to correlate more strongly with resource availability than with the spatial distribution of injustice or grievance. McCammon's (2001) analysis of the diffusion of suffrage mobilization finds that state-level mobilizations resulted in large part from the decision of national suffrage leaders to spatially redistribute movement resources across states in the form of organizers, speakers, literature, money, and events.

resource access greater/easier in core areas that have a lot of resources

more associated w/spatial distribution of resources rather than grievance

Historical Variations in Resource Availability

Both the use-value of specific resource types and the amount of resources present in a specific context vary over time. Shifting use-value is clearest with technology as the pace of innovation may hasten the obsolescence of once important techniques or equipment. For example, the telephone lessened the importance of participation in community organizations or events as a means of sharing movement related information, and email is rapidly replacing older techniques, like organizing "phone trees," as a means of contacting large numbers of people. Increases in the discretionary income of movement constituencies over time has been found to increase the likelihood of movement mobilization by middle-class Americans in the 1960s and, under certain circumstances, collective action by West Bank Palestinians between 1976 and 1985 (McCarthy and Zald 1973; Khawaja 1994). The presence and availability of other resources changes over time as well. For example, the number of local feminist organizations and environmental organizations has grown dramatically since the middle 1960s. Many of these groups have evolved into nonprofit service providers and only intermittently become involved in advocacy or collective action. Nevertheless a denser local infrastructure of such groups provides more appropriable forms of social organization available to facilitate mobilization. Demographic trends over time also shape patterns of resource availability. We consider these and other social groupings next.

utility of certain resources change: w/o phone, needed community meetings

Social Differences in Resource Availability

A number of scholars with varying theoretical orientations pointed to the rise of a "new middle class" with distinctive social and cultural commitments, similar

position in the economy, and similar status as a prime mover in the emergence of the so-called "new" social movements (NSMs) in Europe after the 1960s (Parkin 1968; Inglehart 1977; Melucci 1980; Offe 1985; Kriesi 1989). The NSMs pursued the social change preferences of this increasingly significant and relatively well-resourced social class. During the early 1980s in the US, the African-American tributary of the environmental justice movement emerged to national prominence more rapidly than their white, working-class counterparts. This happened in large part because black environmental justice activists were able to draw upon the substantial civil rights movement infrastructure, seasoned local activists, and a resonant environmental racism issue frame that had already been created. By comparison, working-class white groups "fighting toxics" were resource deprived with a thin national infrastructure, and few seasoned activists and an issue frame their opponents, warped into a caricature of self-interested "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) attitudes that have stuck to this day.[2]

Consider, for instance, the uneven distribution of Internet access and skills and its impact on the mobilization potential of diverse social groups. The Internet is a worldwide social infrastructure widely used to disseminate information and coordinate activities by social movement actors (Gillham 2003). Not only is it widely used; it's use is rapidly becoming the norm among SMOs.[3] Yet use of the web requires access via appropriately equipped computers the distribution of which is highly stratified in the US and worldwide. Recent national research estimates that in September 2001 just over one-half (50.5%) of US households had Internet access at home (NTIA 2002), with substantial disparities by race, income, and education (Wilson et al. 2003). Moreover, putting up and maintaining an effective website requires even better equipment and regular inputs of skilled labor. As Internet competency becomes a marker of legitimacy, which in turn facilitates the acquisition of further resources, the mobilization potential of relatively deprived constituencies may be further constrained.

In general, consistent with our several examples, we expect an inverse relationship between the range of resources that are accessible to specific constituencies and the pace and scope of their mobilization in pursuit of social change preferences. Therefore, the population of currently mobilized social movements in a given society will represent only a subset of its potential social movements. Consequently, currently mobilized movements in any society are more likely to reflect the social change preferences of its better-resourced constituencies than its less well endowed ones.

Resource Redistribution and Social Movements

In neoclassical economics the distribution of resources is treated as the "natural" outcome of market activities and contrasted with the redistribution efforts of states. Resource redistribution by agencies of the state provides significant facilitation to many social movements and even direct patronage to a few. However, individuals and organizations from other sectors (e.g., foundations, religious bodies) also redistribute resources in efforts to redress perceived inequities in the prevailing market driven distribution of goods (Shanahan and Tuma 1994). Such state and nonstate actors are motivated by a number of factors, including altruism, enlightened self-interest, compassion, religious conviction, or ideological commitment. Others may be motivated by the desire to co-opt and thereby to control to some extent the goals

and tactics of a movement. Such motives are important considerations, but we emphasize the behavior of such groups in counteracting the existing patterns of resource distribution in ways that support the mobilization of social movements.

Resource Redistribution by the State

movements also push to stop state redistribution

States redistribute resources to social movements in three ways, which can be broadly differentiated by the kinds of resources provided and what movement actors must do to gain access to those resources.[4] First, monetary resources and technical assistance are provided directly to organizations that meet specific criteria and agree to operate within government guidelines. Second, in the US, legitimacy and overt fundraising facilitation are provided through the granting of nonprofit status by state governments and tax-exempt status by the IRS in exchange for the group adopting certain constraints upon their activities (McCarthy et al. 1991). Both of these statuses augment organizational legitimacy in the eyes of potential supporters, including foundations that typically require these before making grants. Third, states sometimes allow social movement actors access to state decision-making processes.

US feminist SMOs illustrate the mix of facilitation and constraint that may face groups benefiting directly from the redistribution of state resources. Since the mid-1960s a large number of local women's movement groups have taken on social service functions as federally regulated nonprofits, many often contracting with local government to provide an array of services broadly consistent with feminist goals (Ferree and Martin 1995). Of course, such resources may be accompanied by constraints. Matthews' (1995) analysis of state funded rape crisis centers in the 1970s makes clear that the state and the feminist SMOs they funded agreed that rape crisis work should be done, but eventually clashed over what rape crisis work consisted of and how it should be carried out. Hyde's (1995) analysis of New Right efforts to leverage the government to defund feminist SMOs during the 1980s documents the range of impacts resulting from the withdrawal of state funding. Some of the feminist SMOs retained state funding by emphasizing their identity as human service providers and professionalizing their image. Others became more confrontational and mobilized against the New Right by raising scholarship funds for low-income gynecological services and using the threat of New Right initiatives to broaden and radicalize their membership base.

Third, states provide a variety of mechanisms for organized groups and individual citizens to be included in policy decision-making processes, and these sometimes benefit SMOs. In contrast to "corporatist" mechanisms that are common in some European states, regulatory ones are common in the US. For instance, federal mandates for citizen participation in regulatory processes span a range of social movement issues and have created what amounts to a national infrastructure of loosely coupled, decentralized venues of potential participation or contention for social movement actors. Each step in mandated regulatory review processes offers a potential leverage point at which SMOs or individual activists can exert either positive pressure to support or modify a proposal, or exert negative pressure to resist or halt a given endeavor. For example, environmental and social impact assessments required since the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 have been used effectively by environmentalists to influence or block a broad range of

environmentally damaging endeavors. Nuclear power activists used these kinds of federally mandated venues and regulatory reviews to bring the process of nuclear power plant sitings to a halt in the 1970s (Nelkin and Pollak 1981) as have those opposed to the siting of toxic and hazardous waste facilities in the 1980s and 1990s (Edwards 1995; Peterson 2002).

More recently President Clinton's Executive Order #12898 mandating environmental equity impact assessments has extended this tool into the environmental justice arena. Moreover, that order created and funded the National Environmental Justice Advisory Commission (NEJAC), which has held regular meetings around the country to build a body of related state-level environmental equity regulations and plans. Even though NEJAC's operations have been criticized as autocratic and nonparticipatory, its regular meetings provided an occasion for environmental justice activists in different regions of the country to build movement capacity, develop movement infrastructure, and coordinate activities. Activists used the NEJAC meetings in much the same way that NGOs and SMOs enhanced movement infrastructure and capacity globally by piggy-backing the alternative Earth Summit onto the official United Nations Environment and Development conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

Sirianni and Friedland (2001) argue that the very strong citizen participation mandates in the Clean Water Act of 1972 have since the 1970s spawned a broad range of participatory processes across the US. Some have gone so far as to suggest that such local stakeholder processes are exemplars of a broader movement of civic renewal and cooperation (Bernard and Young 1997; Shutkin 2000), though from our perspective they could just as easily become arenas of local conflict and contention. Regardless, these processes provide potential leverage points, venues of participation, and occasions for movement engagement with state-subsidized transaction costs. The extent to which the state redistributes resources in this way varies dramatically across the range of movement issues. In the US those available to environmentalists, for example, are quite extensive, while those available to peace activists and others who wish to influence US foreign policy are virtually nonexistent. Such differences exert substantial impact on cross-movement variations in the range and types of SMO social change strategies, tactics, and targets.

Redistribution by Organizations

A variety of nonstate organizations act to redistribute resources in ways that facilitate movement mobilization. Formal organizations control vast amounts of wealth and are also rich in other kinds of resources in industrial nations. Here we briefly touch on the role of philanthropic foundations, religious organizations, movement mentoring organizations, movement organizations themselves, as well as profit-making organizations in making their resources available to resource poor movement groups and constituencies.

Foundations. US philanthropic foundations possess vast wealth and are widely known as a source of financial resources for social movements. Yet foundations also provide other important benefits to SMOs, especially including legitimacy and templates for action. Spurred by Federal law in the early 1960s existing foundations greatly increased their giving in general and their aggregate support of groups seeking social change in particular. And since then the number of foundations that

do so has steadily increased. A conservative estimate puts that support at close to 90 million dollars in 1990 (Jenkins and Halcli 1999). Nearly one-third of that 1990 total went to women's and environmental groups, and more than half of it went to professionalized advocacy groups and technical support organizations. However, over 40 percent of it went to minority and economic justice groups, so there remains a significant amount of redistribution to groups representing underprivileged constituents in this flow of financial resources.[5] Coalitions of foundations have been formed that aim to expand the extent and level of social change philanthropy, such as the Women's Funding Network and the Neighborhood Funders Group, a caucus of members of the National Council of Foundations.[6]

money from foundations to SMOs

There is some debate about the intent of foundations in providing such funds, and the possibilities that it may serve to moderate movement goals and tactics (see Jenkins and Eckert 1986), but there is little question that it has shaped the organizational structure of SMOs and, especially, their fiduciary procedures. Only groups that meet minimal standards of organizational structure, usually anchored in formal 501(c)3. Internal Revenue Service charitable registration, and financial responsibility are likely to receive foundation grants (McCarthy et al. 1991). As a result, SMOs typically come into compliance with these formal, and sometimes informal, expectations before they apply for grants.

Receipt of a grant from a prestigious national foundation can serve as an important source of legitimacy for an SMO, and there is evidence suggesting that movement groups receiving support from common foundation sources are more likely to develop other kinds of ties with one another. As well, many foundations provide funds for groups willing to adopt a specific organizational form and social change purpose illustrated by the many health related SMOs that have been spawned through the auspices of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Religious organizations. Many religious organizations, consistent with their value commitments, are strongly committed to helping the less privileged. Religious groups in the US directly control far fewer monetary resources than do foundations, but high rates of religious participation and extensive infrastructures mean that they are far richer in human and social-organizational resources. The reverse tends to be the case in many European nations where religious participation is lower, but where state tithing mechanisms provide national religious institutions with larger pools of centralized financial resources (Klandermans 1997). The primary forms of religious organization include national level denominational structures, local congregations and "parachurch" organizations that have no formal connections with religious bodies, but claim religious legitimacy and many times mobilize constituents in "blocs" out of religious infrastructures.

Movements for economic and social justice and those opposing war and preparations for war are particularly likely to be the recipients of religious-based resources, as seen in the efforts during the 1960s and 1970s of the US Catholic Bishops and mainline Protestant denominations. Yet their support is not just financial; rather, they provide moral, cultural, social-organizational and human resource as well (Smith 1996; Wuthnow and Evans 2002).[7] Moral legitimacy is perhaps the most valuable resource religious organizations bestow on movement actors. At the local level congregations and parachurch groups regularly contribute access to in-kind resources as well as privileged access to congregational participants (Liebman and Wuthnow 1986; Cress and Snow 1996).

SMOs and movement mentoring organizations. Social movement organizations commonly provide subsidies and, especially, technological advice, to fledgling groups, as well as ongoing support to other SMOs (Walker 1991; Nownes and Neeley 1996). And, as the social movement sector has grown and become professionalized in wealthier nations, a class of organizations has emerged that provide services, sometimes for a fee, but much of the time "pro-bono," to SMOs. Well known as "technical assistance," such services typically include advice about organizational structure, as well as both mobilizing and production technologies. Some of these organizations, social movement "half-way houses" (Morris 1984) and "schools" (Edwards and McCarthy 1992), are far more proactive in attempting to nurture and form organized groups, while working to create and disseminate new social change technologies. In the US a number of these "technical support organizations" (Jenkins and Halcli 1999: 245) serve as significant financial conduits between foundations and less professionalized SMOs.

A note on firms and corporations. Social movement analysts have generally focused more on the support of profit-making organizations for countermovement organizations (Useem and Zald 1982; Switzer 1997) and conservative movements (Sklair 1997), but there are indications of far broader involvement of firms in providing resources for movement groups, especially recent public health movements (e.g., Wolfson 2001). Some such support can be understood as self-interested (e.g., Blue Cross/Blue Shield Health Insurance firms' support of the tobacco control movement and the automobile insurer Allstate Insurance Company's support of anti-drunk driving activists).[8] But many local SMOs successfully seek support from local merchants (as part of their grass-roots fundraising efforts), and such support includes food for volunteers, the purchase of advertisements in SMO publications, the provision of space for movement activities, and contributions of items for raffles. The traditionally heavy emphasis of movement scholars upon progressive and, more recently, "new social movements" has led to an underemphasis upon the extent and variety of resource flows like these to social movements.

Redistribution by Individuals

By providing resources to SMOs and movement activities individuals turn over their control, thereby making the resources collective. Constituents and adherents are a primary source of such resources, usually in the form of small donations of time and money, and less often the bestowal of moral and cultural resources. SMO members may pay regular organizational dues and respond to campaigns for additional support. They may also be asked to volunteer. Many SMOs seek small donations through the modern technologies of direct mail and telemarketing, usually from adherent pools with which they have very tenuous ties (McCarthy 1987). Members of this class of movement constituents have been called "checkbook" members (Skocpol 1999). Many SMOs, at both the local and national level, receive larger financial donations from individual supporters, and such individual supporters can play a crucial role, for instance, in the early stages of SMOs (Walker 1991; Nownes and Neeley 1996). For small local SMOs, individual donations from a few supporters can make up a significant proportion of annual operating budgets (McCarthy and Wolfson 1996). The donation of moral and cultural resources by individuals are less easily accounted for, but can sometimes be of great value, such as the

endorsement of a local group by a well-known and highly respected local figure or the volunteering of membership list services by an individual who is adept at that technology.

Typology of Social Movement Resources

Social movement actions many times lay bare existing power relations among constituencies with conflicting interests and competing preferences over the distribution and redistribution of scarce values. The concept of resources is indispensable in any analysis of power and conflict relations.[9] Yet in the early 1980s resources remained "one of the most primitive and unspecified terms in the theoretical vocabulary" of social movement analysts (Gamson et al. 1982: 82). By the mid-1990s Cress and Snow could still argue persuasively that little progress had been made in explicating resources conceptually or anchoring them empirically (1996: 1090). Taking the latter approach Cress and Snow developed an inductive taxonomy of moral, material, informational, and human resources from their analysis of the activities of 15 homeless SMOs in eight US cities. By contrast, we have taken the former, more synthetic, approach to explicate resources more generally. To do so we draw upon other social movement scholarship (Zald and Jacobs 1978; Knoke 1986; Oliver and Marwell 1992; Verba et al. 1995; Lahausen 1996).

Our conceptualization of resources has also been shaped by important efforts in other parts of the discipline to theorize forms of capital in criticism of narrowly economistic approaches (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; Putnam 1995; Lin 2001). The most significant difference between our resource typology and that of Cress and Snow is our treatment of social-organizational and cultural resources as separate categories, which among other things eliminates their "informational" resource category.[10] Our conceptualization of social-organizational and cultural resources and much of the foregoing discussion of resource inequality and redistribution draws heavily upon our engagement in the evolving debate over social capital and civil society, especially as it relates to social movements and SMOs.[11] Several relatively distinct streams of theorizing have emerged from this debate. In particular, Pierre Bourdieu theorized three forms of capital (economic, cultural, and social) that taken together "explain the structure and dynamics of differentiated societies" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:119). Bourdieu's emphasis on the analytic centrality of unequal access to differing types of resources via the possession of more or less durable relationships has been especially influential here. In what follows we will differentiate between moral, cultural, social-organizational, human, and material resources.

Moral Resources

Moral resources include legitimacy, solidary support, sympathetic support, and celebrity (Snow 1979; Cress and Snow 1996). Of these, legitimacy has received the most theoretical attention. Neo-institutional organizational theorists make strong claims about the importance of legitimacy as a link between macrocultural contexts and meso- and microlevel organizational processes. Thus they claim that collective actors who most closely mimic institutionally legitimated features for their

particular kind of endeavor gain an advantage relative to groups that do not reflect that template as well (Meyer and Rowan 1977; Powell and DiMaggio 1992). Moral resources tend to originate outside of a social movement or SMO and are generally bestowed by an external source known to possess them. Nevertheless, some movements succeed in the difficult task of creating moral resources, as was clearly the case with the US Southern civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. A key distinction here is that an outsider possessing these transfers them to a social movement and can retract them as well. The retraction of moral resources could be done through public acts of disavowal, backstage by spreading the word informally to interested parties, or by simple atrophy. Because externally bestowed moral resources can be retracted, they are both less accessible and more proprietary than the cultural resources we discuss next.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are artifacts and cultural products such as conceptual tools and specialized knowledge that have become widely, though not necessarily universally, known. These include tacit knowledge about how to accomplish specific tasks like enacting a protest event, holding a news conference, running a meeting, forming an organization, initiating a festival, or surfing the web. This category includes tactical repertoires, organizational templates, technical or strategic know-how encompassing both mobilization and production technologies (Oliver and Marwell 1992). Consistent with Bourdieu's concept of "habitus" as a structural constraint upon access to "cultural capital" and our foregoing discussion of resource stratification, it is worth emphasizing that specific cultural competencies or collective identities, though widely available in a given society, are neither universally available nor evenly distributed. Not every member of a society or group possesses specific competencies or knowledge that could be of value to a social movement or SMO. For example, familiarity with how to navigate the Internet, to point and click a path to useful information, is a rapidly diffusing cultural resource and one that is capable of facilitating movement activities generally. Yet the cultural availability of that resource is distinct from whether or not a specific SMO possesses either the material resource of required equipment, or the human resource of web-competent members.

A key difference between cultural and moral resources is that cultural resources are widely available, less proprietary, and accessible for use independent of favorable judgments from those outside a movement or SMO.[12] For example, Operation Rescue widely employed nonviolent direct-action tactics modeled directly and explicitly upon those used during the heyday of the US civil rights movement without the blessing, and sometimes with the derision, of civil rights organizations and leaders. At a somewhat abstract level this use was possible because that tactical repertoire is a widely accessible cultural resource. At a more operational level the use of this tactical repertoire also depended upon having the human resource of individuals experienced in using the tactics who could train and lead others in doing so. This category of cultural resources includes movement or issue relevant productions like music, literature, magazines, newspapers, and films and videos. Cultural products like these facilitate the recruitment and socialization of new adherents and help movements maintain their readiness and capacity for collective action (see chapter 5 in this volume).

Social-Organizational Resources

This resource category includes both intentional and appropriable social organization (Coleman 1990). Intentional social organization is created specifically to further social movement goals. By contrast, appropriable social organization was created for nonmovement purposes, but movement actors are able to gain access to other types of resources through it. Recruiting volunteers or disseminating information through work, congregation, civic, or neighborhood connections are widely cited examples. The two are further distinguished by the typical means by which movement actors gain access to them. Resources embedded in appropriable social organization must be co-opted, while access to intentional social organization is presumably more collaborative and potentially less problematic. In either case the ease of accessing such resources will vary according to the goodness of fit between the specific legitimacy, organizational form, goals, and tactics of those groups involved. Both forms of social organization have proven crucial in explaining patterns of movement mobilization. Thus presence of social-organizational resources in a particular locale should increase the overall likelihood of movement mobilization and action in that setting. Moreover, we would expect that the social change preferences of those groups with easier access to these resources would be more likely to be mobilized than those of constituencies with constrained access.

There are three general forms of social organizational resources: infrastructures, social networks, and organizations. Clearly, these three forms vary in organizational formality, but we wish to emphasize the extent to which access to them can be controlled, or in other words how proprietary they are. Infrastructures are the social-organizational equivalent of public goods like postal service, sanitation, or civil infrastructures like roads, sidewalks, and traffic lights that facilitate the smooth functioning of everyday life. Infrastructures are nonproprietary social resources. By contrast, access to social networks and especially groups and formal organizations and thereby the resources embedded in them can be controlled. To varying degrees use can be denied to outsiders and hoarded by insiders. Since a chief benefit of any form of social organization is to provide access to other resources, we are here raising the issue of uneven access to social-organizational resources among potential social movement constituencies. Such differential access creates further inequalities in the capacity to access crucial resources of other kinds.

Human Resources

Human resources are both more tangible and easier to appreciate than the three resource types discussed so far. This category includes resources like labor, experience, skills, and expertise. We also include leadership in this category because it involves a combination of other human resources included here. Human resources inhere in individuals rather than in social-organizational structures or culture more generally. Individuals typically have proprietary control over the use of their labor and human resources, except in extreme cases like forced labor or extortion. Through their participation individuals make their labor accessible and usable to specific movements or SMOs. SMOs can aggregate and deploy individuals who are rather portable compared to social-organizational resources, for example. Yet a

movement's capacity to deploy personnel is limited by the cooperation of the individuals involved. And their participation is in turn shaped by spatial and economic factors as well as by social relationships, competing obligations, life-course constraints, and moral commitments.

Thus far we have discussed only labor and not any value-added components of human resources like experience, savvy, skills, or expertise, known also as human capital (Becker 1964). The concept of "value-added" may help differentiate between cultural resources generally present in a given society and the specific individuals whose participation puts competencies, skills, or expertise in the service of a movement or SMO. Clearly, not all adherents offer the same mix of capabilities. A savvy and seasoned activist is not directly interchangeable with an eager undergraduate, no matter how effective the student may become with additional experience. SMOs often require expertise of varying kinds, and having access to lawyers, web designers, dynamic speakers, organizers, or outside experts when the need arises can be vitally important. A key issue in whether the availability of skilled individuals will enhance movement mobilization hinges on how their expertise fits with movement or SMO needs. For example, a prominent physician may have little more to offer than a high-school intern if an SMO needs someone to evaluate the methodology of an environmental equity impact assessment, and the high-school intern may be the best choice to recruit six volunteers to distribute fliers (Oliver and Marwell 1992). Similarly, a celebrated musician participating in a blockade contributes no additional human resource to the blockade than either the tone-deaf academic or the grocery clerk with whom she has linked arms. Yet the evaluation would be much different from the standpoint of moral resources contributed by the musician's presence.

Material Resources

The category of material resources combines what economists would call financial and physical capital, including monetary resources, property, office space, equipment, and supplies. Monetary resources have received the most analytic attention and there are good reasons for that. Money is a necessity. No matter how many other resources a movement mobilizes it will incur costs and someone has to pay the bills. Material resources have also received much analytic attention because they are generally more tangible, more proprietary, and in the case of money more fungible than other resource types. We discuss these concepts next.

Key Resource Attributes

In this section we discuss in more detail two important dimensions along which all resource types vary: how fungible they are and how proprietary they are. First, each resource lies somewhere on a continuum between having a use-value to social movements that is fully fungible (context independent) or fully context dependent (idiosyncratic). Second, resources are more or less proprietary, varying in the degree that individual or collective actors can control access to them. The two resource attributes discussed here do not comprise an exhaustive set of potentially useful possibilities. However, they are of central importance to understanding processes of

resource redistribution and access and, as a consequence, are central to the broader argument we make here. They are also centrally important for specifying the conditions under which resources have greater or lesser use-value for movement mobilization. Beyond this, however, these particular attributes incorporate aspects of other attributes of resources that we have excluded from attention. Resources that are durable, for example, hold their use-value over time and are, thus, fungible across time. By contrast, perishable resources are time-bound and thus, more context dependent. Similarly, much has been made of the distinction between public and private goods that, in our terms, can be seen to vary greatly in how proprietary they are. In thinking about such attributes it is important to focus on those attributes of specific resources. For instance, as we have discussed above, resources are distributed unevenly, often exhibiting a geographic or social concentration. These are not attributes of the resources per se, but rather attributes of the distribution of resources. We turn now to a discussion of resource fungibility and proprietary.

Fungibility and Context Dependence

All resources can be conceptualized along a continuum ranging from having a fully fungible use-value to those whose use-value is entirely context dependent. A fully fungible resource would be one that could be transferred easily between persons or organizations. The use-value to a social movement of a fully fungible resource would be relatively constant from one sociopolitical context to the next. Money is the most fungible of resources. Yet even its value fluctuates daily depending upon how the vagaries of international currency exchanges affect an SMO's preferred currency.[13] Nevertheless, a highly fungible resource like money can presumably be converted into other resources as needs dictate. Therefore, movement actors with a large proportion of fungible resources at their disposal enjoy greater flexibility in the range of strategies and tactics available to them, while the options of their counterparts rich in context-dependent (localized, spatially bound, issue specific, etc.) resources are more constrained.

The greater fungibility of money compared to other resource types means that money can be converted into other resources through the purchase of equipment, hiring of staff, founding of organizations, organizing events, and even in the production of certain cultural resources. The fungibility of money has limits, especially with respect to moral resources like legitimacy. For example, a celebrity endorsement of an issue campaign can greatly increase public attention, generate media coverage, and open doors to policymakers and resource providers alike. This has been the case with the ongoing engagement of Paul Hewson (aka Bono the well-known leader of the music group U2) on the issue of developing-world debt relief. Celebrity endorsements are especially credible in cases like this one where the celebrity commands the details of the issue, evidences sincere and longstanding commitment, and donates his or her own time. By contrast, a group could convert money into an ersatz moral resource by simply hiring a celebrity spokesperson to endorse a particular issue campaign and derive comparable publicity benefits. The legitimacy of the endeavor, however, would be eroded if it became apparent that the celebrity participated for purely financial reasons.

At the opposite end of the continuum from fungible resources are those with a use-value that is more context dependent and thereby limited to specific movement

issues, or is localized in time and place. The use-value of context-dependent resources depends upon a variety of sociocultural and political factors, as well as, the type of endeavor for which they will be used. Among the resource types we have discussed, social-organizational resources and important forms of human capital are quite context dependent. By contrast moral, monetary, and cultural resources are generally more portable, more spatially transferable than social-organizational ones.[14]

For example, in 1999 the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) collaborated with a coalition of Polish farm organizations to undertake a confrontational direct action campaign to block the plans by Smithfield Foods to establish corporate-owned, industrial-style hog operations in Poland (Juska and Edwards forthcoming). Based in Washington, DC, AWI is an advocacy organization with extensive experience and international connections gained from over 25 years of endangered species work. At different points in the successful campaign against Smithfield Foods AWI provided important resources, including limited financial support and deploying paid and volunteer activists to Poland. AWI also produced a Polish language video entitled *The Trojan Pig*, which proved extremely effective in galvanizing opposition to Smithfield Foods among Polish farmers. Yet prior to this campaign AWI had no operations or connections in Eastern Europe. Despite their ability to provide moral, material, human, and cultural resources, AWI's extensive social-organizational resources embedded in its US and international operations remained relatively inaccessible and of little use-value to the Polish campaign against Smithfield Foods.

The benefits of social organizational resources are confined to the geographical areas in which they are nested. While social-organizational resources would be valuable to social movements in any context, for them to have use-value to a social movement they must be accessible, and access to them is limited to the scope of their operations.[15] Similarly, labor is less context dependent than the human capital represented by skills, specialized knowledge, or technical expertise. For example, an activist with years of effective advocacy experience in Washington on a specific issue (e.g., developing-world debt relief) would find that her knowledge of how that system works, her connections, and command of the issues would be relatively useless if she were to find herself involved in a local environmental justice struggle over a proposed hazardous waste landfill. In much the same way, the professionalized expertise so necessary to run an effective issue advocacy organization at the national level would be of only limited use-value in leading a new congregation-based organizing campaign for an affiliate of the Industrial Areas Foundation (Warren 2001). The use-value of skills and expertise is more context dependent than the use-value of labor per se.

Proprietarity

The resources discussed above also vary in the extent to which they are proprietary. Resources vary on a continuum between being completely proprietary, where access to them can be tightly controlled, to those that are universally accessible in the public domain. Money and human labor are both quite proprietary. The decision to participate in a movement or not is a relatively private one, and individuals control which movement actors, if any, have access to their labor. By contrast, cultural resources are the least proprietary. Tactical repertoires, organizational templates,

and other conceptual tools are "culturally available," existing in the public domain usually without proprietary control.[16] Moral resources like formal endorsements or solidary support are proprietary because they are granted from an external source and can be retracted. Social-organizational resources can be highly proprietary, as with those embedded in clandestine organizations or elite social clubs where access is tightly controlled, or they can be widely accessible in the public domain as in the case of dense civic networks. Whether a resource is proprietary or in the public domain will greatly affect social movement efforts to gain access to it and utilize it. As we discuss below, the amount of control a resource provider can exert over a recipient's use of the resource relates directly to how proprietary the specific resource is. All resources may have strings attached, but the strings attached to proprietary resources are likely to be stronger and more numerous.

Mechanisms of Access and Source Constraints

Thus far we have emphasized the uneven distribution of resources and efforts to alter that distribution in order to channel resources toward the support of social movements. We turn now to the concept of access. Before resources present in a specific context can be utilized by social movement actors, those resources must first be accessible. For example, certain foundations may redistribute substantial funding to support a specific social movement, yet their largess is not equally accessible to all SMOs within that movement. The process SMOs must go through to obtain and maintain grant funding limits access to those that have already achieved a certain threshold of organizational formality and legitimacy. We discuss here four mechanisms by which social movement actors gain access to resources: aggregation from constituents, self-production, appropriation/co-optation, and patronage.

Four Mechanisms of Resource Access

Table 6.1 cross-classifies the five resource types described above with four mechanisms of resource access. Thus, the 20 cells of table 1 describe distinct exchange relationships movement actors pursue in order to gain access to the range of resources described above. What follows is not intended as an exhaustive discussion of either the mechanisms of resource access or exchange relationships. Rather, we intend them as conceptual tools to help analysts take into account the mix of resource types, means of access, and exchange relations with sources in specific cases of analytic interest. The emphasis we place on mechanisms of access coupled with the broader spectrum of resource types we have specified helps, we believe, to redirect the longstanding debate over the likelihood that receiving money from external sources leads SMOs to displace goals and moderate tactics. We take up that issue in our discussion of source constraints below.

Aggregation

Aggregation refers to mechanisms whereby resources held by dispersed individuals are converted into collective ones that in turn can be allocated by movement actors.

Table 6.1 Means of Social Movement and SMO Resource Access and Resource Types

Means of Access	*Resource Types* *Moral*	*Cultural*	*Social-Organizational*	*Human*	*Material*
Aggregation	• Lists of endorsers • Recruiting celebrity endorsers • Advisory committee members on letterhead • Soliciting statements of support for specific projects	• Social movement schools movement mentoring orgs. • Movement initiated summits and workshops where groups come together to share advice, information, strategy	• Building networks • Forming coalitions	• Recruiting constituents	• Member contributions • Emily's list • Individual donations from non-members
Self-Production	• Moral authority from the effective use of non-violence (e.g., King, Gandhi)	• Working groups • Ideas • Frames • Tactical repertoires • Music • History	• Founding SMOs	• Raising and socializing children, • Issue/movement oriented summer camps • Training • Movement Mentors • Women's, Environmental, or Black studies programs	• Grassroots fund raising events • Creating items for sale at events (T-shirts, posters, CDs, coffee mugs, etc.)
Co-optation/ Appropriation	• *Allying yourself with a well-respected group* • Hiring grassroots supporters to lobby officeholders • Company unions • Listing links to prominent, well respected groups on your webpage	• *Providing links on your webpage to materials produced by someone else* • Links to someone else's webpage	• Recruiting local affiliates from existing organizations • Gaining access to congregations for solicitation • mesomobilization	• Networked recruitment • Acquiring a mailing list • Organizational members • Bloc recruitment • Drawing on members of coalition partners	• Office space • Buses
Patronage	• A widely respected person or organization recognizing a group or activist in order to call positive attention to their work • Human rights awards • Nobel Pax Prize • An audience with the Pope	• Excellence awards aimed at competence or effectiveness • Accreditation of fiscal procedures to enhance confidence of supporters and donors	• Being loaned the mailing lists and telephone lists of sympathetic individuals	• Providing staff • Providing technical assistance	• Start-up grants • Large donations • Foundation grants • Government grants • Service contracts • Corporate sponsorship

Social movements aggregate privately held resources from beneficiary and conscience constituents in order to pursue collective goals. Social movements aggregate moral resources, for example, by compiling and publicizing lists of individuals and organizations that endorse their goals and actions, as has been the practice of the Mobilization for Global Justice since Seattle (Gillham 2003; Gillham and Edwards 2003). Cultural resources can be aggregated in movement initiated organizing conferences where activists from a range of groups meet to share information, brainstorm strategy, and conduct training.

Self-Production

Self-production of resources refers to those mechanisms whereby SMOs and movement leaders create or add value to resources that have been aggregated, co-opted, or provided by patrons. A fundamental mechanism by which social movements gain access to resources is to produce them internally. Social movements create cultural products like collective-action frames, tactical repertoires, music, literature, and organizational templates for enacting specific types of collective events or issue campaigns. Movements found SMOs, build networks, and form coalitions. Movements self-produce human resources through training rank-and-file activists for leadership, and the socializing of their children into the movement's values and practices. They also produce items to sell such as literature, products with movement symbolic significance like T-shirts, coffee mugs, posters, art, and even cakes and cookies for bake sales.

Co-Optation/Appropriation

Social movements often exploit relationships they have with existing forms of social organization that were not formed for explicit movement purposes. Co-optation refers to the transparent, permitted borrowing of resources that have already been aggregated by such groups. Appropriation refers to the surreptitious exploitation of the previously aggregated resources of other groups. A large proportion of SMOs include other organizations more or less formally among their members. In doing this they are able to some extent to co-opt resources previously produced or aggregated by those other organizations. Co-optation carries with it a transfer of some amount of proprietary control over the resources that are co-opted. The extent of proprietary control varies considerably by resource type. And co-optation usually implies some form of subsequent reciprocity as well as a tacit understanding that the resources will be used for mutually agreeable purposes. Co-optation of resources has received much theoretical attention (McCarthy 1987) because it has been quite common in many consequential movements such as the civil rights (McAdam 1982) and women's liberation (Freeman 1975) movements. Appropriation, on the other hand, has not received as much attention. Selznick (1960) illustrated the process for the American Communist Party, and a number of student groups active in the 1960s that specialized in infiltrating other groups and taking control of their resource base (Isserman 1987; Miller 1987).

Patronage

Patronage refers to the bestowal of resources upon an SMO by an individual or organization that often specializes in patronage. In monetary patronage relationships a patron external to the movement or SMO provides a substantial amount of financial support, but typically exercises some degree of proprietary control over how that money can be used and may well even attempt to exert influence over day-to-day operations and policy decisions. Government contracts, foundation grants, and large private donations are the most common forms of financial patronage as we noted above. Similarly, patronage relationships may involve the provision of some level of human resources, including, especially, the loan of personnel for periods of time. This kind of patronage is common when coalitions of SMOs field large and complex events, usually directed by loosely coupled organizations formed specifically for that purpose. Patronage in moral resources occurs when a widely respected individual or organization recognizes an SMO for positive achievements. Amnesty International's human rights awards and the Nobel Peace Prize are widely known examples, the receipt of which can be an immensely valuable organizational resource.

Source Constraints

Two longstanding debates about resources center on whether social movements obtain their support primarily from indigenous or external sources. This issue leads directly into questions about the extent to which external supporters constrain movement goals and activities (Cress and Snow 1996).[17]

We wish to reframe this debate in several ways. First, we contend that social movements and SMOs typically acquire their resources from a combination of internal and external sources, and all but the very smallest SMOs utilize multiple means of gaining access to resources. Thus the typical SMO simultaneously manages numerous exchange relationships. Even the homeless SMOs studied by Cress and Snow were engaged in multiple exchange relations. Each exchange relationship can be expected to carry a set of expectations and obligations between the parties, with each relationship having widely varying potential for social control. For example, the exchange relationship involved in an SMO aggregating small donations from a range of external conscience constituents is not likely to have the same social control implications for the group as would benefiting from the monetary patronage of a foundation, a single large donor, or a government agency. Given the range of exchange relationships implied in table 6.1, we note that the debate over source and constraint as it has proceeded over the years has been cast very narrowly, focusing almost exclusively on a single exchange relationship – monetary patronage. Even SMOs that benefit from monetary patronage will typically be engaged in a variety of other exchange relationships with various sources. The perspective we advocate here encourages analysts to consider the varying mix of facilitations and constraints across the range of exchange relationships through which specific SMOs, coalitions, issue campaigns, or event organizers mobilize resources.

Key Resource Mobilization Processes

Leaders and their top aides figure prominently in case studies of social movements (e.g., Sale 1973; Dobofsky 1980; Branch 1988; Binder 2002), yet the role of leaders and the strategic decisions they make typically play a far less central role in social movement theories (see chapter 8 in this volume). The focus upon resource mobilization processes, however, brings the role of strategic leadership to the forefront of analysis (Oliver and Marwell 1992; Ganz 2000). Social change entrepreneurs create social movement organizations, leaders and cadre develop and manage those organizations, and the functionaries of SMOs are responsible for creating the vast majority of opportunities that are available to adherents of the goals of a social movement to contribute time and money to a movement. And while collective action does certainly occur independently of SMOs (Oliver 1989b), during the late twentieth century in Western industrial democracies a substantial proportion of social change oriented collective action is directly fielded by SMOs or proceeds under their auspices.

The initial creation of an SMO requires the mobilization and aggregation of some minimum level of resources, as does its ongoing maintenance. Once in existence, SMOs, like all organizations, can be thought of as more or less rountinized bundles of "ways of doing things." The common patterns of these institutionalized practices come to include preferred repertoire of exchange relationships and means of resource access, and importantly shape the extent and form of the mobilization of material resources and activism within any social movement. And, they, in turn, constrain the choice of forms of collective action. These common practices are in turn shaped by the broader patterns of location and stratification of societal resources.

Creating Organizations and Building Organizational Capacity

Increasingly we live in a world dominated, not by the market, but by large-scale, bureaucratic organizations: multinational firms, the military, governmental agencies. Organizations are more powerful than individuals, and individuals seeking to challenge the practices of powerful organizations have formed their own social movement organizations. SMOs have proliferated at an incredibly rapid pace during the last three or four decades (see chapter 7 in this volume). This trend has been clearly established for national groups in the US (Walker 1991; Minkoff 1995; Baumgartner and Leech 1998) and in a number of European nations (Kriesi et al. 1995), with many indications that it is also the case for local groups (i.e., Edwards and Marullo 1995; Rucht 1999; Kempton et al. 2001).

The organizational structure of the social movement economy mirrors that of the demography of firms such that small, local, mostly volunteer, SMOs are the most common form, while large, financially affluent, heavily professionalized SMOs compose only a tiny proportion of the total population (see Edwards and Foley 2003).[18] Trends in the founding of small and large SMOs are partially responsible for this structure, but so are mortality rates of newly founded SMOs as well as the growth and decline of existing ones. We know more about the entrepreneurial

process for large SMOs than for small, local ones. For instance, a significant proportion of larger SMOs were founded with the help of patrons, receiving financial infusions, most importantly, from foundations and wealthy individuals, and sometimes other SMOs (Walker 1991; Nownes and Neeley 1996). If the general process of the founding of SMOs is in most respects similar to that of the founding of firms (Aldrich 1999), most start-ups require very small amounts of capital, and for most of them the entrepreneurs and their friends provide most of it. Some large professionalized national SMOs such as Common Cause (McFarland 1984), for example, began with substantial resources and pretensions to national scope, while others began in local communities and grew into national ones, like MADD (McCarthy 1994).

In any case, when an SMO is initially formed its architects make a variety of strategic choices about the goals, structure, and forms of collective actions that will be embodied in its ways of doing things. Most important for our purposes are decisions about organizational form and "mobilizing technologies."[19] And while SMOs may change and adapt, the choice of templates made at founding are many times very difficult to alter once an organization is up and running, since it has staked its public identity, to some extent, upon them and has begun to invest time and money in acting upon those choices. The templates of structure and mobilizing technology from among which SMO entrepreneurs must choose are part of the stock of available cultural resources, although access to them may be highly stratified as with many forms of knowledge and expertise.[20] Such choices are governed, in part, by typical "organizational means–ends rationality constrained by satisficing" (McCarthy and Zald 2001), but, also importantly, by mimetic, coercive, and normative institutional processes (DiMaggio and Powell 1983).

Adoption of a particular SMO structure may constrain the use of particular mobilizing technologies and facilitate the use of others. A professionalized SMO, like the Children's Defense Fund (Skocpol 1999) that chooses not to enlist individual members, for instance, forgoes a potential source of stable financial support as well as strong ties to a constituency that, potentially, could be mobilized for mass collective actions.

On the other hand, such an SMO may be able to devote greater effort to the use of previously effective fundraising technologies and may, therefore, be in a position to indirectly contribute to mass collective actions by providing subsidies to those groups that directly organize them. This was the case, for example, when Public Citizen provided crucial funding to on-site organizers leading up to the November 1999 WTO protest in Seattle (Gillham 2003). Or an SMO, like one of the local groups associated with the Industrial Areas Foundation (Warren 2001), which chooses to rely upon organizational rather than individual members may, as a result, succeed in stabilizing a large enough financial flow that it can direct more of its effort toward collective action than toward individual membership maintenance. Also SMOs that choose to become officially registered with the US Federal government as nonprofit organizations are expected to adopt certain standard operating procedures and may, as a result, adopt ways of doing things that constrain their choice of certain mobilizing technologies and encourage others (McCarthy et al. 1991; Cress 1997).

The choice of organizational form can have direct implications for the ability of an ongoing SMO to build the organizational capacity for certain types of collective

action, such as grass-roots mobilization and litigation. Some SMOs choose to expand their organizational capacity by creating local chapters, such as the suffrage movement (McCammon 2001). Others, like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), have spun off parallel, but independent, SMOs (The NAACP Legal and Defense Fund) that specialize in litigation tactics. Choices about organizational form like these, pursued for the purpose of building organizational capacity, also can constrain the kinds of mobilizing technologies that are easily accessible to SMO leaders.

Traditional criticisms of the role of SMOs in collective action stress both their conservatizing and their diversionary potential. The former posits that SMOs serve to moderate movement goals and tactics, and the latter that they divert effort from goal accomplishment to organizational maintenance. The greater the share of its resources an SMO devotes to maintaining itself, the less it can invest in production technologies and collective action. Below we will return to the question of SMO overhead costs.

The recent proliferation of SMOs has been accompanied by a trend toward the professionalization of SMO leadership (McCarthy and Zald 1973). The trend reinforces the impact of societal stratification processes upon movement processes. Weed (1995) shows, for instance, that in the US victims movement, paid SMO leaders are increasingly recruited on the basis of professional qualifications rather than on the basis of constituency membership or movement experience. There is also a tendency toward the adoption of professionalized technologies as the locus of SMOs shifts from local to national, to international (McCarthy 1997). To the extent that these trends become even more pervasive, the leadership of movements of disadvantaged groups should be more and more likely to be composed of conscience constituents rather than beneficiary constituents, those for whom the movement speaks.

Mobilizing Money

All money-mobilizing technologies depend, ultimately, upon social movement activists or their representatives asking fellow citizens and/or those in charge of other organizations for financial contributions.[21]

And, under most circumstances, being asked to give is a necessary condition for giving. As a consequence, knowing the volume of requests (the supply side) tells the analyst as much as the rate of positive response (the demand side) about the ebb and flow of money to social movements. Whether the requests for money are directed at beneficiary or conscience constituents defines whether appeals are to internal or external sources, and, as we have noted above, has been the focus of some research attention.

Technologies for mobilizing money can be distinguished between "narrowcast" technologies designed to target a few concentrated deep pockets of money, and "broadcast" ones targeting many widely dispersed shallow pockets. SMOs vary in their typical mix of targets, and hence the technologies they employ, the sources they depend upon, and the various exchange relationships they must negotiate. SMOs with significant annual operating budgets confront dilemmas in choosing, for instance, between whether to seek donations from a few large financial supporters, such as foundations or wealthy philanthropists, or to pursue telemarketing and/or

direct mail strategies aimed at gathering large aggregate sums of money in small amounts from many adherents. Choosing the former can create dependencies upon a few large donors, while the latter may create dependencies upon professional marketing firms. Heavy dependence upon a single technology, in general, makes an SMO more vulnerable to short-term fluctuations in revenues.

Once a large-budget SMO is deeply invested in a particular target and associated technology that has been successful for it in the past, that SMO will incur serious organizational costs, and therefore disincentives, for changing. Indeed, we know that those groups that began with extensive financial help from patrons are highly likely to continue to be dependent upon them (Walker 1991). But, sometimes, environmental conditions require SMOs to rethink their money mobilizing technologies. A good example is seen in the national poverty advocacy groups chronicled by Doug Imig (1992, 1996). Three of these SMOs were quite dependent upon financial resource flows from the US Federal Government before 1980. Those subsidies were severely curtailed during the Reagan years, when government funds available to them fell by 58 percent. This forced the groups to diversify their money mobilizing strategies, and to reduce the resources they devoted to advocacy. Walker (1991) chronicles a similar pattern for his sample of citizens' groups based in Washington, DC. Although many suffered severe cutbacks of federal financial support during the Reagan years, almost all survived, and many of them stepped up efforts to generate money from constituents rather than from outside donors.

Money mobilizing technologies can also be distinguished by whether they are typically handled by mainly professionals ("large-donor fund raising, seeking grants and contracts, direct mail solicitation, paid canvassing, and telemarketing") or they are usually carried out by volunteers ("fairs, rummage and bake sales, brunches, car washes, walk- or run-a-thons, volunteer canvassing and telephoning, raffles, ad-books and selling items on commission") (Oliver and Marwell 1992: 259). No inevitable tie exists between the characteristics of a money mobilizing technology and whether or not it has been professionalized, except for the fact that some business entrepreneurs have discovered a profit potential in packaging it and marketing to SMOs. Many large-budget SMOs routinely assess the advantages and disadvantages of keeping a fundraising operation within the organization versus outsourcing it. Take, for instance, direct mail technology. Such services are widely available for purchase from professionalized firms (Godwin 1988), but at the same time the use of direct mail is so incredibly widespread among advocacy organizations that it is safe to say that a substantial amount of it is accomplished by functionaries and volunteers of SMOs themselves (US Postal Rate Commission 1987). Similarly, while many SMO leaders and their cadre can and do write their own grant proposals to foundations for support, this is a function that has been increasingly professionalized and therefore outsourced by leaders of the largest SMOs.

By the same token many fundraising technologies that have traditionally been staffed by volunteers can occasionally be accomplished by organizations that specialize in such services. For example, product sales such as buttons, T-shirts, and hats are a common staple for SMOs small and large, especially at collective-action events. The same is true for production technologies such as large-event management. When the National Organization for Women stage a large rally in Washington, DC (which they have often done during the last several decades), most of the

many details of the events are planned and coordinated by National Organization for Women (NOW) staff and local volunteers. In contrast, when the Promise Keepers group held their "Stand in the Gap Rally" in Washington, DC, they hired a number of firms to plan and coordinate aspects of the event such as publicity, security, food service, and the like. As the social movement sector grows in size, more and more of what have been traditionally volunteer money raising technologies can be expected to become available for hire from outside contractors.

Finally, money mobilization strategies can be differentiated by their typical overhead costs, that is, the proportion of total money raised devoted to covering the costs of the fundraising itself. The greater the overhead costs the greater the diversion of the organization's efforts away from its collective-action tasks. Both direct mail and telemarketing technologies are notorious for the many instances of their low yields, so that a substantial proportion of money raised was absorbed by the technology itself rather than becoming available for investment in production technologies that could generate more collective action. The same difficulty has beset the use of paid door-to-door canvassing (Oliver 1989a; Everett 1992) so that the cost of paying canvassers absorbs significant proportions of the money they raise.

Mobilizing Activism

The labor potential of movement constituents is more equitably distributed across locations and social groups than are their financial resources, because clear upper limits exist for how much time any activist can contribute, while the limits on the financial contributions of wealthy citizens are more elastic. Consequently, groups poor in financial resources may be able to compensate by mobilizing in greater numbers. That prospect provides a strong rationale for mobilizing a movement's disadvantaged or beneficiary constituents (Warren 2001). But, as we have noted above, movements or SMOs rarely limit their efforts to mobilize activism exclusively to beneficiary constituents. This is especially the case for consensus mobilization technologies. Mobilizing consensus refers to the process of turning bystanders and opponents into adherents to the goals of a social movement and its associated organizations (see chapter 16 in this volume) (Klandermans 1997). Consensus mobilization technologies contrast with action mobilization ones that pertain to the process of turning constituents of all kinds into adherents. We take up consensus mobilization first, and then turn to action mobilization in general and its specific manifestation, membership mobilization, in particular.

Mobilizing citizens for collective action depends upon available pools of adherents to the goals of a social movement. And movements, in practice, devote extensive effort toward increasing these pools. Their efforts, of course, are not the only, or many times the most important, factor responsible for increasing support. Nevertheless, "public awareness," "public education," and "issue awareness campaigns" are commonly some of the most labor and capital intensive of the technologies employed by SMOs.[22] Gaining media attention to a movement's issues and goals is an important aspect of consensus mobilization. Some evidence indicates that the more material resources an SMO has available and chooses to invest in efforts to achieve such coverage, the more it will obtain (Barker-Plummer 2002). Consensus mobilization outcomes, no matter who produces them, however, are nonproprietary resources and, thus, cannot be hoarded by the SMO that may have produced them.

So, while SMOs pursuing similar goals may be in competition for the money and time of adherents to their causes, any success they have in consensus mobilization generates available human resources for the entire movement.

Action, or production, mobilizing technologies are designed to turn adherents into constituents of a movement – those who engage in collective action and who may or may not become continuing members of the SMOs associated with a movement. It is necessary to distinguish between different kinds of participation in collective action in order to analyze important dimensions of action mobilization, since activists mobilize adherents for diverse kinds of collective action. These may include, for instance, taking part in a demonstration, attending a meeting, taking part in a sit-in occupation of a building, contacting allied organizations to solicit support for an effort to change a law, contributing money, contacting a public official, stuffing envelopes, or representing the group at a table where movement literature is being distributed. Klandermans (1997) has usefully characterized participation in collective action along the independent dimensions of cost and duration, positing that larger numbers of adherents can be mobilized for low-cost activities of short duration, such as attendance at a demonstration, than for higher cost ones that imply ongoing commitment of time and energy, such as agreeing to head an important committee of a local SMO. In other words, an inverse relationship exists between the opportunity costs of participation and the number of people mobilized.

Joining an SMO is a standard form of movement participation that is typically a low cost activity of some duration. There are many meanings of SMO membership, however, that vary from a member being fully engaged on a day-to-day basis with an organization through simply making a small financial contribution to it. For instance, nationally MADD counts all of those who pledge money in response to their telemarketing appeals as members, though that number far exceeds the aggregate number of individuals claimed as members by MADD's local chapters. The rather large research literature on membership recruitment (Lofland 1996) suggests that disembodied recruitment technologies, like direct mail and media appeals, can be successful in generating weaker forms of membership, but that technologies that depend upon social networks and face-to-face interaction are more successful in recruiting adherents into stronger membership roles (see chapter 15 in this volume). That literature also suggests (Lofland 1996: 210) that, in general, those who respond to recruitment appeals by SMOs tend to be the more privileged individuals among the movement's adherents, and that recruiters usually know this and target their appeals to the adherents most likely to participate (the privileged), thereby exacerbating the impact of privilege on who ultimately participates in collective action (Brady et al. 1999). The same pattern holds, but with even greater disparities for those who respond to appeals for money (Brady et al. 1995).

Collective action, of course, includes much more than becoming a member of an SMO (Oliver 1989b). Many adherents who attend mass demonstrations, for instance, do not belong to SMOs. And some forms of collective action develop without much planning or sponsorship by SMOs. Yet for events that do result from some more or less centralized planning and coordination, successful activists extend their appeals for participation far beyond the members of their own organizations. One of the most effective technologies for accomplishing mass mobilization is through the co-optation of social-organizational resources. This is done by exploiting existing relationships with organizations that were not formed for

explicit movement purposes, but whose memberships include a large number of adherents who can aid in mobilizing their own constituents.[23] In the US, groups that co-opt social-organizational resources in this way typically enter into these exchange relationships with religious, occupational, or social service organizations. The equivalent technology for enrolling SMO members through cooperating adherent organizations has been called bloc recruitment (Oberschall 1973) and is another example of co-opting social-organizational resources as shown in table 6.1.

Creating Resources and Mobilization Potential Through Collective Action

In order to explore the central role of human and material resources in generating collective action we have had to distinguish between resource mobilization technologies and collective action in a static analysis. But, no doubt, in the dynamic circumstances of social movement development these are reciprocal processes, with people and financial resources being aggregated to facilitate collective action, and that action, in turn, sometimes enhancing subsequent potential for the aggregation of money and people, and sometimes even doing so through a collective action event itself. Such possibilities are most clearly seen in the increasingly popular runs and walk-a-thons (e.g., Klawiter 1999) that engage adherents as participants who may contribute money themselves, probably develop greater commitment to the cause through participation, and extract contributions from nonparticipants that are tied to the event by the participant's own participation.[24] Participation in such an event raises resources through contributions as well as sales of event related merchandise. Similarly, benefit concerts (Lahausen 1996), such as Farm Aid, are collective-action events aimed at raising both money and solidarity among participants, who are probably more likely to contribute to and participate in the movement subsequently if given opportunities to do so.

Conclusion

Putting resources at the center of the analysis of social movement processes reemphasizes the inextricable links between broader societal stratification processes and the ability of social groups to mobilize effectively for ongoing collective action. The durable patterns of resource inequality that stratification analysts have identified (Shanahan and Tuma 1994) and the mechanisms that account for those patterns (Tilly 1998) must be taken into account, since specific instances of collective action are always deeply embedded in existing social and economic relations. As a result, the availability of diverse kinds of resources to social actors and privileged access to them are seen to enhance the likelihood of effective collective action. In this way broader social and economic inequalities are replicated in patterns of collective action, making successful mobilization easier for privileged groups (Kim and Bearman 1997). This is seen in the consistent patterns of differential mobilization that characterize social movements in Western democracies where "new" movements based upon privileged constituencies, such as the middle-class supporters of environmental protection, women, gays and lesbians, and college and university

students predominated in the latter quarter of the twentieth century. In contrast, groups of the economically marginalized have had far less success in mobilizing for collective action.

In spite of such durable barriers to the mobilization of economically marginalized groups, however, now and then underprivileged groups have successfully overcome them and effectively mobilized constituencies for ongoing campaigns of collective action. A notable example was the unionization of Californian farmworkers in the early 1960s (Jenkins and Perrow 1977; Jenkins 1985; Ganz 2000). And while material resources are not unimportant in cases like that one, it was the creative deployment of human, cultural, and social-organizational resources by movement leaders, what Ganz (2000) has termed "strategic capacity," that appears to account for such an unlikely outcome. That deployment highlights the crucial role of human agency in transcending the durable social and economic barriers to mobilizing underprivileged constituencies. Our explication of diverse resource types, resource attributes, and the mechanisms of access to them provide, we hope, some useful analytic tools for understanding the role of agency in accounting for variation in the successful mobilization of constituencies of all kinds, and especially underprivileged ones.

Notes

The authors wish to thank Mayer Zald, JoAnn Carmin, Pat Gillham, and the editors of this volume for their feedback and criticism of an earlier draft of this manuscript.

1 This argument mirrors the distinction between demand and supply-side accounts of religious vitality clearly articulated by Finke and others (Warner 1993; Finke et al. 1996) for religious groups.

2 The large national environmental groups that might have been expected to support this local movement was composed of many grass-roots groups, but generally ignored them.

3 According to a recent census of 739 local and statewide environmental organizations operating in North Carolina, a majority of them (55.3%) maintain websites (Edwards and Andrews 2002). In Gillham's (2003) census of 1,398 US-based organizations that endorsed, supported, or participated in the November 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle, 75% had websites.

4 We focus here on the redistribution of resources, yet these processes are closely related to aspects of political opportunity. Over time, variations in the extent of this redistribution can contribute to the ebb and flow of political opportunity for the social movement sector as a whole and evidence substantial cross-national variation. However, in a country like the US, for example, uneven state redistribution across issue arenas and constituencies favor some movements over others.

5 Jenkins and Halcli (1999) show that in 1960 almost 95% of the foundation grant dollars flowed to groups pursuing minority or economic justice issues, indicating that there has been a dramatic shift in the intervening years toward support of groups whose own constituents are more rather than less privileged.

6 "The Women's Funding Network is the membership organization of public and private women's foundations, and individual donors. The Network promotes development and growth of women's funds that empower women and girls" (Brilliant 2000: 558).

7 The extensive support of the US Catholic Bishops for the pro-life movement is well known.

8 The increasing involvement of business groups in movements concerned with social problems is highlighted by a new emphasis in funding by the Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Sector research Fund (Nonprofit Sector Strategy Group 2001).

9 Gamson makes a strong case (1968) for the utility of treating the potential of resources through a focus on their capacity rather than upon their use. Evaluating the role of resources in mobilization, as in the exercise of power is quite problematic. Gamson's is the preferred strategy of most analysts, and is the one adopted here.

10 We delete their "informational" category entirely. The provision of connections to outside resources that they call "referrals" and treat as an informational resource fits squarely within recent theorizing of social capital as networked access to resources (Foley et al. 2001; Lin 2001) and is included in our "social-organizational" category below. They include both strategic and technical support as "informational resources," describing them as knowledge that facilitates goal-attainment or organizational development respectively (Cress and Snow 1996: 1095). From the perspective we develop below, each of these conflate a cultural resource (the knowledge per se that exists and is culturally available within a given society) and a human resource (the individuals who command that knowledge and by their participation make it accessible and usable to movements or SMOs). These distinctions are discussed in greater detail below.

11 See, e.g., Foley and Edwards 1996; Edwards and Foley 1997; Foley and Edwards 1999; Edwards and Foley 2001; and Edwards et al. 2001.

12 Clearly, some cultural resources can be made proprietary through copyrighting, patents, and other emerging forms of intellectual property. As the domain of commodified culture becomes larger relative to that of public culture issues of unauthorized access to and use of cultural resources will likely become more problematic for social movements and SMOs.

13 Zelizer (1994) shows how the use of money is in specific instances also quite socially constrained, and hence, sometimes, very context dependent, as for instance the strong norms and legal prohibitions governing the buying and selling of children.

14 While this is generally true for cultural resources within a given society, their portability or transferability cross-nationally or cross-culturally is limited. Professional credentials and tacit knowledge about accomplishing specific organizational tasks, for example, typically do not hold their value well when crossing national or cultural borders

15 Organizations can, of course, grow to a larger scale, encompassing a wider geographic scope of operations, and in the process become a less context-dependent resource, as its use-value to another social movement becomes more widely accessible. As discussed below, organizations expand their scope of operations in a variety of ways, all of which require the mobilization of substantial material and human resources.

16 Some cultural resources in capitalist societies, of course, can be made proprietary. The technology of direct mailing, for instance, the basic techniques of which were invented by movement groups, has been made, in its most elaborated form, into a proprietary mobilization technology.

17 Usually unstated in this debate is that what constitutes "indigenous," and "external" to the movement depends entirely upon how one defines a "social movement" (Diani 1992), and secondarily how one defines an SMO. We do not engage that issue here. Rather, we rely here on the definitions of McCarthy and Zald (1977).

18 This pattern is common for organizations of all types across the nonprofit sector. See Smith (1997).

19 Oliver and Marwell (1992) introduce the distinction between mobilizing technologies, which they define as "sets of knowledge about ways of accumulating the resources necessary for production technologies" (255). Production technologies are "sets of knowledge about ways of achieving goals, such as lobbying, demonstrations, strikes or attending a public hearing" (255).

20 We do not deny that there is an element of innovation and adaptation in this process of cultural borrowing (McCarthy 1996), sometimes even significant innovation (Clemens 1997).

21 Social movements mobilize material resources other than money. These "in-kind" contributions of office space, equipment, or supplies are less fungible than money though equally tangible and proprietary. Money predominates in large part because of its fungibility.

22 SMOs that spend high proportions of the proceeds of direct mailing on carrying out the mailing regularly contend that communicating the content included in their mailings constitutes "public education."

23 What we have termed "co-optation," Gerhards and Rucht (1992) called "mesomobilization."

24 A quite different example of the same process is seen in efforts to generate interaction between liberal philanthropists who make large contributions to community organizing and the community organizers themselves. Silver (1998) suggests that such involvement serves to increase the commitment of donors to the movement groups that they fund. See Ostrander (1995) for a contrasting case of a foundation that sought rather to maintain barriers between donors and the movement leaders it funded.

References and further reading

Aldrich, Howard (1999) *Organizational Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barker-Plummer, Bernadette (2002) Producing Public Voice: Resource Mobilization and Media Access in the National Organization for Women. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79, 188–205.

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Beth L. Leech (1998) *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Becker, Gary (1964) *Human Capital*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Columbia University Press.

Bernard, Ted, and Jora Young (1997) *The Ecology of Hope: Communities Collaborate for Sustainability*. Philadelphia: New Society.

Binder, Amy J. (2002) *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1986) The Forms of Capital. In John Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241–58.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Waquant. 1992. *Introduction to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Brady, Henry E., Kay Lehman Schloszman, and Sidney Verba (1999) Prospecting for Participants: Rational Expectations and the Recruitment of Political Activists. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 153–68.

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman (1995) Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89, 271–94.

Branch, Taylor (1988) *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years 1954–63*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Brilliant, Eleanor L. (2000) Women's Gain: Fundraising and Fund Allocation as an Evolving Social Movement Strategy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29, 554–70.

Carmin, JoAnn (forthcoming) Resources, Opportunities, and Local Environmental Action in the Democratic Transition and Early Consolidation Periods in the Czech Republic. *Environmental Politics*.

Clemens, Elisabeth (1997) *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, James S. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* (Supplement), 94, S95–S120.

——(1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cook, Maria Lorena (1996) *Organizing Dissent: Unions, the State, and the Democratic Teachers' Movement in Mexico*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Cress, Daniel M. (1997) Nonprofit Incorporation among Movements of the Poor: Pathways and Consequences for Homeless Social Movement Organizations. *Sociological Quarterly*, 38, 343–60.

Cress, Daniel M., and David A. Snow (1996) Mobilization at the Margins: Resources, Benefactors, and the Viability of Homeless Social Movement Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 61 (6), 1089–109.

——(2000) The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation and Framing. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 1089–109.

Dalton, Russell (1994) *The Green Rainbow*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Diani, Mario (1992) The Concept of Social Movement. *Sociological Review*, 40, 1–25.

DiMaggio, Paul, and Walter Powell (1983) The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–60.

DiMaggio, Paul, Eszter Hargittai, W. Russell Neuman, and John P. Robinson (2001) Social Implications of the Internet. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 307–36.

Dobofsky, Melvyn (1980) *We Shall Be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World*. Chicago: Quadrangle.

Eder, Donna, Suzanne Staggenborg, and Lori Sudderth (1995) The National Women's Music Festival: Collective Identity and Diversity in a Lesbian-Feminist Community. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 23 (4), 485–99.

Edwards, Bob (1995) With Liberty and Environmental Justice for All: The Emergence and the Challenge of Grassroots Environmentalism in the USA. In Bron Taylor (ed.), *Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 35–55

Edwards, Bob, and Kenneth T. Andrews (2002) Methodological Strategies for Examining Populations of Social Movement Organizations. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.

Edwards, Bob, and Michael W. Foley (1997) Social Capital and the Political Economy of our Discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40 (5), 668–77.

——(2001) Civil Society and Social Capital: A Primer. In Bob Edwards, Michael W. Foley and Mario Diani (eds.), *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1–14.

——(2003) Social Movement Organizations beyond the Beltway: Understanding the Diversity of One Social Movement Industry. *Mobilization*, 8 (1), 85–107

Edwards, Bob, and John D. McCarthy (1992) Social Movement Schools. *Sociological Forum*, 7 (3), 541–50.

Edwards, Bob, and Sam Marullo (1995) Organizational Mortality in a Declining Social Movement: The Demise of Peace Movement Organizations in the End of the Cold War. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 908–27.

Edwards, Bob, Michael W. Foley, and Mario Diani (eds.) (2001) *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover, NY: University Press of New England.

Everett, Kevin D. (1992) Opening Doors for Change: Movement Funding and Organizational Transformation. Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Washington, DC.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Patricia Yancey Martin (1995) Doing the Work of the Movement: Feminist Organizations. In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancy Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 3–26

Finke, Roger, M. Guest Avery, and Rodney Stark (1996) Mobilizing Local Religious Markets: Religious Pluralism in the Empire State, 1855 to 1865. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 203–18.

Foley, Michael W., and Bob Edwards (1996) The Paradox of Civil Society. *Journal of Democracy*, 7 (3), 38–52.

——(1999) Is it Time to Disinvest in Social Capital? *Journal of Public Policy*, 19 (2), 199–231.

Foley, Michael W., Bob Edwards, and Mario Diani (2001) Social Capital Reconsidered. In Bob Edwards, Michael W. Foley, and Mario Diani (eds.), *Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 266–80.

Freeman, Jo (1975) *The Politics of Women's Liberation*. New York: McKay.

Gamson, William A. (1968) *Power and Discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

——(1975) *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, and Steven Rytina (1982) *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Chicago: Dorsey.

Ganz, Marshall (2000) Resources and Resourcefulness: Strategic Capacity in the Unionization of California Agriculture. *American Journal of Sociology*, 14, 1003–62.

Gerhards, Jürgen, and Dieter Rucht (1992) Mesomobilization Contexts: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 555–96.

Gillham, Patrick F. (2003) Social Movement Organization Structure and Action: Three Contentious Episodes in the Global Justice Movement. PhD dissertation, University of Colorado.

Gillham, Patrick F., and Bob Edwards (2003) Global Justice Protesters Respond to the September 11 Terrorist Attacks: The Impact of an Intentional Disaster on Demonstrations in Washington, DC. In Jacki Monday (ed.) *Impacts of and Human Response to the September 11, 2001 Disasters: What Research Tells Us*. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Research and Information Center, University of Colorado, 192–229.

Godwin, R. Kenneth (1988) *One Billion Dollars of Influence: The Direct Marketing of Politics*. Chatham, NY: Chatham House.

Hyde, Cheryl (1995) Feminist Social Movement Organizations Survive the New Right. In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancy Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 306–21.

Imig, Douglas R. (1992) Resource Mobilization and Survival Tactics of Poverty Advocacy Groups. *Western Political Quarterly*, 45, 501–10.

——(1996) *Poverty and Power: The Political Representation of Poor Americans*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Inglehart, Ronald (1977) *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Isbester, Katherine (2001) *Still Fighting: The Nicaraguan Women's Movement, 1977–2000*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Isserman, Maurice (1987) *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New*. New York: Basic.

Jenkins, J. Craig (1985) *The Politics of Insurgency*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig, and Craig M. Eckert (1986) Channeling Black Insurgency: Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 249–68.

Jenkins, J. Craig, and Abigail Halcli (1999) Grassrooting the System: The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy, 1953–1990. In Ellen Condliffe Lagemann (ed.), *Philanthrophic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 229–56.

Jenkins, J. Craig, and Charles C. Perrow (1977) Insurgency of the Powereless: Farm Workers Movements (1946–72). *American Sociological Review*, 42, 249–67.

Juska, Arunas, and Bob Edwards (forthcoming) Refusing the Trojan Pig: The American–Polish Coalition Against Corporate Pork Production in Eastern Europe. In Joe Bandy and Jackie Smith (eds.), *Coalitions Across Borders: Negotiating Difference and Unity in Transnational Struggles Against Neoliberalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kempton, Willett, Dorothy C. Holland, Katherine Bunting-Howarth, Erin Hannan, and Christopher Payne (2001) Local Environmental Groups: A Systematic Enumeration in Two Geographical Areas. *Rural Sociology*, 66, 557–78.

Khawaja, Marwan (1994) Resource Mobilization, Hardship, and Popular Collective Action in the West Bank. *Social Forces*, 73, 191–220.

Kim, Hyojoung, and Peter S. Bearman (1997) The Structure and Dynamics of Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 70–93.

Klandermans, Bert (1997) *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Klandermans, Bert, and Dirk Oegema (1987) Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 583–600.

Klawiter, Maren (1999) Racing for the Cure, Walking Women, and Toxic Touring: Mapping Cultures of Action within the Bay Area Terrain of Breast Cancer. *Social Problems*, 46, 104–26.

Knoke, David (1986) Associations and Interest Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 1–21.

Kriesi, Hanspeter (1989) New Social Movements and the New Class in the Netherlands. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 1078–116.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Marco Giugni (1995) *New Social Movements in Western Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: UCL Press.

Lahausen, Christian (1996) *The Rhetoric of Moral Protest: Public Campaigns, Celebrity Endorsement, and Political Mobilization*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Liebman, Robert, and Robert Wuthnow (eds.) (1986) *The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Lin, Nan (2001) *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, J. R. (1978) Community Structure and Industrial Conflict. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 199–220.

Lofland, John (1996) *Social Movement Organizations: A Guide to Insurgent Realities*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

McAdam, Doug (1982) *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1890–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCammon, Holly J. (2001) Stirring up Suffrage Sentiment: The Formation of the Women's Suffrage Organizations, 1861–1914. *Social Forces*, 80, 449–80.

McCarthy, John D. (1987) Pro-life and Pro-choice Mobilization: Infrastructure Deficits and New Technologies. In Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy (eds.), *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 49–66.

—— (1994) Activists, Authorities, and Media Framing of Drunk Driving. In Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph Gusfield (eds.), *New Social Movements*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 133–67.

——(1996) Mobilizing Structures: Constraints and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting and Inventing. In Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 141–51.

——(1997) The Globalization of Social Movement Theory. In Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnocco (eds.), *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 243–59.

McCarthy, John D., and Mark Wolfson (1996) Resource Mobilization by Local Social Movement Organizations: The Role of Agency, Strategy and Structure. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 1070–88.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald (1973) *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning.

——(1977) Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 1212–41.

——(2002) The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements. In Jonathan H. Turner (ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 533–65.

McCarthy, John D., David W. Britt, and Mark Wolfson (1991) The Institutional Channeling of Social Movements by the State in the United States. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 14, 45–76.

McCarthy, John D., Mark Wolfson, David P. Baker, and Elaine Mosakowski (1988) The Founding of Social Movement Organizations: Local Citizens' Groups Opposing Drunken Driving. In Glenn R. Carroll (ed.), *Ecological Models of Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 71–84.

McFarland, Andrew W. (1984) *Common Cause: Lobbying in the Public Interest*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

McLaughlin, Paul, and Khawaja Marwan (2000) The Organizational Dynamics of the U.S. Environmental Movement: Legitimation, Resource Mobilization, and Political Opportunity. *Rural Sociology*, 65, 422–39.

Marx, Anthony W. (1992) *Lessons of Struggle: South African Internal Opposition, 1960–1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, Nancy (1995) Feminist Clashes with the State: Tactical Choices by State-Funded Rape Crisis Centers. In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancy Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 291–305.

Melucci, Alberto (1980) The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach. *Social Science Information*, 19, 199–226.

Meyer, John, and Brian Rowan (1977) Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340–63.

Miller, James (1987) *Democracy in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Minkoff, Debra (1995) *Organizing for Equality: The Evolution of Women's and Racial-Ethnic Organizations in the America, 1955–1985*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

——(1997) The Sequencing of Social Movements. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 779–99.

Morris, Aldon D. (1981) Black Southern Student Sit-in Movement: An Analysis of Internal Organization. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 755–67.

Morris, Aldon D. (1984). *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.

Nelkin, Dorothy and M. Pollak (1981) *The Atom Besieged*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nonprofit Sector Strategy Group (2001) *The Nonprofit Sector and Business: New Visions, New Opportunities, New Challenges*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

Nownes, Anthony J., and Grant Neeley (1996) Public Interest Group Entrepreneurship and Theories of Group Mobilization. *Political Research Quarterly*, 49, 119–46.

NTIA (National Telecommunications and Information Administration) (2002) A Nation Online: How Americans Are Expanding their Use of the Internet <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/dn/index.html>.

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

Offe, Claus (1985) New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics. *Social Research*, 52, 817–68.

Oliver, Pamela E. (1983) The Mobilization of Paid and Volunteer Activists in the Neighborhood Movement. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 5, 133–70.

——(1989a) Selling the Movement on Commission: The Structure and Significance of Canvassing by Social Movement Organizations. Paper Presented at the Annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco.

——(1989b) Bring the Crowd Back in: The Nonorganizational Elements of Social Movements. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 5, 133–70.

Oliver, Pamela E., and Gerald Marwell (1992) Mobilizing Technologies for Collective Action. In Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 251–72.

Ostrander, Susan A. (1995) *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Parkin, Frank (1968) *Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Peterson, Thomas V. (2002) *Linked Arms: A Rural Community Resists Nuclear Waste*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Powell, Walter, and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds.) (1992) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1), 65–78.

Rucht, Dieter (1999) Linking Organization and Mobilization: Michel's Iron Law of Oligarchy Reconsidered. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 4, 151–69.

Sale, Kirkpatrick (1973) *SDS*. New York: Random House.

Schneider, Cathy Lisa. (1995) *Shantytown Protest in Pinochet's Chile*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Selznick, Philip (1960) *The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Shanahan, Suzanne Elise, and Nancy Brandon Tuma (1994) The Sociology of Distribution and Redistribution. In N. Smelser and R. Swedborg (eds.), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 733–65.

Shutkin, William (2000) *The Land that Could Be: Environmentalism and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Silver, Ira (1998) Buying an Activist Identity: Reproducing Class through Social Movement Philanthropy. *Sociological Perspectives*, 41, 303–21.

Sirianni, Carmen, and Lewis Friedland (2001) *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sklair, Leslie (1997) Social Movements for Global Capitalism: The Transformation of the Capitalist Class in Action. *Review of International Political Economy*, 4, 514–38.

Skocpol, Theda (1999) Advocates without Members: The Recent Transformation of American Civic Life. In Theda Skocpol and Morris P. Fiorina (eds.), *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution/Russell Sage Foundation, 461–508.

Smith, Christian. (1991) *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——(1996) *Disruptive Religion: The Force of Faith in Social Movement Activism*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, David H. (1997) The Rest of the Nonprofit Sector: Grassroots Associations as the Dark Matter Ignored in Prevailing "Flat Earth" Maps of the Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26, 114–31.

Smith, Jackie and Dawn Wiest. (2003) The Uneven Geography of Global Civil Society: National and Global Influences on Transnational Association. Unpublished manuscript. State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Snow, David A. (1979) A Dramaturgical Analysis of Movement Accommodation: Building Idiosyncrasy Credit as a Movement Mobilization Strategy. *Symbolic Interactionism*, 2, 23–44.

Snow, David A., Sarah A. Soule, and Daniel M. Cress (2001) Homeless Protest across 17 U.S. Cities, 1980–1991: Assessment of the Explanatory Utility of Strain, Resource Mobilization, and Political Opportunity Theories. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Anaheim, CA.

Soule, Sarah A., Doug McAdam, John McCarthy, and Yang Su (1999) Protest Events: Cause or Consequence of State Action? The U.S. Women's Movement and Federal Congressional Activities, 1956–1979. *Mobilization*, 4 (2), 239–55.

Switzer, Jacqueline Vaughn (1997) *Green Backlash: The History and Politics of Environmental Opposition in the U.S.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Tilly, Charles (1998) *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

US Postal Rate Commission (1987) *Study of Political Advocacy in Third-Class Nonprofit Mail*. Washington, DC: Postal Rate Commission.

Useem, Bert, and Mayer N. Zald (1982) From Pressure Group to Social Movement: Efforts to Promote Use of Nuclear Power. *Social Problems*, 30, 144–56.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady (1995) *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, Jack (1991) *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Warner, R. S. (1993) Work in Progress Toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98 (5), 1044–93.

Warren, Mark R. (2001) *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weed, Frank J. (1995) *Certainty of Justice: Reform in the Crime Victim Movement*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Wickham-Crowley, Timothy P. (1989) Winners, Losers, and Also-Rans: Toward a Comparative Sociology of Latin American Guerrilla Movements. In S. Eckstein (ed.), *Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 132–81.

Wilson, Kenneth R., Jennifer S. Wallin, and Christa Reiser (2003) Social Stratification and the Digital Divide. *Social Science Computer Review* 21 (3), 133–43.

Wolfson, Mark (2001) *The Fight against Big Tobacco: The Movement, the State and the Public's Health*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Wuthnow, Robert, and John H. Evans (2002) *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Zald, Mayer N. (1992) Looking Backward to Look Forward: Reflections on the Past and Future of the Resource Mobilization Program. In Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 326–48.

Zald, Mayer N. and J. Jacobs (1978) Compliance/incentive Classifications of Organizations: Underlying Dimensions. *Administration and Society*, 9 (4), 403–24.
Zelizer, V. A. (1994) *The Social Meaning of Money*. New York: Basic.