Notes to chapter 1

I am grateful to Jeff Broadbent, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly for commenting on a draft version of this chapter.

1 To refer to them, terms as vague as ‘flows’ (Sheller 2000) have recently been invoked.

2 Throughout this introduction, and indeed this book, ‘recent’ and similar words are to be understood in relative terms. It goes without saying that one could easily trace many of the ‘new insights’ discussed here well back in classic sociology (Simmel’s work on formal sociology and Marx’s historical writings on conflicts in France being just two most obvious examples).

3 Mechanisms have been defined as ‘a delimited class of events that alter relations among specified elements in identical or closely similar ways over a variety of situations’ (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001: 11).

4 Blau (1982); Blau and Schwartz (1984). Some very influential works in the field of contentious politics (e.g., Gould 1995) are actually examples of structural analysis in this sense, rather than network analysis proper.

5 See Diani (1992b, 2002) for a more thorough presentation of network methods in reference to social movement analysis. For introductions to social network methods see Scott (1992) and Wasserman and Faust (1994). A useful glossary of network terms may be found at the following web address http://www.nist.gov/dads/termsArea.html#graph.
For thorough reviews of this field of investigation see Knoke and Wisely (1990); Kitts (2000); Diani (forthcoming).

McAdam and Paulsen (1993) show that direct ties do not count if people are involved in broader activities compatible with the type of participation to be explained.

For example, Melucci’s project (1984) suggested that in the environmental field, networks developed in militant contexts had helped to set up natural food trade businesses, but that these largely identified with market activities rather than with a specific cause. In that context, the boundaries between movement community and market were vague at best.

Diani (2000b) presents a different reading of concentric circles, noting that political subcultures in countries like Italy, Belgium, or the Netherlands did not necessarily weaken democracy but provided distinct, previously excluded areas of society with political organization and opportunities for legitimacy.