The Rebel Alliance Strikes Back:
Understanding the Politics of Backlash Mobilization

Christopher Michael Sullivan
Department of Political Science, Louisiana State University

And

Christian Davenport
Department of Political Science, University of Michigan

This article benefited greatly from comments by Kraig Beyelein, Rory McVeigh, participants at CUNY's Protest and Politics Workshop and Notre Dame's Social Movements and Politics Seminar, four anonymous reviewers, and the editor at *Mobilization*. Supplemental material and replication data are available at http://www.sullivanchristophermichael.com.

Abstract

How does repression influence "backlash" (i.e., challenges against political authorities that follow acts of government coercion/force)? This study argues that to adequately address the topic, it is necessary to open up a social movement and examine why specific individuals within the same social movement increase their participation following repression while other members drop out. To investigate the topic of interest, the study uses original panel data on organizational behavior and individual participation in a black-nationalist insurgency called the Republic of New Africa. Results show that the effects of repression are more complex than previously imagined. At the organizational level, repression leads to backlash challenges. At the individual level, however, repression has mixed effects. Challengers who personally experience repression become more likely to participate in post-repression challenging activities. At the same time, those within the organization who did not directly experience repression withdraw.

For approximately forty years, researchers have been examining the impact of state repression[1] on the *occurrence of collective challenges* against political authority (such as dissent, terrorism, and insurgency) as well as the *participation of individual challengers* in these events. The principal objective of this work has been to assess how well governments do at constraining and/or eliminating overt threats to political order, a central concern for authorities, activists, social scientists as well as ordinary citizens. Yet, one of the most prominent conclusions from this work is that repression sometimes increases subsequent challenges (e.g., Lichbach and Gurr 1981; della Porta 1995; Koopmans 1997; Moore 1998; Francisco 2004; Brockett 2005; Walsh and Piazza 2010; Dugan and Chenoweth 2012) and participation in these activities (e.g., Opp and Roehl 1990; Opp and Gern 1993; White 1993; Zwerman and Steinhoff 2005); this is commonly referred to as "backlash".

Although the role of repression in prompting backlash mobilization has received widespread attention, the mechanisms underlying this effect remain contested, at least in part because existing research relies on untested assumptions about the underlying motivations, behaviors, and identities of those who strike back. Effectively, there can be multiple ways in which individuals inside a social movement interact to produce backlash. For instance, it is possible that those targeted with repression are responsible for the escalation of collective challenges (e.g., White 1993; Koopmans 1993; della Porta 1995; Moore 1998; Tarrow 1998; McAdam and Sewell 2001; Moyer et al. 2001; Hess and Martin 2006; Dugan and Chenoweth 2012; Lyall 2013). It is possible that those not targeted with repression are responsible for the escalation of collective challenges (e.g., Klandermans 1984; Hirsch 1990; Opp 1994). It is possible that new entrants into the social movement organization following state repression are

the ones responsible for escalating challenging behavior (e.g., Zwerman and Steinhoff 2005). Or, it is possible that some combination of actors is responsible for backlash.

Our study seeks to understand *who* within a social movement organization engages in challenging behavior after state repression while others withdraw as well as *how* these changes in organizational composition influence backlash challenges to authority. We argue that under a specified set of conditions, repression causes significant cohort effects within the challenger organization. Different from earlier work, we maintain that the repressed members of the challenging institution escalate their commitment to the cause, split off from the non-repressed members and mobilize new recruits more in line with their interest in escalation. Non-repressed members, meanwhile, take on a marginalized out-group status and become less likely to commit to subsequent challenges. *The repressed and new revolutionaries rebel, while the non-repressed revolutionary withdraws*.

To investigate these processes empirically, we examine unique data derived from previously undisclosed police and movement-specific records. These present detailed information on a black-nationalist and secessionist social movement called the Republic of New Africa (RNA), which existed in the United States during the 1960s-1970s (Davenport 2014) as well as government behavior directed against the organization and its membership. In order to investigate who facilitates backlash, we consider mobilization at both the individual and organizational level for one year prior to as well as a year following a specific repressive event (a large-scale raid, arrest, and interrogation referred to as the "New Bethel Incident").

The analyses are insightful. Results show that the effects of repression on backlash are more complex than previously imagined. In particular, when examining repression's effects at the organizational level, we find that while repression is related to significant increases in

behavioral challenges (found in previous work) and it has insignificant effects on per-event participation (i.e., the same number of individuals participate before as well as after repression). Looking at precisely who engages in behavioral challenges, however, we see that repressed members and a small cohort of new members are more likely to participate after experiencing repression, while those within the organization who did not personally experience repression drop out.

The implications of these findings for studies of conflict and repression are substantial and require scholars to rethink both their theoretical and methodological approaches to the subject as it suggests that repression does not increase or decrease movement participation; it does both. The study demonstrates that if we truly want to understand how repression influences those who seek to change/overthrow government, then we must get "inside" movements to study effects both on individuals and on their organizational interactions. Indeed, if the impact of repression is contingent on who is repressed, then we cannot understand how repressive action influences collective challenges solely by studying event counts of observed acts of contention in some aggregate fashion. This should prompt those interested in government action as well as collective challenges to not only consider who is or is not repressed within a challenging institution, but also contemplate how organizations sustain themselves over time.

Below, we outline variation in the existing literature on repression and backlash mobilization. This discussion is used to guide the development of our theory and research design. The fourth section presents the empirical analysis. In the conclusion, we address the implications for academic studies of repression and mobilization as well as the practical importance of the results.

The Influence of Repression on Backlash

Although the investigation of how repression influences backlash is rooted in a common interest with understanding resistance to government efforts to maintain order, there is actually a great diversity in the way the topic is examined. In particular, we wish to focus on one specific dimension of existing scholarship: the units of observation. For example, several studies have the nation-year as the unit of observation (e.g., Hibbs 1973; Muller 1985), whereas others do not concern themselves with whole countries but instead focus on a particular sector or family of movements, attempting to ascertain if repressive behavior influences their activity (e.g., McAdam 1982; Tarrow 1989; Moore 1998; Wisler and Giugni 1999; Lyall 2009; Sullivan 2014). The aggregation of behavior in such work has led to some important conclusions regarding correlations between the form, timing, and context of repression and the occurrence of backlash.

But there are shortcomings with these approaches stemming from issues related to ecological inference. Despite causal mechanisms rooted in identifying how repression influences individual challengers through fear or anger (e.g., Gurr 1969; Tilly 1978; Lichbach 1998), all of the work noted above examines the impact of repressive behavior on collective challenges at the country, sector or group levels.[2] As a result, the actual challengers who compose the relevant organization engaged in struggle and their individual responses to repression are absent. This limitation is significant because there are behaviorally equivalent explanations for the results that cannot be addressed due to the high level of aggregation in the data employed.

Another predominate research approach focuses on individual-level responses to repressive action (e.g., White 1989; Opp and Roehl 1990; Opp and Gern 1993). These studies focus on either individuals within a population that *could become involved* in some type of contentious behavior (e.g., Opp 1994) or a particular set of individuals who are *already engaged*

in a specific social movement (e.g., White 1989; della Porta 1995). The former endeavors to understand the degree to which individuals who exist in a situation where contention is a possibility are or are not influenced by repressive behavior (either actualized or expected), while the latter endeavors to understand the degree to which individuals who exist in a social movement are or are not influenced by repressive behavior. While an improvement on the studies identified above, these studies also reveal important limitations that necessitate further exploration. For example, those works that do not examine social movement organizations exclusively end up combining ordinary citizens along with people who are explicitly associated with social movements, which tends to conflate very distinct issues: how ongoing behavioral challenges are sustained as opposed to why individuals become more involved with behavioral challenges. Both have implications for repression, but they answer slightly different questions and research must be attentive to the differences. Related to this, when movements are evaluated specifically, access to participants is generally neither random nor comprehensive and the research usually examines relationships after contention has taken place, missing a baseline against which to gauge influences. Finally, many of the studies above tend to analyze lower-risk activities where the likelihood of violence/death is limited as well as where the nature of the claims-making effort is moderate.

The brief comparative review sheds light on a number of critical factors that are necessary to improve upon. To begin, investigations of individual movements (rather than nations for example) are useful because they allow researchers to directly probe the government behavior of interest as well as the subsequent mobilization of the repressed target (the challenging institution). In this case, one would need to examine the behavior of individuals within the movement as well as organizational behavior in the aggregate to get an encompassing

perspective on how repression impacts mobilization. When researchers evaluate individuals within a specific movement, they are attempting to understand the influence of repression on the most essential element of any response. But one cannot examine these individuals in isolation without downplaying the relevance of social movement institutions. Looking at both the individuals and the organization can direct attention to how micro- and the meso-level mechanisms interact to produce outcomes such as polarization or, in our case, backlash. Finally, time-series investigations are extremely important because they allow the researcher to establish some baseline against which the influence of repression can be evaluated.[3]

Below we outline our approach to each of these issues.

Re-Evaluating the Impact of Repression on Backlash

Building on the strengths and attempting to overcome the limitations of earlier work, we develop an argument that represents a synthesis of individual and organizational elements.[4] The objective is to identify a set of mechanisms internal to the politics of a social movement that will allow us to predict (within a specified set of conditions) variation in backlash.

Essentially, our argument begins with repressive behavior disturbing a social movement organization. Now, it is clear that the repression needs to exceed a particular threshold in order to have an impact and that the relevant social movement needs to be somewhat receptive/vulnerable to the governments behavior. It is also important to acknowledge that we are speaking of repressive events that are not so severe as to kill or eliminate all members of the challenging organization (cf., Sullivan 2012; Zhukov 2015).

With that in mind, we contend that in order to understand how repression influences mobilization it is crucial to identify which sub-group within a repressed movement one is considering. Networks of individuals within social movements are crucial for understanding how

repression influences subsequent mobilization. For instance, one's network might provide positive or negative feedback regarding what should be done after repression (e.g., Klandermans 1998; Opp and Roehl 1990). Or, networks might polarize because some are highly committed to the specific public good being pursued and they wish to push on in the face of repression (e.g., Opp 1994). Finally, networks might diverge if some members may have been present for an especially important "transformative" repressive event that magnified their commitment to the cause whereas others may have been absent during this time and as a response they wish to change tactics or quit (e.g., Hirsch 1990; Hess and Martin 2006; Francisco 2004). To ignore such connections could lead one to misunderstand what takes place as they might view individuals as being isolated and independent as opposed to being nested in specific communities and identities.

We argue that three distinct cohorts within a movement are relevant to identify and focus upon: repressed members, members spared from repression, and new recruits that were not present for prior activities.

First, there are those who are directly repressed/victimized. Some would argue that these individuals would be most likely to be fearful in the aftermath of repression as these individuals experience the most direct costs of repression. Here, it is believed that if fear is prompted, then subsequent mobilization by repressed challengers will decline (e.g., Lyall 2009; Hibbs 1973). But the costs experienced by repressed individuals have largely been paid prior to any reconsideration of whether to renew protest in the aftermath of repression. Additionally, sunk costs tend to motivate individuals towards commitment escalation, rather than reflection or withdrawal (e.g., Tversky and Kahneman 1981; Wood 2003). Some other research maintains that these repressed individuals are angered by government activity, which magnifies the challengers'

desire for revenge (e.g., Zwerman and Steinhof 2005; Jasper 1998; Gurr 1969). Such anger would likely be magnified by deviation from perceived legitimate/illegitimate government behavior as well as organizationally specific sentiments that emerge from prior groundwork (McAdam and Sewell 2001).

Beyond the individual-level responses, we also anticipate that there are important inter-personal/group dynamics to consider. In line with other literature, we expect that repressive behavior leads those that survive the repressive experience to derive benefits from continued participation beyond simple survival. This is where organizational dynamics come to interact with cognitive mechanisms. Specifically, we argue that survivors would become heralded as heroes to the group as they have suffered at the hands of the state, signifying their commitment to the "struggle" (e.g., Zwerman and Steinhof 2005). This canonization would result in their opinions counting more within movement deliberations, receiving a greater percentage of resources as well as obtaining exalted status in movement discussions, images and folklore. Indeed, their survival becomes a positive signifier to others and they become the "true" members of the organization, increasing their participation and activity. This not only concerns how the survivors are treated by others, but also how they treat one another.

Second, there are those who are not directly repressed/victimized but still exist in the same dissident organization. For these individuals, although there are significant benefits from not directly experiencing repression, there are numerous negative implications associated with being among the group "spared" repression, which we believe has a major impact. For example, in the aftermath of repression, these members become heralded as "outsider-absentees" having missed out on the transformative repressive event. In contrast to insider-heroes, this experiential deficiency comes to signify their lack of commitment to the struggle because although these

individuals were members of the movement, they were not there for their comrades when the situation became most dangerous. Some may try to overcompensate by renewing their commitment after repression. But because these individuals did not experience repressive behavior directly, social stigmatization leads to their opinions being discounted, their receiving fewer resources as well as being diminished or removed from movement discussion, images, and folklore. In this case, the lack of victimization becomes a different signifier, denoting "outsider" status, leading to diminished participation. Again, this concerns not only how the non-repressed are treated by the repressed, but also how they treat one another.[5]

Finally, new members are also important for understanding the impact of repression on mobilization. The role of repression in mobilizing individuals who had previously remained on the sidelines has featured prominently in earlier work on the topic (e.g., Goodwin 2001; Wood 2003; Fransisco 2004; Zweman and Steinhoff 2005; see also Sullivan 2016). We follow their lead to consider how new members influence group dynamics, but also seek to more clearly differentiate between these new individuals and the repressed/non-repressed sub-groups discussed above.[6] New members are of critical importance not just because of their participation, but also because of how they shape organizational politics in the aftermath of state repressive action.

For example, following government coercion, new members enter an institution well understanding the potential risks involved with repression, providing an extra-organizational component that operates in addition to the intra-organizational components. This becomes relevant to the discussion because the full organizational effects of repression should only be identified by considering those who enter the movement alongside those who withdraw. Joining a movement with the knowledge of prior repressive behavior (outrage garnered outside of the

movement) tends to significantly depart from the idea of repression being a cost that is to be avoided whenever possible (e.g., Olson 1965). Indeed, under specific circumstances repressive behavior becomes something of a benefit that individuals outside of the organization wish to obtain not just for the praise they might obtain within the movement, but also for the praise as well as sympathy they might obtain outside of it (Zwerman and Steinhoff 2005).

The wave of new recruits entering into a movement is important because it shifts organizational demographics further towards those individuals prone to see the previously repressed members as heroes. Seeking to replace the non-repressed cohort that departed, the repressed members that stay are likely to recruit those who share their willingness to face repression and their desire for revenge as well as those likely to defer to the "heroes of the struggle." This further adds to the schism within the repressed organization by increasing the social status of repressed members and further marginalizing the non-repressed groups.

The above arguments lead to clear expectations regarding repression's effects on social movement behavior. At the individual level, it is anticipated that repressed members of dissident groups increase organizational participation; non-repressed members will withdraw from organizational activity; and, a range of new recruits will be drawn into the movement largely supportive of those that were repressed. At the organizational level, repression's effects on mobilization are theorized to be contingent on the balance of these forces. We explore these dynamics below.

Qualifications

Before continuing, it is useful to identify some assumptions that are not frequently discussed within the literature but which nevertheless influence the work in the area. Such a discussion outlines the general parameters of the research, but is not subject to investigation.

First, it should be clear that we do not believe that all forms of repressive behavior will yield the same effect and be identified as salient to targeted and non-targeted members of the challenging organization. Though it is most often presumed that a single response (e.g., fear or anger) dominates in the aftermath of repression, there is some discussion that at some levels/magnitudes of repression one response will be prompted whereas at other levels other responses will be prompted (e.g., Muller 1985; Koopmans 1997). Although research on this issue is in its infancy, we believe that directly targeted challengers are most likely angered and prompted to continue their struggle by a wide variety of repressive behaviors, but that these will tend to be either lower in lethality and/or short term in nature. At the same time, at the highest levels of lethality and/or after a long series of repressive events, we would anticipate that fear will predominate.

Second, we believe that the scope of repressive behavior is significant as well. For example, if the repression of the challenger influences a small percentage of the membership, then it is possible that the impact would be negligible unless the targeted represented an important subgroup within the relevant organization. As the ratio of the targeted to non-targeted increases, however, we would anticipate a greater impact on the challengers.[7]

Third, we are concerned with issues of organizational stability as this directly influences how repression impacts social movements. At present, there is no attention given to the condition of the relevant challenging organization at the time of government repression. Consequently, behavioral challenges that have been around for one day are compared to organizations that have

been around for a decade; organizations that have had one leader their whole existence are compared to those that rifle through them monthly. We wish to change this and argue that the effects of repression vary across the history of a challenge.[8] The ideal subject for an investigation would thus be relatively stable (i.e., maintaining some degree of consistent leadership, membership and activity).

Finally, the broader context is important. In our analysis below we examine meso- and micro-level effects, while holding many relevant macro-contextual factors constant. For example, national democratic institutions may impose constraints on the form of repression deployed as well as structure opportunities for activists' engagement with domestic politics. Simultaneously, the organizational field within which challenger groups operate can influence meso-level strategies or individual opportunities for participation in outside organizations. Holding these factors constant enables analysis to pinpoint the dynamic effects of repression on challenges and challengers.[9] But additional work will be needed speak to the interaction of repression and context.

Measurement and Method

To investigate the relationships identified above, we rely upon a unique data source regarding the political mobilization and repression of a dissident organization called the Republic of New Africa. As discussed in earlier work (Davenport 2005, 127):

> This Detroit-based dissident organization, composed of (approximately several hundred) African Americans, explicitly challenged national, state, and local authorities during the period between March 1968 (the founding of the organization) and April 1973 (the last month of police activity reported in the files

> and when the organization shifted its base of operation to Mississippi). The primary goal of the RNA was to establish independence from the U.S. government (through secession). This objective was to be achieved through a threefold strategy: (1) holding a plebiscite among African Americans to determine their "national status"; (2) receiving reparations from the United States for the treatment of blacks as slaves; and (3) purchasing five states from the U.S. government: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina for the Republic (Republic of New Africa 1968). Toward these ends, the RNA engaged in many legal forms of protest: rallies, petitions, political education courses, "self-defense" programs, food drives, lectures, conferences, and the publication of "independent" newsletters/newspapers. The organization also engaged in numerous illegal and violent activities as well: robberies, shootouts with police, plots to bomb state and federal buildings, and even a plane hijacking.[10]

The activities varied in number across the period from several dozen meetings and protest events to a single hijacking.

Given the objectives and tactics of the RNA, it should come as no surprise that the US government was directly involved with monitoring, disrupting as well as trying to eliminate the behavioral challenge presented. Toward this end, a wide variety of organizations were involved including local police (e.g., the Detroit Police Department – Special Investigations, Demonstration Detail, Detective Division, Homicide, Criminal Division, the Public Complaints Division, and Tactical Reconnaissance), state police (e.g., the Michigan State Police – Special Investigation Bureau, Special Investigation Unit), and diverse federal institutions (e.g., the

Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Department of State, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation). These organizations engaged in both covert (i.e., surveillance, informants and agents provocateur) as well as overt activity (i.e., verbal and physical harassment, arrests and raids).

The data used to investigate this case were compiled, scanned and coded between 1999 and 2003 (Davenport 2005; 2014). One of the main sources for information about the RNA and what was done to them was compiled by a Detroit anti-radical police unit or "Red Squad." The objective of the unit was twofold: 1) the monitoring of behavior that was deemed radical in its intent, violent or relevant to "national security"; and, 2) the elimination of targeted organizations (Donner 1990). As for the records themselves, they are composed of different types of documents. *Informant reports* come from the diverse local, state and federal institutions identified above. These records identify when/where events took place, who was in attendance (individual members as well as institutions), and what was done at events (e.g., general discussion, reflection on past events, planning, collection of dues, protesting, shooting practice). *Surveillance records* were submitted by police officers at all levels who either sat outside specific locales and/or followed specific individuals. These identify where/when surveillance was undertaken, who was seen and what they were doing. Finally, *arrest records* were submitted by all police organizations, identifying the individual under arrest, the charge, the arrestee's name, address, job, criminal record, and occasionally known affiliations. Combined, the documents provide detailed knowledge of RNA as well as police actions, who (specifically) was involved, and where (cf., Sullivan forthcoming).

The Red Squad documents are complimented by a set of internal memos and directives from the RNA provided to one of the coauthors by members of the challenging organization

(Davenport 2014). These records are similarly rich and contain detailed information about what was happening within different movement activities, as well as who was participating at each event.[11] The RNA documents work well with the files from the Red Squad by supplying data on the activities and activists where the state was and was not present. The documents also provide detailed information about the repressive tactics employed by the different repressive organizations, including specifics about when and where activities took place and whom they targeted.[12]

Measuring Challenges – RNA activism and participation

Consistent with existing literature, we operationalize challenging activity (our dependent variable of interest) by considering all activities undertaken by members of the Republic of New Africa. This includes rallies, petitions, political education courses, food drives, lectures, conferences, the publication of news letters/papers, conducting armed "self-defense" programs, purchasing land for the new nation, electing a government and developing an army (the Black Legion), engaging in demonstrations, robberies, shooting practice, conducting boycotts, plotting to bomb state and federal buildings as well as hijacking. Deviating from existing literature but consistent with the basic argument, we also identify the participants at all RNA events by name as well as by the number of attendees. Each of these is used to understand who participates in the behavioral challenge.

Measuring Repression – The New Bethel Incident

The measure of political repression employed in this study, our main independent variable, is an event concerning several hundred RNA members known as the "New Bethel Incident"

(Davenport 2014). On March 28, 1969, at the year anniversary of the organization, black-nationalists from all around the US converged on the New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit. Individuals came because officials needed to be elected, proposals and resolutions needed to be evaluated, organizational initiatives needed to be discussed, and updates needed to be provided.

The discussion of these issues would be started but not resolved because quickly after the meeting began everything was put on hold. It is not known exactly what happened but within minutes officers from various precincts arrived. What happened next is shrouded in controversy, but with approximately 50 officers and the discharge of several hundred rounds into and around the church (mostly fired by the police), within 20 minutes almost all occupants in the building were in custody and arrested en masse (142 individuals). These individuals were later brought to a nearby police station, imprisoned and repeatedly interrogated through the next day before most were released. Although limited in lethality, the government's behavior was salient enough to garner the attention of the RNA, influencing its members (present as well as non-present) and organizational deliberations for years to come.

Part of the reason why New Bethel stands out and serves as an important opportunity to examine repression's influence on mobilization is the fact that up until that time the RNA had largely been left alone (at least overtly [(Davenport 2014]). The events on the relevant date were far from normal for the organization. Indeed, it represents the largest single mass arrest that the group experienced in its history. As a result, the event was highly traumatizing and clearly signaled the high-risk nature of the claims making effort the RNA was engaged in. Still, while the raid, interrogation, and arrests were more severe than any repression the movement had previously experienced, this coercion did not kill any of the RNA participants. In this sense, it differs greatly from other forms of repression directed at eliminating organizational leaders and

activists, such as targeted assassinations or disappearances used against groups like the Black Panther Party. Combined with the fact that the police forces did not follow up NBI with sustained overt repression, this is relevant because the New Bethel Incident became a transformative act of repression (Hess and Martin 2006).[13] First, in the lead up to New Bethel, the RNA appears to have been far more preoccupied with fundraising and organizational maintenance than they were with facing violent repressive behavior (Davenport 2014). Conversely, following the violent exchange, both members of the RNA and black nationalists outside of the organization began to reassess their engagement with behavioral challenges. Conversations emerged about differential repression of blacks and whites, about the attack on a black church, and about how the organization could best achieve its goals in the face of state violence (ibid.).

All of this had profound effects on RNA members and activities. The shock of the repressive experience directed against a movement that lacked an earlier history of similar experiences may have presented both insiders and outsiders with a unique opportunity to reframe the nature of their claims making efforts in way that organizations facing more continuous patterns of repression could not. Given this, it seems reasonable to suggest that the shock of NBI on subsequent RNA behavior can be argued to be plausibly exogenous to the RNA's actions at the time of the shooting. It is true that RNA members were armed prior to the New Bethel meeting. But this occurred in response to a larger buildup with regard to the policing of black neighborhoods throughout Detroit (as well as the rest of the country) that followed the rioting/rebellion of 1967/1968, after which the RNA had developed an armed defense wing. This signals that they anticipated government coercion and force on some level (Davenport 2014). Still, in the RNA discussions that preceded the New Bethel meetings, there is no evidence

suggesting that the organization anticipated such a drastic escalation of government coercion (ibid.). There is also little behavioral evidence to suggest that they were prepared for such aggressive repression. In the week prior to NBI, weapons were present in approximately 4% of RNA events; in the week after, weapons were present at approximately 17% of RNA events. For the year before and the year after, these figures are approximately 9% and 15%, respectively.

Less information is available with regards to the planning for New Bethel for the police. As Davenport (2014, p 224) writes, "It is clear that the authorities knew the (anniversary) was going to take place and, at least, surveillance of this type of event would have been standard." The quick response from diverse precincts to the street altercation, however, complete with heavy ordinance and swiftness of the raid as well as subsequent coordinated mass arrest suggested a certain level of preparedness for what transpired.

It is also worth considering the particularities and generalizability of the RNA as a case of "high-risk" activism. Given space constraints, it is not possible to delve too deeply into this topic within the article, but a much longer discussion of the case can be found in the accompanying appendix. Briefly, we see three features as particularly relevant: regime type, the urban context of Detroit, and the fact that the RNA was active in a time of mass mobilization. These factors matter because (1) the U.S. was generally limited in its repressive ability, at least when compared to the potential repression that could have been directed against them by an autocrat; (2) when compared to rural challenges, urban environments create different strategies for both states and challenges, particularly with regards to covert mobilization and surveillance; and (3) the RNA was part of the larger wave of Black Nationalist social movement organizations, which meant the non-repressed members could leave and potentially participate in

other organizations thereby decreasing the perceived necessity for staying with the RNA as viable alternatives could be found.

With these considerations in mind, the following section analyzes the effects of repression on RNA challenges and challengers.

Analysis of Repression's Meso- and Micro-Level Effects

Meso-Level Analysis. In line with existing literatures interested with understanding group behavior, the first series of models evaluates repression's influence at the organizational (i.e., RNA) level. Replicating some of the techniques employed within the literature, the models use a time-series design that estimates the effects of repressive action on temporally aggregated counts of movement behavior and movement participation. Two dependent variables are analyzed—the number of RNA events undertaken and the number of individuals participating in these events. Each dependent variable is measured weekly for one year prior to and one year after the New Bethel Incident. The police raid, as well as the mass arrest and interrogation that accompanied it, is used to identify the independent variable (*New Bethel)*, which is measured dichotomously; weeks prior to the raid, arrest and mass incarceration are coded 0, while weeks after the raid, arrest and mass incarceration are coded 1. This specification treats the act of repression as a categorical and lasting shock to the social movement (which follows from both the discussion found within the police and RNA records). Such an approach is employed in all of the analyses presented in this paper.[14]

(Insert Table I About Here)

The time-series models presented in Table I estimate the effects of repressive action on organizational behavior and movement participation by the week.[15] Model 1 estimates the

relationship between repression and RNA events.[16] Models 2-3 estimate the number of participants at these events, with Model 2 examining the sum of weekly participation and Model 3 examining weekly per-event participation. The substantive interpretation of these tests is to estimate how repression influences movement activity at the organizational level, while controlling for the movement's internal mobilization dynamics. These controls are important because the number of events in a week is significantly related to the number of events conducted during the previous two weeks before that week (t-1, t-2).[17] Similarly, the number of participants in RNA events is significantly related to participation during the previous three weeks (t-1, t-2 and t-3).[18] Alongside the coefficients and standard errors for *State Repression,* Table I displays the sum of significant autoregressive parameters.[19] Failing to model these internal dynamics could lead to biased estimates of repression's effects (Sullivan et al. 2012). And by factoring them into the model, it is possible to examine both the short- and long-term effects of New Bethel.

As found in Model 1, repression is significantly related to an increase in the number of events engaged in by the RNA. Specifically, committing the raid, arrest, and interrogation is estimated to have increased RNA events by 6 events in the week after the New Bethel Incident (NBI) took place. The long-term effects of NBI are estimated to have increased contentious activity by 8 events.[20] When analyzed at the meso-level, the effects of repression on the RNA appear consistent with backlash arguments (e.g., Francisco 2004; Hess and Martin 2006).

At the same time, the results from Model 2 indicate that the participation of black-nationalists engaging in RNA events was unrelated to the state's coercive behavior. Repression is positively, but insignificantly correlated with weekly participation rates. This suggests that while repression is associated with an increase in RNA activity, government coercive action did not

significantly impact aggregate measures of organizational participation. Of course, given this consideration, it could be the case that repression is not influencing total participation, but is driving down per event participation. Model 3 considers this possibility. In particular, the model examines a measure created by taking the number of participants for each week and dividing that by the number of weekly events.[21] The results show that per event participation did decrease slightly following New Bethel, but this result does not meet conventional standards of statistical significance.

Getting deeper into how repression impacts participation requires opening up these aggregate figures and looking inside the movement in order to see precisely who is participating at any given moment. This form of analysis is explored below.

(Insert Table II About Here)

Micro-Level Analysis. To explore what occurred inside the Republic of New Africa in the aftermath of repressive action of the New Bethel Incident, we analyze the attendance or non-attendance of individual RNA members at events before and after the NBI. The units of analysis for the investigation are individual RNA members, whose attendance or non-attendance is recorded on a per-event basis.

Table II provides some initial descriptive statistics.[22] The table identifies the average rates of participation in RNA events for two groups of members. As conceived, *Non-Arrested Individuals* are members of the RNA who participated in organizational activities before New Bethel, but were not overtly repressed at the NBI. *Arrested Individuals* are also members of the RNA that participated prior to New Bethel, but this subgroup represents those who experienced the raid, arrest, and interrogation. For each group, the table displays their participation rates in RNA events for three months preceding and following NBI. This is a shorter time window as

compared with the meso-level or micro-level statistical analyses, which is necessary because the descriptive statistics cannot account for longer-term time trends in the same manner as the econometric models. But even these relatively static comparisons provide some insight into the behavioral patterns of individual RNA members. As found, rates of participation for *Non-Arrested Individuals* decline slightly in the aftermath of repression. By contrast, *Arrested Individuals* sharply increase their average rate of participation. This initial evidence is consistent with the argument that repression creates cohort affects that bifurcate movement participants into distinct subgroups, which allows us to estimate who specifically is responsible for backlash following state repression.

Addressing the concerns of Zwerman and Steinhof, the table provides some initial evidence on the participation of *New Members* (i.e., individuals who had not participated in any RNA events prior to NBI, but subsequently became active in political challenges). From the data, there are 121 such individuals identified in our data. As can be seen from the table, *New Members* participated in post-NBI challenges slightly more than *Non-Arrested Individuals,* but less than the *Arrested Individuals.* Because we know comparatively little about the political lives of the *New Members* prior to New Bethel, it is not possible to systematically examine the effects of the act of political repression on these individuals in the same manner as the *Arrested* and *Non-Arrested Individuals.* But the descriptive evidence suggests that the inclusion of *New Members* into the movement is crucial for understanding participation rates in the aftermath of political repression.

To investigate these dynamics more comprehensively and systematically, a set of cross-sectional time-series models estimate how the New Bethel Incident affected whether individual RNA members engaged in collective action after repression. In this case, we restrict the sample

to the 232 individuals identified as having participated in RNA activities prior to NBI. This is done to provide a baseline for each individual for how s/he participated prior to the repressive action of interest, from which it will be possible evaluate the potential impacts of repression on subsequent participation. The dependent variable here is the per-event attendance of these individuals, which is coded for the 45 events preceding and 35 events following the act of repression.[23] These events take place during the year before and following NBI, representing the cases that have complete information. By comparing the probability of each individual's participation in RNA events before and after repression, we can gauge the effects of that act at the level of the individual RNA member.

Statistical analyses of these data also allow for the inclusion of control variables and time-series dynamics that could potentially confound the statistics presented in Table II. Drawing on existing literature, a number of factors are included to condition the estimates on the varying attendance rates of the different RNA members. For example, each of the individuals was coded for the *Events Since their Last Attendance* in order to control for the individual-level dynamics that lead some individuals to be more likely to participate than others. Natural cubic splines were also included in the analysis to further control for temporal dependence in participation, and the models were run using random effects to adjust the standard errors for heterogeneity across individual participation rates (Beck et al. 1998; Beck and Katz 1996). To address broader mobilization dynamics operating at the organizational level, the models include a control for the total number of *Participants per Event*. This is done to control for time-varying heterogeneity in movement mobilization writ large.

Consistent with the investigation above, repressive action is again identified as the New Bethel Incident, but in these analyses NBI is viewed in two different ways. For all 232 RNA

members active prior to the New Bethel Incident, the variable *New Bethel Average Effect* is coded dichotomously as 0 for events prior to the arrest and 1 for events after the arrest.[24] Accordingly this variable identifies the average effect of the New Bethel Incident across all members – those repressed at New Bethel and those not present at the event but within the organization. A second independent variable *New Bethel Arrested Effect* is employed to measure the effect of the repression specifically on those who were subjected to it (i.e., RNA members who were raided, arrested, and interrogated at New Bethel). This variable tests the proposition that individuals subjected to repressive behavior will respond differently to government action than others in the group. It is similarly measured dichotomously; for individuals not subject to arrest it is coded 0 across all time periods and for the 48 RNA members who were subject to arrest it is coded 0 prior to the arrest and 1 after.[25] Thus for Arrested Individuals, the impact of NBI is estimated as the additive sum of the *New Bethel Average Effect* and the *New Bethel Arrested Effect.* For Non-Arrested Individuals, the consequences of NBI are identified solely by looking at the *New Bethel Average Effect.*[26]

(Insert Table III About Here)

Table III displays the results of four cross-sectional time-series logit models, which estimate the probability that a given individual participated in RNA events before and after the act of repressive action. Models 4-5 test the effects of New Bethel across all participants, while Models 6 and 7 estimate repression's effects on the non-repressed and repressed subsamples, respectively. Because the coefficients for such models can be difficult to interpret, Table III displays the odds-ratio, robust standard error, and level of significance for each variable in the model. Odds-ratios above one signify a relative increase in the predicted probability of participation, while odds-ratios below one signify a relative decrease.

Model 4 estimates the average effect of the New Bethel Incident on RNA members' participation. Here, New Bethel is shown to have a significant and negative effect on the activity of those who had previously participated in the movement. The New Bethel Incident is related to a nearly 30% decrease in the average participant's activity. How can this be? If New Bethel was previously shown to have no effect on RNA attendance rates, how is it possible that when analyzed at the individual level we see that the average effect of the raid, arrest, and interrogation at NBI was to decrease the willingness of RNA members to commit to contentious activities? We maintain that to understand this impact, New Bethel must have had divergent effects, pushing some individuals towards fewer RNA actions, while simultaneously time inspiring others to contribute even more to the RNA and drawing in new recruits.[27] Davenport's (2014, 231) history of the RNA confirms the multiple effects of the New Bethel Incident, noting that, "Perhaps one of the most notable modifications within the RNA concerned the membership. Immediately following New Bethel, some individuals simply stopped showing up; some showed up but no longer seemed to be engaged... In this highly fluid as well as contentious situation filled with emotion, mostly fear, some individuals within the organization came together while some began to turn on one another."

To delve deeper into the mechanics of this process, we identify exactly who withdrew from the organization by investigating the argument that repressive behavior has differing effects contingent on who was subject to the relevant treatment (i.e., repression). Model 5 estimates the effects of New Bethel both across the entire sample of RNA participants and on the subsample of repressed members. Once again, for those who were not raided, arrested, and interrogated, the effects of the raid are calculated using just the first variable – *New Bethel Average Effect.* For those who were raided, arrested, and interrogated, however, the effect of NBI calculated as the

sum of the effects of that variable and *New Bethel Arrested Effect,* the binary variable identifying the period following the raid.[28]

When this is done, we see that the act of repression had divergent effects on the two populations in line with our argument discussed above. Among those who were not overtly repressed, the New Bethel Incident continued to have a negative and statistically significant effect on rates of participation. Model 5 estimates that the average participant who was not arrested was nearly 50% less likely to engage in RNA activities following NBI. Here, repression is successful and dramatically so. Among those who experienced the raid, arrest, and interrogation, however, the model estimates a positive and significant relationship between the New Bethel Incident and their subsequent participation. In Model 5, being subjected to the act of repression is estimated to increase the average arrestee's participation by more than 85%.[29] Here, direct experience with repressive action prompts increased effort on behalf of the targeted, likely out of a desire for vengeance for what happened and, as we suggested, an interest in justifying this victimization with an eventual victory for the RNA.

To further examine these effects, Models 6 and 7 split the sample into non-arrested and arrested subsets. The effects of New Bethel on those who were not repressed are documented in Model 6 and are consistent with previous results. Repressive behavior is shown here to decrease the average non-arrested individual's participation by about 50%. Interestingly, when we examine repression's influence looking just at those who were subjected to the New Bethel Incident, Model 7 estimates that there was no significant relationship between being subjected to repressive action and an increase or decrease in participation in RNA events. Combined, Models 6 and 7 continue to show a divergent trend among those who were and were not subjected to repression, with those who were not raided, arrested and interrogated decreasing their

willingness to participate and those who were subject to New Bethel continuing to participate at the same rate as they were prior to NBI.

(Insert Table IV About Here)

Several additional methods are employed to examine the effects of repression on the repressed and not-repressed subpopulations, while addressing the fact that members of the RNA were non-randomly subjected to repression. The results are presented in Table IV, which again analyzes cross-sectional time-series logit models estimating the effects of New Bethel across all participants. Model 8 includes an added control for the *Count of Events Attended* prior to a given organized event. Model 9 includes individual member fixed-effects. And Model 10 engages in a modified difference-in-difference design.

Including the *Count of Events Attended* allows the models to control for how likely a given individual was to participate in an event based on how many activities they had participated in previously. These values were significantly different for the repressed and non-repressed subgroups, with repressed members having participated in approximately 25% more events in Model 8 as compared to those who were not repressed. This in part captures the fact that these members were likely to be at New Bethel (and therefore be subject to repression) as well as to participate in additional actions later on. However, when the variable is introduced to the analysis in Model 8, results are not substantively affected. To address any remaining individual-level factors that may motivate an individual to both be at New Bethel and also participate more frequently, Model 9 introduced member fixed-effects. The results remain robust to the inclusion of these individual member controls.

As a final technique to address the non-random assignment of repression, Model 10 separates out RNA members into those who were or were not arrested prior to assignment to the

treatment group (i.e., NBI), and then estimates the temporal effects of the arrest contingent on whether members were part of the arrested population. We achieve this through the inclusion of a temporally invariant control variable (*Arrested Individual*), which is coded 0 for individuals in the non-arrested sample and 1 for individuals in the arrested sample.[30] In this case, the binary nature of the measurement strategy means that *New Bethel Arrested Effect* is effectively an interaction term between the *Arrested Individuals* control variable and the *New Bethel Average Effect.* Consequently the model resembles a difference-in-difference (DiD) estimator because it includes both temporal (pre- and post-arrest) and cross-sectional (arrested or not arrested) fixed-effects (Angrist and Pischkey 2009). However, in traditional DiD models, the temporal fixed-effects variable (*New Bethel Average Effects)* is understood as a control variable, rather than a causally significant independent variable as it is in our model.

Substantively, the *New Bethel Arrested Effect* variable in this model estimates the effect of the NBI raid, arrest, and interrogation on the arrested population (controlling for both the systematic differences between the arrested and non-arrested samples and the average effect of the arrest across the entire sample of RNA members). Interestingly, the variable estimating systematic differences between the repressed and non-repressed groups fails to identify significant effects. The coefficient for the general effect of New Bethel maintains its negative and significant result, leading to the conclusion that for the average non-repressed member, participation dropped by more than 45% following New Bethel. Finally, as in the earlier results, after the act of repression, individuals subjected to NBI were significantly more likely to participate in RNA events. Being arrested, raided, and interrogated increased the arrested sample's willingness to participate by nearly 70% in Model 10. Here, repressive behavior fails to deter challenges and significantly so.

What is clear from the analysis is that repressive behavior has divergent effects across the two different samples, supporting our basic point about the importance of getting inside and disaggregating challenging institutions (i.e., moving from movement to members). Those who participated in RNA events and merely heard about the act of repression, but were not subjected to it personally, became less willing to participate in RNA collective action. At the same time, RNA participants who were subjected to raid, arrest and interrogation show an increased willingness to participate after being repressed. Reflecting back to an earlier finding, these individuals are joined by new members, though this group tends to participate less extensively.

Conclusion

Addressing a somewhat long-standing puzzle in the literature of contentious politics, this study considers who engages in backlash after a movement is targeted with state repression. While scholars have postulated individual as well as group level mechanisms linking repression to backlash, without actually examining both micro- and meso-level behavior, they have missed the fact that repressive action actually has a variety of effects within the same dissident organization involving different individuals, in different ways.

Utilizing a unique data source on the internal dynamics of a black-nationalist organization called the Republic of New Africa (Davenport 2014), we investigated the effects of repression at both the organizational and individual levels. With this focus, a number of previously hidden mechanisms become apparent. To begin with, the effect of repressive behavior varies across individuals within the relevant social movement organization depending on who was/was not repressed. The raid, arrest, and interrogation undertaken by diverse police organizations during what is referred to as the New Bethel Incident pushed those who were not

explicitly victimized out of movement engagement, while generating a core of activists who had experienced state repression and were now committed to engaging in increasing levels of contentious activity. To the core was added a new cohort who entered into the movement, but were not quite as active as those who suffered the earlier repression.

With these findings, the research has numerous implications.

Theoretically, these results challenge scholars to move past the responses of whole movements and towards theorizing about how repression influences individual members within a challenging institution. This advancement will open up theorizing to thinking about the implications of repressive behavior for organizational adaptation and explanations of how movement trajectories are shaped by repressive behavior.

Methodologically, the study suggests that scholars should collect data on some of the less easily observed aspects of state-social movement interactions in order to inform their empirical investigations. Studies that fail to examine the individual choices that lead to observed collective behavior distance themselves from the theorized causal mechanisms and are too often unable to decipher between behaviorally equivalent explanations.

Practically, our research has problematized the conception of "successful" state repression. Indeed, we have shown that while repressive behavior might compel some challengers to leave/disengage from behavioral efforts, it compels others to stay with/escalate their challenges and it compels still others to join relevant institutions. This yields clues into the how specific repressive tactics, such as mass raids, arrests, and interrogations, might influence movement membership. But it renders simplistic assessments of repression's effects inappropriate.

We view our work as representing an important step in re-evaluating the politics of backlash mobilization. Clearly, there are some worthwhile improvements that could be made to the current examination. For example, we are in the process of collecting diverse variables for examining what influences reactions to repression such as the age, gender, organizational position, and, especially the networks that members occupy (e.g., Snow et al. 1986; McAdam 1986). We could compare the specific repressive event identified in the current study (a massive raid, arrest and interrogation) to other forms of repression examined (e.g., physical harassment or receiving false letters) as well as other dimensions (e.g., scope, timing in movement cycle, or [in]consistency). The repressive action studied here was relevant because it was encompassing, severe, and distinct enough from prior government action to be considered salient. Of course, not all tactics would be viewed this way and it would be worthwhile to discuss which are viewed as being important.

There is also a need to move beyond the case of the Republic of New Africa to gauge the (in)comparability of the findings across space, time and context. Here, it would be important to consider variation across important structural variables held constant in the RNA analysis (e.g., institutional setting, national levels of political mobilization, etc.). Finally, we believe it merits further attention to consider exactly what it means that repression produces a social movement organization that is populated with individuals who not only do not fear repressive behavior, but who might actually prepare for its use as well as enjoy the social/cultural benefits that might accrue from its deployment. In a sense, this makes governments responsible for radicalization and militancy, which is something that is not generally considered.

These challenges we view as reasonable and, indeed, we hope that the research presented here, like many of the pieces cited in this article on related themes, will continue to prompt

further development of the micro-foundational/sub-national exploration of conflict and contentious politics.

References

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Beck, Nathaniel, and Jonathan N. Katz. 1995. "What to do (and not to do) with time-series cross-section data." *American Political Science Review* 89(3): 634-647.

Beck, Nathaniel, Jonathan N. Katz, and Richard Tucker. 1998. "Taking time seriously: Time-series-cross-section analysis with a binary dependent variable." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(4): 1260-1288.

Brockett, Charles D. 2005. *Political movements and violence in Central America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, A. Colin, and Pravin K. Trivedi. 2005. *Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davenport, Christian. 2005. "Understanding covert repressive action The case of the US Government against the Republic of New Africa." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(1): 120-140.

---. 2014. *How Social Movements Die: Repression and Demobilization in the Republic of New Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Della Porta, Donatella. 1995. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donner, Frank. 1990. *Protectors of Privilege: Red Squads and Police Repression in Urban America*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Dugan, Laura, and Erica Chenoweth. 2012. "Moving Beyond Deterrence The Effectiveness of Raising the Expected Utility of Abstaining from Terrorism in Israel." *American Sociological Review* 77(4): 597-624.

Earl, Jennifer. 2003. "Tanks, tear gas, and taxes: Toward a theory of movement repression." *Sociological Theory* 21(1): 44-68.

---. 2011. "Protest arrests and future protest participation: The 2004 republican national convention arrestees and the effects of repression," in Austin Sarat (ed.) *Special Issue Social Movements/Legal Possibilities (Studies in Law, Politics, and Society, Volume 54)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.141-173

Earl, Jennifer and Sarah A. Soule. 2010. "The Impacts of Repression: The Effect of Police Presence and Action on Subsequent Protest Rates." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 30: 75-113.

Enders, Walter. 2004. *Applied econometric time series*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Francisco, Ron. 2004. "After the Massacre: Mobilization in the Wake of Harsh Repression." *Mobilization* 9(2): 107-126.

Gurr, Ted. 1969. *Why Men Rebel.* New York: Paradigm Publishers

Hess, David and Brian Martin. 2006. "Repression, Backfire and the Theory of Transformative Events." *Mobilization* 11(2): 249-267.

Hibbs, Douglas. 1973. *Mass Political Violence. A Cross-National Causal Analysis*. New York: Wiley.

Hirsch, Eric. 1990. "Sacrifice for the Cause: Group Processes, Recruitment, and Commitment in a Student Social Movement." *American Sociological Review* 55(2): 243-254.

Jasper, James M. "The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements." *Sociological forum*. Vol. 13. No. 3. Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers, 1998.

Jeffries JL. 2002. "Black radicalism and political repression in Baltimore." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(1):64–98

Klandermans, Bert. 1997. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Koopmans, Ruud. 1997. "Dynamics of Repression and Mobilization: The German Extreme Right in the 1990s." *Mobilization* 2(2): 149-164.

Lichbach, Mark. 1998. *The rebel's dilemma*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lichbach, Mark and Ted Gurr. 1981. "The Conflict Process – A Formal Model." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 25(1): 3-29.

Lyall, Jason**.** 2009. "Does Indiscriminate Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks? Evidence from Chechnya." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 53(3): 331-362

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*, *1930-1970.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

---. 1986. "Recruitment to high-risk activism: The case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92(1): 64-90.

McAdam, Doug, and William Sewell, Jr. 2001. "It's About Time: Temporality in the Study of Social Movements and Revolutions." Pp. 89-125 in Silence and Voice in Contentious Politics, Ron Aminzade, Jack Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth Perry, William Sewell, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, Will. 1998. "Repression and Dissent: Substitution, Context, and Timing." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(3): 851-873.

Muller, Edward. 1985. "Income Inequality, Regime Repressiveness and Political Violence." *American Sociological Review* 50: 47-61.

Obadele, Imari Abubakari. 1968. *War in America: The Malcolm X Doctrine.* Detroit: The Malcolm X Society.

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: public goods and the theory of groups*. Harvard University Press.

Opp, Karl-Dieter. 1994. "Repression and Revolutionary Action: East Germany in 1989." *Rationality and Society* 6(1): 101-138.

Opp, Karl-Dieter and Wolfgang Roehl. 1990. "Repression, Micromobilization, and Political Protest." *Social Forces* 69(2): 521-547.

Opp, Karl-Dieter and Christiane Gern. 1993. "Dissident Groups, Personal Networks, and Spontaneous Cooperation: The East German Revolution of 1989." *American Sociological Review* 58(5): 659-680.

Snow, David A, E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 464-481.

Sullivan, Christopher Michael. 2012. "Blood in the Village: Local-Level Determinants of State Massacres." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*. 29(4): 373-396.

---. 2014. "The (In)Effectiveness of Torture for Combating Insurgency." *The Journal of Peace Research.* 51(3): 388-404.

---. 2016. "Political Repression and the Destruction of Dissident Organizations: Evidence from the Archives of the Guatemalan National Police" *World Politics.* 68(4):

---. forthcoming. “Undermining Resistance: Mobilization, Repression, and the Enforcement of Political Order.” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution.*

Sullivan, Christopher M., Cyanne E. Loyle, and Christian Davenport. 2012. "The Coercive Weight of the Past: Temporal Dependence and the Conflict-Repression Nexus in the Northern Ireland “Troubles”." *International Interactions* 38(4): 426-442.

Sullivan, Christopher and Christian Davenport. 2016. “One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: State Repression and Movement Adaptation in an Urban Insurgency” Unpublished manuscript.

Tarrow, Sidney G.1989. *Struggle, Politics, and Reform: Collective Action, Social Movements and Cycles of Protest*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

---. 1998. *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution.* New York: Paradigm Press.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1981. "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice." *Science* 211(4481): 453-458.

Walsh James and James Piazza. 2010. “Why Respecting Physical Integrity Rights Reduces Terrorism.” *Comparative Political Studies.* 43(5): 551-577

White, Robert W. 1989. “From Peaceful Protest to Guerrilla War: Micromobilization of the Provisional Irish Republican Army.” *American Journal of Sociology* 94(6): 1277-1302.

---. 1993. *Provisional Irish Republicans: An oral and interpretive history*. New York: Praeger.

---. 2000. “Issues in the study of political violence: understanding the motives of participants in small group political violence.” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 12(1): 95-108.

Wisler, Dominique, and Marco Giugni. 1999. “Under the spotlight: The impact of media attention on protest policing.” *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 4(2): 171-187.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2003. *Insurgent collective action and civil war in El Salvador*. Cambridge University Press.

Zhukov, Yuri M. 2015. “Population Resettlement in War: Theory and Evidence from Soviet Archives”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1155-1185.

Zwerman, Gilda and Patricia Steinhoff. 2005. “When Activists Ask for Trouble: State-Dissident Interactions and the New Left Cycle of Resistance in the United States and Japan.” In Christian Davenport, Hank Johnston and Carol Mueller, (Eds.), *Repression and Mobilization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Table I – Time-Series Models of Repression and Organizational Behavior

	RNA Events	RNA Participants	RNA Participants Per Event
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
New Bethel	1.847 (.236)***	0.561 (0.845)	-1.134 (0.721)
Sum of Significant AR Parameters	.347	-	-
Constant	2.251 (0.121)	3.825 (0.147)	1.445 (0.121)
N	103	103	103

Huber-White (Robust) Standard Errors in Parentheses.
* p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001 (Two-Tailed Test)

Table II: Participation Rates in RNA Events

	Non-Arrested Individuals	Arrested Individuals	New Members
Pre-NBI Average	3.8%	5.2%	
Post-NBI Average	3.2%	7.3%	5.0%
Difference	-15%	+140%	
N	184	48	121

Table III: Cross-Sectional Time-Series Logistic Models of Repression and Individual Participation

	Full Sample		Non-Arrested Sample	Arrested Sample
	Model 4	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**
New Bethel Average Effect	.709 (.088)**	0.524 (0.073)***	0.533 (0.083)***	
New Bethel Arrested Effect		2.371 (0.394)***		1.168 (0.251)
Events Since Last Attendance	.699 (0.015)***	0.694 (0.016)***	0.695 (0.019)***	0.696 (0.028)***
Participants per Event	1.146 (0.012)***	1.147 (0.011)***	1.156 (0.015)***	1.127 (0.021)***
Constant	0.050 (0.006)	0.051 (0.006)	0.045 (0.007)	0.071 (0.018)
N	18,328	18,328	14,536	3,792

Odds-Ratios Displayed. Huber-White (Robust) Standard Errors in Parentheses. Models Include Random Effects. * p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001 (Two-Tailed Test)

Table IV: Further Examination of Repression and Individual Participation

	Full Sample		
	Additional Controls	Fixed Effects	Difference-in-Difference
	Model 8	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
New Bethel Average Effect	0.407 (0.059)***	0.309 (0.051)***	0.545 (0.078)***
New Bethel Arrested Effect	1.855 (0.239)***	2.181 (0.474)***	1.996 (0.416)***
Events Since Last Attendance	0.694 (0.015)***	0.731 (0.017)***	0.694 (0.016)***
Participants per Event	1.142 (0.012)***	1.146 (0.013)***	1.147 (0.123)***
Count of Events Attended	1.199 (0.012)***	1.098 (0.016)***	
Fixed Effects		Y	
Arrested Individuals			1.315 (0.268)
Constant	0.054 (0.006)		0.047 (0.007)
N	18,328	18,328	18,328

Odds-Ratios Displayed. Huber-White (Robust) Standard Errors in Parentheses. Models 8 and 10 Include Random Effects.
Model 9 Includes Fixed Effects. Cubic Splines and Fixed Effects Omitted From Presentation.
*p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001 (Two-Tailed Test)

[1] Repression refers to actions taken by authorities against individuals and/or groups within their territorial jurisdiction that either restrict the behavior and/or beliefs of citizens through the imposition of negative sanctions or that physically damage or eliminate citizens through the violation of personal integrity (cf., Davenport 2007; Earle 2003).

[2] If one is trying to understand how more encompassing forms of state repression like national curfews on behavior or bans on social movement organizations influence mobilization, then an analysis focused on the national level would be appropriate but if one were trying to gauge the aftereffects of less encompassing action like the arrest of an individual dissident or targeted raid/assassination of a specific movement, then this approach is less useful.

[3] Comparatively, one-shot (cross-sectional) evaluations are somewhat more problematic because they force the researcher to speculate about the impact and/or rely upon projections/recollections of subjects to guide them in assessing the influence.

[4] Along with Koopmans (1997) we suggest humility in the study of the conflict-repression nexus as we attempt to more precisely examine and understand what is taking place.

[5] This account deviates from other work in important ways. For example, the argument is not a standard polarization story (e.g., della Porta 1996; Tarrow 1998; White 2000) because individuals depart, but we make no claims about them joining another claims-making effort. Indeed, we highlight complete disengagement, although abeyance is a possibility. We also highlight the strong cohort effects underlying polarization.

[6] More generally, we believe the literature too often lumps all three subgroups together (e.g., Gurr 1969; Goodwin 2001; Hess and Martin 2006).

[7] Of course, it is possible that if the leader is targeted, that the impact on the movement could be devastating (e.g., Bob and Nepstad 2007). Other research shows that groups without leaders are quite resilient (e.g., Francisco 2004).

[8] This is actually considered within the social movement literature, which discusses individual as well as collective trajectories as in the "conflict cycle" (Brocket 2005; Tarrow 1998). Exactly how old is old is not clear, but the point is well taken that variation exists and might be important.

[9] We provide further detail on the scope conditions outlining the broad contours of our argument in the case discussion below.

[10] Greater discussion of traits this movement and its broader generalizability can be found in Davenport (2014) and in the Appendix.

[11] The volume of information here is much smaller than the police records, which makes sense given the different resource endowments as well as organizational objectives.

[12] We are cognizant of the fact that relevant policing organizations may have either destroyed some of their files entirely or blacked out entries, especially information concerning the most controversial actions. Interestingly, however, there was very little redaction in the police records. Names of informants and contact officers were redacted, but all other information was included in the surveillance reports and arrest records.

[13] During the period analyzed here, there are no post-NBI acts of overt repression directed at the RNA organization or its members revealed in the Red Squad documents (see also Davenport 2014). The next major armed conflict between the RNA and law enforcement occurred in Jackson Mississippi in 1971. There are also a few isolated arrests that take place before this event.

[14] Alternatively, repression's effects may be thought to depend on the amount of time that has passed since the repressive action. To test this proposition, alternative specifications identified New Bethel's effects as a decay function measured as 1/k, where k was the number of weeks following the raid. Results proved substantively identical to those presented below.

[15] Because event counts are considered, ARMA models are run on log-transformed measures of the dependent variables. The Box-Jenkins method was utilized to identify the potential auto-regressive and moving average components of time trends in each dependent variable (Enders 2004). The method reveals that the number of events conducted weekly by the RNA contains significant AR2 effects while the number of participants in RNA events displays AR3 properties. Neither variable displays any significant trends

over the period, suggesting that they are mean stationary. The distributions of the dependent variables were normalized using the transformation log(Y)+1 (Cameron and Trividi 2005).

[16] In this analysis all forms of challenger events are considered. Descriptive information on the different forms of challenger activity is included in the appendix.

[17] This evidence is consistent with cascade theories of social movement mobilization (e.g., Kuran 1993, Marwell and Oliver 1993).

[18] Interestingly when Model 2 estimates the number of individuals participating in RNA events, the significance of the auto-regressive variables disappears, indicating that this variable is temporally stochastic once we control for the repressive actions of the state.

[19] The sum of significant parameters is calculated by adding together the beta coefficients from all of the statistically relevant auto-regressive parameters.

[20] The immediate effect of repression is calculated by transforming the identified effect of the raid on the logged dependent variables into an estimate of its effect on a count of the (non-logged) variable. The long-term effect is calculated using the formula $\beta /(1- \Phi)$ where β is an individual beta coefficient and Φ is the sum of the significant autoregressive parameters, and then transforming the resulting value into a (non-logged) count estimate (Enders 2004).

[21] Estimating participation while controlling for weekly event counts produced comparable results.

[22] Additional descriptive information on the temporal dynamics of challenger events and participation can be found in the appendix.

[23] The differing event counts reflect a general pattern of decline in events over the two years (starting long before New Bethel). For this work, the individual level models below account for temporal trends by including a control for a member's prior participation in earlier events. At the organizational level, the time series models did not identify significant moving average components, despite this seeming pattern of decline. In other work Sullivan and Davenport (2016), we consider both short and long term affects of the NBI as well as the effects of NBI in the context of a longer history of behavior.

[24] RNA "members" are individuals who participated in at least 1 RNA event within our sample of events (excluding NBI).

[25] The 42 arrested individuals are a subset of the 232 members included in our sample. An additional 108 individuals were arrested at NBI who had not participated in any other RNA events, either because they were only peripherally involved in the organization or because they were coming from outside Detroit.

[26] As with the meso-level analyses, we replicated the micro-level analyses using decay functions for *New Bethel Average Effect* and *New Bethel Arrested Effect* (measured as 1/k, where k was the number of events following the raid). Results proved robust to this alternative measurement technique.

[27] The present study is able to provide greater detail on how repression shapes the behavior of those already in the social movement than it is able to inform the reader about the characteristics of new members. Opportunities remain for future research to provide greater insight into who joins a movement after repression and how these individuals might differ from those who joined prior to repression.

[28] We estimate the joint marginal effect and statistical significance using the delta method (Green 2008).

[29] Once again, this estimate reflects the interaction of the New Bethel Average Effect and the New Bethel Arrested Affect.

[30] There is significant collinearity between the number of prior events participated in and whether that individual was arrested or not ($p< .001$).