Social Movements, Civil Society, and the State

Seminar/colloquium on social movements, civil society, and the state. Readings and discussion cover historical and contemporary cases of social movements, contentious politics, and participation by civil society. In the contemporary era of democratic transition and consolidation, the course examines contentious popular and opposition movements that seek to revise the very nature of citizenship, particularly by expanding citizens’ rights of participation so as to include formerly excluded people and groups, and to win benefits for them. It covers both the role of such movements in transitions to democracy and the impact of democratization on the movements themselves. It considers the impact of changing structural factors, such as the shift from heavy industry to the neoliberalism of the information era, on the agency of popular sector actors.

My Latin American politics survey courses employ a top-down perspective, emphasizing the role of the state and political elites. This seminar takes a bottom-up perspective, focusing on participation and agency by worker, peasant, popular, feminist, indigenous, religious, and other sectors of civil society and ideological and political oppositions.

Contemporary scholarly interest in civil society and social movements developed in the 1970s and 1980s, when a body of literature on “New Social Movements” emerged in response to changing political realities, as “post-materialist” peace, civil rights, women’s, and environmental movements developed in Western Europe and North America; as opposition to authoritarian rule crystallized in Latin America; and as unrest challenged the weakening communist party-states in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This literature, inspired by the work of scholars and activists, began to gain recognition by North American specialists on Latin America only in the late 1980s and early 1990s. [Because of my own regional expertise on Latin America and because scholarly work on social movements began earlier in Latin America than in other third world areas, a number of the readings focus on this region.]

In Latin America, scholars and activists raised very optimistic normative expectations that contentious social, economic, and political engagement by hitherto oppressed and excluded lower strata would create new, superior, forms of participatory democracy. The disappointing, or at best mixed, results on these headings prompted a sobering normative reappraisal by scholars, then a reappraisal of that reappraisal, followed by a focus on “contentious politics” by one school and on participatory politics within democratic institutions by others. Now that voters in some countries have elected left-oriented governments in what some are calling the “pink tide” era, Latin American activists are confronted by the dilemma of how to cope with governments they elected whose policies fall short of what they promised. In sum, in their empirical work on various world regions, researchers advanced a seemingly dominant interpretive paradigm and then, under challenge, refined it more than once. The colloquium will survey and illustrate this process.

For the first eleven weeks, class sessions will be part lecture and part colloquium, drawing on a close reading of the assigned materials. Students are responsible for the entire books listed in the course outline below, unless selected passages are indicated. While this seminar will not require reviews of the literature which were required when it was a colloquium in 2008, the guidelines for those reviews can guide your preparation and our class discussions, so I reproduce some of them here for your info:

Class members were required to prepare, in advance of each weekly session, a 4-to-6 page (double-spaced) review of the readings under discussion that week, for a total of 6 reviews during the term. The review should be an analysis and evaluation of the book or readings, rather than a mere summary; it should discuss the authors’ approach or methodology, the appropriateness of the evidence, and the effectiveness of the arguments.
Generally, monographic studies address a debate in their discipline, taking a position that accepts, illustrates, and perhaps refines the prevailing wisdom in the field, or they criticize that prevailing wisdom and present data to support an alternative explanation of the phenomenon under study. Book reviews should identify the debate in the discipline and present the main point or argument of the book or books they treat, showing how the book(s) contribute to knowledge and interpretation in the discipline. They should present the reviewer's evaluation of the arguments, logic, evidence, coherence, and clarity of the book or books. Student reviewers should be able to reread their reviews two years after writing them and effectively recall the key ideas and substance of a book, as well as their evaluation or criticism of it. Many of the books on the syllabus are not monographs but rather anthologies, and it is understood that the observation about monographic studies may apply only loosely for these books as well as for readings combined by me that were not originally packaged together. Reviewers should not feel required to force their review into a procrustean bed.

Questions to keep in mind include the following: Are other conclusions compatible with the data? Might the author(s) have come to different conclusions by using other methods, cases, or data that you can think of? Where appropriate, compare the readings under review to others assigned this term or that you are familiar with. These reviews are intended to help students to make key literature in the field “their own,” to sharpen their analytic, organizational, and expository skills, and to build a file of materials in preparation for the First Exam.

I will open each session by asking students to set the agenda for discussion on the assigned materials. All students should come prepared with several items to place on the agenda, items of the type suggested in the previous paragraph, and they should post them on Blackboard’s discussion board by the evening before the class session. The course follows a seminar format in the final three weeks, when students present and discuss their research projects.

This course is designed with the following objectives: to enable students to develop their abilities to read critically; to think comparatively and logically; to write critically and analytically, organizing their thought into effective analyses or arguments; to understand the processes generating contentious social movements, the evolution of such movements, and in the context of consolidating democracy, their conversion into civil society organizations aiming at policy influence; and to understand how knowledge advances through analytic paradigms that get defined, elaborated, then (usually) challenged and refined or replaced, and to frame research projects in terms of such interpretive paradigms. Guidelines for effective critical and analytic prose are offered in the writing tipsheets that accompany this syllabus.

Course Requirements: Course requirements include: participation in discussion on the assigned readings; posting agenda items on the Blackboard discussion board; preparation of a brief proposal for the research project by Nov. 4 (or, preferably, earlier); a brief oral presentation of the research project and findings; preparation and distribution to all seminar members via Blackboard, five days before the presentation, of a brief written précis of the project, including main hypotheses or research questions, sources being used, findings up to the time of presentation, and, if appropriate, a suggested brief reading or readings (which can be drawn from assigned readings on this syllabus or from one’s research sources); and the final research paper. Attendance is required, because in a colloquium and seminar all students serve as resource persons for their colleagues. Grades will be based on the above.

Students must consult with the instructor about research topics during the first weeks of the course, so that a proposal of the topic for the paper can be emailed to the instructor no later than November 4, with a copy posted on Turnitin.com. It should explain why you chose the topic, what questions you seek to answer, and key conceptual and substantive sources that you have located in your bibliographic search. The research paper is due on December 16. It must be submitted both electronically via Turnitin.com and in hard copy. An optional first draft of the term paper must be turned in by November 25.
For reporting and analysis of relevant current events in the hemisphere that we may discuss in class, students are expected to follow the *New York Times* and other media sources. Let me also point out the often neglected (in this age of television) and truly outstanding news coverage of WNYC radio (AM 82 and FM 93.9). Weekdays, FM carries "Morning Edition," the two-hour National Public Radio newscast from 5 to 9 a.m., and AM carries it from 6:30 to 9 a.m. AM presents “The Takeaway,” from 9 to 10 o'clock. They play "All Things Considered," the NPR evening news program plays from 4 to 6:30 p.m. and 7 to 8 p.m. WNYC-AM broadcasts "The World," a joint PRI-BBC world news magazine from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m., and BBC newscasts overnight and at other hours. AM runs the audio feed of the televised PBS NewsHour from 11 p.m. to midnight. At other hours AM presents excellent current-affairs interview and talk shows. Most of these provide podcasts or downloadable versions.


My Graduate Center office hours are in Room 5211 on Wednesdays, from 5:15 to 6:15 p.m., and immediately after class at 8:30, and by appointment. I prefer being contacted by e-mail at Kenneth.Erickson@hunter.cuny.edu kericksks@hunter.cuny.edu, and kpe973@gmail.com. If you have a junk-mail filter in your email account, please be sure to program it to accept email my addresses. The two Hunter addresses are to the same account, so you only need to use one of them. When corresponding with me, please put the course number “878” in the subject line, to route your message into a priority inbox for this course.

To reach me by telephone during Graduate Center office hours only, please call 212-817-8687 (no voicemail). On other days I am usually at Hunter College (teaching days Mondays and Thursdays). My office telephone there is 212-772-5498, which takes voicemail.

The books on the syllabus below have been ordered at Revolution Books, which is in the process of moving, so they don’t currently have a physical location. They will bring the books to sell at the first undergrad class sessions. All required books and readings have been put on reserve in the library under this course number. Required articles and book chapters are posted on Blackboard.

The required books, are:


Leonardo Avritzer, *Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil* (Johns Hopkins U.P., 2009). And, probably:

[Donatella della Porta, *Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis* (Polity, 2015). This latter book is still under consideration.]

**Useful Bibliographic Sources:** Useful bibliographic sources for research materials or books to review are EBSCO and Lexis-Nexis on the Hunter Library website databases; CUNYPLUS; the Columbia University Library catalogue [https://clio.columbia.edu/catalog](https://clio.columbia.edu/catalog); Google Scholar [http://www.scholar.google.com](http://www.scholar.google.com), and amazon.com and bn.com. Keywords identifying your interests (e.g., workers and Colombia; media and Venezuela; democracy and Mexico; “civil society” and Argentina; peasants and “el salvador”; indigenous and polit* and Guatemala; “social movement” and
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urban and Brazil) will bring up many recent books and articles. Where the catalogue offers you the option to select by descending date, i.e., by most-recent first, as in Columbia’s CLIO, choose that option. You can quickly build a working bibliography by saving, copying, and then pasting the results into a document file. Google.com can provide links to excellent web sources, especially reports from NGOs that don’t get catalogued in the library’s databases.

For research purposes, the assigned books by Tarrow contain lengthy bibliographies on social movements and contentious politics, as does one recent book that I am considering assigning, Donatella della Porta, Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis (Polity, 2015). I also plan to assign Richard Stahler-Sholk, et al. Rethinking Latin American Social Movements: Radical Action from Below (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), and it, too, has an excellent recent bibliography.

### COURSE OUTLINE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

#### I. INTRODUCTION: BASIC ISSUES.

Sept. 2. Read syllabus carefully, to discuss in class.

#### II. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: THE FIRST WAVE OF THEORIES AND CONCEPTS.


Sept. 23. No classes at CUNY.

#### III. THEORY, MOVEMENTS, AND STATES: TARROW’S REFLECTIONS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

IV. OVERVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS OF CIVIL SOCIETY AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.


K. P. Erickson, “Political Leadership, Civil Society, and Democratic Consolidation: Stereotypes, Realities, and Some Lessons that Academic Political Analysis May Offer to Democratic Governments,” for the Conference on Democratic Transition and Consolidation (Madrid, Spain, October 18-20, 2001).


V. LATIN AMERICAN CASES: PROTEST AGAINST AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES, CONSTRUCTIONIST RESPONSES TO ABSENT STATES, INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND COOPTATION BY DEMOCRATIC DYNAMICS.


Cathy Schneider, “Radical Opposition Parties and Squatters Movements in Pinochet’s Chile,” in MSM, 260-275.


VI. LATIN AMERICAN CASES: URBAN CLASS RESTRUCTURING, AGROECOLOGY, NEO-EXTRACTIVISM, AND INDIGENOUS CONTENTION IN THE NEOLIBERAL AND "POST-NEOLIBERAL" ERAS.


Daniela Issa, “Brazil: Praxis of Empowerment: Mística and Mobilization in Brazil’s Landless Rural Workers’ Movement (MST), Ch. 5 in Rethinking LASMs, 85-100.


María Elena Martínez-Torres and Peter M. Rossert, “Latin America: Horizontal Dialogue, Agroecology, and CLOC/Via Campesina,” Ch. 17 in Rethinking LASMs, 331-343.


Maurice Rafael Magaña, “Mexico: Political Cultures, Youth Activism, and the Legacy of the Oaxacan Social Movement of 2006, Ch. 4 in Rethinking LASMs, 67-83.


VII. PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY IN DEMOCRATIC BRAZIL.


VIII. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN TIMES OF AUSTERITY.


http://www.lrb.co.uk/v37/n05/john-lanchester/the-robots-are-coming

Ann Mische, “‘Come to the streets, but without parties’: The challenges of the new Brazilian protests,” *Mobilizing Ideas*, 9-4-2013.

Mark R. Beissinger, “‘Conventional’ and ‘Virtual’ Civil Societies in Autocratic Regimes,” forthcoming in *Comparative Politics*.

IX. PROTEST AND REVOLUTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA.


Charles Tilly's Foreward;
Quintan Wiktorowicz’s Introduction;
Charles Kurzman, “Conclusion: Social Movement Theory and Islamic Studies;”
Diane Singerman, Ch 5, “The Networked World of Islamic Social Movements;”
Janine Clark, Ch 6, “Islamist Women in Yemen: Informal Nodes of Activism,”
Benjamin Smith, Ch 7, “Collective Action with and without Islam: Mobilizing the Bazaar in Iran;”
Mohammed Hafez and Quintan Wiktorowicz, Ch 2, “Violence as Contention in the Egyptian Islamic Movement;”
Carrie Rosefsky Wickham, Ch 9, “Interests, Ideas, and Islamist Outreach in Egypt.”
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X. PROTEST AND REVOLUTION IN ASIA.


Rob Jenkins, “NGOs and Indian Politics,” by Rob Jenkins, in *The Oxford Companion to Politics in India*, eds Niraja Gopal Jayal and Pratap Bhanu Mehta (Delhi, 2010), 409-426.
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XI. PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH PROJECTS.

No v. 25. Presentations:
Marissa, “Curing Violence: Prescriptions for Justice and Peace in Colombia”
Sarah, “Musharraf’s Misstep and the Movement for Restoration of the Judiciary in Pakistan”
Hugo, “Origins, Participants, Content, and Outcome of the Brazilian Protests of 2013”
Diego, “Claim-making and Mobilization in Colombia’s National Strike of 2013”

Dec. 2. Presentations:
Pierre, “Theater Groups as Civil Society Actors: An Assessment of State-Society Relations in Latin America”
Fernando, “Violence, Opportunity Structure and Cycles of Contention”
Gabe, “Conservative Social Movements and the 1993 Race for Mayor: David Dinkins, Rudolph Giuliani, and New York City’s ‘Quality of Life’”
Brandon, “Race, Citizenship, and Contention in the US Civil War”

Dec. 9. Presentations:
Merrill, “Causal Factors Underlying Central and Eastern European Grassroots Mobilization”
Brad, “Buen Vivir: Viable Alternative, Utopia, or Both?”
Haya, “Contentious Politics and Religion in Pakistan”

Dec. 16. Presentations, if necessary.
WRITING TIPSHEET, K. P. Erickson

HANDOUT FOR STUDENTS, ON WRITING PAPERS AND EXAMS (Updated January 2008)

All essays should have an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. Essays should make a point or an argument, and illustrate it with supporting evidence.

Consider the argument of a book review. In most cases, monographic studies address a debate in their discipline. They take a position that accepts, illustrates, and perhaps refines the prevailing wisdom (dominant paradigm) in the field, or they criticize that prevailing wisdom and present data to support an alternative explanation of the phenomenon under study. Reviewers should present the main point or argument of the book or books they treat, along with their evaluation of the arguments, logic, evidence, coherence, and clarity of the book or books. Student reviewers should be able to reread their reviews two years after writing them and effectively recall the key ideas and substance of a book, as well as their evaluation or criticism of it.

Writers should always make the logic of their thought explicit, on the level of overall organization, on the level of paragraphs, and on the level of sentences. They should also make explicit the logic of the processes they describe or analyze. One effective way to make clear the overall logic of a paper, chapter, or dissertation/book is to begin it with an introductory “roadmap” paragraph or section.

Paragraphs should begin with topic sentences, and long paragraphs should be broken into smaller ones, each with its own topic sentence. One of the reasons why long paragraphs usually do not make their thought as clear as shorter ones is that long paragraphs include more than one component of a thought, but they contain only one topic sentence. Breaking up a long paragraph into two or more smaller ones, therefore, is not simply responding to esthetic desires for more white space on a page. Rather, when writers break up long paragraphs, they necessarily must link the components of an argument with more topic sentences, thereby making their logic more explicit.

Illustrations, preferably brief, should be provided for each generalization.

Writers should write for a hypothetical intelligent but uninformed reader, so that they are forced to make explicit the logic and the data on which they make their argument.

In selecting words for strong and effective argument, remember that verbs are much stronger than nouns or other types of words, and that transitive verbs (those that force the reader to include a subject and an object, i.e., to state who did what to whom) in the active voice are the strongest. Avoid passives and intransitive verbs (for they tend to lose information, because passives do not require a subject and intransitives do not require an object) and impersonal constructions where nouns replace verbs. For example, "there was a meeting where it was decided that…" conveys less information and thus is not as strong as "party leaders held a meeting where they decided that…".

Fernando Fajnzylber's phrasing below, for example, in his brilliant but difficult to read (and therefore impossible to assign as required reading) Unavoidable Industrial Restructuring in Latin America (1990), p. 47 relies on nouns that he could have replaced with verbs: "In Japan and in large U.S. corporations, estimates have prognosticated a duplication in the production during the next fifteen to twenty years, with a reduction in employment of between 25 and 40 percent."

A sharp copyeditor could have forced him to check his data and change his formulation to something like: "Japanese and US corporate studies predict that, over the next fifteen to twenty years, production will double while employment will decline by 25 to 40 percent."
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Students are expected to proofread their papers before submitting them, so that typographical errors and spelling errors have been corrected. Students should routinely do such proofreading, out of self-respect as well as out of respect for their instructor.

In the case of papers submitted for this course, those averaging more than three spelling or typographical errors per page over three or more pages will be returned ungraded. The corrected version, when resubmitted, will be graded two-thirds of a letter grade below the grade the work would otherwise earn (e.g., a B+ would become a B-, and a B would become a C+). Students who are not strong spellers should be attentive to prompts from their word processor's spelling checker.

Papers for this course should be typed, double-spaced, stapled, and not in plastic or other folders. Hand-written exams should also be double-spaced.

I grade papers on the basis of their organization, logic, coherence, originality, evaluative criticism, data, and clarity.

Some symbols I use in my penned comments:

**Circled words** or letters indicate spelling errors. A line linking circled words suggests overuse of a word, inconsistency or contradiction in use, or some other problem.

[ ] **Brackets** indicate a word choice that I question. Reconsider the word, even though you may choose to stick with your original word. Brackets also may indicate a passage that I have commented on in the margin. I sometimes add delete marks to brackets, suggesting that you drop the passage.

\(d\) A lower-case "d" in the margin is for diction, i.e., to signal that the sentence next to the "d" does not say well what it seeks to say, perhaps for reasons of grammar or simply due to confusing construction or word choice (e.g., Fajnzylber's sentence above).

**ant** "Antecedent," raises questions about the antecedent of a pronoun or adjective, i.e. ambiguity or error in attribution, as with "they" to refer to a singular noun earlier in the sentence. I also use it also to indicate that you are treating a topic as if the reader is already familiar with it, when in fact it has not yet been introduced.

**logic** When I write "logic" in your ms., it is to signal some break in the internal logic that your exposition seeks to develop.

**trans** Transition needed between components of a thought.

**Parallel upright lines, with diagonal** line through them. Grammatical structures or arguments are not parallel.
SYLLABUS ADDENDUM: GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING SCHOLARLY PAPERS

Notes drafted for inclusion on syllabi (graduate and advanced undergraduate courses), as guidelines for organizing scholarly papers:

Political science, like any other discipline in the natural or social sciences, seeks to identify patterns, processes, or phenomena and to explain how and why they work the way they do. To explain or illuminate such processes or phenomena, political scientists use analytical concepts to organize data and to formulate and assess explanatory theories and hypotheses. Students writing in the discipline of political science therefore should focus their research and write-up on a key conceptual/theoretical issue of importance to them and to the discipline.

Ideally, in papers, theses, and dissertations, and later in journal articles, one should (1) begin with a brief review of conceptual/ theoretical interpretations or explanations of how some political process or phenomenon works, then (2) show how the prevailing explanation or concept falls short in some way, and finally (3) propose some new concept or refinement of a hypothesis that would better explain the phenomenon. Then one can (4) move to specific, operationalizable hypotheses that can be examined with real data in order to infer the answer to the overarching, broader hypothesis.

Within this framework, one can then elaborate a case study that assembles the data to answer one's questions. And as one proceeds with the case material, one needs to make systematic, explicit reference to the theories or hypotheses that the case material helps one address. That is, one should provide the reader with explicit connective tissue that integrates the empirical components of the study with its theoretical and conceptual framework. This task of making a writer's logic explicit, addressed in the writing tipsheet, is what distinguishes an inspired, outstanding manuscript from an inspired but merely good one, and this increases its likelihood of being accepted for publication by the editors of a journal or press.

The identification of shortcomings or needed refinements in a theory or hypothesis usually comes after some work in graduate school, so students at earlier stages are more likely to draw upon a prevailing concept or hypothesis to gather and organize data to illuminate some specific problem or issue. In comparative politics, for example, one might use a generally accepted hypothesis to organize the questions asked and the data gathered about some process in a country or context of one's choosing, for example, the role of elite pacting in democratization or the impact of electoral or parliamentary rules on party accountability.

Well designed case studies of this type have considerable academic value. When preparing a manuscript to submit for publication in comparative politics, one should keep in mind that the board of a journal will surely prefer a manuscript that seeks to refine an accepted concept or to develop a new one. Such a journal, however, will also consider seriously a case study applying an accepted concept in a way that can be replicated, cumulatively, in other contexts for the development of comparative analysis. And journals devoted to specific regions or nations explicitly seek out such case studies.

[Revised January 2008]
Academic Dishonesty and University Policies

The Hunter College Senate passed the following resolution on May 11, 2005: “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The college is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

The College and University policy on academic honesty and dishonesty is set forth in the Hunter College Undergraduate Catalogue, 2007-2010 (p. 71): “The use of material (whether or not purchased) prepared by another and submitted by students as their own will result in disciplinary proceedings.” Section 15.3.a of the Student Disciplinary Procedure Bylaws of CUNY (on p. 275 of the same catalogue) instructs members of the college community: “Any charge, accusation, or allegation…must be submitted in writing in complete detail to the office of the dean of students promptly by the individual…making the charge.” The dean’s office then investigates and disposes of such cases.

The reason that academic communities consider academic dishonesty such a serious offense is that scientific research and learning—and hence the very life of the academic enterprise—are built on a foundation of truth. Without that foundation, academic institutions would lack the integrity that permits critical analysis and that, from a utilitarian perspective, fosters scientific, economic, and social progress.

To make the case that academic honesty is indispensable to scholarly work in the social sciences, let me begin with a discussion of the natural sciences. Students who perform laboratory experiments must carefully record their procedures in their lab reports. This enables them, and their instructors, to verify that their findings are correct, or, if not, to know why not. Such record keeping is not simply a make-work exercise. Students follow the same procedures as professional scientists, who must keep careful records of their work so that their colleagues, critics, or successors can replicate the original experiments to test their work and verify (or, depending on the results, qualify or reject) their findings.

For library research in the social sciences, correct and complete citation is analogous to rigorous laboratory procedure in the physical sciences. Scholars in the social sciences take careful notes so that their evidence can be checked and their work replicated or challenged by other social scientists. This enables knowledge and understanding to evolve as researchers confirm, refine, or reject prevailing paradigms of explanation. And, just as laboratory experiments and lab notes must represent a student’s own work, so too must research papers or other written work—properly documented—be the student’s own.

Web links to the Hunter College and CUNY policy on academic integrity are posted on line. This policy is consistent with, but not identical to, the regulations above, and can be viewed in detail at:
http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/provost/academic-integrity and
http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/la/Academic_Integrity_Policy.pdf
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