

American Journal of Sociology

The Dividends of Dissent: How Conflict and Culture Work in Lesbian and Gay Marches on Washington. By Amin Ghaziani. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. Pp. xxiv+419. \$25.00 (paper).

Nancy Whittier
Smith College

Amin Ghaziani's *The Dividends of Dissent* is both an ambitious theoretical analysis of infighting in social movements and a comprehensive account of the four major marches on Washington, D.C., by the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) movement. Ghaziani argues that the assumption that infighting splits movements is inaccurate; instead, infighting is ubiquitous in successful movements as well as those that disintegrate, and it can yield the eponymous "dividends of dissent" because "airing dissent enables activists to carry on a more complex conversation" about abstract questions of identity and strategy (p. 219). Scholars of social movements reap dividends of dissent as well, because infighting provides a location where culture is concretized and thus is a rich source of data.

Ghaziani's substantive insight is the salience of marches on Washington for analyzing the development of the movement's organizations, strategies, and identities. His inspired use of the marches to gain purchase on a national movement that includes grassroots groups yields important analytical payoffs. Ghaziani's theoretical insight is the usefulness of infighting for tapping the often amorphous cultural dimensions of movements. What he terms a "resinous culture" framework (p. 6) essentially means that contentious internal conversations make culture tangible; infighting is the "resin" that captures abstract cultural material. Organizers argue about similar tasks for each march, relying on a "cultural template" for decision making established through practice and precedent. Although the points of contention may appear mundane, they encode debates about the movement's identity and strategy. Dissent serves as a "culture carrier" for these abstract, yet crucial, aspects of movements.

The body of the book consists of paired chapters dealing with each of the marches, based on impressive archival, newspaper, and interview data. The first chapter of each pair provides an overview of the GLBT movement and the political and cultural context during the period leading up to the march, while the second focuses on the march itself. The chapters on the marches examine the recurring questions activists debated—whether to march, when to march, the theme, speakers, platform, and the organizing structure for planning the march—with extensive detail about how organizers argued about these issues. These often contentious discussions expressed and negotiated the movement's changing identity: making gender differences explicit by naming the first march "lesbian and gay" rather than "gay" (1979), debating and rejecting inclusion of bisexuals (1987), then adding first "bi" (1993) and later "bisexual" to the march title

(2000), and debating and rejecting inclusion of transgendered people (1987 and 1993), and ultimately including them in the title (2000). Ghaziani effectively shows how debates about the organizing structure for march planning reflected the overall state of the movement, including tensions between coasts and “the hinterlands,” issues of inclusion of women and people of color, tensions between mainstreaming and liberationism, and issues of grassroots versus top-down organizing. His analyses of questions of race and the representation of people of color and of the ongoing strength of both liberationist and mainstream orientations are particularly strong.

The first three marches were organized through a labor-intensive process of multiple meetings that used participatory-democratic processes and included regional, gender, and racial representation. Extensive infighting at these meetings helped activists to articulate their changing identities and strategies. The controversial 2000 march, in contrast, adopted a top-down style of organizing and sparked a boycott by most major movement organizations. Ghaziani argues that this failure—dissent without dividends—was a result of the march’s departure from the established “cultural template” for organizing a march and airing dissent. As I write this review, a new GLBT march on Washington is under discussion. Called for by longtime activist Cleve Jones, the march has a website with a date, an identity-neutral title (“March for Equality”), a platform, a logo, and the promise that the march will be organized with a “grassroots, bottom up” approach (“National Equality March,” at <http://www.nationalequalitymarch.com/>, accessed June 16, 2009). Dissent is gathering around several of the central recurring issues that Ghaziani identifies, including whether and when to march, representation of transgendered people, and organizing structure (Queerty, “Here’s How the Future of Gay Rights was Decided [Whether You Were Involved or Not],” at <http://www.queerty.com/heres-how-the-future-of-gay-rights-was-decided-whether-you-were-involved-or-not-20090608/>, accessed June 16, 2009; Michael Petrelis, “Torie Osborn: March on D.C.: No Public Meetings Needed” at <http://mpetrelis.blogspot.com/2009/06/torie-osborn-march-on-dc-no-public.html>, accessed June 16, 2009). According to Ghaziani’s model, a strong national consciousness and national-level issues should increase support, but the organizing process determines whether dissent is likely to produce productive conversations about identity and strategy or to harm or prevent the march. Whether the planning committee follows precedent, establishes participatory democracy, and embraces open dissent are the key determinative factors (p. 305).

Ghaziani carefully notes that his model remains tentative and applies best to movements that, like the GLBT movement, are identity based, adopt participatory democracy, and focus on organizing protest events. Infighting may not be as unique a location for cultural concretization as Ghaziani implies, and when it leads to defections, that may be because it is a symptom of underlying power struggles or genuine differences of

identity within the movement rather than a causal factor in itself. In this vein, the book would have benefited from a stronger analysis of institutional power and organizational structure, including links between the movement and corporate sponsors. In addition, Ghaziani's argument that infighting yields positive effects, while convincing, is shaped by his cases, which are almost all examples of successful events. While the model may or may not prove generalizable, its power lies in the successful retheorizing of dissent and the fruitful and interesting propositions it generates. Ghaziani has raised important questions for other scholars, who might examine infighting at local levels, within organizations, and in other movements. Further research might study infighting that culminates in factionalism as well as that which does not, contributing to a more complete theorizing of infighting. The author has also produced a stunning and definitive account of these important marches that is compelling and readable enough for course use. For these reasons, *The Dividends of Dissent* is a major contribution to the fields of social movements and queer studies. I expect that it will become a standard text in these fields, as well as widely read by other scholars.

How the Religious Right Shaped Lesbian and Gay Activism. By Tina Fetner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Pp. vii+156. \$22.50 (paper).

Andrea Smith
University of California, Riverside

Tina Fetner's timely and accessible book, *How the Religious Right Shaped Lesbian and Gay Activism*, analyzes the relationship between the Christian Right and lesbian and gay movements, providing a helpful context for contemporary struggles around gay marriage and gay rights. Building on social movement theory on opposing movements, Fetner details how the Christian right fundamentally reshaped the lesbian and gay movement.

Fetner contends that the Christian Right has influenced lesbian and gay organizing in myriad ways. In what seems to be her one area of primary research in this book, Fetner assesses the changes in the framing devices utilized by lesbian and gay organizations as they began to interface with Christian Right antigay organizing. She argues that as Christian Right organizing grew in prominence, the framing devices used by lesbian and gay organizations shifted from those that emphasized the similarities between lesbians and gays and heterosexuals to oppositional frames that positioned the Christian Right as the enemy to be feared. As will be discussed later, Fetner further contends that the rise of the Christian Right encouraged the mainstreaming and bureaucratization of the lesbian and gay movement so that it shed its leftist political agenda in order to pursue