FEMINIST SOCIAL MOVEMENT
ORGANIZATIONS: THE CONSTRUCTION
OF AN IDEAL TYPE

Cheryl Hyde

Sept. 1987   CRSO #349

FEMINIST SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS:
THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN IDEAL TYPE

Cheryl A. Hyde

Center for Research on Social Organization
4015B LSA Building
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

FEMINIST SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS:
THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN IDEAL TYPE

The feminist movement has had a profound impact on American society. It challenged male dominance in the family, education, employment, government, and other social institutions. Basic principles of egalitarianism, empowerment, and personalizing the political (e.g. the creed: "personal is political") confronted popular notions of hierarchy, dominance and status. The feminist movement has suffered major reverses, however, such as the defeat of the E.R.A. and the attack on reproductive rights. Despite, or perhaps because of these setbacks, it is likely to remain one of the most crucial and controversial social movements in the United States in the coming decades. It is, therefore, ironic that the organizational building blocks of this movement - Feminist Social Movement Organizations - have received relatively little attention in the feminist and social movement literature.

Feminist Social Movement Organizations (FSMOs) are organizations which explicitly state ties to, or support for, the women's movement. They have a local community presence which brings the feminist movement into "a woman's backyard". As organizational embodiements of feminist theory and practice, FSMOs possess diverse ideologies, develop varying structures, span a range of issues, use numerous strategies, and provide a variety of products. Such organizations include credit unions, peace encampments, consciousness-raising groups, displaced homemakers' programs, low-income coops, and anti-violence shelters.

Despite their significance for the feminist movement, little systematic research has been done on FSMOs. Historical accounts of the women's movement often emphasize the role of organizations in the origins of the movement, but do not suggest how these organizations sustain the movement (Evans, 1980; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Freeman, 1984). There are numerous case studies of various feminist social change and service organizations, yet such work tends to focus on national and reformist organizations. Such case studies often neglect the broader, theoretical social movement or social action paradigms (Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Gornick et al, 1985; Harvey, 1985). While Riger (1984) does address FSMOs, her propositions are both confusing and non-empirical. There is no a systematic, cross-ideological and cross-issue study that examines the birth, survival, maintenance and demise of FSMOs. In essence, there is no comprehensive study of the organizational underpinnings of the women's movement.

The goal of this paper is the construction of an FSMO Ideal Type. The focus is on the internal characteristics of these organizations. The ideal typical framework, produced through an inductive analysis, is a composite of utopian visions and everyday realities within the feminist movement. Through the formulation of the FSMO ideal type, I am able to present the vitality and scope of feminist values, beliefs and practices. As an ideal or pure organizational type, however, it probably is not attainable. Actual FSMOs could share some or most of its characteristics, though it is more likely that they are hybrids of the ideal type. The value of this Ideal Type is that it synthesizes various pieces of disparate information, clarifies organizational dimensions and provides the framework for empirical research. As a context for this undertaking, I first present a brief overview of relevant themes in the social movement literature.

<div align="center">LITERATURE</div>

In recent years there has been a paradigmatic shift in the way social movements are analyzed. No longer are collective behavior approaches, which emphasize structural strains, the psychological state of the masses, and the irrational, spontaneous growth of the movement, dominant. Replacing this framework is the resource mobilization perspective, which calls attention to the acquisition, mobilization and diffusion of resources, the rational actions of particpants, and the critical, facilitative roles of organizations.

Resource mobilization theorists grapple with the question - how does a social movement recruit participants? Some have argued that rational individuals will not engage in movement activities as long as their interests can be realized through the collective actions of others. The solution to this problem rests in the movement's ability to offer potential participants selective incentives (benefits), which are not available to the general public (Gamson, 1975; Jenkins, 1983; McCarthy and Zald, 1977; Morris and Herring, forthcoming; Olson, 1965; Tilly, 1978). Such incentives are solidary - influence, friendship, personal growth (Fireman and Gamson, 1979), or material - money and goods (Olson, 1965). The movement's ability to develop and disseminate incentives hinges, in turn, on the acquisition of resources from the larger society (e.g. fundraising). Resource mobilization theorists also direct attention to the unequal distribution of available power and resources in the political, economic and social arenas

(Gamson, 1975; Tilly, 1978). Such inequality places constraints on the movements ability to accumulate resources, and hence, to offer the selective incentives necessary for participant engagement.

Three, broad analytical themes within the resource mobilization perspective guide the examination of FSMOs. First, resource mobilization theorists refined the concepts: social movement and social movement organization. A social movement is a "...set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977:1217). A social movement organization is an organization "which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement...and attempts to implement those goals" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977:1217). Resource mobilization literature suggests two ideal-typical models of SMOs: the hierarchical, centralized, differentiated, professional organization (McCarthy and Zald, 1977; Zald and Ash, 1966), and the decentralized, non-differentiated, democratic-collectivist organization (Freeman, 1983; Rothschild-Whitt, 1982). SMOs are critical to the movement because they serve as overall coordination centers in which resources are mobilized, participants educated, and communication networks developed (Evans, 1980; Morris, 1984).

Second, resource mobilization theorists direct attention to the aquisition, development and utilization of resources. Three types of resources exist: tangible (money, space, publicity), intangible-specialized (expertise, networks, status), and intangible-unspecialized (time, commitment) (Freeman, 1983:196-197). While virtually all social movements are short on tangible resources, a relationship does exist between the type of SMO and the type of resources. The collectivist organization is more likely to depend on intangible-unspecialized resources, while the professional organization is more likely to depend on specialized-intangible resources, which have a greater chance of leading to tangible resources. Furthermore, types of resources usually translate directly into similar kinds of incentives (e.g. intangible-unspecialized resources result in the offering of solidary incentives). It is the strategic use of resources that largely determines the SMO's options and outcomes.

Third, resource mobilization theorists place the problems and tensions of SMOs within a political and economic context. This is discussed in terms of either social movement industries (analogous to businesses in industrial sectors), in which the focus in on the cooperative and competitive arrangements between SMOs (McCarthy and Zald, 1977); or, the repressive functions of the state, in which the focus is on the ways SMOs are constrained as they pursue their goals (Gamson, 1975; Tilly, 1978). This

contextual analysis sheds light on the strategic choices that participants must make. Given the need for resources, the suppression by the polity, and the limited opportunities to act, participants' actions, no matter how "outrageous" or "illegitimate", can be understood as part of a rational pursuit of their goals.

In the study of FSMOs, the insights just described are quite beneficial. Yet many of these points can not fully explain the reality of FSMOs. First, the centralized, professional definition of SMOs dominates the literature. While in the majority of cases this is an accurate model, there is a substantial cluster of democratic-collectivist organizations for which it is not appropriate. Moreover, this definition pre-determines a number of findings, particularly with respect to careerism and professionalism. Organizations that do not fit this model could hold greater potential for revolutionary change. Such organizations expand the visions of what an SMO is and can be.

Because the centralized, professional organization is the prevailing model, there is disproportionate emphasis on tangible and specialized-intangible resources. There is no doubt that these are critical to organizational survival. Yet also important as resources are ideological frameworks, affective ties, cultural symbols, and process-oriented procedures. While some resource mobilization theorists mention the importance of ideology and unspecialized-intangible resources (Fireman and Gamson, 1979; Gamson, 1975; Gamson and Schmeidler, 1984), they do not receive the attention paid to tangible resources. Consequently, there is not a sufficient understanding of why people join a movement and why people are willing to take risks when there are few tangible resources. Recent works have attempted to integrate the three types of resources and cultural belief systems (Morris, 1984), or the rational use of resources with select social-psychological processes (Ferree and Miller, 1985). Such works provide springboards for more holistic analyses of SMO resources.

Finally, while the political and economic context provides important insights into the external factors that impinge on the SMO, this line of inquiry also is used as a means of determining the success of the organization. Success is evaluated in terms of the SMO's ability to successfully compete for resources, or by the SMO's impact on the polity. Neither view seriously considers the growth and development of social movement participants as a factor in determining success. The acquisition of skills, the formation of friendship networks, and the development of self-confidence and self-esteem, go unnoticed. Moreover, social change, specifically revolution, is often cast as an abrupt and violent act (Tilly, 1978).

The study of FSMOs addresses these three concerns. First, a substantial number of FSMOs (perhaps a majority) are collectivist-oriented organizations, or at least strive to be. Many of these FSMOs incorporate a revolutionary vision that includes anti-professional, anti-bureaucratic beliefs. Second, intangible, especially unspecialized, resources are the dominant resources within the women's movement. Women, by and large, do not possess the necessary financial base with which to obtain tangible resources. Many FSMOs have as their explicit goals the development of alternative communities or cultural centers, and thus the development and dissemination of ideology and cultural symbols is of prime importance. Successful FSMOs shed light on how intangible, particularly unspecialized, resources can build a movement. Finally, FSMOs simultaneously are attentive to process and product dynamics. Evaluation of FSMOs, based on the development of affective ties, personal growth and friendship networks, provides a model with which the general definition of success can be expanded. And social change, as nourished by FSMOs, is viewed as a long, gradual process that is both institution- and people-changing (Freeman, 1983; Hyde, 1986; Morgan, 1978). Feminist revolutionary processes attend to the needs and development of individual and groups, and to the alterations, creation or destruction (if necessary) of organizations.

The study of FSMOs both compliments and challenges key concepts within social movement theory. To further clarify these reciprocal relationships, I now turn to the construction of an FSMO Ideal Type.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FSMOs

Many organizational characteristics could have been included in this ideal type. I have chosen to focus on the internal characteristics of the FSMO: ideology, structure and processes, participants, strategies and products. These characteristics present the critical challenges to prevailing theory, and offer unique insights into SMO dynamics. This unfortunately is done at the expense of understanding the societal context within which such organizations function. While such discussion is vital to a full understanding of SMOs, it is beyond the scope of this paper. A discussion of each organizational characteristic is presented. I conclude with a summary that suggests an FSMO Tdeal Type.

Ideology:

An ideology is a coherent set of ideas and beliefs that reflect the needs and aspirations of the individual, group, organization or culture. Within the women's movement, there has been a variety of attempts to categorize feminist thought and ideology (Bunch, 1974; Deckard, 1983; Evans, 1980; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Kolias, 1976; Weil, 1986; Van Den Bergh and Cooper, 1986). A synthesis of these efforts reveals four basic or key ideological frameworks: (1) liberal/career, (2) socialist, (3) radical, and (4) women of color. The first framework reflects the values and goals of the older or reform branch of the contemporary women's movement. The final three represent the values and goals of the younger or revolutionary branch of the women's movement.

The liberal/career framework argues that the sex-role socialization process is the primary cause of women's oppression. It is an explanation that focuses on individual liberty and equal rights. This plank's goals are successful assimilation and equal opportunity, achieved through legal and educational reform, policy development, mass-membership building, and "famous firsts" publicity. Organizations within this framework are usually formal, hierarchies with top-down communication and decision-making processes. Examples include NOW and the National Women's Political Caucus (Deckard, 1983; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Freeman, 1984; Kolias, 1976; Weil, 1989). Such organizations are closest to the SMOs emphasized in the social movement literature.

In contrast to this reformist framework, both socialist- and radical-feminist perspectives emphasize a revolutionary process of social change. This ideology of the movement's younger branch is rooted in the black empowerment and new left movements of the 1960s. Though these two frameworks cite different causes of women's oppression, they share an anti-structure, anti-leadership organizational philosophy. Their rejection of bureaucratic norms results in energy placed on the development of collectives and consensus processes (Bunch, 1974; Evans, 1980; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Freeman, 1984; Morgan, 1978; Weil, 1986).

The socialist-feminist framework locates the cause of women's oppression in the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy. The goal is the elimination of gender and class oppression, and analyses focus on connections between labor processes, reproduction, family dynamics and socialization. Unfortunately, socialist-feminists have not developed viable, independent organizations, nor have they realized their potential in grassroots and worksite organizing. They primarily exist as caucuses of leftist organizations

(Evans, 1980; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Kolias, 1976; Weil, 1986). Kolias observes: "With few actions or programs to make them more visible, socialist-feminists are the least well known and most isolated group in the women's movement" (1976:5).

Within radical feminism, gender is the root of all oppression. Patriarchy (male privilege and power) must be eliminated. This framework focuses extensively on the empowerment of women, through the celebration of women's culture and herstory, the use of consciousness-raising, the linkage of personal and political action, and the development of alternative centers and communities. While there exists the tendency within the more extreme segment of this plank to create separatist structures, radical feminists largely are responsible for the provision of vital, women-centered services, particularly concerning violence against women. FSMOs within this perspective include rape crisis centers, peace encampments, domestic violence shelters and artist collectives (Browne, 1978; Bunch 1974; Kolias, 1976; Weil, 1986).

Perhaps the most exciting and comprehensive framework is the emerging Women of Color perspective. While some black feminist organizations do fall within a reformist framework, this perspective alligns itself primarily with the revolutionary wing of the movement. It emphasizes collectivity, consciousness-raising, personal and political action, and reclamation of history. The unique contribution of this framework to feminist thought is its articulation of the interlocking nature of oppressions. Women's oppression is caused by the mutually reinforcing dynamics of sexism, racism, classism, and heterosexism. This perspective recognizes the diversity of various oppressed groups and at the same time advocates a movement in which social, economic, and political oppression, on personal and institutional levels, is eliminated. Small groups and collectives are supportive environments in which individuals and groups can undertake internal education and plan social and economic strategies. FSMOs within this perspective include the Combahee Collective, the National Black Feminist Organization, and the Chicana Service Action Center (Combahee, 1984; Dill, 1983; Weil, 1986).

Structures and Processes

Perhaps no issue has received more attention and been subject to more debate within the feminist community than that of organizational structures and processes. The controversy centers on the ideological commitment to egalitarianism, participation and diversity, seen by many as only operational within a collectivist organization. The development of collectives is the structural backbone of the revolutionary branch of the women's movement. Within these groups and organizations, women

experimented with various decision making, leadership, and conflict resolution styles. While some

innovative and creative organizations are produced, the desire for collectivity often goes to the extreme.

In many FSMOs, collectivity becomes the goal rather than a means of achieving the goal, and ironically,

the values that the organization set out to preserve are undermined.

It is not surprising that this branch of the movement adopted the collective structure. Trained in

the radical left and civil rights movement, these women embraced the anti-leadership, anti-structure

philosophy of SDS and SNCC (Evans, 1980; Freeman, 1984). As a radical feminist critique crystalized,

collectives were viewed as a means of rejecting the hierarchical, bureaucratic relations rooted in

patriarchical authority (Ferguson, 1984). For those collectives that provided services, the structure

became an important way of distinguishing feminist from traditional service delivery (Gornick et al,

1985). Finally, the radical wing used collectives as a means of clarifying the differences between itself

and the reform movement, which adopted traditional, complex organizational structures (Whitlock, n.d.).

·Because of the centrality of the collective organization to revolutionary ideology, and the lack of emphasis

that this organization receives in social movement literature, I undertake an examination of this structure

in this section.

Groundbreaking work on collectives has been done by Rothschild-Whitt (1982; 1979). I use her

characteristics of the ideal-typical collectivist-democratic organization as a way of summerizing this

structure:

> 1. Authority resident in the collectivity as a whole...Compliance is to the consensus of the
> organization.
> 2. Minimal stipulated rules...some calculability possible on the basis of knowing the
> substantive ethics involved in the situation.
> 3. Social controls primarily based on personalistic or moralistic appeals and the selection of
> homogeneous personnel.
> 4. Ideal of community; relations are to be holistic, personal, or value in themselves.
> 5. Employment based on friends, social-political values, personality attributes, and informally
> assessed knowledge and skills. ...Concept of career advancement not meaningful; no hierarchy
> of positions.
> 6. Normative and solidarity incentives primary; material incentives secondary.
> 7. Egalitarian; reward differentials, if any, strictly limited by the collectivety.
> 8. Minimal division of labor: administration combined with performance tasks; division
> between intellectual and manual work reduced. ...Generalization of jobs and functions; holistic
> roles. Demystification of expertise (1982:37).

The ideal-typical collective incorporates key feminist values, such as community, collective actions,

egalitarian relations, and solidarity. The collectivist structure was particularly well suited for the

consciousness raising groups that provided the organizational base for the early women's movement

(Freeman, 1973; 1984). It underscores the unique expertise that lay persons and indigenous workers bring to an organization. The strength of feminist collectives resides in the ability to achieve the above characteristics.

In reality, FSMOs encompasses a variety of structures. At one extreme are pure the collectivities, which include peace encampments (Buehler, 1985; Costello and Stanley, 1985; Hayes, 1983), the Combahee River Collective (Combahee, 1984), some rape crisis centers (Gornick et al, 1985; Harvey, 1985), and some publishing organizations (Heresies Collective, n.d.; Journal Collective, 1978). In the other extreme are complex, hierarchical organizations such as NOW, "which internally reproduces the same form of power relations and hierarchical domination that characterizes a patriarchal society" (Whitlock, n.d.). There are also examples of FSMOs that fit between these poles. Rape crisis centers that Harvey (1985) labels, "modified collectives", possess a number of characteristics associated with collectives. They do, however, have a squat hierarchy (2 or 3 tiers), a mixture of professional and lay staff, and the extension of program and policy decision-making to the director and an active community board, with staff imput. There are also agency-type, professional, women-controlled FSMOs, such as some rape crisis centers (Gornick et al, 1985) or the Feminist Women's Health Center (Gottlieb, 1980), which share more characteristics with the hierarchical ideal type. And, there are hydrids, such as feminist organizations embedded in other institutions [e.g. Women Organized Against Rape (WOAR), housed in a Philadelphia hospital ("Ten Years..."; 1984)].

What is clear is that the examination of FSMOs cannot be based on propositions or assumptions that rest solely on one organizational type. FSMOs come in a variety of organizational structures, and analyses need to take such variance into consideration. Because the collectivist organization has been downplayed in the literature, I continue the focus on this structure with a brief discussion on the problems of implementation. These organizational dilemmas, however, are distinct from the constraints (e.g careerism, professionalism) often discussed in the social movement literature.

A key factor in an organization's ability to achieve its goals lies in its decision making process. Within the collectivist structure, decision making follows a consensus format (Newton, 1982; Rothschild-Whitt, 1982). This involves the airing of ideas and feelings from all group members. Unless there is total agreement, or no blocking of consensus (which places tremendous pressure on the dissenter), decisions do

not get made (Allison, 1979; Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Freeman, 1973). Progress is hampered when decisions are tabled.

In theory, this process ensures equal participation. In reality, individuals have different norms and styles of communication, possess different levels of understanding, and have varying abilities to influence others. Leadership, which is denied by the collective in the name of egalitarianism, often emerges on a covert level as persons attempt to convince others that their way is best. Expertise, prior status and familiarity with the consensus process eventually result in the formation of an elite that controls the organization (Freeman, 1973; Newton, 1982). The newcomer is at a distinct disadvantage. Without clear rules that guide decision-making, a select few dominate the organization.

The denial of expertise further complicates the collective. Often, there is an overcommitment to job rotation which hinders the full utilization of a woman's creativity or talents (Ahrens, 1980; Galper and Washburne, 1976b). Considerable attention is paid to training, so that all functions can be performed by all members. Clearly some rotation is a strength of the collective. For example, no single individual or group should be responsible for all maintenance (e.g. shitwork). Yet the collective structure often works against the use of needed knowledge or skills.

Unacknowledged leadership and expertise results in the lack of accountability (Bunch and Fisher, 1976; Freeman and McMillan, 1976/77a). This effects the organization internally and externally. Because authority resides in the collective, it is not clear who assumes overall responsibility. There is no basis for the evaluation of the quality of work. Task completion, strategic planning and interorganiztional relationships are compromised. It also creates conditions for non-representative leaders to emerge (Freeman, 1973), due to their abilities to informally influence the collective or effectively communicate with the external environment.

Leadership and expertise dilemmas are difficult for women's groups to address because of "The Politics of Trust" (Weston and Rofel, 1984). The intensity of the face-to-face contact, the emphasis of interpersonal solidarity and the quest for community create an environment in which dissension and conflict are viewed not as constructive experiences, but rather, as personal attacks (Allison, 1978; Mansbridge, 1982; 1973; Riger, 1984). Most women's groups do not undertake serious analysis of power and conflict, in terms of its influence on the setting and individual styles. Thus, they are ill-prepared to

deal with problems. Many women leave the organization out of frustration and confusion. Problems often are resolved in favor of an unacknowledged elite.

It is clear that an underlying condition for collectivism is homogeneity (Allison, 1978; Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Bunch and Fisher, 1976; Dill, 1983; Rothschild-Whitt, 1982). Collectivity members typically recruit like-minded individuals, since shared values are less likely to create a divisive environment. In order to achieve consensus, the goal of diversity is sacrificed. Without new ideas, a "group think" emerges, and often leads to the collective withdrawing from the community. Moreover, collectives must limit the size of their membership. The various processes that support this structure are too cumbersome for large groups (Davidson, 1983; Hornstein, 1974).

The reward and incentive structure also reinforces homogeneity. Collectives, with few resources, are unable to provide financial or career renumeration. The benefits they offer are solidary incentives, such as friendship networks and safe spaces. As important as these incentives are, they do not "put food on the table". The high level of commitment that is demanded by the collective exacerbates this problem. Members must provide considerable time and energy to insure organizational survival. A number of processes, such as consensus decision making, are not efficient. Insufficient rewards, and confusing processes lead to feelings of martyrdom and burnout. Both the reward structure and the commitment demands limit or prevent the participation of child-rearing, working class and poor women (Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Buehler, 1985; Cools, 1980; Davidson, 1983; Freeman and McMillan, 1976/77a; McShane and Oliver, 1978).

When not pursued in the extreme, there are numerous benefits to the collectivist structure, such as fulfillment of ideology, the potential for different expertise and inclusion of non-professionals, and the rewards of solidary incentives. Yet, the preceding discussion suggests drawbacks that have implications for FSMOs participants. I now consider the make-up of FSMO participants, with particular emphasis placed on why certain groups are included or excluded.

Participants

Every FSMO makes conscious or unconscious choices about the inclusion of some groups over others. Such decisions have generated considerable controversy regarding the feminist movement. From outside the movement, feminism has been attacked as lesbian dominated and man-hating. The middle-class characteristics of movement participants also has engendered criticsm. Many critics have pointed to

the exclusion of minority, working class and poor women. From within the movement, radical feminists have criticized reformist groups for their exclusion of lesbians and the inclusion of men. While both the reformist and revolutionary branches have challenged each other on class issues, neither has overcome the problems. Only recently have some FSMOs undertaken serious self-analysis regarding their inaccessable structures, processes and issues. In this section, I discuss three dilemmas of inclusion for FSMOs: the Alienation of Working Class, Poor and Minority Women; Lesbian Purges; and the Role of Men. The factors that determine FSMOs participation provide new insights into the general question - "why do individuals join or not join social movements".

The Alienation of Working Class, Poor and Minority Women: It frequently is argued, and often quite rightly, that the women's movement is a white, middle class movement. In part, this is due to the relative success of the reformist wing, which is composed of professional or career oriented women. Yet it also is due to some of the dynamics generated within the revolutionary branch. What further exacerbates this problem is that many members of these "excluded" groups agree with most of the goals of the feminist movement and promote women as leaders and activists, yet do not consider themselves feminists (Bers and Mezey, 1981; Gittell and Naples, 1982; Lewis, 1977; Mancuso, 1980).

Working class and poor women have two complaints with the women's movement: (1) its emphasis on personal fulfillment and individualism, and (2) its threat to their lifestyle (Brightman, 1978; Gittell and Naples, 1982). The result is that the women's movement

> ...did not capture the hearts of white, ethnic, working-class women. Viewed as narrow, elitist, and threatening to basic value systems, it could not approach a constituency base for women whose concerns were more closely allied with crucial survival needs and issues (Mancuso, 1980:41).

Working class and poor women often define their identities in terms of family and neighborhood. They tend to sympathize with their husbands or male partners because of a shared sense of class oppression (Brightman, 1978; Gittell and Naples, 1982; Mancuso, 1980). Issues that challenge (or are perceived to challenge) marriage, sexuality, family privacy, or gender roles often alienate these women. Thus, the revolutionary wing of the movement is too threatening in its rhetoric and action. The reformist movement, with its professional, entrepeneurial bias, does not speak to the fundamental economic problems of these women. There are some very powerful organizations run by working class and poor

women, most notably the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (Brightman, 1978). Yet they tend to disassociate themselves from the feminist movement.

In addition to the economic elitism of the reformist wing, the traditional, professional organization fosters additional problems. The emphasis on technical expertise and the high-degree of differentiation create a sense of insecurity among women unfamiliar with the system, the language or the methods. Suggestions offered by professional staff are guided by middle-class values and assumptions. Their privilege prevents them from understanding the limited options, that stem from the economic scarcity of working class, poor and minority women's lives (Coalition, 1984; Ferraro, 1983). The professional emphasis on individual achievement is alien to a woman rooted in a collective sense of self (Dill, 1983). Finally, within some organizations is the disturbing development of worker walk-outs and strikes. Apparently feminist solidarity is not always extended to the rights of FSMO workers (Ahrens, 1980; "We Walk...", 1979; Weston and Rofel, 1984).

While it is not surprising that the reform branch exhibits exclusionary actions, it is ironic that the revolutionary branch, with its emphasis on egalitarianism and diversity, should demonstrate similar tendencies. As indicted earlier, many problems arise as a result of this wing being wedded to a collectivist structure, in which there is a high demand for energy and resources, accompanied by low financial renumeration. This limits participation to those who can afford it, and thus, excludes working class and poor women, as well as women with primary child care responsiblity. Because the collective structure requires a high degree of homogenity (Rothschild-Whitt, 1982), it works against the inclusion of non-middle class, non-white values (Dill, 1983; Lewis, 1977; Mancuso, 1980). The revolutionary ideology also alienates many working class, poor, and minority women. As noted above, it targets the very issues that are threatening to these women's identities. These include lifestyles (vegetarianism, communes), partnerships (lesbian relationships) or particular means of empowerment (insisting that battered women leave and disown their husbands). Finally, the more gender is stressed as the primary source of oppression, and subsequent political action is based on a collective sense of being oppressed solely because one is female, the greater the likelihood that such ideology will not be embraced by working class, poor or minority women (Dill, 1983; Lewis, 1977; Weston and Rofel, 1984).

As discussed in the section on ideology, there is a growing feminist movement among women of color, particularly black women. As part of its development, minority female activists have articulated

the link between feminism and racial empowerment, and the exclusion of minority women by the white feminist movement. Unfortunately, women of color are often forced by both the civil rights and women's movements to select the most salient form of oppression - race or gender (Smith, 1985). The exclusionary practices by the women's movement only exacerbate this divisive question and deny FSMOs of needed talent and insights.

Lesbian Purges: It is more than unfortunate that the women's movement, succumbing to its own and society's homophobia and heterosexual privilege, has engaged in numerous lesbian purges. Within FSMOs, this involves the implicit and explicit denial of lesbians as organizational members, the request that lesbians belong but not advocate gay rights, and the expulsion of lesbians. Such actions are typically undertaken to ease tensions between the FSMO and the community. They result, however, in a cooptation of ideology and the loss of vital activists.

It is the perceived threat of a lesbian lifestyle, combined with the inability of straight feminists to confront their own heterosexism, that results in FSMOs engaging in these purges. Some organizations, such as NOW, reluctantly support a gay rights platform. It assumed this position, however, after considerable pressure from radical groups (Ferree and Hess, 1985; Freeman, 1984; Morgan, 1978; Whitlock, n.d.). Other organizations, when asked about lesbian members, avoid the issue. When accused of being a haven for lesbians, many organizations "take the bait" by disclaiming lesbian presence. It is rare for an organization to acknowledge either the contributions of lesbians or to assume a proactive stance on lesbian rights in the face of such accusations (Allison, 1978; Browne, 1978; Bunch, 1975; Goodman, 1980; Rich, 1984; "Ten years...", 1984).

Other incidents involve the failure of an FSMO to anticipate hostile community reaction. The most potent examples are the continual battles between feminists and community members at the Seneca Falls Peace Encampment. Townspeople subjected camp members to continual verbal harassment, the contents of which were extremely homophobic. Yet in an attempt at reconciliation, the camp released a statement that focused on the many identities of women, except as lesbians (Costello and Stanley, 1985; Hayes, 1983).

These actions against lesbians only divide the movement. There is no indication that such purges improve community relations. Yet many organizations are driven by survival, not goals, and succumb to community pressures. In doing so, these organizations loose many valued and talented members. They

fail to provide a model for how heterosexism can be confronted, and how straight and gay persons can act as allies. Furthermore, such actions lend credibility to the right wing's attack on feminism. Lesbian purges are the classic examples of survival over ideology, and one has to wonder if survival is worth this price.

Inclusion of Men: The role that men play within the FSMO is a highly controversial one. While most feminists want to acknowledge support offered by pro-feminist men, concerns exist as to how that support can be demonstrated, at what cost, and under whose responsibility. Some issues, such as legal or educational reform, are more amenable to men's support than are others, such as violence against women.

Arguably the most open FSMO, with respect to men, is NOW. Men can become members and leaders. NOW endorses male political candidates with solid track records on women's issues. Slightly more exclusive is the National Political Women's Caucus, which has male members but does not endorse male candidates (Deckard, 1983). Men are often included in FSMO activities in support roles, such as child care workers. At the Puget Sound Peace Encampment, men provided food, changes in clothing, and transportation during some of the marches and demonstrations (Buehler, 1985). In such cases, they model behaviors that embrace typically feminine qualities of nurturance and compassion. A more creative approach involves men assuming responsibility for the misogynistic acts of other men. One such example is a Boston based men's group, Emerge, that works with men who batter (Schecter, 1982). Such efforts indicate the willingness of men to confront their own sexism, as well as that in other males. It also relieves some of the pressure placed on FSMOs, which are often asked to provide help to men as well as women.

Such supportive involvement cannot be downplayed. Yet there are instances in which it is not advisable to have men as active FSMO participants. The general argument for this focuses on the importance of an all-women's space. Within such an environment, women are able to express their thoughts, fears, and concerns without the intimidation of men (Gottlieb et al, 1983; Schecter, 1982). Such environments also position women as role models, which in turn serves as an empowering device for the beneficiaries (Cools, 1980). The feeling of safety and sanctuary within FSMOs can be violated with the presence of men.

With no other issue is the assurance of safety more important than in the provision of services for women who are victims of violence. For some women at domestic violence shelters, just the presence of men (e.g. maintenance or child care workers) is damaging (Schecter, 1982). There are examples, however, of men staffing crisis hotlines and providing counseling services (Ahrens, 1980). Credibility within the community or professional arena is cited as the reason for such a decision. It is also an attempt to avoid the "man-hating" accusation often launched against FSMOs. Such decisions, however, violate both the organization's ideology and the beneficiaries' needs.

In summary, only recently have FSMOs seriously undertaken an analysis of inclusion/exclusion problems. With respect to class, race and sexual preference, most FSMOs resolve the problems by insisting that these groups can be involved, but on the organization's terms. Or, FSMOs make token appointments of members of these groups to boards, committees, or administrative positions. FSMOs fail to understand that racism, classism, and heterosexism are the problems of the dominant, not subordinate, group (Ahrens, 1980; Browne, 1978; Bunch, 1975; Coalition, 1984; Dill, 1983; Giddings, 1984; Hayes, 1983; Mancuso, 1980; Rich, 1984). Additionally, there has been little systematic thought or evaluation regarding what role men could play within FSMOs. By virtue of raising such issues, however, new light is shed on the reasons for participation (or lack of participation) in SMOs.

Strategies and Products

In this final section, I discuss both how and what FSMOs produce. FSMOs have employed a wide variety of strategies and have created and distributed a range of products. FSMO ideology guides developmental processes, tactics and outcomes. FSMO strategies and products share some or all of the following traits: 1) emphasis on individual and group self-help and development; 2) attention to the cultural spheres of women, specifically activists; 3) a commitment to non-violence; 4) support for critical consciousness raising, and 5) the delivery of goods to women, that can not be found elsewhere. As a brief aside, a variety of constraints impinge on the choices of both strategies and products. While these won't be detailed they include the organization's ideology, goals, structures and resources, and relationships with beneficiaries and other community organizations (Freeman, 1983; Gornick et al, 1985; O'Sullivan, 1976).

Pressure group strategies achieve legal or procedural change, and usually rely on such tactics as letter writing, testimony, legal suits, and policy development (O'Sullivan, 1976). Coalition building,

around a particular issue, is commonly done. These strategies are often used by reformist oriented groups, such a NOW (Whitlock, n.d.). Picket lines, demonstrations, marches and rallies are the more collective, and militant, expression of this strategy (Deckard, 1983; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Freeman, 1984; Morgan, 1978; Weil, 1986). These are considered part of this strategic category as they push for assimilation into the mainstream by applying sufficient leverage to get others to make the desired change (O'Sullivan, 1976). The products of such strategies are both the event, itself, and the resulting change (e.g. a pro-choice rally and then pro-choice legislation, respectively). Occasionally, new organiztions or coalitions are founded.

Service project strategies involve the delivery of alternative, woman-centered services; the very existence of which acts as a critique of the existing service delivery network (Masi, 1981). The inclusion of lay persons, particularly survivors, reflects the strategic commitment to self-help and self-empowerment values, and to the consideration of different types of expertise (Galper and Washburne, 1976b; Gornick et al, 1985; Schecter, 1982). These strategies are executed through multi-service programs, direct care programs, or preventative programs (Harvey, 1985). They are oriented to the individual, such as a one-on-one treatment center (Cools, 1980) or to the masses, such as a feminist publishing company (Deckard, 1983). Service strategies encompass the disseminating of information, dispensing of medical care, supplying of legal consultation, and providing of refuge and sanctuary (Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Boston, 1984; Deckard, 1983; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Gottlieb, 1980).

In many instances, the need for information is the primary reason women become involved in activism (Hyde, 1986). This reflects the feminist principle of acquiring and demystifying knowledge previously denied to women. Examples of products generated by this strategy range from The New Our Bodies, Ourselves, the landmark health manual by the Boston Women's Health Collective (Boston, 1984); to separation and divorce manuals, such as that by Women in Transition (Galper and Washburne, 1976b); to a pamphlet, "How to Organize a Women's Crisis Center" (Women's Crisis Center, 1979). Community education programs, media speaking engagements, public service announcements, hotlines and drop in centers (counselling or generic) also exemplify informational products transmitted to the general public (Batchelder and Marks, 1979; Freeman and McMillan, 1976/77a; Masi, 1981).

Finally, there are *cultural development* strategies, which explicitly connect the personal with the political in an effort to create or emphasize a woman-centered domain. Specifically, personal

empowerment is linked with political action. The most familiar form of this strategy is consciousness-raising, the cornerstone of the radical branch (Deckard, 1983; Ferree and Hess, 1985; Morgan, 1978). The use of emotions or life stages is a common guidepost for these strategies, and is exemplified by the 1981 Women's Pentagon Action. The organizers coordinated this event, and designed comparable activities, around the emotions - mourning, rage, empowerment, and defiance (Linton and Whitham, 1982; Popkin and Delgado, 1982). A third, also common, version of this strategy is the establishment of a woman's center which expresses the cultural and historical contributions of women. In keeping with this notion of an all-women's space is the emergence of all-female communities that embrace radical feminist ideology, structure and processes. Contempory examples are all-women peace encampments (Buehler, 1985; Costello and Stanley, 1985).

Cultural development strategies also include the use of outrageous and humorous means that attempt to shock the public into understanding women's oppression. These include guerilla theater, such as the WITCH Hex on Wall Street and the disruption of the Miss America Pageant, and satirical theater, such as that provided by "Ladies Against Women" (Freeman, 1975; 1984; Morgan, 1977; Omi and Philipson, 1983). The problem with this strategy is that it often is misinterpreted by the media and public.

Products of cultural development strategies include the events themselves, and accounts of the event that can be used as models of empowerment. Additionally, ideological manifestoes and symbols are products that often arise from these strategies. These declarations of liberation, analyses of oppression, and statements of demands range across ideological frameworks. They include (a) liberal/career - the NOW Bill of Rights (Deckard, 1983; Ferree and Hess, 1985); (b) socialist-feminist - "Liberation of Women" (Evans, 1980:240-242); (c) radical feminist - peace encampment and the 1981 Pentagon Women's Action unity statements (Buehler, 1985; Costello and Stanley, 1985; Linton and Whitham, 1982; Popkin and Delgado, 1982); and (d) women of color - "A Black Feminist Statement" (Combahee, 1984). FSMOs, particularly those with a radical perspective, also develop symbols that depict or create women's culture (Hyde, 1986).

These various strategies, and the products they generate, should not be viewed as discrete categories. For example, cultural development events could give rise to pressure group strategies. Furthermore, many (if not most) FSMO employ are variety of strategies. Being locked into one strategy

or product can often result in the demise of the organization, as evidenced by NOW after the defeat its primary quest, ratification of the ERA. In this section I have indicated a range of possible strategies and products, though by no means have I exhausted the list. This diversity, combined with the emphasis on participant education and development, process, alternative service provision, and cultural or historical events, results in another unique contribution of FSMOs to our understanding of social movement dynamics.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

For each organizational characteristic, there exist numerous options and dilemmas. How, then, can an ideal type be constructed? By way of summary, I indicate an ideal-typical formulation for each FSMO characteristic. I base this formulation on a series of questions posed by Bunch:

> (1) Does it [reform] materially improve the lives of women, and if so, which women?
> (2) Does the reform build on individual women's self respect, strength, and confidence? (But not at the expense of others.)
> (3) Does working for the reform give women a sense of power, strengths, and imagination as a group, and help build structures for further change?
> (4) Does the struggle for reform educate women politically, enhancing our ability to criticize and challenge the system in the future?
> (5) Does the reform weaken patriarchal control of society's institutions and help women gain power over them? (1974:46-47)

Though intended for the feminist activist considering strategic options, I used these questions to conceptualize the FSMO ideal type. With Bunch's criteria as the foundation, I present the FSMO ideal-typical characteristics, below.

While all of the *ideological frameworks* have strengths and weaknesses, the reformist perspective is the most limiting. Within this framework, the system is not challenged fundamentally. Of the three revolutionary frameworks, the Women of Color perspective is exemplary. Within this ideology, diversity in terms of analysis, issues, cause and strategies is emphasized.

In terms of *structures and processes*, either extreme of the collectivity-hierarchy spectrum is problematic. Participation, leadership and expertise are compromised in such organizations. The modified collectivity (Harvey, 1985) holds considerable promise. In this structure, there is an explicit recognition of differences, of individual knowledge, and of differential commitment. Accountability is built into the various organizational processes, without limitation on participation.

The FSMO's structure, processes, and issues are flexible in order to insure *participation* by working class, minority and poor women. Lesbians and lesbian rights are supported and not used as sacrificial lambs. The organization acknowledges the unique needs and agendas of non-white, non-middle class, and non-straight women, and commits itself to confronting racism, classism and heterosexism. Men are included when it is useful to have non-traditional gender role models present, or when they offer necessary services to other men. Men are not used in the provision of direct services to women. There is an emphasis by the organization on the power generated by an all-women's environment.

There exists a diversity of *strategies and products* for the FSMO. Strategies and products include some or all of the following traits: individual and group self-help, emphasis on the culture and herstory of women, a conception and articulation of revolutionary ideology, critical consciousness raising, and the delivery of needed goods to women. Strategies and products are used not only to achieve the goals of the organization, but to educate and develop the participants, as well.

In this paper, I presented an overview of Feminist Social Movement Organizations, the organizational building blocks of the contemporary women's movement. This consisted of an analysis of key internal characteristics of these organizations - ideology, structures and processes, participants, and strategies and products. I argued that while social movement theory, specifically the resource mobilization paradigm, contributed to the study of FSMOs, fundamental assumptions about social movement organizations were challenged when FSMOs were considered. This was most apparent when the collectivist-oriented SMO (a significant proportion of FSMOs) was discussed. This paper concluded with a formulation of ideal typical FSMO characteristics. The next step is to empirically test this ideal type, since the feminist movement, particularly the FSMO, remains an untapped resource for knowledge about social justice and social change.

REFERENCES

Ahrens, L. 1980. "Battered women's refuges: feminist cooperatives vs. social service institutions", Community Organizers, J. Ecklein (ed). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 194-200.

Allison, D. 1978. "Weaving the web of community", Quest, IV(4):75-92.

Batchelder, E. and Marks, L. 1979. "Creating alternatives: a survey of women's projects", Heresies, 2(3):87-127.

Bers, T.H. and Mezey, S.G. 1981. "Support for feminist goals among leaders of women's community groups", Signs, 6(4):737-749.

(The) Boston Women's Health Collective. 1984. The New Our Bodies, Ourselves. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brightman, C. 1978. "The women of Williamsburg", Working Papers for a Just Society, 61(Jan-Feb):50-57.

Browne, K. 1978. "Reassessing basics", Quest, II(4):31-37.

Buehler, J. 1985. "The Puget Sound women's peace camp: education as an alternative strategy", Frontiers, VIII(2):40-44.

Bunch, C. 1975. "Not for lesbians only", Quest, II(2):366-368 (reprint in Feminist Frontiers).

_____. 1974. "The reform tool kit", Quest, I(1):37-64.

Bunch, C. and Fisher, B. 1976. "What future for leadership", Quest, II(4):2-12.

Coalition of Battered Women's Service Groups. 1984. "Race, class and sexual preference in the battered women's movement", Community Organizers, J. Ecklein (ed). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Combahee River Collective. 1984. "A Black feminist statement", Feminist Frameworks, A. Jagger and P. Rothenberg (eds). New York: McGraw Hill, 202-209.

Cools, A. 1980. "Emergency shelter: the development of an innovative women's environment", New Space for Women, G. Werkele et al (eds). Boulder: Westview Press, 311-318.

Costello, C. and Stanley, A. 1985. "Report from Seneca", Frontiers, VIII(2):32-39.

Davidson, L. 1983. "Countercultural organizations and bureaucracy: limits on the revolution", Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies, J. Freeman (ed). New York: Longman, 162-176.

Deckard, B.S. 1983. The Women's Movement: Political, Socioeconomic, and Psychological Issues. New York: Harper & Row.

Dill, B. 1983. "Race, class, and gender: prospects for an all-inclusive sisterhood", Feminist Studies, 9(1):131-150.

Evans, S. 1980. Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights and the New Left. New York: Vintage Press.

Ferguson, K.E. 1984. The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ferraro, K. 1983. "Negotating trouble in a battered women's shelter", Urban Life, 12(3):287-306.

Ferree, M.M. and Hess, B. 1985. Controversy and Coalition: the New Feminist Movement. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Ferree, M.M. and Miller, F. 1985. "Mobilization and meaning: toward an integration of social psychological and resource perspectives on social movements", Sociological Inquiry, 55(1):38-61.

Fireman, B. and Gamson, W. 1979. "Utilitarian logic in the resource mobilization perspective", The Dynamics of Social Movements, M. Zald and J. McCarthy (eds). Cambridge: Winthrop, 3-44.

Freeman, A. and J. McMillan. 1976/77a. "Building feminist organizations", Quest, III(3):73-80.

_____. 1976/77b. "The feminist workplace: an interview with Nancy MacDonald", Quest, III(3):65-73.

Freeman, J. 1977. "Crisis and conflicts in social movement organizations", Chrysalis, 5.

_____. 1983a. "A model for analyzing the strategic options of social movement organizations", Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies, J. Freeman (ed). New York: Longman, 193-210.

_____. 1983b. "On the origins of social movements", Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies, J. Freeman (ed). New York: Longman, 8-32.

_____. 1975. The Politics of Women's Liberation. New York: Longman.

_____. 1973. "The tyranny of structurelessness", Radical Feminism, A. Koedt, E. LeVine, and A. Rapone (eds). New York: Quadrangle Books, 285-299.

_____. 1984. "The women's liberation movement: its origins, structures, activities and ideas", Women: A Feminist Perspective, J. Freeman (ed). Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing, 543-556.

Galper, M. and Washburne, C.K. 1976a. "Maximizing the impact of an alternative agency", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Nov:248-257.

_____. 1976b. "A women's self-help program in action", Social Policy, 6(5):46-52.

Gamson, W. 1975. Strategies of Social Protest. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Gamson, W. and Schmeidler, E. 1984. "Organizing the poor", Theory and Society, 13(4):567-585.

Giddings, P. 1984. When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America. New York: Bantam.

Gilkes, C. 1982. "Successful rebellious professionals: the black woman's professional identity and community commitment", Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6(3).

Gittell, M. and Naples, N. 1982. "Activist women: conflicting ideologies", Social Policy, Summer.

Goodman, B. 1980. "Some mothers are lesbians", Women's Issues and Social Work, E. Norman and A. Mancuso (eds). Itasca: Peacock, 153-180.

Gornick, J. et al. 1985. "Structure and activities of rape crisis centers in the early 1980s", Crime and Delinquency, 31(2):247-268.

Gottlieb, N. 1980. "The feminist women's health care center", Alternative Services for Women, N. Gottlieb (ed). New York: Columbia Press, 81-101.

Gottlieb, N. et al. 1983. "The distinctive attributes of feminist groups", Social Work with Groups, 6(3/4):81-94.

Harvey, M.R. 1985. Exemplary Rape Crisis Programs: A Cross-site Analysis and Case Studies. Rockville, MD: NIMH, DHHS Pub. # ADM/85-1423.

Hayes, L. 1983. "Separatism and disobedience: the Seneca Peace Encampment", Radical America, 17(4):55-64.

Heresies Collective. "True confessions", Heresies, 93-96.

Hornstein, F. 1974. "An interview on women's health politics", Quest, I(1):27-36.

Hyde. C. 1986. "Voices of women activists: a feminist centered approach to community organizing", presented at the NASW Conference on Women's Issues.

Jenkins, C. 1983. "Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements", American Review of Sociology, 9:527-53.

(The) Journal Collective. 1978. "Towards a new definition of power", Women: A Journal of Liberation, 6(1):62-64.

Kolias, K. 1976. "Feminism in action", Quest, II(3):2-7.

Lewis, D. 1977. "A response to inequality: black women, racism and sexism", Signs, 3(2):339-361.

Linton, R. and Whitham, M. 1982. "With mourning, rage, empowerment and defiance: the 1981 Women's Pentagon Action", Socialist Review, 12(3-4):11-36.

Mancuso, A. 1980. "No drums, no trumpets: working class women", Women's Issues and Social Work Practice, E. Norman and A. Mancuso (eds). Itasca: Peacock, 41-54.

Mansbridge, J. 1982. "Fears of conflict in face to face democracies", Workplace Democracy and Social Change, F. Lindenfeld and J. Rothschild-Whitt (eds). Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, 1982.

_____. 1973. "Time, emotion, and inequality: three problems of participatory groups", The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 9:351-368.

Masi, D. 1981. Organizing for Women. Lexington: Lexington Books.

McCarthy, J. and Zald, M. 1977. "Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory", American Journal of Sociology, 82(6):1212-1241.

McShane, C. and Oliver, J. 1978. "Women's groups as alternative service agencies", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 5(5):615-626.

Morgan, R. 1978. Going to Far: The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist. New York: Vintage Books.

Morris, A. 1984. The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change. New York: Free Press.

Morris, A. and Herring, C. Forthcoming. "Theory and research in social movements: a critical review", American Political Science Review.

Newton, G. 1982. "On structure and decision-making", Workplace Democracy and Social Change, F. Lindenfeld and J. Rothschild-Whitt (eds). Boston: Porter Sargent Pub., 271-278.

Olson, M. 1965. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Omi, M. and Philipson, I. 1983. "Misterhood is powerful: interview with Ladies Against Women", Socialist Review, 13(2):9-27.

O'Sullivan, L. 1976. "Organizing for Impact", Quest, II(3):68-80.

Popkin, A. and Delgado, G. 1982. "Mobilizing emotions: organizing the Women's Pentagon Action", Socialist Review, 12(3-4):37-47.

Rich, A. 1984. "Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence", Women Identified Women, T. Darty and S. Potter (eds). Palo Alto: Mayfield Pub., 119-149.

Riger, S. 1984. "Vehicles for empowerment: the case of feminist movement organizations", Prevention in Human Services, 3(2-3):99-117.

Rothschild-Whitt, J. 1982. "The collectivist organization: an alternative to bureaucratic models", Workplace Democracy and Social Change, F. Lindenfeld and J. Rothschild-Whitt (eds). Boston: Porter Sargent Pub., 23-50.

_____. 1979. "Conditions for democracy: making participatory organizations work", Coops, Communes and Collectives: Experiments in Social Change in the 1960s and 1970s, J. Case and R. Taylor (eds). New York: Pantheon, 215-239.

Schecter, S. 1982. Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement. Boston: South End Press.

Smith, B. 1985. "Some home truths on the contemporary black feminist movement", The Black Scholar Magazine, 4-13.

Stanley, J. 1978. "Lesbian relationships and the vision of community", Feminary, IX(1):4-9, 57-60.

Sullivan, G. 1982. "Cooptation of alternative services: the battered women's movement as a case study", Catalyst, 4(2).

"Ten Years After: Rape Crisis Centers", Off Our Backs. 1984. 17-22.

Tilly, C. 1978. From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading: Addison-Wesley Pub.

Van Den Bergh, N. and Cooper, L. 1986. "Introduction", Feminist Visions of Social Work, N. Van Den Bergh and L. Cooper (eds). Silver Springs, MD: NASW, 1-28.

"We Walk the Line", Radical America. 1979. March/April, 9-24.

Weil, M. 1986. "Women, Community and Organizing", Feminist Visions of Social Work, N. Van Den Bergh and L. Cooper (eds). Silver Springs, MD: NASW, 187-210.

Weston, C.M. and Rofel, L.B. 1984. "Sexuality, class and conflict in a lesbian workplace", Signs, 9(4):623-646.

Whitlock, K. nd. "Moving toward autocracy: power brokerage and single issue politics in NOW", Quest, V(2):37-53.

Women's Crisis Center, Ann Arbor. 1979. "Organizing a women's crisis-service center", Strategies of Community Organization, F. Cox et al (eds). Itasca: Peacock, 1979.

Zald, M. and Ash, R. 1966. "Social movement organizations: growth, decay and change", Social Forces, 44:327-341.

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Center for Research on Social Organization is a facility of the Department of Sociology, The University of Michigan. Its primary mission is to support the research of faculty and students in the department's Social Organization graduate program. CRSO Working Papers report current research and reflection by affiliates of the center; many of them are published later elsewhere after revision. Working papers which are still in print are available from the center for a fee of $2.00 for any paper under 100 pages and $4.00 for papers over 100 pages. The center will photocopy out-of-print working papers at cost (approximately five cents per page). Request copies of working papers, the list of other center reprints, or further information about center activities from: Center for Research on Social Organization, The University of Michigan, 4501 LSA, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109-1382: (313)764-7487.

340   "Bridging the Gap: International Organizations as Organizations," by Gayl D. Ness and Steven R. Brechin, January 1987, 42 pages.

341   "Popular Response to China's Fertility Transition," by Gu Shengzu, Li Zhen, and Martin King Whyte, March 1987, 32 pages.

342   "Self-Help Groups as Intervenors in Patient-Provider Conflict in Health Care," by Mark Chesler, March 1987, 30 pages.

343   "Beyond Agreement: Value Judgements in Conflict Resolution and Cooperative Conflict in the Classroom," by Alfie Kohn, April 1987, 12 pages.

344   "Program in Comparative Study of Social Transformations," by William H. Sewell, Jr., Terrence J. McDonald, Jefferey M. Paige, and Sherry B. Ortner, May, 1987, 15 pages.

345   "Professionals' Views of the 'Dangers' of Self-Help Groups," by Mark Chesler, May 1987, 29 pages.

346   "Labor History, Uneven Development, and the Autonomy of Politics: The Dockworkers of Nineteenth-Century Marseille," by William H. Sewell, Jr., July 1987, 45 pages.

347   "Coffee, Copper, and Class Conflict in Central America and Chile: A Critique of Zeitlin's Civil Wars in Chile and Zeitlin and Ratcliff's Landlords and Capitalists," by Jeffery M. Paige, September 1987, 10 pages. Also CSST Working Paper #3.

348   "Institutionalizing Conflict Management Alternatives," by Nancy Manring, September 1987, 23 pages. Also PCMA Working Paper #7.