Review of Research and Commentary on Social Movements Generally

This review of the social movement literature has been prepared as part of the Civil Society Engagement in Health for All project (CSE4HFA). This project is structured around five themes regarding civil society engagement: movement building, campaigning and advocacy, capacity building, knowledge building and dissemination and policy dialogue and governance.

In the context of the CSE4HFA project these themes are addressed from the subject position of the activist and the organisation; how to build the movement, how to campaign, how to build capacity, etc.

The research literature doesn’t speak directly to these questions, partly because they are so context dependent and partly because of the ‘objectives’ voice within which research and academic commentary is cast.

Accordingly this review is structured around relevant themes in the academic literature with a concluding section in which the implications for the five generic themes adopted for the CSE4HFA project are drawn out.

The literature review presented in this annex was supplemented by the note on social movement theory in the Colombian Overview and Synthesis Report (ES, EN) and the literature review prepared for the Indian Report (here). Both of these reviews draw upon theoretical materials which are only briefly touched upon in this review.

Definitions and theoretical perspectives

Social movements are defined in many ways in the literature. Following Porta and Diani (2006) we list the defining characteristics of social movements as:

1. a group of individuals and organisations who
2. share a set of concerns, beliefs, values, practices and commitments which are in various ways at odds with the dominant zeitgeist, and share a sense of mutual solidarity in this respect; and
3. are linked through informal networks for communication and cooperation and who collaborate in
4. collective action around contentious issues, deploying
5. a shared repertoire of forms of action.

The academic study of social movements is commonly reported through four broad and overlapping perspectives which Porta and Diani describe as:

1. ‘Collective behaviour,’
2. ‘Resource mobilisation’,
3. ‘Political opportunity’,
4. ‘New social movements’.

‘Collective behaviour’ refers to a body of research and commentary within sociology which is concerned with a range of different kinds of collectivities including social movements.

‘Resource mobilisation’ refers to a body of research and commentary which focuses on the kinds of resources (human, financial, organisational, cultural, etc) which social movements draw upon; the
processes for accessing or developing such resources and the constraints on collective action arising in the processes of resource mobilisation.

‘Political opportunity’ refers to a tradition of research and commentary which seeks to relate the social movement to its political context including the institutions of governance. The configurations of political institutions and forces around the issues of concern to a particular social movement are necessary for understanding the strategic logic of the movement. They also help to explain the waxing and waning of social movement activity which may reflect a growing rejection of established norms but can also reflect periods of institutional stability or an ‘unfreezing’ of institutional forms (the window of opportunity).

The ‘new social movement’ school seeks to locate the concerns, growth and action of social movements to the underlying social forces and political dynamics of social stability and social change. Writings in this tradition are building on an older Marxist analysis which saw the contradiction between capital and labour as key to understanding stability and change. However, the capital versus labour analysis is seen as too limited with a need for a social and political analysis which gives more weight to other contradictions, including ethnicity and gender, as independent dynamics also contributing to stability and change. It is also the case that with globalisation, class analysis based on the opposition of classes within the nation state is not sufficient and needs to be complemented by a definition of class relations at the global level (Robinson 2004).

Other useful themes in the research literature include ‘forms of action’, ‘diffusion’, ‘culture’ (discussed below) and the life cycles of social movements. Some of the life cycle patterns described, see for example, Snow and colleagues (Snow, Soule et al. 2004), include emergence (of a social movement from isolated protests, through new alliances to a robust movement); expanding in scale from local to national to global; convergence of separate concerns into broader bases; institutionalisation (where the movement activists are all absorbed into the bureaucratic structures developed in response to the movement); and fragmentation and loss of energy. This is not an obligatory sequence.

Brecher et al (2002) sketch their concept of movement formation:

At certain points, people see existing power institutions as blocking goals that could be attained by cooperation that transcends existing institutions. So people develop new networks that outrun them. Such movements create subversive “invisible connections” across state boundaries and the established channels between them. These interstitial networks translate human goals into organizational means.

If such networks link groups with disparate traditions and experiences, they require the construction of what are variously referred to as shared worldviews, paradigms, visions, frames, or ideologies.

... The emerging belief system becomes a guide for efforts to transform the world. It defines common values and norms, providing the basis for a common program. When a network draws together people and practices from many formerly marginal social spaces and makes it possible for them to act together, it establishes an independent source of power. Ultimately, new power networks may become strong enough to reorganize the dominant institutional configuration.
Shared grievances, identity, solidarity

It is commonly assumed in the scholarly commentary on social movements that ‘shared grievances’ and an emerging solidarity around such ‘grievances’ are fundamental to the cohesion of social movements.

Some commentators conceive solidarity largely in terms of shared identity and the building of solidarity in terms of the construction of that ‘collective identity’ (Hunt and Benford 2004). This is too restrictive. The primary glue which binds the nuclear disarmament movement or the environment movement is a shared concern and in a sense this gives rise to a shared identity but hardly a defining identity. The experience of the women’s movement is that a singular focus on identity can exclude people; hence the need for a politics of difference (Gunew and Yeatman 1993) operating in a dialectic with a politics of identity.

Brecher, Costello and Smith (2002) comment that:

Seeing that other people share similar experiences, perceptions, and feelings opens a new set of possibilities. Perhaps collectively we can act in ways that have impacts isolated individuals could never dream of having alone. And if we feel this way, perhaps others do, too. This group formation process constructs new solidarities. Once a consciousness of the need for solidarity develops, it becomes impossible to say whether participants’ motives are altruistic or selfish, because the interest of the individual and the collective interest are no longer in conflict; they are perceived as one.

One of the most dramatic examples of many different constituencies coming together was the ‘Battle of Seattle’ in 1999 (Smith 2002). This was a mobilisation which brought together unions, environmental organisations, consumer organisations, social justice groups, peace activists and fair trade advocates in a rowdy opposition to neoliberal economic globalisation, symbolised by the WTO but responding also to NAFTA and the aborted MAI (multilateral agreement on investment). While much of the opposition expressed in Seattle was domestic to the US, Smith demonstrates that the Seattle protests were based on ‘transnational mobilising structures’ which had emerged over the preceding 50 years. Smith describes the work of transnational social movement organisations in supporting dialogue, negotiating policy positions which addressed the concerns of North and South, facilitating information flows, cultivating movement identities and building globally oriented solidarity identities.

Fadee and Schindler (2014) have argued that the spectacular early growth of the Occupy Movement, including transnational extensions, reflected the focus on the shared vulnerability experienced by many different groups and constituencies and the role of the 1% in reproducing that vulnerability. They argue that the sense of shared vulnerability enabled collaboration and solidarity to develop across different constituencies. It may be that the difficulties faced in building on the Occupy Movement reflected the difficulty in deepening the shared understanding across the movement regarding the underlying structures which reproduced such vulnerability.

McCarthy and Zald (1977) warn against relying too much on ‘shared grievances’ in explaining the development of social movements. They point out that many social movements benefit from the solidarity of ‘outsiders’ who do not personally share the grievances central to the claims of the movement. More darkly they point to the many ways in which the concerns of particular groups can be manipulated by media, politicians and corporations.
Nepstad (2002) has explored the international reaction to the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero and the role that that played in building transnational solidarity with the struggle of the Salvadoran democracy movement. Clearly solidarity is more than ‘shared grievance’.

In her analysis of anti-WTO protest actions (see below) Smith (2002) has suggested that participating in protest dramatizes the conflict and reinforces us-versus-them identities. Saul Alinsky (1971) has reported how, in his own practice as a community organiser, he would deliberately build on the grievances of the community he was working with to sharpen their awareness of the complicity of the authorities and strengthen their own sense of solidarity.

Paolo Freire (1971) took a different approach; emphasising the need to express in words the grievances and to find the words needed to explore possible analyses and strategies. Zanchetta and colleagues (Zanchetta, Kolawola-Salami et al. 2014) have described a Freirian critical awareness and reflection program involving community health agents in Brazil. The workshops utilized evocative objects to link and develop participants’ conceptual and experiential knowledge. The participants exchanged connections and experiences and created hypothetical action plans to be implemented in collaboration with community members.

Earl (2004) has commented on the cultural dimensions of movement building which include building solidarity and building the culture and the practices which support working across difference.

Forms of action and sources of power

Smith provides a useful summary (adapted below) of the ‘protest repertoires’ responding to globalisation and evident in the anti-WTO protests. Smith also provides a useful discussion of these various forms of action, what they involved and how they might have contributed to the protest objectives and to movement building.
Education and mobilization
• Cultivating organizations and “affinity groups”
• Public demonstrations at global site
• Teach-ins and speaker forums
• Coordinated “N30” protests around the globe
• Polity-bridging: local MAl-Free Zones
• Nonviolence training/medic training

Framing and Symbolic Mobilisation
• Press centre and conferences for mainstream media
• Global witnessing / Transcontinental caravan
• Satirical newspaper wraps
• Dramaturgy
  o Street theatre and puppets
  o Greenpeace’s condom drop
  o Banner hangs
  o Boston WTeeA Party
  o Bove’s Roquefort resistance

Disruption
• Blockade of international conference site
• Civil disobedience
• Legal observers
• Vandalism against corporate sites

Organization/ mobilization actions
• Transnational organisation
• Producing NGO newspaper at global conferences

Borrowing official templates
• Global People’s Assembly
• Participation in government delegations to multilateral forum
• People’s Tribunal versus corporate crimes

Electronic Activism
• Information exchange: Internet, list serve
• Independent Media Center
• Rapid response action networks
• Virtual sit in
• Mirror websites
• E-mail and fax jams


The concept of empowerment appears commonly in discussions of social movements and community participation in health (Wallerstein and Bernstein 1988, Lord and Hutchison 1993, Labonte 1994, Minkler, Thompson et al. 2001, Weng 2006, Wright, Newman et al. 2006, DeVos, Malaise et al. 2009, Wiggins 2012). This is variously conceived at the level of the individual who gains access to resources (information, relationships, confidence, etc.) through active participation in community organisations but also at the aggregate level where people who share a grievance or a cause gain power through standing together (Brecher, Costello et al. 2002, Minkler, Wallerstein et al. 2008). The emphasis on community participation in the Alma-Ata Declaration (WHO and UNICEF 1978) encompasses both of these forms of empowerment.

Brown and Zavestoski (2004) describe one of the main effects of social movements as putting personal experience into public discourse in a way which complements scientific evidence and instrumental rationality. This may be illustrated by the women’s health movement from the 1970s which insisted on women’s experiences and perceptions being taken into account in health care.
More generally Crossley (2002) highlights the role of social movements in terms of agenda setting. This function has been described (McCarthy and Zald 1977) in terms of changing the terms of public debate through the communication of frustrations and grievances. This might be illustrated by the suffragette movement (Flexner 1996, Whitfield 2001).

Brown and Zavestoski (2004) also highlight the role of social movements in strengthening the accountability of established organisations, illustrated by the role of asbestos campaigners in demonstrating how corporate science was hiding the harmful effects of asbestos exposure.

Hochschild (2005) has explored the concept of the social movement through a detailed case study of the abolitionist movement in Britain. This involved a continuing and persistent intervention in public debate which progressively accrued greater public support.

Warkentin (2001) speaks of a similar dynamic in the present era in emphasising the use of the internet by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in spreading alternative policy frameworks and in publicising information which undermines the conventional wisdom. This was particularly clear in the Treatment Action Campaign in South Africa (Heywood 2009, Robins 2010).

Delegitimation and framing

Brecher and colleagues (2002) highlight ‘delegitimation’ as a strategy and as a source of the political power of social movements:

*The movement against globalization-from-above can be understood as the withdrawal of consent from such globalization.*

Several commentators have used the concept of ‘framing’ to highlight the significance of challenging the hegemonic naturalisation of the way things are (Snow 2004). Joachim (2003) has analysed the success of the women’s movement globally in re-framing violence against women and reproductive rights away from being exclusively private to being issues of public policy.

*I find that in the beginning of the agenda-setting process, the influence of NGOs is rather limited, their frames are highly contested, and structural obstacles outweigh organizational resources. However, over time the influence of NGOs increases. As they establish their own mobilizing structures, they become capable of altering the political opportunity structure in their favour, and their frames gain in acceptance and legitimacy.*

Connor and Phelan (2013) draw on the concept of the ‘antenarrative’ to explore the power that can be generated through telling different stories about problems, engagements and solutions. Connor and Phelan explore different narratives regarding sweatshops contracted by Nike: the established narrative of corporate spin and an alternative narrative which highlights the agency of thousands of workers and activists and depicts more clearly the political dynamics through which they impacted on Nike’s practices.

In some cases civil society action has taken a more defiant approach as in the opposition in Cochabamba to the privatisation of water (Olivera and Lewis 2004). In this case the refusal of people already living in poverty to pay escalating water prices damaged the legitimacy of the political leadership which had initiated the privatisation. Shareholder activism (Lounsbury 2011) represents another form of de-legitimation as a social movement strategy.
Counter hegemonic knowledge production

In this context, the role of counter-hegemonic knowledge production and policy advocacy can be an important part of social movement strategy. Carroll (2015) describes ‘transnational alternative policy groups (TAPGs)’ as networks and centres within and around which ‘counter-hegemonic knowledge is produced and mobilized among subaltern communities and critical social movements’. Carroll argues that alternative knowledge makes an indispensable contribution to counter-hegemony.

Carroll interviewed 91 practitioners in 16 TAPGs from both global North and South engaged in ‘alternative knowledge production and mobilization (alt KPM)’ and identified eight ‘modes of cognitive praxis’ as summarised below, taken from Carroll’s Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenging hegemonic knowledge</th>
<th>Contesting and disrupting the common sense of hegemony through critical research, scholarship, and other means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing alt knowledge through engaging with dominant institutions</td>
<td>Pursuing outsider strategies that engage the integral state strategically from an oppositional stance, and/or insider strategies of dialogue and negotiation with select elements of the integral state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering the grassroots through participation and capacity building</td>
<td>Helping to foster activist capabilities and communities and, within those communities, organic intellectuals who produce their own knowledge as a basis for transformative collective agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building solidarities through dialogical KPM</td>
<td>Through cross-sectoral, cross-cultural, and other dialogues, bridging gaps, breaking silos, and undoing hierarchies that divide and limit effectivity of movements as forces for transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating theory and practice</td>
<td>Dialectically unifying the practical, experiential knowledge of activists trying to change the world with theoretical knowledge on how that world is structured and how it might be transformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating spaces for reflection and invention</td>
<td>Producing and sustaining physical, social, and virtual spaces where new ideas can breathe and begin to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematizing and disseminating alternative knowledge</td>
<td>Making alt knowledge robust, rich in comparative nuance, applicable across contexts, and thus useful in practice; disseminating the product to various publics and constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefiguring alternative futures from present practices</td>
<td>Identifying real potentialities for living otherwise, analysing how they can be strengthened, mobilizing knowledge of these openings within counter-publics and general publics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Eight ‘modes of cognitive praxis’ adapted from Carroll’s (2015) Table 2**

Culture

Johnston and Klandermans (2013) have curated a useful collection of reports on the cultural analysis of social movements. The cultural perspective provides useful insights into a range of aspects of social movement practice.

The act of re-framing a social problem is a core strategy for social movements including through the (cultural) act of knowledge production and dissemination. Culture, institutions, practices and power relations are mutually constitutive, so changing the way we speak and practice can drive change in both institutional structures and social relations, even while being constrained by these. This applies to challenging established norms and also to the creation of our own organisational culture. However, the cultural work of challenging established norms, rituals and symbols is always constrained by our own embeddedness in the culture we are trying to change. Even while challenging we are also reflecting and enacting established norms. Accordingly the development of
the movement itself, including decision making, meeting the needs of the participants and working with other constituencies, is also a function of its culture and should be a focus of its own internal cultural work (Earl 2004). The role of consciousness-raising within the second wave women’s movement epitomises such cultural work.

Williams (2004) suggests that cultural environment of a movement can be thought about in terms of boundedness and resonance. Boundedness refers to what can be said, within the movement and in its public face. Boundedness refers to both intelligibility and legitimacy and transgressing such boundaries can impact on movement building and public perceptions. Resonance is the fit between the way the movement is framing its claims and the audiences' previous beliefs, world views and life experiences.

Organisational forms

Brecher and colleagues acknowledge that the organisation of political parties (or engagement with existing parties) is one potential strategy but point out that this strategy:

faces further difficulties in the era of globalization. Reform and revolution depend on solving problems by means of state power, however acquired. But globalization has outflanked governments at local and national levels, leaving them largely at the mercy of global markets, corporations, and institutions. Dozens of parties in every part of the world have come to power with pledges to overcome the negative effects of globalization, only to submit in a matter of months to the doctrines of neoliberalism and the "discipline of the market." Nor is there a global state to be taken over.

On the other hand as Thompson and Tapscott (2010) emphasise nation-state governments remain important centres of power within the wider field of networked governance (Rhodes 1997, Burris, Drahos et al. 2005). Thompson and Tapscott (2010) have assembled a collection of case studies of social movement activism from the global South and point out much of the work of these activists has necessarily focused on national and provincial governments and the associated political parties. This does not necessarily imply neglect of the structures of global governance; nation state institutions may be intermediate targets in seeking to influence global governance.

Staggenborg (1989) explored, in a case study of two different women’s organisations, the benefits and costs of a loose flat structure as compared with a more hierarchical organised structure. She concluded that an informal, decentralised structure encouraged strategic and tactical innovation, but undermined organizational maintenance, while a more formalized and centralized structure facilitated organizational maintenance, but led to a narrowing of strategies and tactics.

Various initiatives directed to institutional development represent a different approach to social change, illustrated by the voluntary movement involved in delivering health care to residents of informal settlements in South American cone countries (Scarpaci 1991). Social movements based on people living with AIDS have pioneered new forms of health care in Brazil (Nunn 2009) and Australia (Dowsett 1998) as well as in South Africa. Atim has explored the role of active community involvement in strengthening the performance of voluntary health insurance organisations (Atim 1999).
Resources

In a relatively early paper McCarthy and Zald (1977) emphasise the different kinds of resources which social movements need to survive and succeed, including financial resources, personnel, and relationships (media, authorities, other interest groups) and the quality of interactions among movement organizations.

More recently Edwards and McCarthy (2004) have summarised ‘resource mobilisation theory’ in relation to social movements. They identify several different types of resources (moral, cultural, social-organisational, human and material) and different modes of gaining access to resources: aggregation, self-production, co-option, appropriation and patronage.

Warkentin (2001) provides a useful survey of the role of the internet in supporting wider reach, including transnationalisation, of social movements. He shows how the internet has shaped organisational development and how it has been used (internal communication, dissemination of resources, political advocacy). Warkentin’s study is restricted to Northern NGOs; a comparable study in the global South would be useful.

Contingency and leadership

The contingencies of time, place, person and context powerfully influence dynamics and strategy. They constitute critical features of the conditions in which mobilisation occurs and mitigate against universalising generalisations.

Many scholars have pointed to the efflorescence of protest movements in the late 1960s as epitomising the waxing of the movement zeitgeist and likewise the decline of such activity during the austerity of the 1980s (Koopmans 2004). Clearly this waxing and waning reflect various factors in the wider environment. The late 1960s bloom came at the end of the long boom which followed WWII. The 1980s saw the rise of neoliberalism accompanied by the repeated message that ‘there is no alternative’ (TINA).

The political context varies (Kriesi 2004). In the field of policy studies Kingdon (1984) has argued that windows of opportunity open when three streams (problem, policy and politics) come together. Social movements need to be sharp in identifying and taking advantage of windows of opportunity (they can create windows of opportunity also).

Complexity and unpredictability are corollaries of contingency. This has implications for readiness, being ready to seize the chance, and for patience, sustaining the movement during unfavourable times in the knowledge that ‘the times, they are a’changing’.

Leadership matters, including a complex range of functions: analysis, strategy, inspiration, mobilisation, coordination and teaching. Such capacities may come together in an individuals or in a collective leadership and may be manifest at the top of an organisational hierarchy or at all levels within a movement.

Morris and Staggenborg (2004) have argued that ‘leaders help to create or undermine political and socioeconomic realities that influence the trajectories and outcomes of social movements’.

Leaders interpret relevant structural contexts and identify their weaknesses, strengths, and contradictions and make decisions about how they are to be exploited for movement purposes. In our view social movement theory should avoid the tendency to view political opportunities as part of a structure that is always external
to social movements. For example, black leaders had prepared the foundations and
developed the connections to exploit the international arena long before the Cold
War materialized. Because the groundwork had been established, the leaders of the
civil rights movement were positioned to take advantage of Cold War politics.

... 

Human initiatives and choices guide social movements. Social movement agency is
rooted in these initiatives and choices. Social movement leaders are the actors whose
hands and brains rest disproportionately on the throttles of social movements.

Morris and Staggenborg pose a number of questions about leadership in social movements,
including:

- How are leaders developed within movement organizations?
- How do leaders and leadership teams create effective strategies and frames?
- What types of organizational structures are conducive to democratic leadership
  and the agency of participants?
- How are connections among leaders within and across movements created and
  maintained? How do these connections affect strategies and coalitions?
- How do movement leaders become elite challengers and how do their connections
to leaders in government and other sectors affect movement goals, strategies, and
outcomes?

Global social movements and the structures and dynamics of global governance

O’Brien and his colleagues (2000) have put together a useful collection focused on the
international financial institutions (IFIs) and their relations with a range of social movements under
the rubric of ‘complex multilateralism’. They seek to show how social movement strategies
(environment, labour and women’s movements) have impacted on institutional structures and
policies, recognising the concomitant pressures exerted on the IFIs by the corporate sector.

Barlow and Clarke (2001) also recognise the new structures of global governance, including the
international financial institutions and the ‘disciplines of the market’. They point out that there are
limits to resistance and delegitimation and that at a particular point it becomes necessary to
advance specific policy claims within and from outside the existing structures of global governance.
In this context influencing the nation state and the political parties which are active in nation state
politics may be critical. Willets (2010) provides an overview of the role of NGOs in global
governance.

Zamponi and Vogiatzoglou (2015) provide an insightful commentary on the impact of globalisation
on labour unions in the context of economic contraction and neoliberal austerity. Where national
unions face internationally mobile capital the bargaining power of the unions is greatly reduced and
their capacity to resist austerity is likewise diminished. Zamponi and Vogiatzoglou review alternative
organising strategies, sometimes described as ‘social unionism’, being developed in Italy and Greece.
They first, examine efforts to organise precarious workers in professions and productive sectors that
previously had weak or no union presence. Second, they investigate projects addressing changes in
the physical space where production takes place and their consequences for collective organisation. Third they review strategies of workers’ mutualism (i.e. social solidarity structures ran by the workers themselves) and finally, they look at projects that are posing broader questions regarding alternative models of production and development.

The bulk of research around CSE in health has been focused at the local, and occasionally national, levels, with some work exploring the implications of globalisation for health and for the achievement of HFA (Smith and Johnston 2002, Loewenson 2003). An exception is the work of Brecher and colleagues (2000) who explored the role of NGOs in relation to globalisation and describe how NGOs (or what others call CSOs, see the distinction above) have challenged the legitimacy of intergovernmental bodies such as the IMF (for example in relation to the impact on health of the IMF’s structural adjustment programs). Their study also emphasises the need to develop alternative policy frameworks as part of their advocacy.

Access to decent health care and improving the social conditions for health involve local and global engagement and there important synergies where local and global engagements are complementary. There is only limited published research throwing light on how this kind of complementary action can impact on the governance structures at the global as well as the local levels. O’Brien and colleagues (2000) trace the involvement of civil society organisations in holding the multilateral economic institutions to account. Loewenson (2003) cites global debates over infant feeding, tobacco control and access to medicines. On the other hand, Kapilashrami and O’Brien (2012) have expressed some scepticism as to the role of civil society in the governance of the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria.

Loewenson (2003) lists the ways in which civil society organisations (CSOs, a term sometimes used interchangeably with NGOs but which, unlike NGOs, usually have no service delivery function) have intervened in global health policy including interventions to legitimise policies, mobilise constituencies, produce resources and advocate for policies and monitor their implementation. CSOs have contributed technical expertise to policy development. They have made global and international policy processes more publicly accessible through disseminating information on them, and thus helped to widen public accountability around these policies.

**Diffusion and convergence**

Social movements learn from each other. Whittier (2004) discusses the diffusion of disciplines, methods, tactical and cultural repertoire, rituals, symbols. Second wave feminism was informed by the experience of the New Left. Non-violence in the environment movement has been informed by Ghandi.

Whittier discusses the role of veteran activists who maintain their activism through many decades, pass through different social movement organisations and who mediate some of the influence between movements. Long term activists can move between movements and serve as a conduit of influence. Diffusion can also take place within each generation of activists. Activists from different social movements meet each other and informal networks form; overlapping memberships may give rise to more organised networks.

Diffusion of disciplines and tactics is not the same as diffusion or convergence with respect to political and economic analysis. Smith (2004) discusses the transnational dimensions of social movement organisation: engagement with global institutions, attending conferences, mobilising resources, and advocacy. She argues that social movement strategy at the global level needs to be
contextualised within a world system perspective and a network governance perspective but she does not discuss whether different social movements do in fact share this kind of political analysis.

Part of the appeal of social movement activism is the vision of a convergence of different (progressive) social movements working together to tame neoliberal capitalism and to move towards a more equal, sustainable and convivial world. It would seem that some kind of shared analysis in relation to global dynamics might be a necessary condition for such a convergence. It may be that different movements tend to get preoccupied with the specifics of their sectoral territories and that the global dynamics (the structures of global governance, the political economy of neoliberal capitalism) which in fact constrain many shared aspirations are not seen as central.

More research is needed into the diffusion of this kind of global analysis and its contribution to convergence.

**Pitfalls**

The success of social movements is not guaranteed. Brecher and colleagues list a range of pitfalls which may weaken social movements or lead to failure. These include: schism, repression, fading out, leadership domination, isolation, co-optation, leadership sell-out, and sectarian disruption.

In the context of elaborating a ‘resource dependency’ theory of social movement development McCarthy and Zald (1977) highlight the contradictions which can emerge between social movement organisations and their funding sources and between what they term ‘beneficial constituents’ and ‘conscience constituents’.

**Implications of this review for the five generic themes of the CSE4HFA project**

The most useful outcomes of this review of research and commentary is that it provides a vocabulary and snatches of theory which can help to extend discussion and deepen reflexivity within the movement. It certainly does not yield simple guidelines or principles.

In relation to movement building there are useful resources regarding:

- shared grievances, identity and solidarity;
- organisational forms and resources;
- contingency and leadership and organisational culture;
- diffusion and convergence.

In relation to campaigning and advocacy there are useful resources regarding:

- forms of action and sources of power;
- delegitimation and framing.

In relation to capacity building, we can draw out some useful implications about objectives and methods:

- learning from, and about, each other (and ourselves) are conditions for solidarity and movement building;
- reflecting on practice, learning about our movement, developing a culture of reflexivity and commitment, are part of movement building and leadership development;
- learning about other struggles and movements beyond our boundaries speak to the possibilities of learning from and working with a wider range of allies and friends,
• learning about the wider configurations and dynamics of power within which we are working, are core resources for strategy;
• acquiring the knowledge and skills needed to reframe grievances into policy proposals, locally, nationally and globally; are core resources for policy dialogue;
• methods of teaching and learning must balance sharing and relationship building with skills and knowledge sharing.

In relation to knowledge building and dissemination Carroll’s eight ‘modes of cognitive practice’ provide a particularly useful framework.

In relation to policy dialogue and governance we can draw some useful implications:
• addressing the local and immediate challenges in ways that also impact on the larger scale structures and longer term dynamics which reflect and reproduce those challenges;
• outrage about injustice and critiques of existing power relations must sometimes be translated into specific policy proposals to be advanced through existing structures of governance.
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