Social Movement Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/csms20

Bridges or divides? Conflicts and synergies of coalition building across countries and sectors in the Global Justice Movement

Priska Daphi, Felix Anderl & Nicole Deitelhoff

To cite this article: Priska Daphi, Felix Anderl & Nicole Deitelhoff (2022) Bridges or divides? Conflicts and synergies of coalition building across countries and sectors in the Global Justice Movement, Social Movement Studies, 21:1-2, 8-24, DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2019.1676223

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1676223

Published online: 25 Oct 2019.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 780

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Citing articles: 4 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=csms20

SOCIAL MOVEMENT STUDIES
2022, VOL. 21, NOS. 1–2, 8–24
https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1676223

Bridges or divides? Conflicts and synergies of coalition building across countries and sectors in the Global Justice Movement

Priska Daphi[a], Felix Anderl[b] and Nicole Deitelhoff[c]

[a]Faculty of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany; [b]Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; [c]Institute for Political Science, Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

ABSTRACT

Interest in social movement coalitions has been increasing significantly in recent years. While this growing body of research has paid much attention to conditions and processes of coalition building, the consequences of coalitions remain understudied. This article aims to contribute to a better understanding of coalitions' internal impact by exploring how different types of coalitions affect each other. In particular, we analyse how coalitions across countries influence coalitions across movement sectors. The article explores the diverse coalitions in the Global Justice Movement (GJM) in Europe and Southeast Asia, a movement characterized by its strong transnational as well as cross-sectoral ties. Our analysis includes four case studies from different transnational coalitions within the GJM: the peasant network *La Vía Campesina*, the debt-relief campaign *Jubilee 2000*, the network of women's movements *World March of Women*, and the grassroots network *Peoples' Global Action*. The case studies in Indonesia, the Philippines, the UK and Italy show how coalition building across countries can both enhance as well as hinder coalitions across sectors. We demonstrate how transnational coalitions in some cases deepen divides between local movement sectors and hamper domestic coalition building, while they help bridging divisions within local movement coalitions in others. Our findings point to the relevance of conflicts, power inequalities and trade-offs in coalition building as well as to the importance of negative effects of coalitions.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 5 January 2019
Accepted 28 June 2019

KEYWORDS
Social movement coalitions; transnational social movements; Global Justice Movement; Jubilee debt campaign; La Vía Campesina; World March of Women; Peoples' Global Action

Large transnational social movements such as the Global Justice Movement (GJM) bring together activists from different countries as well as from different political traditions. While much research has been dedicated to understanding how coalition building works across countries and sectors, we know little about how transnational and cross-sectoral cooperation interact. Even though both may be closely intertwined, they do not necessarily follow the same path. Do they reinforce or hinder each other? Does cooperation at one level pave the way for bridging other divides or does it perhaps create new mechanisms of division and exclusion? By exploring how different types of coalitions interact, this article aims to contribute to a better understanding of internal outcomes of coalitions, a dimension that remains considerably understudied in the growing literature on movement coalitions.

CONTACT Priska Daphi priska.daphi@uni-bielefeld.de Faculty of Sociology, Bielefeld University, P.O. Box 10 01 31, Bielefeld 33501, Germany

© 2019 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

The article examines the interaction of different types of coalition building in the GJM in Europe and Southeast Asia; a movement characterized by its strong transnational coalitions as well as extensive cooperation across different movement sectors (Daphi, 2017; Della Porta, Andretta, Mosca, & Reiter, 2006). More specifically, the article explores how transnational coalition building affects domestic cooperation across different movement sectors. The analysis draws on four case studies from different GJM networks: the peasant network *La Vía Campesina*, the largely NGO and church-based debt-relief campaign *Jubilee 2000*, the network of women's movements *World March of Women*, and the grassroots network *Peoples' Global Action*.

Below we will first elaborate the article's conceptual framework based on a discussion of the existing literature on movement coalitions as well as on insights from International Relations. Following a brief outline of our analytical approach and data we will proceed to the analysis of four cases. Our case studies in Indonesia, the Philippines, the UK and Italy demonstrate how transnational coalitions in some cases deepened divides between local movement sectors and hampered domestic coalition building as they drew attention to differences or one-sidedly strengthened certain perspectives (*Jubilee 2000* in the UK; *La Vía Campesina* in Indonesia and the Philippines). In other cases, however, transnational coalitions helped bridging divisions within local movement coalitions as they highlighted similarities and horizontality (*World March of Women* in the Philippines; *Peoples' Global Action* in Italy). In a final part we will discuss our findings and stress how they point not only to the relevance of conflicts and trade-offs in coalition building but also to the importance of unintended and negative effects of coalitions.

Coalition building: consequences and conflicts

Within social movement studies, interest in coalition building has been growing in recent years (McCammon & Moon, 2015). Reflecting the significant growth in movement coalitions across borders and issues (Van Dyke & McCammon, 2010), this body of research addresses a particular kind of coordination within and between movements that entails closer activist relationships than networks but looser ties than mergers. Coalitions hence are defined as 'a mid-range relationship entailing cooperative joint action while distinct organizational identities and structures remain intact' (McCammon & Moon, 2015, p. 327). Drawing on social movement studies' long-standing interest in cooperation between activist groups and movements and processes such as diffusion and spill-over, the literature on coalitions provides significant insights into the dynamics and conditions of coalition building. The consequences of coalitions, however, remain understudied as we will elaborate below (McCammon & Moon, 2015; Staggenborg, 2010). With this article we aim to contribute to a better understanding of the consequences of coalitions, in particular internal impacts.

Exploring coalitions' internal consequences

Several studies examine the circumstances facilitating coalition building. This body of research shows that central factors include shared goals and interests, previous social ties (e.g. Rose, 2000; Van Dyke, 2003), availability of resources and political threats or defeats (for an overview see McCammon & Moon, 2015). In a meta-analysis McCammon and

Van Dyke (2010) reveal that coalitions are most likely when shared goals combine with plentiful resources. Sharing ideas, goals and frames crucially helps in building coalitions as studies across a variety of movements show (e.g. Bandy & Smith, 2005; Chávez, 2011; Di Gregorio, 2012). Strong differences, on the contrary, can importantly impede coalition building, in particular if they involve narrow ideologies and excluding practices (Gerhards & Rucht, 1992; Roth, 2010). Of course, similar interests by and large do not mean that differences are eliminated in coalitions. In fact, maintaining certain differences may also help building coalitions (Della Porta, 2005). For example, Barvosa-Carter (2001) shows how internal differences can be beneficial for the formation of strong alliances.

Furthermore, studies have identified several relevant external factors that influence coalition building: on the one hand, political opportunities in terms of favourable legislation, potential allies in political elites, and overall political culture can have a positive impact on coalition building (e.g. Bandy & Smith, 2005; Meyer & Corrigall-Brown, 2005). On the other hand, threats and defeats can have a strong facilitative effect, too, as they provide incentives to collaborate (e.g. Chang, 2008; Dixon & Martin, 2012).

In contrast to the conditions of coalition building, consequences of coalitions have received considerably less attention. Some studies explore consequences with regards to organizational effects on activist groups, mobilization dynamics and political outcomes. For example, coalitions have been shown to significantly increase the size of protest events (e.g. Gerhards & Rucht, 1992; Luna, 2010) and often help achieving political victories such as policy changes, in particular if coalitions fit together well and share high levels of mutual trust (e.g. Dixon, Danaher, & Kail, 2013). With regard to organizational effects, scholars have in particular highlighted the influence of coalitions on providing activist groups with additional resources and new networking opportunities (e.g. Lee, 2011) in addition to possibly changing the framing and tactics of involved activist groups (e.g. Luna, 2010; Wang & Soule, 2012). Furthermore, recent studies have for example explored how coalitions built in the context of the GJM affected other movements, for example the more recent anti-austerity protests (e.g. Flesher Fominaya, 2015; Zamponi & Daphi, 2014) or the environmental movement (e.g. Hadden, 2014). Despite these insights, various dimensions of the consequences of coalitions require further research including the organizational effects and the impact of transnational coalitions on domestic mobilization (McCammon & Moon, 2015) as well as the unintended and negative consequences of coalitions (Staggenborg, 2010).

Different types of coalitions

In exploring coalitions' internal consequences we distinguish between different kinds of coalitions and study their interaction. Coalitions can develop between rather different activist entities. Not only may the duration, intensity and scope differ considerably between coalitions (Di Gregorio, 2012; Van Dyke, 2003), but also the type of coalition may vary. Existing studies have explored different dynamics in coalitions formed *within* social movements and coalitions *between* different movements. Van Dyke (2003), for example, shows in her study of left-wing protests on US-university campuses that coalitions within movements and coalitions between different movements are affected differently by the availability of resources and threats. In addition, we propose to distinguish between transnational and cross-sectoral coalitions, i.e. cooperation between

movement groups across different countries, on the one hand, and across different issues and political traditions on the other. The advantage of such a distinction is that it allows studying the different dynamics of each type of coalition as well as their influence on each other.

While coalitions across countries and sectors may of course closely overlap, assuming that both follow the same paths may prove problematic empirically. After all, conditions for and consequences of coalitions across countries may look considerably different than those in the case of coalitions across different movement sectors. Equally problematic may be the related assumption – implicit in several studies on transnational movements – that the two kinds of coalitions strengthen each other, i.e. that transnational coalition building will facilitate cross-sectoral coalitions and vice versa. On the contrary, the two kinds of coalitions may also hinder rather than reinforce each other as some studies of transnational movements suggest. For example, Widener (2007) has shown in her study of protests against a new oil pipe line in Ecuador how transnational coalition work hampered domestic coalition building. In our analysis below we hence distinguish between both kinds of coalitions and explore their effect on each other as part of coalitions' internal outcomes.

Conflictive dynamics of coalitions

Existing studies on consequences of coalitions have tended to highlight positive influences of coalitions on mobilization capacity, resources and policy impact. Coalitions can increase mobilization numbers, resources and success. However, coalitions may also have negative impacts on mobilization capacities, resources and outcomes for example linked to dynamics of exclusion or competition. While negative ramifications and conflictive dimensions of coalitions have been rarely studied (but see e.g. Murphy, 2005 on limiting effect on resources), there is an increasing awareness in social movement studies about this, in particular in the context of research on postcolonial constellations in movements (see e.g. Conway, 2013; Cox, Nilsen, & Pleyers, 2017). This focus on postcolonial dynamics challenges the assumption that coalitions are primarily instances of organizational learning and improvement. Conflicts and trade-offs may equally form part of coalition building as do unintended forms of domination pre-structured by colonial continuities (Conway, 2011; Dhawan, 2013).

In drawing more attention to conflictive relations within and between social movements, insights from the field of International Relations (IR) on norm diffusion and contestation can be highly useful. IR as a discipline generally has a strong focus on asymmetries and power-imbalances as it is centrally concerned with the relations between hegemonic and peripheral states. If IR scholars hence study processes of diffusion, power differences play a much more prominent role than in the studies of diffusion in the context of movements' coalition building. As the subject of research differs between both bodies of literature (e.g. states vs. movements), insights can of course not be simply transferred from one discipline to the other. Still, there are similarities that might be useful for the study of movement coalitions. While the cooperation between movements is not as unequal as the asymmetrical field of international relations, conflicts are likely to arise also within alliances. Shifting the epistemological lens to a more open,

process-oriented perspective on the negotiation practices and conflicts involved in coalitions will help evade a harmonious bias in studies on coalition building.

In IR, as in social movement studies, definitions of diffusion have been refined in the last years, criticizing essentialist notions that imply a stable direction of diffusion from A to B and highlighting diffusion as a dynamic process. While also in IR, research started with a largely harmonious conceptualization of diffusion with the image of a teacher-pupil relationship (Finnemore, 1993), many IR scholars later criticized that such concepts leave little space for local actors' self-initiative. Accordingly, IR scholars paid more attention to the role of local structures and actors in their studies of normative change (e.g. Cortell & Davis, 1996; Ottendörfer, 2013) and identified specific models of norm *cycles* (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998), or *spirals* (Risse, Sikkink, & Ropp, 1999) assuming a back-and-forth between 'norm-givers' and 'norm-takers'.

Building on these studies, the recent IR literature on diffusion pays growing attention to conflicts during processes of diffusion, a perspective that provides a useful addition to social movement studies. Highlighting the negotiation and translation of norms between actors from different backgrounds (Zimmermann, 2017; Zwingel, 2012) several IR scholars now refer to contestation rather than diffusion (Deitelhoff & Zimmermann, 2018, 2019; Wiener, 2014). The focus on contestation in the context of normative exchange makes it less 'natural' that norms are constructed at the international level and then automatically 'diffused' to the local (Acharya, 2004). Especially in a postcolonial reading of international politics, the role of power-imbalances and the dynamics of coercion underlying what might look like smooth processes of diffusion from afar have been highlighted (Anderl, 2016; Epstein, 2014).

The study of movement coalitions can profit from these recent insights on diffusion. Although movement coalitions can be enabling for the involved movement groups, the resultant changes of their organizational forms or culture can be attributed, at least in part, to the result of contestation in the coalitions that they form part of. In our analysis below, we hence focus on aspects of conflict and negotiation in addition to more consensual and mutually enriching dimensions of coalitions. As we show, keeping both conflictive and consensual internal outcomes in mind is crucial for analysing interactions between transnational and cross-sectoral coalition building.

Analytical approach and data

In order to analyse the interaction between transnational and cross-sectoral coalition building, the article examines dynamics of coalition building in the GJM, a movement characterized by its strong transnational coalitions as well as extensive cooperation across different movement sectors (Daphi, 2017; Della Porta et al., 2006). More specifically, we focus on effects of transnational coalitions on cross-sectoral coalition building on the local and regional level. With this focus we aim to contribute to the understanding of the impact of transnational coalitions 'on domestic mobilization [which] is not yet fully understood' (McCammon & Moon, 2015, p. 332).

To cover the diversity of this 'movement of movements' our analysis includes case studies from different transnational coalitions within the GJM, addressing different issues and ranging from more moderate to more radical networks: the peasant network *La Vía Campesina*, the largely NGO and Church-based debt-relief campaign *Jubilee 2000*, the

network of women's movements *World March of Women*, and the grassroots network *Peoples' Global Action*. In each of these coalitions, we analyse one national or regional group. The selection of these cases was guided by the principle of geographical contrast. In particular, we included groups in the Global North and Global South based on the observation that their participation in transnational campaigns works differently due to inequalities in resources and influence (see e.g. Doherty & Doyle, 2012). For this purpose, we conduct research in Europe and Southeast Asia, selecting national and regional movement groups that were especially prominent in the region. For example, the debt campaign *Jubilee 2000* constituted one of the strongest national debt-campaigns in Europe (Josselin, 2007). *La Vía Campesina* became especially influential in Indonesia when the network's International Secretariat was located in its capital, Jakarta. We thus explore one national or regional case for each of these four transnational coalitions in both regions, namely in Indonesia, the Philippines, the UK and Italy. Due to the limited space of the article each case will only be elaborated briefly. However, the rationale for exploring all four case studies is that it allows assessing possible interactions between transnational and sectoral coalitions across a broad range of different mobilization contexts – both ideologically as well as geographically.

The following case studies draw on a combination of interviews and secondary analyses. We conducted interviews with activists centrally involved in the four analysed national movement coalitions or related groups between 2014 and 2016.[1] Interviews focussed on the development of the national movement in question, the relationship with the transnational GJM, its major changes over time, and internal as well as external factors influencing these changes. In selecting interviewees, we paid particular attention to including different perspectives within each activist network, including different political outlooks and degrees of involvement (rank and file as well as leaders). Since many of the empirical developments analysed took place over ten years ago, we triangulated these interviews with an analysis of movement documents from the time[2] as well as secondary sources in order to cross-check the recollections of interviewed activists.[3]

Analysing effects of transnational coalitions

In our discussion of the case studies in Indonesia, the Philippines, the UK and Italy below, we will first illustrate how transnational coalitions may deepen divides within local movement networks as they draw attention to or increase differences in approaches within the national network (*Jubilee 2000* in the UK); or because they one-sidedly strengthen certain groups or viewpoints within the regional network and marginalize others (*La Vía Campesina* in Indonesia and the Philippines). As we will demonstrate in the second section, transnational coalition building may also help bridge divides within local movement networks as it highlights similarities and decreases attention to differences (*World March of Women* in the Philippines; *Peoples' Global Action* in Italy).

Increasing tensions between movement sectors

Jubilee 2000 in the UK

The UK debt relief movement is characterized by various campaigns; the most prominent was the *Jubilee 2000* debt-campaign (JDC) due to its broad alliance and strong

mobilization capacity. Built on pre-existing campaigns on debt in the UK (Mayo, 2005; Saunders & Papadimitriou, 2012), JDC was launched in 1996. It brought together about 110 different groups and organizations in the UK, both secular and religious (Buxton, 2004; Josselin, 2007). This UK-based campaign formed an influential part of the worldwide network of autonomous national Jubilee groups in over fifty countries operating as an informal transnational hub (Somers, 2014).

JDC has often been described as a success story – internationally as well as with respect to the UK. Indeed, the UK campaign successfully pushed the issue of debt on the agenda and crucially influenced debt regulation in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Josselin, 2007), thanks to its innovative and accessible campaigning and strong leadership (Saunders & Papadimitriou, 2012, p. 217). It mobilized an unprecedented number of people in the UK, for example with its 70,000-strong human chain during the G7 summit in Birmingham in 1998 or in the context of a petition with almost 3 million signatures in 2000 (Mayo, 2005). However, the JDC also was characterized by considerable divisions (Buxton, 2004; Somers, 2014) and these divisions were deepened rather than bridged in the context of transnational coalition work.

The JDC brought together a variety of groups in the UK and accordingly views on debt and how to tackle it differed from the outset. Different approaches prevailed particularly between large NGOs with considerable funding and established organizational structures and the more loosely organized grassroots groups, including small Christian collectives (Buxton, 2004). The former more moderate groups, particularly large charity NGOs such as *Christian Aid* and *Oxfam*, tended to focus on debt relief for the poorest countries as a way to relieve hardship and were more open towards negotiation and collaboration with governments and international organizations (IOs) (Saunders & Papadimitriou, 2012). Other groups instead approached the issue of debt with a more fundamental critique of the economic and political system creating debt and reproducing global inequality and tended to be more sceptical about cooperating with governments and IOs (Buxton, 2004).

These different perspectives on debt started to further grow apart in the course of the JDC in the context of increasing divisions in the international debt campaign. In particular divides between groups based in the Northern and Southern hemisphere were growing, connected to the considerable inequality in resources as well as the lack of formal international structures (Anheier & Themudo, 2002; Buxton, 2004). An important moment of this growing international divide was the foundation of *Jubilee South* in 1999 during a meeting of Southern debt groups in South Africa (Somers, 2014). Southern groups felt their perspectives on debt were not receiving enough consideration within the transnational coalition. Disagreements centrally concerned the scope and rationale of debt reduction and whether to engage with debt initiatives proposed by the national governments and IOs. Southern groups tended to take a more critical, justice-oriented approach than many of their Northern counterparts (Buxton, 2004; Somers, 2014).

The divide within the transnational coalition left considerable traces in the UK Jubilee campaign as it drew attention to existing differences among its members and pushed them further apart. Activists felt the need to position themselves with regard to the transnational disagreements, in particular about how justified the foundation of *JubileeSouth* was and – connectedly – how valid their more critical approach to debt. Accordingly, UK activists' interpretations considerably diverged concerning the foundation of *JubileeSouth* and the validity of its different approach to debt. While in

particular activists from more moderate and institutionalized groups stressed their regret about the foundation as a split of the transnational network and criticized its motives (Interviews JDC-1, JDC-2; see also Buxton, 2004; Somers, 2014), others saw it more as an 'enrichment' (Interviews JDC-3, also JDC-6). Furthermore, UK debt activists increasingly disagreed about the usefulness and influence of the more structural approach to debt pushed forward particularly by Southern groups, which entailed a critique of the underlying structures of global trade and post-colonial politics more generally. In this context, several Southern debt groups for example talked about impoverished rather than poor countries and stressed that debts were not simply 'unpayable' due to the human hardship involved but 'illegitimate' due to the unjust global power relations creating it (Interviews JDC-3, JDC-6, see also Somers, 2014). While many groups within the UK coalition largely rejected the concept of illegitimate debt, for example describing it as 'a silly distinction' (Interview JDC-1), others considered this proposition more useful, particularly the more grassroots oriented groups. In this vein, some activists stressed how Southern groups influenced parts of the UK campaign as some UK groups started 'having a more radical perspective, that came from the experience with them [southern groups]', especially with respect to the issue of illegitimate debt (Interview JDC-6; see also Interviews JDC-3 & JDC-2). These deepening divides made it more difficult to continue joint debt campaigning efforts after the *Jubilee 2000* campaign ended as planned in 2000. As a result, from 2000 onwards the different components of the campaign went separate ways with different successor campaigns forming but losing considerable momentum (Anheier & Themudo, 2002; Buxton, 2004).

La Vía Campesina in Indonesia and the Philippines

La Vía Campesina (LVC) is a transnational peasant movement set up in 1993 in order to oppose the development strategy of global agricultural industrialization. Assembling against transnational agribusiness companies, as well as the *World Bank*, the *International Monetary Fund* and the trade agreements within the *World Trade Organization* (WTO), they first marched together through Mons (Belgium) in 1993 and later attended the *General Agreement of Tariffs in Trade* (GATT) meeting in Geneva as a united block (Desmarais, 2007, p. 8). The core problem of these peasants at the time was the decline of prices for crops and livestock, as well as increasing displacement due to the 'Green Revolution' policies and conditions of international institutions. Identifying TNCs and international finance capital behind the rules of these international institutions, national peasant organizations (particularly in Latin America) decided that the suffering peasants should themselves organize transnationally (Martínez-Torres & Rosset, 2010, p. 153).

From 2005 to 2013 LVC's International Operative Secretariat (IOS) was headed by the Indonesian chapter *Serikat Petani Indonesia* (SPI), coinciding with an overall deepening of the transnational coalition (Martínez-Torres & Rosset, 2010, p. 164). The IOS rotates among national movements and is decided at the international LVC conferences upon proposition by the International Coordination Committee. SPI's role within the transnational network and the increasing integration of LVC across borders during the time of SPI's chairmanship granted extraordinary influence to the latter. Therefore, the policy goals of SPI were very influential in the transnational network. For the Indonesian activists, it sometimes felt like

their national movement and the transnational network 'had merged to be one entity' (Interview SPI-3). During these years, LVC used the opening-up for civil society of the *United Nations*' (UN) Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and 'brought the idea of the right of the peasant to Geneva' (Interview SPI-2). As a consequence, food sovereignty was successfully diffused into international political discourse through sustained mobilization by LVC and their allies, and subsequently influenced national constitutions as well as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants (Dunford, 2015; Monsalve, 2013).

However, this idea has not always been popular within LVC which, on the contrary, used to be hostile towards any cooperation with IOs and even some international NGOs (Desmarais, 2003, p. 27). More decisively, however, the peasant rights frame itself was seen as western and neoliberal. One of the key critics was the Philippine movement within LVC, *Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas* (Peasant Movement of the Philippines, KMP). They neglected the human rights framework, in favour of 'genuine' agrarian reform which focuses on 'campaigning for nationalization of land, advocating for state farms, although allowing for a transitional individual ownership' (Borras & Franco, 2009, p. 22).

As a militant movement of landless peasants, small farmers, farm workers, rural youth and peasant women, KMP uses a class-based style of agitation and employs massive militant actions to uphold interests of the peasants. One of its core origins was the *Communist Party of the Philippines – New People's Army* (CPP-NPA), established in the late 1960s. Then, the radical Philippine left still had a common enemy in the national dictatorship. After Marcos' disempowerment in the late 1980s, however, the splits within the CPP-NPA strongly echoed in the peasant movement and left KMP in a post-Maoist sectarian corner – against the neoliberal state and particularly against imperial forces outside the Philippines (especially the US and economic IOs). On the basis of this political trajectory, the framework of peasant rights within the larger global governance architecture was not an acceptable basis for coalition building. Resulting from this ideological split, 'KMP has fallen from grace [...] and has been politically marginalized within Via Campesina' (Borras, 2010, p. 784). The faction around SPI won this internal discussion and installed a 'critical but collaborative relationships with some groups within the FAO [...]' (Borras, 2008, p. 268). The coincidence of two phenomena hence led to Philippine movement to distance itself from the transnational movement: the *deepening* of the transnational coalition and the mainstreaming of the Indonesian viewpoint within this coalition. As an effect, KMP's political trajectory lost traction in the transnational network overall and their energy was channelled back to more national concerns. In fact, it has even become actively destructive towards LVC by using their ongoing membership only to block another Philippine mass movement from joining the network (Interview KMP-4; see also Borras, 2010, p. 784). While in the Indonesian case the national movement almost merged with its transnational coalition, resulting in considerable political success, in the Philippine case the *strengthening* of the transnational network and its growing institutionalization led to their de facto retreat from LVC resulting in a re-nationalization of activism.

Enhancing cooperation between movement sectors

While the above section has revealed how transnational coalitions may hinder cross-sectoral cooperation, in the following, we will outline two cases in which transnational coalition building has helped bridge divides within local movement networks.

World March of Women in the Philippines

The *World March of Women* (WMW) has its roots in a ten-day, women-led march in 1994 to protest against poverty in Québec, Canada. The march being perceived as highly successful, the idea of a world march was brought up at a workshop of the UN conference in Beijing in 1995 (Conway, 2012, p. 385). On 8 March 2000 (International Women's Day), hundreds of national and local women's marches were organized across the world. One of the biggest took place in the Philippines, organized by *Kilos Kabaro* (movement of sisters). The coalition of eleven groups, some of them again coalitions, have been part of the Social Forum movement and are decidedly anti-capitalist. The ties to the international WMW became closer after the millennium, the activist network then being renamed *WMW-Pilipinas*. The Philippina women's movement – as the left in the Philippines more generally – has been sharply divided since the fall of Marcos' dictatorship in the late 1980s (see case study above). However, transnational cooperation in the context of the WMW has importantly contributed to bridging some of these divides. Generally, the Maoist feminists who 'reaffirm' the revolutionary struggle are represented by the Gabriela Party ('Reaffirmists'), while the more cooperative, anti-sectarian ('Rejectionist') groups assemble in the the *WMW-Pilipinas*. Yet, also within the *WMW-Pilipinas*, a spectrum can be observed, from anti-imperialist narratives that resemble, and are organizationally close to, Reaffirmsist groups, to moderate women's groups rather oriented at the UN and other more institutionalized political bodies. This divide pre-structures many discussions in the feminist movement, one aspect being internationalism. *WMW-Pilipinas* have been distinctly internationalist in outlook. Yet, while some groups frame their transnational affiliation around 'Global Justice', others rather refer to 'Anti-Globalization', the former stressing commonalities with feminists from abroad, the latter highlighting the anti-imperialist heritage, mainly directed against the US. The anti-imperialist perspective of the *WMW-Pilipinas* is linked to their activism related to problems associated with the high numbers of sex work, rape and HIV/Aids at the US military bases (Interviews WMW-1, WMW-3, WMW-8).

The anti-imperialism which resulted from this solidarity work has inspired the feminist left to partly turn nationalist, which used to be more characteristic of the largely left-authoritarian 'Reaffirmist' groups. This is not only a considerable problem for transnational coalition building but also has deepened divides to other activist groups who feel 'uncomfortable with nationalism as such' and criticise the Reaffirmists, arguing that 'this national chauvinism [. . .] that's our main problem with the RAs [Reaffirmists]' (Interview WMW-1). Because of the general assumption that radicalism should also be nationalist and the fear to be appearing with the wrong allies, alliance-building for solidarity campaigns have been difficult for a long time.

Yet, the transnational coalition building in the context of the WMW crucially facilitated organizing cross-sectoral coalitions in this difficult national political environment: the orientation towards a broad framework of fighting the causes of poverty and violence

against women has provided possibilities for abstraction from particular organizational foci and moving together under a common 'global' framework in the context of the WMW. From a purely instrumental viewpoint, the March rally organized by *WMW-Pilipinas* gave various groups the possibility to reach an audience that they usually would not be able to address and by that consolidate the movement in itself. When one anti-imperialist group, for instance, voiced unease to join the WMW because they found that it focused too much on 'soft' topics such as health and education, the *WMW-Pilipinas* encouraged them by cohering the demonstration under an anti-war label (Interview WMW-3). The particular group's position ('globalization cannot be achieved without war', Interview WMW-3) was not shared by all groups, but they did share a commitment to end all wars. In that vein, 'March 8 is an opportunity for us to bring this together and show that we're one movement.' (Interview WMW-1). Strikingly, this national coalition building of feminist movements and their struggles against all forms of inequality and discrimination has proven to be sustainable beyond the single demonstration on 8 March for over a decade now. During this process, the anti-imperialist groups crucially diversified their agenda. In contact with other feminist groups, they adopted more issues that affect women. Activists directly attribute this to the transnational coalition: on a journey to Mexico, for instance, they learned that 'our campaign is [about] war and militarism but we have to address so many issues that affect women and that of course includes climate, work, and everything else' (Interview WMW-3). This diversification, in turn, made it easier for the more moderate Philippina groups to connect to them. The transnational coalition building has thus helped bridge the divides and contributed to work more closely together beyond their traditional fights.

Peoples' Global Action in Italy

Inspired by the Zapatist insurgency in Chiapas (Mexico), the transnational activist network *Peoples' Global Action* (PGA) was founded in February 1998 in the context of protests against the Ministerial Conference of the WTO in Geneva, Switzerland. The founding of the PGA network goes back to several international encounters initiated by the Zapatistas where activists and intellectuals from various countries and continents met (Maiba, 2005; Routledge, 2004). Based on the Zapatistas' central idea that less emphasis should be given to helping activists in other parts of the world with their struggles and more to connecting own struggles with those elsewhere, the goal of this network was to facilitate the sharing of information and improve coordination between grassroots social movements around the world. PGA brought together grassroots groups from more than fifty countries in a loosely coordinated and decentral network that encompassed indigenous groups, peasants' movements as well as environmental organizations and anarchist groups. While groups' ideological and thematic perspectives differed, they shared the aim to resist corporate rule and the neoliberal capitalist development paradigm as formulated in the shared hallmarks (Maiba, 2005). While PGA lost some of its momentum in later phases of the GJM, it played an important role in the movement's early phase, mobilizing for central GJM events such as the counter-summit in Prague in 2000 (Routledge, 2004).

Zapatism left a particularly strong mark on left groups across Europe (Daphi, 2017). Against the background of the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Zapatist political imaginary provided an important source of inspiration and motivation for various grassroots and radical left projects and crucially contributed to their revival in the 1990s. In Italy, Zapatist

input was particularly influential for anarchist and autonomous activists linked to the *Centri Sociali*, the social centres (SC), which played a major role in Italian GJM mobilizations (Daphi, 2017; Membretti & Mudu, 2013). For example, as early as 1994, a new network had formed in Italy in solidarity with the Zapatista struggle, called *Ya Basta!*, which was centrally involved in PGA, becoming its second European convenor. Transnational coordination in the PGA context left considerable traces in the social centre environment. In particular, it strengthened cross-sectoral coalitions as it helped bridge divides between different groups of the radical left and beyond in the context of early GJM mobilizations .

Transnational cooperation importantly contributed to coalition building across the various strands of the social centres helping them to move from 'a defensive and identitarian approach to an open network conception of action and communication' (Membretti & Mudu, 2013, p. 90). In particular, collaboration in the context of PGA contributed to deepening domestic coalitions as it provided both ideological and organizational bridges that facilitated exchange, collaborative efforts and joint mobilization across previously distant groups. First, PGA and its Zapatista-inspired hallmarks facilitated ideological bridges by providing a 'political imagination of a common, shared political collaboration' (Interview SC-5) on the basis of which social centres increasingly thought 'about themselves as a subject of political aggregation' (Interview SC-6). This facilitated new synergies between different political strands including various communist groups, autonomists and anarchists as activists were ready 'to take on innovations and understand that one does not have to stick to what historically was their education and background' and tried to pay 'particular attention to the diversity of culture' (Interview SC-4).

Second, transnational cooperation in PGA provided organizational bridges that crucially contributed to domestic coalition building. On the one hand, PGA's attention to horizontality helped finding common ground as various activists stress. In particular, the network's joint decision making and mutual respect helped overcome some of the frictions among Italian activists. On the other hand, concrete interactions with activists worldwide put local differences into perspective (Daphi, 2017). Activists describe how the exchange with other activist groups within the PGA network such as *Reclaim the Streets* in the UK or peasant movements in India not only allowed sharing ideas and developing joint activities, but how it also facilitated cross-sectoral cooperation in Italy. The PGA network offered a joined platform were various social centre groups could feel more at ease and move closer to each other as it provided 'a neutral common field' where local competitions were less central and 'everyone could feel comfortable' (Interview SC-2).

Conclusion

In this article we analysed the interaction between coalition building across countries and sectors with the aim of contributing to a better understanding of movement coalitions and their internal outcomes. Distinguishing between transnational and cross-sectoral coalition dynamics, we have analysed in particular the effect of the former on the latter. Our four case studies have illustrated the different dynamics of coalition building across countries and sectors and how they interact. While the cases of the *Jubilee 2000* in the UK (JDC) and *La Vía Campesina* (LVC) in Indonesia and the Philippines highlighted how transnational coalitions may hamper or undo local or regional coalitions across sectors or traditions, the cases of the *World March of Women* in the Philippines and *Peoples' Global Action* (PGA) in

Italy showed how transnational coalitions may also have the opposite effect, strengthening and facilitating cross-sectoral domestic coalitions.

Our analysis provides some first insights into the conditions of the different effects of transnational coalition building on cross-sectoral cooperation. Neither the geographical location nor the form of organization per se seem to determine such effects: our case studies show that negative effects occur both in the Global North and South (JDC in UK and LVC in Indonesia) as well as both in more formally structured transnational networks (LVC) and in less formally structured networks (JDC). However, our case studies do point to certain general factors influencing whether transnational coalitions hinder or facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation. From our four cases we infer that transnational coalitions will likely have a negative effect on cross-sector coalitions when they reinforce existing power inequalities or splits within a movement more generally. The growing tensions between different sectors of JDC in the UK were linked to and partly reflected divisions within the transnational coalition, in particular the split between Northern and Southern debt campaigns. This reinforced the division within the local network and limited future efforts of cross-sectoral coalition building. That division was similarly reinforced in the case of the peasant movements in the Philippines and Indonesia resulting from the growing predominance of a moderate, rights-based approach within the transnational LVC coalition. These cases highlight how intended or unintended hierarchies and accumulations of decision making in favour of a particular group or person within a transnational coalition can be detrimental to strengthening cross-sectoral ties. The increased traction of one group's viewpoint can lead to other groups turning-away.

Our case studies of transnational coalitions with positive effects on domestic cross-sectoral coalitions conversely point to the importance of openness and inclusiveness on behalf of the transnational coalitions. Both the WMW and PGA were characterized by an open framework that allowed highlighting similarities rather than differences, especially thanks to their inclusive thematic framings: poverty and violence against women in the first case, neoliberal capitalism in the second. This broad framework allowed a loosening of sectarian tendencies and an abstraction from differences regarding ideological traditions, organizational and tactical preferences and trajectories of internal competition. In fact, the concept of cross-issue coalition was ingrained into the very identity of the WMW and PGA networks, much more than in the cases of LVC and JDC, which had a narrower thematic focus.

Further research is required to specify the conditions that shape whether transnational coalitions hinder or help cross-sectoral cooperation. However, our analysis does point to the conclusion that openness and inclusiveness in organization and issue-setting are of crucial importance for the ability to stimulate cross-sectoral coalition building. This finding echoes insights from IR studies in norm diffusion which highlighted the importance of non-hierarchical and inclusive institutions to increase the chance of successful norm diffusion (e.g. Deitelhoff, 2009). It also echoes earlier findings in social movement studies about how narrow ideologies and excluding practices hinder coalition work more generally (e.g. Gerhards & Rucht, 1992). In particular, our findings reiterate recent post-colonial insights within social movement studies, which emphasize the need to look at underlying power relations in activists' interactions as well as the importance of sensitivity in coalition building across differences, both geographical and ideological. With the aim of contributing to the comparably small literature on coalition outcomes, this paper hence highlights

the need to pay close attention to negative effects as well as conflicts and contestation within movement coalitions linked to dynamics of exclusion, competition and domination. On this basis, future studies on movement coalitions need to pay more attention to both consensual and conflictive dynamics of coalition building and their ramifications.

Notes

1. Eight to twelve interviews were conducted for each of the national or regional movement groups, i.e. 39 in total for the four case studies.
2. For each case we collected materials published by the respective activist network in the period under investigation. Depending on the case, the kind of documents and availability differed: For the case of Jubilee UK we draw on reports and discussion papers published between 1998 and 2000 on the campaign webpage (www.jubilee2000uk.org; accessed via the web archive wayback machine in February 2018). For the case of PGA we draw on reports published by Italian grassroots activists about activities between 1998 and 2002 on the PGA archival webpage www.nadir.org. For the case of La Vía Campesina we draw on the websites of the Indonesian local groups (https://spi.or.id/and predecessor http://www.fspi.or.id/ accessed via the web archive wayback machine in February 2018), and KMP press releases or statements in the newspaper 'Manila Standard'. For the case of the World March of Women we draw on pamphlets and press releases between 2002 and 2008 received vie email or hard copy from the Philippine member groups.
3. In this way, the below case studies only include interview statements that have been triangulated by documents or secondary analyses. However, due to the brevity of the case studies the document analysis itself cannot be discussed in detail.

Acknowledgments

We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. The article draws on a research grant provided by the *German Research Foundation* (DFG); project title: 'No Alternative? Social Protest in the Alter-Globalisation Movement between Opposition and Dissidence'.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

Notes on contributors

Priska Daphi is Professor of Conflict Sociology at Bielefeld University and co-founder of the Institute for Protest and Social Movement Studies (IPB) in Berlin.

Felix Anderl is a research associate on the ERC-funded project ARTEFACT at the University of Cambridge, Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities.

Nicole Deitelhoff is Professor of International Relations and Theories of Global Orders at Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany.

References

Acharya, A. (2004). How ideas spread: Whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism. *International Organization*, *58*(2), 239–275.

Anderl, F. (2016). The myth of the local. How international organizations localize norms rhetorically. *The Review of International Organizations*, *11*(2), 197–218.

Anheier, H., & Themudo, N. (2002). Organisational forms of global civil society: Implications of going global. In Anheier H (Eds.), *Global Civil Society* (pp. 191–216). Oxford University Press.

Bandy, J., & Smith, J. (2005). Cooperation and conflict in transnational protest. In J. Bandy & J. Smith (Eds.), *Coalitions across borders. Transnational protest and the neoliberal order* (pp. 1–17). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Barvosa-Carter, E. (2001). Multiple identity and coalition-building: How identity differences within us enable radical alliances among us. In J. Bystydzienski & S. Schacht (Eds.), *2001: Forging radical alliances across difference: Coalition politics for the New Millennium* (pp. 21–34). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Borras, S. (2008). La vía campesina and its global campaign for agrarian reform. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *8*(2), 258–289.

Borras, S. (2010). The politics of transnational agrarian movements. *Development and Change*, *41* (5), 771–803.

Borras, S., & Franco, J. (2009). Transnational agrarian movements struggling for land and citizenship rights. *IDS Working Paper 323*. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Buxton, N. (2004). Debt cancellation and civil society: A case study of Jubilee 2000. In P. Gready (Ed.), *Fighting for human rights* (pp. 54–77). London: Routledge.

Chang, P. Y. (2008). Unintended consequences of repression: Alliance formation in South Korea's democracy movement (1970–1979). *Social Forces*, *87*(2), 651–677.

Chávez, K. R. (2011). Counter-public enclaves and understanding the function of rhetoric in social movement coalition-building. *Communication Quarterly*, *59*(1), 1–18.

Conway, J. (2011). Activist knowledges on anti-globalization terrain: Transnational feminism at the world social forum. *Interface*, *3*(2), 33–64.

Conway, J. (2012). Transnational feminisms building anti-globalization solidarities. *Globalizations*, *9*(3), 379–393.

Conway, J. (2013). *Edges of global justice. The world social forum ad its 'others'*. London: Routledge.

Cortell, A. P., & Davis, J. W. (1996). How do international institutions matter? The domestic impact of international rules and norms. *International Studies Quarterly*, *40*(4), 451–478.

Cox, L., Nilsen, A., & Pleyers, G. (2017). Social movement thinking beyond the core: Theories and research in post-colonial and postsocialist societies (editorial). *Interface: a Journal for and about Social Movements*, *9*(2), 1–36.

Daphi, P. (2017). *Becoming a movement: Identity, narrative and memory in the European global justice movement*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Deitelhoff, N. (2009). The discursive process of legalization. Charting islands of persuasion in the ICC case. *International Organization*, *63*(1), 33–65.

Deitelhoff, N., & Zimmermann, L. (2018). Things we lost in the fire: How different types of contestation affect the validity of international norms. *Review of International Studies*. Online First.

Deitelhoff, N., & Zimmermann, L. (2019). Norms under challenge: Unpacking the dynamics of norm robustness. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, *4*(1), 2–17.

Della Porta, D. (2005). Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities, and the Construction of 'Another Politics': Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Fora. In D. Della Porta & S. G. Tarrow (Eds.), *People, passions, and power. Transnational protest and global activism* (pp. 175–202). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Della Porta, D., Andretta, M., Mosca, L., & Reiter, H. (2006). *Globalization from below: Transnational activists and protest networks. Social movements, protest, and contention: Vol. 26*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Desmarais, A. (2003). *The WTO … will meet somewhere, sometime. And we will be there!* Ottawa: The North-South Institute.
Desmarais, Aurélie. (2007). *La via campesina: globalization and the power of the peasants*. London: Pluto Press.
Dhawan, N. (2013). Coercive cosmopolitanism and impossible solidarities. *Qui Parle*, *22*(1), 139–166.
Di Gregorio, M. (2012). Networking in environmental movement organisation coalitions: Interest, values or discourse? *Environmental Politics*, *21*(1), 1–25.
Dixon, M., Danaher, W., & Kail, B. (2013). Allies, targets, and the effectiveness of coalition protest: A comparative analysis of labor unrest in the US south. *Mobilization*, *18*(3), 331–350.
Dixon, M., & Martin, A. W. (2012). We can't win this on our own: Unions, firms, and mobilization of external allies in labor disputes. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(6), 946–969.
Doherty, B., & Doyle, T. (2012). North-south environmentalisms: Friends of the earth international (FOEI). In J. Howell (Ed.), *Global matters for non-governmental public action* (pp. 153–177). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Dunford, R. (2015). Peasant activism and the rise of food sovereignty: Decolonising and democratising norm diffusion? *European Journal of International Relations*, *23*(1), 145–167.
Epstein, C. (2014). The postcolonial perspective: An introduction. *International Theory*, *6*(2), 294–311.
Finnemore, M. (1993). International organizations as teachers of norms: The united nations educational, scientific, and cutural organization and science policy. *International Organization*, *47*(4), 565–597.
Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, *52*(4), 887–917.
Flesher Fominaya, C. (2015). Debunking spontaneity: Spain's 15-M/Indignados as autonomous movement. *Social Movement Studies*, *14*, 142–163.
Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (1992). Mesomobilization: Organizing and framing in two protest campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(3), 555–596.
Hadden, J. (2014). Explaining variation in transnational climate change activism: The role of inter-movement spillover. *Global Environmental Politics*, *14*(2), 7–25.
Josselin, D. (2007). From transnational protest to domestic political opportunities: Insights from the debt cancellation campaign. *Social Movement Studies;*, *6*(1), 21–38.
Lee, J. E. (2011). Insularity or solidarity? The impacts of political opportunity structure and social movement sector on alliance formation. *Mobilization*, *16*(3), 303–324.
Luna, Z. T. (2010). Marching toward reproductive justice: Coalitional (re) framing of the march for women's lives. *Sociological Inquiry*, *80*(4), 554–578.
Maiba, H. (2005). Grassroots transnational social movement activism: The case of peoples' global action. *Sociological Focus*, *38*(1), 41–63.
Martínez-Torres, E., & Rosset, P. (2010). La vía campesina: The birth and evolution of a transnational social movement. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *37*(1), 149–175.
Mayo, M. (2005). 'The world will never be the same again'? Reflecting on the experiences of jubilee 2000, mobilizing globally for the remission of unpayable debts. *Social Movement Studies*, *4*(2), 139–154.
McCammon, H. J., & Van Dyke, N. (2010). Applying qualitative comparative analysis to empirical studies of social movement coalition formation. In N. Van Dyke & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements* (pp. 292–315). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
McCammon, H. J., & Moon, M. (2015). Social movement coalitions. In D. Della Porta & M. Diani (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of social movements* (pp. 326–339). Oxford: OUP.
Membretti, A., & Mudu, P. (2013). Where global meets local: Italian social centres and the alterglobalization movement. In C. Flesher Fominaya & L. Cox (Eds.), *The European social movement experience: Rethinking 'new social movements', historicising the alterglobalisation movement and understanding the new wave of protest* (pp. 76–93). London: Routledge.

Meyer, D., & Corrigall-Brown, C. (2005). Coalitions and political context: US movements against wars in Iraq. *Mobilization*, *10*(3), 327–344.
Monsalve, S. (2013). The human rights framework in contemporary agrarian struggles. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *40*(1), 239–290.
Murphy, G. (2005). Coalitions and the development of the global environmental movement: A double-edged sword. *Mobilization*, *10*(2), 235–250.
Ottendörfer, E. (2013). Contesting international norms of transitional justice: The case of timor leste. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, *7*(1), 23–35.
Risse, T., Sikkink, K., & Ropp, S. (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change*. Cambridge: CUP.
Rose, F. (2000). *Coalitions across the class divide: Lessons from the labor, peace, and environmental movements*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
Roth, B. (2010). 'Organizing one's own'as good politics: Second wave feminists and the meaning of coalition. In N. Van Dyke & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements* (pp. 99–118). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Routledge, P. (2004). Convergence of commons: Process geographies of people's global action. *The Commoner*, *8*(1), 1–20.
Saunders, C., & Papadimitriou, T. (2012). Dropping the debt? British anti-debt camapaign and international development policy. In P. Utting, M. Pianta, & A. Ellersiek (Eds.), *Global justice activism and policy reform in Europe: Understanding when change happens* (pp. 213–234). New York: Routledge.
Somers, J. (2014). The dynamics of south/north relationships within transnational debt campaigning. *Interface*, *6*(2), 76–102.
Staggenborg, S. (2010). Conclusion: research on social movement coalitions. In N. Van Dyke & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements* (pp. 316–330). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Van Dyke, N. (2003). Crossing movement boundaries: Factors that facilitate coalition protest by American college students, 1930–1990. *Social Problems*, *50*(2), 226–250.
Van Dyke, N., & McCammon, H. J. (2010). Introduction: Social movement coalition formation. In N. Van Dyke & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements* (pp. xi–xxviii). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Wang, D. J., & Soule, S. A. (2012). Social movement organizational collaboration: Networks of learning and the diffusion of protest tactics, 1960–1995. *American Journal of Sociology*, *117*(6), 1674–1722.
Widener, P. (2007). Benefits and burdens of transnational campaigns: A comparison of four oil struggles in ecuador. *Mobilization*, *12*(1), 21–36.
Wiener, A. (2014). *A theory of contestation*. Berlin: Springer.
Zamponi, L., & Daphi, P. (2014). Breaks and continuities in and between cycles of protest. Memories and legacies of the global justice movement in the context of anti-austerity mobilisations. In D. Della Porta & A. Mattoni (Eds.), *Spreading protests. Social movements in times of crisis* (pp. 193–226). Essex: ECPR-Press.
Zimmermann, L. (2017). More for less: The interactive translation of global norms in post-conflict guatemala. *International Studies Quarterly*, *61*(4), 774–785.
Zwingel, S. (2012). How do norms travel? Theorizing international women's rights in transnational perspective. *International Studies Quarterly*, *56*(1), 115–129.