dressed political scientists' use of history. For Katzenstein, the lessons of his own research were frankly (a) to bastardize history recklessly, even as Gerschenkron confessedly did; and (b) at all costs to avoid the "dirty work" of the historians, especially archival investigation, and to rely on secondary sources. Abraham found precisely this "bastardization" problematic; he saw in Katzenstein's new book a functionalism that might be difficult to reconcile with the broader European evidence.

Dependency theory is "dead in the water."

Richard Sklar of the University of California, Los Angeles, from the floor, wondered where all of this left us. Dependency theory is "dead in the water"; but what remained? What precise connections between the external and the internal can be specified? I pushed the question further; can anything still be assigned unambiguously to domestic causes? Almond, responding, largely concurred in the negative assessment of dependency theory. That he did not regard internal causation as unimportant can be inferred from other sections of his paper in which he discussed recent work on the domestic sources of foreign policy. But the precise weights to be assigned to internal and external forces are a matter for further historical, and above all for comparative, inquiry. □

Social Protest Movements: What Sociology Can Teach Us

David J. Garrow
City University of New York

The social protest movements roundtable provided an opportunity for a cross-disciplinary exchange between political scientists and sociologists sharing similar research interests. Although the political science literature of the 1968-1978 period witnessed a lively and productive use of the E. E. Schattschneider tradition of examining nonelectoral forms of political activism and protest, in more recent years sociology has generated a richer and more extensive literature concerning protest movements. As I noted in two preliminary memos to interested colleagues and as several panel members reiterated at the session, the scholarly literatures in the two disciplines have to date developed in relative isolation from each other.

The New Orleans roundtable opened with University of Missouri sociologist J. Craig Jenkins providing an excellent overview of the theoretical and conceptual developments that have occurred in sociology's social movements literature since the early 1970s. A new paradigm, generally known as "resource mobilization" theory, was introduced in 1973 through the works of Anthony Oberschall and John McCarthy and Mayer Zald. Resource mobilization challenged the previously prevailing assumption that protest movements could be explained simply by reference to the psychological needs and "discontent" of mass participants. Instead, "RM" theory presumed that protesters were rational rather than irrational actors, and focused upon the organizations and resources available to potential protest participants. In succeeding years, "RM" theory increasingly split into two competing perspectives, one of which maintained an organizational focus and the other developing what is sometimes called a "political process" emphasis. The first approach increasingly focused on the appearance of "professional social movement organizations," or "SMOs," groups that had fulltime, paid staffs, cultivated "conscience constituencies," possessed largely "paper" memberships, and concentrated upon manipulating the mass media so as to influence public opinion and hopefully generate elite responses and policy changes.

Jenkins, author of the newly published *Politics of Insurgency* (Columbia University Press), explained that the "political process" approach has given primacy to indigenous protest mobilization while also acknowledging the importance of reactive external support from movement

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900624839 Published online by Cambridge University Press

patrons, and said that increasing attention now is being paid to the presence or absence of national political coalitions supportive of movement goals. He stressed that "professional SMOs" deserve more intense study, especially with regard to how this institutionalized social movement industry, like other interest groups, may be fundamentally weakening the roles of political parties. Jenkins also noted that the potential social control effects of external patronage from ostensible movement supporters such as foundations also will receive increased attention from interested sociologists.

University of Washington sociologist Paul Burstein, author of the newly published *Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics: The Struggle for Equal Employment Opportunity in the U.S. Since the New Deal* (University of Chicago Press), described how his studies of congressional consideration of equal employment legislation had highlighted the importance of multiple components within the American civil rights movement. While direct action protests were essential to convincing the American public that anti-discrimination laws were an important issue, passage of such legislation depended upon the prior crafting of draft statutes and the expertise of the movement's Washington lobbyists. Burstein emphasized that public opinion data indicate that the cumulative effect of the civil rights movement was not to make the American public any more liberal on policy questions involving race, rather that the movement succeeded in convincing the country that long-standing problems had to be moved to the front of the political agenda and acted upon in some fashion.

Political scientist Paul Schumaker of the University of Kansas took polite issue with the suggestions from Jenkins and me that sociology in recent years had generated more and better scholarship on social protest movements than had political science. Schumaker noted the recent work of Clarence Stone and Rufus Browning, Dale Rogers Marshall, and David Tabb, and argued that the long tradition of "community power" studies offered a theoretical and conceptual richness equal to any recent developments. He contended that political science has been a more evaluative discipline than sociology, with a greater interest in analyzing the distribution of power in society and the differential policy responses to citizen participation. The conditions for responsiveness, as distinct from the conditions for citizen mobilization, have more productively been the province of political science, Schumaker argued.

While sociology has displayed far too little interest in the social roles of traditional political institutions, political science has been equally remiss in failing to devote sufficient attention to grass roots political activism and non-traditional forms of participation and mobilization.

University of Michigan political scientist Jack L. Walker described how over the past two decades the study of social movements and race relations topics increasingly has belonged to sociology rather than political science. Walker noted how rare it was for relevant, major articles in one discipline, such as his own earlier work with Joel Aberbach, to be cited by scholars in the other discipline, and how political science in recent years has had far fewer young scholars interested in such subjects than has sociology. Walker expressed regret that political scientists generally "have a very static view of the world" and "don't understand change well," or "the roots of change" either. The discipline has suffered from too heavy a focus on institutions alone and from generally looking at too few variables. Political science and sociology "need each other desperately" for analytical progress and improvement, and ought greatly to increase their cross-disciplinary dialogue, Walker stressed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900624839 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Political scientist James Button of the University of Florida agreed with Walker that political science has lagged behind sociology with regard to developing theoretical frameworks that can be used for analyzing the development of protest movements and especially for studying the impact and outcomes of such movements. Button's research on community-level changes in small Southern towns has contrasted the effects of traditional and nontraditional strategies of political participation, and he indicated he had found better theoretical insights in recent social movements studies by sociologists than in the existing political science literature.

Audience members suggested that political science's best recent work on protest had taken place in the comparative field rather than in the American politics literature, but both Button and Walker responded that even in that broader context, political science had concentrated its energy too narrowly on studying traditional but not less traditional political action, and had focused too exclusively on studying some forms of participation —e.g., voting—while neglecting the study of nonparticipation, even nonvoting. Panel members noted that the Schattschneider tradition, like much sociological literature but unlike much political science, focused more on conflict than on consensus, and sociologist Jenkins pointed out that many scholars of social movements in his discipline do not accept the liberal democratic ideal that many see as a pervasive presence in much political science scholarship. Paul Burstein noted that sociologists generally disdain the study of political institutions, such as Congress, and Jenkins agreed, noting the widespread lack of interest in that discipline with the role of political parties. Roundtable participants all agreed that while sociology has displayed far too little interest in the social roles of traditional political institutions, political science has been equally remiss in failing to devote sufficient attention to grassroots political activism and nontraditional forms of participation and mobilization.

Both audience members and the roundtable participants agreed that the session, which easily and productively could have gone on for another hour or more, represented a valuable opportunity for just the sort of cross-disciplinary exchange of views that all would like to increase. Several participants expressed particular hope that further similar sessions could be arranged in the future, and interest was expressed in seeking the funds and institutional support necessary for convening a special multi-disciplinary conference on social protest movements at which several dozen or so scholars would be able to expand upon the dialogue that was begun in New Orleans. □

The Future of the Congressional Budget Process

James A. Thurber
American University

Are we better off today than we were before passage of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974? How do we judge success and failure of the budget process? What can ten years of budgeting under the act tell us about the future of the congressional budget process? Each of the roundtable participants on "The Future of the Congressional Budget Process," John Ellwood of Dartmouth College, Louis Fisher of the Library of Congress Congressional Research Service, Allen Schick of the American Enterprise Institute and the University of Maryland, College Park, and Aaron Wildavsky of the University of California at Berkeley offered varying perspectives on these questions.

Ten years after the Budget Act's implementation, few of its original objectives have been met. Budget and appropriations deadlines have been missed. Continuing resolutions and supplemental appropriations are commonplace. There is little control over budget deficits with the country facing a $200 billion federal deficit and pushing a $2 trillion debt limit in the next fiscal year. Spending has risen to an all-time high percentage of the Gross National Product. There is more "backdoor" spending (spending that skirts the Appropriations committees)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900624839 Published online by Cambridge University Press