

Changing the system from the outside – an evaluative analysis of social movements opposing the 2007 G8 summit

by Patrick T. Hiller, Nova Southeastern University

"Even a purely moral act that has no hope of any immediate and visible political effect can gradually and indirectly, over time, gain in political significance".

Vaclav Havel

This essay examines the large-scale social protests surrounding the 2007 G8 summit in Heiligendamm, Germany. Based on a discussion of social protests surrounding the 2007 G8 summit with respect to their goals and objectives and the exploration if and how they are related to public policy changes, it is argued that contextual factors surrounding social movements' intents to change public policy outweigh content-related issues on the activists'. A document analysis of the summit and its environment leads to the following conclusions: (1) The government will evaluate how to deal with social protest depending on factors not directly related to social protest. (2) The logistics of the G8 summits are highly influenced by the anticipated protests. (3) Selective media coverage and the self-representation of assorted movements minimize the movements' struggles. (4) Organized social movements intend to increase the salience on issues that differ from the objectives of the G8 summit participants. (5) Violence by splinter groups justifies violent

countermoves by authorities against larger groups of social protesters. (6) By using the ‘instantaneity of the internet’⁷ as a platform, social movements can act as educators and address their issues and objectives in an in-depth manner and reach a virtually unlimited audience. (7) Contextual factors determine the extent to which social movements act.

Introduction

The 2007 G8⁸ summit in Heiligendamm, Germany has once again brought social protest into the international spotlight. In fact, the social actions surrounding the meetings seemed to have received at least the same amount of attention as the actual meetings among the heads of state of the eight most powerful economic nations in the world. During a time which, most generally, is depicted as the ‘age of globalization’ the study of social movements needs to be revisited. Globalization as such has lead to a myriad of campaigns opposing this phenomenon⁹. Many of these movements are made up of grassroots social activists engaged in a struggle against the political and economic elites. With this in mind the question arises as to which extent social movements can draw on social protest to achieve sustainable changes of public policy on the national and international level.

The impact of social movements is a widely studied issue. In very general terms the main arguments regarding the impact can be divided into two groups – the ones claiming that “social movements strongly influence public policy, and that they do not” (Burstein, 1999, p. 4). Within this debate I argue that contextual factors surrounding the intents of the social movements to change public policy outweigh content-related issues on the activists’ agendas. In other words, policy-makers and government authorities place emphasis on how to deal with the manifestation of social protest, i.e. the context/environment, as opposed to addressing the topics, i.e. the content/demands set forth by social movements aim to address. To support

7 I refer to this notion as it previously has been discussed by Linstroth (2002).

8 G8 stands for “Group of Eight”, which is made up by the countries of France, United States, United Kingdom, Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy, and Canada.

9 I am using the term ‘globalization’ in a very loose way that often is used by the so-called anti-globalization movements targeting transnational organizations such as the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank.

my argument, I discuss the social protests surrounding the 2007 G8 summit with respect to their goals and objectives and explore if and how they are related to public policy changes.

This article hopefully will stimulate further research and understanding regarding the dialogic interaction of social movements and public policy (makers). First I will review literature discussing the forms, tactics and impacts of social protest in relation to public policy. Then I will show how social protest specifically was applied at the 2007 G8 summit followed by a discussion of the results.

Social movements have been defined in numerous ways. Frequently, and for the purpose of this article, these movements are considered as grassroots movements. According to Tilly (1999, p. 257, *italics in original*) social movements consist of “a sustained challenge to power holders in the name of population (groups or individuals) living under the jurisdiction of those power holders by means of repeated public displays of that population’s worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment”. For the purpose of this article I will use a slightly revised definition of social movements that has been developed by Goodwin and Jasper (2003). A social movement is a collective, organized, sustained, and non-institutional challenge to authorities/powerholders aiming at a change of public policy through the means of social protest. Social protest will be defined as an act or acts of “challenging, resisting, or making demands upon authorities, powerholders, and/or cultural beliefs and practices by some individual or group” (Goodwin & Jasper, 2003, p. 3). Public policy is defined as “political agreement on a course of action (or inaction) designed to resolve or mitigate problems on the political agenda – economic, social, environmental, and so on” (Fischer, 1995).

Social movements, social protest and public policy

A major reason for the emergence of social movements in democratic societies is the perceived failure of the implementation of public policies or the policies per se. I consider this as relative deprivation on the political realm. The theoretical notion of relative deprivation is defined as “actors’ perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities” (Gurr, 1970, p. 24). Value expectations have to be understood as goods and necessities for living that people believe they are justifiably entitled to. In this case, these goods and necessities are public policies and/or services. Value capabilities are the values members believe they are

capable of maintaining, both in the present and in the future. Value capabilities can be further subdivided into value positions, which have been attained or provided for by the government (present), and value potentials, which are the skills that society or governments will allow them to attain (future). Within this notion there are personal, societal, and political opportunities for achieving and/or maintaining desired value positions. Inherited and value-enhancing actions are considered as personal opportunities (e.g. admission to an Ivy League school through family connections). Societal opportunities are said to be found in the normal course of action (e.g. a strong economy providing employment security). Political opportunities are considered as political actions as a means to providing satisfaction (e.g. social protest against perceived injustices) (Gurr, 1970).

Social movements, as discussed in this article, act outside the political realm. In other words, they form no part of official political and administrative bodies in the executive, legislative or judiciary branches of states. There are virtually no limits to the types of actions they undertake in order to achieve their goals. Social movements are an important feature of the contemporary national and international political landscape. Scholars argue that there is a firm link between institutionalized politics and social movements (e.g. McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996). The major activities of social movements with respect to public policy are: “(1) agenda-setting - identifying a problem of international concern and producing information; (2) developing solutions – creating norms or recommending policy change; (3) building networks and coalitions of allies; and (4) implementing solutions – employing tactics of persuasion and pressure to change practices and/or encourage compliance with norms” (Price, 2003, p. 584). According to Offe (1985) this notion implies the actors in the movements do not negotiate or compromise as it is done in the political arena. Instead, Offe (1985) argues that they apply tactics with sharp antinomies yes/no, them/us, now/never or victory/defeat. This is an oversimplified, merely theoretical argument. I maintain that a form of negotiation and compromising generally takes place when social movements emerge and act. While the open rhetoric and manifestation often contain the antinomies stated by Offe (1985), there is a constant negotiation taking place within the movements and between them and the political structures they address. These negotiations do not necessarily have to be direct if the mere interaction, often carried out through mass media, is considered as negotiation. It is my contention that the media coverage, regardless if the emphasis is placed on the movements’

contents or actions, creates an environment of negotiation between the social movements and public policy makers as well as the broader public in general.

A myriad of transnational anti-globalization movements challenge neoliberal policies and institutions. The framing and understanding of the contemporary economic globalization process and with it associated policy making has lead to collective action that needs to be given as much attention as the socio-economic process per se. It is argued that “the mobilization of beliefs and interpretations critical of neoliberal globalization had been central to the eruption of a protest movement that achieved global proportions by 2003” (Ayres, 2004, p. 27). Ayres (2004) provides an overview of contested interpretations of the globalization process. The actors in the anti-neoliberal protest movements are identified as civil society activists, national/transnational social movement organizations, independent media centers, and internet websites. The neoliberalism proponents are identified as states, multi-national corporations, currency speculators, financial media outlets and supra-national financial and trade bodies such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO. The protest movements’ policy proposals include de-ratification and reform of existing treaties, debt relief, strengthening of state sovereignty, deglobalization, and return to a more local orientation. The proponents of neoliberalism propose policies of liberalized trade and investment, deregulation, tax cuts, privatization, and the reduction of public expenditures. Ayres’ (2004) succeeds in creating a general picture. Its strength lies in the fact that the presentation and self-presentation of numerous anti-globalization movements is based on these or similar content-related categories. However, I argue that this approach needs to be elaborated by examining the variable ‘social environment’ within which both sides are embedded.

Regardless of the form or impact of social movements, one has to view the national, political, and social context of the respective protest actions to assess their implications. Rucht (1996) conceptualizes the impact of a social movement’s structural context. Briefly stated, the conjunction of the political, social, and cultural context has structural implications with regard to the movement’s themes. Within this context, the movements’ structures, their strategies, and other internal factors lead to the protest activities. The outcome of these activities then can bring the process back to the conjunctural context with newly created opportunities or constraints. I

maintain that Rucht's (1996) conceptualization is a useful analytical tool for the study of social movements within different contexts.

Social protest can be displayed in forms such as public meetings, demonstrations, marches, creation of special associations and commissions, mass media statements, pamphlets, petitions, posting or wearing of identifying symbols, the adoption of distinctive slogans, sit-ins, and/or the celebration of difference (Bernstein, 2003; Morris, 2003; Sharp, 1973; Tilly, 1999). According to Offe (1985) positive aspects of protest demands are framed in grammatically negative forms by using key words such as never, stop, freeze, ban, and end. Consequently, one might consider the mobilization of public attention is one of the main objectives of social protest in general.

It is argued that governmental concern about the mobilization potential of opposing groups (social movements) has grown during the last years (Cleaver Jr., 1998; Linstroth, 2002). Modern communication technologies, especially the internet, have created an atmosphere surrounding social movements called the "Zapatista Effect", referring to the internet's ability in having brought the struggle of the Mexican Zapatista movement from the geographical and ideological margins to the center (Cleaver Jr., 1998, p. 622). Contemporary social movements are faced with the concept of "instantaneity with the advent of the Internet" (Linstroth, 2002, p. 212). The internet has linked struggles "challenging dominant policy and ideology in ways that often bypass the nation state" (Cleaver Jr., 1998, p. 637), thereby allowing the capacity for action sought by social movements to become more concrete (Cleaver Jr., 1998). Furthermore, I argue that coordination of actions, exchange of ideas, and calls for solidarity, are additional factors which social movements draw from on a pragmatic level of social protest. The creative use of modern communication technologies, especially the internet, has broadened the spectrum for protesters.

The impacts of social movements on public policy can extend over a period of time, from winning a specific state policy decision to providing continuing leverage over a political process. In general it is argued that most social movements aim at benefits to flow to a constituency (Amenta & Young, 1999) in the forms of changed laws, policies, regulatory practices and administrative (Goodwin & Jasper, 2003). Social movements can create social change by changing the salience of the issue. Burstein (1999, p. 16) hypothesizes that "the greater the impact of interest organizations on an

issue's salience to the public, the greater their (indirect) impact on legislative action, provided that there is a discrepancy between the public's preferences and public policy". Briefly stated, Burstein (1999) maintains that social movements potentially can change public policy if they are able to change public preference and issue salience, as legislators acting outside of their own self-interests in an electoral agenda will most likely act according to the wishes of the majority of their constituency.

Institutional change as a consequence of social protest has been examined by numerous scholars. According to Kriesi and Wisler (1999) frames of political institutions have been purposely designed to make it difficult to challenge and change them from the outside. However, the authors further assert that social movements can transform political institutions under certain conditions. First, there has to be a societal crisis, typically of economic character. Second, a master frame must exist that provides citizens with credible alternatives. Third, a movement's success depends on institutional vulnerability. Fourth, a movement can create a momentum for change only if the established elites cannot maintain control over the masses (Kriesi & Wisler, 1999).

Burstein (1999) argues that social movements can influence public policy under the constraints of electoral competition and the limited ability of citizens and legislators to simultaneously deal with many issues. Burstein's (1999, p. 14) public preference hypothesis states that "the greater the impact of interest organizations [i.e. social movements] on the public's preferences on an issue currently framed or as reframed, the greater their (indirect) impact on legislative action". While this hypothesis seems appealing, Burstein (1999) admits that there is a lack of data to support this hypothesis. The author follows the assumption that public opinion often influences policy; however, the empirical link between social movements and their ability to frame public opinion still is rather weak.

Contemporary anti-globalization movements collectively act within international norms to restructure world politics, where they are "emerging as a powerful new force in international politics and are transforming global norms and practices" (Khagram, Riker, & Sikkink, 2002, p. 4). It can be further argued that these non-state actors have actively become parts of "de-facto global governance" (Khagram et al., 2002, p. 4). Edelman (2001, p. 311), for example, posits that "the new anticorporate activism ... employs an action repertoire that combines decidedly postmodern elements

(informational politics, cyber-attacks, and ‘swarming’) with others that hark back to early nineteenth-century forms of direct action, albeit with global rather than local audiences”. In this line, Meyer’s (2003) dialogic model on the mutual influence of social protest and policy shows that policy processes are not only the sources of social protest mobilization but also the outcomes.

Social movements act as educators for populations through their protest actions. Public policy makers do not necessarily share information on certain topics with the public for a variety of reasons. For example, they can intentionally suppress information to maintain their self-interests or the interests of powerful groups. On the other hand, given the fact that policy makers often have to deal with a myriad of issues they will hardly ever have all the necessary information to make informed choices on certain issues (see also Burstein, 1999). The dissemination of information by a social movement thus potentially brings topics to the public agenda - topics that would have otherwise remained unknown (Grant, 2004). Consequently social movements potentially can inform and educate not only the public but also the policy makers.

The above review has shown that social movements act outside official political channels to challenge and/or change public policies and entire political, administrative and economic institutions. To convey their messages and achieve their goals the movements rely on a myriad of tactics. In order to explore if and how social protest is successful regarding the goals and contents and what the impact of the protest environments have in relation to the goals and content, I will now turn to an analysis of the social protests surrounding the 2007 G8 summit.

Clashing agendas at the 2007 G8 summit

The 2007 G8 summit in the German city of Heiligendamm followed an agenda set forth by the organizing government of Germany. The summit and the preceding time period were accompanied by numerous organized and unorganized violent and nonviolent protests following an alternative summit agenda. According to the German government¹⁰, the key foci of the 2007 summit were shaping globalization and aiding development Africa. The summit’s agenda included the two main topics of growth and responsibility in the global economy and growth and responsibility in Africa.

¹⁰ Information retrieved from <http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/2007/03/Anlagen/2007-03-01-g8-schlaglichter-en.property=publicationFile.pdf>, July 7, 2007

Within this framework the focal areas with respect to the global economy were: (1) global imbalances and the agenda for global growth, (2) promotion and protection of innovation, (3) investment, (4) transparency of the international capital markets (Hedge Funds), (5) social shaping of globalization, (6) climate protection, (7) energy efficiency, and (8) raw materials. With respect to the focus on Africa the focal areas were: (1) good governance, (2) sustainable development, (3) peace and security, and (4) strengthening the health care system, fighting HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria (German Federal Government). Within these categories a myriad of issues were to be discussed by the summit participants. The focal areas do not bare any surprises. The global leading economic powers have discussed similar topics throughout the preceding G8 summits. For example, the focal areas of the 2006 G8 summit in St. Petersburg, Russia were global energy security, infectious diseases, and education. The main issues on the agenda at the 2005 G8 summit in Glencages, Scotland were climate change, Africa and development, global economy, oil and trade, regional issues and proliferation¹¹.

Protest organizers used existing alliances and the internet as an information platform for summit related protests. The following actions took place within the provided “choreography of resistance”¹². The organizers called for a march against precarization, caravans for refugee rights, bicycle caravans, regional actions against G8, occupation of “Bombodrom” (an area used by the German military which is supposed to be established as a air-ground bombing range for German, EU, and NATO forces), a demonstration in the city of Rostock, an anti-Nazi demonstration in the city of Schwerin, a concert “Move against the G8”, a day of action on global agriculture (a rally with stops at supermarkets, laboratories for genetically modified animals and crops), a day of action on migration (with panel discussions on activities at refugee camps, deportation authorities, etc.), an action day for education, actions against militarism, war and torture, mass blockades of the access roads to the summit in Heiligendamm, marches to Heiligendamm, and an alternative summit.

11 Information retrieved from <http://www.g8.gov.uk/> and <http://en.g8russia.ru/>, July 7, 2007

12 Information retrieved from <http://de.indymedia.org/2007/05/175755.shtml>, <http://www.g8-2007.de>, <http://antig8.tk/>, <http://www.heiligendamm2007.de>, and <http://www.g8-alternative-summit.org/en/>, July 7, 2007.

Outcome of social protest at the G8

There is no doubt that the protest accompanying the 2007 G8 summit in Heiligendamm received extensive media coverage. However, coverage emphasized the violent nature of the protests and the clashes between police forces and protesters rather than the agenda set forth by the protest organizers. With this in mind one has to question whether the objectives of these organizers aimed at affecting the policy decision-making of the summit leaders were undermined or strengthened. The following part will provide the findings and practical and theoretical interpretations of my analysis of the 2007 G8 summit and the protests surrounding it.

The government will evaluate how to deal with social protest depending on factors not directly related to social protest. One must not assume that the government agents act in the best interest of the people. The state actors' self-interest outweighs the interest of protest, even if the concerns brought up are legitimate. The examined material reveals that policy-makers are more concerned with the manifestations of social protest than with the content of what the social movements addressed. For example the German chancellor Angela Merkel German repeatedly emphasized that she was open for any type of nonviolent protest but would take a strong stand against violence. Even though these statements can be understood as obvious political rhetoric, this position was taken by government authorities. The social protests that have been analyzed for this study often have very clear but at the same time limited objectives in regard to potential satisfactory resolution through policy makers. As mentioned above, the addressed issues were for example agriculture, migration, education, militarism, war and torture. Regardless of the relevance of their claims, the protesters were not speaking the language of the policy-makers. Policy-makers are aware that the mere fact that they are meeting and discussing the issues on their agenda is strongly opposed by the anti-globalization movement. I argue that these movements are of no concern to policy-makers as long as the general public-opinion, i.e. the policy-makers constituency, does not shift. Thus the "danger" for policy-makers stemming from the anti-globalization movement is the conscientization of the larger, silent public. In other words, the conditions for social change (see discussion of Kriesi and Wisler, 1999) were not in place.

The logistics of the G8 summits are highly influenced by the anticipated protests. After extremely violent clashes at the summit in Genoa 2001 leading to the death of a protester, the meetings have been held in rather

isolated rural areas. The demonstrations have drawn attention away from issues on the agenda. Weeks before the summit, mass media was more focused on the preparation by police authorities and the construction of a security fence isolating the entire city of Heiligendamm rather than on the issues to be discussed by the G8 members. The summit itself took place out of public view only allowing the media to cover the summit in a controlled environment.

Selective media coverage and the self-representation of assorted movements minimize the movements' struggles. A German government official was quoted: "I don't think they [the protesters] had any influence at all on the summit. They only influenced the media coverage" (Kirschbaum, 2007). A content analysis of media coverage during the G8 summit shows that the focus indeed was partly taken away from the summit's objectives. However, the focal areas of the organized social movements were lost as well. Headlines such as Protesters fight police, block roads to G8 summit, Protesters attack police after Rostock anti-G8 demo, or Germany warns of left-wing terrorism at G8 summit outweighed the content-related issues of the G8 participants and their protesting counter-parts¹³. The analysis of the organizers' websites revealed that numerous activities indeed had strong content-related messages of social concern. Panel-discussions and informative events of social/public concern were held but not given the necessary public attention. The examination suggests that the forms and objectives of social protest at the G8 summit did not strongly reflect the underlying issues that the protesters wished to address.

Organized social movements intend to increase the salience on issues that differ from the objectives of the G8 summit participants. The issues set forth by the organizers touched upon contents of the G8 summit. However, the call for mobilization was framed rather negatively by keywords such as against, stop, anti, fight, or no (see earlier discussion of Offe, 1985). I maintain that such negative media coverage contributes toward depicting these social movements in a negative light, thus associating them with anarchistic, destructive movements with no interests in the advancement of constructive dialogue with policy makers. The negative frame distracted from the issues

¹³ The media analysis took place by examining the reports by the international news agency Reuters which were re-printed in national and international news media. The archives can be found at <http://www.reuters.com>.

that also differed from the ones discussed by the summit participants. Thus again I argue that the demonstrators did not speak the language of the summit participants.

Violence by splinter groups justifies violent countermoves by authorities against larger groups of social protesters. As the discussion has revealed, numerous social movements created platforms to create nonviolent social actions throughout the G8 summit. Self-declared anarchistic groups disrupted protest events and engaged in violent clashes with the police. As it has already been discussed, these clashes detracted from the true objectives of the organized nonviolent demonstrations. Furthermore, police authorities used the violent encounters to gain control over the violent groups and the entire protest surroundings. Protest organizers strongly condemned the violent clashes between “police and a hardcore group of militants” (Armitage, 2007). I maintain that the differentiation between nonviolent protesters and the violent groups shrunk in the public perception, and along with it, the moral legitimacy of the organized nonviolent social movements. The violence surrounding demonstrations against the G8 will de-legitimize any attempts to raise awareness on issues of global concern that social movements intend to bring to the public through their protests.

By using the ‘instantaneity of the internet’ as a platform, social movements can act as educators and address their issues and objectives in an in-depth manner and reach a virtually unlimited audiences¹⁴. The anti-globalization movements are linked through websites, web-blogs, and email communication. Large unrelated groups can be mobilized for joint protest actions. The process of conscientization of the public can be taken to more profound levels by providing in-depth information on the movements’ objectives with regard to public policy. Through the internet, social movements can create an alternative ‘news’ outlet not covered by the dominant media. According to Sharp (cited in Ameglio, 2006, n.p.), “a basic principle that the logic of nonviolent action entails is that of political judo and jujitsu”. This principle implies that “the adversary’s apparent force and errors are used against him, which demands a public construction and in the

¹⁴ It must be noted that not all social movements have the financial and technical resources to draw from this newly existing information outlets. I am not implying that social movements who cannot make use of the internet cannot spread their information, create networks or act as educators for the public.

medias of some epistemic ruptures in people (and if possible in authority)” (Ameglio, 2006, n.p.). The news media depicted the demonstrations and social movements surrounding the G8 summit in a rather negative light. While the movements' organizers do not have equal access to the mass media platform, they can use the internet as an alternative news outlet to construct a discourse using the force of the media against their adversaries, the G8 leaders. The ‘instantaneity of the internet’ allows social movements to contest moves by the media or government authorities that would have remained undiscovered during earlier times.

Contextual factors determine the extent to which social movements act. In general, the environment surrounding social movements has to be taken into consideration, i.e. no social protest takes place in a political vacuum. The discussed displays of social protest in Germany took place within a protest-friendly environment, as has been shown by the official acceptance of nonviolent protest constantly reiterated by German Chancellor Merkel. Protesters following a creative nonviolent agenda did not have to fear persecution from state authorities. In contrast, social protest challenging the recent election results of the 2008 Presidential elections in Kenya and Zimbabwe took place in threat-laden, violent environments, where manifestation of discontent was dealt with through oppressive manners. I follow Goodwin and Jasper’s (2003) contention that the uses of tactics in social protest are structurally determined by the resources, threats, opportunities and daily lives of the social activists. Factors such as timing, location, participants, and resonance have to be taken into consideration when trying to examine the outcome (Moore, 1999). I am arguing from a social contextualist perspective set forth by Goodwin and Jasper (2003, p. 222) that “protestors in different societies face different political structures within which they must operate ...”. Nevertheless, I maintain that the repertoire of action of social movements has many similarities even though the struggles might be completely disconnected.

Conclusion

The paper has shown that governments will evaluate how to deal with social protest depending on factors not directly related to social protest. The G8 summit’s logistics were largely determined by the anticipated social protest. Throughout the meetings the media coverage minimized the movements’ struggles on a content-basis. The violent splinter groups had a negative impact on the organized nonviolent movements, since the focus was taken

away from the content related issues. Nevertheless, social movements use the internet is used as an instrument for practicing “political judo” by allowing them on a pragmatic level to organize their actions and on a content-level to create an alternative news outlet. In general, the German social context was supportive of social action. Any study of social movements needs to carefully examine contextual factors.

The findings of this study certainly do not mark the end of the road. The empirical data is based on ongoing processes, thus the long-term outcomes are unknown. However, I maintain that every finding as such deserves follow-up research and a more profound analysis with which the assertions can be tested for accuracy. The protest surrounding the 2007 G8 summit can be seen as an opening for elaborative studies on the dialectical relationship between social movements and public policy. One might seek the connection between the literature review that extensively deals with nonviolent social protest and the discussion of the protest surrounding the 2007 G8 summit. Briefly stated, I argue that it is crucial for social movements to create salience of issues through strictly nonviolent action. It is essential for movements to act reflectively and organize themselves guided by the philosophy of nonviolent action. Moral authority and legitimacy can be reached within the larger public audience which then can lead policy makers to consider the claims the social movements share in their protest actions.

If one follows the position that “the rise of the protest movement against neoliberal globalization represents one of the most significant illustrations of social conflict and contentious political behavior of the past several decades” (Ayres, 2004, p. 11), then it becomes clear that social movements need to be studied in the same way as their political counterparts have been studied – as actors in shaping the social and political landscape of any given society.

References

- Ameglio, P. (2006). Civil Resistance and Nonviolence. In International Security, Peace, Development, and Environment, [Ed. Ashok Jhunjhunwala], in Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS), Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK, [<http://www.eolss.net>] [Retrieved May 24, 2007]
- Amenta, E., & Young, M. P. (1999). Social Movements and Public Policy. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 22-41). Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.

- Armitage, T. (2007). German organizers condemn violence at anti-G8 demos. Retrieved July 7, 2007, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/topNews/idUSL0354906320070603>
- Ayres, J. M. (2004). Framing Collective Action Against Neoliberalism: The Case of the "Anti-Globalization" Movement. *Journal of World Systems Research*, 10(1), 11-34.
- Bernstein, M. (2003). The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement. In J. Goodwin & J. M. Jasper (Eds.), *The social movements reader: cases and concepts* (pp. 234-248). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Burstein, P. (1999). Social Movements and Public Policy. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 3-21). Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cleaver Jr., H. M. (1998). The Zapatista effect: The Internet and the rise of an alternative political fabric. *Journal of International Affairs*, 51(2), 621-640.
- Edelman, M. (2001). Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 285-317.
- Fischer, F. (1995). *Evaluating public policy*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (2003). *The social movements reader: cases and concepts*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Grant, R. (2004). Informal Social Movements. In *Conventions, Treaties and other Responses to Global Issues*, [Ed. Gabriela Maria Kutting], in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK, [<http://www.eolss.net>] [Retrieved June 12, 2007]
- Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton, N.J.: Published for the Center of International Studies, Princeton University [by] Princeton University Press.
- Khagram, S., Riker, J. V., & Sikkink, K. (2002). *Restructuring world politics: transnational social movements, networks, and norms*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kirschbaum, E. (2007). G8 protesters claim victory, but was message heard? Retrieved July 7, 2007, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSL08854254>
- Kriesi, H., & Wisler, D. (1999). The Impact of Social Movements on Political Institutions: A Comparison of the Introduction of Direct Legislation in Switzerland and the United States. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 42-65). Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Linstroth, J. P. (2002). *The Basque Conflict Globally Speaking: material culture, media and Basque identity in the wider world*. Oxford Development Studies, 30(2), 205-222.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, D. S. (2003). *Social Movements and Public Policy: Eggs, Chicken, and Theory*, Center for the Study of Democracy. Paper 03-02.
- Moore, K. (1999). Political Protest and Institutional Change: The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and American Science. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 97-115). Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morris, A. (2003). Tactical Innovation in the Civil Rights Movements. In J. Goodwin & J. M. Jasper (Eds.), *The social movements reader: cases and concepts* (pp. 229-233). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Offe, C. (1985). New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics. *Social Research*, 52(4), 817-868.
- Price, R. (2003). Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics. *World Politics*, 55(4), 579-606.

Rucht, D. (1996). The impact of national contexts on social movement structures: A cross-movement and cross-national comparison. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 185-204). Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of nonviolent action*. Boston: P. Sargent Publisher.

Tilly, C. (1999). From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam & C. Tilly (Eds.), *How social movements matter* (pp. 253-270). Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.