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ABSTRACT

What happened to the globalization movement in the United States? Since September 11, 2001, large-scale protest in the U.S. has predominantly targeted aspects of the so-called “War on Terror” and the Bush administration’s policies more broadly, rather than on issues related to economic globalization and trade liberalization. Although from the outside, these protest events seem to be unrelated instances of citizens mobilizing to express their dissatisfaction, this paper argues that they are related. Building off of the research on cycles of protest and those who have theorized about movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest, this paper explores what happens to social movements within the context of increasing political repression. Using data collected through two stages of surveys with protesters who were randomly sampled at
INTRODUCTION

With the 1999 protests against the World Trade Organization in Seattle, social scientists have increasingly studied the globalization movement. Significant attention has been devoted to understanding the ways in which this movement represents a new form of transnational contention and how this movement is different from earlier movements (e.g., Ancelovici, 2002; Ayres, 2001; Bandy & Smith, 2004; della Porta & Tarrow, 2004; Fisher, Stanley, Berman, & Neff, 2005; Guidry, Kennedy, & Zald, 2001; Meyer & Tarrow, 1998; O'Brien, Goetz, Scholte, & Williams, 2000; Risse-Kappen, 1995; Rothman & Oliver, 1999; Smith & Johnston, 2002; Smith, Chatfield, & Pagnucco, 1997; Tarrow, 2001, 2005; Tilly, 2004, Chapter 5; but see Atwood, 1997; Boli & Thomas, 1999; Cortright & Pagnucco, 1997; Korey, 1998). As has been noted by Ayres and Tarrow (2002), in the wake of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, political repression has escalated “both in the United States and elsewhere” (p. 1). Concurrent with this heightened repression, protest in the United States has shifted away from issues related to globalization—such as trade liberalization and the policies of international financial institutions—to focus on the so-called “War on Terror” and the policies of the Bush Administration more broadly. This paper explores the relationship between these seemingly unrelated protest movements and studies them as components of one specific cycle of protest.

In particular, I build off of the work by scholars who have explored the relationship between movements within a cycle of protest to understand how collective action changes in the wake of political repression. In this paper, I focus particularly on how the globalization movement in the United States was redirected to protest the War on Terror and the policies of the Bush Administration since September 2001. Presenting data collected from five large-scale protests in the United States between 2002 and 2004, I show that there are significant similarities among these protesting populations. Moreover, I contend that these movements are all part of one specific cycle of protest within which collective action shifted in the wake of increased political repression. This paper is separated into three sections. First, I review the literature on cycles of protest and the research that looks at social movement transmission within cycles of protest. Second, I present data collected through two stages of surveys and interviews in order to better understand how recent protests are connected and how movements change in response to political repression.

STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS CYCLES

Scholars have studied the connections between social movements (e.g., Buechler, 1990; Evans, 1980; Minkoff, Zald & McCarthy, 1980). Nonetheless, the research tends to provide a “high privileges structure over process and focus” (p. 218). Although there has been some level of agreement by their predecessors that there is yet to be a consensus regarding the connection between collective action changes in response to the dynamics of movement-to-movement social movement spillover (Meyer & Tilly, 2004, Chapter 5; but see Atwood, 1997; Boli & Thomas, 1999; Cortright & Pagnucco, 1997; Korey, 1998). As has been noted by Ayres and Tarrow (2002), in the wake of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, political repression has escalated “both in the United States and elsewhere” (p. 1). Concurrent with this heightened repression, protest in the United States has shifted away from issues related to globalization—such as trade liberalization and the policies of international financial institutions—to focus on the so-called “War on Terror” and the policies of the Bush Administration more broadly. This paper explores the relationship between these seemingly unrelated protest movements and studies them as components of one specific cycle of protest.

In particular, I build off of the work by scholars who have explored the relationship between movements within a cycle of protest to understand how collective action changes in the wake of political repression. In this paper, I focus particularly on how the globalization movement in the United States was redirected to protest the War on Terror and the policies of the Bush Administration since September 2001. Presenting data collected from five large-scale protests in the United States between 2002 and 2004, I show that there are significant similarities among these protesting populations. Moreover, I contend that these movements are all part of one specific cycle of protest within which collective action shifted in the wake of increased political repression. This paper is separated into three sections. First, I review the literature on cycles of protest and the research that looks at social movement transmission within cycles of protest. Second, I present data collected through two stages of surveys and interviews in order to better understand how recent protests are connected and how movements change in response to political repression.
United States from 2002 to 2004, this recent protest movements are connected to political repression.
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World Trade Organization in Seattle, understanding the ways in which this transnational contention and how this movements (e.g. Ancelovici, 2002; Ayres, Tarta & Tarrow, 2004; Fisher, Stanley, Aundy, & Zald, 2001; Meyer & Tarrow, Williams, 2000; Risse-Kappen, 1995; Johnston, 2002; Smith, Chatfield, & Tilly, 2004, Chapter 5; but see Atwood, Bitt & Pagnucco, 1991; Korey, 1998). As Bow (2002), in the wake of the terrorist 11th, 2001, political repression has and elsewhere (p. 1). Concurrent with the United States has shifted away from as trade liberalization and the polices to focus on the so-called “War on Terrorism” more broadly. This seems these presumably unrelated protest movements of one specific cycle of protest. Work by scholars who have explored the concept of a cycle of protest to understand the wake of political repression. In this movement in the United States on Terror and the policies of the post-9/11. Presenting data collected from United States between 2002 and 2004, I show among these protesting populations. Movements are all part of one specific cycle of action shifted in the wake of increased paraded into three sections. First, I revisit and the research that looks at social cycles of protest. Second, I present data collected through two stages of surveys with protest participants at five large-scale protest events in the United States. Third, I discuss the implications of these findings to our understanding of contemporary cycles of protest and the ways that social movements respond to political repression.

STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AS CYCLES OF PROTEST

Scholars have studied the connections between social movements for years (e.g. Buechler, 1990; Evans, 1980; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Morris, 1984; Zald & McCarthy, 1980). Nonetheless, as McAdam (1995) points out, much of the research tends to provide a “highly static view of collective action that privileges structure over process and single movements over cycles of protest” (p. 218). Although there has been a recent increase in research on the relationship between social movements, the scholarship is constrained by differing terms that refer to similar aspects of collective action. In addition there is yet to be consensus regarding which perspective best explains how collective action changes in response to political repression. Scholars exploring the dynamics of movement-to-movement transmission have studied social movement spillover (Meyer & Whittier, 1994), the relationship between initiator and spin-off movements (McAdam, 1995), and the sequencing of social movements (Minkoff, 1997). Although all these studies focus on different aspects of the connections between movements, there has been some level of agreement by their authors that movements can be better understood by looking at them within what Tarrow has called a “cycle of protest.” In the pages that follow, I review the scholarship that has presented details on the relationship between social movements, paying particular attention to the ways each theory conceptualizes political repression’s role in the process through which activism breeds activism.

Cycles of Protest

Building off of Tilly’s (1978, 1986) work on repertoires of contention (see also the volume edited by Traugott, 1995), the notion of the cycle of protest was conceived by Tarrow (1993) to explain the broad process of the mobilization through which innovations in collective action are diffused. In his more recent work, Tarrow (1998) defines a cycle of contention as “a phase of heightened conflict across the social system: with a rapid diffusion of
collective action frames; a combination of organized and unorganized participation; and sequences of intensified information flow and interaction between challengers and authorities” (p. 142; see also Tarrow, 1991, 1993, 1994; the volume edited by Traugott, 1995). Within this work, the author states that cycles begin with what he calls “early risers” who mobilize when they perceive that there is a political opportunity. The collective action then diffuses to include “latecomers.” Implicit to the cycle of protest is the recognition that many forms of collective action can take place during a period of time and that they are related as part of a distinct cycle. After conflict widens, protest becomes routinized with “more conventional protests with more instrumental goals” becoming common (Tarrow, 1991, p. 53). Although Tarrow (1998) points out that the end of such cycles of protest are “diverse,” he states that “as the cycle winds down... polarization spread[s] and the initiative shifts to elites and parties” (p. 160).

Tarrow (1993) also discusses the role of political repression in his work on cycles of protest. He states that collective action will not “cease just because a particular group has been satisfied, repressed, or becomes tired of life in the streets” (pp. 285–286). Instead, in the face of repression, collective action changes. More recently, Tarrow (1998) has suggested that radicals push for “more violent forms of action” when the state becomes repressive (p. 150). This radicalization is likely to lead to the defection of more moderate participants. In his own words, “the spiral of tactical innovation [in the form of disruptive collective action] contributes to a decline in mass participation” (Tarrow, 1991, p. 55). Thus, the author sees political repression leading to increased violence, which tends to turn-off more mainstream movement participants.4

By looking at cycles of protest, we can see the ways that multiple forms of contention against various targets during a specific period of time are interrelated and build off of the initial sense of political opportunity. Within his discussion of the “elements of cyclicity,” Tarrow discusses the role of new frames of meaning. He states: “Protest cycles-characteristically produce new or transformed symbols, frames of meaning and ideologies that justify and dignify collective action and around which a following can be mobilized” (p. 286). Here, the author builds off of the work on framing and frame alignment (e.g. Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986; Snow & Benford, 1992; see also Gamson, 1992). In fact, Snow and Benford (1992) themselves highlight the importance of framing in movement-to-movement transmission within cycles of protest: “movements that surface early in a cycle of protest are likely to function as progenitors of master frames that provide the ideational and interpretive anchoring for subsequent movements within the cycle” (p. 144). In other words, cycles can be seen as one of the central themes of research on such cycles and periods.

Even with the utility of the notion of cycles and periods, “they occupy no clearly demarcated place in the literature” (p. 143). There are, however, those that do, to some degree, build off of the more specificity to understanding the movement to movement transmission takes place. In the section perspective paying particular attention to alignment and political repression in movement-to-movement transmission.

Social Movements

Perhaps one of the earliest clear and specific transmission within a cycle of protest was Tarrow (1994) in their work on “social movement spillover...of the style, participants, and organization boundaries to affect other social movements.” (p. 277, emphasis in original). The authors United States frequently involve a diversity of demands. The “laundry list” of demands... A bellwether group of activists view as either the most promising vehicle for action, comes to share similar or related concerns” (Mayer, 1999). The diversity of interests of the organizers in the movement, spillover becomes possible.

Looking specifically at the connections in the United States Peace Movement in the 1960s, that participants of social movements who consider more critical: “as a movement with a set of issues, its personnel and organization challenge to another set of issues” (Burr, 1992). Movement spillover to the connection with other liberation movements, see Valocchi, one of the targets is the product of differing proponents.
Within this work, the author calls "early risers" who mobilize when opportunity. The collective action then to the cycle of protest is the recognition can take place during a period of of a distinct cycle. After conflict widens, more conventional protests with more on (Tarrow, 1991, p. 53). Although such cycles of protest are "diverse," own ... polarization spread[s] and the (p. 160).

The use of political repression in his work on he will not "cease just because repressed, or becomes tired of life in the face of repression, collective action has suggested that radicals push for the state becomes repressive (p. 150). the defection of more moderate part-tactical innovation [in the form of to a decline in mass participation] (p. 277, emphasis in original). The authors acknowledge that protests in the United States frequently involve a diversity of organizations "that address a 'laundry list' of demands ... A bellwether issue, generally representing what activists view as either the most threatening and urgent problem or the most promising vehicle for action, comes to unify a broad spectrum of groups that share similar or related concerns" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 290). Owing to the diversity of interests of the organizations and participants involved in the movement, spillover becomes possible.

Looking specifically at the connections between the women's movement and the U.S. Peace Movement in the 1980s, Meyer and Whittier (1994) find that participants of social movements change their focus to issues that they consider more critical: "as a movement shifts into abeyance on one set of issues, its personnel and organizations may switch the grounds of the challenge to another set of issues" (p. 279; for an application of social movement spillover to the connections between the political left and gay liberation movements, see Valocchi, 2001). In other words, the shifting of targets is the product of differing perceptions about the most urgent issue
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Social Movement Spillover

Perhaps one of the earliest clear articulations of movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest was put forward by Meyer and Whittier (1994) in their work on "social movement spillover." The authors conceptualize social movement spillover to explain the ways that "ideas, tactics, style, participants, and organizations of one movement often spillover over its boundaries to affect other social movements" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, emphasis in original). The authors acknowledge that protests in the United States frequently involve a diversity of organizations "that address a 'laundry list' of demands ... A bellwether issue, generally representing what activists view as either the most threatening and urgent problem or the most promising vehicle for action, comes to unify a broad spectrum of groups that share similar or related concerns" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 290). Owing to the diversity of interests of the organizations and participants involved in the movement, spillover becomes possible.
and impressions of changing political opportunities. One of the major connections that the authors identify between these movements is their frame alignment. The authors conclude that the peace movement combined frames about peace and feminism, which was successful in recruiting "both feminist and non-feminist women as activists for the [nuclear] freeze" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 287).

Although the authors do not explicitly discuss the role that political repression may play in social movement spillover, they find in their case that, when there was hostility to political challenge from the Left, there was more "impetus for movement–movement linkages as beleaguered activists and organizations pool their strength against powerful opponents" (Meyer & Whittier, 1994, p. 293). In other words, the authors conclude that a hostile political environment leads to a broader coalition of activists and organizations involved in social movements. Such a broader field leads to a cascading effect within which activism gives way to activism.

Initiator and Spin-Off Movements

Another perspective on movement-to-movement transmission is presented in McAdam's work on initiator and spin-off movements. Written as a chapter in an edited volume on Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action (Traugott, 1995), McAdam addresses the ways that movements are connected within a cycle of protest. He distinguishes between "two broad classes of movements whose origins reflect very different social processes": initiator movements, which "signal or otherwise set in motion an identifiable protest cycle"; and spin-off movements, which "in varying degrees, draw their impetus and inspiration from the original initiator movement" (McAdam, 1995, p. 219).

By separating these two related types of movements, McAdam adds specificity to movement-to-movement transmission within a cycle of protest. In particular, he explores the differences in the ways early rising initiator movements and spin-off movements, or what Tarrow would call "latecomers," engage in collective action. The author finds that spin-off movements "develop within the formal organizations or associational networks of an earlier movement, while also appropriating and adapting elements of its collective action frame" (McAdam, 1995, p. 231). In other words, the initiator movement develops the frame and the spin-off movement adapts it.

McAdam finds that this adaptation takes place in a different political context than that of the initiator movement. Although they are borne of the organizations and connections among the movement, McAdam posits that spin-off movements are born in the "context of contracting political opportunities" (McAdam, 1995, p. 225, emphasis in original). Movements are not expected to specifically respond to what he calls "cultural pressure and collective action frames. While these movements are not expected to specifically respond to political opportunity, the spreading acceptance of the repertoire of action, marches and demonstrations involves a repressive political environment, a so-called inopportune organizational and situational in opportunity.

The Sequencing of Movements

Minkoff also explores the relationship between the civil rights and feminist movements in her work on the sequencing of cycles of protest in her work on the sequencing of cycles of protest that include cultural and political repressive political environments. (Minkoff, 1997, p. 780), she finds that the sequencing of the interaction between organizational and environmental factors is what helps to facilitate the expansion of social movements.

Although Minkoff also does not explicitly discuss the role that political repression plays in certain formative environments, she acknowledges the role that political repression plays in the diffusion of protest. She finds that "the development of a repressive political environment," she might consider a repressive political environment or the civil rights movement (Minkoff, 1997, p. 795). In other words, protest movements require some degree of repression to develop, and this can include a repressive political environment.

In short, these three theories--of social movement, spin-off movements, and the sequencing of movements within a distinct cycle of protest--provide some insight into understanding the dynamics of social movements.
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The Sequencing of Social Movements

Minkoff also explores the relationship between social movements within a
cycle of protest in her work on the organizational behavior and connections
between the civil rights and feminist protest movements (1997). Going be-
ond what she considers to be “predominantly cognitive” conceptualizations
of cycles of protest that include cultural elements such as frame alignment
(Minkoff, 1997, p. 780), she finds protest cycles to be “the visible manifesta-
tion of the interaction between organization trajectories and protest-event
trajectories” (p. 779). Adopting Tarrow’s terminology, she notes that early
risers help to facilitate the expansion of the cycle of protest by mobilizing
organizational growth and what she calls “organizational density.”

Although Minkoff also does not look specifically at political repression
and the role that it might play in social movement sequencing, she does
explore the role that political allies and political opponents (in the form of
democratic and republican dominance in the U.S. Congress) plays in the
diffusion of protest. She finds that “Republican dominance [or what some
might consider a repressive political environment] limited the diffusion of
protest from the civil rights movement to the feminist movement” (Minkoff,
1997, p. 795). In other words, protest does not tend to spread as quickly in
such a repressive political environment.

In short, these three theories – of social movement spillover, initiator and
spin-off movements, and the sequencing of social movements – provide
some insight into understanding the relationship between social move-
ments within a distinct cycle of protest. Table 1 presents a summary of the
### Table 1. Expectations of the Literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>First Wave</th>
<th>Later Wave</th>
<th>Role of Repression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social movement spillover (Meyer &amp; Whittier, 1994)</td>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>Subsequent movement (no temporal terminology)</td>
<td>Repression leads activists and organizations to work more closely together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator and spin-off movements (McAdam, 1995)</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Spin-off</td>
<td>Narrowing political opportunities lead to spin-off movements, which respond to cultural opportunities and are less politically successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing of social movements (Minkoff, 1997)</td>
<td>Early-risers and initiators</td>
<td>Later-entrants</td>
<td>Repression in the form of political opposition limits the diffusion of protest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expectations of these theories with regard to the timing of social movements in a cycle of protest and the role that repression plays.

Although these perspectives on movement-to-movement transmission are a good starting point, they provide limited assistance in understanding the actual effects that political repression has on social movements within a cycle of protest. Accordingly, this paper traces the ways that protest changes during a particular cycle of protest as the political opportunities constrict. In the pages that follow, I present the case of the globalization movement in the United States since September 11, 2001.

**Political Context and Shifting Political Opportunity since September 11th**

After the September 11th attacks on the United States in 2001, politics and political opportunity for collective action in the United States changed significantly. On October 7, 2001, the US began its military campaign in Iraq. The Patriot Act, passed in September 2001, expanded the government's ability to surveil and detain suspected terrorists without formal charges, placing the principle protection under the law in the hands of the government. This has affected how Americans have engaged in political practices.

Of particular consequence to collective movements, the Patriot Act broadly defines "domestic terrorism" as acts that have been used by activists to protest American government. This has expanded the definition of domestic terrorism, to include the indefinite detention of individuals without formal charges, the principle protection under the law having been placed in the hands of the government. The new powers have been used to affect how Americans have engaged in political practices.

Data for this paper were collected during the implementation of the Patriot Act and the anti-war protests. The data spanned the period from September 2001 to the end of December 2002. The data were collected through interviews with activists and organizers, as well as through a content analysis of media coverage. The remainder of the paper is separated into two sections. In the first section, I discuss the implications of protest and the relationship between...
significantly. On October 7, 2001, the United States began military strikes in Afghanistan. On the following day, President Bush signed an executive order to establish the Office of Homeland Security. The office was created to "develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks" (Bush, 2001). Later that month, on October 26th, the Patriot Act was signed into law. In an overview provided by the American Civil Liberties Union, it reported: "many sections of this sweeping law need proper checks and balances to protect our constitutional freedoms." The Center for Constitutional Rights (2002) summarized the effects of this Act on everyday people living in the United States: "From the USA PATRIOT Act's over-broad definition of domestic terrorism, to the FBI's new powers of search and surveillance, to the indefinite detention of both citizens and non-citizens without formal charges, the principles of free speech, due process, and equal protection under the law have been seriously undermined" (p. 1). In other words, the new powers awarded to the government through the Act have affected how Americans can legally criticize the government and protest its practices.

Data for this paper were collected from protests that took place since the implementation of the Patriot Act and before and after the United States began its military campaign in Iraq. By looking at participation in large-scale protests over time since September 11th, we are able to explore the role that the shifting political climate in the United States played on social movements within this cycle of protest. As such, we can observe the changes in the cycle of protest as social movements in the United States respond to the increasingly repressive government that provides narrowing political opportunities. In particular, my analysis will focus on the priorities of the protesting populations at these events and how they are similar and different. The remainder of the paper is separated into three parts: first, I outline how and where the data were collected; second, I present the analyses of the data; and third, I discuss the implications of my findings to understanding cycles of protest and the relationship between social movements in America today.
DATA AND METHODS

Data were collected through a two-stage process: random surveying of protest participants at five large-scale protest events in the United States since September 11, 2001, and an Internet follow-up survey with those in the original sample who were willing to participate. Initially, data were collected by randomly surveying participants at five large-scale protests held from February 2002 to August 2004. All five protests were legally permitted rallies in outdoor public places and were large gatherings of broad coalitions of organizations as well as unaffiliated activists and others who joined the protest. All the demonstrations took place on weekend days to maximize citizen participation. Three of the protests were chosen because they were seen as the most important globalization protests in the United States during this time period according to the globalization movement itself. The other two protests included one of the most important antiwar protests in the United States, which was part of an internationally coordinated day of protest against the War in Iraq, and one of the largest protests against the policies of the Bush Administration, which was scheduled to coincide with the Republican National Convention (RNC) in summer 2004. By including data from these five protest events, we are able to explore the shifting focus of social movements within this cycle of protest and examine the commonalities among the protesting populations and their grievances over time. While surveying protesters at each of these protest events, subjects were asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up Internet survey. Data from both stages of this project are included in the analysis. Each stage will be discussed in detail below.

Random Survey of Protest Participants at Large-Scale Protest Events

First, protesters were randomly surveyed at five large-scale protests held in the United States since the September 11th attacks on the United States. Survey participants were chosen using a field approximation of random selection at the demonstrations. Starting from different points across the field site, field surveyors “counted off” protesters standing in a formal or informal line, selecting every fifth protestor to participate. Because field situations varied, random selection was achieved at some events by choosing every fifth person standing in a line to enter a rally area and, at others, by choosing every fifth person in a line or row as determined by the researcher working in a particular area.
METHODS

Regarding process: random surveying of protest events in the United States since the current survey with those in the participants. Initially, data were collected at five large-scale protests held from the protest groups and allies of these protests were legally permitted rallies or large gatherings of broad coalitions of activists and others who joined the protest on weekend days to maximize citizen participation. The dates were chosen because they were seen as key events in the United States during this nation’s antiwar movement itself. The other two prominent antiwar protests in the United States were from the internationally coordinated day of protest and the largest protests against the policies of the Bush administration in summer 2004. By including data from these events, we were able to explore the shifting focus of the U.S. protest and examine the commonalities and differences in their grievances over time. While protest events, subjects were asked if they were willing to participate in a follow-up Internet survey. Data from 2,230 of these respondents were included in the analysis. Each stage will be briefly summarized in turn.

Protests Surveyed

Data from five large-scale protests that took place in the United States from February 2002 to August 2004 are included in this paper: (1) the Another World is Possible March at the 2002 World Economic Forum, New York City; (2) the A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the spring 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC; (3) the Mobilization for Global Justice at the fall 2002 meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC; (4) the International ANSWER Antiwar protest in Washington, DC in April 2003; and (5) the World Says No to the Bush Agenda March on the Eve of the RNC in New York City in August 2004.

Overall, 2,230 demonstrators were sampled. Of the sample, 2,036 – or 91.3% – agreed to participate in the survey. In total, 194 people refused to take part in the survey, representing an overall refusal rate of approximately 9%. Using data collected from field notes, media accounts, and protest materials provided by organizations that were involved with the protests studied, each of the five protests will be briefly summarized in turn.

The Another World is Possible March at the World Economic Forum, New York City. The World Economic Forum (WEF) is a meeting of invited global elites ranging from heads of state to heads of the world’s largest corporations. As described by Ben Wright (2002) of the BBC, “the Forum is meant to be a sort of town hall meeting for the world’s movers and shakers, a place where Colin Powell can mingle with German trade unionists and Archbishop Desmond Tutu can swap ideas with the president of Coca-Cola.” Held annually in Davos, Switzerland, the WEF was moved to New York for the 2002 meeting as a gesture of support for the City after the attack on the World Trade Center. Similar to the meetings of the World
Trade Organization, World Bank, and the IMF, the WEF has become an annual opportunity for globalization protesters to voice grievances against corporate globalization as well as other global concerns such as labor conditions, AIDS, and environmental degradation. According to Another World is Possible (AWIP), a coalition of more than 100 social movement organizations that organized the protest, the purpose of the 2002 WEF protest was to “tell the Masters of the Universe that they don’t have the answers to our problems. Join us in the streets as we visualize solutions that build a better world where the people are in control.”

On Saturday, February 2, 2002, approximately 7,000 people gathered for a rally at the southeastern corner of Central Park to protest the WEF and to march to the Waldorf-Astoria hotel where the meeting was being held (Sanger, 2002, p. A1). All interested organizations and individuals were invited to participate. Although groups that practiced varying action forms were invited to join the protest, the organizers asked that participants honor their request that the protest be completely nonviolent and exclude direct action, or in the parlance of globalization demonstrations, they asked for a “green” demonstration. In the words of a flyer that was handed out at the demonstration: “many local activists would prefer not to alienate our local heroes (i.e. police and fire fighters) right now, especially since so many of them are feeling screwed by the same system we are protesting” (AWIP flyer, 2002). Because the protests that had been scheduled to take place during the 2001 fall meetings of the World Bank/IMF had been canceled in response to the September 11th attacks on the United States, this demonstration, which aimed to protest the practices of the World Economic Forum, was the first large-scale organized protest to take place in the United States after September 11. Even with the plea for a nonviolent demonstration from the protest organizers, 38 people were arrested during the Saturday protest (Sanger, 2002, p. A1).

Protesters were surveyed at the rally prior to the march. Surveyors entered the rally site from the four corners of Grand Army Plaza, on Fifth Avenue between 59th and 60th Streets, where the rally was taking place. Researchers completed 316 surveys with participants from four countries. Twenty-seven people refused to answer questions and one person did not complete the full survey.

The A20 Stop the War at Home and Abroad/Mobilization for Global Justice at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Since the 1999 protests against the World Trade Organization in Seattle, the spring joint meetings of the World Bank/IMF in Washington, DC had also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. During the spring meetings in April 2002, globalization protesters were calling for peace in Palestine as well as at home and abroad.”

On Saturday, April 20, 2002, 2002, protest to “Stop the War at Home and Abroad.” The protest took place in the form of a rally, and then marched to the site of the Spring Meetings of the World Bank/IMF. At the rally, over 100 organizations and individuals, including members of the Palestine rallies, Networking for the Middle East (NFME), and the Democratic Alliance for Social Justice (DASJ), participated. The rally was organized by the National Coalition for Peace and Democracy (NCPD) and the International Socialist Organization (ISO).

The A20 protest was followed by a series of events, including lectures and musical performances, that continued throughout the weekend. The protest was well-organized and peaceful, with few incidents reported. The crowd estimates ranged from 5,000 to 10,000.

From researchers' observations and interviews with participants in the Palestine rally/antiwar protest, it appears that the globalization protesters perceived the direct action component seen at the protests as a way to challenge the mainstream media's portrayal of the protests. The media coverage of the protests was generally uneventful with respect to the protests themselves. The reports often focused on the violence and disorder at the protests, while ignoring the peaceful and nonviolent nature of the actions.
and the IMF, the WEF has become an open target for protesters to voice grievances against the growing concentration of power in the hands of the few. According to Another World, a coalition of more than 100 social movement organizations and individuals who practiced varying action forms, the purpose of the 2002 WEF was to “send a message” that the world “is in control.”

Approximately 7,000 people gathered for the WEF protest in Washington, D.C., where the meeting was being held. The organizers and individuals were clear that they practiced varying action forms; organizers asked that participants honor completely nonviolent and direct action demonstrations, they asked for people to participate in actions that would not alienate our allies right now, especially since so many of the people we are protesting” (AWIP 2002).

The World Bank/IMF had been canceled in the United States, and this was the result of the World Economic Forum protest to take place in the United States. The organizers were clear that they were calling for a nonviolent demonstration, and 38 people were arrested during the protests.

Prior to the march, researchers entered the World Bank/IMF headquarters in Washington, DC, and found that person did not complete the survey. Researchers from four countries. Twenty-seventy people refused to participate in the march. Researchers surveyed 177 participants, none of whom reported traveling from outside the United States to participate in the protest. Twenty-four people refused to participate in the survey.

Mobilization for Global Justice at the Fall Meetings of the World Bank/IMF, Washington, DC. Like the spring meetings of World Bank/IMF, the fall meetings have also become an annual gathering of globalization protesters. The locations of the fall meetings rotate and the 2002 meetings were held in Washington, DC on September 28 and 29. Many of the same characteristics, messages, and organizing principles of that spring’s A20 protest were used during the fall protest. On Saturday, September 28, 2003, participants in the Mobilization for Global Justice rally gathered at the Sylva Theatre and then marched to the World Bank/IMF headquarters where the meetings were being held. Protesters voiced concern on a number of issues including reducing third world debt, corporate power, AIDS, environmental degradation as well as the war with Iraq.

Attendance for the protest fell far short of the 20,000 expected with crowds estimated from 3,000 to 5,000 people (Reel & Fernandez, 2002). As a
result of direct action taking place on the Friday prior to the protest, which
involved the breaking of windows at a Citibank building and the arrest of 649
people (Fernandez & Fahrenthold, 2002), there was a very large and highly
publicized police presence. In the words of Reel and Fernandez (2002, p. C4),
"swarms of police may have kept some protesters away" (see also Andrews,
2002). In fact, rumors spread throughout the rally prior to the march that
busses of protesters were being held outside the city. Despite the reduced
attendance and the earlier unrest, the protest was generally festive with
speakers and musicians performing on the Sylvan stage prior to the march.

As with the A20 protest, demonstration participants were surveyed at
the Sylvan Theatre prior to the march. The research team surveyed 730
participants from 11 countries, with 83 people refusing the survey. It is
important to note that the number of people who were surveyed at this event
is much higher than for any of the other demonstrations included in this
paper. In fact, protest participants from this event represent about a third
(36%) of the total number of protesters surveyed. This high number is the
result of a large research team attending the protest and not attributable to
the size of the overall protesting population at this event. In order to ensure
that the data from this protest do not bias the paper’s overall findings, the
majority of data analyses are presented by protest event.

*International ANSWER March on Washington in Spring 2003*. On Sat-
urday, April 12, 2003, protesters came to Washington, DC to participate in
a day of protest against the war in Iraq. The protest was coordinated with
events taking place in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and cities around
the world (Fernandez & Perlstein, 2003). It was the third to take place in the
four weeks since the war in Iraq had begun on March 19, 2003. The protest
was organized by International ANSWER to coincide with the spring
meetings of the World Bank/IMF. In so doing, the organizers expected
members of the globalization movement to come to Washington and par-
ticipate in the antiwar event scheduled on Saturday, as well as the global-
ization-focused event that was scheduled for Sunday. The protest began
with a rally in Freedom Plaza at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
and ended with a march to the Justice Department. With the media re-
porting the fall of Baghdad during the week prior to the protest and tele-
vision stations broadcasting images of the Iraqi people tearing down a
statue of Saddam Hussein in the middle of Baghdad (Dobbs, 2003), turn-out
at the event was lower than expected and the protesters adjusted their focus
to be the U.S. occupation of Iraq.

During the march, protesters also stopped outside the FBI to express their
dissatisfaction with policies included in the Patriot Act. They chanted: "tapping
our phones, reading our mail – the Bush/Cheney agenda!" (Perlstein, 2003). The *Washington Post* positively
covered the peaceful, with no protesters blocking the road, of the crowd at 30,000 (Fernandez & Perlstein,
2003). Freedom Plaza prior to the march, and the Washington Post began marching. Researchers entered the
march, surveyed 424 participants, one of whom refused to participate in the research.

*Taking Cover Beneath the Anti-Bush Umbrella: A National Convention*. On Sunday, April 13, Justice coordinated what they called a "legal
march" in protest of the Bush administration’s refusal to allow protests in New York City, most
of the march was the cornerstone of a week of protests organized by those groups that mobilized activists
and its policies. Prior to the event, when the New York Mayor’s office organize a rally in Central Park. This refusal
was perceived by many activists as being trampled” (McFadden, 2004).

The march was endorsed by groups including peace and globalization and
Military Families Speak Out, and also included participation from any environmental groups. While critical
Democratic Party, many organized to protest the Democratic National
Kerry campaign “distanced itself from Justice during the Republican Convention

On the United for Peace and Justice’s purpose of the march was to protest the website: "Democracy begins with an
world is possible!" Beyond clearly protect the repressive political environment of the main slogans of the global

Even though the New York State and Justice’s bid to rally in Central Park. A bid to rally in Central Park.
Attendance at the march was very high, estimating the crowd at 500,000.
Taking Cover Beneath the Anti-Bush Umbrella

our phones, reading our mail — the FBI should go to jail” (Fernandez & Perlstein, 2003). The Washington Post reported that the protest was relatively peaceful, with no protesters being arrested and local police estimates of the crowd at 30,000 (Fernandez, 2003). Surveys were conducted on Freedom Plaza prior to the march and while protesters were lining up to begin marching. Researchers entered the Plaza from its four corners and surveyed 424 participants, one of whom was from Canada. Twenty-five people refused to participate in the survey.

The World Says No to the Bush Agenda March on the Eve of the Republican National Convention. On Sunday, August 29, 2004, United for Peace and Justice coordinated what they called an “impassioned, peaceful, and legal march” in protest of the Bush Administration’s policies. 15 This legal march was the cornerstone of a week of protest organized by a coalition of organizations that mobilized activists to protest the Bush Administration and its policies. 16 Prior to the event, the protest received national attention when the New York Mayor’s office denied the organizers their request to rally in Central Park. This refusal to permit access to a common site of protest in New York City, ostensibly to protect the grass on the Great Lawn, was perceived by many activists as “free speech and not the grass being trampled” (McFadden, 2004).

The march was endorsed by groups that focused on a diversity of issues, including peace and globalization as well as Iraq Veterans Against the War, Military Families Speak Out, and the group September 11th Families. It also included participation from antiwar, civil rights, labor, feminist, and environmental groups. 17 While critics of the protest tried to link it with the Democratic Party, many organizations involved in the protest had also protested the Democratic National Convention in Boston. In addition, the Kerry campaign “distanced itself from the protests” that were organized during the Republican Convention (Mishra & Robertson, 2003).

On the United for Peace and Justice’s Website, they explained that the purpose of the march was to protest political repression. In the words of its website: “Democracy begins with an absolute commitment to the rights and civil liberties of all ... we march for peace, we march for justice .... Another world is possible!” 18 Beyond clearly stating that the march was intended to protest the repressive political environment, the organizers also invoked one of the main slogans of the global justice/globalization movement.

Even though the New York State Supreme Court ruled against United for Peace and Justice’s bid to rally in Central Park, people came out in droves. Attendance at the march was very high, with United for Peace and Justice estimating the crowd at 500,000 people (McFadden, 2004). Although a
papier mâché dragon was ignited as it passed in front of Madison Square Garden, the march was relatively peaceful. Even though there were widespread expectations that the protest would turn violent, the police reported that only about 200 people were arrested during the march (McFadden, 2004).

Surveys were conducted with participants as they queued up to march on the cross streets between 5th and 9th Avenues from 14th to 21st Streets in Manhattan. Researchers entered the holding area and began surveying protesters at its four corners. During the march, surveys were also conducted with participants as they marched up 7th Avenue to Madison Square Garden. In all, 454 participants were surveyed, with seven people reporting that they had come from outside the United States to participate. Forty-one people refused to participate in the survey.

Internet Follow-Up Survey of Protest Participants

All protesters who participated in the first stage of the study and agreed to be contacted via e-mail about the follow-up Internet survey were contacted. The follow-up web-based survey included questions about the protesters’ involvement in multiple social movements, which large-scale protest events and days of protest that they had attended, and what particular issues motivated them to participate in social protest. Overall, approximately three-quarters of those protesters initially surveyed at the five-protest events agreed to provide an e-mail address and expressed interest in participating the follow-up component of the study. Of those people who provided e-mail addresses, 334 people – or 22.3% – participated in the follow-up survey. The follow-up response rate varies from 16.7 to 31.7%. Although the overall response rate is not as high as some studies that employ Internet surveys (for a full discussion see Porter & Whitcomb, 2003; see also Cho & LaRose, 1999 for a full discussion of the role of trust in Internet survey response rates), it is consistent with the limited number of studies that have used this method to understand participation in social movements (e.g. Allen, 2000; Park, 2003). The sample of respondents to such a Web-based Internet survey are likely to be biased somewhat toward the more affluent and well-educated protest participants (e.g. Hewson, Laurent, & Vogel, 1996). Even with this limitation, however, as participants in social protest have become increasingly tentative about being studied, the technology of the Internet provides a unique opportunity to gain additional information from the protest participants who were randomly surveyed at demonstrations. Because the Internet allows a person to be contacted without requiring that person to provide an e-mail address, rather than providing an e-mail address, rather than participating in the follow-up survey. Table 2 presents an overview of the numbers of people and the response rate for the follow-up survey.

**Table 2. Summary of Protests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Summary of Protests</th>
<th>Another World is Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, February 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported attendance</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants initially</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveyed (%)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal rate (%)</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage providing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail addresses (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in follow-up</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey (%)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage is calculated based on those participants who initially provided e-mail addresses.*

As has been previously discussed, this study included information of protests that took place during the...
It passed in front of Madison Square Garden. Even though there were widespread reports that the police were prepared to use force, the protests remained peaceful. As the marchers passed through the streets, they were greeted by enthusiastic crowds. Some marchers wore signs or carried banners, while others simply held up their fists in solidarity.

**Table 2. Summary of Protest Participants Surveyed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Another World is Possible</th>
<th>A20</th>
<th>Mobilization for Global Justice</th>
<th>International ANSWER</th>
<th>The World Says “No” to the Bush Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported attendance</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>50,000–70,000</td>
<td>3,000–5,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants initially surveyed</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal rate (%)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage providing e-mail addresses (%)</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in follow-up survey</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up response rate (%)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage is calculated based on those participants who provided their e-mail addresses to participate in the follow-up Internet survey.*

allows a person to be contacted without his or her identity being known, it is likely that participants at these protest events are more comfortable providing an e-mail address, rather than a phone number or mailing address. Table 2 presents an overview of the protests included in this paper, along with the numbers of people originally surveyed at each protest event and the response rate for the follow-up survey.

**RESULTS**

As has been previously discussed, these five protest events provide a sample of protests that took place during the period after September 11 when the
U.S. government was implementing repressive policies that limited the ability of its citizens to express their dissatisfaction with the government. In fact, prior to the RNC protest, the New York Times reported police officials plans to use an army of “police officers to deter violence” during the protest and had identified “about 60 people as militants, some of whom were arrested for violent acts in past protests,” whom they were investigating prior to the event at the end of August (Archibold, 2004). As can be seen by the overview of the protest events studied, the targets of the protests had moved away from global justice to the practices of the Bush Administration, focusing on different aspects of its “War on Terror.”

Even with this shift in target, however, the organizers of the protests continued to employ the global justice frame to mobilize participants. At every event, protesters could be heard chanting slogans made popular by the globalization movement, such as “Another World is Possible.” Also, all of these protests continued to employ the repertoire made popular during the earlier protests of the globalization movement: at all of these events, some participants dressed in costumes, carried puppets, and the protests created an atmosphere that included festive street theater (for a discussion see Wood, 2004). During the RNC protest, this technique was innovated, with the so-called “Billionaires for Bush” joining the March, as well as protesters dressed as pallbearers carrying “a thousand mock coffins of cardboard draped in black or in American flags” (McFadden, 2004).

The consistency of the collective action frame employed and the tactics used suggests that these movements are, indeed, related and part of the same cycle of protest. The question that remains, however, is: what happened to those people who were participants in the globalization movement and, to what degree, did they spillover into the movement to protest the Bush Administration in post 9/11 America? In the analysis that follows, I will present data collected from the protest participants at these five large-scale protest events since September 11 to answer questions and discuss how these findings help us to understand movement-to-movement transmission during a period of heightened political repression in the United States.

*How Engaged are these Protesters Overall*

Overall, most protesters who participated in the follow-up survey were very engaged, with the average protester reporting having attended an average of about ten protests in last two years. Table 3 presents the numbers of protests attended by participants at each protest event. Although participants at all of these protest events were very engaged in protests in the past two years, those at the RNC protest had participated in significantly more protests, averaging six to seven years. Although the maximum protests in 1993, participants was the same as that for those at the RNC protest was much smaller, the population at this event was less engaged; this suggests that participants at the RNC protest saw their being protest “regulars,” attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Protests</th>
<th>Another World is Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, February 2002</td>
<td>Washington April 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What did we do?*

These protesters were very engaged in fact, participants at these events called a “laundry list” of anti-intervention, anti-war and civil rights, anti-racism, anti-violence, and many others. As noted, participants in these large-scale protests; they were active in many of the movement to protest multiple social causes. The participants reported protesting in the pursuit of civil rights, and the environment.

Peace was a priority for protesters in 2001: overall, 92% of the protest that were about peace.
pressive policies that limited the ability of activists to protest against the government. In fact, "The New York Times" reported police officials planned to "overflow violence" during the protest and arrested some of whom were arrested for "plotting" violence. As can be seen by the overview of the protests had moved away from the Bush Administration, focusing on other issues.

However, the organizers of the protests framed their events to mobilize participants. At rallies, slogans made popular by the "other World is Possible." Also, all of the organizers made popular during the movement: at all of these events, some organizers used puppets, and the protests created "street theater" (for its discussion see). This technique was innovated, with the March, as well as protesters using thousand mock coffins of cardboard (McFadden, 2004).

The organizers employed and the tactics employed were indeed, related and part of the same frame. However, is: what happened in the globalization movement and, the movement to protest the Bush Administration. In the analysis that follows, I will look at participants at these five large-scale protests and discuss how these events contributed to the movement in the United States.

Protesters Overall

Participants in the follow-up survey were very engaged having attended an average of five events. Table 3 presents the numbers of protests participants attended at each event. Although participants at all protest events were very engaged and had participated in numerous protests in the past two years, there were originally surveyed at the RNC protest had participated in significantly fewer protest events. In fact, participants were half as engaged, averaging only about five protests in the past two years. Although the maximum protest attendance reported by RNC protest participants was the same as that for the A2O March in 2002, the mean for those at the RNC protest was much lower. In other words, the protesting population at this event was less engaged in protesting overall. This finding suggests that participants at the RNC protest were less radical in terms of their being protest "regulars," attending multiple protests over time.

What did they Protest?

These protesters were very engaged in protesting multiple social issues. In fact, participants at these events came out to protest what Meyer and Whittier (1994) call a ""laundry list" of demands. Broad issues ... have pulled together groups from diverse movements including the peace, women's, anti-intervention, gay and lesbian, and AIDS movements" (p. 290). In other words, participants in these large-scale protest events were not single-issue protesters; they were active in many different political issues and reported protesting multiple social causes. The top-four issues that the protest participants reported protesting in the past two years were peace, globalization, civil rights, and the environment.

Peace was a priority for protesters at all of the events since September 11, 2001: overall, 92% of the protest participants reported participating in protests that were about peace. Even though the cycle of protest began
with the globalization movement, fewer and fewer protest participants reported attending protests that were about globalization. At the A20 March in spring 2002, where the focus was on globalization and stopping the war at home and abroad, only about three-quarters of the protesters reported attending protests about globalization. By spring 2003, after the war in Iraq had begun, less than 40% of the protest participants at the International ANSWER March reported attending protests about globalization, despite the fact that the march was scheduled to take place on the same weekend as the protests at the spring meetings of the World Bank-IMF. More recently, at the RNC protest in summer 2004, less than 20% of the protesters reported attending protests about globalization. It is also worth noting that, with the increasingly repressive political environment in America during this period of time, about a third of the protesters at each event reported attending protests about civil rights, which would certainly include protests about civil liberties and components of the Patriot Act. Table 4 summarizes these responses.

**Participation in the Globalization Movement**

Even though the globalization movement seemed to retreat after September 11, 2001, in terms of protest participants who reported protesting globalization in the past two years, many of the participants in these protest events had been relatively active in the globalization movement. Table 5 lists the percentages of respondents from each protest event who had participated in some of the most well-known protests of the globalization movement prior to September 11, 2001. Because most respondents were originally surveyed at protests taking place on the East Coast of the United States, it is not surprising that the respondents reported the highest levels of protest attendance at events in that region. Although participants at the first three protests, globalization, were more active in the participants at the International ANSWER involved in earlier globalization protests at these well-known events. In fact, about 80% of the event reported participating in the march in Convergence in Washington, DC in face of attacks on the United States. Participants in 2004 reported even lower attendance at protests, with less than 10% reporting to globalization events.

These data suggest that participants targeted the Bush Administration’s policy involvement in the globalization movement in the proportion of the participants at the globalization movement at some reported protesting globalization together with the globalization protest prior to the results of these two questions will provide a picture of which the globalization movement split over War on Terror. Table 6 summarizes the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Attendance at Major Protests</th>
<th>Another World is Possible (%)</th>
<th>A20 (%)</th>
<th>Mobilization for Global Justice (%)</th>
<th>International ANSWER (%)</th>
<th>The World Says &quot;No&quot; to Bush (%)</th>
<th>All Five Protests (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, November 1999, WTO</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2000, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, January 2001, Presidential inauguration</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec, Canada, April 2001, Summit of the Americas</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2001, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, September 2001, Anti Capitalist Convergence/March against War and Racism</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. What Subjects were the Foci of Protesters’ Protest?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace</th>
<th>Globalization</th>
<th>Civil Rights</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
fewer and fewer protest participants report globalization. At the A20 March globalization and stopping the war at headquarters of the protesters reported at.
By spring 2003, after the war in Iraq protest participants at the International protests about globalization, despite to take place on the same weekend as the World Bank-IMF. More recently, less than 20% of the protesters realization. It is also worth noting that, n environment in America during this protesters at each event reported at which would certainly include protests of the Patriot Act. Table 4 summarizes
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The Foci of Protesters’ Protest?

Taking Cover Beneath the Anti-Bush Umbrella

### Table 5. Attendance at Major Globalization Protests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Another World Possible (%)</th>
<th>A20 (%)</th>
<th>Mobilization for Global Justice (%)</th>
<th>International ANSWER (%)</th>
<th>The World Says “No” to the Bush Agenda (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, November 1999, WTO</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2000, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, January 2001, Presidential inauguration</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec, Canada, April 2001, Summit of the Americas</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2001, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, September 2001, Anti Capitalist Convergence/March against War and Racism</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attendance at events in that region. Also not surprising is the fact that participants at the first three protests, which directly targeted aspects of globalization, were more active in the globalization movement overall. Participants at the International ANSWER protest in April 2003 were less involved in earlier globalization protests, but still had attended a number of these well-known events. In fact, about a fifth of the participants at this event reported participating in the Anti-Capitalist Convergence in Washington, DC in fall 2001, right after the September 11 attacks on the United States. Participants at the RNC protest in August 2004 reported even lower attendance at these large-scale globalization protests, with less than 10% reporting having attended any of these major globalization events.

These data suggest that participants at the protests that specifically targeted the Bush Administration’s policies had dwindling interest and involvement in the globalization movement. However, to get a better sense of the proportion of the participants at these protests who had been involved in the globalization movement at some time, we must look at those who reported protesting globalization together with those who reported attending a major globalization protest prior to September 11, 2001. Combining the results of these two questions will provide clearer evidence of the degree to which the globalization movement spilled over to the movement against the War on Terror. Table 6 summarizes the comparison of responses to these

### Table 6. Proportion of Participants Attending Both the Globalization Protest and Other Events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, November 1999, WTO</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2000, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, January 2001, Presidential inauguration</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec, Canada, April 2001, Summit of the Americas</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, April 2001, World Bank-IMF</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC, September 2001, Anti Capitalist Convergence/March against War and Racism</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. International ANSWER Protest Participants’ Involvement in the Globalization Movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Protesting the Issue of Globalization</th>
<th>Reported Being at a Major Globalization Protests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. RNC Protest Participants’ Involvement in the Globalization Movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Protesting the Issue of Globalization</th>
<th>Reported Being at Major Globalization Protests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past two years, the percentage of participants involved, to some degree, with the protest movement retracted and a movement's War on Terror. Although it was not a relatively disconnected, data collected on large scale protest events after September 10, there is no overlap in the participants at these two events to support the claim that there was movement to the area of the globalization movement to the anti-Bush movement.

Upon first glance, this shift from the Whittier’s (1994) statement that “as a movement, shifts into abeyance on occasion, organizations may switch the grounds of their activity” [among targeting the Bush Administration’s War on Terror]. My analysis of the protest events after September 11 does not seem to have shifted into another movement; rather, this movement shifted their targets based on political opportunity.

In addition, although the relationships among the “ideas, tactics, style, participants, and movement inspiration” from one movement to another (p. 277), the expectation that these movements work in concert (p. 278). In fact, the organizers of the movement on Terror consistently employed the tactics of the more radical activists who were involved in the global justice movement to protest the United for Peace and Justice, the organization that global justice as one of its six major campaigns.
Protest Participants' Involvement in Globalization Movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: ENDING THE CYCLE OF PROTEST?**

In sum, the results from this paper support the notion that, in the wake of increasing political repression after September 11, 2001, the globalization movement retracted and a movement emerged to target the Bush Administration's War on Terror. Although initially these movements seem to be relatively disconnected, data collected from protest participants at five large-scale protest events after September 11 show that there was significant overlap in the participants at these protests events. Thus, these findings support the claim that there was movement-to-movement transmission from the globalization movement to the anti-Bush movement.

Upon first glance, this shift in movements seems to support Meyer and Whittier's (1994) statement that "as a movement [such as the globalization movement] shifts into abeyance on one set of issues, its personnel and organizations may switch the grounds of the challenge to another set of issues" [such as targeting the Bush Administration's policies] (p. 279). But, based on my analysis of the protest events after 9/11, the globalization movement does not seem to have shifted into abeyance. Rather, activists involved in this movement shifted their targets based on their perceptions of narrowing political opportunity.

In addition, although the relationship between these movements provide an example of what Meyer and Whittier (1994) would call the ways that the "ideas, tactics, style, participants, and organizations" spills over from one movement to another (p. 277), these data do not support the authors' expectation that these movements were "allied, but separate, challenges" (p. 278). In fact, the organizers of the more recent protests against the War on Terror consistently employed the global justice frame to mobilize those activists who were involved in the globalization movement and get them involved in the movement to protest the Bush Administration's policies. United for Peace and Justice, the organizer of the RNC protest, even lists global justice as one of its six major campaigns. The organization produced
a statement paper on "How Globalization Promotes War" to appeal to members of the globalization movement and mobilize them to participate in protests against the war on terror.²⁴

Upon closer consideration, these findings are actually more consistent with McAdam’s (1995) work, which finds that, as political opportunities narrow, spin-off movements emerge that respond to the political inopportune. In this case, as the political climate changed after September 11, a movement emerged to protest the policies of the Bush Administration and the initiator movement – the globalization movement – became less active. Even though it became less active, however, these data show that many members of the initiator movement were involved in the spin-off movement. In addition, it is clear that the movement against the Bush Administration's War on Terror adapted the tactics and collective action frames that were originally designed within the context of the globalization movement.

Although these data do support the notion that these movements were all part of a single cycle of protest, they do not support Tarrow's expectation that cycles of protest will radicalize over time (e.g. Tarrow, 1991, 1998). In fact, the RNC protest experienced neither more radicalized protest forms, nor was there increased violence.²⁵ many protest participants reported coming out for such mainstream reasons as to support the Left and the Democratic Party. The lack of violence at the largest of these large-scale protests is particularly interesting given the “fears of explosive clashes with the biggest security force ever assembled in New York” (McFadden, 2004). In addition, data collected from these protest events do not support Minkoff’s (1997) prediction that repression in the form of political opposition will limit the diffusion of protest, at least not in the short term. Nonetheless, given the decline in social protest since President Bush was reelected and the Republican majorities were upheld in both houses of the US Congress in 2004, Minkoff’s claim may still be correct. Even with the ongoing War on Terror, which involves American soldiers being killed on a regular basis, protest has significantly decreased. In fact, this more recent decline in protest activity may suggest that ongoing political opposition in the form of a reelected Republican Administration and Congress can halt the sequencing of social movements and, perhaps more important, it can end a cycle of protest.

The findings of this study of movement-to-movement transmission in the face of political repression suggest the need for future research to focus on three main areas. First, future research must examine the conclusions of cycles of protest and test the claim that the cycle of protest that began with the globalization movement has ended. Second, future research should study how political repression of other types in movement-to-movement transmission can lead to the development of new movements. Without understanding more about the movements therein, we will never be able to understand collective action.

NOTES

1. The globalization movement is often described as a world movement, particularly by the popular media. As globalization may involve different forms, it is common to use the term “globalization” per se, that many within the movement have used interchangeably despite the fact that globalization is a term used by political actors to describe their actions or ideas (Hardt & Negri, 2000).

2. This term includes the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that some consider to be civil wars.

3. More recently, Tarrow (1998) has redefined the term “contention.” Because I am focusing primarily on the globalization movement, I will maintain consistency within this paper. In addition, Tarrow notes that "contention" is a more accurate term than "movements" to describe a movement of political actors in the form of a social movement.

4. See, for example, Tarrow (1998), Goldstone, Gurr, & Moshir (1991), and McFadden (2003) for examples of political contention.

5. See action.aclu.org/reformtheborder for more information and actions.

6. For more information see www.action.aclu.org/reformtheborder.

7. The official beginning of the campaign was on August 29, 2004.

8. All of the protest events took place on August 29, 2004, the day before the Bush Agenda Protest before the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio.

9. Protests.net and Indymedia.org list protests in over 50 cities in the United States, such as the World Economic Forum in New York City and the G8 meetings in Chantilly, France.

10. International ANSWER, which coordinates international solidarity demonstrations, lists over 100 protests worldwide in support of the protests in New York City on August 29, 2004.

11. In fact, this protest was said to be the largest antinuclear rally in Central Park (McFadden, 2004).
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how political repression of other types and in other cultural contexts affects movement-to-movement transmission. Third and finally, in order to understand movement-to-movement transmission more clearly, future research must look at the specific connections between initiator and spin-off movements. Without understanding more specifics of cycles of protest and the movements therein, we will never be able to understand how repression affects collective action.

NOTES

1. The globalization movement is often termed the “antiglobalization movement,” particularly by the popular media. As Graeber (2001, p. 12) has observed, the expressions “globalization movement” and “antiglobalization movement” are often used interchangeably despite the fact that the movement has benefited from globalization per se, that many within the movement call for “globalization with a human face,” “globalization from below” (Brecher, Tim, & Brendan, 2002) and the “globalization of people and ideas” (Hart & Negri, 2000) and that the term “antiglobalization” is one many within the movement have “never felt comfortable with” (Graeber, 2001, p. 12). I will use the term “globalization movement” in favor of the alternatives.

2. This term includes the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq as well as the perceived war against civil liberties in the United States.

3. More recently, Tarrow (1998) has renamed “cycles of protest” to be “cycles of contention.” Because I am focusing particularly on social protest and in order to maintain consistency within this paper, I will refer to work mainly as “cycles of protest.”

4. In some cases, however, Tarrow notes that increased violence can lead to terrorism and/or revolution (Tarrow, 1998, p. 150; see also Tarrow, 1991; Tilly, 1993; Goldstone, Gurr, & Moshiri, 1991; for a case of extreme repression, see Almeida’s (2003) work on protest waves under authoritarian regimes).

5. See action.aclu.org/reformthepatriotact/primer.html (accessed on November 11, 2005).


7. The official beginning of the campaign was March 19, 2003.

8. All of the protest events took place on a Saturday except the World Says No to the Bush Agenda Protest before the Republican National Convention, which took place on Sunday, August 29, 2004.

9. Protest.net and Indymedia.org list protests at international economic summits, such as the World Economic Forum and the annual World Bank/IMF meetings, as among the most important international demonstrations.

10. International ANSWER, which coordinated this protest, reported concurrent demonstrations taking place in 60 countries on this day (for an archive of the call for the event and its endorsements, see iacenter.org/archive2003/a12_endor4.htm (accessed on November 11, 2005)).

11. In fact, this protest was said to be the largest in New York City since the 1982 antinuclear rally in Central Park (McFadden, 2004).
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