

**Literature Review on Social Movements.**

**Are “Smart Mobs” the New New *Social Movements*?**

June 22, 2009

David Raison  
Matrikelnummer: 0316053  
Studienkennzahl: C300  
<david.raison@student.uibk.ac.at>

**Seminararbeit, eingereicht zum Seminar „Theorie und Empirie nuklearer Rüstung und Rüstungskontrolle” im Sommersemester 2009 (402.043) von Dr. Martin Senn an der Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck**

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Historical Overview</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 The New <i>New Social Movements?</i></b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 The Evolution of Scope . . . . .	8
2.2 Enter the Social Networks . . . . .	9
<b>3 Social Movements and ICTs</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Internetworked . . . . .	12
3.2 Short Message Service . . . . .	13
<b>4 Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>17</b>

## Introduction

To outline the contemporary status of research on social movements is quite an extraordinary task in that it is extraordinary difficult if not impossible. Almost a century of documented research into the field of collective activism and “an enormous growth and elaboration in the last few decades” (Tsutsui 2004) have indeed produced more than only a few concise definitions of what social movements are, how they come to be and what outcomes they achieve. Nonetheless, opening up with Goodwin and Jasper (2003, 4), we can say without much doubt or debate that social movements, which are “complex sets of groups, organizations, and actions that may have different goals as well as different strategies for reaching their aims” (Giugni 1999, xx), are a main source of political conflict and change” and that their study is “a good way to comprehend human diversity” (Goodwin and Jasper 2003, 4). Questions such as *Why do people do things and why do they do them together?* or *Why do they cooperate in social movements or in general?* are essential in understanding social movements and the way they can alter various aspects of society (see Giugni 1999).

Also, research into social movements has not become obsolete. On the contrary, events such as the *Twivolution* (Spudich 2009), the Iranian presidential candidate Mussavi’s supporters’ use of the Internet tool TWITTER or mobile phones and text messaging, have not only renewed interest in social movement theory, but also demonstrated its inter-relations with new media on a global scale. In a similar way, the emergence of the new pirate party in several European member states can be understood as a new form of social movement as well. In effect, while the “traditional emphasis on domestic politics has been a serious limitation in the field, preventing examination of important factors that lie outside the national borders” (Tsutsui 2004), the global dimension of social movements has recently been recognized to become one of the major topics for research in the near future (Goodwin and Jasper 2003, 6).

The contemporary engagement with Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) like the Internet or mobile phones, seems to have brought in a considerable amount of researchers into this field of science. While only a limited number of authors, such as Steven Buechler, James Jasper, Doug McAdam, Mario Diani, Sidney Tarrow or Charles Tilly - to name only a few - published their investigations into social movements in the 1980s and early 1990s, it is almost impossible to identify a core group of researchers to date.

Together with the field, scholars querying its motives and inner workings have also diversified and their numbers expanded.

While some of these theories are more than fifty years old, I feel that introducing some of the older frameworks is important in order to be able to relate to them when identifying the main advantages of treating activism through social networks as a form of social movements. While some concepts are still relevant and some building blocks can still be relied on, others have been rendered incapable of capturing the complexity of such “internetworked” social movements.

In the remainder of this paper, I will argue that existing social movement theories will regain popularity as they are being utilized and extended to analyze and explain ICT aided social movements.

In order to do so, I will first present an overview over the three main analytical focuses into which several approaches in the social movement field have converged, namely resource mobilization (RM), political process theory (PP) and framing (Tsutsui 2004). I will, however, not go into so much detail as to enumerate the several debates still being fought out in this field, such as the *internal vs. external* or the *disruption vs. moderation* debates. See Tarrow 1999 for a brief summary or Giugni 1999 for a thorough synopsis on these issues.

In a second step, I will demonstrate how the existing theories have been adapted and expanded to encompass the globalization of social movements and how theory on social networks has been integrated into the social movement field, incorporating network analysis as a methodological tool.

In a third section, I will embrace two technologies, namely mobile phones and specifically text messaging, as well as the Internet, to illustrate how social movements have found their way onto ICTs. These might even be a prime example of constructivist conceptions in social movement theories, for ICTs will surely change the way social movements re-group, organize and act, as well as the ways and methods with which scholars analyze them. But similarly, social movements are without doubt already changing the way ICTs are used and thought of. As Goodwin and Jasper (2003, 7) put it, “[r]esearch on social movements will undoubtedly continue to evolve as social movements themselves evolve.”

# 1 Historical Overview

“Until the 1960s, most scholars who studied social movements were frightened of them. They saw them as dangerous mobs who acted irrationally [...]” (Goodwin and Jasper 2003, 5).

This attitude changed in the 1960s when privileged people became part of the social movements themselves. As Goodwin and Jasper (2003, 5) ascertain, this development led to several “turns” in social movement theory. One of these turns, in 1965, was the so-called economic turn, valuing participants of social movements as purely rational actors who’d weigh the costs and benefits of their choices before making the decision to protest or not to. This rational approach also included an emphasis on social movement organizations’ (SMO) mobilization of time and money, which is why the most prominent of these theories, emerging in the 1970s, would be called resource mobilization (RM) theory. (Goodwin and Jasper 2003, 6) RM has been “[...] the dominant theoretical framework for analyzing social movements and collective action within the discipline of sociology” (Buechler 1993, 193) for a respectable time, but one of its major drawbacks was that it tended to focus exclusively on the meso-level of organizational analysis, blinding out issues of social structure on the macro-, and of individual motivation on the micro-levels (Buechler 1993, 200).

Understandably, that view has been “criticized as economic by those who argue that collective, moral, purposive, or solidary incentives often motivate people to join movements even if they could theoretically ‘ride free’ on the efforts of others.” (Fireman and Gamson as cited in Buechler 1993, 194) Drawing on that critique, some scholars recognized that social movements also have political dimensions and that state actors would become involved in the social movements’ activities, or at least in the outcomes. This insight gave rise to the political process (PP) model, which also holds that social movements emerge from opportunities provided by the state or by elites from within institutionalized organizations. According to the PP model, which developed in the early 1980s and draws on some aspects of Marxist theory, social movements are above all a political phenomenon and should not only be analyzed in view of their outcomes or on the circumstances of their constitution, but rather as a “continuous process from generation to decline” (McAdam 1997, 172). Detailing the opportunities concept, the PP “[...] model suggests that mobilization can take place only under favorable political conditions and focuses on the relationship between social

movements and political institutions to understand movement mobilization.” (Munson 2001) Probably anticipating the challenges that global social movements would impose on the PP theory, scholars such as Giugni (1999, xxvi) have been requesting that more weight be put on a comparative perspective, judging and comparing social movements from various states and regions. Indeed, PP theory seems to have been adapted to transnational and even global levels, with Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) pointing out that critiques of political process theory are beginning to coalesce into a new approach to social movements which they call *multi-institutional politics* approach.

However, in the late 1980s, some researchers criticized that the cultural dimension of social movements were missing from both RM and PP theories and that one had to look at how those movements *framed* their issues in order to appeal to potential recruits and construct collective identities (Goodwin and Jasper 2003, 6). *Frame analysis* or *framing* has been essentially promoted by authors Robert Benford and David Snow and has since gained in popularity among scholars. They contend that for a social movement to be considered successful, the movement’s as well as the participant’s frames of an issue need to align. Large scale changes by social movements in society can only be achieved through such frame alignments. *What contextual factors constrain or facilitate framing processes?* is a question that, among others, need to be asked and answered in framing analysis. (Benford and Snow 2000)

“[...] framing processes have come to be regarded, alongside resource mobilization and political opportunity processes, as a central dynamic in understanding the character and course of social movements.” (Benford and Snow 2000)

Still, scholars, such as Bayat (2005) and Munson (2001), attempting to apply social movement theory to Islamist movements and Muslim societies in general, have pointed to limitations of the framing as well as the earlier models. Munson’s analysis of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood suggest that the concept of framing does not allow for a sufficient number of ways of how ideas can be integrated in social movements (Munson 2001). Also, while it is certainly possible to do empirical research on cultural outcomes of movements, Giugni (1999, xxii) acknowledges that “policy changes are easier to measure than changes in social and cultural arenas.”

Some forays have been made into additional theories that, while having received

due recognition, have not become as popular as is the case for the RM, PP or framing theories. Postmodern and constructivist theories have had an influence on models such as the *new social movements* theory or the *cognitive model*, mainly represented by Eyerman and Jamison (1997). Whereas cognitive praxis focuses on communicative interaction, the construction of society by re-cognizing (Eyerman and Jamison 1997, 247), and social movements as producers of knowledge (Eyerman and Jamison 1997, 251), new social movement theory argues that the concept of collective identity can “fill gaps in resource mobilization and political process accounts of the emergence, trajectories, and impacts of social movements.” (Polletta and Jasper 2001) According to Buechler (1993, 204), the question of who engages in collective actions and how they view themselves and their allies in struggle is central to the concept of collective identities and the study of new social models.

## **2 The New New Social Movements?**

In the twenty-first century, research on social movements has expanded to include and analyze an ever increasing globalization of collective activism. Also, the notion of social networks as explanatory framework for social movement formation and their subsequent development has been introduced into social movement research. As Langman (2005) argues, the rise of ICT has led to the emergence of new, qualitatively different kinds of social-protest movements. Though these new types of movements, which I'd like to call *new new social movements* or simply *new<sup>2</sup> social movements*, seem diffuse and unstructured, their participants are forging unlikely coalitions of various activists with diverse backgrounds. Their rapid rise and the advent of “virtual public spheres” and “internetworked social movements” raised questions that require rethinking social movement theory. (Langman 2005)

In his account of social movements in the twenty-first century, Tilly (2003, 8) asks a couple of questions that reflect the roadmap for research into these *new<sup>2</sup> social movements*, mentioning globalization and ICT developments:

“Are new technologies transforming social movements? In what ways? If so, how do they produce their effects? How do new tactics and new forms of organization interact in 21st century social movements? More generally, to what extent and how do recent alterations in social movements result from the changes in international connectedness that people loosely call globalization?”

There are those who say that social movements have a causal explanation invariant of their environment, and others like Marco Giugni or Charles Tilly who stress that social movements, “their coming to be and their outcomes” can only be understood in their historical context (Tarrow 1999). Doubtlessly, proponents of the latter model will advocate that current developments such as broadening of social movements in reach and scope as well as the increasing value of social networks require a re-conception or at least a re-haul of traditional theory structures. While “[s]ocial movement theory has typically focused on local structures, leadership, recruitment, political opportunities, and strategies from framing issues to orchestrating protests” (Langman 2005), the expansion of social movements to a global level and fuzzier boundaries requires the respective scholars to permeate new fields of research and develop, or adapt, new tools for analysis.

## **2.1 The Evolution of Scope**

In their introduction of a *Multi-Institutional Politics Approach*, Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) demonstrate that the view of society and power underlying the traditional PP model is too narrowly defined to encompass the diversity of contemporary change efforts. This is why they argue that a multi-institutional approach provides powerful analytical tools for the analysis of contemporary change efforts. Also, considering social movements as agents of innovation, researchers have begun importing other strands of theory, such as innovation theory, from the fields of technology research and adapted it or expanded its scope to the study of social phenomena. Kern and Nam (2008) for example used such an innovation model and extended their theoretical framework to include institutions that would formerly not have been thought of as participants in social movements. Studying citizen journalism in South Korea as a form of social innovation, they argue that such forms result from brokerage activities among journalists, labor and unification activists and progressive intellectuals.

Other scholars analyze the features of transnational networks in global social movements. Marchetti and Pianta (2006) contest that global social movements are simply an internationalization of domestic experiences. Contrariwise, they argue that networks, which I'll go into more precisely in the next section, show a degree of political maturation from local and national protest to global proposals. And while they're expanding, social movements are thought to develop a political skill in challenging and implementing institutional policy-making at the state and international level (Marchetti and Pianta 2006).

Rigging the analytical toolbox, Barrett and Kurzman (2004) have developed conceptual tools for analyzing global factors that affect transnational social movements. In a continuity of PP and framing models, they have adapted the political opportunity approach to an international level and incorporated global culture. As an illustration of their framework, Barrett and Kurzman (2004) base their study of social movements for *eugenics* on the findings that there was no international political opportunity before World War I and, understandably, a rather hostile climate of global culture after World War II.

In his musings on *Global Civil Society and Ethnic Social Movements*, Tsutsui (2004) acknowledges that the exponents of the traditional models, Tarrow, McAdam et al. had already begun to increasingly examine international political opportunity structures. Similarly, they embarked upon analyzing the transnational flow of human and material resources for movements and a new pattern of framing that reflects sensitivity to global audiences. Also, cognitive framing has not refrained from taking advantage of global discourses.

According to Maiba (2004), the process of globalization has profoundly affected social movement activism: "Much of today's social movement activism takes place in a trans-boundary space enabling social movements to coordinate their activities." Therefore, Maiba continues to argue, social movement research needs to move beyond the state-centric perspective.

## **2.2 Enter the Social Networks**

As McAdam (1997, 179) reports, "the ability of insurgents to generate a social movement is ultimately dependent on the presence of an indigenous 'infrastructure' that can be used to link members of the aggrieved population into an organized campaign of mass political action." One has come to realize that social networks constitute such an infrastructure and the backbone of a new political agency (Marchetti and Pianta 2006). As a consequence, the appropriate analytical tools need to be imported into social movement research. Accordingly, in order to study the aforementioned citizen journalism in South Korea, Kern and Nam (2008) based the empirical part of their study on social network analysis of movement groups and alternative media organizations.

This realization has also led to a network-centric redefinition of social movements:

"[S]ocial movements are represented by campaigns run by civil society organizations, and a social movement could be defined as 'a

network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity.” (Steve Wright as cited in Saeed, Rohde and Wulf 2008)

In their project to *explain differential participation in social movements*, Passy and Giugni (2001) found empirical support for their hypothesis:

“[...] the intensity of participation depends both on the embeddedness in social networks and on the individual perceptions of participation, that is, the evaluation of a number of cognitive parameters related to engagement.” (Passy and Giugni 2001)

In their view, networks fulfill three basic functions for social movements, all of which seem to relate to the framing model from the late 1980s:

1. They structurally connect prospective participants to an opportunity to participate.
2. They socialize participants to a protest issue.
3. They shape a participant’s decision to become involved.

Tilly (2003, 8) also suggests that, “compared [to] the 20th century, internationally organized networks of activists, international non-governmental organizations, and internationally visible targets such as multinational corporations and international financial institutions all figure more prominently in recent social movements”.

### **3 Social Movements and ICTs**

In the first half of the 1990s, the EJÉRCITO ZAPATISTA DE LIBERACIÓN NACIONAL<sup>1</sup> (EZLN) were among the first social movements to make use of the Internet. A few years later, in the late 1990s, Anti-WTO protests in Seattle and Genoa were supported by ICT such as email, the WORLDWIDEWEB and the short message service (SMS) (Langman 2005). In his account of the events in Manila in 2001, which will be further detailed in a subsequent section, Tilly (2003, 7) asks if “[...] the 21st century [would] finally bring social movements to the long-dreamed culmination of People Power across the world?” and continues:

---

<sup>1</sup>Zapatista Army of National Liberation, based in Chiapas, Mexico

“Would technologies of communication such as the text-messaging mobile telephones that carried the word so swiftly through Manila provide the means for activists and ordinary people to shift the tactical balance away from capitalists, military leaders, and corrupt politicians? Or, on the contrary, did the assembly of thousands in the streets there and elsewhere merely mark the last churning of popular politics in the wake of globalization’s dreadnaught (sic)?” (Tilly 2003, 7)

In the light of these developments, scholars from the domain of ICT have increasingly begun not only analyzing “their own” technologies but also what people use them for and what they make of it. They have joined ranks with sociologists and started adapting proved social movements theory to their fields of expertise. But also sociologists are increasingly investigating social movement phenomena in connection with ICTs.

In their study of *the Reemergence of the Peace Movement after 9/11*, Carty and Onyett (2006) examine ways in which “the international and alternative forms of media have enhanced the global [...] political mobilization in the anti-war effort in the post-9/11 environment.” What is the role of cyberactivism in this peace movement and how are contemporary social movements using advanced forms of technology and mass communication as a mobilizing tool [...]? Their approach shines a light on the conversion of traditional theory to those new fields of research. Can mass communication, or ICT as a whole, be seen as a sizable resource in the RM model? Indeed, Carty and Onyett (2006) argue that ICT have a critical role in the organization and success of social movements’ internal political mobilization.

Referring to Eyerman and Jamison’s (1997, 252) cognitive praxis model, “[a] social movement is [...] a new conceptual space that is filled by a dynamic interaction between different groups and organizations.” This idea can be applied to a number of contemporary social movements and is probably best illustrated by the very recent emergence of the PIRATE-PARTIES throughout the European Union. Several pre-existing groups and organizations who were already handling such issues have filled this “new conceptual space” of a Pirate-Party by aggregating their ideas and beliefs on copyright and patent laws, free software, data protection and privacy.

### 3.1 Internetnetworked

Though seemingly relying on that model, the steady and ever increasing availability of ICTs is definitely challenging some of the assumptions made by the RM theory that Buechler (1993, 197) had already criticized. Mainstream RM holds “[...] that grievances can be assumed as a constant, background factor with no explanatory relevance, while changes in access to resources of many sorts will be the critical, variable factor which explains the periodic appearance of collective action.” ICTs challenge this view in that they are, at least to a considerable amount of people in “the West”, always and ubiquitously available.

Also, RM favored formal organizations as critical in facilitating mobilization. However ICTs and specifically the Internet represent forms of very informal, unstructured and decentralized organizations, contesting the RM approach. (see Buechler 1993, 199) Further on, a problematic issue of RM theory, namely implying a form of unity and homogeneity, is also less important when looking at ICT. The Internet is in some form hiding diversity and heterogeneity and is thus “going easy” on RM theory and those that viewed intra-movement diversity as a liability, rather than an asset. (Buechler 1993, 205)

Some aspects of PP theory can also be applied to ICT fairly easily. As McAdam (1997, 177) states, “[...] social processes such as industrialization promote insurgency only indirectly through a restructuring of existing power relations.” In fact, the Internet has brought about a considerable restructuring of power relations, even if that hypothesis can only hold among the very fortunate inhabitants of the industrialized countries. Just as it normalizes diversity and heterogeneity, the Internet also doesn't know of format power relations. It thus not only reduces the discrepancy between insurgent groups and their opponents, which is a major asset in improving the chances for successful social protests, according to McAdam (1997, 178), but even reverses the power relations on some accounts. Subsequently reflecting upon the notion of the PP model that established polity members are adhering to conservatism and seek to discourage activists from politically organizing and entering into the competitive establishment (McAdam 1997, 174), one can safely assume that ICTs seem to offer a new form of public sphere that makes access and resource restriction considerably more difficult.

McAdam (1997, 180) also argues that the strength and breadth of a communication network largely determines the pattern, speed and extent of movement expansion. Yet again, the Internet is the perfect device in so many

aspects of fulfilling those demands. Also, ICTs ease organizational resources which, according to McAdam (1997, 188), are required to sustain a social movement. Particularly the last few years have truly seen the development and rise of a few resources that considerably fit those demands, i.e. social networking sites such as FACEBOOK or the widespread availability of instant messaging and collaborative office tools. Truly, “[t]he Internet and other ICTs have tremendous potential to serve as tools for information dissemination and organizing protest along with traditional mobilization methodologies for social movements.” (Saeed, Rohde and Wulf 2008)

Although I’ve repeatedly stated that those changes primarily apply to the western hemisphere and the industrialized world, ICTs have also begun to transform civil society in developing countries. The effects ICTs have on these countries are all the more important as they bring forth rather radical changes and previously unknown opportunities. To explore the contemporary developments, Saeed, Rohde and Wulf (2008) suggest a research framework to investigate IT usage in mobilization and information dissemination processes of Pakistani civil society. They contend that there is a growing need to empirically investigate mobilization processes in ICT, but do not hide that there’s also a need to account for the *digital divide* or *participatory gap*. In order to illustrate the still considerable differences between western and, as in this case eastern society, they compare the communication habits of World Social Forum Chapters in Europe and Pakistan.

### **3.2 Short Message Service**

In an account of social movements in the twenty-first century, Tilly (2003, 8) refers to Howard Rheingold’s concept of SMART MOBS (Rheingold 2002) and their use of mobile phones, “taking over from conventional 20th century social movements.” Indeed, Rheingold lists a few examples where seemingly unrelated people have achieved remarkable outcomes by spontaneously connecting and coordinating through text messaging:

**November 1999:** autonomous but internetworked squads of demonstrators, using so-called swarming tactics, win the “Battle of Seattle”.

**September 2000:** British citizens outraged by the sudden rise in gasoline prices block fuel stations in the UK and coordinate by mobile phones’ SMS function.

**Since 1992:** loosely linked networks, alerted by mobile phone, split into tele-coordinated groups during CRITICAL MASS bicycle demos in San Francisco. (Rheingold 2002, 158)

Tilly (2003, 6) extends this list with an event in Manila, on 16 January 2001. On that day, text messages containing “Go 2EDSA, wear blk (sic)” were sent all around the South-East-Asian state. Over the next 4 days, numerous groups from across the Philippines began joining the movement and finally more than a million people gathered and ousted then-president Joseph Estrada from power. (Tilly 2003, 6)

More illustrations of new<sup>2</sup> social movements can not only be found in Rheingold’s book, but certainly also by looking at events that took place around the world since the year 2002. It is striking on so many levels, to what extent mobile phones have led to improvements in trade and working conditions on the African continent.

Hirsch and Henry (2005) describe the ways activists used their text messaging tool (TXTMOB) to share information and coordinate action during decentralized protests during Democratic- (DNC) and Republican National Conventions (RNC). They contend that text messaging supports new forms of distributed participation in mass mobilizations made possible by the widespread adoption of SMS-enabled cell phones and in parallel, a range of evolutions in protest tactics. While prior use of messaging has been mostly ‘viral’ and primarily among pre-existing social networks, TXTMOB made text messaging a part of a broader communications strategy developed by organizers during the RNC and DNC in 2004.

Swarming-tactics, as already mentioned by Rheingold, consist of “the dispersion of command among many small, autonomous units that are able to collectively ‘attack an enemy from all directions’” (Hirsch and Henry 2005, 1455) and depend heavily on an effective communications infrastructure. The ubiquity of cell phones makes them relatively inconspicuous devices and their use makes it possible to rely on robust commercial networks that aren’t easily jammed or otherwise disrupted as i.e. 2-way radios (Hirsch and Henry 2005, 1456).

It is remarkable though, that when given control over their communications platform, protest organizers still established fairly strict communications protocols. This shows that the use of ICT for collective activism seems to be pretty self-regulating. The protesters came up with several methods of “quality control” for their communications:

“Users adopted several strategies to improve information quality, including citing source, signing messages, and contesting false or inaccurate texts.” (Hirsch and Henry 2005, 1457)

Specifically in response to the question of what motivates participation in movements, TXTMOB seems to have hit the right nerve, as “[s]everal users reported spontaneously joining protest actions as a result of receiving TXTmob messages.” (Hirsch and Henry 2005, 1458) SMS is certainly a relatively invasive medium, but only further investigation by applying cognitive theory could deliver more specific results as to why people found the SMS messages so compelling. Hirsch and Henry (2005, 1458) announced that they would be more specifically looking at finding answers to questions such as *Does text messaging constitute a form of collective identity?*

McGuigan (2005) contends that, while there has been little critical research on the mobile phone so far, it has become a prime object for sociological attention both at the macro and micro-levels of analysis. Social demography, political economy, conversation, discourse and text analysis as well as ethnography represent four methods for studying the social features of the mobile phone he briefly sketches in his paper.

## 4 Conclusion

In the present paper, I have given a short overview over the most prominent traditional theories and models of social movements. In a second section, I have presented two developments that led to the expansion of social movement theory to both a globalized scope and the inclusion of social networks. It can be assumed that the proved theories from the 20th century have not disappeared but have been aggregated and expanded to apply to these new situations. More specifically, I have then pointed out a few examples of how ICT and the use of mobile phones, especially text messaging, have transformed social movement set-ups and inter-movement communications.

Though these developments seem to hold both a bright future for social movements and interesting times for social movement researchers, “[...] nothing assures us that movements *always* make society more democratic [...] [emphasis in original]” (Giugni 1999, xxx)

In the same way, Tilly (2003), who has been shown as enthusiastic about the developments in social movement theory, does not miss to point out that the

coeval study of social networks should not be oblivious to a few important catches. He advocates that technological determinism ought to be avoided and that one should recognize that not all new features of social movements result from technical innovations but most of them from “alterations in their social and political contexts” (Tilly 2003, 8) Also, all the while social movements are increasingly permeating the global, virtual and physical spaces, one should “[r]emember that most 21st century social movement activity continues to rely on the local, regional, and national forms of organization that already prevailed during the later 20th century.” (Tilly 2003, 8)

In my eyes it is legitimate though to ask whether this will hold in the foreseeable future. Already to date, local social movements<sup>2</sup> are being announced, advertised and coordinated through means of pre-existing infrastructures such as FACEBOOK. This is not to blindly accept these developments as unavoidable or even safe. In effect, it can be easily foreseen what fate awaits those movements who gladly put all their eggs in the basket of social networks that pursue commercial ends. That is indeed a critique that has to apply to pretty much all of the aforementioned technologies. Relying on ICT services also requires being able to cope with their risks and dangers.

---

<sup>2</sup>I.e. the anti-fascist demonstrations in Innsbruck, Austria on June 20, 2009

## References

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A. and Mary Bernstein. 2008. "Culture, Power, and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements." *Sociological Theory* 26(1):74–99.
- Barrett, Deborah and Charles Kurzman. 2004. "Globalizing Social Movement Theory: The Case of Eugenics." *Theory and Society* 33(5):487–527.
- Bayat, Asef. 2005. "Islamism and Social Movement Theory." *Third World Quarterly* 26(6):891–908.
- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–639.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1993. "Beyond Resource Mobilization." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34(1):217–235.
- Carty, Victoria and Jake Onyett. 2006. "Protest, Cyberactivism and New Social Movements: The Reemergence of the Peace Movement Post 9/11." *Social Movement Studies* 5(3):229–249.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. 1997. Social Movements as Cognitive Praxis. In *Social Movements. Perspectives and Issues*, ed. Steven M. Buechler and Kurt F. Cylke. Mayfield Publishing pp. 245–259.
- Giugni, Marco. 1999. How Social Movements Matter. Past Research, Present Problems, Future Developments. In *How Social Movements Matter*, ed. Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. University of Minnesota pp. xiii–xxxiii.
- Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper. 2003. Editors' Introduction. In *The Social Movements Reader. Cases and Concepts*, ed. James M. Jasper and Jeff Goodwin. Blackwell Publishing pp. 3–7.
- Hirsch, Tad and John Henry. 2005. TXTmob: Text Messaging For Protest Swarms. Technical report Association for Computing Machinery. paper presented to CHI 2005 conference for human-computer interaction in Portland, Oregon, USA.
- Kern, Thomas and Sang-Hui Nam. 2008. Social Movements as Agents of Innovation: Citizen Journalism in South Korea. Technical Report 73 German Institute of Global and Area Studies.

**URL:** [http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/wp73\\_kernnam.pdf](http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/wp73_kernnam.pdf)

Langman, Lauren. 2005. "From Virtual Public Spheres to Global Justice: A Critical Theory of Internetnetworked Social Movements." *Sociological Theory* 23(1):42–74.

Maiba, Hermann. 2004. The Case of Peoples' Global Action. Technical report University of Illinois. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

**URL:** <http://www.geser.net/gesleh/Maiba.pdf>

Marchetti, Raffaele and Mario Pianta. 2006. "Understanding Networks in Global Social Movements."

McAdam, Doug. 1997. The Political Process Model. In *Social Movements. Perspectives and Issues*, ed. Steven M. Buechler and Kurt F. Cylke. Mayfield Publishing pp. 172–192.

McGuigan, Jim. 2005. "Towards a Sociology of the Mobile Phone." *Human Technology* 1(1):45–57.

Munson, Ziad. 2001. "Islamic Mobilization: Social Movement Theory and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood." *The Sociological Quarterly* 42(4):487–510.

Passy, Florence and Marco Giugni. 2001. "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 16(1):123–153.

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283–305.

Rheingold, Howard. 2002. *Smart Mobs. The Next Social Revolution*. Cambridge: Perseus Publishing.

Saeed, Saqib, Markus Rohde and Volker Wulf. 2008. "ICTs, an alternative sphere for social movements in Pakistan. A Research Framework."

Spudich, Helmut. 2009. "Die Twivolution ist schwer zu unterdrücken." *DerStandard* p. 31. Wednesday, June 17, 2009.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1999. Foreword. In *How Social Movements Matter*, ed. Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. University of Minnesota pp. vii–x.

Tilly, Charles. 2003. "Social Movements. Enter the Twenty-first Century." paper presented at the conference on Contentious Politics and the Economic Opportunity Structure.

Tsutsui, Kiyoteru. 2004. "Global Civil Society and Ethnic Social Movements in the Contemporary World." *Sociological Forum* 19(1):63–87.