

TAKING COVER BENEATH THE ANTI-BUSH UMBRELLA: CYCLES OF PROTEST AND MOVEMENT-TO-MOVEMENT TRANSMISSIONS IN AN ERA OF REPRESSIVE POLITICS

Dana R. Fisher

ABSTRACT

What happened to the globalization movement in the United States? Since September 11, 2001, large-scale protest in the U.S. has predominantly targeted aspects of the so-called "War on Terror" and the Bush administration's policies more broadly, rather than on issues related to economic globalization and trade liberalization. Although from the outside, these protest events seem to be unrelated instances of citizens mobilizing to express their dissatisfaction, this paper argues that they are related. Building off of the research on cycles of protest and those who have theorized about movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest, this paper explores what happens to social movements within the context of increasing political repression. Using data collected through two stages of surveys with protesters who were randomly sampled at

Politics and Globalization

Research in Political Sociology, Volume 15, 27-55

Copyright © 2007 by Elsevier Ltd.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0895-9935/doi:10.1016/S0895-9935(06)15002-0

large-scale protest events in the United States from 2002 to 2004, this paper provides data to show how recent protest movements are connected and how movements change in response to political repression.

INTRODUCTION

With the 1999 protests against the World Trade Organization in Seattle, social scientists have increasingly studied the globalization movement.¹ Significant attention has been devoted to understanding the ways in which this movement represents a new form of transnational contention and how this movement is different from earlier movements (e.g. Ancelovici, 2002; Ayres, 2001; Bandy & Smith, 2004; della Porta & Tarrow, 2004; Fisher, Stanley, Berman, & Neff, 2005; Guidry, Kennedy, & Zald, 2001; Meyer & Tarrow, 1998; O'Brien, Goetz, Scholte, & Williams, 2000; Risse-Kappen, 1995; Rothman & Oliver, 1999; Smith & Johnston, 2002; Smith, Chatfield, & Pagnucco, 1997; Tarrow, 2001, 2005; Tilly, 2004, Chapter 5; but see Atwood, 1997; Boli & Thomas, 1999; Cortright & Pagnucco, 1997; Korey, 1998). As has been noted by Ayres and Tarrow (2002), in the wake of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, political repression has escalated "both in the United States and elsewhere" (p. 1). Concurrent with this heightened repression, protest in the United States has shifted away from issues related to globalization – such as trade liberalization and the policies of international financial institutions – to focus on the so-called "War on Terror"² and the policies of the Bush Administration more broadly. This paper explores the relationship between these presumably unrelated protest movements and studies them as components of one specific cycle of protest.

In particular, I build off of the work by scholars who have explored the relationship between movements within a cycle of protest to understand how collective action changes in the wake of political repression. In this paper, I focus particularly on how the globalization movement in the United States was redirected to protest the War on Terror and the policies of the Bush Administration since September 2001. Presenting data collected from five large-scale protests in the United States between 2002 and 2004, I show that there are significant similarities among these protesting populations. Moreover, I contend that these movements are all part of one specific cycle of protest within which collective action shifted in the wake of increased political repression. This paper is separated into three sections. First, I review the literature on cycles of protest and the research that looks at social movement transmission within cycles of protest. Second, I present data

collected through two stages of survey research on large-scale protest events in the United States. Third, I discuss the implications of these findings to our understanding of protest and the ways that social movements

STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS CYCLES OF PROTEST

Scholars have studied the connections between social movements (e.g. Buechler, 1990; Evans, 1980; Meyer & Zald & McCarthy, 1980). Nonetheless, the dominant approach of the research tends to provide a "highly structured view of the relationship between social movements" (p. 218). Although there has been a growing interest in the relationship between social movements, differing terms that refer to similar aspects of the relationship. There is yet to be consensus regarding the relationship between collective action changes in response to political repression, exploring the dynamics of movement-to-movement relationships, social movement spillover (Meyer & Zald, 1999), and between initiator and spin-off movements (Mink, 1999). The focus on different aspects of the connection between social movements has been some level of agreement by their researchers. The relationship is understood by looking at them within the context of a cycle of protest."³ In the pages that follow, I present details on the relationship between social movements, with particular attention to the ways each theoretical approach has played a role in the process through which actions

Cycles of Protest

Building off of Tilly's (1978, 1986) work on cycles of protest, as well as the volume edited by Traugott, 1995, this paper was conceived by Tarrow (1993) to explore the process of globalization through which innovations in social movements. In more recent work, Tarrow (1998) defines a cycle of protest as a period of heightened conflict across the social

collected through two stages of surveys with protest participants at five large-scale protest events in the United States. Third, I discuss the implications of these findings to our understanding of contemporary cycles of protest and the ways that social movements respond to political repression.

STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS CYCLES OF PROTEST

Scholars have studied the connections between social movements for years (e.g. Buechler, 1990; Evans, 1980; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Morris, 1984; Zald & McCarthy, 1980). Nonetheless, as McAdam (1995) points out, much of the research tends to provide a “highly static view of collective action that privileges structure over process and single movements over cycles of protest” (p. 218). Although there has been a recent increase in research on the relationship between social movements, the scholarship is constrained by differing terms that refer to similar aspects of collective action. In addition there is yet to be consensus regarding which perspective best explains how collective action changes in response to political repression. Scholars exploring the dynamics of movement-to-movement transmission have studied social movement spillover (Meyer & Whittier, 1994), the relationship between initiator and spin-off movements (McAdam, 1995), and the sequencing of social movements (Minkoff, 1997). Although all these studies focus on different aspects of the connections between movements, there has been some level of agreement by their authors that movements can be better understood by looking at them within what Tarrow has called a “cycle of protest.”³ In the pages that follow, I review the scholarship that has presented details on the relationship between social movements, paying particular attention to the ways each theory conceptualizes political repression’s role in the process through which activism breeds activism.

Building off of Tilly's (1978, 1986) work on repertoires of contention (see also the volume edited by Traugott, 1995), the notion of the cycle of protest was conceived by Tarrow (1993) to explain the broad process of the mobilization through which innovations in collective action are diffused. In his more recent work, Tarrow (1998) defines a cycle of contention as "a phase of heightened conflict across the social system: with a rapid diffusion of

on of organized and unorganized par-
ed information flow and interaction
(p. 142; see also Tarrow, 1991, 1993,
1995). Within this work, the author
calls "early risers" who mobilize when
opportunity. The collective action then
cit to the cycle of protest is the recog-
tion can take place during a period of
f a distinct cycle. After conflict widens,
ore conventional protests with more
on (Tarrow, 1991, p. 53). Although
of such cycles of protest are "diverse,"
own ... polarization spread[s] and the
(p. 160).

e of political repression in his work on
ive action will not "cease just because
repressed, or becomes tired of life in
he face of repression, collective action
) has suggested that radicals push for
the state becomes repressive (p. 150).
the defection of more moderate par-
of tactical innovation [in the form of
s to a decline in mass participation"]
or sees political repression leading to
urn-off more mainstream movement

an see the ways that multiple forms of
ing a specific period of time are in-
ense of political opportunity. Within
licity," Tarrow discusses the role of
otest cycles characteristically produce
f meaning and ideologies that justify
nd which a following can be mobi-
ds off of the work on framing and
Worden, & Benford, 1986; Snow &
) In fact, Snow and Benford (1992)
framing on movement-to-movement
"movements that surface early in a
as progenitors of master frames that
anchoring for subsequent movements

within the cycle" (p. 144). In other words, a particular frame of meaning can be seen as one of the central themes within a cycle of protest.

Even with the utility of the notion of cycles of protest, however, research on the subject remains limited. Tarrow (1998) himself recognizes the lack of research on such cycles and periods of contention, acknowledging that "they occupy no clearly demarcated space with respect to institutional politics" (p. 143). There are, however, three particularly relevant perspectives that do, to some degree, build off of the notion of cycles of protest to present more specificity to understanding the ways that movement-to-movement transmission takes place. In the sections that follow, I will review each perspective paying particular attention to the role that they see for frame alignment and political repression in their understanding of movement-to-movement transmission.

Social Movement Spillover

Perhaps one of the earliest clear articulations of movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest was put forward by Meyer and Whittier (1994) in their work on "social movement spillover." The authors conceptualize social movement spillover to explain the ways that "ideas, tactics, style, participants, and organizations of one movement often *spill over* its boundaries to affect other social movements" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 277, emphasis in original). The authors acknowledge that protests in the United States frequently involve a diversity of organizations "that address a 'laundry list' of demands ... A bellwether issue, generally representing what activists view as either the most threatening and urgent problem or the most promising vehicle for action, comes to unify a broad spectrum of groups that share similar or related concerns" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 290). Owing to the diversity of interests of the organizations and participants involved in the movement, spillover becomes possible.

Looking specifically at the connections between the women's movement and the U.S. Peace Movement in the 1980s, Meyer and Whittier (1994) find that participants of social movements change their focus to issues that they consider more critical: "as a movement shifts into abeyance on one set of issues, its personnel and organizations may switch the grounds of the challenge to another set of issues" (p. 279; for an application of social movement spillover to the connections between the political left and gay liberation movements, see Valocchi, 2001). In other words, the shifting of targets is the product of differing perceptions about the most urgent issue

and impressions of changing political opportunities. One of the major connections that the authors identify between these movements is their frame alignment. The authors conclude that the peace movement combined frames about peace and feminism, which was successful in recruiting "both feminist and non-feminist women as activists for the [nuclear] freeze" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 287).

Although the authors do not explicitly discuss the role that political repression may play in social movement spillover, they find in their case that, when there was hostility to political challenge from the Left, there was more "impetus for movement-movement linkages as beleaguered activists and organizations pool their strength against powerful opponents" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 293). In other words, the authors conclude that a hostile political environment leads to a broader coalition of activists and organizations involved in social movements. Such a broader field leads to a cascading effect within which activism gives way to activism.

Initiator and Spin-Off Movements

Another perspective on movement-to-movement transmission is presented in McAdam's work on initiator and spin-off movements. Written as a chapter in an edited volume on *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action* (Traugott, 1995), McAdam addresses the ways that movements are connected within a cycle of protest. He distinguishes between "two broad classes of movements whose origins reflect very different social processes": initiator movements, which "signal or otherwise set in motion an identifiable protest cycle"; and spin-off movements, which "in varying degrees, draw their impetus and inspiration from the original initiator movement" (McAdam, 1995, p. 219).

By separating these two related types of movements, McAdam adds specificity to movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest. In particular, he explores the differences in the ways early rising initiator movements and spin-off movements, or what Tarrow would call "latecomers," engage in collective action. The author finds that spin-off movements "develop within the formal organizations or associational networks of an earlier movement, while also appropriating and adapting elements of its collective action frame" (McAdam, 1995, p. 231). In other words, the initiator movement develops the frame and the spin-off movement adapts it.

McAdam finds that this adaptation takes place in a different political context than that of the initiator movement. Although they are borne of the

organizations and connections among movements, McAdam posits that spin-off movements are not expected to be particularly responsive to what he calls "cultural political and collective action frames. While they may respond to political opportunity, the spin-off movements' acceptance of the repertoire of marches and demonstrations involves a response to cultural opportunity when there is an *inopportunit*y."

The Sequencing of

Minkoff also explores the relationship between the civil rights and feminist movements in her work on the cycle of protest. Beyond what she considers to be "predominant cycles of protest that include cultural and political trajectories" (p. 779), she finds that "the interaction between organizations helps to facilitate the expansion of organizational growth and what she calls 'the cycle of protest'."

Although Minkoff also does not explicitly discuss the role that political repression might play in social movement spillover, she explores the role that political allies and democratic and republican dominance play in the diffusion of protest. She finds that "the spin-off movements might consider a repressive political environment as a protest from the civil rights movement" (1997, p. 795). In other words, protest movements develop within a distinct cycle of protest.

In short, these three theories – of social movement spillover, spin-off movements, and the sequencing of movements – offer some insight into understanding the relationship between movements within a distinct cycle of protest.

opportunities. One of the major connections between these movements is their frame. The peace movement combined frames successful in recruiting "both feminist and for the [nuclear] freeze" (Meyer &

discuss the role that political repression, they find in their case that, challenge from the Left, there was more linkages as beleaguered activists and against powerful opponents" (Meyer & s, the authors conclude that a hostile coalition of activists and organizations. Such a broader field leads to a case-study way to activism.

organizations and connections among participants within the initiator movement, McAdam posits that spin-off movements tend to emerge in the "context of *contracting* political opportunities" such as political repression (McAdam, 1995, p. 225, emphasis in original). As a result, spin-off movements are not expected to be particularly politically successful. Instead, they respond to what he calls "cultural processes" that include common tactics and collective action frames. While the initiator movement emerges to respond to political opportunity, the spin-off movement responds to a broadening acceptance of the repertoire of contention, be it sit-ins or more recent marches and demonstrations involving puppets. Thus, when there is a repressive political environment, a spin-off movement can emerge in response to cultural opportunity when the public perceives there to be political *inopportunity*.

The Sequencing of Social Movements

Spin-Off Movements

movement transmission is presented as spin-off movements. Written as a *Moires and Cycles of Collective Action* the ways that movements are connected distinguishes between "two broad reflect very different social processes": otherwise set in motion an identity movements, which "in varying degrees, from the original initiator movement"

types of movements, McAdam adds transmission within a cycle of protest. differences in the ways early rising initiator or what Tarrow would call "latecomer" author finds that spin-off movements through personal or associational networks of an imitating and adapting elements of its (1995, p. 231). In other words, the initiator and the spin-off movement adapts it. This takes place in a different political environment. Although they are borne of the

Minkoff also explores the relationship between social movements within a cycle of protest in her work on the organizational behavior and connections between the civil rights and feminist protest movements (1997). Going beyond what she considers to be "predominantly cognitive" conceptualizations of cycles of protest that include cultural elements such as frame alignment (Minkoff, 1997, p. 780), she finds protest cycles to be "the visible manifestation of the interaction between organization trajectories and protest-event trajectories" (p. 779). Adopting Tarrow's terminology, she notes that early risers help to facilitate the expansion of the cycle of protest by mobilizing organizational growth and what she calls "organizational density."

Although Minkoff also does not look specifically at political repression and the role that it might play in social movement sequencing, she does explore the role that political allies and political opponents (in the form of democratic and republican dominance in the U.S. Congress) plays in the diffusion of protest. She finds that "Republican dominance [or what some might consider a repressive political environment] limited the diffusion of protest from the civil rights movement to the feminist movement" (Minkoff, 1997, p. 795). In other words, protest does not tend to spread as quickly in such a repressive political environment.

In short, these three theories – of social movement spillover, initiator and spin-off movements, and the sequencing of social movements – provide some insight into understanding the relationship between social movements within a distinct cycle of protest. Table 1 presents a summary of the

Table 1. Expectations of the Literature.

Theory	First Wave	Later Wave	Role of Repression
Cycle of protest (Tarrow, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1998)	Early-risers	Latecomers	Repression causes movement radicalization and increases in violent tactics, which then discourages broader participation
Social movement spillover (Meyer & Whittier, 1994)	Movement	Subsequent movement (no temporal terminology)	Repression leads activists and organizations to work more closely together
Initiator and spin- off movements (McAdam, 1995)	Initiator	Spin-off	Narrowing political opportunities lead to spin-off movements, which respond to cultural opportunities and are less politically successful
Sequencing of social movements (Minkoff, 1997)	Early-risers and initiators	Later-entrants	Repression in the form of political opposition limits the diffusion of protest

expectations of these theories with regard to the timing of social movements in a cycle of protest and the role that repression plays.

Although these perspectives on movement-to-movement transmission are a good starting point, they provide limited assistance in understanding the actual effects that political repression has on social movements within a cycle of protest. Accordingly, this paper traces the ways that protest changes during a particular cycle of protest as the political opportunities constrict. In the pages that follow, I present the case of the globalization movement in the United States since September 11, 2001.

Political Context and Shifting Political Opportunity since September 11th

After the September 11th attacks on the United States in 2001, politics and political opportunity for collective action in the United States changed

significantly. On October 7, 2001, the President signed Executive Order 13224 in Afghanistan. On the following day, the President signed Executive Order 13225 in order to establish the Office of Homeland Security. The President also "develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive strategy to secure the United States from terrorism" (2001). Later that month, on October 26, 2001, the President signed law. In an overview provided by the President, he reported: "many sections of this sweeping new law will give us the means to protect our constitutional rights and freedoms. The President's Rights (2002) summarized the President's living in the United States: "From the President's definition of domestic terrorism, to the President's surveillance, to the indefinite detention of suspects without formal charges, the principles of the rule of law have been protected under the law have been protected. In other words, the new powers awarded to the President have affected how Americans can legally live their lives and practices.

Of particular consequence to collective action is the Patriot Act broadly defines "domestic terrorism" and "domestic terrorism" that have been used by activists to protest. The American government has expanded its power in what it defines as domestic terrorism. Those criticizing the American government's potential risks to protesters have increased.

Data for this paper were collected during the implementation of the Patriot Act and the September 11th attacks. The implementation of the Patriot Act began its military campaign in Iraq in 2001. The scale of protests over time since September 11th shows that the shifting political climate in the United States has movements within this cycle of protest. The cycle of protest as social movements within this cycle of protest to the increasingly repressive government's opportunities. In particular, my analysis of protesting populations at these events shows that the remainder of the paper is separated into three parts: first, and where the data were collected; second, and third, I discuss the implications of protest and the relationship between

as of the Literature.

Later Wave	Role of Repression
omers	Repression causes movement radicalization and increases in violent tactics, which then discourages broader participation
quent movement (temporal binology)	Repression leads activists and organizations to work more closely together
off	Narrowing political opportunities lead to spin-off movements, which respond to cultural opportunities and are less politically successful
entrants	Repression in the form of political opposition limits the diffusion of protest

rd to the timing of social movements
 epression plays.
 ment-to-movement transmission are
 ited assistance in understanding the
 has on social movements within a
 traces the ways that protest changes
 e political opportunities constrict. In
 e of the globalization movement in
 2001.

Opportunity since September 11th

the United States in 2001, politics
 action in the United States changed

significantly. On October 7, 2001, the United States began military strikes in Afghanistan. On the following day, President Bush signed an executive order to establish the Office of Homeland Security. The office was created to "develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks" (Bush, 2001). Later that month, on October 26th, the Patriot Act was signed into law. In an overview provided by the American Civil Liberties Union, it reported: "many sections of this sweeping law need proper checks and balances to protect our constitutional freedoms."⁵ The Center for Constitutional Rights (2002) summarized the effects of this Act on everyday people living in the United States: "From the USA PATRIOT Act's over-broad definition of domestic terrorism, to the FBI's new powers of search and surveillance, to the indefinite detention of both citizens and non-citizens without formal charges, the principles of free speech, due process, and equal protection under the law have been seriously undermined" (p. 1). In other words, the new powers awarded to the government through the Act have affected how Americans can legally criticize the government and protest its practices.

Of particular consequence to collective action in the United States, the Act broadly defines "domestic terrorism" so that it includes many activities that have been used by activists to protest. In addition, through the Act, the American government has expansive powers to investigate anyone who is engaging in what it defines as domestic terrorism.⁶ Thus, the rights afforded those criticizing the American government have become limited while the potential risks to protesters have increased.

Data for this paper were collected from protests that took place since the implementation of the Patriot Act and before and after the United States began its military campaign in Iraq.⁷ By looking at participation in large-scale protests over time since September 11th, we are able to explore the role that the shifting political climate in the United States played on social movements within this cycle of protest. As such, we can observe the changes in the cycle of protest as social movements in the United States respond to the increasingly repressive government that provides narrowing political opportunities. In particular, my analysis will focus on the priorities of the protesting populations at these events and how they are similar and different. The remainder of the paper is separated into three parts: first, I outline how and where the data were collected; second, I present the analyses of the data; and third, I discuss the implications of my findings to understanding cycles of protest and the relationship between social movements in America today.

DATA AND METHODS

Data were collected through a two-stage process: random surveying of protest participants at five large-scale protest events in the United States since September 11, 2001, and an Internet follow-up survey with those in the original sample who were willing to participate. Initially, data were collected by randomly surveying participants at five large-scale protests held from February 2002 to August 2004. All five protests were legally permitted rallies in outdoor public places and were large gatherings of broad coalitions of organizations as well as unaffiliated activists and others who joined the protest. All the demonstrations took place on weekend days to maximize citizen participation.⁸ Three of the protests were chosen because they were seen as the most important globalization protests in the United States during this time period according to the globalization movement itself.⁹ The other two protests included one of the most important antiwar protests in the United States, which was part of an internationally coordinated day of protest against the War in Iraq,¹⁰ and one of the largest protests against the policies of the Bush Administration, which was scheduled to coincide with the Republican National Convention (RNC) in summer 2004.¹¹ By including data from these five protest events, we are able to explore the shifting focus of social movements within this cycle of protest and examine the commonalities among the protesting populations and their grievances over time. While surveying protesters at each of these protest events, subjects were asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up Internet survey. Data from both stages of this project are included in the analysis. Each stage will be discussed in detail below.

Random Survey of Protest Participants at Large-Scale Protest Events

First, protesters were randomly surveyed at five large-scale protests held in the United States since the September 11th attacks on the United States. Survey participants were chosen using a field approximation of random selection at the demonstrations. Starting from different points across the field site, field surveyors "counted off" protesters standing in a formal or informal line, selecting every fifth protester to participate. Because field situations varied, random selection was achieved at some events by choosing every fifth person standing in a line to enter a rally area and, at others, by choosing every fifth person in a line or row as determined by the researcher working in a particular area.

The survey was designed to be sho data collection in the field and encour among the demonstrators. It includes to elicit responses that can easily be co respondent came to be participating collected from protesters, data on the pamphlets, fliers, and other materials of each protest. In addition, media co along with the websites of the coordi the movement news websites (such as

Protests

Data from five large-scale protests tha February 2002 to August 2004 are in World is Possible March at the 2002 City; (2) the A20 Stop the War for Global Justice at the spring 200 Washington, DC; (3) the Mobilizatio meetings of the World Bank/IMF, W ANSWER Antiwar protest in Washi World Says No to the Bush Agenda New York City in August 2004.

Overall, 2,230 demonstrators were 91.3% – agreed to participate in the s take the survey, representing an over Using data collected from field notes, provided by organizations that were in of the five protests will be briefly sum

The Another World is Possible M New York City. The World Economic global elites ranging from heads of corporations. As described by Ben W meant to be a sort of town hall meetin a place where Colin Powell can min Archbishop Desmond Tutu can swa Cola." Held annually in Davos, S New York for the 2002 meeting as a g attack on the World Trade Center.

METHODS

age process: random surveying of protest events in the United States since a follow-up survey with those in the participate. Initially, data were collected at five large-scale protests held from the protests were legally permitted rallies large gatherings of broad coalitions of activists and others who joined the protest on weekend days to maximize citizen were chosen because they were seen as tests in the United States during this nation movement itself.⁹ The other two important antiwar protests in the United Nationally coordinated day of protest the largest protests against the policies as scheduled to coincide with the Re- in summer 2004.¹¹ By including data able to explore the shifting focus of protest and examine the commonalities and their grievances over time. While protest events, subjects were asked if in a follow-up Internet survey. Data included in the analysis. Each stage will

ants at Large-Scale Protest Events

ved at five large-scale protests held in r 11th attacks on the United States. g a field approximation of random ing from different points across the " protesters standing in a formal or otester to participate. Because field achieved at some events by choosing enter a rally area and, at others, by row as determined by the researcher

The survey was designed to be short and noninvasive, so as to facilitate data collection in the field and encourage the widest possible participation among the demonstrators. It includes six short questions that are designed to elicit responses that can easily be coded into categories regarding how the respondent came to be participating in the protest. Beyond survey data collected from protesters, data on the protest events were collected through pamphlets, fliers, and other materials that were distributed by the organizers of each protest. In addition, media coverage of each protest was monitored, along with the websites of the coordinating coalitions of each protest, and the movement news websites (such as Indymedia.org).

Protests Surveyed

Data from five large-scale protests that took place in the United States from February 2002 to August 2004 are included in this paper: (1) the Another World is Possible March at the 2002 World Economic Forum, New York City; (2) the A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the spring 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC; (3) the Mobilization for Global Justice at the fall 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC; (4) the International ANSWER Antiwar protest in Washington, DC in April 2003; and (5) the World Says No to the Bush Agenda March on the Eve of the RNC in New York City in August 2004.

Overall, 2,230 demonstrators were sampled. Of the sample, 2,036 – or 91.3% – agreed to participate in the survey. In total, 194 people refused to take the survey, representing an overall refusal rate of approximately 9%. Using data collected from field notes, media accounts, and protest materials provided by organizations that were involved with the protests studied, each of the five protests will be briefly summarized in turn.

The Another World is Possible March at the World Economic Forum, New York City. The World Economic Form (WEF) is a meeting of invited global elites ranging from heads of state to heads of the world's largest corporations. As described by Ben Wright (2002) of the BBC, "the Forum is meant to be a sort of town hall meeting for the world's movers and shakers, a place where Colin Powell can mingle with German trade unionists and Archbishop Desmond Tutu can swap ideas with the president of Coca-Cola." Held annually in Davos, Switzerland, the WEF was moved to New York for the 2002 meeting as a gesture of support for the City after the attack on the World Trade Center. Similar to the meetings of the World

Trade Organization, World Bank, and the IMF, the WEF has become an annual opportunity for globalization protesters to voice grievances against corporate globalization as well as other global concerns such as labor conditions, AIDS, and environmental degradation. According to Another World is Possible (AWIP), a coalition of more than 100 social movement organizations that organized the protest, the purpose of the 2002 WEF protest was to "tell the 'Masters of the Universe' that they don't have the answers to our problems. Join us in the streets as we visualize solutions that build a better world where the people are in control."¹²

On Saturday, February 2, 2002, approximately 7,000 people gathered for a rally at the southeastern corner of Central Park to protest the WEF and to march to the Waldorf-Astoria hotel where the meeting was being held (Sanger, 2002, p. A1). All interested organizations and individuals were invited to participate. Although groups that practiced varying action forms were invited to join the protest, the organizers asked that participants honor their request that the protest be completely nonviolent and exclude direct action, or in the parlance of globalization demonstrations, they asked for a "green" demonstration. In the words of a flyer that was handed out at the demonstration: "many local activists would prefer not to alienate our local heroes (i.e. police and fire fighters) right now, especially since so many of them are feeling screwed by the same system we are protesting" (AWIP flyer, 2002). Because the protests that had been scheduled to take place during the 2001 fall meetings of the World Bank/IMF had been canceled in response to the September 11th attacks on the United States,¹³ this demonstration, which aimed to protest the practices of the World Economic Forum, was the first large-scale organized protest to take place in the United States after September 11. Even with the plea for a nonviolent demonstration from the protest organizers, 38 people were arrested during the Saturday protest (Sanger, 2002, p. A1).

Protesters were surveyed at the rally prior to the march. Surveyors entered the rally site from the four corners of Grand Army Plaza, on Fifth Avenue between 59th and 60th Streets, where the rally was taking place. Researchers completed 316 surveys with participants from four countries. Twenty-seven people refused to answer questions and one person did not complete the full survey.

The A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Since the 1999 protests against the World Trade Organization in Seattle, the spring joint meetings of the World Bank/IMF in Washington, DC had also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. During the spring

meetings in April 2002, globalization protesters called for peace in Palestine as well as peace at home and abroad."

On Saturday, April 20, 2002, protesters joined in a demonstration to "Stop the War at Home and Abroad." At the Theater, an outdoor stage in the shadow of the Empire State Building, A20 protesters clustered in groups for lectures and musicians who were performing. As the demonstration began, the A20 protest participants included many who had been organized by International Women's War and Racism). The march was led by anti-globalization capitalists with black bandannas over their faces. Some mothers wrapped in traditional Palestinian headscarves alongside campus peace activists" (Fernandez, 2002). From researchers' observations and interviews with protesters, pants in the Palestine rally/antiwar demonstration overshadowed the globalization protesters. The demonstration's direct action component seen at the Seattle protests was generally uneventful with respect to the mainstream media reported local police encounters (Fernandez, 2002).

Surveys were conducted at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF alongside the A20 and Mobilization for Global Justice. Researchers surveyed 177 participants, including those outside the United States to participate in the survey. Those who refused to participate in the survey.

Mobilization for Global Justice at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Like the spring 2001 fall meetings have also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. The locations of the fall meetings were held in Washington, DC on September 26-27, 2002. Characteristics, messages, and organizing strategies used during the fall protest. Participants in the Mobilization for Global Justice at the World Bank/IMF Theatre and then marched to the World Bank/IMF meetings were being held. Protesters included reducing third world debt, environmental degradation as well as the war with Iraq.

Attendance for the protest fell from 10,000 in 2001 to crowds estimated from 3,000 to 5,000 in 2002.

d the IMF, the WEF has become an protesters to voice grievances against other global concerns such as labor degradation. According to Another n of more than 100 social movement test, the purpose of the 2002 WEF e Universe' that they don't have the e streets as we visualize solutions that are in control."¹²

roximately 7,000 people gathered for ntral Park to protest the WEF and to where the meeting was being held organizations and individuals were s that practiced varying action forms anizers asked that participants honor letely nonviolent and exclude direct tion demonstrations, they asked for ls of a flyer that was handed out at sts would prefer not to alienate our) right now, especially since so many e system we are protesting" (AWIP t had been scheduled to take place e World Bank/IMF had been can- a attacks on the United States,¹³ this the practices of the World Economic ed protest to take place in the United the plea for a nonviolent demon- 38 people were arrested during the

rior to the march. Surveyors entered Grand Army Plaza, on Fifth Avenue e rally was taking place. Researchers s from four countries. Twenty-seven d one person did not complete the

nd Abroad/Mobilization for Global World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. ld Trade Organization in Seattle, the k/IMF in Washington, DC had also zation protesters. During the spring

meetings in April 2002, globalization protesters were joined by activists calling for peace in Palestine as well as by activists calling for peace "at home and abroad."

On Saturday, April 20, 2002, protesters who were part of the A20 coalition to "Stop the War at Home and Abroad," gathered at the Sylvan Theater, an outdoor stage in the shadow of the Washington Monument.¹⁴ A20 protesters clustered in groups preparing for the march while listening to lectures and musicians who were performing on the stage. When the march began, the A20 protest participants were joined by other demonstrators, who had been organized by International ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and Racism). The march was described as a blend of "teenage anti-capitalists with black bandannas over their faces marching alongside Muslim mothers wrapped in traditional headress and pushing baby strollers alongside campus peace activists" (Fernandez, 2002; see also Kaplan, 2003). From researchers' observations and media reports, it appeared that participants in the Palestine rally/antiwar component of the protest far outnumbered the globalization protesters. Perhaps as a result, this protest lacked the direct action component seen at the Another World is Possible March and was generally uneventful with respect to arrests and vandalism. The mainstream media reported local police estimates of the crowd at 50,000–70,000 (Fernandez, 2002).

Surveys were conducted at the Sylvan Theater prior to the march, and alongside the A20 and Mobilization for Global Justice feeder marches. Researchers surveyed 177 participants, none of whom reported traveling from outside the United States to participate in the protest. Twenty-four people refused to participate in the survey.

Mobilization for Global Justice at the Fall Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Like the spring meetings of World Bank/IMF, the fall meetings have also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. The locations of the fall meetings rotate and the 2002 meetings were held in Washington, DC on September 28 and 29. Many of the same characteristics, messages, and organizing principles of that spring's A20 protest were used during the fall protest. On Saturday, September 28, 2003, participants in the Mobilization for Global Justice rally gathered at the Sylvan Theatre and then marched to the World Bank/IMF headquarters where the meetings were being held. Protesters voiced concern on a number of issues including reducing third world debt, corporate power, AIDS, environmental degradation as well as the war with Iraq.

Attendance for the protest fell far short of the 20,000 expected with crowds estimated from 3,000 to 5,000 people (Reel & Fernandez, 2002). As a

result of direct action taking place on the Friday prior to the protest, which involved the breaking of windows at a Citibank building and the arrest of 649 people (Fernandez & Fahrenthold, 2002), there was a very large and highly publicized police presence. In the words of Reel and Fernandez (2002, p. C4), "swarms of police may have kept some protesters away" (see also Andrews, 2002). In fact, rumors spread throughout the rally prior to the march that busses of protesters were being held outside the city. Despite the reduced attendance and the earlier unrest, the protest was generally festive with speakers and musicians performing on the Sylvan stage prior to the march.

As with the A20 protest, demonstration participants were surveyed at the Sylvan Theatre prior to the march. The research team surveyed 730 participants from 11 countries, with 83 people refusing the survey. It is important to note that the number of people who were surveyed at this event is much higher than for any of the other demonstrations included in this paper. In fact, protest participants from this event represent about a third (36%) of the total number of protesters surveyed. This high number is the result of a large research team attending the protest and not attributable to the size of the overall protesting population at this event. In order to ensure that the data from this protest do not bias the paper's overall findings, the majority of data analyses are presented by protest event.

International ANSWER March on Washington in Spring 2003. On Saturday, April 12, 2003, protesters came to Washington, DC to participate in a day of protest against the war in Iraq. The protest was coordinated with events taking place in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and cities around the world (Fernandez & Perlstein, 2003). It was the third to take place in the four weeks since the war in Iraq had begun on March 19, 2003. The protest was organized by International ANSWER to coincide with the spring meetings of the World Bank/IMF. In so doing, the organizers expected members of the globalization movement to come to Washington and participate in the antiwar event scheduled on Saturday, as well as the globalization-focused event that was scheduled for Sunday. The protest began with a rally in Freedom Plaza at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW and ended with a march to the Justice Department. With the media reporting the fall of Baghdad during the week prior to the protest and television stations broadcasting images of the Iraqi people tearing down a statue of Saddam Hussein in the middle of Baghdad (Dobbs, 2003), turn-out at the event was lower than expected and the protesters adjusted their focus to be the U.S. *occupation* of Iraq.

During the march, protesters also stopped outside the FBI to express their dissatisfaction with policies included in the Patriot Act. They chanted: "tapping

our phones, reading our mail – the Perlstein, 2003). The *Washington Post* described the march as "surprisingly peaceful, with no protesters breaking out of the crowd at 30,000 (Fernandez & Fahrenthold, 2002). Freedom Plaza prior to the march was crowded with protesters beginning to march. Researchers entered the march area and surveyed 424 participants, one of whom refused to participate in the survey.

The World Says No to the Bush Administration. The *World Says No to the Bush Administration* was a *Republican National Convention*. On Sunday, April 13, 2003, Peace and Justice coordinated what they called a "peace and justice legal march" in protest of the Bush administration's war in Iraq. The march was the cornerstone of a week-long series of events by organizations that mobilized activists to protest the war and its policies.¹⁶ Prior to the event, the New York Mayor's office refused to allow a large rally in Central Park. This refusal to allow a large protest in New York City, ostensibly to protect the Central Park Lawn, was perceived by many activists as "censorship" and "being trampled" (McFadden, 2004).

The march was endorsed by groups including peace and globalization activists, the Military Families Speak Out, and environmental groups.¹⁷ While critics of the Democratic Party, many organizations that protested the Democratic National Convention, the Kerry campaign "distanced itself from the march" during the Republican Convention.

On the United for Peace and Justice website, the purpose of the march was to protest the war and the website: "Democracy begins with a commitment to the civil liberties of all ... we march for a world where peace is possible!"¹⁸ Beyond clearly stating the purpose of the protest the repressive political environment of the main slogans of the global justice movement.

Even though the New York State Peace and Justice's bid to rally in Central Park was rejected, attendance at the march was very high. Estimates of the crowd at 500,000

the Friday prior to the protest, which Citibank building and the arrest of 649 (2), there was a very large and highly of Reel and Fernandez (2002, p. C4), protesters away" (see also Andrews, out the rally prior to the march that outside the city. Despite the reduced protest was generally festive with the Sylvan stage prior to the march. ation participants were surveyed at h. The research team surveyed 730 33 people refusing the survey. It is people who were surveyed at this event her demonstrations included in this n this event represent about a third s surveyed. This high number is the g the protest and not attributable to tion at this event. In order to ensure bias the paper's overall findings, the by protest event.

Washington in Spring 2003. On Sat- to Washington, DC to participate in . The protest was coordinated with s Angeles, Seattle, and cities around It was the third to take place in the gun on March 19, 2003. The protest WER to coincide with the spring so doing, the organizers expected t to come to Washington and par- on Saturday, as well as the global- ed for Sunday. The protest began reet and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW e Department. With the media re- week prior to the protest and tele- the Iraqi people tearing down a of Baghdad (Dobbs, 2003), turn-out d the protesters adjusted their focus

our phones, reading our mail – the FBI should go to jail" (Fernandez & Perlstein, 2003). The *Washington Post* reported that the protest was relatively peaceful, with no protesters being arrested and local police estimates of the crowd at 30,000 (Fernandez, 2003). Surveys were conducted on Freedom Plaza prior to the march and while protesters were lining up to begin marching. Researchers entered the Plaza from its four corners and surveyed 424 participants, one of whom was from Canada. Twenty-five people refused to participate in the survey.

The World Says No to the Bush Agenda March on the Eve of the Republican National Convention. On Sunday, August 29, 2004, United for Peace and Justice coordinated what they called an "impassioned, peaceful, and legal march" in protest of the Bush Administration's policies.¹⁵ This legal march was the cornerstone of a week of protest organized by a coalition of organizations that mobilized activists to protest the Bush Administration and its policies.¹⁶ Prior to the event, the protest received national attention when the New York Mayor's office denied the organizers their request to rally in Central Park. This refusal to permit access to a common site of protest in New York City, ostensibly to protect the grass on the Great Lawn, was perceived by many activists as "free speech and not the grass being trampled" (McFadden, 2004).

The march was endorsed by groups that focused on a diversity of issues, including peace and globalization as well as Iraq Veterans Against the War, Military Families Speak Out, and the group September 11th Families. It also included participation from antiwar, civil rights, labor, feminist, and environmental groups.¹⁷ While critics of the protest tried to link it with the Democratic Party, many organizations involved in the protest had also protested the Democratic National Convention in Boston. In addition, the Kerry campaign "distanced itself from the protests" that were organized during the Republican Convention (Mishra & Robertson, 2003).

On the United for Peace and Justice's Website, they explained that the purpose of the march was to protest political repression. In the words of its website: "Democracy begins with an absolute commitment to the rights and civil liberties of all ... we march for peace, we march for justice Another world is possible!"¹⁸ Beyond clearly stating that the march was intended to protest the repressive political environment, the organizers also invoked one of the main slogans of the global justice/globalization movement.

Even though the New York State Supreme Court ruled against United for Peace and Justice's bid to rally in Central Park, people came out in droves. Attendance at the march was very high, with United for Peace and Justice estimating the crowd at 500,000 people (McFadden, 2004). Although a

ped outside the FBI to express their Patriot Act. They chanted: "tapping

papier maché dragon was ignited as it passed in front of Madison Square Garden, the march was relatively peaceful. Even though there were widespread expectations that the protest would turn violent, the police reported that only about 200 people were arrested during the march (McFadden, 2004).

Surveys were conducted with participants as they queued up to march on the cross streets between 5th and 9th Avenues from 14th to 21st Streets in Manhattan. Researchers entered the holding area and began surveying protesters at its four corners.¹⁹ During the march, surveys were also conducted with participants as they marched up 7th Avenue to Madison Square Garden. In all, 454 participants were surveyed, with seven people reporting that they had come from outside the United States to participate. Forty-one people refused to participate in the survey.

Internet Follow-Up Survey of Protest Participants

All protesters who participated in the first stage of the study and agreed to be contacted via e-mail about the follow-up Internet survey were contacted. The follow-up web-based survey included questions about the protesters' involvement in multiple social movements, which large-scale protest events and days of protest that they had attended, and what particular issues motivated them to participate in social protest. Overall, approximately three-quarters of those protesters initially surveyed at the five-protest events agreed to provide an e-mail address and expressed interest in participating the follow-up component of the study. Of those people who provided e-mail addresses, 334 people – or 22.3% – participated in the follow-up survey. The follow-up response rate varies from 16.7 to 31.7%.²⁰ Although the overall response rate is not as high as some studies that employ Internet surveys (for a full discussion see Porter & Whitcomb, 2003; see also Cho & LaRose, 1999 for a full discussion of the role of trust in Internet survey response rates), it is consistent with the limited number of studies that have used this method to understand participation in social movements (e.g. Allen, 2000; Park, 2003). The sample of respondents to such a Web-based Internet survey are likely to be biased somewhat toward the more affluent and well-educated protest participants (e.g. Hewson, Laurent, & Vogel, 1996). Even with this limitation, however, as participants in social protest have become increasingly tentative about being studied, the technology of the Internet provides a unique opportunity to gain additional information from the protest participants who were randomly surveyed at demonstrations. Because the Internet

Table 2. Summary of Protest Data

	Another World is Possible	A20
	New York, February 2002	Washington, April 2002
Reported attendance	7,000	50,000–70,000
Participants initially surveyed	317	177
Refusal rate (%)	9.8	7.8
Percentage providing e-mail addresses (%)	72.2	87.0
Participants in follow-up survey	38	26
Follow-up response rate (%) ^a	16.7	16.9

^aPercentage is calculated based on those participants who agreed to participate in the follow-up Internet survey.

allows a person to be contacted without the need for a physical presence, it is likely that participants at these protests are more likely to provide an e-mail address, rather than a physical address. Table 2 presents an overview of the data collected along with the numbers of people who participated in the survey and the response rate for the follow-up survey.

RES

As has been previously discussed, the protests that took place during the

passed in front of Madison Square
 peaceful. Even though there were wide-
 could turn violent, the police reported
 tested during the march (McFadden,
 participants as they queued up to march on
 Avenues from 14th to 21st Streets in
 holding area and began surveying pro-
 the march, surveys were also conducted
 up 7th Avenue to Madison Square
 surveyed, with seven people reporting
 United States to participate. Forty-one
 survey.

of Protest Participants

first stage of the study and agreed to
 follow-up Internet survey were contacted.
 posed questions about the protesters'
 events, which large-scale protest events
 attended, and what particular issues
 of protest. Overall, approximately
 surveyed at the five-protest events
 expressed interest in participating
 Of those people who provided e-mail
 participated in the follow-up survey. The
 16.7 to 31.7%.²⁰ Although the overall
 studies that employ Internet surveys (for
 2003; see also Cho & LaRose, 1999
 in Internet survey response rates), it
 of studies that have used this method
 movements (e.g. Allen, 2000; Park,
 such a Web-based Internet survey are
 the more affluent and well-educated
 rent, & Vogel, 1996). Even with this
 social protest have become increas-
 technology of the Internet provides a
 information from the protest partici-
 demonstrations. Because the Internet

Table 2. Summary of Protest Participants Surveyed.

	Another World is Possible	A20	Mobilization for Global Justice	International ANSWER	The World Says "No" to the Bush Agenda
	New York, February 2002	Washington, April 2002	Washington, September 2002	Washington, April 2003	New York, August 2004
Reported attendance	7,000	50,000–70,000	3,000–5,000	30,000	500,000
Participants initially surveyed	317	177	730	399	413
Refusal rate (%)	9.8	7.8	11.4	5.9	9.0
Percentage providing e-mail addresses (%)	72.2	87.0	64.0	75.1	76.5
Participants in follow-up survey	38	26	85	84	101
Follow-up response rate (%) ^a	16.7	16.9	18.2	28	31.7

^aPercentage is calculated based on those participants who provided their e-mail addresses to participate in the follow-up Internet survey.

allows a person to be contacted without his or her identity being known,²¹ it is likely that participants at these protest events were more comfortable providing an e-mail address, rather than a phone number or mailing address. Table 2 presents an overview of the protests included in this paper, along with the numbers of people originally surveyed at each protest event and the response rate for the follow-up survey.

RESULTS

As has been previously discussed, these five protest events provide a sample of protests that took place during the period after September 11 when the

U.S. government was implementing repressive policies that limited the ability of its citizens to express their dissatisfaction with the government. In fact, prior to the RNC protest, the *New York Times* reported police officials plans to use an army of "police officers to deter violence" during the protest and had identified "about 60 people as militants, some of whom were arrested for violent acts in past protests," whom they were investigating prior to the event at the end of August (Archibold, 2004). As can be seen by the overview of the protest events studied, the targets of the protests had moved away from global justice to the practices of the Bush Administration, focusing on different aspects of its "War on Terror."

Even with this shift in target, however, the organizers of the protests continued to employ the global justice frame to mobilize participants. At every event, protesters could be heard chanting slogans made popular by the globalization movement, such as "Another World is Possible." Also, all of these protests continued to employ the repertoire made popular during the earlier protests of the globalization movement: at all of these events, some participants dressed in costumes, carried puppets, and the protests created an atmosphere that included festive street theater (for a discussion see Wood, 2004).²² During the RNC protest, this technique was innovated, with the so-called "Billionaires for Bush" joining the March, as well as protesters dressed as pallbearers carrying "a thousand mock coffins of cardboard draped in black or in American flags" (McFadden, 2004).

The consistency of the collective action frame employed and the tactics used suggests that these movements are, indeed, related and part of the same cycle of protest. The question that remains, however, is: what happened to those people who were participants in the globalization movement and, to what degree, did they spillover into the movement to protest the Bush Administration in post 9/11 America? In the analysis that follows, I will present data collected from the protest participants at these five large-scale protest events since September 11 to answer questions and discuss how these findings help us to understand movement-to-movement transmission during a period of heightened political repression in the United States.

How Engaged are these Protesters Overall

Overall, most protesters who participated in the follow-up survey were very engaged, with the average protester reporting having attended an average of about ten protests in last two years. Table 3 presents the numbers of protests attended by participants at each protest event. Although participants at all

Table 3. Number of Protests

	Another World is Possible	A20
	New York, February 2002	Washington April 2002
Minimum	1	1
Maximum	150	50
Mean	22	12

of these protest events were very engaged. In fact, participants at these events were more engaged than those at the RNC protest. Those who had participated in the RNC protest had participated in significantly more protests in the past two years, those who had participated in the RNC protest were half as engaged, averaging about five protests in the past two years. Although the maximum protests attended by participants was the same as that for those at the RNC protest was much less, the population at this event was less engaged. This suggests that participants at the RNC protest were not "regulars," attending their being protest "regulars," attending

What did they protest?

These protesters were very engaged. In fact, participants at these events were more engaged than those at the RNC protest. Whittier (1994) call a "laundry list" of social issues that protesters bring together groups from diverse movements, including anti-intervention, gay and lesbian, and environmental. In other words, participants in these large-scale protests were active in many protests; they were active in many protesting multiple social causes. The participants reported protesting in the past two years on civil rights, and the environment.

Peace was a priority for protesters. In 2001: overall, 92% of the protest events were about peace.²³ Even

pressive policies that limited the ability to interact with the government. In fact, the *New York Times* reported police officials planned to use "excessive violence" during the protest and that some of the protesters were arrested for disorderly conduct. Some of the protesters were investigating prior to the event. As can be seen by the overview of the protests had moved away from the Bush Administration, focusing on

ever, the organizers of the protests used a frame to mobilize participants. At the protest, chanting slogans made popular by the "Another World is Possible." Also, all of the protesters used a repertoire made popular during the movement: at all of these events, some protesters used puppets, and the protests created a street theater (for a discussion see below). At this technique was innovated, with the use of puppets during the March, as well as protesters using thousand mock coffins of cardboard (McFadden, 2004).

ion frame employed and the tactics used, indeed, related and part of the same movement, however, is: what happened in the globalization movement and, the movement to protest the Bush Administration. In the analysis that follows, I will discuss participants at these five large-scale protest events and discuss how these events contributed to movement transmission during the protest in the United States.

Protesters Overall

ed in the follow-up survey were very interested in having attended an average of 11 protests. Table 3 presents the numbers of protests attended at each event. Although participants at all

Table 3. Number of Protests Attended in the Past Two Years.

	Another World is Possible	A20	Mobilization for Global Justice	International ANSWER	The World says "No" to the Bush Agenda
	New York, February 2002	Washington, April 2002	Washington, September 2002	Washington, April 2003	New York, August 2004
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	150	50	101	100	50
Mean	22	12	12	13	5

of these protest events were very engaged and had participated in numerous protests in the past two years, those who were originally surveyed at the RNC protest had participated in significantly fewer protest events. In fact, they were half as engaged, averaging only about five protests in the past two years. Although the maximum protests attendance reported by RNC protest participants was the same as that for the A20 March in 2002, the mean for those at the RNC protest was much lower. In other words, the protesting population at this event was less engaged in protesting overall. This finding suggests that participants at the RNC protest were less radical in terms of their being protest "regulars," attending multiple protests over time.

What did they Protest?

These protesters were very engaged in protesting multiple social issues. In fact, participants at these events came out to protest what Meyer and Whittier (1994) call a "'laundry list' of demands. Broad issues ... have pulled together groups from diverse movements including the peace, women's, anti-intervention, gay and lesbian, and AIDS movements" (p. 290). In other words, participants in these large-scale protest events were not single-issue protesters; they were active in many different political issues and reported protesting multiple social causes. The top-four issues that the protest participants reported protesting in the past two years were peace, globalization, civil rights, and the environment.

Peace was a priority for protesters at all of the events since September 11, 2001: overall, 92% of the protest participants reported participating in protests that were about peace.²³ Even though the cycle of protest began

with the globalization movement, fewer and fewer protest participants reported attending protests that were about globalization. At the A20 March in spring 2002, where the focus was on globalization *and* stopping the war at home and abroad, only about three-quarters of the protesters reported attending protests about globalization. By spring 2003, after the war in Iraq had begun, less than 40% of the protest participants at the International ANSWER March reported attending protests about globalization, despite the fact that the march was scheduled to take place on the same weekend as the protests at the spring meetings of the World Bank-IMF. More recently, at the RNC protest in summer 2004, less than 20% of the protesters reported attending protests about globalization. It is also worth noting that, with the increasingly repressive political environment in America during this period of time, about a third of the protesters at each event reported attending protests about civil rights, which would certainly include protests about civil liberties and components of the Patriot Act. Table 4 summarizes these responses.

Participation in the Globalization Movement

Even though the globalization movement seemed to retreat after September 11, 2001, in terms of protest participants who reported protesting globalization in the past two years, many of the participants in these protest events had been relatively active in the globalization movement. Table 5 lists the percentages of respondents from each protest event who had participated in some of the most well-known protests of the globalization movement *prior* to September 11, 2001. Because most respondents were originally surveyed at protests taking place on the East Coast of the United States, it is not surprising that the respondents reported the highest levels of protest

Table 4. What Subjects were the Foci of Protesters' Protest?.

	Peace	Globalization	Civil Rights	Environment
Another World is Possible (%)	92.1	97.4	42.1	50
A20 (%)	100	76.9	42.2	38.5
Mobilization for Global Justice (%)	94.1	92.9	30.6	31.8
International ANSWER (%)	92.9	36.9	25.0	15.5
The World Says "No" to Bush (%)	88.1	18.8	33.7	28.7
All Five Protests (%)	92.2	55.7	32.3	29.3

Table 5. Attendance at Major Protests

	Another World is Possible (%)	A20 (%)
Seattle, November 1999, WTO	2.6	3
Washington, DC, April 2000, World Bank-IMF	26.3	15
Washington, DC, January 2001, Presidential inauguration	36.8	11
Quebec, Canada, April 2001, Summit of the Americas	15.8	3
Washington, DC, April 2001, World Bank-IMF	23.7	38
Washington, DC, September 2001, Anti Capitalist Convergence/March against War and Racism	21.1	46

attendance at events in that region. Participants at the first three protests about globalization, were more active in the globalization movement. Participants at the International ANSWER March, involved in earlier globalization protests, reported attending these well-known events. In fact, about 40% of the participants at the event reported participating in the march. At the Convergence in Washington, DC in fall 2001, after the September 11 attacks on the United States. Participants at the RNC protest in summer 2004 reported even lower attendance at protests, with less than 10% reporting attending globalization events.

These data suggest that participants who reported protesting globalization targeted the Bush Administration's policy of globalization. Participants who reported protesting globalization *together* with other issues, such as the environment, reported protesting globalization *together* with other issues. The results of these two questions will provide a more complete picture of which the globalization movement spilled over into the War on Terror. Table 6 summarizes the

ever and fewer protest participants re-
about globalization. At the A20 March
globalization *and* stopping the war at
quarters of the protesters reported at-
By spring 2003, after the war in Iraq
test participants at the International
protests about globalization, despite
to take place on the same weekend as
the World Bank-IMF. More recently,
less than 20% of the protesters re-
lization. It is also worth noting that,
al environment in America during this
protesters at each event reported at-
which would certainly include protests
of the Patriot Act. Table 4 summarizes

Table 5. Attendance at Major Globalization Protests.

	Another World is Possible (%)	A20 (%)	Mobilization for Global Justice (%)	International ANSWER (%)	The World Says "No" to the Bush Agenda (%)
Seattle, November 1999, WTO	2.6	3.8	4.7	0	4.7
Washington, DC, April 2000, World Bank-IMF	26.3	15.4	23.5	11.9	1.0
Washington, DC, January 2001, Presidential inauguration	36.8	11.5	16.5	16.7	5.9
Quebec, Canada, April 2001, Summit of the Americas	15.8	3.8	5.9	2.4	2.0
Washington, DC, April 2001, World Bank-IMF	23.7	38.5	24.7	10.7	4.0
Washington, DC, September 2001, Anti Capitalist Convergence/March against War and Racism	21.1	46.2	32.9	21.4	2.0

Globalization Movement

ent seemed to retreat after September
ants who reported protesting global-
the participants in these protest events
lization movement. Table 5 lists the
protest event who had participated in
of the globalization movement *prior*
respondents were originally surveyed
Coast of the United States, it is
reported the highest levels of protest

The Foci of Protesters' Protest?

Globalization	Civil Rights	Environment
97.4	42.1	50
76.9	42.2	38.5
92.9	30.6	31.8
36.9	25.0	15.5
18.8	33.7	28.7
55.7	32.3	29.3

attendance at events in that region. Also not surprising is the fact that participants at the first three protests, which directly targeted aspects of globalization, were more active in the globalization movement overall. Participants at the International ANSWER protest in April 2003 were less involved in earlier globalization protests, but still had attended a number of these well-known events. In fact, about a fifth of the participants at this event reported participating in the march associated with the Anti-Capitalist Convergence in Washington, DC in fall 2001, right after the September 11 attacks on the United States. Participants at the RNC protest in August 2004 reported even lower attendance at these large-scale globalization protests, with less than 10% reporting having attended any of these major globalization events.

These data suggest that participants at the protests that specifically targeted the Bush Administration's policies had dwindling interest and involvement in the globalization movement. However, to get a better sense of the proportion of the participants at these protests who *had* been involved in the globalization movement at some time, we must look at those who reported protesting globalization *together with* those who reported attending a major globalization protest prior to September 11, 2001. Combining the results of these two questions will provide clearer evidence of the degree to which the globalization movement spilled over to the movement against the War on Terror. Table 6 summarizes the comparison of responses to these

Table 6. International ANSWER Protest Participants' Involvement in the Globalization Movement.

Reported Protesting the Issue of Globalization	Reported Being at a <i>Major</i> Globalization Protests	
	No	Yes
No	40 47.6%	13 15.5%
Yes	13 15.5%	18 21.4%

Table 7. RNC Protest Participants' Involvement in the Globalization Movement.

Reported Protesting the Issue of Globalization	Reported Being at <i>Major</i> Globalization Protests	
	No	Yes
No	70 69.3%	12 11.9%
Yes	11 10.9%	8 7.9%

questions for participants in the International ANSWER protest in April 2003. Although only about a fifth of the participants at this protest reported attending at least one of the most well-known globalization protests before September 11 *and* reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization, when I also include those participants who attended any of the biggest globalization protests *or* who reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization, the percentage of the protest participants who had been involved in the globalization movement increases to over half (52.4%). In other words, these data suggest that there was significant spillover from the globalization movement to this stage in the anti-Bush movement.

Table 7 summarizes the same comparison of responses to these questions for participants in the RNC protest in August 2004. Here, only about 8% of the protest participants had reported attending any of the most well-known globalization protests prior to September 11 *and* reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization. When I incorporate those respondents who attended at least one of the biggest globalization protests *or* and those who reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization in the

past two years, the percentage of participants involved, to some degree, with the globalization movement is about a third (30.7%). Although the percentage of participants less involved in the globalization movement is about a third of them had changed the target of their protests to the policies of the Bush Administration.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION CYCLE OF

In sum, the results from this paper suggest that the increasing political repression after September 11 and the movement retracted and a movement emerged in the administration's War on Terror. Although it is relatively disconnected, data collected from these large scale protest events after September 11 show an overlap in the participants at these events that support the claim that there was movement from the globalization movement to the anti-Bush movement.

Upon first glance, this shift in movement from globalization to anti-Bush movement supports Whittier's (1994) statement that "as a result of the [movement] shifts into abeyance on one side, other organizations may switch the grounds of their protest [such as targeting the Bush Administration]. In my analysis of the protest events after September 11, it does not seem to have shifted into a new target. This movement shifted their targets because of the political opportunity.

In addition, although the relationship between the globalization movement and the anti-Bush movement is an example of what Meyer and Whittier (1994) call the "ideas, tactics, style, participants, and goals" of one movement to another (p. 277), there is no expectation that these movements will be the same (p. 278). In fact, the organizers of the anti-Bush movement on Terror consistently employed the same tactics as the activists who were involved in the globalization movement to protest the United for Peace and Justice, the organization that targeted global justice as one of its six major concerns.

Protest Participants' Involvement in Globalization Movement.

Reported Being at a Major Globalization Protests	
No	Yes
	13
6%	15.5%
	18
5%	21.4%

Protest Participants' Involvement in the Globalization Movement.

Reported Being at Major Globalization Protests	
No	Yes
	12
3%	11.9%
	8
9%	7.9%

International ANSWER protest in April 2001, the participants at this protest reported attending more well-known globalization protests before the September 11 protests that were mainly about globalization. Participants who attended any of the protests reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization. The percentage of the protest participants who reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization increases to over half in the anti-Bush movement. This suggests that there was significant spillover from the globalization movement to the anti-Bush movement. In a comparison of responses to these questions from the August 2004. Here, only about 8% of the participants attending any of the most well-known protests after September 11 and reported attending protests that were mainly about globalization. When I incorporate those respondents who attended globalization protests or and those who attended protests that were mainly about globalization in the

past two years, the percentage of participants at this event who had been involved, to some degree, with the globalization movement increases to about a third (30.7%). Although the participants in the RNC protest remain less involved in the globalization movement, these results suggest that about a third of them had changed the target of their protesting from globalization to the policies of the Bush Administration.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: ENDING THE CYCLE OF PROTEST?

In sum, the results from this paper support the notion that, in the wake of increasing political repression after September 11, 2001, the globalization movement retracted and a movement emerged to target the Bush Administration's War on Terror. Although initially these movements seem to be relatively disconnected, data collected from protest participants at five large-scale protest events after September 11 show that there was significant overlap in the participants at these protests events. Thus, these findings support the claim that there was movement-to-movement transmission from the globalization movement to the anti-Bush movement.

Upon first glance, this shift in movements seems to support Meyer and Whittier's (1994) statement that "as a movement [such as the globalization movement] shifts into abeyance on one set of issues, its personnel and organizations may switch the grounds of the challenge to another set of issues" [such as targeting the Bush Administration's policies] (p. 279). But, based on my analysis of the protest events after 9/11, the globalization movement does not seem to have shifted into abeyance. Rather, activists involved in this movement shifted their targets based on their perceptions of narrowing political opportunity.

In addition, although the relationship between these movements provide an example of what Meyer and Whittier (1994) would call the ways that the "ideas, tactics, style, participants, and organizations" spilled over from one movement to another (p. 277), these data do not support the authors' expectation that these movements were "allied, but separate, challenges" (p. 278). In fact, the organizers of the more recent protests against the War on Terror consistently employed the global justice frame to mobilize those activists who were involved in the globalization movement and get them involved in the movement to protest the Bush Administration's policies. United for Peace and Justice, the organizer of the RNC protest, even lists global justice as one of its six major campaigns. The organization produced

a statement paper on "How Globalization Promotes War" to appeal to members of the globalization movement and mobilize them to participate in protests against the war on terror.²⁴

Upon closer consideration, these findings are actually more consistent with McAdam's (1995) work, which finds that, as political opportunities narrow, spin-off movements emerge that respond to the political inopportunities. In this case, as the political climate changed after September 11, a movement emerged to protest the policies of the Bush Administration and the initiator movement – the globalization movement – became less active. Even though it became *less* active, however, these data show that many members of the initiator movement were involved in the spin-off movement. In addition, it is clear that the movement against the Bush Administration's War on Terror adapted the tactics and collective action frames that were originally designed within the context of the globalization movement.

Although these data do support the notion that these movements were all part of a single cycle of protest, they do not support Tarrow's expectation that cycles of protest will radicalize over time (e.g. Tarrow, 1991, 1998). In fact, the RNC protest experienced neither more radicalized protest forms, nor was there increased violence,²⁵ many protest participants reported coming out for such mainstream reasons as to support the Left and the Democratic Party. The lack of violence at the largest of these large-scale protests is particularly interesting given the "fears of explosive clashes with the biggest security force ever assembled in New York" (McFadden, 2004). In addition, data collected from these protest events do not support Minkoff's (1997) prediction that repression in the form of political opposition will limit the diffusion of protest, at least not in the short term. Nonetheless, given the decline in social protest since President Bush was reelected and the Republican majorities were upheld in both houses of the US Congress in 2004, Minkoff's claim may still be correct. Even with the on-going War on Terror, which involves American soldiers being killed on a regular basis, protest has significantly decreased. In fact, this more recent decline in protest activity may suggest that on-going political opposition in the form of a reelected Republican Administration and Congress can halt the sequencing of social movements and, perhaps more important, it can end a cycle of protest.

The findings of this study of movement-to-movement transmission in the face of political repression suggest the need for future research to focus on three main areas. First, future research must examine the conclusions of cycles of protest and test the claim that the cycle of protest that began with the globalization movement has ended. Second, future research should study

how political repression of other type movement-to-movement transmission stand movement-to-movement transmission must look at the specific connections movements. Without understanding more movements therein, we will never be able to affect collective action.

NO

1. The globalization movement is often particularly by the popular media. As G expressions "globalization movement" and used interchangeably despite the fact that globalization per se, that many within the movement face," "globalization from below" (Breche zation of people and ideas" (Hardt & Neg tion" is one many within the movement has 2001, p. 12). I will use the term "globalization".
2. This term includes the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the war against civil liberties in the United States.
3. More recently, Tarrow (1998) has written of "cycles of contention." Because I am focusing on protest, I will maintain consistency within this paper, I will use the term "protest waves".
4. In some cases, however, Tarrow notes that protest can lead to terrorism and/or revolution (Tarrow, 1998, Goldstone, Gurr, & Moshiri, 1991; for a more recent (2003) work on protest waves under authoritarianism, see 2005).
5. See action.aclu.org/reformthepatriot (accessed on November 11, 2005).
6. For more information see www.aclu.org/cfm?ID=11437&c=111 (accessed on November 11, 2005).
7. The official beginning of the campaign was on August 29, 2004.
8. All of the protest events took place on the Bush Agenda Protest before the Republican National Convention, which took place on Sunday, August 29, 2004.
9. Protest.net and Indymedia.org list protests such as the World Economic Forum and the World Trade Organization among the most important international events.
10. International ANSWER, which coordinated demonstrations taking place in 60 countries for the event and its endorsements, see www.answer2004.org (accessed on November 11, 2005).
11. In fact, this protest was said to be the largest anti-nuclear rally in Central Park (McFadden, 2004).

ization Promotes War" to appeal to
ent and mobilize them to participate in

findings are actually more consistent
finds that, as political opportunities
that respond to the political inopportu-
climate changed after September 11, a
licies of the Bush Administration and
ation movement – became less active.
however, these data show that many
ere involved in the spin-off movement.
ent against the Bush Administration's
nd collective action frames that were
t of the globalization movement.

e notion that these movements were all
do not support Tarrow's expectation
ver time (e.g. Tarrow, 1991, 1998). In
either more radicalized protest forms,
many protest participants reported
asons as to support the Left and the
nce at the largest of these large-scale
iven the "fears of explosive clashes
assembled in New York" (McFadden,
n these protest events do not support
ression in the form of political oppo-
test, at least not in the short term.
cial protest since President Bush was
ies were upheld in both houses of the
m may still be correct. Even with the
ves American soldiers being killed on a
y decreased. In fact, this more recent
t that on-going political opposition in
Administration and Congress can halt
and, perhaps more important, it can

ment-to-movement transmission in the
e need for future research to focus on
rch must examine the conclusions of
at the cycle of protest that began with
. Second, future research should study

how political repression of other types and in other cultural contexts affects
movement-to-movement transmission. Third and finally, in order to under-
stand movement-to-movement transmission more clearly, future research
must look at the specific connections between initiator and spin-off move-
ments. Without understanding more specifics of cycles of protest and the
movements therein, we will never be able to understand how repression
affects collective action.

NOTES

1. The globalization movement is often termed the "antiglobalization movement," particularly by the popular media. As Graeber (2001, p. 12) has observed, the expressions "globalization movement" and "antiglobalization movement" are often used interchangeably despite the fact that the movement has benefited from globalization per se, that many within the movement call for "globalization with a human face," "globalization from below" (Brecher, Tim, & Brendan, 2002) and the "globalization of people and ideas" (Hardt & Negri, 2000) and that the term "antiglobalization" is one many within the movement have "never felt comfortable with" (Graeber, 2001, p. 12). I will use the term "globalization movement" in favor of the alternatives.

2. This term includes the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq as well as the perceived war against civil liberties in the United States.

3. More recently, Tarrow (1998) has renamed "cycles of protest" to be "cycles of contention." Because I am focusing particularly on social protest and in order to maintain consistency within this paper, I will refer to work mainly as "cycles of protest."

4. In some cases, however, Tarrow notes that increased violence can lead to terrorism and/or revolution (Tarrow, 1998, p. 150; see also Tarrow, 1991; Tilly, 1993; Goldstone, Gurr, & Moshiri, 1991; for a case of extreme repression, see Almieda's (2003) work on protest waves under authoritarian regimes).

5. See action.aclu.org/reformthepatriotact/primer.html (accessed on November 11, 2005).

6. For more information see www.aclu.org/NationalSecurity/NationalSecurity.cfm?ID=11437&c=111 (accessed on November 11, 2005).

7. The official beginning of the campaign was March 19, 2003.

8. All of the protest events took place on a Saturday except the World Says No to the Bush Agenda Protest before the Republican National Convention, which took place on Sunday, August 29, 2004.

9. Protest.net and Indymedia.org list protests at international economic summits, such as the World Economic Forum and the annual World Bank/IMF meetings, as among the most important international demonstrations.

10. International ANSWER, which coordinated this protest, reported concurrent demonstrations taking place in 60 countries on this day (for an archive of the call for the event and its endorsements, see iacenter.org/archive2003/a12_endor4.htm (accessed on November 11, 2005)).

11. In fact, this protest was said to be the largest in New York City since the 1982 antinuclear rally in Central Park (McFadden, 2004).

12. See www.artistsnetwork.org/news2/news98.html (accessed on October 4, 2004).
13. Although the larger protest was canceled, as were the meetings of the World Bank/IMF, the simultaneously scheduled Anti-Capitalist Convergence was not canceled and an estimated 2000 people attended the Convergence in Washington and participated in the March Against War & Racism that weekend.
14. For the remainder of this paper, I will refer to this protest in the same manner as its organizers, as the "A20," which was so named because it took place on the 20th of April.
15. www.unitedforpeace.org/article.php?id=1810 (accessed on November 11, 2005).
16. Because it was organized to coincide with the beginning of the RNC and is best known as the largest protest during the Convention, for the remainder of this paper, I will refer to this protest at the "RNC Protest."
17. For a list of "member groups," see www.unitedforpeace.org/article.php?list=type&type=27 (accessed on November 14, 2005).
18. www.unitedforpeace.org/article.php?id=1810 (accessed on November 8, 2005).
19. Researchers began surveying at 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue on 14th Street and 5th Avenue and 9th Avenue on 22nd Street.
20. The variance in follow-up response rates can be explained, to some degree, by the difference in time between when protest participants were originally surveyed and when they received e-mails asking them to participate in the follow-up survey. Protesters at the International ANSWER protest and the United for Peace and Justice March, which had higher follow-up response rates, received e-mails the week following the protest to participate in the follow-up survey. Owing to constraints in acquiring Human Subjects approval for the follow-up component of the study, participants in the earlier follow-up surveys were not contacted as quickly.
21. Many protest participants provided e-mail addresses that were not traceable to their names and/or places of work.
22. To see a call for such street theater at the 1999 WTO protest in Seattle, see www.infoshop.org/octo/wto99_1.html (accessed on November 15, 2005).
23. Most of these protests, however, were framed as being "antiwar" instead of pro-peace.
24. www.unitedforpeace.org/downloads/Globalization_and_War.pdf (accessed on June 15, 2004).
25. Although 200 people were reported arrested during the RNC protest, they represent less than 0.04% of the estimated protest participants.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all of the sociology students who helped collect data at the multiple protest events. Also, I would like to thank the Contentious Politics Workshop at Columbia University and three anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Research for this project was supported, in part, by the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies.

REFER

- Allen, L. D., II (2000). Promise keepers and organizational vitality. *Sociology of Religion*, 61(1), 1-15.
- Almeida, P. D. (2003). Opportunity organizations in authoritarian settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(1), 1-34.
- Ancelovici, M. (2002). Organizing against globalization. *Journal of American Studies*, 36(3), 427-463.
- Andrews, E. L. (2002). World financial office. *Times*, September 28, p. A6.
- Archibold, R. C. (2004). Anarchists emerge as August 20, p. A1.
- Atwood, D. C. (1997). Mobilizing around the In: J. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *global politics* (pp. 141-158). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Ayres, J. M. (2001). Transnational political process. *Mobilization*, 6(1), 55-68.
- Ayres, J., & Tarrow, S. (2002). The shifting ground. 28 January 2002, from www.ssrc.org/se
- Bandy, J., & Smith, J. (Eds) (2004). *Coalition and the neoliberal order*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (1999). *Constructing organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brecher, J., Tim, C., & Brendan, S. (2002). *Globalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Buechler, S. M. (1990). *Women's movements in the United States and beyond*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bush, G. W. (2001). Executive order establishing the National Commission on the September 11 attacks. September 2005, from www.whitehouse.gov/news
- Center for Constitutional Rights (2002). The September 11 attacks. 11 November 2005, from www.ccr-ny.org
- Cho, H., & LaRose, R. (1999). Privacy issues in the digital age. *Review*, 17(4), 421-434.
- Cortright, D., & Pagnucco, R. (1997). Limits to globalization. In: J. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *global politics* (pp. 159-174). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- della Porta, D., & Tarrow, S. (Eds) (2004). *Strategic social movements*. MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Dobbs, M. (2003). After the fall of a Tyrant, the world is a different place. *Post*, April 10, p. C1.
- Evans, S. M. (1980). *Personal politics: The role of the woman and the new left*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fernandez, M. (2002). Demonstrators rally to protest the war. *The Washington Post*, 11 September 2002, p. A1.
- Fernandez, M. (2003). D.C. Braces for weekend protests. *The Washington Post*, 11 September 2002, p. A1.
- Fernandez, M., & Fahrenthold, D. A. (2002). Demonstrators arrested in rally's 1st day. *The Washington Post*, 11 September 2002, p. A1.

REFERENCES

- news98.html (accessed on October 4, 2004).
 canceled, as were the meetings of the World
 Anti-Capitalist Convergence was not can-
 celled the Convergence in Washington and
 Racism that weekend.
 will refer to this protest in the same manner
 so named because it took place on the 20th
- id=1810 (accessed on November 11, 2005).
 de with the beginning of the RNC and is
 the Convention, for the remainder of this
 RNC Protest.”
 www.unitedforpeace.org/article.php?list=
 4, 2005).
 id=1810 (accessed on November 8, 2005).
 n Avenue and 9th Avenue on 14th Street
 Street.
- rates can be explained, to some degree, by
 t participants were originally surveyed and
 o participate in the follow-up survey. Pro-
 test and the United for Peace and Justice
 onse rates, received e-mails the week fol-
 low-up survey. Owing to constraints in
 the follow-up component of the study, par-
 ticipants were not contacted as quickly.
 e-mail addresses that were not traceable
- r at the 1999 WTO protest in Seattle, see
 cessed on November 15, 2005).
 ere framed as being “antiwar” instead of
- /Globalization_and_War.pdf (accessed on
- d arrested during the RNC protest, they
 d protest participants.
- Allen, L. D., II (2000). Promise keepers and racism: Frame resonance as an indicator of organizational vitality. *Sociology of Religion*, 61(1), 55–72.
- Almeida, P. D. (2003). Opportunity organizations and threat-induced contention: Protest waves in authoritarian settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(2), 345–400.
- Ancelovici, M. (2002). Organizing against globalization: The case of ATTAC in France. *Politics & Society*, 30(3), 427–463.
- Andrews, E. L. (2002). World financial officials back new debt framework. *The New York Times*, September 28, p. A6.
- Archibald, R. C. (2004). Anarchists emerge as the convention’s wild card. *The New York Times*, August 20, p. A1.
- Atwood, D. C. (1997). Mobilizing around the United Nations special sessions on disarmament. In: J. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds), *Transnational social movements and global politics* (pp. 141–158). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Ayres, J. M. (2001). Transnational political processes and contention against the global economy. *Mobilization*, 6(1), 55–68.
- Ayres, J., & Tarrow, S. (2002). The shifting grounds for transnational civic activity. Retrieved 28 January 2002, from www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/ayres.html
- Bandy, J., & Smith, J. (Eds) (2004). *Coalitions across borders: Transnational protest and the neoliberal order*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (1999). *Constructing world culture: International nongovernmental organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brecher, J., Tim, C., & Brendan, S. (2002). *Globalization from below: The power of solidarity* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Buechler, S. M. (1990). *Women’s movements in the United States: Woman suffrage, equal rights, and beyond*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bush, G. W. (2001). Executive order establishing office of homeland security. Retrieved 11 November 2005, from www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/print/20011008-2.html
- Center for Constitutional Rights (2002). The state of civil liberties: One year later. Retrieved 11 November 2005, from www.ccr-ny.org/v2/reports/docs/Civil_Liberties.pdf
- Cho, H., & LaRose, R. (1999). Privacy issues in Internet surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 17(4), 421–434.
- Cortright, D., & Pagnucco, R. (1997). Limits to transnationalism: The 1980s freeze campaign. In: J. Smith, C. Chatfield & R. Pagnucco (Eds), *Transnational social movements and global politics* (pp. 159–174). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- della Porta, D., & Tarrow, S. (Eds) (2004). *Transnational protest & global activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Dobbs, M. (2003). After the fall of a Tyrant, An uneasy climb out of chaos. *The Washington Post*, April 10, p. C1.
- Evans, S. M. (1980). *Personal politics: The roots of women’s liberation in the civil rights movement and the new left*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fernandez, M. (2002). Demonstrators rally to Palestinian cause; Arab Americans, supporters drown out other issues. *The Washington Post*, April 21, p. A1.
- Fernandez, M. (2003). D.C. Braces for weekend of rallies. *The Washington Post*, April 11, p. B1.
- Fernandez, M., & Fahrenthold, D. A. (2002). Protests oroduce very few problems; hundreds arrested in rally’s 1st day. *The Washington Post*, September 29, p. C1.

EDGMENTS

gy students who helped collect data at
 would like to thank the Contentious
 ersity and three anonymous reviewers
 paper. Research for this project was
 ions University Institute of Advanced

- Fernandez, M., & Perlstein, L. (2003). Marchers bring new signs, same passion; war protesters, Bush supporters rally in Washington. *The Washington Post*, April 13, p. A25.
- Fisher, D. R., Stanley, K., Berman, D., & Neff, G. (2005). How do organizations matter? Mobilization and support for participants at five globalization protests. *Social Problems*, 52(1), 102–121.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstone, J. A., Gurr, T. R., & Moshiri, F. (1991). *Revolutions of the late twentieth century*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Graeber, D. (2001). The globalization movement: Some points of clarification. *Items*, 2(3–4), 12–14.
- Guidry, J. A., Kennedy, M. D., & Zald, M. (2001). *Globalizations and social movements: Culture, power, and the transnational public sphere*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hewson, C., Laurent, D., & Vogel, C. M. (1996). Proper methodologies for psychological and sociological studies conducted via the Internet. *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 28, 186–191.
- Kaplan, E. (2003). A hundred peace movements bloom. *The Nation*, January 3, pp. 11–16.
- Korey, W. (1998). *NGOs and the universal declaration of human rights: A curious grapevine* (1st ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McAdam, D. (1995). Initiator and 'spin-off' movements: Diffusion processes in protest cycles. In: M. Traugott (Ed.), *Repertoires and cycles of collective action* (pp. 217–239). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social-movements – partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212–1241.
- McFadden, R. D. (2004). Vast anti-Bush rally greets republicans in New York. *The New York Times*, August 30, p. A1.
- Meyer, D. S., & Tarrow, S. G. (1998). *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Meyer, D. S., & Whittier, N. (1994). Social movement spillover. *Social Problems*, 41, 277–298.
- Minkoff, D. C. (1997). The sequencing of social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 779–799.
- Mishra, R., & Robertson, T. (2003). Crowd protest as GOP gathers hundreds of thousands march against Bush, war. *The Boston Globe*, August 30, p. A1.
- Morris, A. D. (1984). *The origins of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change*. New York: Free Press.
- O'Brien, R., Goetz, A. M., Scholte, J. A., & Williams, M. (2000). *Contesting global governance: Multilateral economic institutions and global social movements*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, E. (2003). *'Net' profit of the nonprofits: The effect of the Internet on social movement mobilization and participation*. Dissertation thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- Porter, S. R., & Whitcomb, M. E. (2003). The impact of contact type on web survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67(4), 579–588.
- Reel, M., & Fernandez, M. (2002). Protesters' momentum weakens. *The Washington Post*, September 29, p. C1.
- Risse-Kappen, T. (1995). *Bringing transnational relations back in: Non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Rothman, F. D., & Oliver, P. E. (1999). From Southern Brazil, 1979–1992. *Mobilization*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Sanger, D. E. (2002). Economic forum shifts its focus. *The Washington Post*, February 3, p. A1.
- Smith, J., Chatfield, C., & Pagnucco, R. (Eds) (1998). *Politics: Solidarity beyond the state*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Smith, J. G., & Johnston, H. (2002). *Globalization and social movements*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1992). Master frames of protest: The case of the anti-nuclear movement. In: C. M. Mueller (Eds), *Frontiers in social movement theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. (1999). Social movement processes. *American Sociological Review*, 64(1), 1–29.
- Tarrow, S. (1993). Cycles of collective action: The case of contention. *Social Science History*, 17(1), 1–24.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements from 1994 edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2001). Transnational politics: Contentious politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 1–24.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1991). *Struggle, politics, and cycles of protest*. Ithaca, NY: Center for the Study of Social Movements.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1994). *Power in movement: Social movements from 1994 edition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. G. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1986). *The contentious French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1993). *European revolutions, 1492–1992*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements, 1768–2004*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, M. (1995). *Repertoires and cycles of collective action*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Valocchi, S. (2001). Individual identities, collective action, and the relationship of the political left and gay rights. *Perspectives*, 44(4), 445–467.
- Wood, L. (2004). *The diffusion of direct action*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Wright, B. (2002). WEF: New York's big deal. *The Washington Post*, 2004, from news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/2004/09/040921_1_1.shtml.
- Zald, M. N., & McCarthy, J. (1980). Social movements and movement organizations. In: *Research in social movements, conflict, and change* (Vol. 3, pp. 1–20). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

- ers bring new signs, same passion; war protesters, *The Washington Post*, April 13, p. A25.
- Neff, G. (2005). How do organizations matter? Unions at five globalization protests. *Social Problems*, 42(4), 579–588.
- New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (1991). *Revolutions of the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ment: Some points of clarification. *Items*, 2(3–4), 1–16.
- M. (2001). *Globalizations and social movements: The public sphere*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- bridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 1996). Proper methodologies for psychological and behavioral research. *Behavioral Research Methods, Instruments, & Procedures*, 28(1), 1–16.
- nts bloom. *The Nation*, January 3, pp. 11–16.
- declaration of human rights: A curious grapevine. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 18(1), 1–16.
- s.
- movements: Diffusion processes in protest cycles. *American Sociological Review*, 60(2), 217–239. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- orce mobilization and social-movements – partial diffusion. *American Sociological Review*, 62(6), 1212–1241.
- y greets republicans in New York. *The New York Times*, August 30, p. A1.
- social movement society: Contentious politics for a new era. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- movement spillover. *Social Problems*, 41, 277–298.
- social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 66(1), 1–20.
- protest as GOP gathers hundreds of thousands. *The New York Times*, August 30, p. A1.
- rights movement: Black communities organizing for a new era. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, M. (2000). *Contesting global governance: The effect of the Internet on social movement*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- the impact of contact type on web survey response. *Survey Research Methods*, 1(4), 579–588.
- ers' momentum weakens. *The Washington Post*, August 30, p. A1.
- nal relations back in: Non-state actors, domestic politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothman, F. D., & Oliver, P. E. (1999). From local to global: The anti-dam movement in Southern Brazil, 1979–1992. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 4(1), 41–57.
- Sanger, D. E. (2002). Economic forum shifts its focus to new dangers. *The New York Times*, February 3, p. A1.
- Smith, J., Chatfield, C., & Pagnucco, R. (Eds) (1997). *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Smith, J. G., & Johnston, H. (2002). *Globalization and resistance: Transnational dimensions of social movements*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In: A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 464–481.
- Tarrow, S. (1993). Cycles of collective action: Between moments of madness and the repertoire of contention. *Social Science History*, 17(2), 281–309.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (also section from 1994 edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2001). Transnational politics: Contention and institutions in international politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 1–20.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1991). *Struggle, politics, and reform: Collective action, social movements and cycles of protest*. Ithaca, NY: Center for International Studies Cornell University.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1994). *Power in movement: Social movements, collective action, and politics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. G. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tilly, C. (1986). *The contentious French*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Tilly, C. (1993). *European revolutions, 1492–1992*. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements, 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Traugott, M. (1995). *Repertoires and cycles of collective action*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Valocchi, S. (2001). Individual identities, collective identities, and organizational structure: The relationship of the political left and gay liberation in the United States. *Sociological Perspectives*, 44(4), 445–467.
- Wood, L. (2004). *The diffusion of direct action tactics: From Seattle to Toronto and New York*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Wright, B. (2002). WEF: New York's big deal. *BBC News*, February 1. Retrieved October 4, 2004, from news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1795521.stm
- Zald, M. N., & McCarthy, J. (1980). Social movement industries: Conflict and cooperation among movement organizations. In: *Research in social movements, conflicts and change* (Vol. 3, pp. 1–20). Greenwich, CT: JAI.