CRESC Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 7

Social Movements and Social Change

Tim Jordan

CRESC, The Open University

September 2005

ISBN: **1-905405-07-3**

Published by: Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC)
Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University,
Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK
Tel: +44 (0)1908 654458 Fax: +44 (0)1908 654488
Email: cresc@manchester.ac.uk *or* cresc@open.ac.uk
Web: www.cresc.ac.uk

The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is gratefully acknowledged.

Social Movements and Social Change

Tim Jordan
Sociology Department
Open University
t.r.jordan@open.ac.uk

1. Introduction

The relationship between social movements and socio-cultural change can seem too obvious to need explanation. Rather than questioning whether there is a connection between protest and change, it is far more likely that it will be presumed that social change and social movements are simultaneously occurring. This might seem obvious as social movements may be thought to exist in order to protest or produce different societies but, particularly in a period when many sociologists and cultural studies analysts have argued for a profound or even epochal social change having recently occurred, the meaning of such a connection is worth examining. This paper will explore meanings of social change that result or are implied when social movements are analysed, offering some light both on ways of analysing social change and ways social change is conceptualized, which is intended to be a conceptual backdrop to empirical research within CRESC on social movements. To initially establish this integral, if often also unthought, nature of a connection between social movements and social change we can briefly look at definitions of social movements from the two main schools of social movement studies; McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly who represent what has been called the political process school and Touraine who has been important within the theory of 'new social movements'. These two schools do not represent the totality of social movement studies but between them they capture most of the discussions of social movements that have coalesced since the 1970s into a sub-discipline.

At the beginning of the twentieth-first century, McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly redefined the nature of social movement politics as being a field of study devoted to 'contentious politics'. They defined such politics as 'episodic, public, collective interaction among makers of claims and their objects when (a) at least one government is a claimant, an object of claims, or a party to the claims and (b) the claims would, if realized, affect the interests of at least one of the claimants'. (McAdam et.al., 2001; 5) Change is here referenced by the term 'claims', and focuses studies of popular politics onto moments when different forms of society are brought into being or existing forms defended, both through contestation. Further, they argue there is a need to distinguish 'contained' from 'transgressive' contention. Transgressive is the focus of McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly and occurs when an episode of contention contains 'newly self-identified actors and/or at least some parties employ innovative collective action' (McAdam et.al., 2001; 7–8). Innovation, newness and difference all enacted through some form of conflictual or contentious political engagement is their object and indicates how social change is integral to their research programme without it being their explicit topic.

Alain Touraine's work contrasts with that of MacAdam, Tarrow and Tilly, and the tradition they represent, in many ways except for the connection between social movements and social change. Touraine has consistently argued that fully social, as opposed to political or cultural, movements participate centrally in the control of a society's 'historicity', by which he means 'the control of … the action of society upon itself.' (Touraine, 1981; 9) Social movements are 'the collective action of actors at the highest level - the class actors - fighting for the social control of historicity, i.e. control of the great cultural orientations by which a society's environmental relationships are normatively organized.' (Touraine, 1981; 26) Again we see social movements integrated into struggles by which the nature of society is formed and

reformed. In Touraine's case, social movements are located at the central point of such struggles, where the stakes are the very means by which society is maintained and changed.

In the 1970s Touraine confidently asserted that 'social movements are becoming the main actors of society' (Touraine, 1981; 9), but by the twenty-first century he had become gloomy.

> It is in a very pessimistic way that I defend the importance of the concept of social movement. It is not possible to say just now that social movements play a central role in our processes of social change. I accept the idea that social movements have been wiped out in many parts of the world, because either economic progress has incorporated new categories of people into mass consumption or because movements of political and ideological rupture have taken over.
>
> (Touraine, 2002; 95)

It is striking that the moment at which social movements are eliminated is also the moment they are eliminated from processes of social change.

We can see in these two accounts that social change is integral to conceptions of social movements and that this is consistent across the two main schools of social movement studies; schools which have often disagreed over the nature of social movements and methods of studying them. We can also see that integral is the correct term to describe this relationship because on the two accounts just given it is impossible to separate social movements from social change. The next section will give an example of such an integration in Touraine's account of recent forms of globalisation and social movements. This will connect my initial point about the integration of social change and social movements to recent arguments concerning epochal change, such as those found in accounts of globalisation, the rise of networked or information societies and so on. With this example in place the question of this paper will be clear; what conceptions of social change result from social change being analysed from the point of view of social movements? To complete this argument I will then first examine how social movements help us develop conceptions of social change that connect within the one theoretical framework the everyday and the epochal. Second, I will examine how analysing social movements helps us to analyse the ethical implications of social change.

2. Neo-Liberalism and the Disappearance of Social Movements

Touraine implies above that the disappearance of social change is tantamount to the disappearance of social movements. His gloomy account of social movements relates to his passionate attack on neo-liberalism and, it should be remembered, was articulated in the same period during which he had a personal involvement with the Zapatista struggle and saw the concomitant emergence of the anti- or alter-globalisation movement. The core of Touraine's attack on neo-liberal institutions is for their, in his view, attempt to convince societies that there is no alternative in their proper construction to neo-liberal strictures which are themselves conceived outside of society. The success of such a strategy results in the de-socialisation of society.

> We must resolutely reject all discourses that try to convince us that we are powerless. How long can we go on listening to and speaking a language that contradicts … what we do? How long are they going to go on telling us that we are subject to the absolute domination of the international economy, when we invent and defend ideals, discuss reforms and break the silence every day of our lives?
>
> (Touraine, 2001; 116)

For Touraine the struggle over globalization resolves in part into a struggle for the existence of historicity, the ability of actors to act on their societies. The employees of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the G8, the World Trade Organisation and so on, construct a form of globalisation in which only the implementation of certain economic conditions lead to social good; ultimately the market makes good. Touraine's attack on neo-liberalism is for precisely this evacuation of the social. Such an analysis of neo-liberalism is now fairly common, though it is also often oversimplified. For example, Stiglitz who was the Chief Economist at the World Bank accuses the IMF of pursuing just such an asocial approach in which 'The IMF had the answers (basically, the same ones for every country)' (Stiglitz, 2002; 14). He does this while, at the same time, complicating the picture of neo-liberal globalisation by exonerating the organisations he worked for (World Bank and Clinton's USA administration) from such a mistake.

The point that Touraine opens up for us is that any approach that eliminates differences between cultures and societies also, effectively, eliminates the ability of cultures and societies to work on themselves and thus also eliminates social movements; the end of history. If we take Stiglitz's critique of the IMF again we can see how this might work.

> In some of the universities from which the IMF hires regularly, the core curricula involve models in which there is never any unemployment. After all, in the standard competitive model - the model that underlies the IMF's market fundamentalism - demand always equals supply. If the demand for labor equals supply, there is never any involuntary unemployment. … Because … there cannot be unemployment, the problem cannot lie with markets. It must lie elsewhere - with greedy unions and politicians interfering with the workings of free markets by demanding - and getting - excessively high wages.
>
> (Stiglitz, 2002; 35)

The social and cultural is here evacuated by the market, itself considered by the IMF to be an asocial and acultural actor. A social actor like a trade union becomes no more than a spanner in the works. Rejecting such accounts returns to us the ability of actors to work socially and culturally and the extent to which we confirm the social can work on the social, also returns social movements to a place within social change.

The nexus that Touraine and Stiglitz exemplify, and was present in MacAdam, Tarrow and Tilly, is one between collective political action and socio-cultural change. In both cases this nexus derives from society and its institutions being considered to be fully social, that is the result of the work of actors and agencies in society. Social movements as, in part, the carriers of politicized collective action are in this way integrated within notions of social change. This relationship is also revealed as one way; social movements are integrated within social change but social change is not integrated within social movements. As Touraine's example shows social change, in this case neo-liberal globalisation, was occurring in ways which eliminated social movements, yet the opposite - social movements without social change - is inconceivable. The first stage of this paper's argument identifies the close relationship between social movements and social change and that this relationship does not reduce one to the other but does identify the integration of social movements within social change. Such a view should not be taken to mean that social movements achieve their stated or desired form of social change, far from it. Rather possibilities for complicated and contested forms of social change are key to the existence of social movements.

We can now move from these examples that establish an initial understanding of relations between social movements and social change, to examine two ways in which studying social movements might help in studying social and cultural change. First, we will explore the way that the everyday and the epochal are integral to understandings of social movements and

social change. Second, we will examine the problem of the unity of a movement - what makes it a movement rather than a disparate collection of events, people, texts and so on - and how this relates to the ethics of social change. Looking at these two issues in turn will allow some definition of the particular insights studying social movements might offer to understanding social change.

3. Everyday, Habitus, Network

Much social movement analysis concerns organisational features such as hierarchies, leadership, maintenance of commitment, construction of media and so on. These often refer not to the spectacular moments of demonstrations and protests but what looks very much like everyday existence. One example of theorising this is Melucci's reference to 'networks in the everyday'. These relate to the reconception of social movements in the 1970s and 1980s (part of the definition of 'new social movements')to be agglomerations of individuals, groups, events, texts, media and so on rather than being conceived as hierarchically constituted organisations.

> A movement consists of diversified and autonomous units which devote a large part of their available resources to the construction and maintenance of internal solidarity. A communication and exchange network keeps the separate quasiautonomous cells in contact with each other. Information, individuals, and patterns of behaviour circulate through this network, passing from one unit to another, and bringing a degree of homogeneity to the whole. Leadership is concentrated but diffuse, and it restricts itself to specific goals. … strong incentives for solidarity and direct participation as the condition for action do create considerable cohesion among the components; cohesion which even persists through the troughs in the cycle of collective mobilization.
>
> (Melucci, 1996a; 113–4)

The work to construct and maintain such movements as Melucci describes occurs both visibly and invisibly; both in the riot and the meeting, in the massed placards of a demonstration and the massed drinks consumed in a pub. At one stage in his work, Melucci refers to this division as one between visibility and latency, asserting the primacy of visibility and letting the latent or everyday be understood as a period in which public protest exists as a potential and, in a sense, as the goal. (Melucci, 1989; 71–3) For example, a founding moment of the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender movement is often held to be the Stonewall riots, in which the invisible, everyday moments of gay social life in bars and clubs was assaulted releasing the latent protest into a visible riot and assertion of identity.

While Melucci's later conceptions do not use such an obvious terminology of priority as is offered by visibility/latency, the implication of the primacy of one over the other is nevertheless often present in social movement theory. This both underscores connections between the everyday and the epochal and warns of a need to treat the relationship carefully.

Another example is Crossley's Bourdieuian revision of social movement theory which develops the 'notion of a resistance habitus. … Habitus are not always or just formed in periods and contexts of stability … They can be born in periods of change and discontent and can give rise to durable dispositions towards contention and the various forms of know-how and competence necessary to contention. Putting it another way, protests and insurgency do not arise out of nowhere and neither do they die away into nowhere. They persist in habits of resistance and political opposition.' (Crossley, 2002; 190) Here the habits of life are interpreted as, potentially, remembering past and constructing future resistance. Though

avoiding the loaded terminology of Melucci, Crossley also conceives the everyday of social movements as existing in relation to periods of dramatic social change.

The everyday is a concept that received considerable attention in Sociology and Cultural Studies during the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. De Certau's account, particularly connecting everyday language to everyday cultures, provided a theoretical basis, along with the very different problematic laid out by Lefebvre's analysis of the everyday to provide some key theoretical interventions. (De Certau, Lefebvre 1992) Though by no means the only theorists working on conceptions of the everyday, De Certau and Lefebvre's accounts are exemplars of the kind of theoretical intervention that was bringing the routine moments of daily life into theoretical view. At a similar time, work coming in particular from feminism was drawing out complex understandings of power and dominance in everyday interactions, symbolized by the longstanding second wave feminist slogan 'the personal is political'. The intermingling of the insights of both feminism and some theorists, a contested intermingling given some accounts of the everyday which argued for the everyday as both a feminine and depoliticising space (Lefebvre 1991), produced considerable insight and argument about the kinds of places that had at times been passed by in grander sociological and cultural theory; the bar and pub, the street, the kitchen and the home. In this work, the concern has been to excavate the routine and habitual putting aside focus on spectacular or unusual events.

The everyday is integral to studies of social movements but in a somewhat different way to the studies of the everyday just outlined. For example, the everyday is sometimes considered integral to the extent that it supports or produces the non-everyday. This reflects a more general condition of concepts of the everyday, in that the spectacular and unusual - the 'non-everyday' - must exist in some relationship to the everyday, otherwise the mundane and routine moments of life could themselves be taken as non-everyday. The necessary connection, though often implicit, of the spectacular and unusual to the everyday is clear when a particular group adopts as their everyday something most of society finds unusual. The marathon coding sessions of hackers or the detailed arguments over rules of role-playing games that dungeons and dragons' players conduct are, for the vast majority of us both not-everyday and distinctly odd. Yet for hackers and role-playing fans, they are entirely routine, habitual and repetitive. The same may be said for social movement activists participating in the activities that construct their everyday and their habitus, as these vary from the entirely routine - visits to Farmer's markets - to the distinctly unusual - training sessions in 'locking on' or tripod construction.

The tension within social movement theory over the visibility and invisibility of movement activity reflects general conditions for thinking through the nature of the everyday, but the difference is that these two cannot treated separately when studying social movements. The connection between the everyday and the non-everyday is essential for social movements and cannot be avoided. This is not the case for much of the sociology of the everyday where the object is, often, precisely to explore the routine and repetitive. For example, De Certau begins his analysis of the everyday from routine linguistic interactions, creating social and cultural analysis of such habitual moments as people greeting each other. (De Certau 2002) The implication of these arguments is that the particularity of the everyday in social movement theory is that it cannot be separated from the non-everyday; epochal change co-exists with the everyday routine, the mundane and the spectacular are both crucial and inter-dependent within social movements.

An example of explorations that imply the non-everyday of social movements while studying the everyday are network analyses. For example, Ray et.al. use social network analysis to demonstrate that networks developed over time within social movement organisations are more significant in creating mobilisations than networks of 'weak ties'. (Ray et.al, 2003; 55) Such a conclusion brings to the fore the weekly development of an organisation or protest

group rather than the transient intensity of a particular mobilisation. Yet the point of the research is to uncover activities which produce the spectacle of a mobilisation or other actions to pursue social and cultural change. Another example is Anne Mische's work, particularly her connection of conversational analysis to network analysis in the context of ethnographic work on Brazilian student politics. She notes the following membership ties which students might have; Catholic youth pastoral, local movement, trade union, university course representative, helping local land reform, supporting rap groups, membership of youth political committees, friendships, common courses taken, romances and shared cultural, geographical or political backgrounds. (Mische 2003) The sheer spread of sources of political membership that Mische is able to integrate by using a network analysis points to the integration of routine, daily actions within social movements. While I am imposing the vocabulary of the 'everyday' onto network analysis, and I am not suggesting such analyses are easily integrated into theoretical frameworks such as De Certau's, it is nevertheless an avenue through which the networks of living - which constitute movements as movements rather than as disconnected series of event - are explored and theorized.

We see, therefore, that one important reason for studying social movements in relation to social change is exemplified in network studies of social movements is the ability of movements to connect and read across everyday life and dramatic events within one consistent view focused on social change. This means we can refuse to separate the mundane from the extraordinary, and connect the continuities of society to discontinuities. Social change when viewed through social movements operates at every social and cultural level.

One implication of such a view is the refusal of a macro/micro distinction within social change. This has not been thoroughly theorized within social movement studies, rather it remains implicit within the networked conception of social movements that factors of different social 'size' - for example the difference between an individual or a text or a mass demonstration - all circulate within a movement and somehow connect to construct it. There has been some theorisation of the consequences of a macro/micro collapse within analyses of collective action that are related to but situated somewhat outside social movement studies. One useful example of this is Barry Barnes' work outlining a theory of society as collections of knowledgeable actors. The easiest way to see this connection is to consider Barnes' account of divisions between structure and agency.

> Suppose we think of so many responsible agents, acting and interacting together as members on the basis of their shared knowledge. Now concentrate on that part of their shared knowledge which is knowledge of their own social and institutional order, made of statuses and the associate rights, powers, responsibilities, and so forth. This is knowledge of things that are what they are because they are counted as being what they are, that is, because they are known to be what they are.
>
> (Barnes, 2000; 149)

For example, we can, as seems usual in this context, think about how banks work as social institutions. Barnes' answer is that banks appear external to us, or objective, because we all know them to be so. The important knowledge we have, in this context, is the knowledge of what we all do in relation to banks. The fact that we deposit money in the bank and it then lends out that money, making most banks formally insolvent at all times, is overcome by the shared knowledge each depositor has that other depositors are not about to withdraw their money. A bank's objectivity depends on the knowledge all its depositors have of the likely actions of other depositors. This is revealed when there is a run on a bank and the shared knowledge depositors have changes from 'all other depositors will leave their money in the bank' to 'most other depositors are going to withdraw their money, Help! I had better do so as well'. The result of such a shift in collective knowledge is that even a competently run and sound bank will have its already existing insolvency revealed and will collapse. Barnes' point

is that social structures can be understood in the same way as we have just understood depositors and banks. (Barnes, 1983, Barnes 2000)

Agency and structure are not separate, contradictory or theoretically incommensurable realms but are the constructions of each other. Within such a Barnesian framework social structures grow directly out of day-to-day interactions, in turn forming hard, objective surfaces that we find impermeable. (Barnes 1983) Neither should this be understood as an individualistic or voluntaristic theory, despite the references to responsible agents above. For example, Barnes' asserts that individualism and voluntarism are compelling everyday perceptions that yet need to be understood socially.

> For all that it appears to refer to the internal states of individuals, voluntaristic discourse is actually the vehicle of human sociability, through which its users co-ordinate their actions and cognition, and thereby constitute every level of their amazingly elaborate social life.
>
> (Barnes, 2000; 2)

If we were to take Barnes to be an individualist, arguing that individuals construct social structures, then we would miss the collapse between individuals and structures that his account generates.

By connecting such a theoretical perspective with social movement theory we might produce a way of analysing social changes in action without surrendering to either an epochal or micro view of society or of disconnecting these two. However, I am not suggesting Barnes' particular theory necessarily needs to be integrated, I am instead using his work as an example of possibilities. For example, those who see Bourdieu's notion of the habitus as a key sociological concept may disagree with Barnes' rejection of it as providing 'no clear recognition of the *essential* role of interaction in the construction of order' (Barnes, 2000; 55) or some may find Barnes' use of naturalism to anchor the claim that humans are inherently social odd in the context of his assertion of an all-encompassing sociological analysis of humans. (Barnes, 2000; ix) Rather it is Barnes' clear assertion that 'the central problems of sociology are actually problems of collective agency' (Barnes, 2000; x) and his thoroughgoing theorisation of the consequences of this claim that, once connected to social movement theories, offers some interesting avenues into understanding social change.

Social movements provide us with the opportunity to examine social change including within the one frame of analysis moments of the everyday, conceptions like the resistance habitus and epochal breaks. This is not an anti-epochal position, rejecting *a priori* the possibility of social rupture, nor does it privilege the everyday, assuming all social processes no matter how large they are can be reduced to everyday interactions. Instead, the everyday and the epochal mark extreme points from and between which we can locate moments of social change and hold all these different moments together through the lens of a social movement's activity. This particular frame of analysis allows us to explore the processes by which social changes are enacted; the 'how' of social change. Such a framework allow us to avoid breaking social changes into categories based on hard to theorize notions of size, which themselves have at times obscured forms of social change, and opens up social movement studies to broader realms of social theory. In this way, we can hope that by examining social movements we can use the expertise generated within social movement studies and wider social theory to support analyses of social change that integrate the mundane and the spectacular, in ways which will play a key role in the CRESC research agenda.

4. Unity and Collective Identity

A second point arises here for definitions of social movements such as Melucci's, which consider them to be fluid and unstable entities in which spectacular moments of mobilisation and day-to-day networks both co-exist and are interdependent, create the problem of accounting for the unity of a social movement. The image of an insurrectionary or rebellious movement which, consciously or not, reflects the centred and hierarchical organisation typical of, in particular, Bolshevism and, in general, working class movements, has been largely dispensed with within social movement studies. Rather, movements are seen as diverse collections of all kinds of elements and actors. The problem then results over how to define what it is that makes a movement a 'movement' as opposed to being a series of discrete events, groups and ideas circulating in different societies at different times. In general, this problem has been solved with reference to some kind of 'we' or collective identity, through which agents recognize each other as members with some common purpose.

Notions of collective identity in social movements have tended to exist between two poles. At one end a notion of identity *as* identity comes to the fore; here collective identity emphasises the production of unity within and through the production of a 'we'. Diani argues 'To be considered a social movement, an interacting collectivity requires a shared set of beliefs and a sense of belongingness' (Diani, 1992; 8) In this pole, identity becomes something like the way individuals create the intuition that they have something in common in relation to a political conflict. Identity is or embodies unity. The second pole of theories of collective identity recognizes the complexity of identity and inscribes within it fragmentary, contradictory and ongoing processes of identity formation that are familiar from psychoanalysis and cultural theories of the subject. Melucci argues;

> One cannot treat collective identity as a 'thing', as the monolithic unity of the subject; it must, instead, be conceived as a system of relations and representations. Collective identity takes the form of a field containing a system of vectors in tension. These vectors constantly seek to establish an equilibrium between the various axes of collective action, and between identification declared by the actor and the identification given by the rest of society
>
> (Melucci, 1996a; 76)

Melucci takes his interest in identity to its logical conclusion by exploring ideas about individual subjectivities. Here too identity is not quite identity. 'Identity, then, is a process involving constant negotiation among different parts of the self, among different times of the self, and among the different settings or systems to which each of us belongs.' (Melucci, 1996b; 49) Within some strands of social movement studies the model of the decentred subject is also a model for the decentred collective subject.

The two divergent understandings of identity, unified or fragmented, place within much social movement theory a set of tensions that are worth untangling. First, the two theories contradict each other. The pole that sees collective identity as unity is contradicted by the pole that sees collective identity as relational and unstable. Second, if collective identity is not unity and is rather fragmentary, as those like Melucci suggest, does this reinscribe the problem of unifying social movements within collective identity? Rather than providing an explanation of the elements that unify a social movement, the problem of a networked movement might be internalized within the notion of a fragmented collective identity. This may not be as contradictory as it might seem, but it is worth exploring the consequences of these two points.

First, it is useful to see that the notion of collective identity as a stable, unified form of solidarity has been criticized by relational conceptions of identity. An example of unity as identity is Taylor and Whittier's analysis of lesbian feminist mobilizations which argued for

the unifying characteristic to be 'the shared definition of a group that derives from its members' common interests, experiences and solidarity'. (Taylor and Whittier, 1992; 105) Here the notion of a 'we' is established at the centre of a particular mobilization that contributes to a broader social movement. Such notions of collective identity may be framed in different ways but they share an unproblematic or stable notion of identity. A movement's nature can be made present in some way to the collective of actors who make up the movement; activists can 'see' themselves in each other and through this 'seeing' recognize a 'we', a solidarity.

However, much socio-cultural theory has been devoted to disaggregating any such identities and to seeing them as unstable, contradictory, constructed and constantly reconstructed. The work of Judith Butler, for example, on the body or of Roland Barthes on the author have counterparts in social movement theory. (Butler 1993, Barthes 1993) In both Barthes and Butler can be found what had been conceived of as an entity with identity - the author and the body - that is then shown to be broken down into circulating fragments of social and cultural customs. Similarly, collective identity is now often not conceived of as a simple unity, and Melucci's already outlined view is possibly more typical these days than any simple notion of unity. Such views fairly immediately contradict those like Taylor and Whittier, as the entities which construct collective identities are unstable as is the collective construction. An example of this is the attempt within the contentious politics school to address the self-criticism that their previously utilized notions of collective identity have been too simple.

The tradition out of which the contentious politics school has grown includes such concepts as cycles of protest, repertoires of contention and resource mobilisation. This tradition has often assumed an uncomplicated view of identity, treating it as unified and sometimes assuming individuals are self-interested, rational agents. Diani and Della Porta summarized such views in this way: 'Protest actions derive … from a calculation of the costs and benefits, influenced by the presence of resources - in particular by organization and by the strategic interactions necessary for the development of a social movement.' (Della Porta and Diani, 1999; 8)

Such a view has been subject to internal critique within this tradition, with McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly stating that one of their main aims in establishing the theory of contentious politics was to overcome the following existing problems 'its static character, its poor representation of interplay among actors, and its reduction of complex experience to framing and strategic calculations.' (McAdam et.al., 2001; 190) This led to some reframing of notions of identity such that 'In practice, finally, constituent units of claim making actors often consist not of living, breathing whole individuals but of groups, organizations, bundles of social relations, and social sites, such as occupations and neighbourhoods. Actors consist of networks deploying partially shared histories, cultures, and collective connections with other actors.' (McAdam et.al., 2001; 132) Such a view is not far from notions of decentred subjects and introduces into this tradition of social movement theory, the most conservative in terms of concepts of identity, a more fluid conception.

Yet, McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly do not pursue their view of collective identity as far as Melucci and others do. They keep in mind that at some point unity needs to be produced from within collective identity. This is necessary, they argue, because 'one of contentious politics' great paradoxes [is] how contingent assemblages of social networks manage to create the illusion of determined, unified, self-motivated political actors, then … act publicly as if they believed that illusion.' (McAdam et.al., 2001; 159, brackets added) McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly's answer to this paradox is that there are at least four mechanisms that shape a movement's identity; brokerage, category formation, object shift and certification. Without side-tracking the present argument into a too close engagement with the contentious politics school, it is worth noting that these four mechanisms somewhat smuggle back into their theory the notion of the actor as a unified, rational, self-interested agent upon whom collective identities can be built. Rather than assuming such an identity across mechanisms, in fact they

strenuously refuse such a notion, we find within each performance of a mechanism that the unified actor re-materializes. For example, when discussing the 'yellow revolution' in the Phillipines the assassination of Aquino is mentioned as a galvanising factor but the analysis gives way to implicitly rational-actor analysis of mobilisation with no discussion of the emotive consequences of the assassination. (McAdam et.al., 2001 115–7) Similarly issues of irrationality or emotion are not touched on at all in discussing the end of apartheid in South Africa, this is particularly noteworthy in the entirely rational-actor account of a negotiated compromise that the ANC developed as recounted by Joe Slovo. (McAdam et.al., 2001; 152–3) When discussing the brokerage mechanism, McAdam et.al. use the example of itinerant traders passing information in the Kenyan highlands during the Mau Mau rebellion. These traders are understood effectively as rational agents. (McAdam et.al., 2001; 104–5) In this way, the theory of contentious politics both takes account of the diffusion of identity while often seemingly continuing to operate within its case studies as if stable, unified identities can be imputed to individual actors and this stability then allows the building of collective identities to unify movements. This reflects the tension within social movement studies between accounts of identity (collective and otherwise) as fragmentary and dispersed and the need to have an identity which unifies a movement.

It might be expected that those such as Tarrow and Tilly, whose study of social movements began by opposing views that saw movements as irrational mobs (Crossley, 2002; 12–3), would find it difficult to, in the end, move to entirely decentred notions of subjectivity. Even so their attempt to take account of more flexible notions of identity indicates an emergent consensus within social movement studies that identities both collective and individual can no longer be assumed to be stable, rational and self-interested. For some the implication is that studies of movements should shift away completely from notions of unity. McDonald goes so far as to argue that the notion of solidarity must be replaced by one of fluidarity and that 'What we encounter … is a struggle for subjectivity, questions of the nature of mediation, sociality and representation, and the emergence of an ethic grounded in an experience of self and others, as opposed to an ethic of 'us'.' (McDonald, 2002; 125) He claims that rather than continuing to develop a theory of collective identity, which will always be reliant at some point on an identity understood as a unity, social movements should be understood as being drawn together as networks by a 'public experience of the self'. Rather than the constitution of a 'we' McDonald argues that social movements are constituted around struggles for subjectivity which cannot be understood as unities but as experiences of selves and others. (McDonald, 2002; 124–5)

Crossley's concept of the resistance habitus provides another example of the complexity now being invested by social movement theorists in the forms of construction of social movements. In Crossley's account the habitus is part of the myriad social games that people engage in as part of their daily lives;

> agents are not minimal 'calculating machines'. They are social beings endowed with forms of know-how and competence, schemas of perception, discourse and action, derived from their involvement in the social world. … their actions are not rooted in abstract logical calculations of utility but in a 'feel for the game' which they have acquired through involvement in the social world.
>
> (Crossley, 2002; 176)

Crossley's use of Bourdieu allows him to point out that the knowledge actors have is of a regularly played and constructed game. This game may well be thought of as the construction around which a movement can be said to exist, or may be said to *be* the existence of a movement. Like McDonald, Crossley's notion of unity lies within social action which is informed by knowledge of other actors and previous actions within the context of a 'gamelike' social world. That these games are multiple and actors are situated differently

within games means that the subject thought to be in action here cannot be considered a simple unity but is more akin to Melucci's account of the decentred or fragmented subject.

But yet, unity remains an issue. Crossley and McDonald take social movement theory far from any simple notion of unity, in McDonald's case explicitly disavowing it. The problem however remains that the processes that make up a public experience of the self must help construct something like a social movement, or there is no movement to analyse. Similarly, Crossley's habitus of resistance must construct in some ways, albeit imperfectly and constantly renegotiated, some ongoing structures of life - the rules of the social and cultural games played - or there is no habitus and no movement to consider. A choice can be made at this point between abandoning the notion of social movement as one irredeemably based on the image of the actor strutting their hour on the stage of history or one can retain some notion of unity, however complexly constructed. Whereas Crossley would seem to fit the second choice, McDonald seems to hint at the first as a possibility.

By considering the nature of collective identity we come close to grasping movements' ethical concerns; what a movement may be for and what it may be against. This 'for and against' can be seen within the complex field of collective identity, ensuring that the ethical concerns of social movements must also be seen as being understood on a continuum which stretches from a pole which sees identity as unity - self-consistent ethics - to a pole that sees identity as complex, fragmented and constantly reconstructed - self-contested ethics. From this basis we can now try to turn more directly to grasping the ethics of social change when analysing social movements.

5. Unity and Domination

Movements are engaged in promoting social change because there is some belief in the need either for a changed society or to defend a society from change; an ethics is always present. However, as already noted, the 'why' of a social movement is often subordinated in social movement studies to the 'how'. Values and beliefs about the nature of oppression become part of the process of a movement 'framing' itself or are part of a movement's ideas which are then integrated into processes of movement formation.

From the perspective of social movement studies, such an approach has some utility as it frees analyses from evaluating the particular change a movement is pursuing. Analysis of social movements would be engaged in a potentially interminable discussion about the better or worse society produced by a movement, if it could not bracket ethical discussion of the movement overall and then reintroduce such ethics within the process of movement creation and maintenance. However, for analyses which attempt to use social movements as a means of opening up social change, it may be worthwhile drawing out the meaning of social change from its role in movement formation. It is possible that social movements provide a way not only of 'seeing' social change in its full range from the everyday to the epochal, but also of assessing what particular social changes mean, of confronting analyses of social change with ethical questions. One reason for analysing collective identity within social movements may be that it opens up the question of what is a good or bad life in a better or worse society.

Social movement studies as a sub-discipline has not been particularly good at assessing the political meaning of social movements. For example, Touraine is one of the most engaged of social movement theorists yet his general definition of social movements' political meaning abstracts substantive social issues by arguing social movements address struggles for the control of historicity. In his later work on subjectivity, he claims 'a social movement is an attempt on the part of a collective actor to gain control of society's 'values' or cultural orientations by challenging the action of an adversary with which it is linked by power relations. ' (Touraine, 1995; 239) We can note how rather than specifying any substantive

social dominations - such as theft of labour - Touraine abstracts the political role of social movements to be that of gaining control of society's self-production. Similarly, I have argued that social movements have become the means by which ethical visions of changed societies are generated. Again, this evacuates substantive ethics in favour of the process by which ethics are collectively produced in social movements. (Jordan, 2002) These two examples demonstrate how social movement studies tends to evacuate substantive politics for processes of politics.

If social movement studies fail to offer resources here, there is a substantial body of work outside of social movement studies which engages in detail with the ethics or visions of changed societies generated by social movements. All too rarely connected to social movement studies, understood in a sub-disciplinary sense, are the works of feminist studies, queer studies, race and ethnicity studies, Marxism and some class theory, subaltern studies, anarchist studies, utopian studies and more. All these touch on social movement relevant ground largely in ethics or about substantive conflicts. Even when explicitly discussing movement organisation, the standpoint is quite different to social movement studies' quest for widely applicable processes, often with a focus on the most politically effective mechanisms. (Rowbotham et.al., 1979) This is a vast and diffuse set of scholarship, that is hard to connect to and while it is often separate from social movement studies it is not necessarily so. For example, the work of Sasha Roseneil draws on social movement studies while also situating itself within feminist studies. (Roseneil 1995)[i]

What is shared by a wide range of theory is a close concern with the nature of a particular domination. This complex exploration of the ethical 'why' of a movement can be seen, optimistically, as complementing social movement studies. By drawing this work into an exploration of social change we gain the advantage of wide resources for analysing dominations and oppressions in an ethical context. Though there are good reasons why social movement studies tends to include issues of ethics within issues of mobilisation, and not as topics in-themselves - a discussion of what *is* a better society is potentially endless and divisive - within analysis of social change there is an argument for retaining a critical edge that is focused on what we might argue to be 'right' or 'wrong'. Sociological and cultural studies traditions have built on critical insights to the nature of domination and liberation within societies, as Urry notes.

> most developments in sociology have at least indirectly stemmed from social movements with 'emancipatory interests' that have fuelled a new or reconfigured social analysis. … The emancipatory interests of these groupings were not always directly reflected within sociology; more they have had a complex refracted impact. But in that sense, sociology has been 'parasitic' upon these movements
>
> (Urry, 2000; 210–11)

We potentially miss much that is inspirational and compelling in social and cultural theory by not including an explicit engagement with the meaning of social change and the bodies of literature found in feminist studies, queer studies and so on all form a key resource for the question of ethics and social change. To further establish the relevance of this work, it is useful to note three further points.

First, it is useful to note the type of engagement with ethics that emerges here. It is an engagement that begins from a particular from of social and/or cultural conflict; it is ethics with a social base. Discussion of ethics is often conducted through abstractions, principles are pursued which might found, develop or contradict political positions. For example, the work of Peter Singer in relation to animal liberation or of deep ecological theorists, or even of some queer theorists, all approach in an abstract way the social and cultural dominations the authors wish to establish an ethics in relation to. (Singer 2005, Sessions 1995, Morland and Willox

2004) Beginning an ethical discussion from a basis in the particular sociality of a social movement is a different project, one that ensures a social basis for discussions of ethics. This is not necessarily to criticize discussions of ethics that begin and often remain abstract, nor is it to argue that ethical analysis that begins from social movements must remain concrete and never become abstractly philosophical. Rather, it makes clearer that the type of ethical discussion that we can generate from within analysis of social change based on social movements is one that begins from existing, materially based ethical dilemmas. This is only a basis, a beginning, but it ensures the type of ethical analysis proposed here is a socially and culturally engaged one.

Second, the bodies of work concerned with oppressions but which usually do not take account of social movement studies become especially relevant when particular episodes or movements are examined. If we were to explore the resistance habitus created (or not) by male gay society centred on Canal Street in Manchester then we would be able to draw in both social movement studies and queer theory. If we were to take up an event such as the J18 City of London demonstration, then we would be able to draw on social movement studies and a range of Marxist and globalisation theory, given the focus on globalisation and international financial services in this demonstration. For the purposes of analysing social change, the literature that explores the meaning of oppression and domination becomes a resource through which the ethics of social change can be articulated. Here we gain resources for examining 'why' movements engage in social change which, at the same time, allow connections to the previously discussed literatures exploring 'how' movements move. The theoretical point is that research on social change can be drawn into an ethical engagement with the nature of society and its dominations through the analysis of social movements.

A third point is that we need to theorize this connection, even if only in a preliminary way to demonstrate that it is possible to do so, much as I used Barnes earlier to demonstrate it is theoretically possible to connect the everyday and the epochal within one theoretical framework. I am going to offer an example that I hope makes this point, without asserting it is the only or a complete answer to such a question. It will also introduce actor-network theory allowing us to locate further resources for analysing actors.

In the early 1980s, Callon and Latour suggested a thorough going social theoretical answer to the problem of the difference in sizes between social actors. Their question was, how does one actor become macro while another is micro? (Callon and Latour, 1981) In the context of this paper, we might think of the question as being, how do some social actors gain size, in the sense that they can dominate other social actors who are made to be of lesser size? This extends Callon and Latour's meaning but is implicit within it.

> A difference in relative size is obtained when a micro-actor can, in addition to enlisting bodies, also enlist the greatest number of durable materials. … By associating materials of different durability, a set of practices is placed in a hierarchy in such a way that some become stable and need no longer be considered. Only thus can one 'grow'.
>
> (Callon and Latour, 1981; 284)

Callon and Latour's claim is that macro-actors are not in any essential way different to micro- or medio- actors, but have organized and solidified various materials (both animate and inanimate) to support them. An example would be the mass online demonstration that supported protests against the World Trade Organisation meeting in Seattle. Here a British based hacktivist group, the Electrohippies, wrote two small software programmes. These programmes were embedded in web-pages so that if anyone visited the web-page their browser would automatically begin to load and reload targeted pages on the WTO site serving the Seattle meeting. The only difference in coding was that one programme on one page was

for those with slower connections and only sought to open three WTO pages at a time, while the second programme and page was for faster connections and opened more pages. The aim was to bombard the WTO site with so many messages that it would either slow down the WTO network or halt it entirely, in this way creating an online or virtual sit-in. The Electrohippies create two small black boxes in the form of software programmes. Illustrating an additional actor-network theory point, these black boxes become actors in-themselves despite being non-human. For the period of the protest the Electrohippies provided black boxes on which a mass online demonstration could be constructed - according to the Electrohippies their sites received 450,000 visits over the three days of the protest. (Jordan and Taylor, 2004; 74–79)[ii] The generation of the alter-globalisation movement as a social actor of a particular size was partially built on the Electrohippies' black boxes.

Drawing on work from science studies to which Latour in particular contributed, Callon and Latour explain what they mean by durable materials by reference to the metaphor of the black box. (Callon and Latour, 1981; 284–6) In science studies the black box referred to the way social negotiations resulted in scientific or technological objects, such as molecules or a laser, which were then treated as unproblematic or natural. The social negotiations that produced the object were put in a black box, which concealed the social nature of scientific and technological objects. Similarly, political macro-actors are created by the support of various black boxes which the macro-actor can rely upon; the army, roads, media and so on. The construction of micro- and macro-actors is the construction of social relations, and here we are most concerned with those that result in exploitations.

> In order to grow we must enrol other wills by translating what they want and by reifying this translation in such a way that none of them can desire anything else any longer.
>
> (Callon and Latour, 1981; 296)

Once the workforce is convinced that they receive 'a fair days pay for a fair days work' then the employer has lined up one black box on which they can exert a domination. If the 'natural' role of women is understood to be within the home, then male domination has reified a social relation to its advantage. If IQ tests are considered socially neutral - that is, they have been successfully black boxed - then social inequalities around race can be justified with IQ scores. The list could go on but the general point is that Callon and Latour open up a thoroughly social form of analysis of dominations and oppressions.

The thorough-going social nature of Callon and Latour's analysis mirrors that of Barnes outlined in the previous section and, while I am not asserting Barnes and Callon and Latour are entirely in agreement, this make it possible to see how we can keep analyses of the nature of oppression within the same frame of analysis that was able to connect the mundane and routine to the spectacular. A further point introduced by Callon and Latour is that such thoroughly social analyses are able to see inanimate objects as actors. Social movements offer analysis of social change a means of analysing and contemplating the nature and ethics of social changes. This fully draws the 'why' of social change into view.

6. Conclusion

Social movements provide a valuable object for the analysis of social change. Their value comes from the ability to generate one framework of analysis which can connect the everyday and routine to the epochal and spectacular and can bring into focus the meaning of social dominations and oppressions. Supporting such a theoretical framework is a sub-discipline containing rich resources, a widely dispersed yet extensive set of analyses of the meaning of

particular oppressions and a strong focus on the social and cultural nature of social change, supported by an even wider range of social and cultural theory.

Social movements crack open the sociality of social change, from its smallest moment to its largest explosion.

This is not to suggest that all this theory neatly and simply accumulates into one framework. The exploration of differences within social movement studies and the use of thinkers such as Barnes and Callon and Latour have all been in part to demonstrate differences between relevant approaches to social movements. Any particular analysis of a social movement in relation to social change will need to stabilize the theoretical framework suggested here by making clear its own choices. However, the way that the concept of social change itself, which so often escapes specific analysis, can be drawn out and broken down into relations between the everyday and the epochal and into a consideration of the meaning of a social change, points toward the utility of social movements in analysing social change.

One aspect of this cracking is a re-orientation of analyses of social change to claims of epochal change. Sociology has seen in the last 30 years numerous claims of an epochal change in the nature of society; globlisation, glocalisation, networking, informational innovation, communication changes, risk, reflexivity, late modernity and postmodernity are all concepts or areas of sociological work in which proposals have emerged about the epochal newness of society at the beginning of the twenty-first century. (Castells 2000, Beck 1992, Giddens 1991) At first sight, the approach outlined here might be taken as anti-epochal, in particular the emphasis on the everyday within social movements might seem to rule out a view of change at a global, cataclysmic level. Yet the approach advocated here is about connecting such seemingly contradictory social states as the everyday and the epochal. It is not easy to analyse social movements without having access to some conception of major or cataclysmic social and cultural change - think for example of revolutionary movements like the Czech and Slovak Velvet Revolution or of the effects of the 19th Century labour movement. What this approach argues is that analysis of such epochal moments by connecting everyday happenings that make up such episodes is a potential strength of analysing social movements in order to analyse social and cultural change.

By allowing us to connect the everyday and the epochal is socio-cultural change, while also providing a social and cultural basis for ethical analysis of such changes, social movements provide a valuable tool for analysing social change.

---

[i] There is too much work here to summarize easily. An indicator of the range and type of work being referred to can be offered by reference to the large number of 'readers' now available. For example, Hill 1997, Belsey and Moore 1997, Morland and Willox 2004, Back and Solomos 1999)

[ii] An alternative example using one of the largest of macro-actors would be a King. We could analyse usurpation of the crown by William and Mary by exploring how the materials that had supported King James II were gradually dismantled, allowing William and Mary to construct a greater actor. For example, James' explicit and unyielding Catholicism gradually drew away social actor after social actor who initially supported him. This occurred to the extent that when a legitimate male heir was born to him, and thereby displaced his Protestant daughter Mary as the heir to the throne, it was possible for propagandists to suggest this was a false pregnancy fulfilled by a baby smuggled into the birthing room so that a Catholic succession would be assured. James lacked the ability to line up the kind of materials under his Kingship that had supported the previous King Charles II and this opened the way for William and Mary to marshal such actors as the public, the Protestant nobility and an allied army to seize the crown. The macro-actor of all macro-actors, an absolutist monarch, remains subject to Callon and Latour's rules for constructing macro-actors. (Waller, 2002)

Bibliography

Back, L. and Solomos, J (1999) *Theories of Race and Racism*; a reader, London; Routledge.

Barnes, B. (2000) *Understanding Agency: social theory and responsible action*, London: Sage.

Barnes, B. (1983) 'Social Life as Bootstrapped Induction' *Sociology*, 17: 44–55.

Barthes, R. (1993) *Image, Music, Text*, New York; Fontana

Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society; towards a new modernity*, London: Sage.

Belsey, C. and Moore, J. (1997) *The Feminist Reader: essays in gender and the politics of literary criticism*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies that Matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'*, London: Routledge.

Callon, M. and Latour, B. (1981) 'Unscrewing the big Leviathan: how actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so' in, K. Knorr-Cetina, and A. Cicourel, (eds), *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: towards an integration of micro and macro-sociologies*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.277–303.

Castells, M. (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age Volume 1*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Collins, H.M. (1992) *Changing Order: replication and induction in scientific practice; second edition*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Crossley, N. (2002) *Making Sense of Social Movements*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

De Certau, M. (2002) The Practice of Everyday Life, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Della Porta, D. and Diani, M. (1999) *Social Movements: an introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Diani, M. and McAdam D. (2003) (eds) *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, Oxford: OUP.

Diani, M. (1992) 'The Concept of Social Movement', *Sociological Review*, 40(1): 1–25.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity; self and society in the late modern age*, Cambridge: Polity.

Hill, M. (1997) *Whiteness: a critical reader*, New York: New York University Press.

Jordan, T. and Taylor, P. (2004) *Hacktivism and Cyberwars: rebels with a cause?*, London: Routledge.

Jordan, T. (2002) *Activism!: direct action, hacktivism and the future of society*, London: Reaktion.

Lefebvre, H. (1991) *Critique of Everyday Life*, London: Verson.

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. and Tilly, C. (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonald, K. (2002) 'From Solidarity to Fluidarity: social movements beyond 'collective identity' - the case of globalization conflicts' *Social Movement Studies*, 2 (1): 109–128.

Melucci, A. (1996a) *Challenging Codes: collective action in the information age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Melucci, A. (1996b) *The Playing Self: person and meaning in the planetary society*, Cambridge: CUP.

Melucci, A. (1989) *Nomads of the Present: social movements and individual needs in contemporary society*, London: Century Hutchinson.

Mische, A., (2003) 'Cross-talk in Movements: Rethinking the Culture-Network Link', in Diani, M. and McAdam D. (2003) (eds) *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 258–80.

Morland, D. and Willox, A. (2004) (eds) *Queer Theory: readers in cultural criticism series*, London: Palgrave.

Ray, K., Savage, M., Tampubolon, G., Warde, A., Longhurst, B., and Tomlinson, M. (2003) 'The Exclusiveness of the Political Fieldk: networks and political mobilization', Social Movement Studies, 2 (1): 37–60.

Roseneil, S. (1995) *Disarming Patriarchy: feminism and political action at Greenham*, Buckingham; Open University Press.

Rowbotham, S., Segal, L., and Wainwright, H. (1979) *Beyond the Fragments: feminism and the making of socialism*, London: Merlin.

Sessions, G. (1995) (ed) *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Singer, P. (2005) (ed) *In Defence of Animals: the second wave*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Stiglitz, J. (2002) *Globalization and its Discontents*, London: Penguin.

Taylor, V. and Whittier, N. (1992) 'Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: lesbian feminist mobilization', in Morris, A. and Mueller, C. (eds) *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 103–121.

Touraine, A. (2002) 'The Importance of Social Movements', Social Movement Studies, 1 (1): 89–95.

Touraine, A. (2001) *Beyond Neo-Liberalism*, Cambridge: Polity.

Tourain, A. (1995) Critique of Modernity, Oxford: Blackwell.

Touraine, A. (1981) *The Voice and the Eye: an analysis of social movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*, London: Routledge.

Waller, M (2002) *Ungrateful Daughters: the Stuart Princesses who stole their father's crown*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.