1. Introduction: linking political citizenship and social movements
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POLITICAL CITIZENSHIP, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND THE LEGACY OF THE 1960s

From the early days of modern social science onwards, political citizenship and social movements have been core concepts in analyzing major social changes. The anti-slavery movement in the USA, the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century labor movements in Western Europe, and the first feminist wave on both sides of the Atlantic, for instance, have not only functioned as pivotal to analyzing the striving for all different kinds of human (citizenship) rights, but also as paradigmatic examples for defining and explaining major transformations in the social and political world.

Almost five decades ago, Western society (and numerous parts of global society as well) found itself on the eve of one of the most turbulent episodes in modern history. Apart from sociologists like James Scott and Charles Tilly with strong roots in the practice of social history,1 most contemporary social movement scholars have taken the late 1960s as the starting point for their research endeavors (e.g., Tarrow, 1994; McAdam et al., 1996; Della Porta and Diani, 2006). Actually, it was also around that time that ‘social movement studies’ established itself as a kind of subdiscipline in contrast to previous studies of collective action, which, rather, took concepts like ‘alienation’, ‘mass behavior’ or ‘relative deprivation’ as their starting point. In the 1960s, black students staged sit-in demonstrations throughout the American South, sit-ins that in their turn would revitalize not only a moribund civil rights movement but also the tradition of leftist activism dormant in America since the 1930s. During the ensuing decade the United States was rent by urban riots, student strikes and massive anti- (Vietnam) war demonstrations (McAdam et al., 1996, p. 1). With respect to Europe, opposition against American imperialism, the May 1968 revolt in France, the worker–student coalitions of the 1969 ‘Hot Autumn’ in Italy, and the pro-democracy mobilizations in locations as diverse as Francoist Madrid and communist Prague are cases in point (Della Porta and Diani, 2006, p. 1). Further, all over the Western
world women’s groups campaigned for equal citizenship rights for women and men. Environmental groups started to question the ‘hidden side’ of the prevailing limitless economic growth: pollution of air, water and soil; destruction of nature; exhaustion of natural resources. Finally, in cities as diverse as Berkeley, Paris, Berlin and Amsterdam, but also in countries like Japan, Mexico and Pakistan, students campaigned for university reforms in order not only to improve the quality of their education, but also to turn research and development towards more socially relevant directions.

The civil rights, women’s, environmental and students’ movements were center-stage among the movements that one decade later would be called ‘new social movements’, and that would decisively change Western society into a ‘social movement society’ (Meyer and Tarrow, 1997). These movements, in their turn, would play a pivotal role in the further development of the concept of political citizenship (Dalton, 2008).

For a long time, the concept of citizenship has been the way to define the social and political role of individual citizens vis-à-vis civil society and the state. As early as 1950, Marshall’s influential book on citizenship and social class was published. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, in most Western societies a social-democratic, Keynesian welfare state discourse was the hegemonic way of doing and defining politics and citizenship, even in countries where right-wing governments were in charge. Modern citizenship rights drawing from the nation-state typically include civil rights (free speech and movement, the rule of law); political rights (voting, seeking electoral office); and social citizenship rights (welfare, unemployment insurance and health care) (Marshall, 1950; Isin and Turner, 2003, p. 3). Among these three kinds of rights, it was in terms of social citizenship rights that citizenship was considered in those days, and social-democratic parties and labor movements singularly and jointly struggled to improve these rights.

At present, half a century later, the political and social landscape has radically changed. From the late 1970s onwards, neoliberalism, going along with what has been called ‘possessive individualism’ (Macpherson, 1964), has become the hegemonic social and political discourse. Most of the former ‘new social movements’ have become institutionalized (e.g., the environmental movement), but at the same time ‘new new social movements’ like the global justice movement have emerged, not only opposing neoliberalism but also proposing the necessity of global citizenship (rights). Apart from this, during the past 50 years in numerous non-Western countries social movements have decisively contributed to regime change. The former communist block, South Africa, and several countries in the Middle East and Latin America are telling cases in point. Moreover,
globalization and the ICT revolution have also impinged on social movements, resulting not only in the emergence of a number of transnational or even global social movement organizations (e.g., Amnesty International, Greenpeace), but also of numerous transnational social movement networks. In sum, the concept of a movement society seems to apply not only to Western, but also, or even more, to non-Western and global civil society.

As touched on above, citizenship has traditionally referred to a particular set of political practices involving specific public rights and duties for a specific political community (Bellamy, 2010, p. xii). In this respect, the past half-century has witnessed the successes of the civil rights movement in the USA, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, and numerous other movements striving for legal, political and social rights in all parts of the world. Influenced by theories about post-modernism, post-modernity and post-modernization (Harvey, 1989; Jameson, 1991), these five decades have also experienced the emergence of women’s, immigrant, aboriginal, gay, lesbian and other groups, all striving for the recognition of their specific rights and identities. Apart from the new forms of citizenship resulting from this (e.g., sexual, diasporic, multicultural and aboriginal citizenship), from the 1980s onward globalization has brought about new forms of transnational (e.g., European) citizenship, and a reinvigoration of cosmopolitan citizenship.

In the social sciences large bodies of literature have developed on citizenship on the one hand, and on social movements on the other. These two topics of academic interest, however, are often pursued separately and distinctly, as the first traditionally refers to the individual dimension of social and political acting, and the second to the collective one. Besides, as Gaventa observes, those who examine how citizens engage with the state often do so with a focus on participation in the political processes of elections, parties, deliberative spaces or occasionally protest, but not on social movements, many of which emerge outside the formal political arena, and use extra-institutional channels to express their demands. On the other hand, those who focus on social movements have concentrated largely on how and why they engage, and on the dynamics within them, but not necessarily on their contribution to realizing substantive citizenship rights or to building and deepening responsive, more democratic forms of governance (Gaventa, 2010, pp. xi–xii). However, despite these distinct trajectories of development, social movement and citizenship studies have much ground in common. One of the underlying goals of this handbook is to bridge or, at least, to narrow the gap between them in order to lay the foundations for a social science research program that would do more justice to social and political reality.
SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, POLITICAL CITIZENSHIP, AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Seen from a political science point of view, the dominant concept of liberal citizenship refers to the subfields of political theory and political behavior that are related to the individual level of political activity and identity, whereas the concept of social movements addresses the collective dimension of them. Citizenship as conceived of in this handbook and social movements are inextricably connected, but, as said above, in the social sciences the two have gone through quite different trajectories of development and institutionalization.

Until the 1960s social movements were widely seen as forms of irrational or unorganized political behavior, and were studied under labels like ‘mass society’, ‘collective behavior’ and ‘relative deprivation’. However, vis-à-vis the new wave of movement activity in the USA, the newly emerging resource mobilization approach (RMA) convincingly argued that social movement action could be very rational and effective indeed (McCarthy and Zald, 1977). Conventional as well as unconventional political activities by groups of citizens could result in all kinds of favorable outcomes and successes for them. The resource mobilization approach in its turn proved to be very successful as an academic endeavor. In the 1970s, over half of all social movement and collective action articles in journals like the American Sociological Review, the American Journal of Sociology, Social Forces, and the American Political Science Review were based on this new approach, whereas by the early 1980s it was almost three-quarters (McClurg Mueller, 1992, p. 3).

Whereas the US-based resource mobilization approach was mainly interested in the impacts of the different kinds of resources (manpower, money, organizational structures, expertise, networks, and so on) for social movement organizations (SMOs), the Western European ‘new social movement’ (NSM) approach largely focused on the distinctive features of the recently originated new social movements (post-material values, unconventional action repertoire, new middle class constituency, and so on). More recently, this new social movement approach has also addressed issues like the relationship between global modernity and social movements and, from a Foucaultian perspective, the interrelationship between regimes of governance and practices of resistance.

From the 1980s onwards, on the heels of Charles Tilly, political scientists with an interest in social movements became aware that the specific features of an individual political system decisively impinged on the action repertoires, forms of organization, as well as on the successes of these
movements (Kriesi et al., 1995). Whereas, for instance, unconventional or even radical action could be effective in one political context, it could be counterproductive in another one. This political opportunity structure (POS) or political process approach has developed into a full, third approach to the study of social movements.

A fourth approach finally (Van der Heijden, 2010, pp. 18–28), addresses the way social movements frame their issues of contention, the social and political discourses in which these frames are embedded, and the individual and collective identities that are formed in different kinds of social movement actions and interactions (social-constructivist or post-structuralist approach). According to this approach, the key feature of a social movement is not its material success but its ‘cognitive praxis’. A social movement is primarily seen as a producer of knowledge; by framing an issue in a ‘counter-hegemonic’ way, by developing points of view that challenge dominant ways of looking at the social and political reality, it points to alternative ways of modeling society (Eyerman and Jamison, 1991).

From the mid-1970s onwards, academic research into social movements has started its process of institutionalization in specialized university departments; in research committees of international professional associations (e.g., the International Sociological Association Research Committees on ‘Social Classes and Social Movements’ and ‘Social Movements, Collective Action and Social Change’); in the publication of thousands of books and journal articles; in several handbooks, for example, the Blackwell Companion to Social Movements (Snow et al., 2003), and the Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines (Klandermans and Roggeband, 2010); in the 1977-founded (and still existing) book series Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change; in authoritative monographs or collective endeavors covering the field (e.g., Tarrow, 1994; McAdam et al., 1996, 2001; Della Porta and Diani, 1999; Van Stekelenburg et al., 2013, to name just a few of them); and, finally, in a number of specialized academic journals (e.g., Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen [founded 1988], Mobilization [1996], Mouvements [in French, 1998], Social Movement Studies [2002], and Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements [2009]).

To be sure, the study of social movements is definitely not restricted to the academic disciplines of sociology and political science. Social movements not only include the anti-nuclear, the civil rights, and similar political social movements, but also innumerable youth, cultural, and religious movements like, for instance, Hare Krishna and the International Naturist Federation. These primary ‘a-political’ social movements are widely studied by anthropologists, social psychologists, and other social
scientists (Klandermans and Roggeband, 2010), but do not really cover the central topic of concern of this handbook.

Within social movement studies, the concept of citizenship has received only sparse attention. This is surprising because, as Bosniak observes, however it may be defined, ‘Citizenship is commonly portrayed as the most desired of conditions, as the highest fulfillment of democratic and equalitarian aspirations’ (Bosniak, 2006, p. 1). Up to the present day, discussions about citizenship are largely based on two classic models: a ‘republican’ model based on political participation, and a liberal, rights-based model, emphasizing citizenship as a legal status that can be separated from any involvement in decision-making (Bellamy, 2010, p. xxiii; Leydet, 2011). However, over the past couple of decades citizenship has gradually developed into an ‘essentially contested concept’ with numerous competing (and overlapping) categorizations and conceptualizations, including citizenship framed in moral terms, as a legal status, in terms of active participation, and in terms of identifying with the political community (whether this be local, national or global) (Kiwan, 2010, p. 100). One way to bring order in this conceptual chaos has been developed by Delanty. According to him, citizenship can be seen in terms of four models, all emphasizing different dimensions of what membership of a political community might entail: rights, duties, participation, and identity (the rights, conservative, participatory, and communitarian model of citizenship; Delanty, 1997, p. 288).

Another relevant contribution in this respect comes from Kiwan. Citizenship, historically, has been by definition an exclusionary concept, with the rights and responsibilities of citizenship conferred to only a well-defined subset of people within a society. However, according to Kiwan, with the relatively recent expansion of citizenship to include all members of society – including gender, social class, disability, ethnicity, and religion – there is an increasing interest in inclusive theorizations of multicultural citizenship (Kiwan, 2010, p. 102).

Citizenship studies as a field of political and social science research started to develop only in the 1990s, significantly later than social movement studies, and also, in terms of the number of scholars and students, it has remained smaller. Nevertheless, citizenship studies have become firmly institutionalized. Marshall’s classic text on Citizenship and Social Class (1950) has been cited more than 6000 times in Google Scholar, whereas Kymlicka’s Multicultural Citizenship (1996) received over 5000 citations. In 2003 the authoritative Handbook of Citizenship Studies was published (Isin and Turner, 2003), and at present there are at least two academic journals exclusively addressing this topic of academic interest: Citizenship Studies (founded 1997), and Education, Citizenship and Social Justice (2006).
In order to articulate the relationship between social movement research and citizenship studies, in this handbook the concept of political citizenship will be further explored. Rather than emphasizing traditional conceptualizations of citizenship like the right to vote and the right to be eligible or to stand for office, the focus will be on topics that are also addressed by social movements, for instance, the ecological, gender, and urban dimensions of citizenship.

As for the distinction between the two classic models of liberal and republican citizenship mentioned above, scholars like Benjamin Crick have presented republican citizenship as an alternative to the dominant liberal tradition, a corrective to what Crick sees as the overly individualistic, litigious and inactive nature of contemporary political life (Crick and Lockyer, 2010). A similar interpretation of this concept of republican political citizenship has been suggested by Benjamin Barber in his highly praised *Strong Democracy* (1984). Strong democracy, Barber argues, aims at understanding individuals not as abstract persons but as citizens, so that commonality and equality rather than separateness are the defining traits of human society (ibid., p. 119).

The concept of political (or engaged) citizenship as explored in this handbook is strongly influenced by the ideas as developed by authors like Crick, Barber, and Russell Dalton, ideas that are shared by numerous other scholars as well (e.g., Bellamy, 2010, p. xi). Political citizenship is, as will be elaborated below, the very concept to decrease the cleavage between citizenship and social movement activities, as well as between citizenship and social movement studies.

According to Dalton, institutionally focused, ‘rights- and duty-based’ citizenship has a restrictive definition of participation – it dissuades people from participating in direct, challenging activities. However, as Dalton observes (2008, p. 88), as over the past decades people have become more educated and politically skilled, they seek different means of influencing policy:

In contrast [to duty-based citizenship] engaged citizenship taps participatory norms that are broader than electoral politics. The engaged citizen is more likely to participate in boycotts, buying products for political and ethical reasons, demonstrations and other forms of contentious action. These effects are even more striking for internet activism, which is unrelated to citizen duty but strongly related to norms of engaged citizenship. In other words, the norms of citizen duty lead to participation in electoral politics, but do not encourage a broader repertoire of political action.

In order to adequately assess this broader political action repertoire, citizenship and social movements could no longer be addressed separately. This applies in particular to the present era of neoliberalism. The forms
of political citizenship and the social movements analyzed in this book have mainly developed during the past three decades, the global neoliberal era. Neoliberalism has structured and shaped the life of every individual and every collectivity to a certain extent, including individual citizens and social movements. The way the neoliberal discourse encourages individuals and collective actors to perceive competition, egoism, and ruthlessness as self-evident; the way individuals are socialized to behave as ‘calculating citizens’; the way the ‘logic of the market’ permeates all spheres of human life and human society – the hegemony of neoliberalism is overwhelming. On top of this, in many cases neoliberal policies have also included a frontal attack on citizenship rights and social movements themselves, for example, the attack on the labor movement under Thatcher. At the same time, however, it is engaged citizens and social movements (or, at least, parts of them) that do not stop to challenge the global hegemony of the neoliberal discourse, and try to develop alternative bodies of knowledge, alternative social practices and other forms of resistance (Klein, 2000; Herz, 2001; Smith, 2002; Hardt and Negri, 2004; Cox and Flesher Fominaya, 2009; Flesher Fominaya and Cox, 2013). It is this background that interconnects the different parts and chapters of this handbook.

ABOUT THIS HANDBOOK

This book aims to be more than a mere description of all different kinds of citizenship and social movement studies; it is intended to function as an academic handbook. In order to fulfill the requirements of such a handbook, the authors of the individual chapters have been advised to include as much as possible the following four topics of attention:

- an overview of the most important research endeavors within the research area of their specific chapter (for instance, multicultural citizenship, the new social movement approach, or the international human rights movement);
- an overview of the most important (theoretical and/or empirical) research results;
- an assessment of the most important middle-range theories and concepts within the specific area of research;
- a short sketch of relevant future developments and future research topics within that area.

As noted before, citizenship and social movements have developed as basically distinct fields of academic research, but the linkages between the
two are numerous. As Isin and Turner observe, one of the very reasons for the emergence of citizenship studies has been the emergence of new social movements and their struggles for recognition and redistribution. Major social issues such as the status of immigrants, refugees, and environmental injustices have increasingly been expressed through the language of rights and obligations, and hence of citizenship (Isin and Turner, 2003, p. 1). Citizenship studies, however, as Isin and Turner contend, is ultimately not (only) about books and articles. It is about ‘addressing injustices suffered by many peoples around the world, making these injustices appear in the public sphere, enabling these groups to articulate these injustices as claims for recognition and enacting them in national as well as transnational laws and practices, and thus bringing about fundamental changes’ (ibid., pp. 2–3).

Apart from this introduction, the Handbook of Political Citizenship and Social Movements consists of four different parts: one on the different forms of, and approaches to political citizenship; one on the current approaches to social movements and on recent developments within social movement studies; one on a number of contemporary social movements; and, finally, a part specifically devoted to social movements and political citizenship in non-Western countries. To be sure, this perforce division in four parts reflects the current academic practice rather than the interconnection between citizenship and social movement studies as advocated in this introduction. Hopefully, however, this handbook may contribute to a future research practice in which citizenship and social movement studies are a joint rather than a separate research endeavor.

In the first part of the book, the different approaches to, and forms of political citizenship are addressed. In Chapter 2, Russell J. Dalton gives a sketch of the history and the present status of the concept of political citizenship. Most scholars agree that the concept of citizenship is composed of three main elements: citizenship as legal status, citizenship as political agency, and citizenship as membership of a political community, which furnishes a distinct source of identity (Leydet, 2011). However, as has been elaborated above, during the past couple of decades citizenship has developed into a contested concept with a large number of different conceptualizations and categorizations. The core goal of Dalton’s chapter is to provide a succinct overview of these conceptualizations and categorizations, to assess them, and, most of all, to further elaborate and refine the concept of political citizenship. On top of this, Dalton provides us with a fine set of data about the distribution of ‘traditional’ and ‘political’ forms of citizenship in a large number of countries all over the Western world.

As has been observed above, whereas liberal individualism has a conception of citizenship as status, civic republicanism has a conception of
citizenship as ‘practice’, thus coming closer to the definition of political citizenship as developed by authors like Dalton. Consequently, whereas at present liberal citizenship is the hegemonic definition of citizenship, in Chapter 3 of this handbook James Bohman elaborates – at a theoretical level – republican citizenship in terms of an alternative to this dominant liberal tradition in the present context of globalization. Topics addressed by Bohman include the concepts of epistemic injustice, communicative freedom, and civic friendship, and the question of to what extent the European Union provides an institutional basis for the further development of republican self-rule.

Chapters 4–6 address three forms of citizenship that have developed as major ‘thematic’ approaches in citizenship studies over the last couple of decades: gendered, multicultural, and ecological citizenship. Since the 1970s, feminist theorists have criticized the republican and liberal models’ shared assumption of a rigid separation between the private and the public spheres (Leydet, 2011). This critique has provided the impetus to the development of a large body of literature on the relationship between citizenship, gender and sexuality. In Chapter 4, Surya Monro and Diane Richardson not only assess this literature, but, importantly, they also expand the object of analysis by introducing the concepts of sexual and transgender citizenship, and by including LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) groups as social movements in their research agenda on citizenship, gender, and sexuality.

Whereas liberal and republican citizenship define citizenship primarily as a legal status for all members of a polity, during the past decades both models have been challenged by groups that stressed three specific types of demands: special representation rights (for disadvantaged groups); multicultural rights (for immigrant and religious groups); and self-government rights (for national minorities) (Kymlicka, 1996; Leydet, 2011). The research area of (some of) these kinds of differentiated citizenship is addressed by Narzanin Massoumi and Nasar Meer in Chapter 5. Interestingly, in this chapter the authors not only assess the literature on multicultural citizenship, but they also consider how multicultural citizenship and (new) social movement literature, with its strong emphasis on the construction of new individual and collective identities, can be synthesized in the theorization of contemporary citizenship.

A third thematic approach, also challenging the universalist liberal and republican models, refers to the relationship between citizens and the environment. In political science and political philosophy, an extensive debate has developed about environmental or ecological citizenship as a way to achieving sustainability, encouraging individuals to act according to the ‘public environmental good’. Perhaps more than any other social
movement, Sherilyn MacGregor argues in Chapter 6, environmentalism has succeeded in changing the way citizenship is theorized. These theorizations include the greening of liberal citizenship; the importance of individual green virtues in republican ecological citizenship; and, finally, the global responsibilities of post-cosmopolitan ecological citizenship.

Up to the present day, citizenship has mostly been defined as the status of being a citizen of a specific national political community. Transnationalization and globalization, however, are increasingly eroding the national state as the exclusive locus of citizenship. At the same time, however, the partial erosion of the nation-state due to globalization has also led to a reinforcement of the role of the ‘local state’, the urban or metropolitan political community. The impact of these national de-territorialization processes on citizenship will be addressed in three chapters: one on urban citizenship (Chapter 7), one on the impact of the European Union on the reshaping of the concept of citizenship (European citizenship; Chapter 8); and one on the possibilities of global or cosmopolitan citizenship (Chapter 9).

In Chapter 7 on urban citizenship, Patricia Burke Wood analyzes urban citizenship both as a tool of governmentality in the Foucaultian sense of the word, and as an empowering or liberating device. After defining the specifically urban elements of urban citizenship, Burke Wood analyzes three empirical examples of urban citizenship: the urban uprisings that together constituted the Arab Spring; the mass protests in 61 Spanish cities in 2011 under the joint banner of ‘Real Democracy NOW’; and, finally, the Occupy movement. She connects these occupations of urban public spaces to Lefebvre’s concept of ‘right to the city’, and also introduces the concept of ‘the grid’. Encampment in urban public space, she argues, is a successful disturbance of the order of ‘the grid’ and all that it represents.

In many parts of the world, the European Union is seen as a shining example of what a twenty-first-century polity could look like. Australian political scientist Robyn Eckersley, for instance, has called the European Union the very first cosmopolitan, post-national democracy in the world, ‘the closest empirical approximation of a greenish Kantian culture, with intimations of a post-Westphalian culture’ (Eckersley, 2004, p. 47). In The European Dream the American economist Jeremy Rifkin contrasts the American emphasis on economic growth, personal wealth and individual self-interests with the European emphasis on sustainable development, quality of life and community. Rifkin concludes that the EU is developing a new social and political model better suited to the needs of the globalizing world of the new century and, consequently, that ‘Europe’s vision of the future is quietly eclipsing the American dream’ (Rifkin, 2004, p. iii). In Chapter 8 on European citizenship, Espen D.H. Olsen investigates
to what extent Rifkin’s optimism about the EU can be recognized in the different approaches to European citizenship. Olsen contrasts essentialist with constructivist ideas on the viability of European citizenship; he discusses the normative literature on the desirability, problems and possibilities of European citizenship; and, finally, he assesses the historical and institutionalist research on the emergence of citizenship as a policy field in European integration.

The final chapter of this first part of the handbook, Chapter 9, deals with global and cosmopolitan citizenship, concepts with both strong supporters and opponents. In order to unravel the different arguments, Sebastiaan Tijsterman makes a strict distinction between empirical, normative, and prospective perspectives on cosmopolitan citizenship. Themes being addressed in his chapter include the influence of globalization upon territorial citizenship, the normative question of whether we should foster global citizenship and, finally, the discussion between voluntarists and skeptics about the possibilities of realizing cosmopolitan citizenship in some meaningful way.

In the second and third parts of this handbook, focus shifts from political citizenship to social movements. The second part (Chapters 10–16) addresses the different approaches and recent developments in the study of social movements. A quick glance at the field of recent social movement studies reveals that the four approaches as identified in the introduction of this chapter are still the ones that largely dominate the field, although it is increasingly recognized that the four approaches are complementary rather than contradictory to one another, and that there is also a considerable number of scholars who work outside any of these approaches, or selectively re-work some aspects of them. Nevertheless, Chapters 10–13 not only present the core concepts and most important research results from the resource mobilization approach, the new social movement approach, the political opportunity structure approach, and the post-structuralist approach, but also the middle-range theories and research findings emerging from these, their consequences for future research, and the interconnections between the four approaches. Apart from these four chapters on different approaches to social movements, the three subsequent chapters will address some recent developments: the importance of emotions as analytical category in social movement research (Chapter 14); the transnationalization of social movements due to globalization (Chapter 15), and, closely related to this, the impact of recent developments in information and communication technology on the action repertoires, the organizational structures and the impacts of social movements (Chapter 16).

For numerous contemporary social movement scholars, McCarthy
and Zald’s (1977) ‘partial theory’ of resource mobilization and social movements has played a key role in their socialization in social movement research, for instance, in order to define the differences between social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs). The article received almost 4000 citations, and has been seminal in the development of the resource mobilization approach. In Chapter 10, Bob Edwards and Melinda Kane analyze the current state of affairs of this approach, both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view. On the theoretical level the authors develop typologies of different resource types (material, human, social-organizational, cultural, and moral resources), and mechanisms of resource access. In their analysis of the empirical literature they assess a large number of studies, dealing with all kinds of resources. The authors conclude that current social movement research tends to underutilize resource mobilization theory relative to other theoretical explanation, partly caused by a lack of accessible and reliable indicators with which to measure all types of resources and organizational characteristics.

Social movements themselves rather than social movement organizations are the core topic of attention of the new social movement (NSM) approach. The NSM approach has tried to explain the emergence of the environmental, women’s, peace, students’, civil rights and other social movements in the 1960s and 1970s. These movements basically differed from ‘old’ movements like the labor movement, and because of that were called ‘new social movements’. In contrast to the ‘micro-sociological’, US-based resource mobilization approach, the European ‘macro-sociological’ NSM approach tries to explain the emergence of new social movements by referring to the large structural transformations Western societies had gone through since the end of World War II. In Chapter 11 on this approach, Christian Scholl first of all analyzes the specific contributions of some of the most important NSM theorists: Alain Touraine, Alberto Melucci, Jürgen Habermas and Manuel Castells. Thereafter he discusses three main criticisms and debates. What is really new about new social movements? What is the difference between the NSM approach and instrumentalist-structuralist approaches (the ‘strategy versus identity’ debate)? And, finally, are new social movements not as much about lifestyle as about politics? In the final sections of his chapter, Christian Scholl delves into the relevance of the NSM approach to explain the ‘newest social movements’ like, for instance, the climate justice movement, the counter-globalization movement, and Occupy.

The distinctive contribution of political scientists to the study of social movements has been the concept of ‘political opportunity structure’ (POS). POS scholars argue that POS could explain to a large extent the widely different impacts, action repertoire, levels of mobilization, and
organizational structures of social movements in individual political systems, for example, nation-states. In Chapter 12, ‘Citizenship, political opportunities and social movements’, David S. Meyer and Erin Evans start from the observation that social movements are almost all about citizenship. For instance, citizenship bargains structure the form, claims, and influence of social movements, and social movements connect individuals through both formal organizations and less formal networks. Subsequently, Meyer and Evans sketch and discuss the different ways in which the concept of POS has been operationalized in the political process approach, and they reflect on the most promising methodology for finding transformative changes that social movements have induced.

The fourth and final contemporary approach to the study of social movements is the social-constructivist approach. One of the forerunners of this approach is the ‘cognitive approach’ to social movements as developed by Eyerman and Jamison (1991). According to these authors, the key feature of a social movement is not its material success but its ‘cognitive praxis’. A social movement is primarily seen as a producer of knowledge; by framing an issue in a ‘counter-hegemonic’ way, by developing points of view that challenge the dominant discourse, it points to alternative ways of modeling society. The social-constructivist approach has been elaborated in two different ways: frame theory and discourse analysis. Frame theory (Snow et al., 1986; Snow and Benford, 1988; Gamson, 1992; Benford and Snow, 2000) starts from the idea that social movements try to express their vision on (a part of) social and political reality by means of collective action frames. Collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization (Benford and Snow, 2000, p. 614). In this respect Benford and Snow distinguish between three ‘core framing tasks’ for SMOs: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing (Snow and Benford, 1988). Diagnostic framing deals with the way a problem is defined by a social movement organization, prognostic framing addresses the resulting solution strategies, whereas motivational framing provides a ‘call to arms’ or rationale for engaging in collective action (Benford and Snow, 2000). The analytical framework as developed by Benford, Snow, and their colleagues has been proved very successful and has been applied in several hundreds of social movement studies. Their 1986 article has received almost 4000 citations, their 1988 one over 2500, and their 2000 overview and assessment was cited more than 3250 times.

A slightly different conceptualization of framing has been suggested by William Gamson. According to Gamson, collective action frames in social movements have three important characteristics in common: a feeling of injustice, agency, and, finally, identity. Whereas the injustice aspect refers
to ‘moral indignation about harm and suffering’, the agency side points to the idea that it is possible to alter social conditions or policies through collective action. The identity component, finally, refers to the process of defining a ‘we’, typically in opposition to a ‘they’ who have different interests or values (Gamson, 1992, p. 7).

The second way the social-constructivist approach to social movements has been operationalized is discourse analysis. Whereas one could argue that framing theory is based on a positivist rather than on a social-constructivist epistemology, discourse analysis explicitly starts from a post-structuralist point of view. In Chapter 13, ‘Post-structuralism, social movements and citizen politics’, Steven Griggs and David Howarth examine the ways in which post-structuralism offers a particular style of theorizing and ethos, which is appropriate to doing research into social movements. In contrast to most mainstream theories, the post-structuralist approach starts from the recognition that both interests and identities are contingent and political constructs, with precise discursive conditions of existence. Consequently, the approach draws attention to the ways in which shared interests and identities in moments of citizen mobilization are constructed politically and discursively, as well to the dependence of the group identity that is forged on an opposition to other groups.

After this assessment of the four contemporary approaches to social movements, the next three chapters of this part of the handbook address three recent developments in social movement research. In Chapter 14 on social movements and emotions, Helena Flam criticizes the rational actor model underlying most social movement studies until the 1980s. In their 1977 article on the resource mobilization approach, for instance, McCarthy and Zald posited an analogy between social movements and industry, casting movement leaders as ‘movement entrepreneurs’ and mobilizing individuals as rational actors seeking to realize their preferences by choosing between different movement organizations. Soon after the publication of McCarthy and Zald’s article, the ‘emotional turn’ in social movement studies took off with a number of studies of self-help groups within the women’s movement. A vast array of emotions, these studies showed, makes women, subject to various forms of victimization or stigmatization, form or join self-help groups, and thus enables the development of new collective identities. Subsequent topics addressed by social movement scholars with a focus on emotions include, for instance, the role of friendship and solidarity, but also of grievances, anxiety, and fear in social movements. Case studies discussed by Helena Flam in this chapter address, among many others, the student protest at the Tiananmen Square in Beijing in 1989; the Madres de Playa de Mayo in Buenos Aires; and the enduring action campaign of the Israeli Women in Black.
In Chapter 15 on the transnationalization of social movements – another emerging trend in social movement studies – Movindri Reddy contends that existing theories fall short in explaining this transnationalization, as they are primarily suited to analyzing social movements in the Global North. Consequently, numerous scholars are inclined to give transnational social movements a coherence and rationality that does not actually exist. What is distinctive about the Global South in our current period of globalization, Reddy argues, is that in many countries the globalization of the economy and the transition to formal, liberal democracy have occurred at the same time. Social movement theories, however, have neglected to analyze and contextualize the marginalization of these countries and social movements emerging from these circumstances.

In Chapter 16, ‘Social movements and the ICT revolution’, Jennifer Earl, Jayson Hunt and R. Kelly Garrett discuss the impact of new information and communication technologies both on social movements and on social movement research. They sketch the development of this kind of research from humble early examinations of activists’ Usenet bulletin boards and the Zapatistas, to the examination of different forms of ‘internet activism’ across the globe. The authors outline the different positions within the grand debate over the general theoretical impact of ICTs on protest: does ICT usage have no effect on fundamentals underlying social movement theory; does it accelerate knowing processes or otherwise enlarge them; or are social movement theories fundamentally altered through ICT use? Finally, the authors assess empirical research results on the influence of ICT on phenomena like micro-mobilization and participation; organizing and organizations; online collective identity and community.

In the third part of this handbook, research on six contemporary social movements will be assessed: the environmental, the women’s, and the international human rights movement, as well as urban social movements, the Tea Party movement in the United States, and the animal rights movement. These movements are not only among the most important social movements of the present era, but they also show the inextricable relationship with specific forms of political citizenship (e.g., ecological or urban citizenship).

The environmental movement and the women’s movement are generally considered to be the most important and most influential social movements of the past half-century, and thus should be included anyway. One could, however, argue that the same applies to the labor movement. Obviously, the labor movement has been the most important social movement of the first half of the twentieth century. From the 1970s onwards, however, this movement has lost most of its movement characteristics,
at least in Western countries, whereas in several countries in the Global South it remains an important social movement indeed. Consequently, it has been decided not to reserve a separate chapter for the Western labor movement, but to pay ample attention to it in the individual, non-Western regional chapters in the fourth part of the handbook.

Of all social movements discussed in this handbook, the environmental movement is probably the most diversified one. It encompasses both the environmental justice movement in the USA and the ‘environmentalism of the poor’ movements in the Global South; both the European GMO-Free Regions Network, and the Russian branch of Greenpeace, fighting against the drilling in the Arctic shelf by the Russian Gazprom company. Large parts of the environmental movement have become highly institutionalized and solidly operate within the master frame of ecological modernization. However, in Chapter 17 by Hein-Anton van der Heijden on the environmental movement it is argued that over the decades there have always been groups within the environmental movement that have framed environmental problems as one of the ‘routine consequences’ of modernity and its four interconnected institutional features: capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power. It is argued that the uniqueness of these ‘counter-hegemonic’ parts of the environmental movement lies in the fact that they deliberately challenge the very institutional features of modernity, and thus show us a glimpse of what a greener society could look like, both in the Northern and the Southern Hemisphere.

The history of the women’s movement, in particular the North American one, is sketched by Jo Reger in Chapter 18. Reger argues that while scholarship of social movements has deeply influenced the ways in which women’s movements have been studied, women’s movements in their turn have also provided important theoretical concepts and frameworks that are relevant for all social movement research. Examples discussed by Reger include, for instance, the concepts of abeyance; the critique of the concept of ‘waves’ of protest; feminist work on the intersectionality of social identities; and, finally, the expansion of notions of mobilization and movement outcomes.

In Chapter 19 on the international human rights movement, Ann Marie Clark and Paul Danyi analyze how this movement has made itself a lasting political and moral force to be reckoned with. They describe the growth of this movement since the 1970s; the differences and similarities between the two most important SMOs in the field, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch; and the three categories within the movement’s repertoires of contention: bringing human rights violations to light; incorporating human rights concerns into international law and institutions; and, finally,
holding states accountable. Apart from this, Clark and Danyi also discuss a number of debates about the human rights movement, among which the question of what impact the movement has had internationally.

Urban social movements have received an individual chapter not only because of their constituent role in the formation of social movements in the recent past, but, more importantly, because life in the twenty-first-century world will increasingly be lived in urban and metropolitan areas. With more than 60 percent of the world population living in these areas, urban citizenship and urban social movements are expected to become an increasingly important area of twenty-first-century social science research. Urban struggles include, for instance, squatting/rent struggles, struggles around the use of public space, traffic and mobility. In Chapter 20 on urban movements Pierre Hamel reconstructs the debate on these movements, from Manuel Castells’s 1972 influential volume on the urban question to recent work of authors like David Harvey, Saskia Sassen and, again, Manuel Castells. In the ‘suggestions for further research’ section of his chapter, Pierre Hamel stresses, among others, the ongoing tension between structure and agency-based approaches to the study of urban social movements, the emergence of mega-cities in the Global South and the resulting conflicts and movement mobilizations in countries like China, India, and Brazil.

Social movements as conceived of in this volume not only include ‘left-leaning’ or ‘progressive’ ones. In the United States, the conservative Tea Party movement has developed into the most influential social movement of the past decades, with many millions of members or sympathizers. Consequently, Chapter 21, written by Edward Ashbee, will try to unravel not only the discourse, but also the organizational structures, the action repertoire, and the impact of this Tea Party movement. Besides, Ashbee tries to systematically answer the question of why there has long been a theoretical and methodological cleavage between surveys of conservative and radical rights movements in the USA on the one hand, and studies of (other) social movements on the other.

The last movement addressed in this part of the handbook is the animal rights movement. In his book on radical environmentalism, Rik Scarce has observed that few of us give a second thought to using animals for food, clothing, and other purposes. However, Scarce contends, vast industries have built up around exploiting tens of millions of dogs, cats, monkeys, and horses for medical research. Apart from this, in the USA alone every year six billion animals are killed for human consumption (Scarce, 1990, pp. 116–18).

In his chapter on the animal rights movement, Lyle Munro in Chapter 22 first of all assesses the literature on the abuse of animals from different
disciplinary perspectives: political science, sociology, social psychology, and so on. Thereafter he analyzes the animal rights movement as a stratified movement consisting of three categories: animal welfarists, animal liberationists, and animal rightists. From each branch he discusses the most important SMOs, not only with respect to their intellectual underpinnings, but also their organizational structures and action repertoires.

In the fourth, final part of this handbook, focus shifts from a thematic to a geographic approach, and from a separated to an integrated assessment of political citizenship and social movements. As Stammers (2009) has pointed out, historically the attainment of rights in the North was the outcome of sustained social movement activity. In contrast, many social movements in the Global South have arisen as a consequence of opportunities presented by rights entrenched in relatively recently founded constitutional democracies. In such contexts, social mobilization is, in many respects, aimed at achieving substantive citizenship that yields material gains (Thompson and Tapscott, 2010, p. 2). Consequently, whereas in many Western countries the academic distinction between social movement activism and political citizenship has become somewhat artificial, in most countries in the Global South the distinction has lost most of its relevance: social movement activism and political citizenship struggles are virtually indivisible (cf. Thompson and Tapscott, 2010). Accordingly, the authors of the chapters in this part of the handbook have been asked to take into account, as much as possible, both the social movement angle as well as the political citizenship point of view when analyzing political activism.

The selection of countries and regions for this part of the handbook not only reflects the political relevance and the state of social movement activism and political citizenship in the respective different parts of the world, but also the level of development of social movement and political citizenship research. In Chapter 23 on political citizenship and social movements in China, Lei Xie analyzes in what ways China’s restrictive political system limits the options open to people for forming movements or to systematically organize large-scale collective actions. She describes the research about the present state of affairs with respect to five contemporary social movements: peasant, labor, urban, environmental, and women’s movements. Subsequently she analyzes the rights consciousness and the conceptualization of citizenship in contemporary China, and the way the concept of political citizenship has been applied in and by social movements.

Contrary to China, India has a rich history of organized and spontaneous social activism from across the political-ideological spectrum. Contrary to China, India also has a rich history of social movement
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research, including research from the structural-functionalist, the dialectical Marxist, the new social movement, and from a large number of ‘in between’ approaches. In the first part of Chapter 24, Dip Kapoor meticulously analyzes the numerous research endeavors within these different approaches. In the second part he describes the state of the art with respect to research in four encompassing movements in present-day India: peasant and new farmers’ movements; informal economy and industrial working class movements; women’s movements; and, finally, human (citizenship) rights movements.

In comparison to India, social movement research in Africa is still in its infancy. Consequently, rather than describing the state of affairs of this kind of research in Africa, in Chapter 25 Patrick Bond describes a large number of social movement activities all over the continent, in which the climate justice movement appears to play a leading role. Much attention is also paid to the macro political-economic context. Is Africa ‘rising’ as a great new economic power, or is the continent better seen as witnessing early – and potentially widespread – uprisings, in a context of worsening economic conditions, as climate catastrophe also bears down on a billion Africans? It is this question that determines the structure of the chapter on political citizenship and social movements in Africa.

In the final chapter, Roel Meijer first of all analyzes how politics in the Arab world in past and present has impinged on the civil, political, social, and cultural rights of the citizen. The trajectory of citizenship in the Middle East appears to have had different historical phases with different combinations of rights (e.g., civil, political, social, and cultural rights). Thereafter Meijer compares the status of these rights during the period of the struggle for independence with the rise of citizenship rights over the past 20 years. As social movement theory gives agency to the citizen, Meijer subsequently tries to answer the question of how contestation has influenced the position of the citizen. His overall conclusion is that both citizenship and social movement studies can correct the tendency to portray the Arab as passive or indolent, or the exact opposite, fanatic and religious, so reminiscent of the orientalist tradition.

Although some parts of the world (e.g., Russia, South East Asia, and, most importantly, Latin America) have remained unrepresented, this final part of the handbook convincingly shows that political citizenship and social movements, and academic interpretations of them, have developed into an increasingly global phenomenon. Time will tell in which forms and to what extent they will continue to bring about core social transformations, and so again will basically change the world.
NOTES

* The author would like to thank Christian Scholl and Sebastiaan Tijsterman for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.
1. Apart from Scott and Tilly, social historians like Hobsbawm and E.P. Thompson should also be mentioned in this respect.
2. There is no lack of studies into political citizenship and social movements in Latin America, but most of them are in Spanish or in Portuguese.
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