The Ethnic Dimensions

Bringing ethnic divisions & conflict to the center of social movement theory
Outline (A Theme with Variations)

1. Starting point: thinking about racial disparities and the problem of repression and backlash
2. Considering the differences between minority and majority movements: a 2-dimensional array
   1. Why connections matter, not just hierarchies
   2. Typologizing movements by ethnicity
3. Unpacking the three dimensions of ethnicity: hierarchy, networks, time (intergenerational transmission)
4. Applying the ethnic dimension(s) as an analytic framework for understanding all movements
5. Conclusions
1. THE MATTER OF REPRESSION
Correlation = -.21; $r^2 = .05$. Weighted by Black Population
1993-1998
Black prison sentences disparity ratio, logged for 1995-2002

194 areas with complete prison data. Weighted by Black population
r2* is signed R2
The racial disparities movement

- Black Movement
- Latino & other ethnic movements
- Criminal Justice Reform Movement
- People who work in or write about CJ system

Movement addressing racial disparities in criminal justice
Types of Actors

- Professional & Elite Reformers
- Advocates Based in Aggrieved Communities

All the actors in the field

Offenders & Ex-offenders
• Direct
  • Non-voting for immigrants
  • “Illegal” immigrants at risk of deportation
  • Ban language from public spaces, require teaching in dominant language
  • Restrictions of religious or cultural garb
• Indirect through criminal convictions
  • Felon disenfranchisement
  • “Community supervision” for long periods
  • Deportation of arrestees who are illegal immigrants

Political repression of minorities
The sense of repression

• The quotation on the next slide was written by Ida Thomas, an older Black woman whose children have been in prison. She describes herself as an uneducated woman who only finished the 9th grade. She wants her name used.

• She wrote the statement as her contribution to a meeting of a task force on racial disparities in criminal justice; it was used in the final report. She asked me to edit it so that it would not sound uneducated. I have edited lightly to remove grammatical and spelling errors and have selected part of it. She has read and approved this editing.
What we Blacks fail to realize is that we have invaded their town. We are on their turf now. It’s do like we say or go to prison, for sometimes petty stuff. And we did wrong by coming here, trying to change their ways. They only know how to protect their own color. They are not used to us. Especially the way we think or act. Every race has its own culture. I don’t think this will ever change here. . . . It’s a nice place to live if you can stay out of their system. But can you be sure to do that here? No. It’s like in the slave days here. Yes Madam, yes sir, you are right. Every Black person here is living on borrowed time for freedom. You have to walk a straight and narrow line... Many White people do not know how to deal with Blacks here in Wisconsin — they look at us like we are from another planet. Their culture is much different than ours. We think differently, look at life differently. . . . Your best bet is to stay out of trouble if you can here, or you will end up with your back up side the wall like so many have done before. It is said, come down here on vacation, go back on paper. But that’s not true about going back on paper, because sometimes they want you to stay down here and finish your paper here. That’s unfair because if you sneeze the wrong way you will be going to prison to finish up some of your time. You are never free here.

*Written by Ida Thomas July 2009, minor edits & selection by Pamela Oliver*
• Policing of whole communities, constant surveillance
• People “on paper” are intensively repressed from collective or political action
• The movement to fight this repression itself suffers (at least indirectly) from the repression of those most affected
  • → outside allies, professional movements, activist professionals
  • → class and ethnic conflicts within the movement
Linking repression and crime control
REPRESSION AND BACKLASH

The standard question:
Does repression decrease mobilization through increasing the costs of protest or increase it through increasing grievance?
Repression

“Repression Works”

Cost & possibility of action

Grievance

Backlash

Level of Mobilization

Backlash and the net effect of repression
Two over-simplified models

1. Repressive regime:
   - Society
   - Dissenters
   - Criminals

2. Crime control:
   - Society
   - Regime
   - Dissenters
   - Criminals

Two over-simplified models
Regime and dissenters are part of the same society

Regime

Dissent
Repression

Society
ETHNIC (OR OTHER) DIVISIONS AND THE LEGITIMACY OF REPRESSION
## What we know about legitimizing dissent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repression is Legitimate</th>
<th>Backlash Repression is Illegitimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions of dissenters and regime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissenters are violent</td>
<td>Dissenters are peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression in proportion to dissent</td>
<td>Repression is overreaction to dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation between dissenters and the larger society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many are hurt or inconvenienced by dissent</td>
<td>Few are hurt or inconvenienced by dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissenters are extremists or outsiders</td>
<td>Dissenters are ordinary people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissenters have few ties to the larger society</td>
<td>Dissenters have many ties to the larger society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression is narrowly targeted on dissenters</td>
<td>Non-dissenters are repressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-way attacks with no repression

Regime

Group 1
Targets (Victims)

Group 2
Dissenters (Aggressors)

Dissent (crime)
Approval of regime
Discontent with regime

One-way attacks with no repression
One-way attacks with regime repression
Imbalanced repression
Ethnic dominance
Regime identified with one side
Multi-ethnic control & unbiased repression

Predictions
Greater balance & targeting in repression
Greater system legitimacy for all?
Political complexities & dynamics
• You cannot analyze repression and backlash without attention to the divisions within a society
  • Who are the dissenters?
  • Who are the targets?
  • Where does the regime stand with respect to the dissenters and the targets?
• Repression is uneven
  • Much evidence that racial/ethnic minorities are repressed more than majorities
  • Weaker groups more repressed than stronger groups
  • Less backlash from repressing socially isolated groups

Conclusions about repression & backlash
2. ETHNICITY AS A DIMENSION OF NETWORK INTEGRATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High in hierarchy or status</th>
<th>Elite movements</th>
<th>Non-polarized reform movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Affluent but culturally distinct immigrant groups</em></td>
<td><em>Reform movements tied to subcultures</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in hierarchy or status</td>
<td><em>Oppressed &amp; segregated minorities</em></td>
<td><em>Ethnic majority worker or nativist movements</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Servants living with masters. Women (in some contexts).</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Dimensions: Hierarchy X Integration

How I laid this out in Amsterdam in 2009
“Theoretical work on social movements has too often assumed that all movements confront basically similar tasks and operate out the same internal logic. This assumption is problematic when applied to the organizational and material factors structuring movement activity; it completely breaks down when applied to cultural dynamics.”

- Structures of domination and subordination; multi-institutional systems of domination
- Development of oppositional consciousness is different in entrenched subordinate communities than around chosen categories and identities.
- Types
  - **Liberation.** Carriers have a historically subordinate position within an ongoing system of social stratification. Movement members are primarily members of the oppressed group; membership is externally imposed. Most are physically segregated
  - **Equality-based special issue movements.** Address issues primarily of affecting an oppressed group. They mobilize liberation ideologies to fight a specific battle. Smaller goals but tied to a larger movement.
  - **Social responsibility.** Challenge conditions affecting the general population. Members choose whether to identify with the group.

Relation to Structures of Domination
Aldon Morris & Naomi Braine (2001)
• **My ideas build on this but break apart the dimensions they conflate**

• Their analysis treats ethnic/racial or class subordination as similar to gender, sexual minority or disability subordination.

• * Oppression, subordination **HIERARCHY**

• * Involuntary group membership externally assigned vs. chosen group membership **BOUNDARIES & ASCIPTION**

• * Ongoing (typically inter-generational) communities with cultures of opposition and subordination **ASCIPTION, INHERITANCE, CULTURE, BOUNDARIES**

• *Isolated groups develop oppositional culture more readily **NETWORKS**
• The term “movement carrier” is being used here rather loosely to refer to the stratum or segment of society from which the activists in a movement are drawn.
• This is different from the social movement community concept as it is usually defined to refer to the loose network of activists a movement draws from e.g. Taylor and Whittier 1992, Buechler 1993, Stoecker 1995.
• But there are other usages of “the community” which are similar to the idea of a “movement carrier.”

Movement carriers
Ethnicity as a cliqued network structure
• **Class interests**: Social policies like tax rates or social welfare affect groups of people and affect socially similar people similarly. (Hierarchies)

• **Indirect or network effects**: People in social contact with each other are affected by the impacts on others. Multiplier effects of wealth/poverty or comfort/fear or joy/grief. E.g. a prisoner or a crime victim impacts everyone who knows the person. (Networks)

• **Spatial interests**: people who share a space experience common consequences from crime, repeated protests, trash pickup, etc. (Spatial segregation)
Policies/events affect nearby* people, not just direct target

* Geographically or socially
The degree of segregation of a group affects the scope of the impact on the rest of society of a policy directed toward that group.
Cliqued Networks: virtually all the impact is on the low class, none on the high class
• It is not just a matter of how the issue impacts individual people but the relations between the impacted people and others in society
• It is about the degree of correlation between issues
• It is about connections (or lack thereof) between different groups of impacted people
• Network structure, not just individual status

To emphasize
MOVEMENT CARRIERS VARY IN THEIR NETWORK LOCATIONS

Network cliquing matters
Structurally, not all axes of dominance/subordination are the same in that they differ in whether/how they form cliqued networks.
Women and men in the US, cross-cutting ties with class & ethnicity
Gays & lesbians similarly have cross-cutting ties with class & ethnicity
Racial/ethnic network cliquing due to residential racial segregation is generally higher than the gender cliquing among US adults.
The structure of ethnic and class cliquing is more complex as both are tied to residential segregation in the US
Movements draw from people in different network locations
• The horizontal dimension is about who is connected with whom
• Ethnicity matters if/when if is a network clique that
  • Generates both shared fate within a group and lack of common interests between groups
  • Generates conflicts of interest between groups
  • Generates common identities within groups and contrasting identities between them
  • Generates common understandings of reality and common frames within them and different understandings and frames between them
• This horizontal dimension of network connection is different from the vertical dimension of dominance and hierarchy

Summing up the “ethnic dimension” of networks
AN ETHNIC TYPOLOGY OF MOVEMENTS
All movements have ethnic dimensions

- They are internally homogenous or they are not
- They are carried by a dominant ethnie or a minority or subordinate ethnie or are multi-ethnic
- They have extensive network ties to the broader society or their networks are highly cliqued and they are isolated
- They are relatively central or relatively peripheral to mainstream discourses
- They identify with the dominant social groups or they do not
Ethnic Regime Types

• **Majority rule (democratic)**
  - Homogeneous
  - Dominant ethnie = nation, minorities suppressed or assimilated
  - Multiethnic image of the nation
  - Ethnic majority rule with an economically advantaged minority (not considered here)

• **Minority rule**. Non-democratic (not considered here)

My focus
Ethnic Structures Change Over Time

- Majority rule (democratic)
  - Homogeneous
  - Dominant ethnie = nation, minorities suppressed or assimilated
  - Multiethnic image of the nation
  - Ethnic majority rule with an economically advantaged minority (not considered here)

- Minority rule. Non-democratic (not considered here)

Ethnic Regime Types
• Ethnic Majority
• Ethnic Minority
• Cross-Ethnic
  • Majority with minority
  • Multi-minority

Ethnic Movement Types
Ethnic Majority Movement Types

- **Anti-minority**
  - Addressing maintaining domination over or reacting to threats from other ethnic groups (nativism, anti-immigrant, White supremacist)
  
- **Pro-minority**
  - Addressing axis of domination within the majority
  - Addressing general social issues (“social responsibility” movements)
  - Addressing particular local issues
  - Ally movements supporting other ethnic groups or the less privileged groups within the majority

These vary from anti- to pro- to indifferent to minorities but are empirically they are ethnic majority
• Majorities typically draw on larger pools of potential participants and resources
• Majorities have electoral power
• Majorities are much less likely to be repressed
• Repression of majorities is more likely to generate backlash from other (non-repressed) members of society

Majorityness and the facilitation of mobilization
• Majority movements are often problematic for (from the point of view of) minorities
  • Often hostile
  • Frequently “clueless”
  • Even when trying to be pro-minority, can often mess it up

Majorityness and the problem for minorities
• Ethnic minority movements (framed as ethnic)
  • Civil rights & group advancement movements
  • National liberation or secessionist movements
  • “Intersectional” movements linking social responsibility or gender or class with ethnicity
• Movements of ethnic minorities
  • Class movements that are empirically mostly minority
  • Place-based community issues
  • Oppressed and repressed minorities, e.g. felons, undocumented workers

Ethnic minority movement types
• Oppression and repression are common and real issues
  • Much evidence of more severe repression of minorities
  • Morris: cultures of opposition and cultures of subordination tend to intermingle; the problem of consciousness
• Ethnic minorities typically lack sufficient resources and political power to achieve their goals without majority allies

Minority movements and the hierarchy and network problems
In the US, each racial/ethnic minority (Black, Native, Hispanic, Asian) has a distinctive movement history that is linked to its specific social network position:

- Group size
- Created by conquest vs. immigration
- Degree of historic violent suppression
- Degree of disadvantage
- Historic rituals of subordination
- Location in urban vs. rural areas, concentrated vs. dispersed populations
- Language & cultural homogeneity or diversity
- Character of ethnic identity: unified (esp. Black) vs. diverse (all the others)
- Citizenship status
- Cultures of resistance and subordination
- Characteristic strategies and tactics
- Mixture of integrationist and separatist tendencies

Similarly complex to consider other countries.

Variability among minorities: no general theory of “minority”
Strategies of ethnic minorities are in interaction with strategies of the dominant majority.
• Majority-majority mixed-ethnic movements
  • Movements around non-ethnic issues
  • Majority movements that have minority outreach programs e.g. Communists & Socialists in the 1930s US
  • Professionalized advocates working with or for disadvantaged oppressed minorities

• Majority-minority mixed-ethnic movements
  • Groups dominated by one or more minorities that others join
  • Coalitions between groups with different ethnic configurations
  • Mobilizations from multi-ethnic constituencies

Cross-ethnic movements
The racial disparities movement

Black Movement

Movement addressing racial disparities in criminal justice

Criminal Justice Reform Movement

People who work in or write about CJ system

Latino & other ethnic movements

The racial disparities movement
Types of Actors

Professional & Elite Reformers & Advocates

Advocates Based in Aggrieved Communities

All the actors in the field

Offenders & Ex-offenders
Tensions in cross-ethnic movements

- Privilege issues
- Hierarchical & power issues
- Network cliquing issues
- Agenda issues
• Hierarchies are often replicated within the movement, often unconsciously
• Differential resources: email, copiers, travel money, computers, days off, discretionary time
• Differential skills and self-assurance in talking and writing
• Differential habits of dominance or submission
• Access to information?

Privilege issues in cross-ethnic movements
Hierarchy and power issues in cross-ethnic movements

- Differential access to power
  - Network ties to power holders
  - Being seen as knowledgeable, objective by outsiders
- Differential risk of repression
- Differential control over the purse strings of the organization due to funding source
- Gate-keeper to jobs or benefits needed by others
• Different experiences give radically different views of “reality”
• Different cultural practices about how to “do” movements
• Different ways of talking and framing issues
• Different identities
• Different languages
• Different customs about holding meetings and having discussions

Network issues in cross-ethnic movements
• Commitment issues: are “conscience constituents” or allies in for the long haul or can they just leave?
• Shared fate issues: who will suffer consequences if things go wrong?
• Divergent goals based on different experiences and positions
• Leadership issues: who’s in charge?
• Conflicts over resources within the movement e.g. access to paid positions, allocation of funding to different groups

Agenda issues in cross-ethnic movements
3. THEORIZING ETHNICITY

From ethnicity as a dimension to the dimensions of ethnicity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High in hierarchy or status</th>
<th>Elite movements</th>
<th>Elite-led mass Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>without mass base</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Affluent but culturally distinct immigrant groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-polarized reform movements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reform movements tied to subcultures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in hierarchy or status</td>
<td><strong>Oppressed &amp; segregated minorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ethnic majority worker or nativist movements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fully isolated</strong></td>
<td><strong>Servants living with masters. Women (in some contexts).</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Dimensions: Hierarchy X Integration

How I laid this out in Amsterdam in 2009
THE VERTICAL DIMENSIONS
• Numbers (group size)
• Resources (wealth, land)
• Political power (control of government, coercion)
• Day-to-day restrictions on life (segregation, surveillance, exclusion)
• Symbolic/cultural dominance (rituals of submission, enforced ignorance, suppress culture/language or enforce separate culture/language, ascription)

Vertical (Hierarchical) Dimensions of Ethnicity
Ethnic Groups Vary in Resources, Resource Distributions, or Degree of Internal Stratification
The vertical hierarchical dimension affects the horizontal network dimension.
Structures of domination that are “ethnic” not only are hierarchical but also create social segregation and cultural difference
THE THIRD DIMENSION OF ETHNICITY: TIME AND INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION
Ethnicity is intergenerational & Ascribed

- You are born with an ethnicity
- You inherit it from your parents
- You are acculturated into your ethnicity in childhood
• Both are inter-generational: you inherit them from your parents
• Race is understood to refer to physical groupings of people based on ancestral geographic origins
• Ethnicity is understood to refer to groupings based on culture
• They are logically distinct
• They overlap in practice
• They tend to be used interchangeably in ordinary life
• * Race is often harder for an individual to change or disguise than ethnicity

Race and Ethnicity
Ethnicities (and races) are lineages that stay distinct if and only if they are physically & socially segregated and do not intermarry
Ethnicity

- Lineage
  - Inter-generational inheritance

- Group Boundaries

- Distinct Cultural Practices
• Construction of group boundaries is a big topic in race & ethnicity
  • Mutable
  • Contested
• Cultures always blending, being defined and re-defined in interaction with other ethnicities
Historically, ethnicities diverged through migration, separation or segregation that prevent intermixing and lead to separate languages & cultures.
Political or social forces bring the groups back into contact
Initially distinct groups that intermarry become one group across generations
How groups merge varies a lot between societies.
Ongoing processes of construction and reconstruction of ethnic groups are tied to how much they mix and also the rules of mixing.
Sometimes groups are forced to assimilate or merge by outside political forces.
Sometimes politicized ethnic conflict separates mixing or mixed people.
THE DIMENSIONS OF ETHNICITY REINFORCE EACH OTHER
Across time, ethnic hierarchies tend to reduce ethnic assimilation (networks, boundaries) and increase cultural difference.
There are cases in which dominant ethnicities seek to erase cultural differences among minorities.
4. THE ETHNIC DIMENSIONS AS ANALYTIC TOOLS

Broadening the idea of “ethnic” to apply to other kinds of groups
The Ethnic Dimensions

Network Connections & Structure
• Class is often ethnic
  • Conquest
  • Differential immigration
• Ethnic differences often disrupt class unity
• Within “the same” ethnicity, class is ethnic if classes are socially and spatially segregated and do not intermarry.
• Reduction in class intermarriage is a marker of a rigidifying class structure; increase in intermarriage of an opening class structure.

Class and ethnicity
The network structure of gender is different from ethnicity

- Sexes are not lineages
- Sexes are not spatially and socially segregated: different sexes occupy the same households
- “Intersectionality” – gender hierarchies interact with class & ethnicity

- Sex-segregated networks and cultures could be understood in ethnic terms
- Sexual minorities are not lineages, do have distinct subcultures, may be segregated
- The principles of the interrelations among hierarchy, segregation and cultural difference apply to women and sexual minorities

Gender
• Groups you are born into and grow up in are different from groups you join as adults. **Why race & ethnicity are “different”**

• There are languages and cultures that are transmitted from child to child or young adult to young adult
  • Children’s games
  • Creole languages, street dialects
  • Youth cultures

• Ethnic dimension: the extent to which movement cultures or movement communities have an intergenerational component

Intergenerational movements
• Movements that are transmitted across generations from parents to children are (or can be seen as) ethnic movements
• Many overlay “real” ethnic groups
• Spatial & social segregation of political subcultures \( \rightarrow \) proto-ethnic
• Inter-generational transmission of movement culture outside families parallels creoles & other dialects taught across child generations

Movement/political subcultures as proto-ethnic
• How people in different ethnic groups talk about issues
• Understandings of what is “real”
• Language and signification

Ethnic “universes of discourse”
• Polarized liberal & conservative politics
• Religious versus secular subcultures
• Class cultures.
• Sectarian or extremist politicos or religious sects

Proto-ethnic movement cultures?
Tweets with the #GOP hashtag. Mostly within liberal or conservative. Orange are mentions across communities.
Lada Adamic, HP Labs, Palo Alto, CA and Natalie Glance. “The Political Blogosphere and the 2004 U.S. Election: Divided They Blog”, March 4, 2005. (This image is all over the Internet, but it was surprisingly difficult to find the original and reference)
Book purchases
who is citing
http://www.thenetworkthinker.com/2008/10/complete-polarization.html Valdis Krebs
V. RECAPITULATION
From ethnicity as a single trait or dimension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High in hierarchy or status</th>
<th>Elite movements</th>
<th>Elite-led mass Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affluent but culturally distinct immigrant groups</td>
<td>Reform movements tied to subcultures</td>
<td>Non-polarized reform movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in hierarchy or status</td>
<td>Oppressed &amp; segregated minorities</td>
<td>Ethnic majority worker or nativist movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully isolated</td>
<td>Servants living with masters. Women (in some contexts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Dimensions: Hierarchy X Integration

How I laid this out in Amsterdam in 2009
To the ethnic dimensions as analytic tools for understanding movement carriers and movement types
The Ethnic Dimensions
• Movement carriers are in different ethnic-structural locations that affect everything about them
  • Mobilization processes
  • Choice of strategy/tactics
  • Core framing tasks & consciousness raising
  • Likelihood of repression
  • Ability to influence the larger society
• These dimensions of difference are theoretically central not afterthoughts
• “General” social movement theory that ignores this is a theory of majority movements

Making the ethnic dimensions central
• Subordination and network isolation make mobilization difficult and repression likely → no movement
• Equality and network integration make mobilization unnecessary → no movement
• Movements that do not exist are as theoretically interesting as movements that do exist
• Studying only movements that exist is a selection bias problem
• Examine the theoretical space of movement carriers and the existence of subordination and look for what is not there as well as what is there

Studying non-movements not just movements
• Can the idea of the ethnic help to explain the content of movements and why people in the same class position end up in opposite political camps?
• People of different ideological views live in different neighborhoods, participate in different religious or secular organizations, read or watch different information sources.
• Radically different “universes of discourse” can be easily identified both between ethnic groups and within the majority around these ideological issues.
• When people encounter the discourses from unfamiliar universes of discourse, the response tends to be outrage and polarization, not influence.

The Problem of “unexplained” ideological divergence
• Walder’s critique: a decline in the interest of movement scholars in explaining the content of movements in favor of mobilization-centric theory
• The failure of “old” class-centric or deprivation theory to provide adequate explanations
• The ethnic dimension provides a way to integrate thinking about structures of domination, prospects for mobilization, and the cultural network cliquing that shapes identity formation, framing, and ideology
• There is much to do.
The End

Thank you
• Decline of attempt to relate character of movements to social structure, to explain variations in political views.
• Critique of exclusive focus on mobilization. (A critique that generally applies to me)
• A call for the study of the content of movements
• Examples of studies of content of movements
  • Studies showing structural factors like class to account for political differences or factions but are instead explained by short-term changes in identity formation.
  • Studies of ethnic mobilization, seeking to explain when and why ethnic identity becomes salient as a cause of conflict.
  • Studies of variations in union mobilization
  • Studies of impact of religious ideas on political orientations

Summary of Walder’s Critique
IV. Ethnic Conflicts Within Movements

- Cultural & political differences
- Hierarchical differences
- Conflicts are endemic to any heterogeneous group
Cultural differences

- Different cultural standards for how to run a meeting, what is a polite way to talk
- What forms of action are meaningful
- Different perceptions of what the issues are
- Different perceptions of how to produce social change
• Education and forms of cultural capital limit who can engage in different forms of action
• Organizing meetings & work by email (Facebook Twitter etc) can exclude those who do not have home computers
• Elite reformers often bring assumptions of superiority into the field, expect deference
• Resentment by aggrieved beneficiary constituents of domination, forms of action of elite allies
• Poor and uneducated people are sometimes mis-informed. (So are affluent and educated people.)
Examples of conflicts in my work -1

• Outsiders listen to Whites more on race issues, Blacks delegitimated as speakers on race issues. Convicted criminals delegitimated on punishment issues. Illegal immigrants can say anything.
  • Leads to frustration, anger, silencing of the principals
• Wildly different views of what “the problem” is
  • Poverty leading to bad behavior?
  • Differential treatment for the same behavior?
  • Is the policing too rigorous or does Madison have a higher (better) standard of behavior?
Examples of conflicts in my work -2

• Institutional reformers care about issues but react with threat if attributions of personal racism or malfeasance are made (even about others in the organization)
• Taking offense: cultural practices about public disagreement, cultural differences in what is offensive
  • “legal pretender”
  • complaints about unfair policing are taken personally
  • Story about 4 stops after the rally
  • “Making nice” vs. not with people you disagree with
• Example of a person literally being talked over, viewed as hostile when she (in a hostile tone) complained about it
Examples of conflicts in my work -3

• Concerns about allocation of social service funding: complaints that minorities are the “clients” but Whites get the jobs serving them -> implicit conflict of interest among allies on the issues
• Poor people, especially released felons, need jobs badly, cannot afford to volunteer, look to movement for employment, may lead to “corruption” of non-profit law
• Conflict that led an advocacy group leader to call a parole officer on a group member
• Some CJ professionals are literally unaware of how the system works (often perversely) in areas slightly out of their purview
Examples of Conflicts in my work -4-

- Capacity to contribute in a mixed-class arena is heavily dominated by education, professional status
  - Ability to do research, write reports
  - Sensitivity to being thought ignorant or uneducated
- Internet and email: professionals have ready access, prefer to communicate that way, exclude poorer people who do not have the same access
  - Meeting-scheduling woes
  - Reading drafts, getting work in on time
  - Example of frustration leading to conflict & tears
• Different minorities have different issues
  • Conflicts between Blacks & Hispanic immigrants about whose issues are most important
• Conflicts between moderates and radicals.
• Racial-cultural differences in the structure of the issue
  • Whites divide into “liberals” focusing on structure & disadvantage versus “conservatives” focusing on problems of Black crime
  • Blacks do not make this distinction: concerned about crime and see it as a product of discrimination

Examples of conflicts in my work -5-
• Conflicts are the norm in groups that mix people from different cultural backgrounds & class positions
  • ESPECIALLY if the “beneficiary constituents” are poor &/or oppressed and the “conscience constituents” are affluent and relatively powerful
• Most groups become more homogeneous over time, even if they start as mixed
  • One group tends to dominate the organization
  • Others move on, sometimes quietly disappearing, sometimes after an ugly fight

In sum
V. Ethnicity and New Communications Media

• Class and access to new media
  – This is also a global issue
  – Lower class groups and less developed countries are not using Facebook and Twitter

• Ethnicity & nationality & language
  – New media are highly segregated
  – Tend to reproduce or even exacerbate existing ethnic (social, political) boundaries, little evidence that it lessens them
  – The virulence of between-group hostilities seems exacerbated in the new media
VI. Inter-Movement Competition

- Movements compete not only with their direct opponents but with other movements
  - For attention
  - For resources
  - For personnel
- These inter-movement competitions have ethnic dimensions
  - Dominant and integrated groups compete better than subordinate and isolated groups
  - Elite allies are often necessary, raise the conflicts described earlier
• Broadening “ethnic” to encompass not just the usual popular understanding
  • Think of it as patterns of networks and cliques
  • Applies to religious groups, political groups
  • It is the question of ties outside the group
  • And the question of hierarchy
• These divisions and dimensions should be central to all theorizing: fundamental axes of variation among types of movements

Conclusion
All movements have an ethnic dimension

• They are internally homogenous or they are not
• Part of dominant ethnie or not
• Relatively central or peripheral to mainstream discourses
• Identify or not with the dominant social groups
• Can the class, political or religious divisions among White Americans be understood as proto-ethnic?
  • Few network ties between groups, network cliquing
  • Spatial segregation
  • Inter-generational inheritance and socialization

Proto-ethnic?
Are the classes mixing among Whites?
OR are classes becoming cliques among Whites? Are intermarriage rates falling between occupational, educational, and class groups?
Is ideological polarization among Whites leading to cliquing and proto-ethnicization?
The #GOP hashtag is widely used and an example of a popular, grassroots meme. In the diffusion network we can often observe two clearly separated clusters. These correspond to conservative and liberal communities, using the tag in different ways. People tend to retweet others in the same community and not in the other community, so we see the clusters in blue. We also see orange edges connecting the two communities. These occur when users mention people in the other community, typically to disagree or criticize.
Figure 1: Community structure of political blogs (expanded set), shown using utilizing a GEM layout [11] in the GUESS[3] visualization and analysis tool. The colors reflect political orientation, red for conservative, and blue for liberal. Orange links go from liberal to conservative, and purple ones from conservative to liberal. The size of each blog reflects the number of other blogs that link to it.

Lada Adamic, HP Labs, Palo Alto, CA and Natalie Glance. “The Political Blogosphere and the 2004 U.S. Election: Divided They Blog”, March 4, 2005. (This image is all over the Internet, but it was surprisingly difficult to find the original and reference)
Book purchases
who is citing
http://www.thenetworkthinker.com/2008/10/complete-polarization.html Valdis Krebs
The end

Thank you.
• Segregation and anti-miscegenation laws designed to keep groups apart
• Politicized ethnic group conflict raises salience of ethnic origins among a mixing/mixed population
  • Jews in Germany
  • Sarajevo
  • Rwanda
• Resistance to cultural domination can take the form of increasing or exaggerating language or cultural divergence from the dominant group
• Overt ethnic conflicts can paradoxically be most overt as groups are actually mixing and blending

Politics and conflict can re-separate groups that have been merging
The converse is also true: across time, equality between groups is tied to integration and cultural mixing.
“Theoretical work on social movements has too often assumed that all movements confront basically similar tasks and operate out the same internal logic. This assumption is problematic when applied to the organizational and material factors structuring movement activity; it completely breaks down when applied to cultural dynamics.”

- Structures of domination and subordination; multi-institutional systems of domination
- Development of oppositional consciousness is different in entrenched subordinate communities than around chosen categories and identities.
- Types
  - **Liberation**. Carriers have a historically subordinate position within an ongoing system of social stratification. Movement members are primarily members of the oppressed group; membership is externally imposed. Most are physically segregated
  - **Equality-based special issue movements**. Address issues primarily of affecting an oppressed group. They mobilize liberation ideologies to fight a specific battle. Smaller goals but tied to a larger movement.
  - **Social responsibility**. Challenge conditions affecting the general population. Members choose whether to identify with the group.

**Relation to Structures of Domination**
Aldon Morris & Naomi Braine (2001)
• My ideas build on this but break apart the dimensions they conflate
• Their analysis treats ethnic/racial or class subordination as similar to gender, sexual minority or disability subordination.
• * Oppression, subordination  HIERARCHY
• * Involuntary group membership externally assigned vs. chosen group membership  BOUNDARIES & AScription
• * Ongoing (typically inter-generational) communities with cultures of opposition and subordination  AScription, INHERITANCE, CULTURE, BOUNDARIES
• *Isolated groups develop oppositional culture more readily  NETWORKS

Unpacking Morris & Braine
Ethnic Regime Types

- **Majority rule (democratic)**
  - Homogeneous
    - A common national myth, rarely completely true
    - If mostly true, a product of past forced or natural assimilation or blending
  - Dominant ethnie = nation, minorities suppressed or assimilated
    - Melting pot in US CREATED a dominant ethnie of White Americans, forced ethnic Europeans to be White Americans
    - Similar stories in Europe, Japan etc.
    - Comparative nationalism e.g. France vs. Germany
    - Different minorities have different relations to the majority. Some may be economically advantaged
  - Multiethnic image of the nation
    - Brazil, Canada, US today?
    - Ethnic politics
    - Different minorities have different relations to the majority
  - Ethnic majority rule with an economically advantaged minority (e.g. Whites in modern South Africa, Chinese in Malaysia or Indonesia). Not considered here.

- **Minority rule** (special case not considered here). Non-democratic

**Ethnic Regime Types**
Hierarchies that vary within as well as between ethnicities

- **Resources**
  - Wealth
  - Control of means of production, control of commercial establishments
  - Control of key institutions: education, medicine, entertainment, culture

- **Political power: numbers + resources**
  - Coercive: control over means of violence (vs. target of violence)
  - Control of the machinery of government (vs. exclusion)
  - Control of policies

- **Symbolic/cultural dominance** (non-ethnic, i.e. gender, age, or sexual orientation)
  - Ascribed group membership
  - Enforced ignorance, inadequate education
  - Stigmatize or ban a group’s language or cultural practices
  - Rituals of dominance and submission, practices enforcing symbolic hierarchies & distinctions

These forms of domination can vary within ethnic boundaries as well as between them. If these cross-cut ethnic boundaries, ethnic hierarchies may be reduced.

If these cross-cut ethnic boundaries, ethnic hierarchies may be reduced.
Hierarchies Linked to Networks

- **Numbers (group size)**
  - Electoral power: function of relative group size + suffrage
  - Cultural dominance

- **Day-to-day restrictions on life**
  - Physical segregation, exclusion from some places, privileged access to places
  - Surveillance and control, passport checks, reporting to authorities, curfews, etc.
  - Exclusion from key institutions or arenas of life (e.g. education, religion)

- **Symbolic/cultural dominance**
  - Ascribed group membership
  - Enforced ignorance, inadequate education
  - Stigmatize or ban a group’s language or cultural practices
  - Rituals of dominance and submission, practices enforcing symbolic hierarchies & distinctions

Sheer size matters & is itself a product of group formation

These forms of domination tend to create/enforce group boundaries and network cliquing → ethnic groups