

The following content is provided under a Creative Commons license. Your support will help MIT OpenCourseWare continue to offer high quality educational resources for free. To make a donation or view additional materials from hundreds of MIT courses, visit MIT OpenCourseWare at [OCW.mit.edu](https://ocw.mit.edu).

RICHARD SCHMALENSEE: OK. Social movements remind you of the picture we had the first day, and once or twice-- I should have done it more often since-- but on the first day we've been talking about policy making. We did on Monday. We talked mainly about interest groups here, a little bit about regulatory processes. We'll come back to that on Wednesday.

But up here at the top is this vague outside the box-- outside these boxes, at least, category of norms and customs and values and traditions and institutions that we had movements in their, social movements. And that's what we're going to talk about today. We're going to talk about what they are, how they differ from other policy actors, how they work, and briefly, what impacts can we see on energy and environmental policy.

So if you think about who effects policy, there are obviously individual firms or households. And in the US setting you have to think about for federal policy. You have to think about some federal governments that occasionally tribes. What we talked about last time were all of these, this alphabet soup of interest groups that you will find on K Street in Washington, and you'll find various analogs in state capitals. Sometimes they fly in.

For those who don't live in this world, that's the National Rifle Association, the American Forrest Products Association, the Environmental Defense Fund, the AFL/CIO, the Union Organization, the American Association of Retired People, which sends you mailings when you turn 50 to show you're really old. The American Petroleum Institute, the National Coal Institute, and there are many more.

Then there are political parties. Republican, Democrat, or Democratic, depending on which parity you affiliate with. Green parties in lots of places, Whig parties in US history, plenty of other parties in various places. And then social movements.

So the best way I find to think about a social movement is to think about examples. So as I go back to my period of consciousness, there are a number of them that come to mind, and let me just walk through a few. There is the Civil Rights Movement. That's the group gathering to hear Dr. Martin Luther King. Not all those people were paying dues to anything or had membership cards to anything, but they had all come to Washington. Most people would probably call the Civil Rights Movement successful, maybe not.

This is the Anti-Vietnam War Movement. That, of course, is at MIT. This was in 1970. The picture-- and that's some other campus, and this is Washington. The picture I looked for very hard but couldn't find, and I know it exists, is a picture of the then President of MIT, Howard Johnson, marching with a group of students down Mass Avenue with an anti-war banner.

That movement, you might call successful ultimately. But I'm going to come back to this. You might ask, why? Most of those people were too young to vote, so why was that movement successful? Or did the movement have anything to do with ending the war, actually?

This is the environmental movement. That's an early rally. Senator Muskie in Washington-- I think that's in Washington, addressing a group. And the tree hugger on the right, I couldn't resist.

So there you've got the environmental movement. Successful? Maybe, maybe not. Also, you'll notice one of the interest groups I had up there was the Environmental Defense Fund. So one might want to think about where that boundary is, and we'll come back to that.

The Women's Movement. You see there, the-- I think that's the entirety of the Equal Rights Amendment, for which there was also opposition. As regards the Equal Rights Amendment, you could argue that was pretty successful.

Those-- you don't see votes like that anymore. The Equal Rights Amendment phrased on the left passed the House in 1972 354 to 24, in the Senate, 84 to 8. That means there were a lot of Republican votes for it.

30 states ratified it by the end of 1973, but it failed. They needed 38 to pass. It got 35 by 1979. Never got to 30-- all of these pieces of-- all of these amendments have a deadline for ratification.

The deadline here was '79, and it didn't make it and some states rescinded ratification. And I don't think you could get that-- I don't think you could get that Amendment voted on in Congress now, let alone passed. So you've got to ask, was that movement successful?

That was a movement. I mean, you got troops turning out. You got rallies. You got an anti movement. Was that movement successful? What did it do?

This is a more recent one. You may recall the meetings of the World Trade Organization, the International Organization that basically sets trading rules for international trade. For a period, those meetings were dangerous. I don't know whether this is the one in Seattle, but Downtown Seattle got sort of trashed by people who were protesting globalization, protesting the WTO, which is a bunch of bureaucrats who deal with trade disputes and associated it with global injustice. 1999.

That movement failed. I think that's fair to say, right? We have globalized. Trade has not turned back, and that movement has pretty much vanished.

How come? How come some succeed and some fail? This is the anti-nuclear movement. This is international. This is-- that's Germany, [SPEAKING GERMAN]. That's Japan, and that, of course, is Vermont, where the future of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Plant is much debated.

Is that movement successful? That movement start-- well, I'm going to come back to that movement, because we'll talk about that, actually, at some length. But that movement is global. A lot of power plants have been built since that movement started, a lot of nuclear plants still active.

This is the anti-fracking movement, more recently. That's New York, as you see. That's somewhere in Paris, and that, I believe, is Bulgaria.

So it, like the anti-nuclear movement, is fairly broad geographically. Has succeeded in some places, succeeded at least tentatively in New York and in France. I have no idea what the status is in Bulgaria.

The Tea Party movement, look at those numbers. Has the Tea Party movement succeeded? will the Tea Party movement last? How does the Tea Party movement work?

And, of course, on the other side-- by the way, that's impressive. That's Washington. That's Pennsylvania Avenue full of people. This is the opposite side of the coin, the Occupy Movement.

Again, jobs not cuts whereas the-- we want less over here. And jobs not cuts over here. So you have two opposed social movements as we speak.

And then most dramatically, this is a good time for this topic, most dramatically, the Arab Spring. So as you go around, there's Tahrir Square in Egypt. There's Tunisia. There's Yemen.

Government toppled, government toppled, government toppled. Bahrain, protests continuing. Syria, Civil War. Libya, government toppled.

Social movements. OK, there are a lot of them. This is just one slice of history, a recent slice of history. I'm going to come back and talk about some of them. But the first thing we ought to worry about is, what are these things? How are they distinct from other actors?

Certainly, they're trying to influence policy. That's what they're there for. Not always in a coherent way, not always in a well-defined way.

The anti-globalization movement, what exactly did they want? What's the Occupy Movement want? But in any case, they're trying to-- not necessarily with a specific agenda, but they're trying to have some influence.

This is easy. I listed these actors at the start. They're not a formal part of the process. They're not on the ballot. They're not registered. They don't have national committees and slates of candidates formally.

The boundary between a social movement and an interest group, though, and Burstein talks about, this is a little blurrier, right? [? Lowey, ?] whom we read earlier, has this italicized phrase, which is interesting. All established interest groups are conservative. And he means conservative not in the sense of left, right, in the sense of less government, more government, but in the old-fashioned sense of less change, more change.

So he means they are conservative in the sense that interest groups tend to resist radical change. They're part of the system. The American Forrester Products Association has some laws it likes, has some laws it doesn't like, lobbies here, lobbies there. If you said, let's fundamentally rethink the way we do timber, they'd be appalled because that's not what they're there for.

OK. So that's-- and they also tend to be more structured, right? The Environmental Defense Fund has members, has a budget, has offices, has lobbyists, writes papers. They do routine influence. They lobby. They enter briefs in court. They send in petitions.

Social movements tend to be on the margins, tend to be on the margins of the system. Membership is not well defined. Who was a member of the Civil Rights Movement? Who was a member of the anti-war movement, anti-Vietnam movement? Almost everybody I knew did something. None of us had cards.

And they tend to engage in what you'd call non-routine actions, like marches and demonstrations and chaining themselves to fences and all of that stuff. They vary, resources, organization, tactics. Greenpeace is an interesting example, right? Greenpeace is noted for its anti-whaling activities, has ships, intercepts, interferes with whaling. That's a non-routine action.

It also has lobbyists in various capitals to push for various things. So Greenpeace is an interest group in the sense of being organized and having members and dues and stuff, but it also engages in non-standard tactics. But all of the examples social movements I had tend to be without a defined membership.

Who was part of the Arab Spring? Varied from day to day. Who showed up for the demonstrations? Who's part of the anti-Putin movement, to the extent it is a movement, in Russia? Who comes?

Who was part of the anti-war movement? Who was part of the Civil Rights Movement? So the membership tends to be unclear. The actions tend to be non-standard.

The anti-Vietnam movement did engage in massive letter writing campaigns, which is pretty standard. But it also occupied the MIT president's office and various other University presidents offices, which is pretty non-standard. So it's a mixture.

Thoughts about this so far? OK. So how do they work when they work? How might any of these affect public policy? What are the mechanisms?

Why do they matter? What do they ever matter? What are they doing? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: Sometimes, it's trying to show that if a politician does something that these social movements-- or back something these social movements find distasteful, unpopular, [INAUDIBLE] less likely to get elected. [INAUDIBLE] an example might be that [INAUDIBLE] People made it very clear that this was not something they supported, and so politicians backed away from it.

RICHARD So one mechanism is in a sense, they provide information or they demonstrate salience. Salience is awareness.
SCHMALENSSEE: So an issue's salient to me if I'm aware of it and I consider it important.

So you could argue that the anti-Vietnam protests made it clear that, to at least a segment of the population, all of us who could get drafted, we were very aware of what was going on. It was very important to us. We felt strongly.

OK, so they can provide information about salience, about the population's feelings. How else might it work? Yeah, Brendan?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] You could just-- not necessarily motivate the politician. You also motivate other people to come on board.

RICHARD So you might-- well, there are two ways you might do that, right? One way is to change preferences. You could
SCHMALENSSEE: persuade people that-- by getting them to think about it, that this group is right.

You could argue that was a large part of what Martin Luther King did, and the effective leadership of the Civil Rights Movement. It persuaded a lot of people that the current state of affairs was just wrong, full stop, wrong. It blurs with raise salience.

I think these two are hard to separate, because it could be that an awful lot of people in the North were unaware of just how segregated the South was. So you made people aware of it by increasing awareness. That works, of course, if they agree with you. Charlotte?

AUDIENCE: I also think that, going along with the trend of getting more people involved, just having a group makes people who already have that belief, maybe are already aware of the issue, but just unaware of how they could affect it, join together. And then it [INAUDIBLE] just because there are more bodies.

RICHARD So this is--

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: Like attract people, I guess [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD The-- yeah. Yeah. The model Burstein has is that works if it makes a politician rethink, rethink their prospects.

SCHMALENSSEE: And so I guess I'd sort of put that one in a way here. But you'd say it not only demonstrates to politicians that a lot of people care about, it demonstrates to a lot of other people that people care about it.

And that's a lot of the story of the Arab Spring, I think, is you've got a few people who are just sufficiently outraged that they would risk getting shot at. And other people said, well, I feel that way, too, and if they're going to do that, maybe I should do that. And at some point you demonstrate to the regime that it lacks popular support.

And regimes that aren't Democratic tend to not have much idea how much support they have, and it's easy to exaggerate how much support you have. Because every time you go out in public and have a parade, people cheer. Because they-- why wouldn't you cheer? The dictator's going by.

So that's interesting. You can say it sort of rallies people, and I think those are the most plausible ways we've got them. The others-- Burstein looks at people who argue that these somehow persuade, as in a logical sense.

But that's not plausible, he says, and I agree with him, that they're not going to-- you don't march in the streets to make an intellectual argument. You march in the streets to do something else. And if it isn't going to affect re-election, why bother? And if it is, why is the group necessary if the person knows it?

You could argue that the anti-Vietnam demonstrations simply made it inescapable that there was widespread opposition to the war. Public opinion polls said the same thing, but marching in the streets made us all feel better, of course. But also, brought it home.

The other point I'm making here in that second bullet is donors. I mean, gun control is an interesting example of the impact of salience and the impact of an interest group. Polls say that 70% of Americans-- typically, the number varies a little bit, but 70% of Americans would favor some gun control, say limits on assault weapons on campus. You-- or some restrictions on carrying weapons.

But most people don't care much. Every police chief favors gun control. Most people don't care much. People who support the National Rifle Association, who oppose gun control, care a lot, and they win.

Because the fact that I favor gun control is not going to cause me, in most cases, to change my vote on anything, because that's rarely a big campaign issue. If I'm elected, I will enact-- no. That's rarely a campaign issue. So those of us who care a little bit don't do anything, and those who care a lot and have some money have control. So that's a concentrated interest diffuse interest example of some importance.

So the other ways we talked about providing information. You could argue that's what happened in Vietnam. That's what happened in East Germany. When-- I didn't put up the demonstrations that brought down the Berlin Wall, but as distinct from the Arab Spring, nobody got shot, right? That happened quickly.

They talked about the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, talked about in East Germany, nothing much happened. Crowds turned out, crowds turned out. They didn't seize the government buildings. They didn't overrun the president's or prime minister's house.

The government just gave up and left. So I think the argument here is that they provided enormous amount of information to voters that you have no support. You're loathed.

Changing preferences. This often has to do with reframing an issue. Think about the pro-life movement, which is a brilliant piece of reframing.

How can you be against life? I mean, you're for choice, but what's more important, choice or life? So you could argue that reframing the issue as, are you for or against life, has an impact on preferences.

The attacks on the health care legislation by making it Obama's legislation as opposed to, by the way, no pre-existing condition, universal insurance, blah, blah, blah, changes how it's thought of. It's something Obama is shoving down our throats.

And you can argue that Civil Rights did that, that that was the essence of the Civil Rights Movement. That if you saw in real time the marchers being taken down with fire hoses, it was hard not to think, that's just wrong. These people are marching. How can they-- why is that right?

So and you don't do-- King's speeches were important, but watching people peacefully protest being beaten changes your views of the people beating them and of the issue. So part of what they do social movements is theater that changes preferences as well as signals information.

You can raise salience by making people aware of an issue, but it only works if they agree with you, right? I mean, think about globalization, the anti-globalization movement. So they protested globalization. They protested poor working conditions in poor countries, and they trashed Starbucks.

And most people said what? I'm sorry. If you're very sympathetic to poor people, you say, yeah. They should pay people more in poor countries.

And if you're not, you say, well, they don't have to take the jobs, you know? I mean, they're not being forced to work in these factories. It's more fun than being in a village.

So the example-- one of the optional readings, C and G-- I forget now what their initials are-- make the point that among people who are for environmental change and who were opposed to environmental change in a survey, awareness of environmental issues was equal. Values differed. So the policy implications differed.

So you make people aware that there's a lot of international trade, and a lot of what you buy is produced by people in poor countries, one response is, that's really terrible. Another response is, well, that's a market. And if people mainly think, that's a market because that's what they value, making them more aware of an issue won't help.

You could argue the same thing happens with climate change. There's been a lot of work-- I wouldn't call it a movement, but an awful lot of people have spent a lot of time trying to educate people about climate change. It has not produced a groundswell. Quite the contrary.

And the argument is that it comes up against it's a conflict of values. Do you want to have economic growth, or do you want to have environmental protection? We can both be aware of climate change and its issues, but reach very different policy conclusions. So raising salience only works, raising awareness only works if there's agreement or potential agreement, or something like agreement.

And the final way, and this is the borderline-- this isn't really social movement. I think the Burstein article is, nonetheless, a good article. For interest groups, how do interest groups affect policy?

Well, they do all this other stuff, right? The National Rifle Association does advertise, does-- the Environmental Defense Fund does send out mailings to people, so these people do engage in the organized petition drives that do all this. But interest groups work on implementation. That's inside baseball, right? So we'll talk about it in the environmental case next time when we talk about what EPA did to set standards a couple of times.

But the Dodd-Frank law is the big current example, right? You can read about it in the paper all the time. The law required lots of regulations, set up some new entities, and it required this regulation, that regulation. Spell this out, make this clear, hundreds, thousands of regulations required.

No votes in Congress. Really, really boring stuff. Who wins? The people who have offices in Washington, who have lawyers, who have staff, who have resources. It's not a matter of buying votes in regulatory agencies. It's a matter of providing information, lobbying, per the piece we had assigned for last time.

When the issue has low salience to the public-- interchange fees on debit cards I will tell you exercise the entire banking industry, and it may have been in the *Globe* twice on the third business page. Every banker in the country was up in arms. The Federal Reserve was required to regulate that.

It had enormous discretion. It was required to regulate that fee paying due attention to incremental costs. Incremental costs varied all over the lot. Hundreds of submissions went into the Federal Reserve. They made a decision. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: So that's the Durbin Amendment, right?

RICHARD The Durbin Amendment, yep.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: So when that-- so when that was approved, the fact that, for instance, Bank of America started charging monthly fee for people when they use their debit card to try to offset the fact that they couldn't make as much money from marginal cost-- like the marginal revenue that they had before.

RICHARD Yeah.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: But wouldn't that cause people to care a lot? Because at the end of the day, the regular customer was the one who kind of got screwed over a little bit, and the merchants were the ones who won. But wouldn't eventually like people be against the Dodd-Frank?

RICHARD Well, you mean against that Amendment.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: Yeah, yeah.

RICHARD Well, I mean here's-- here are the-- this was a fight in which I participated. Here's what happens in the short run.

SCHMALEENSEE: What happens in the short run is merchants save a little bit on debit card transactions. Not enough to cause them to cut prices, because it's only a little bit.

So one person, one large chain said on a conference call-- I think it was Home Depot-- said on a conference call that that was worth about \$100 million to them, short run profits. So prices don't go down. What happens to banks is checking accounts are now less profitable, so they look to recoup in other ways.

They tried the monthly fee. That didn't work. The easiest thing to do, and what they've done quietly, is they've raised the minimum balances required for free checking. And we'll see the numbers, but checking, because of these fees, if you use the debit card a lot, the bank is-- you're profitable to the bank even if you don't leave a lot of money on deposit.

Take away those fees, you're no longer profitable. So they start raising the minimum requirement for free checking, and the number of people without checking accounts goes up. So, I mean, that's the predictable consequence of the amendment.

It was pushed by merchants, and Senator Durbin talked about his friend, I think it was a hardware store owner or drug store owner, who was being taken to the cleaners by these fees. So he's presumably happy. In the long run, costs get passed through. It's just they're frictions to changing prices, so in the short run they don't.

In the long run, prices adjust up. People pay slightly more if they use cash. So-- but this is a typical-- this is a-- this is an extreme piece of legislation.

It was not debated, really. It got a floor vote-- a quick floor vote, not much material on it anywhere. It said to the Federal Reserve, neglect the fixed costs of running these programs when you set a price.

Wait, what? They have to cover the fixed cost. OK, neglect the fixed costs, and it instructed the Fed to consider marginal cost.

The Fed ran a survey. Marginal costs varied by roughly an order of magnitude across banks. OK, now what do you do? And they came out with a proposed rule.

There was the expected howling. They doubled the ceiling. There was less howling. Life goes on.

But yeah, it'll have the effect of increasing the number of unbanked people. It's not as serious as it used to be not to have a bank account, but it's still pretty serious. So yeah. The Durbin Amendment, you follow this stuff. That's amazing. It's not even energy.

Anything else while I pause for breath and anecdote? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: Can you tell us a little bit about the role that social media has played like how to mobilize all these different publics? Like, I can see with Occupy Wall Street and Occupy Everything how [INAUDIBLE] come together. I saw that. But something like the Civil Rights Movement--

RICHARD But it's a little less clear, isn't it, how-- the Occupy Movement, I find mysterious. Because the Civil Rights
SCHMALENSSEE: Movement had a set of charismatic leaders. It had some clear objectives, and it had great media coverage, right? I mean, when those kids went to-- where was it that the Civil rights workers got shot? Selma, maybe?

Boy, that coverage of three college students go down to help the black community organize in Selma, Alabama and get shot for their troubles, that woke people up in an amazing way. And when you watch them fire hose the marchers, that was galvanizing. And when Dr. Martin Luther King spoke, that was, oh, gee. There is something here.

Occupy was mysterious. Occupy just happened. I don't know. I don't know.

These things-- and the anti-globalization, similarly. What was-- I can point to triggering events. You go back to the Rosa Parks refusing to sit in the back of the bus, people moving into integrated lunch counters, all of this getting media attention. I can see-- the triggering events in Civil Rights were clear.

The triggering event in Vietnam was pretty clear. It just went on and on, and thinking about thousands of people chanting, hey, hey, LBJ. How many kids did you kill today? Those are pretty dramatic things.

But Occupy, I don't know what triggered Occupy. I also don't know what triggered the anti-globalization movement. We know the Arab Spring. We know it was the-- normally, there's something. The guy in Tunisia who burned himself to death in protest.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] but like how people are mobilizing come together.

RICHARD Well, now you-- now people point to, particularly in the case of Egypt, it was much discussed social media. You
SCHMALENSSEE: can organize through Twitter and Facebook and various other connections, and just things going viral in a variety of ways through people's personal networks. You can organize. Vietnam was posters. There will be a rally today,

AUDIENCE: There was a leader that called it all.

RICHARD There were people who appointed themselves leaders. You put up a poster and you say there's going to be a
SCHMALENSSEE: demonstration today in [INAUDIBLE] well, it was then the great court, nobody had to show up. If people weren't ready to do something, you can imagine calling a rally and nobody comes. That happens often enough.

This, as far as I know, and undoubtedly there's-- people have written boring papers on it, but it strikes me just as an observer of history that it's a bit mysterious what does it. It's a bit mysterious.

So guy burns himself to death in Tunisia. Why does that spread? What triggers that?

Did somebody in Egypt set himself up or herself up as a leader and began saying, hey, we're going to meet in the square tomorrow, and then gradually it built. It did build from a relatively small group.

But in Moscow, there are protests that have lost, have plainly lost. Their anti-Putin protests in Russia, they were small. I don't know how they happened.

They weren't sufficient. They dissipated. So it doesn't always happen. Doesn't always happen. Andrew?

AUDIENCE: Just as-- it might be an extreme, could someone argue that, especially in, say, for the Arab Spring movements, that violence or the threat of violence, or blackmail or the threat of just physically destroying something is a means of affecting public policy? So not votes, just the fact that there's a big body out there that will affect the way the country is run. So let's read their demands.

RICHARD Well, a standard thing that happens, although in France it tends to be well organized, mass strikes. You can call
SCHMALENSSEE: it-- you call a general strike. And if the general strike is effective, you've demonstrated that you have the-- that enough-- you've demonstrated there are enough people care enough about the issue to do something.

I don't know if it has to be physical violence, but I think it has to be an action. Because that's how you demonstrate that you care, right? I mean, now, of course, you just send an email to Congress. No, that doesn't really say that you're very excited about the issue. If you go out and march, you stand in the hot sun for a few hours, it demonstrates it.

The story of the Civil Rights Movement is kind of the reverse, right? There was no threat of violence from the activists. It was the violence from those acting against them that really built support. It was Dr. King's nonviolent strategy which worked beyond anything I've seen.

In the anti-Vietnam, people were pretty nonviolent, too. I don't think it mattered much. Occupy has been nonviolent. The Tea Party, been a little shrill but nonviolent.

Tea Party's had some effect politically in the Republican Party. The Occupy Movement seems to have vanished in the night. So it's a little bit mysterious.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] because you mentioned strikes. Because one another where would that category [INAUDIBLE] So say some people said, I don't know, like tomorrow all bus drivers decided that they want to strike. So for some reason actually that's more pertinent in Europe where transportation is, but I guess I've seen it happen.

RICHARD Those are those tend to be very heavily union. That's why I talked about a general strike.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: So I was going to say, even for a union. So because it's a relatively small body, but because it exhibits a big-- a lot of power and the fact that we will have buses or the subway tomorrow, will bother a bigger majority of people. And basically, that's almost like blackmail.

So you're influencing what the majority of people is thinking about this issue. It's not that it's directly influencing what you're asking for, which could be wages for bus drivers. But they're so frustrated that we don't have buses, so OK, let's give them the wages because they're causing all this--

RICHARD But it can fail. It could fail. There was a-- I was reading recently a fictionalized treatment of the famous police
SCHMALENSSEE: strike in Boston in 1919.

That strike, police hadn't been paid. They were underpaid, hadn't gotten a raise in 30 years kind of thing, badly underpaid. They struck. There was a crime wave.

The police completely lost the popular sympathy, and lots of them were fired and jailed and all kinds of things. So that was the threat. They carried out the threat. People got very, very angry, made Calvin Coolidge president because of how drastically he reacted against the strike.

So it's not necessarily a winning strategy. It's not necessarily a winning strategy. Another hand? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: I'm confused by the difference between the first and the second strategies.

RICHARD The first-- yeah. I must say reading that reading the paper, I was a little confused about his argument, too. He

SCHMALENSSEE: said, well, can you just walk in and say, I'm opposed to the Vietnam War. I've got-- there are bunch of us and here are my arguments. And I think what he's saying is, that's not going to work.

Social movements work by demonstrating that it matters to enough people, that you have to take it into account. And if the policymaker knows that it matters enough to a lot of people, you don't need a social movement. And if it doesn't-- Occupy-- if it doesn't, the movement won't have any effect. I think that's what he's saying.

In my money, in social movements, what you want to think about is to think about these three. Are you persuading people that a lot of people care? Are you making-- changing people's preferences toward an issue? Are you making them more aware of an issue and making it more important?

You could be aware of fracking. You could make it more important in people's-- in people's minds by providing information. You could raise salience either by awareness or on the important side.

And this is an inside baseball story. So I share your confusion about the first. I confess, I read his argument on the first one and I said, well, what would that look like?

The closest thing I can think of is maybe in Vietnam there was some persuasion, but I think what Vietnam was all about was this, was letting people know that a large part of the population was passionate. And that's what happened in Czechoslovakia, in East Germany, and generally throughout Eastern Europe.

Once it became clear the Russians weren't going to intervene militarily, and it became clear to the government that they had no popular support, game over. Game over. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: I'm not sure if I'm correct, but my theory, my [INAUDIBLE] theory for the Occupy Movement, is that it wasn't necessarily [INAUDIBLE] by any particular event. However, there was-- since the financial crisis and then all the economic problems that were happening in the country. I think there were just a lot of people unsatisfied with the current status. But I don't think that would have been enough to trigger that movement in-- for this particular case.

I think the actual people, the initial leaders who tried to convince people, those are really the key players. I don't think that's something that would have-- that was bound to happen, regardless of whether or not someone had started. I don't think it would have been something that if it didn't happen then, it would have happened two months after.

I just think that the people who initially organized it did a really good job. They [INAUDIBLE] this anarchy concept of-- they had all those masks of that movie *V for Vendetta*. And they [INAUDIBLE] that image, and they were just very secretive about how they attracted people. They became viral and [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD Became viral, but what's interesting is you point to the particular leaders. I mean, they occupied Portland,

SCHMALENSSEE: Oregon for heaven's sakes. What was that about? This was a protest against global capitalism?

Have you been to Portland, Oregon? I mean, this is not the financial hub of the Western world with millions of people getting rich on the backs of the masses, right? It's a pretty mellow place.

But they occupied Portland. So they occupied a lot of places. I give up. Let me move on. Yeah, Julian?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD I was going to try, but undoubtedly as profound. Give it a shot.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: I think, [INAUDIBLE] it's kind of the precipitation of a general sentiment that the government isn't necessarily benefiting [INAUDIBLE] I feel like [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD Which is exactly what the Tea Party people thought, too, which is interesting. I mean that's it. There's something

SCHMALENSSEE: wrong in Washington, something wrong with a different diagnosis.

AUDIENCE: Different diagnosis. I mean, very different ideas in the Tea Party movement. But it's just a general precipitation of some things wrong you don't necessarily like it from a financial statement. The grand majority of people that took place in-- they don't necessarily know what is wrong or exactly how to fix it to begin with. So I think that's one of the reasons why it died out is that it just became a general shout of, I'm angry.

RICHARD Yeah.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] nothing--

RICHARD And you saw a lot of movements of the, I'm angry variety during the Great Depression, from both left and right.

SCHMALENSSEE: So it does-- you do get this in hard times. There was a-- I think sometime in the '30s, there was a World War I veterans March on Washington because pensions weren't adequate. And you got the rise of both extreme left and extreme right political groups on the grounds that it's just not right.

The Tea Party movement has more heft because it actually has clearer objectives, right? There's a caucus in Congress. There are relatively organized groups in some congressional districts.

Tea Party backing is a big deal. They have a convention, so they've made themselves into an interest group from a movement, interestingly enough. With a little incoherence.

There was a split between the Boston Tea Party and the Worcester Tea Party recently, so they had separate rallies. The Worcester Tea Party said, we're all about low taxes and limited government and stuff like that. And the Boston Tea Party said, yeah, and we hate gay marriage, too. And the Worcester people said, no, maybe we ought to just stay focused. So they split. Anyway.

OK. To get a little closer to this course and a little less abstract, there's an interesting-- the other assigned paper is [INAUDIBLE] which is about nuclear power. And they trace the partial evolution of the politics here.

What did the politics of nuclear power look like in the '50s and '60s? Movements, interest groups, what? That was a hand? No, it was not waving. OK. Yeah. Brandon, you got it. OK.

AUDIENCE: I think it was kind of like, let's do this. This is gonna be-- it's gonna cost pennies to-- it's going to cost you penny--

RICHARD Too cheap to meter was the phrase. Too cheap to meter.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: It was very enthusiastic. The navy was going nuclear. There was a lot of proliferation technology out there so these reactors were ready to build.

RICHARD And the politics was industry interest groups, right? There were-- the paper labeled a bunch of them. The big

SCHMALENSSEE: thing, their big win was there's a limit still in force on the liability of any-- related to any nuclear facility.

The Atomic Energy Commission was regulatory, but it also was promoting Atomic Energy as well as regulating. So it was like the early years of airline travel where what politics there was was positive, industry groups dominated, inside the beltway stuff. Not much in the media, except for cheap, swell, good, clean, et cetera.

What happened in the '70s? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: It was a combination of a movie called *The China Syndrome* that came out and then Three Mile Island--

RICHARD *China Syndrome* might have been a little later, but go ahead. Not much later.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: They were similar. [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD It followed Three Mile Island a little bit.

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] Three Mile Island happened, which seemed to mimic the movie with like, oh geez, this is reality. It's actually dangerous.

RICHARD And you began to get a different kind of politics, right? Politically, what did you get?

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD I showed you. What was on that slide? You've got an anti-nuclear movement. You've got people marching. You've

SCHMALENSSEE: got protests.

All of a sudden, you had these industry groups in Washington with guys in suits and other capitals for that matter. It wasn't just an American phenomenon. And then you begin to have those German marchers and the Japanese marchers and Vermont is recent, but you had American marchers. You began to get an anti-nuclear movement with protests. And after Three Mile Island, the industry stopped.

Now this is the neat part, which I actually wasn't aware of until I saw the article. What did the industry try to do to react to this? Do you have the guys in suits in Washington? Are they a good reaction? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: They tried to form their own pro-nuclear movement.

RICHARD They try to do a pro-nuclear movement. Did it work?

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: Not really.

RICHARD How come?

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: Well, the article mentions like the anti-nuclear movement came from the people, and they all felt like he-- or that an industry-backed movement [INAUDIBLE] so they were set apart from the masses. And then [INAUDIBLE]

RICHARD So they tried to do it, but they really had trouble making it authentic. The anti-nuclear movement was mom and

SCHMALENSSEE: pop and your uncle and people really upset, and the pro-nuclear movement was industry people with their ties off. The phrase they use in the businesses to distinguish between grassroots and AstroTurf. Grassroots movements are really genuine and reflect popular sentiment. AstroTurf is created, right?

You can see it when you get emails-- when a congressional office gets emails on an issue and they're all identical. You say, oh. That's AstroTurf. Somebody is really pushing people to send-- somebody's saying to all their employees, send this email.

That's not people being passionate. And it just didn't work, didn't work. It was an attempt to create a movement to affect energy policy. Didn't work.

There's not a lot of social movements in energy directly. You see them more on the environmental side. And the piece by [? Rooked-- ?] but environmental movements affect energy, so it's worth talking about.

That's a depressing article, if you read the first part in a bad mood. Because he says the environment's gotten worse and species are getting extinct, and we're depleting natural resources. I would just argue that he's measuring against the past, not against what would have happened but for the environmental movement since the air and the water in US and Europe and many other places has improved notably. Nobody believes that, but those are the numbers.

He argues-- so he's trying to be quantitative. He says that an environmental movement can work through lobbying, can work through public opinion, can work through individual attitudes, or through a Green Party, as exist in some countries. And the reason he does this rather than thinking about the ways we just finished talking about, the more general ways, is he's got measures of all these things.

He's got measures of how big the green movement is. He's got measures of public opinion. He's got measures of attitudes of various kinds, and he certainly knows whether there's a Green Party that gets any votes.

So he can measure these channels, and he gives you this nice picture. So environmental movements react to environmental problems. I think interpreted largely via sciences is a little too optimistic, but perceive problems they can lobby.

They can be an interest group. The Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club. There are more. I'm trying to think of a few, but they lobby as well as do other things.

And so here are his channels. So he has this very interesting table. Based on a set of measures, he looks at the strength of environmental pressure groups. He looks, based on opinion polls, attitudes toward the environment. Is there a Green Party, and how strong is the policy and what's happened to the environment?

It's interesting, the US scores high in terms of the environmental pressure group. We're kind of in the middle in terms of attitudes. We don't have a Green Party. A lot of places don't have green parties, and we're kind of in the middle on policy efforts, which I think is, compared to these countries, I think is not far off the mark roughly.

And we're in the middle in terms of Environmental Quality. I forget how he measures that. That's a tough one because he's got so many different things.

But this is the summary, his summary of how these work. And I must say-- so what he did was-- to be clear, the US gets a three here. It gets a two here. It gets a one here.

It gets a one there. And a one-- sorry, a two there and a two there. This is three. This is two. This is one.

And then he looks at correlations, which is not obviously the right way to do it. It's not, I would say, the wrong way to do it. But here they are.

OK. So reading across, an environmental pressure group is most strongly associated with the strength of policy across countries. Has very little to do with whether there's a Green Party or not, the stars or statistical significance. Very little to do with whether there's a Green Party or not.

Why don't we have a Green Party in the United States? Brendan?

AUDIENCE: I thought we did. Wasn't that Ralph Nader [INAUDIBLE]?

RICHARD Oh. Is that what he called it? OK. We might have once. We don't have one now. They do in Germany. Various
SCHMALENSSEE: other countries do.

Well, Julian?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] it's just insignificant.

RICHARD It's what?

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: It's just insignificant.

RICHARD Insignificant. Yeah. Well, maybe that's it. Why don't we have one that's significant?

SCHMALENSSEE:

AUDIENCE: Well, we've always been heavily polarized [INAUDIBLE] Democrats or Republicans. It's really hard for any party to break into that and make a three party system, especially a Green, which is like a subset of the Democratic party.

RICHARD It's very important. Our electoral rules are pretty important as they are in some countries. In some countries, you
SCHMALENSSEE: vote for the party, not the candidate. And the party has representation in parliament, depending on the percentage of the votes it gets.

In that case, a Green Party could get 5%, 6% of the votes and have somebody in Washington. Here, you've got to win a majority to get into the house, to get into the Senate. It's very tough for third parties of any kind in our system.

Not in all systems. I wouldn't say we're heavily-- we're heavily polarized now. The Republican and Democratic parties used to overlap more. You used to actually have conservative Democrats who were more conservative than liberal Republicans, believe it or not.

So one of the reasons for this is electoral laws. But it's-- this is the strongest correlation he's got. And that's between the importance of environmental pressure groups and the strength of policy efforts to preserve the environment, which is sort of interesting. He says the environmental movement does matter.

He called-- the environmental movement pressure. If you think about it in the US, we don't actually have a lot of marches and rallies for the environment. We have interest groups in Washington. The Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, the this, the that. So there are not a lot of non-conventional actions being done to save the environment.

There was a time in the Pacific Northwest when people would drive iron spikes into trees to prevent logging. You don't hear much of that anymore. You don't hear people chaining themselves to a nuclear power plant much anymore.

So at this point, we're lobbying. Other places, stronger. The other interesting correlation is how much stronger the correlation between environmental movement pressure and policy is than between movement pressure and his measure, at least, of changes in the environment. And part of that has to do with where you are and what the natural conditions are, right?

Policy efforts in Los Angeles are extraordinary. Los Angeles has dirty air. I don't think there's a European country that takes as much pain to preserve air quality as there is done in the Los Angeles basin. It's just really hard. It just doesn't ventilate. So the notion that-- and if you're highly-- if it's a very dense country, it's kind of hard to preserve species against development and so on and so forth.

So, I don't know. You believe the-- are you persuaded by the article? Comments on it? Does that actually seem like a plausible description of interest group, of environmental politics?

And I would notice also that the difference-- the link between-- and, again, causation is an inference. Its correlation is all we measure. The link between individual-- between environmental pressure and attitudes isn't that great, which makes sense in the US, right? Because the Sierra Club isn't trying to persuade you and me. It's trying to persuade Congress and the EPA. So if it's successful there, it wins.

Individual attitudes and policy, not that strong either. Not that strong a correlation. So this is sort of a picture of lobbying where the environmental movement acts directly on policy. Doesn't act indirectly, seems to me, through parades, mass marches, demonstrations, and any of those other mechanisms.

I think that's a fair description of the movement now in the US. Yeah?

AUDIENCE:

Seems to me, seems pretty reasonable even though it's correlation not causation, right? Because although one can make the argument that interest groups [INAUDIBLE] people would come out after certain policy is made. It seems to me that the more logical flow would be for information-- for those groups to be formed initially and then the policy is made. So even though he proved only correlation, I think that that flow makes more sense.

RICHARD Oh, yeah. No. It's not-- is not from-- in fact, it can go the other way. Because when Reagan basically declared war
SCHMALENSEE: on environmental policy, the memberships of those groups soared because they saw a threat. And the groups sent out mass mailings, saying, look what this guy is trying to do to the environment, and the money flowed in.

So the question of, are they exerting pressure? Yes, but in that case, they were exerting more pressure in a much more hostile environment politically. So yeah. I think that the direction is generally right. Any other comments? Yeah, Charlotte?

AUDIENCE: I guess-- I know he had a system for doing all this, but it seems like you could come up with a different system and get different results. And--

RICHARD You're just not a natural sociologist. You're just--
SCHMALENSEE:

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE] apply to this.

RICHARD Yeah, well-- but this raises a general problem in social science. In economics, we get lucky because you have
SCHMALENSEE: dollars and quantities and tons and stuff. This is sociology. What have you got?

You've got attitudes. You've got some ill-defined measures of this, that, and the other. You want to say, are environmental groups effective? It seems to me you're stuck doing something like this.

You could do it well or poorly. I think this is pretty good. I'm still not-- I hadn't thought about it much, but it just didn't strike me that just running ordinary correlations is quite the right way to do it.

But there's no obviously better way that comes to mind. I don't know. What would you do?

AUDIENCE: I think I'd be more persuaded by case studies where it did work in the case where there was a Green Party or wasn't a Green Party, or didn't work in that sort of case. I think I'd be able to relate to that more. And I know that's not as general as what he's trying to do here--

RICHARD Yep.
SCHMALENSEE:

AUDIENCE: --but I think that maybe he makes it too general. Like, what's the difference between a 0.6 and a 0.7 on his little scale? That doesn't mean anything to me.

RICHARD No, I'm sort of with you. I'd prefer to understand one or two cases well than 18 cases badly. The issue he's-- well,
SCHMALENSEE: it's a general problem, right?

You do a case study. You have a study where n equals 1, right? You can't test the hypothesis with n equals 1. So if you're interested in testing a hypothesis, say, environmental movements operate mainly through individual attitudes, you can't do n equals 1.

You could probably do before and after in a case study. You could try it. But, of course, you can't hold everything else constant.

No, I'm sympathetic. I'm not excited about uni-dimensional measures of policy efforts, right? I mean, US policy is stronger than some of those other countries on some dimensions and weaker on others.

European tax systems favor use of diesels. Diesels produce small particulates. Small particulates have terrible health effects. So are they more environmentally conscious than we are because they recycle or more, or are we more environmentally conscious because we avoid diesels?

Very hard to do. Yeah. No, I take the point. Anybody else?

OK. We will, Wednesday, talk about US environmental policy, walking through the case study and looking beyond it. So please read that. And for those of you who came late, Monday we will see if we can find a guest speaker for an hour, and we'll do an hour's soft shoe on-- a half an hour soft shoe on green growth, reflecting the will of a narrow majority.