

12

Infighting and Insurrection

AMIN GHAZIANI AND KELSY KRETSCHMER

Introduction

Research on social movements highlights the centrality of conflict, yet scholars frequently conflate its diverse forms and associated consequences for mobilization. In this chapter, we take a special interest in infighting, a type of conflict that is remarkably pronounced in political organizing (Balsler 1997; Levitsky 2007). Early debates between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois about the nature of black political progress are instructive. Washington advocated gradualism and accommodation to white oppression, while Du Bois countered that social change required persistent agitation, direct action, and higher education. The disagreement between them shows how conflict can clarify trajectories of activism. “The black men of America have a duty to perform, a duty stern and delicate—a forward movement to oppose a part of the work of their greatest leader” (Du Bois 1903). Du Bois did not insist that activists had to converge in their viewpoints. Rather, his disagreements with Washington clarified the meanings and material expressions of civil rights, including the importance of agitation, action, and academic education.

The contemporary landscape is also peppered with “horizontal hostility,” a term that feminist Florynce Kennedy coined to describe fights among minority group members (Penelope 1992). Consider that Harry Belafonte dismissed Colin Powell as a “house slave” who only serves his “master” (President Bush) and sells out the black community. Belafonte contends that conservative African Americans damage the legacy and future of the civil rights movement. Years earlier, Malcolm X attacked Martin Luther King Jr. for wanting to be part of the white man’s world (McAdam 1982; Morris 1984). This argument resembles what DuBois said to Washington and, one hundred years later, the assault that Richard Goldstein launched against “Homocons,” or conservative, especially Republican, LGBT people (Goldstein 2003).

Infighting is the expression of a dissenting opinion, a discrepant view, or a debate among activists that attempts to redefine past struggles, frame the present moment, or shape future trajectories of activism. It is a type of conflict that flares as activists spar over their political ethos (Geertz 1973; Melucci 1996), collective identity (Brown-Saracino and Ghaziani 2009; Taylor and Whittier 1992), perceived moral order (Wuthnow 1987), strategy and tactics (Cohen 1985), or types of leadership (Weber 1958). These battles reflect both pre-existing and emergent differences between groups of activists. In organizing a march on Washington, for example, lesbian and gay activists fought lengthy battles over the inclusion of bisexual and transgender people in the title of their demonstrations (Ghaziani 2008). Should they call the march “The National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights” or “... for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Rights?” This decision had concrete implications for matters like fundraising, formulating demands, and selecting speakers. Similarly, feminists used dissent to find answers to broad concerns like “What is a woman?” and “What are female values?” (Echols 1989; Rich 1980; Taylor and Rupp 1993: 41). Infighting in this instance was a source of “creative disunity” that birthed a distinctly female way of life and worldview (Lorde 1984).

Infighting typically erupts in small-group brainstorming and planning sessions as activists strive for a “precarious equilibrium” between inclusion and group boundaries (Ghaziani and Fine 2008: 65), and the fights have implications for the distribution of power, status, authority, and resources. For students of social movements, infighting provides a “measurement directive” to identify the underlying assumptions that motivate political engagement (Ghaziani 2009: 589). Indeed, “if we emphasize integration and coherence at the expense of dissonance and discontinuity,” scholars risk overlooking how participating in protest can “crystalize, objectify, and communicate group experience” (Hebdige 1979: 79).

We argue that infighting is analytically and empirically distinct from other movement outcomes like factions, schisms, and defections, and it does not uniformly or inevitably lead to them. For example, following an auspicious start with a group of well-connected professional founders and great media fanfare, the National Organization for Women (NOW) experienced two schisms during its early days. The first split occurred when a group of conservative Ohio members walked out of a conference in protest of NOW’s decision, at the behest of radical East Coast chapters, to support abortion rights. The Ohio faction later formed the Women’s Equity Action League, which served as a safe haven for women who were uncomfortable with polarizing social issues like abortion (Kretschmer 2014). The second schism occurred over NOW’s decision to support the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), a Constitutional Amendment mandating women’s equality in all areas of the law. American unions had long championed labor protections for working women. Because the ERA would invalidate these policies, many labor-affiliated members chose to stay loyal to their union and exit NOW (Barakso 2004). The conference revealed insurmountable factionalism over what NOW should be, who it should represent, and what it should fight for—so much that one participant wondered if any members would be left by the end of all the organizational defections.¹ These examples show that factions, schisms, and defections are a common class of phenomena in which groups fail at conflict resolution, resulting in “the proper break-up of the group” and a “certain release” (Simmel 1955: 48-49) of the generative potential of

conflict. Infighting is the antecedent to factionalism, threatening to separate activists in terms of their instrumental and expressive goals, but such splits are by no means destined from the mere presence of disagreements.

The examples with which we have opened this chapter include civil rights, feminist, and LGBT social movement organizing, yet they all reveal the same core insight: no analysis of social change can ignore the role of conflict (Weber 1949). Early theorists explained how its presence can promote self-conscious action (Park and Burgess 1921). Their work shows that conflict is not uniformly destructive but rather a form of sociation that can also produce unity (Simmel 1955). “Society is sewn together by its inner conflicts,” Ross (1920: 164–165) remarked. Three decades later, Coser (1956: 80) echoed that conflict “sews the social system together.” Many thinkers noted the ability of conflict to create a deeper engagement with social life, enable members of a group to become aware of the ties that bind them to a shared moral universe, and fashion a sense of cultural commonality and political coherence. Others like Parsons (1949) critiqued conflict for undermining collective norms. A concern with the conservation of social order motivated many structural functionalists to dismiss the generative potential of conflict and define it instead as a social sickness. These scholars favored consensus over conflict because they saw the latter as “destructive of the social organism” (Horowitz 1962: 180).

Whether conflict is productive or pernicious depends on its form. This is why it is theoretically important to recognize the unique properties of infighting. Simmel (1955: 48–49) states, “People who have many common features often do one another worse or ‘worsen’ wrong than complete strangers.” Infighting is a special case of conflict that is unlike factions, defections, schisms, or splits. When activists express a dissenting opinion from others in the same organization or across organizations that belong to the same movement, they implicitly define the boundaries of their group without unraveling the network ties that bind them together. Conflict in this situation can promote integration by allowing activists to negotiate the concerns that matter most to them.

Movement scholars have long debated the relationship between infighting and insurrection. In this chapter, we review this vast literature and organize it into three major traditions: (1) classical; (2) conditional; and (3) causal treatments of conflict. Extant research is based on case studies of social movement organizations, and it is primarily concerned with the causes and consequences of conflict. Much of this work treats conflict as an undifferentiated pathogen that infects and eventually destroys mobilization efforts by producing paralyzing factional splits, schisms, defections, or counter-movements. These outcomes are related to infighting yet distinct in theoretical terms from it. Factions, splits, splinters, schisms, and defections ensue when groups mismanage disagreements (Bernstein 1997, 2003), fail to resolve internal conflicts (Gamson 1975), diverge in their perceptions of injustice (McAdam 1982), seek organizational independence (Rochford 1989), and pursue non-overlapping courses of action (Balsler 1997; Miller 1983; Mushaben 1989; Stern, Tarrow, and Williams 1971; Zald and McCarthy 1980).

Some caveats are worth mentioning before we proceed. Not all research on infighting can be classified into one of our three traditions, while some work evokes multiple themes, blending aspects of one intellectual tradition with another. We have organized the literature in this way to identify variation in how scholars have

conceptualized conflict and illustrate that its effects are neither uniform nor always destructive. We also want to be clear that by grouping research into one tradition, we do not mean to suggest that those respective pieces are the same across the board, but rather that the works are similar only on those aspects of conflict that are of interest to us in this review. The ideal types that we offer enable us to trace how students of social movements have imagined the relationship between infighting and insurrection, and they represent in broad strokes the state of the field. We conclude by outlining the tenets of a sociology of infighting that synthesizes insights from across the three traditions. We also advocate that future researchers should reconceptualize the relationship between infighting and insurrection through a field-theoretic perspective that links micro-level interpersonal instances of infighting with macro-level contentious actions for social change.

The Classical Tradition

Foundational research on the labor movement finds that competition between workers thwarts their ability to organize (Marx and Engels 1978). As they form into a self-conscious class, competition cedes to antagonism against those who own the means of production. Infighting in this analysis is the antecedent of inter-group conflict, which holds the potential for economic transformation through revolution. Inspired by Marx and Engels, movement scholars in the 1960s and 1970s studied social class and organizational cohesion, and their primary concern was to predict infighting using variables like the composition of the mass base, organizational form, and competition for limited resources (Zald and Ash 1966).

Research shows that inclusive organizations require little commitment and have a small initiation period. These groups are harmonious because they have relaxed criteria for joining (members are allowed to affiliate with other groups) and political orthodoxy (members are not subjected to ideological purity). Inclusive organizations are “split-resistant” (ibid.: 337). Exclusive organizations hold new members in an extended trial period and require submission to the group’s strict principles and leadership. They demand intense investments of time and energy, and members are discouraged from exploring other interests. Exclusive organizations “spew” forth factions because activists are barred from expressing multiple allegiances; sometimes they prefer to “switch than fight” (ibid.). In later work, Piven and Cloward (1977) identified strategy as a mediator between organizational form and factionalism. Their analysis is consistent with other research that finds recruitment procedures and membership requirements affect the causes and consequences of conflict (Gamson 1975; Stern, Tarrow, and Williams 1971). Finally, internal dissent flares when social movement organizations (SMOs) compete for scarce resources like money, media attention, and new members (Gitlin 1980; Jenkins 1983; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Morris 1984; Oberschall 1973). As they struggle for position in a crowded field and search for stable sources of financing, competition compels leaders to reassess their strategy, resulting in groups that change their views from radical to moderate or vice versa. This causes conflict if activists feel confused or uncertain about the organization’s values, goals, and targets of action.

Unlike most scholarship that devoted itself to predicting the causes of conflict, Gamson's (1975) work on 53 protest groups that mobilized over 150 years focused on effects. He argues that groups with inadequate mechanisms for managing conflict will fail. To make this strong claim, he first concedes to the ubiquity of infighting. "Internal division is a misery that few challenging groups escape completely – it is the nature of the beast" (ibid.: 99). Such conflicts arise for a number of reasons, including disagreements over strategy and tactics, the leadership profile, the distribution of power within the group, differences in political priorities, movement goals, and short- and long-term solutions for change. What differentiates successful movements from others is whether activists can resolve their disputes. Poor channels for conflict resolution induce factional splits, and for Gamson, these undermine effective political action. "The sorry reputation of factionalism is a deserved one," he argues. "That factional splits are a concomitant of failure is clear enough" (ibid.). In his study, Gamson uses "formal schism" (ibid.: 101) as his only measure of conflict, although he mentions "internal divisions," "internal disputes," "factions," "factional splits," and "factionalism" throughout his analysis. While the findings introduce new questions about the consequences of infighting, his limited measures prevent theoretical nuance, especially the conditions under which internal disputes are generative. Defections are more detrimental for a movement's longevity than the mere presence of dissent, but this hypothesis about the comparative effects of different forms of conflict remained empirically untested in the classical tradition.

Like Gamson, McAdam (1982) also offered a negative assessment of infighting. He found that infighting caused organizational proliferation (the splintering off of more organizations that compete with one another); persistent disagreements over the core issues and goals of the movement; the escalation of intra-movement conflict (animosity across organizations); and geographic diffusion (infighting was partly responsible for the spread of the civil rights movement from the South to the North). These findings led McAdam to conclude, "Once effective insurgent organizations were rendered impotent by factional disputes that drained them of the unity, energy, and resolve needed to sustain protest activity" (ibid.: 189). Infighting obstructed opportunities for cooperative action between civil rights groups and reduced the political strength and effectiveness of each one.

Gamson and McAdam became the leading voices in social movement scholarship, and their position on infighting defined it as toxic for the next generation of students. Mushaben (1989: 269) summarizes the wisdom that coalesced in the field: "Intramovement or group conflict is viewed as a disruptive, destructive force, with few exceptions." Her review of research leads her to summarize that "factionalization is engraved all too often as the 'cause of death' upon the tombstones of protests past in the graveyard of SMOs."

The Conditional Tradition

Researchers in the mid-1980s and 1990s began to examine the uneven effects of conflict. Findings from the women's movement in its organizational doldrums was among the first to challenge Gamson's and McAdam's conclusions that internal divisions are always destructive (Rupp and Taylor 1987). This work

showed that the presence of infighting mattered less than the ability of activists to channel it toward productive purposes. Studies of the West German peace movement show that conflict can be a “destructive or creative force” for social movements (Mushaben 1989: 269). Under certain conditions, it is a mobilization resource for activists who can use it to foster creativity, protect diversity, and promote conciliation among contending voices. Like classical researchers, scholars whom we group in the conditional tradition also isolated organizational problems (Downey 1986; Walsh and Cable 1989), but they were less likely to conclude that infighting was “internecine dog fighting” (Gerlach and Hine 1970: 64). The objective for scholars who were writing at this time shifted from predicting infighting to assessing its effects. New research specified the conditions under which infighting creates beneficial pressures for accountability and transparency in decision-making.

In his work on frame disputes in the nuclear disarmament movement, Benford (1993: 694) finds that infighting is “detrimental and facilitative” for organizing efforts. It halts the mobilization of some SMOs by depleting their resources while catalyzing others. Although it can cause splits, internal dissent also inspires cohesiveness. It aids in the division of interpretive labor, a type of culture work that helps activists diversify their articulations of strategy and identity (Cohen 1985). Several other studies contributed to a theoretical diplomacy about infighting. Balser (1997) offers a compelling comparison of its effects across four movement organizations: Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the American Federation of Labor (AFL), and Earth First! (EF!). Her work is exemplary because she carefully distinguishes infighting from factional splits. Like conflict theorists, Balser finds that defection is a variable outcome that requires explanation. It does not follow inevitably from an internal dispute nor is it interchangeable with it. Her findings showcase the role of the external environment on mobilization, including the nature of political opportunities (access to the system, the ability of activists to pass favorable legislation, the presence of allies, and the relative stability of electoral alignments); social control mechanisms like government infiltration, repression, and institutional pressures to espouse moderate views; and resources like money, meeting facilities, and media attention; and power-exchange relationships with other SMOs (see also Eisinger 1973; Glass 2009; King 2008; Kitschelt 1986; McAdam 1982; Romanos 2011; Shriver and Adams 2013).

The Causal Tradition

The classical tradition of infighting assumed that conflict within movements deserved its sorry reputation; it was a form of internecine dog fighting; and it hastened movement collapse by rendering insurgent groups impotent. Highly cited studies from the conditional tradition also documented the capacity of infighting to immobilize activists, but they considered its generative potential as well. These trends inspired a new generation of scholars to identify the causal factors that explain why some SMOs become mired in infighting while others avoid it. This work developed in a context when movement scholars were concerned with questions about the origins of social movements (Morris and Herring 1987), while sociology as a discipline was in the midst of a cultural turn (Friedland and Mohr 2004). For these reasons, the

1990s and 2000s comprise what we call a causal tradition that isolated cultural variables in particular – like frames, ideologies, identities, communities, and consciousness – to explain the origins of infighting.

Why does infighting occur in social movements? Research shows that its primary causes are racist attitudes and beliefs among members (Fantasia 1988; Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981), sexist attitudes and beliefs (Chesler 2001; Robnett 1997), and other social divisions that arise from differing structural positions (Cohen 1999, 2000; Gamson 1995, 1997; Goldstein 2003; Waite 2001; Walker and Stepick 2014). Infighting is also a function of coordination and communication problems that activists confront when they are situated at the intersection of multiple oppressions (Cohen 1999; Collins 2000; McCall 2005; Stockdill 2003), the changing generational and cohort profile of activists (Klandermans 1994; Whittier 1997), competing economic interests among individuals (Oliver 1993), failure to mobilize consensus (Klandermans 1988), disagreements over the political logics that drive the selection of strategies and tactics (Armstrong 2002; Wrenn 2012), challenges with participatory democracy as a structure for decision-making (Polletta 2002; Wilde 2004), and the struggle to maintain continuity and coherence across different stages of mobilization (Blee 2012; Ghaziani and Baldassarri 2011; Taylor 1989).

Most research on infighting in this tradition focused on contradictions in movement culture and identity (Bernstein 1997; Jasper 1997; Johnston and Klandermans 1995; Larana, Johnston, and Gusfield 1994; Lichterman 1995; Melucci 1985, 1995; Polletta 1997; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Stryker, Owens, and White 2000); pressures for ideological purity in values, viewpoints about the past and present, and visions for the future (Echols 1983, 1989; Klatch 2004; Ryan 1989; Taylor and Rupp 1993); and disputes over how to identify and define situations that require change most urgently, what to do about those situations, and how to inspire the rank and file to act (Benford 1993; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992). The literature shows the common occurrence of frame disputes in particular, which provide competing answers to questions like who are we (the protagonists), who are they (the antagonists and audience), what are we doing, and why are we doing it (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994; Trumpy 2014).

Scholars who published in the causal tradition refrained from taking an evaluative stance on the relationship between infighting and insurrection. Instead, they attributed the causal significance of infighting to single explanatory variables. This happened for several reasons. Avoiding evaluation was a reaction against the provocative language that Gamson, McAdam, and others used in prior years. Neutral language also continued the diplomatic stance that Benford advocated. Finally, many scholars skirted evaluation because they saw infighting as epiphenomenal to other theoretical concerns.

In summary, the classical, conditional, and causal traditions offer distinct insights about infighting in social movements. Table 12.1 summarizes the major themes from each.

Table 12.1 displays an ongoing debate among scholars about infighting. At one end are scholars who conclude that infighting is destructive. It is a form of inter-cine dog fighting that saps political potency. Infighting deserves its sorry reputation because it hastens movement collapse and renders insurgent groups impotent. It is the cause of death written upon the tombstones of protests past. The imagery here is

Table 12.1 Classical, conditional, and causal traditions in the study of infighting

<i>Dimensions of infighting</i>	<i>Scholarly tradition</i>		
	<i>Classical</i>	<i>Conditional</i>	<i>Causal</i>
Why study it?	To predict its occurrence	To determine its impact	Epiphenomenal
Is it distinct from defection?	No	Sometimes	Yes
Why does it matter?	Spews forth defection	Prompts defection, decline or growth	Highlights diversity
Why does it occur?	Organizational form	Organizational form	Many causal variables
How can it be resolved?	Change organizational form	Allow for articulation of dissent	Remedy causal variable
Is it positive or negative?	Negative	Positive or negative	Negative, but rectifiable
What is its relationship to defection?	Inevitable – always causes defection and decline	Unclear – may or may not cause defection and decline	Unspecified – emphasis of research is elsewhere

powerful, and the language is sharp. In the middle is a space for theoretical diplomacy: infighting can be beneficial or burdensome depending on how activists think about it and manage the challenges that they confront. At the other end are a collection of studies that show the resourceful contributions of infighting. Infighting allows activists to account for and celebrate their internal differences, and it offers moments of reflection as they calculate new directions in a shifting political terrain. This work offers some counterintuitive insights: consensus, rather than conflict, can be dangerous if it allows disputes to fester without careful examination and deliberation. Infighting is painful for those who must endure it, but it recalibrates and rebalances the movement in a way that sustains it over time (Luna 2010; McCammon 2012).

Some studies show that activists can successfully reframe their internal divisions as a source of strength. Hewitt (2011) found that international networks of feminist activists faced significant obstacles in generating a common understanding for what women needed globally, but they used infighting as proof to both insiders and outsiders that they incorporated diversity in ways that made their network stronger. This finding is consistent with the research by Armstrong (2002), Ghaziani (2008, 2009), Stein (2012), and Bernstein and Taylor (2013), all of whom have shown that LGBT activists established a sense of unity through their diversity, not despite it or by ignoring it. Rather than stunting movement growth, dissent can expand options for adherents, create new styles of participation, produce tactical innovation, and generate a wider array of strategies and tactics for achieving a movement's goals (Ferree and Hess 2002; McCammon 2003). This can be true even in the event of a factional split. In their study of the Texas women's movement, McCammon, Bergner, and Arch (2015) find that disagreeing with radical groups in their movement allowed moderates to gain entry into a closed political system. Contrasting their limited proposal with the sweeping Equal Legal Rights Amendment (ELRA), moderate activists

leveraged factionalism in the movement to create a positive radical flank effect. The specter of radical feminism worked to win institutional allies for movement moderates in the short run, and it set the stage for Texas legislators to eventually pass the ELRA after feminists had made the necessary inroads.

Conclusion

There is no denying that people fight. Conflict is a constitutional element of social life and social movements, and it is a dynamic process with variable outcomes. As a type of conflict, we believe that infighting ought to be a central category for the analysis of mobilization. Activists express dissenting opinions to define what it means to be involved in a movement, how to strategize their objectives, and how to execute those strategies with the most effective tactics. Infighting can generate multiple perspectives, despite the unease it sometimes evokes among activists who do the hard work of organizing on the ground. The expression of discrepant opinions highlights the fine line between including some while excluding others, and it reveals clues for which actions, cultural worldviews, and collective identities will be effective in the planning and organizing stages in light of volatile and shifting power dynamics (Walker and Stepick 2014). Infighting privileges differences among activists, and it directs scholarly attention away from shared concerns and group building to contested questions of political agency.

Based on insights from our review of research in the classical, conditional, and causal traditions, we advocate a sociology of infighting that frames this type of conflict as a case of cultural skepticism (Swidler 2001). The doubts and challenges activists articulate against each other enable them to concretize abstract ideas of culture and collective identity, the nature of injustice, the operations of inequality, and strategic remedial action. This is why we believe that any analysis of the cultural consequences of mobilization must examine the prevalence, role, and patterns of infighting. Glossing over the conflicts that arise between “us versus them-inside” (Gamson 1997), conflating it with factions and defections (Balser 1997), or an exclusive emphasis on coherence, consensus, integration, and unity among activists at the expense of “dissonance and discontinuity” (Hebdige 1979: 79) undermines the validity of research findings by denying the negotiation that activists require to objectify, communicate, and act on their visions for social justice.

Our review shows that focusing on infighting can allow scholars to learn about the micro-dynamics that underlie the construction of activist identities and cultures over time. Left unaccounted is how conflict at once shapes and is shaped by the broader political context in which activists are situated. To round out our proposed sociology of infighting, we bring it into conversation with the increasingly prominent field theory in social movements (Barman 2016; Fligstein and McAdam 2012; Pettinicchio 2013). Both approaches treat conflict as a constant feature of social life and a potentially productive aspect of mobilization. Strategic action fields are the meso-level bridge that connects infighting among activists with the political opportunity structure. Like a set of Russian nesting dolls, strategic action fields are nested within one another, and the rules and structures of those that are higher in order (e.g. presidential parties, relationships with elites, the view of municipal authorities)

shape those that they surround (e.g. conflicts and collaborations among activists). Every field is comprised of multiple actors, each with varying access to the resources they need to get what they want. In this framework, a single organization is both an actor in the larger field, where it competes and negotiates with other organizations, as well as a field with its own set of internal actors (chapters, regions, and board members, among others) who themselves are competing and collaborating as they struggle to create a culture and collective identity that is consistent with their goals.

Infighting shapes relationships across strategic action fields, including other organizations in the same movement, opposing and allied movements, public organizations, and state agencies (Pearlman 2011). For example, Whittier (2014) finds that feminist infighting over pornography in the 1980s and 1990s kept their organizations on the sidelines during the major policy campaigns around it. The absence of an organized feminist presence gave religious conservatives an advantage in spotlighting their own frames and minimizing feminist critiques of pornography in the policy process. Bringing field theory to a sociology of infighting clarifies how conflicts within a movement affect strategic action fields by expanding, limiting, or shifting how activists and counter-activists are positioned within different parts of a complex, nested political and policy structure. Bringing a sociology of infighting to field theory articulates how shifts in the configuration of the political and policy context affects local struggles over cultural meanings and collective identities (Harrison, Lopez, and Martin 2015).

Our review of the literature suggests some slippage between infighting at the organizational level (or conflicts within a single organization) and that which occurs at the movement level (or inter-organizational conflicts). Existing studies inadequately distinguish these forms of infighting, yet our review shows that the tasks required of members within an organization are unlike those that exist between organizations. A notable exception is Davenport's (2014) research, which shows that repression and infighting interact at the organizational and individual levels to "kill" a movement. His findings raise new questions: How are internal organizational conflicts different from larger-scale fights between movement organizations? And how do these distinctions affect mobilization efforts? Because field theory focuses on the layered nature of political life, researchers can use it to conceptualize the nuances of infighting.

To make this less abstract, we return to an example with which we opened this chapter. NOW's early schisms were the outcome of conflict over strategies, goals, resource distribution, and collective identity. A narrow focus on just the individual organization tells us one story about the effects of conflict. But these disputes also represented flashpoints in a broader, and ultimately productive, struggle to settle the emerging feminist field. Activists and organizations were unsure of which issues and which actors would come to define feminism. Multiple rounds of infighting within and between organizations clarified the boundaries of the movement and shaped the larger field. Despite the controversy of its positions on abortion and the ERA, NOW's prominence in the feminist field helped to institutionalize its preferences as the central tenets of the movement (Kretschmer 2014). In fact, WEAL, which was formed by the faction of Ohio members of NOW who defected, adopted abortion rights as a plank of its own platform just a few years after splitting with NOW over that very same issue.

We use this example to open and close the chapter because it shows that theories of infighting fit well with those of strategic action fields. Together, they provide a comprehensive explanation for the micro-, meso-, and macro-dynamics that interact when activists contend with questions of culture, identity, and strategy. Future research can investigate the conditions under which activists invoke field relationships to shape the outcome of their local conflicts or when those conflicts reconfigure alliances in larger arenas, as well as how fields shape whether infighting produces factionalism or buffers against it.

Note

- 1 Mary Jean Collins, telephone interview, May 29, 2009.

References

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2002. *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950–1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Balsler, Deborah B. 1997. “The Impact of Environmental Factors on Factionalism and Schism in Social Movement Organizations.” *Social Forces* 76: 199–228.
- Barakso, Maryann. 2004. *Governing NOW: Grassroots Activism in the National Organization for Women*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barman, Emily. 2016. “Varieties of Field Theory and the Sociology of the Non-profit Sector.” *Sociology Compass* 10: 442–458.
- Benford, Robert D. 1993. “Frame Disputes within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement.” *Social Forces* 71: 677–701.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement.” *American Journal of Sociology* 103: 531–565.
- Bernstein, Mary. 2003. “Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained? Conceptualizing Social Movement ‘Success’ in the Lesbian and Gay Movement.” *Sociological Perspectives* 46: 353–379.
- Bernstein, Mary and Verta Taylor. 2013. *The Marrying Kind? Debating Same-Sex Marriage within the Lesbian and Gay Movement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Blee, Kathleen M. 2012. *Democracy in the Making: How Activist Groups Form*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown-Saracino, Japonica and Amin Ghaziani. 2009. “The Constraints of Culture: Evidence from the Chicago Dyke March.” *Cultural Sociology* 3: 51–75.
- Chesler, Phyllis. 2001. *Woman's Inhumanity to Woman*. New York: Nation Books.
- Cohen, Cathy J. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, Cathy J. 2000. “Contested Membership: Black Gay Identities and the Politics of AIDS.” In *Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy, and Civil Rights*, edited by John D’Emilio, William B. Turner, and Urvashi Vaid, 382–406. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Cohen, Jean L. 1985. “Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements.” *Social Research* 52: 663–716.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Coser, Lewis. 1956. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: The Free Press.

- Davenport, Christian. 2014. *How Social Movements Die: Repression and Demobilization of the Republic of New Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downey, Gary L. 1986. "Ideology and the Clamshell Identity: Organizational Dilemmas in the Anti-Nuclear Power Movement." *Social Problems* 33: 357–373.
- Du Bois, William Edward Burghardt. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Company.
- Echols, Alice. 1983. "Cultural Feminism: Feminist Capitalism and the Anti-Pornography Movement." *Social Text* 7: 34–53.
- Echols, Alice. 1989. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America 1967–1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eisinger, Peter K. 1973. "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities." *American Political Science Review* 67: 11–28.
- Fantasia, Rick. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx and Beth Hess. 2002. *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement across Four Decades of Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. 2012. *A Theory of Fields*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Friedland, Roger and John W. Mohr. 2004. "The Cultural Turn in American Sociology." In *Matters of Culture: Cultural Sociology in Practice*, edited by Roger Friedland and John W. Mohr, 1–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1995. "Must Identity Movements Self-Destruct? A Queer Dilemma." *Social Problems* 42: 390–407.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1997. "Messages of Exclusion: Gender, Movements, and Symbolic Boundaries." *Gender & Society* 11: 178–199.
- Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gerlach, Luther and Virginia Hine. 1970. *People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Ghaziani, Amin. 2008. *The Dividends of Dissent: How Conflict and Culture Work in Lesbian and Gay Marches on Washington*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ghaziani, Amin. 2009. "An 'Amorphous Mist'? The Problem of Measurement in the Study of Culture." *Theory and Society* 38: 581–612.
- Ghaziani, Amin and Delia Baldassarri. 2011. "Cultural Anchors and the Organization of Differences: A Multi-method Analysis of LGBT Marches on Washington." *American Sociological Review* 76: 179–206.
- Ghaziani, Amin and Gary Alan Fine. 2008. "Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago Dyke March." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 20: 51–67.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glass, Pepper G. 2009. "Unmaking a Movement: Identity Work and the Outcomes of Zapatista Community Centers in Los Angeles." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 38: 523–546.
- Goldstein, Richard. 2003. *Homocons: The Rise of the Gay Right*. London: Verso.
- Harrison, Jill Ann, Steven H. Lopez, and Andrew W. Martin. 2015. "Rethinking Organizational Decoupling Fields, Power Struggles, and Work Routines." *Social Currents* 2: 341–360.
- Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge.

- Hewitt, Lyndi. 2011. "Framing across Differences, Building Solidarities: Lessons from Women's Rights Activism in Transnational Spaces." *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements* 3: 65–99.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. 1962. "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory." *Social Forces* 41: 177–188.
- Hunt, Scott A., Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow. 1994. "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 185–208. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins, Craig J. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 527–553.
- Johnston, Hank and Bert Klandermans. 1995. "Social Movements and Culture." In *Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, vol. 4, edited by Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- King, Leslie. 2008. "Ideology, Strategy and Conflict in a Social Movement Organization: The Sierra Club Immigration Wars." *Mobilization* 13: 45–61.
- Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 16: 57–85.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1988. "The Formation and Mobilization of Consensus." *International Social Movement Research* 1: 173–196.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1994. "Transient Identities? Membership Patterns in the Dutch Peace Movement." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 168–184. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Klatch, Rebecca E. 2004. "The Underside of Social Movements: The Effects of Destructive Affective Ties." *Qualitative Sociology* 27: 487–509.
- Kretschmer, Kelsy. 2014. "Shifting Boundaries and Splintering Movements: Abortion Rights in the Feminist and New Right Movements." *Sociological Forum* 29: 893–915.
- Larana, Enrique, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Levitsky, Sandra R. 2007. "Niche Activism: Constructing a Unified Movement Identity in a Heterogeneous Organizational Field." *Mobilization* 12: 271–286.
- Lichterman, Paul. 1995. "Piecing Together a Multicultural Community: Cultural Differences in Community Building among Grassroots Environments." *Social Problems* 42: 513–534.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Luna, Zakiya T. 2010. "Marching Toward Reproductive Justice: Coalitional (Re)-framing of the March for Women's Lives." *Sociological Inquiry* 80: 554–578.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1978. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 469–500. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30: 1771–1800.
- McCammon, Holly J. 2003. "Out of the Parlors and Into the Streets." *Social Forces* 81: 787–818.
- McCammon, Holly J. 2012. *The U.S. Women's Jury Movements and Strategic Adaptation: A More Just Verdict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- McCammon, Holly J., Erin M. Bergner, and Sandra C. Arch. 2015. "Are You One of Those Women?" Within-Movement Conflict, Radical Flank Effects, and Social Movement Political Outcomes." *Mobilization* 20: 157–178.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212–1241.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1985. "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements." *Social Research* 52: 789–816.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1995. "The Process of Collective Identity." In *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans, 41–63. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1996. *Challenging Codes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Frederick D. 1983. "The End of SDS and the Emergence of Weatherman: Demise through Success." In *Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies*, edited by Jo Freeman, 279–297. New York: Longman.
- Moraga, Cherrie and Gloria Anzaldúa. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Morris, Aldon. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.
- Morris, Aldon and Cedric Herring. 1987. "Theory and Research in Social Movements: A Critical Review." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 137–198.
- Mushaben, Joyce Marie. 1989. "The Struggle Within: Conflict, Consensus, and Decision Making among National Coordinators and Grass-Roots Organizers in the West German Peace Movement." *International Social Movement Research* 2: 267–298.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oliver, Pamela E. 1993. "Formal Models of Collective Action." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 271–300.
- Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1949. *The Structure of Social Action*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Pearlman, Wendy. 2011. *Violence, Nonviolence, and the Palestinian National Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Penelope, Julia. 1992. *Call Me Lesbian: Lesbian Lives, Lesbian Theory*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Pettinicchio, David. 2013. "Strategic Action Fields and the Context of Political Entrepreneurship: How Disability Rights Became Part of the Policy Agenda." *Research in Social Movement Conflict and Change* 36: 79–106.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Polletta, Francesca. 1997. "Culture and Its Discontents: Recent Theorizing on the Cultural Dimensions of Protest." *Sociological Inquiry* 67: 431–450.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2002. *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 283–305.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5: 631–660.
- Robnett, Belinda. 1997. *How Long? How Long? African-American Women in the Struggle for Civil Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Rochford, E. Burke, Jr. 1989. "Factionalism, Group Defection, and Schism in the Hare Krishna Movement." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28: 162–179.
- Romanos, Eduardo. 2011. "Factionalism in Transition: A Comparison of Ruptures in the Spanish Anarchist Movement." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 24: 355–380.
- Ross, Edward Alsworth. 1920. *The Principles of Society*. New York: The Century Company.
- Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryan, Barbara. 1989. "Ideological Purity and Feminism: The U.S. Women's Movement from 1966 to 1975." *Gender & Society* 3: 239–257.
- Shriver, Thomas and Alison Adams. 2013. "Collective Identity and the Subjective Terrain of Political Opportunities: Movement Dissension Over Participation in Party Politics." *Mobilization* 18: 65–82.
- Simmel, Georg. 1955. *Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliations*. Translated by Kurt H. Wolff and Reinhard Bendix. New York: Free Press.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1: 197–217.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol M. Mueller, 133–155. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stein, Marc. 2012. *Rethinking the Gay and Lesbian Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Stern, A. J., Sidney Tarrow, and M. F. Williams. 1971. "Factions and Opinion Groups in European Mass Parties. Some Evidence from a Study of Italian Socialist Activists." *Comparative Politics* 3: 529–559.
- Stockdill, Brett C. 2003. *Activism Against AIDS: At the Intersections of Sexuality, Race, Gender, and Class*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Stryker, Sheldon, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White. 2000. *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, Verta. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54: 761–775.
- Taylor, Verta and Leila J. Rupp. 1993. "Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19: 33–61.
- Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg, 104–129. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Trumpy, Alexa J. 2014. "Woman vs. Fetus: Frame Transformation and Intramovement Dynamics in the Pro-life Movement." *Sociological Spectrum* 34: 163–184.
- Waite, Lori G. 2001. "Divided Consciousness: The Impact of Black Elite Consciousness on the 1966 Chicago Freedom Movement." In *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*, edited by Jane Mansbridge and Aldon H. Morris, 170–203. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walker, Edward T. and Lina M. Stepick. 2014. "Strength in Diversity? Group Heterogeneity in the Mobilization of Grassroots Organizations." *Sociology Compass* 8: 959–975.
- Walsh, Edward and Sherry Cable. 1989. "Realities, Images, and Management Dilemmas in Social Movement Organizations: The Three Mile Island Experience." *International Social Movement Research* 2: 199–211.
- Weber, Max. 1949. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Translated by Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Weber, Max. 1958. "The Three Types of Legitimate Rule." *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions* 4: 1–11.
- Whittier, Nancy. 1997. "Political Generations, Micro-Cohorts, and the Transformation of Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 62: 760–778.
- Whittier, Nancy. 2014. "Rethinking Coalitions: Anti-Pornography Feminists, Conservatives, and Relationships between Collaborative Adversarial Movements." *Social Problems* 61: 175–193.
- Wilde, Melissa J. 2004. "How Culture Mattered at Vatican II: Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 69: 576–602.
- Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2012. "Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies." *Peace Studies Journal* 5: 27–44.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1987. *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zald, Mayer N. and Roberta Ash. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decline, and Change." *Social Forces* 44: 327–340.
- Zald, Mayer N. and John D. McCarthy. 1980. "Social Movement Industries: Competition and Cooperation among Movement Organizations." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change* 3: 1–20.