Social Movements

Lecture 20
Social Movements Can **Sometimes** Matter!

- Social Norms, Customs, Values, Traditions, Institutions, Movements,…

- Federal, State & Local Political & Regulatory Processes & Institutions

- Federal, State & Local Laws & Regs

- Supply: Diverse Govt. & Private Enterprises

- Markets

- Demand: Households, Firms, Governments, Others

- Flows: Primary Energy $\rightarrow$ Conversion $\rightarrow$ Energy Services

- Stocks: Reserves & Other Assets (e.g. cars, buildings, technologies)
Today’s Agenda

• What are Social Movements?
• How do they differ from other policy actors?
• How do they influence public policy, if they do?
• Impacts on energy & environmental policy?
The Array of Policy Actors:

- Individual Businesses or Households
- Sub-Federal Governments, Tribes
- Organized Interest Groups: e.g. NRA, AFPA, EDF, AFL/CIO, AARP, API, NCI, …
- Political Parties: Republican, Democrat(ic), Green, Whig, …
Social Movements – A few I have known:

• The Civil Rights Movement
• The Anti-Vietnam Ware Movement
• The Environmental Movement
• The Women’s Movement - & Opponents
  ➢ In 1972, the ERA passed the House 354-24 & the Senate 84-8
  ➢ By the end of 1973, 30 states had ratified
  ➢ But only 35/38 had done so by the 1979 deadline
  ➢ Hard to imagine even getting a floor vote today…
• The Anti-Globalization Movement
• The Anti-Nuclear Movement
• The Anti-Fracking Movement
• The Tea Party Movement
• The Occupy Movement
• The Arab Spring: Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, Bahrain, Syria, Lybia
Comparisons with other multi-person policy actors

- Like other actors, social movements (SMs) reflect a set of preferences/ideologies or interests & try to influence public policy

- Unlike political parties, SMs are not a formal part of the political process

- Blurry boundary between SMs & interest groups (IGs)
  - IGs generally part of the system, Lowi: “All established interest groups are conservative” (i.e., resist radical change)
  - IGs have clear constituencies, sometimes members; exercise routine influence (e.g., lobbying, briefs, etc.)
  - SMs tend to be on the margins of the system, without clear membership, & engage in non-routine actions (e.g., marches!)
  - Both vary in resources, organization, tactics (e.g., Greenpeace)
How Can IGs & SMs Affect Public Policy? (Burstein)

- **Direct**: Persuade policy-makers to act – but unlikely if issue can’t affect re-election, may not be necessary if it can; anti-Vietnam?
  - Preferences on an issue will drive votes, $$ only if voters, donors are aware of it & consider it important (high salience) – gun control
- **Information to Policy-makers**: Demonstrate that lots of voters (ideally a majority) feel strongly about an issue – anti-Vietnam?, East Germany
- **Changing Public’s Preferences**: Often by *reframing* an issue, changing how it is understood – e.g., Pro-Life, Obamacare
- **Raising an Issue’s Salience**: Only works if public agrees (C&G ⇒ depends on values) – e.g., climate change, globalization
- **(IGs) Influence Implementation**: inside baseball; easiest when low salience to public, great admin discretion – e.g., Dodd-Frank
Main SM Energy Battle: Nuclear Power (Useem & Zald)

• Politics of nuclear power through 50s & 60s?
  ➢ Dominated by “inside the beltway” industry interest groups
  ➢ Highlight: liability limit passed in 1957
  ➢ AEC promotional & regulatory – “too cheap to meter”

• What happened in the 1970s to change this?
  ➢ Rise of an anti-nuclear movement, grass roots protests
  ➢ After TMI in 1979, no new plants started

• How did industry react?
  ➢ Worked to create a pro-nuclear movement
  ➢ Problem: attaining legitimacy: grass roots v. astroturf

• Did it succeed?
How about environmental policy? (Rucht)

- Contends that the environmental movement has both successes & (more serious) failures
  - Measures v. the past, not v. a but-for world
  - In US & EU, air & water quality notably improved

- Argues that can work via lobbying (IGs), public opinion, individual attitudes, or a green party
  - Other channels (above) harder to measure

![Impact of Environmental Movements](image)
Using various measures, ranks countries on these dimensions & environmental change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental movement pressure</strong></td>
<td>Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, United States</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Spain, France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy</td>
<td>Greece, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Denmark, the Netherlands, Luxembourg</td>
<td>Austria, Canada, Spain, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, United States</td>
<td>Belgium, Great Britain, Greece, Ireland, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green parties</strong></td>
<td>Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland</td>
<td>Great Britain, Sweden</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Spain, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Portugal, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy efforts</strong></td>
<td>Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, United States</td>
<td>Spain, Greece, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in environmental quality</strong></td>
<td>Austria, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, United States</td>
<td>Spain, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarizes with correlations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Environmental movement pressure</th>
<th>Individual attitudes</th>
<th>Green parties</th>
<th>Policy efforts</th>
<th>Changes in environmental quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental movement pressure</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.6144**</td>
<td>0.2820</td>
<td>0.9031**</td>
<td>0.6789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual attitudes</td>
<td>0.6144**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.2670</td>
<td>0.5702*</td>
<td>0.6843**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green parties</td>
<td>0.2820</td>
<td>0.2670</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.4421</td>
<td>0.6045**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy efforts</td>
<td>0.9031**</td>
<td>0.5702**</td>
<td>0.4421</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7919**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in environmental quality</td>
<td>0.6789**</td>
<td>0.6843**</td>
<td>0.6045**</td>
<td>0.7919**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < 0.05   **p < 0.01

Calculations based on values 1, 2, or 3 according to the categorizations weak, medium, and strong, respectively in the previous slide.

• Rucht’s conclusions:
  - Strong environmental movements can drive policy
  - Other factors determine role of green parties, including electoral system – e.g., US
  - Policy alone doesn’t drive the environment

• Persuasive? Comments?
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