1

MEMORY AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

An introduction

Stefan Berger, Sean Scalmer and Christian Wicke

Social movements rely on collective memories to assert claims, mobilize supporters and legitimize their political visions. Social movements also help to shape collective memories. But though frequently intertwined in practice, scholars have rarely pondered the relationship between 'memory' and 'activism' in any depth. Individual scholars have certainly identified the import of 'memory activists'[1] or 'heroes of memory'[2] in the transformation of shared understandings of the past. Likewise, the role of memory in the maintenance of an insurgent movement's collective identity has also been widely recognized, even if few studies have begun to consider its actual place in mobilization.[3] Overall, there has been, until very recently, little attempt to consider 'memory' and 'activism' in an integrated, systematic and comparative fashion.[4]

In part, this failure is a product of the distinct history of the separate institutionalization of scholarship on 'activism' and 'memory'. Scholars working on 'activism' have often been inspired by the dissent of the 1960s and 1970s. The sub-discipline of social movement studies, with a strong focus on the new social movements emerging in the wake of 1968, has been the key arena for research on activism. 'Memory studies', by contrast, emerged out of the cultural turn in the humanities during the 1980s. Its original concentration on national memory is indebted to the crisis of national historical master narratives. Pierre Nora's concept of the 'realms of memory' is a cunning attempt to resurrect a national historical master narrative after poststructuralism had effectively undermined such master narratives.[5] Even where memory scholarship was not tied to attempts to stabilize or re-invent national history, it was fascinated by traumatic events such as wars and genocides that had led to major national and transnational debates and controversies, and thus to some extent democratized official interpretations of the past. Social movement studies and memory studies have over the last three decades developed as distinctive sub-disciplines. Each is defined by exclusive

scholarly associations and journals. Each has their canons of exemplary scholarship. Each uses their own 'master concepts' and hegemonic methods. All of this has ensured that studies of 'memory' and 'social movements' have been pursued in parallel rather than connected fashion; there has so far been little mutual borrowing or intellectual exchange across borders that at times appeared rather impermeable. This is somewhat surprising, as social movements have had great agency in shaping historical cultures and public memory.

'Social movement studies' boasts three dedicated international journals in the English language alone: *Mobilization*, founded in 1996; *Social Movement Studies*, launched in 2002; and *Interface: a Journal for and about Social Movements*, an online journal that has been published since 2009. Two research committees of the International Sociological Association (ISA) – RC47: Social Classes and Social Movements, and RC48: Social Movements, Collective Action and Social Change – were formally recognized by the ISA in the early 1990s. Major English-language publishers have established book series – for example, Cambridge University Press, University of Minnesota Press, University of Chicago Press, Amsterdam University Press. A succession of textbooks has been published, and major universities (as well as many minor ones) now offer courses in the field, undergraduate and postgraduate.

The consolidation of social movement studies as a sub-discipline has, however, also been accompanied by an intellectual narrowing. Interest in collective action and social movements has a very long lineage, and has been widely shared among historians, as well as social scientists. In celebrated works published from the later 1950s, British Marxist scholars Edward Thompson, George Rudé and Eric Hobsbawm identified the importance of collective action as a motor of history, and ventured influential hypotheses on the long-term trajectory of protest forms.[6] As 'social movement studies' has developed, however, it has cohered much more closely and exclusively within the disciplines of sociology and political science. Historical studies have become increasingly marginal. There have been exceptions to the rule, such as the work of historical sociologists like Sidney Tarrow, Charles Tilly and Craig Calhoun.[7] However, the study of social movements is in need of a much deeper historical perspective. Reflecting this need, historians interested in social movements have recently established a distinctive book series, *Palgrave Studies in the History of Social Movements*, edited by Stefan Berger and Holger Nehring, and their own academic journal, *Moving the Social: Journal of Social History and the History of Social Movements*, edited by Stefan Berger and Sean Scalmer.

The 'fathers' of 'social movement studies' (despite the presence of important female scholars, above all, Donatella della Porta, the recognized 'founders' are all men) were all sociologists of various kinds. Broadly speaking, research initially developed around two competing approaches. First, a 'European' school, best exemplified by Alain Touraine and Alberto Melucci, was distinguished by its interest in so-called 'new social movements' (such as environmentalism and feminism) that were alleged to succeed the labour movement as primary social actors.[8]

Students concerned with these movements were marked by close interest in consciousness and in the constitution of the subject. Distinct from this European approach, there also developed an 'American' school, propelled by the Stakhanovite productivity of Charles Tilly and by his leading collaborators such as Sidney Tarrow and Doug McAdam.[9] It was wider in its temporal range but less concerned to trace the underlying social basis and phenomenology of collective actors, and much more concerned with political organizations, relationships and processes.

The combination of competition and cooperation among these scholars and their peers has propelled a series of splits, regroupings and reconfigurations. In consequence, the investigation of social movements has for some years principally been organized around a handful of central processes: the mobilization of protest (through formal organizations and alternative political structures); the production of collective identities; the 'framing' of protest demands and arguments; the interactions between movements and other pertinent actors (especially opponents and the state); the presence and influence of movement networks (often transnational in scope); the nature and transformation of contentious performances; or some combination of part or all of the above. Even if collective identity has been considered as an important feature of social movements in this crowded field, the study of 'memory' has only recently begun to find a place of its own. Nicole Doerr has asked how social movement activists have constructed collective memories in order to further their activism in wider society and build strong internal collective identities.[10] The analysis of forms of collective action can benefit enormously from paying attention to the role of subjectivities and memory in underpinning the activities of social movements.[11] Ron Eyerman has produced a preliminary survey of the work on how social movements use memory and history in order to build strong collective identities in 2015.[12] Lorenzo Zamponi has been looking at the role of memory in the construction of media narratives of Spanish and Italian student movements.[13] Priska Daphi has been exploring the relationship between identity, narrative and memory in the European Global Justice Movement.[14] Priska Daphi and Lorenzo Zamponi have published a special issue of *Mobilization* on the topic of social movements and memory.[15] Donatella della Porta and her collaborators have looked at the impact of memory on forms of democracy in contemporary southern Europe.[16] Lara Leigh Kelland has published an account of how forms of memory work have been crucial for a great variety of US-based social movements, including civil rights, black power, women's, gay liberation and red power movements.[17] A comparison of right-wing populist movements in contemporary Europe has shown that the success or failure of those movements is strongly linked to public memory cultures commemorating fascist movements in the twentieth century.[18] Ann Rigney's current project *Remembering Activism: The Cultural Memory of Protest in Europe* (REACT) is trying to further fill this gap.[19] Yifat Gutman and Jenny Wüstenberg, whose work in this field has been mentioned,[20] are currently preparing a handbook of memory activism that will for the first time attempt to present an overview of scholarship concerned with protest and its relationship with memory.

Why has it taken so long for social movement studies to discover memory? The acknowledged founders of sociology – so-called 'classical' thinkers like Karl Marx, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim – were remarkable not simply for distinguished works of analysis, but for their minting of specialized concepts to explain social processes. Later work claiming authority within the discipline has typically sought to extend these concepts, or else to develop some rival conceptual language. The most prestigious thinkers concerned with 'social movements' have largely conformed to this pattern: positioning their studies within broader intellectual traditions (for example, emphasizing a challenge to Marxian approaches),[21] developing relatively elaborate conceptual schema or sometimes drawing upon and adapting recent theoretical approaches (Latour's 'actor network theory'; Bourdieu's 'field theory', Deleuzian analysis; Lefebvre's rhythmanalysis).[22] Memory plays no major explanatory role in this wider sociological canon, regardless of the fact that one of the founding fathers of memory studies, Maurice Halbwachs, was a sociologist.[23] Deprived of strong theoretical legitimacy, the import of memory into social movement studies has, for a long time, escaped the attention of students of particular movements and campaigns.

There are other reasons too. Since the rise of the 'survey' and then of procedures of statistical sampling, the field of applied sociology has also been marked by an expansion of quantitative approaches, a process heightened by the rise of the computer.[24] Besieged and somewhat defensive, 'qualitative' social scientists have been forced to assert the equal rigour of their analyses, and the 'scientific' status of their scholarship. This could be interpreted as a somewhat inhospitable context for memory studies. It has encouraged qualitative sociologists to treat the interview transcript as a relatively transparent data source, providing the raw material for analysis. The procedures of 'grounded theory' have been developed to guide the researcher in movement from '(interview) text' to 'analysis'.[25] Dedicated computer programs have aided the process, allowing for the identification of key themes and tropes. In these ways, testimony about the past has been incorporated into the operation of a 'normal science'. By contrast, historians using the interview as a method – typically identifying as 'oral historians' rather than as 'qualitative' social scientists – have been less pressured to establish the 'scientific reliability' of their informants. This, in turn, has liberated a more reflexive consideration of the vagaries and the limits of 'memory'.[26] And it has thereby provided one important inspiration for the development of 'memory studies'.

A third reason why social movement studies has found it so difficult to forge a positive relationship with memory studies has to do with its temporal orientation. The discipline of sociology emerged and grew on a promise that it might understand the problems of emergent industrial societies. It is present- and future-oriented. Reflecting such a perspective, the journal *Social Movement Studies* was launched with the assertion that social movements play an 'increasingly key role' as 'the dynamic and oppositional forces within global socio-economies'.[27] Most scholars working on protest and collective behaviour have been excited to explore the relationship between the 'social movement' and contemporary change.

Studies of recent rather than temporally distant mobilizations have predominated, and these have certainly tended to draw greater interest than historical studies.[28] The most influential theorists in social movement studies have sought to proclaim the possibility that still unfolding campaigns embody prospects of incipient transformation: first, 'new social movements' of the 1960s and 1970s; more recently, 'global movements'.[29] And with their quest for novelty and eyes fixed ahead, students of social movements have been very slow to develop a close interest in how the 'past' is recalled.

'Memory studies', in turn, has also been slow in developing an interest in social movements. While heritage studies in particular over the last years have opened new perspectives into the relations between official memory and civil society activism,[30] memory studies has been marked predominantly by its own emphases, preoccupations and oversights. There are a range of scholarly journals focussing on memory studies today, above all the appropriately named *Memory Studies* that came into existence in 2008 and is widely regarded as the lead journal in the field. In 2016 a Memory Studies Association was founded, and it has held hugely successful and well-attended conferences since. In 2019 almost 2,000 memory scholars assembled in Madrid to discuss a wide variety of different subjects.[31] Specifically concerned with history is the journal *History and Memory* founded in 1989 with the explicit aim of encouraging research into the question how the past has shaped the present through a wide variety of memorialization practices and how our perception of the past is always moulded by present-day agendas. Today virtually all major academic publishing houses have book series on memory studies. As a field of study, memory studies comes onto the scene of academic scholarship around two decades later than social movement studies. It is not rooted in 1968 but rather in the 1980s, when questions of national identity were coming to the fore again in politics as well as scholarship. Pierre Nora's path-breaking 'realms of memory' project, referred to above, provided in effect a new national master narrative for France at a moment in time when the republican master narrative was perceived to be in deep crisis. It was the starting point of a remarkable career of one of the most successful paradigms in humanities research over recent decades. Rediscovering the forgotten Halbwachs, Nora opened the curtain for a vast amount of research that was primarily concerned with the memory of the nation,[32] especially where this memory was held to be particularly traumatic and related to war and genocide.[33] Thus, for example, the Holocaust and controversies over the colonial legacies of racism have shaped memory studies to a considerable extent.[34] The double emphasis on trauma[35] and national memory has produced a range of blind spots for memory studies, as subjects that were neither central to national recollection nor necessarily traumatic were only rarely dealt with.[36] Social movements were one such topic.

Yet, the production of 'social', 'collective' or 'cultural' memory has been strongly intertwined with the history of social movements. Social movements have had, for example, the capacity to manipulate official memory, in demanding 'official apologies' for atrocities committed by political regimes in the past.[37]

They also have at various times and places been successful in constructing forms of 'counter-memory' through street protests, the creation of counter-monuments, the toppling of existing monuments (something very much to the fore in the discussions we are witnessing in many countries across the globe as we are putting the final touches to this introduction in the summer of 2020) or the curation of alternative exhibitions.[38] And they have been influential in making collectives forget – a process that is as important as remembering, as scholars ranging from Ernest Renan to Paul Ricoeur have taught us.[39] And social movements have not only used and forged memory, but memory has also been a key motivation for the formation of social movements.[40]

Next to Halbwachs the art historian Aby Warburg and his concept of 'social memory'[41] served memory scholars to understand memory not as something that was biologically inherited but as something that required a cultural transmittance that we can shape. As Andreas Huyssen put it: '[the] past is not simply there in memory … it must be articulated to become memory'.[42] Memory studies was to adopt social constructivist positions wholesale.[43] Jan and Aleida Assmann became two of the most influential theorists of memory, in particular with their distinction between three levels of memory: individual memory, where conception of time operates very subjectively; 'communicative memory', which operates in any social group, where its members are still alive; and 'cultural memory', which is connected to the institutionalization of communicative memory in museums, heritage initiatives, monuments and public discourses about the past.[44] The forging of memory by and through state power has often caught the attention of scholars in memory studies.[45] However, as this volume will demonstrate, social movements as civil society actors were also important in shaping public discourses about the past and thus have become, time and again, carriers of cultural forms of memory and forgetting, as Guy Beiner reminded us in his recent memory history of the Ulster Rebellion.[46] Other historians have pointed out that political activists have made frequent references to the past in order to legitimize visions for the future – think, for example, of Joan Derk van der Capellen's lecturing on the parallels between the eighteenth-century American Revolution and the sixteenth-century Batavian Revolution or Jacques-Pierre Brissot reminding the Genevans during the same age of revolutions of their heritage of William Tell who had lived in the fourteenth century.[47] Already before the French Revolution, the citizens of several European cities used the memory of past rights in order to justify political entitlements and to construct a strong sense of place identity.[48] Nineteenth- and twentieth-century national movements, which can also be understood as social movements, have invariably referenced their visions for the future with interpretations of the past.[49] Historians have contributed to the study of the memory of 1968,[50] and they have looked at the importance of memorializing the civil rights movement in the US.[51] The study of terrorism in Italy has also been enriched by perspectives from memory studies.[52] How different conceptions of historical time have influenced a variety of social movements, such as the Madres in Argentina, and how forms of transitional justice

have been blind to the conflicts produced by such different ideas of historical time have been the subject of an intriguing analysis by Berber Bevernage.[53] In future an even stronger focus on social movements and their constructions of the past would arguably contribute further to a better understanding of the political 'dynamics of cultural memories'.[54] If we take, for example, the role of social movements in the production of heritage, a rich field for further examination opens up. As memory activism in the form of industrial-heritage movements becomes institutionalized, memory often becomes part of branding campaigns for place identities, touristified and commodified for profit.[55] The touristification of the past, memory activists have argued, may also involve the banalization of remembrance, as for instance the site of the Berlin Holocaust memorial illustrates, where visitors have frequently behaved disrespectfully.[56]

If social movements are conscious of their own role in the political process, and if their representatives are highly articulate, they are far more likely to leave memory work that, in turn, can influence and has to be deconstructed by historians. As Richard Vinen has pointed out in relation to 1968, activists dominate the memory literature on 1968 and they are not shy in securing their special place in history. Vinen has shown that 'the leading figures in 68 often had a highly developed sense of themselves as historical actors and as people who would one day be the object of historical research'. This was reinforced by 1968ers subsequently working as historians seeing 'politics and historical research as intertwined'. This affected the way we think of 68. By contrast, Vinen points out, working-class protest in and around 1968 is rarely present through ego-documents of workers: 'Students in 68 are portrayed in words, frequently their own words, but workers are often remembered in pictures'.[57]

While we have identified above some attempts to begin to think social movements and memory together, this collection is a response to the relative scarcity of such attempts to examine the 'memory'-'activism' relationship, and its editors see themselves in line with those who wish to change this. Previous and current research on the relationship between social movements and memory has disclosed several concepts and approaches that may be useful to both fields. Here we grant sustained attention to five areas of research that seem to us to hold special potential for a more integrated and cross-disciplinary treatment of memory activism: repertoires of contention, historical events, generations, collective identities and emotions.

The concept of a 'repertoire of contention' was first advanced by Charles Tilly 40 years ago.[58] Seeking to describe and explain the changing ways in which people made collective claims, Tilly observed that though people might act in an almost limitless range of ways (from throwing dynamite to composing a letter), in practice campaigners in a particular time and place typically employed only a small number of tactics. The 'repertoire' was this cluster of preferred performances. It was limited, it was learned, and like the repertoire of a jazz musician, it was open to improvisation, at the margins.[59] Tilly's principal studies of the 'repertoire' of contention focussed on long-term shifts in the dominant forms of

collective action in Great Britain and France, especially over the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. To schematize, he divined a shift from an 'old' repertoire of contention that was 'parochial' (concentrated in a single community), 'bifurcated' (taking different forms, depending on whether issues were predominantly local or national) and 'particular' (varying greatly), to a 'new repertoire' of performance that was 'cosmopolitan' (spanning many localities), modular (easily transferable between places) and 'autonomous' (beginning on the claimants' own initiative). This was a transformation embodied in the replacement of the grain seizure by the demonstration. It was, according to Tilly, integral to the rise of the modern social movement.[60] In his later work Tilly somewhat moderated this binary treatment of the repertoire. He conceded that there were 'many repertoires' rather than just two, arguing more carefully that this 'exaggerated division' served only as a 'useful guide' to a more 'complex history'.[61] More recent scholars have largely elaborated this pluralism using the term 'repertoire' to describe more particular and limited clusters of performance: the Gandhian repertoire,[62] suicide protest,[63] cyberactivism,[64] 'carnivalized politics',[65] disruption,[66] 'slutwalks',[67] parades,[68] and so on.

But if the concept is widely and creatively used, then the historical processes that underpin the making and alteration of a repertoire have not always been rigorously examined.[69] Perhaps responding to such a deficit, a new vein of scholarship has recently emerged, specifically concerned with the import of 'strategy' and 'strategic interaction'. This research has introduced a fresh conceptual language (of 'players' and 'arenas') as an alternative to the familiar language of 'social movements'. It has emphasized that the strategic choices of 'players' are based on 'meaning' and 'emotions', and not simply on rational calculation of 'means' and 'ends'. And its leading practitioners have signalled an openness to close ('micro') studies (such as those advanced by historians) rather than to abstract structural analyses.[70] They have not, however, granted 'memory' any direct consideration notwithstanding isolated studies that have asked how social memory has underpinned community-making using affective means in strategic ways to support specific political aims. One example here would be Ruth Cardoso's study on how popular movements in the city of Sao Paulo have used memory to build a sense of belonging to specific neighbourhoods that, in turn, strengthened demands for improving those neighbourhoods.[71] Another would be how the transfer of repertoires of contention from western and southern Europe to Romania was limited by a host of local factors in relation to social movements mobilizing on behalf of students, against the government and against business interest in Romania after 2011.[72]

Notwithstanding such oversight, scholarly examinations of the 'repertoire of contention' offer one potentially fruitful point of connection between 'memory studies' and 'social movement studies' and indeed, one recent intervention has already advocated such a possibility.[73] If an actor's preferred political performances rest greatly on habit and custom, then they are largely conveyed through remembrance: processes of sharing and story-telling, personal testimonies, influential

texts (whether handbooks, memoirs or histories) that convey lessons concerning the appeal of rival tactics. Scholars working specifically on social movements have not granted such processes very direct or sustained attention. Experts in the study of memory can here provide a model and a guide.

The likelihood of successful collaboration in such a quest is heightened by conceptual similarities between the fields. Like students of the 'repertoire of contention', leading figures in 'memory studies', such as Ann Rigney, have emphasized the principle of 'scarcity': of the enormous number of past experiences only a few are in practice recollected.[74] Like students of the repertoire, 'memory' scholars, such as Michael Rothberg, have identified the process by which one actor's successful strategy is borrowed or exploited by others seeking public recognition (a process that Rothberg calls 'multi-directional memory').[75] Some of the chapters in this volume pursue such connections. We hope our collective work encourages more research of this kind.

Notwithstanding an abiding preoccupation with structure (reflective of the influence of sociology), students of social movements have also evinced considerable interest in the 'event' as an object of research. Charles Tilly pioneered an influential research method that organized data collection around the occurrence of 'contentious events', reported in major public sources, such as newspapers. He also reflected explicitly on the relationship between these 'event catalogues' and broader social theories.[76] More ambitiously, historian and political scientist, W.H. Sewell Jr., has argued in a series of influential publications for the value of an 'event-ful sociology', registering the centrality of 'historical events' to processes of structural change.[77] A 'historical event', Sewell has suggested, can be analytically distinguished from the flow of everyday experiences as: '(1) a ramified sequence of occurrences that (2) is recognized as notable by contemporaries, and that (3) results in a durable transformation of structures'.[78] The catalytic power of historical events lies in their capacity to touch off unpredictable ruptures in the distribution of resources, access to political power and cultural understanding.[79] They rearticulate broader power structures and incite more events.[80] But they are also symbolically loaded: characterized by heightened emotion, punctuated by ritual, distinguished by collective creativity: a 'historical event' is not simply a happening, for 'symbolic interpretation' is also 'part and parcel' of what grants it a transformative capacity.[81]

Sewell demonstrated the potential of these insights in an extended analysis of the taking of the Bastille as an 'historical event'. In Sewell's handling, this 'event' could be considered 'historical' for its pivotal role in the creation of the modern concept of 'revolution'. The liberation of the King's prisoners was one thing. The linking of popular violence with the concept of popular sovereignty a second. The King's subsequent yielding of effective power to the National Assembly a third. Cumulatively, they can be understood as a transformation of political structures – a major historical event.[82] Sewell's presentation is notable for its attention to culture and time. It was only in the days after the liberation of the prisoners, he argues, that orators, journalists, politicians and 'the crowd itself'

reinterpreted the rising as a culturally significant moment, seizing on the political theory of 'popular sovereignty' as a means to 'explain' and to 'justify' the popular violence.[83] But notwithstanding the richness of this examination, the student of memory will be struck perhaps more forcefully by the relative truncation of Sewell's symbolic examination. The invention of 'revolution', in his treatment, is completed in 1789. There is no attention to the ways in which the taking of the Bastille was recalled or rearticulated in new combinations in future months and years. The ways in which 'memory' might consolidate or undermine new political schema lie outside his purview. The 'interpretation of events' is treated as a relatively immediate action, not a long-term, collective and contentious process in its own right.[84] Closer attention to the processes through which occurrences are remembered, reshaped and exploited would enrich our understanding of the ways that they become significant. Students of memory have independently grappled with these issues, developing such concepts as 'memory events'[85] and 'impact events'.[86] Further examination of these questions offers one obvious basis for a richer cross-disciplinary research.

Next to utilizing repertoires of contention and historical events, those intent on bringing memory studies and social movement studies closer together might also think of generation as a useful concept. Many forms of social protest have been described as generational. Thus in German contemporary history, for example, there has been much talk about a 1945 generation, a 'sceptical generation', a 1968 generation and a 1989 generation.[87] In Spain, the recent iaioflautas movement explicitly used their grandparents' identity in order to draw attention to the democratic deficits of the transition period between Francoism and the post-Francoist democracy in Spain.[88] Generational factors have also been examined in relation to the question whether particular generational cohorts remember the women's movement differently in the US.[89] Studies on the generational memory within left-wing movements in the US and France revealed not only a whole host of amnesias but also important memory strains active in mobilizing left-wing protest cultures in both countries.[90] Anna Wiemann's study on the Fukushima protests in Japan highlighted the way in which activists disassociated themselves from the violent protests of social movements in 1960s Japan.[91] She thereby pointed not only to the importance of generational continuity but also discontinuity. Attention to generational memory would be one way of thinking the construction of the past together with the history of protest, especially if one generation of memory activists is referencing the work of previous generations of memory activists. Of course, the scholar who wishes to bring together memory and social movements has to be careful not to reduce every political conflict to generation thereby sidelining other issues such as class, race, gender and other issues relevant to the formation of social movement memories. Yet, with Karl Mannheim we can nevertheless assert that the concept of generation 'is one of the indispensable guides to an understanding of the structure of social and intellectual movements'. Mannheim already emphasized the importance of memory for the constitution of generations. For him generations were not concrete

communities but rather constructions within a particular timeframe of distance to actual experience that was communicated as joint tradition and heritage. In particular at times of significant social change, Mannheim argued, a generation was some kind of historical community sharing an imagined destiny. Even if generations' representations of personal and collective pasts would be reformed in accordance with the conditions of the changing present, memories of the past would be crucial in understanding the politics of the past, including the politics of social movements.[92]

Next to the concept of 'generation', the concept of 'collective identity' constitutes a kind of golden bridge between social movement studies and memory studies. Like generation, collective identity is in some respects a deeply problematical concept. Indeed, it has been described as a 'plastic word' by Lutz Niethammer.[93] Yet if we approach 'collective identity' as a construction rather than an essence, then we can see how collective identities were forged with the help of particular memories. This has also been true for the collective identities of social movements.[94] In social movement studies, collective identity has often been seen as necessary and constitutive to the formation and endurance of social movements.[95] To Alberto Melucci the collective identity of social movements consisted predominantly of a process of formalizing boundaries between the social movement network and the outside world which emerged from the relatively concentrated exchanges and internal debates within the movement. The sense of belonging of social movement members, developed in the course of their struggles, was the result of a convergence between interests and practices among individuals.[96] In memory studies, Halbwachs already pointed to the intrinsic relationship between collective memory and collective identity. Individual memory had always been intermingled with the social: you might think you are alone, but you never are in your perceptions of the past which are collectively constructed. Halbwachs showed that our individual memory is fundamentally shaped by group belongings and the associated 'collective memory', which is a key basis for 'collective identity'. Dieter Rucht has pointed out that the mechanisms according to which social movements operate rely on such memory and identity work.[97] This has been the case not just for new social movements but also for the nineteenth-century labour movement. Especially in its Marxist variant, it constructed a collective identity of class that was based partly on strong memory work. Class identity, forged to some extent through memory, was the precondition for successful revolutions and the implementation of a socialist future. Even at the beginning of the twenty-first century some Marxist theorists, such as Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, argued that class identities would forge a comprehensive proletarian public sphere countering the bourgeois one.[98] Similarly, historians of youth subcultures have pointed to the importance of collective identities of youth that were built on the construction of common memories.[99] And the forging of the Stonewall myths in LGBTQ circles was crucially based on memorial practices that were institutionalized nationally and internationally over time.[100]

Finally, we would like to suggest that social movement studies and memory studies can be brought closer together by paying attention to developments in the field of history of emotions.[101] Social movement scholars have long pointed out that social movement activists do not only follow rational calculations.[102] Emotional processes, as manifested, for example, in ritual practices, have been at least equally important in explaining social movement action.[103] A wide range of emotions such as shame, sorrow, anger, hatred, happiness and love have influence not only the way in which social action has been remembered but also the way in which such memories have then been transformed again into social action. As the history of emotions has recently moved from a concern with the discursive construction of emotions to the bodily basis of emotions, so scholars interested in the role of emotions in both memory and social movement work could usefully ask how subjectivities were linked to political performances and memory work in the realm of social movements.[104] The history of emotions allows for the unpacking and deconstruction of memories of selves and memories contributing to the forging of collective identities. Transferred to the fields of memory and social movement studies, the study of emotions would allow us to problematize the construction of identities and collective selves through emotional memory work. If we take, for example, the history of the French revolution, Bill Reddy has argued that it is impossible to understand that seminal event in world history without paying due attention to changes in the navigation of emotions that took place between the 1660 and the 1780s.[105] Turning grief into anger and transforming anger into political demands was a strategy followed by many social movements, for example, the movement to make medication available more readily to those suffering from AIDS.[106] Emotional dynamics were often crucial in allowing social movements to acquire critical mass of supporters and to mobilize the media on their behalf. As the attention space of the media is extremely limited, the strength of emotional mobilization through social movements is vital in positing the concerns of social movements on the scale of what the media regard as important news. The emotional dynamics of social movements have both internal appeal and external effects.[107] If social movement studies have been rediscovering the history of emotions, the same can be said for memory studies, where scholars have discussed to what extent emotional memories can be deemed accurate,[108] what role emotions have played in forms of disputed memories,[109] and to what extent emotions are important to agonistic memory regimes,[110] to mention but a few examples in a rich field of enquiry. Overall then, the scene seems to be set for a greater dialogue in which ways social movement studies and memory studies are dealing with the role of emotions in their respective sub-fields.

The case studies of this volume

Having pointed out some of the fruitful ways of conceptually combining memory studies and social movement studies in the future, in the final part of this introduction we would like to draw out some of the challenges and promises of

combining those two fields of studies as they present themselves in the contributions to this volume.

We have not sought to impose a uniformity of approach on individual contributions, but rather to present a diversity of cases and methods. The cases are drawn from a variety of national and cultural contexts: Europe – especially Germany – Australia, the US, India, South Korea, Japan, China. They also range across many different kinds of social movements: the women's movement; the anti-nuclear movement; the environmental movement; the labour movement (in its reformist and revolutionary wings); memory activists in post-war Germany; African-Americans and Southern whites in the US, struggling to shape their polity. They extend from the nineteenth century to the contemporary period. And they consider how activists shape public memory and how memory is mobilized within social movements.

Notwithstanding such diversity, we do not claim comprehensiveness. The chosen case studies are especially drawn from two national contexts – Germany and Australia. This relative geographical concentration is partly an expression of the identities of editors (German and Australian). But it is also a reflection of the vibrancy of memory politics in these societies. Marked by traumatic histories of genocide, war and colonialism, they have also been shaped by strong social movements and by major public controversies over the past (the so-called 'Historikerstreit' in Germany and the 'History Wars' in Australia). This makes them especially fecund soil for the student of 'memory and activism'.

While the chapters that follow give the particularities of various national contexts due attention, they are not offered primarily as contributions to national histories. We hope and expect that they will be of special interest to students of social movements and of memory, whatever their national affiliations and expertise. And we hope still more fervently that our explorations here will elicit further research into a still more diverse range of historical cases.

The collection is made up of 14 substantial case studies. The first, Lauren Richardson's chapter, shows how the so-called 'comfort women' of South Korea forged a powerful social movement which, by the 1990s, enabled them to write their memories of victimhood into the national South Korean memory of Japanese colonialism in the Second World War. She demonstrates that the framing strategies of the movement were key to its success. By framing their claims in the universalist language of human rights,[111] the women could write themselves into the burgeoning democracy movement in South Korea that looked favourably on rights-based political claims. The movement could also link itself very successfully to a transnational discourse that condemns violence against women. It is a good example of how a social movement was capable of transforming national memory when both the national and the transnational frames have been favourable to such transformation. Richardson uses the case of the Chinese 'comfort women' as counter-example to the success of their Korean counterparts, as she argues that both the domestic and transnational frameworks, dictatorship and non-acceptance of a global human rights discourse, have meant

that the Chinese movement has not been able to gain much attention or even to form itself into an effective movement to date. However, Richardson also shows clearly how it takes two to tango, for the 'comfort women's' calls for financial redress from Japan so far have gone unheeded, as Japan's government and the majority of Japan's public opinion does not share the narrative of Japanese perpetratorship that is being pronounced by the Korean women.

Devleena Ghosh and Heather Goodall, in their chapter, deal with another social movement for women, the Indian women's movement and its long struggle for greater emancipation of Indian women. They demonstrate how memory activism was crucially important for the movement both after Indian independence, when memories of the earlier struggles of the movement served to underpin the conviction that independence did not bring the envisioned emancipation for women and fell far short of women activists' expectations. In subsequent decades the memory activism of members of the women movement served the purpose of strengthening the internal identity of the women's movement and in presenting a narrative of ongoing struggle and progress that helped to mobilize new generations of women on behalf of the movement. Thus, almost over the entire course of the second half of the twentieth century, memory activism was a vital ingredient of the women's movement of India.

Sophie van den Elzen and Berteke Waldijk also deal with the memory of the women's movement – in the form of histories that have been produced by activists from within the movement. They can show how such histories have contributed vitally to forging the memory of the movement – thus relativizing the gulf that is sometimes wrongly put between history and memory by both theorists of memory and theorists of history. The texts the authors have chosen construct feminism as an explicitly global movement that posited solidarity across national, racial, class, age and other boundaries. They focus in particular on strategies that sought to overcome racial boundaries within feminist movements. In contrasting the narrative strategies in histories produced by feminists before the First World War with texts that were produced from the 1980s onwards, the authors highlight efforts in the later period to overcome exclusions of race and class that still often characterized the histories written by white middle-class feminist authors around the turn of the twentieth century.[112]

If the first three chapters deal with memory issues in the women's movement, the following chapter underlines how memory activism was also crucial in the peace movement. Richard Rohrmoser in his chapter underlines the importance of the memory of the Second World War for the German peace movement of the 1980s. In fact, both the peace movement and those in favour of stationing new nuclear missiles on German territory argued with history and memory in order to justify their respective positions. As the author argues, the verdict of the constitutional court in 1995 on the legitimacy of peaceful resistance to the stationing of new missiles vindicated the memory activism of the peace movement as the court seemed to follow the logic of their memory-based arguments

and memory-driven actions in the 1980s. Like the previous chapter this one also demonstrates how history and understandings as well as representations of history can serve as a powerful memory discourse.

The chapter on joint British-Australian atomic bomb testings in Australia by David Lowe highlights the role of the memory of the terrible environmental and human costs of those tests as a powerful resource of the anti-nuclear, environmental and aboriginal social movements in Australia. He peels back the layers of memory of different groups and institutions, official state memory as well as the memory of diverse groups from within civil society to highlight the role of popular Australian nationalism and the impact of colonial legacies on the memory of atomic bomb testing that had been initially combined with strong utopias about Australia's future role in world politics and its access to nuclear weapons and a nuclear-powered future. Social movements, Lowe shows, very successfully remediated the official government investigation report on the nuclear testing in order to establish a particular narrative highlighting the environmental and human costs of the tests, which serve as negative counterfoil to the aims of the anti-nuclear, environmental and aboriginal social movements in Australia.

Environmentalism and memory already looms large in Lowe's chapter and it moves centre stage with Iain Mcintyre's chapter on the role of song in the memory of the US-American environmental movement Earth First between 1980 and 1995. Drawing on diverse traditions of protest songs, both from the US and internationally, song, sometimes deliberately commemorating specific events, became a powerful means of memorializing the movement and providing strength and re-assurance to its members. Consciously and unconsciously the Earth First activists built lines of traditions to earlier activists inside and outside the US, from the First World War to American folk song, Native American songs and European radical and popular protest songs ranging back to the pre-industrial era. Song, as McIntyre underlines, was also a powerful way of highlighting the plight of nature in the industrial era and of harking back to a glorified pre-industrial past that was often treated with high doses of nostalgia in the song culture of the movement. Songs are an important repertoire of social movement memory.[113]

From Environmentalism we move to urban social movements in the chapter by Christian Wicke comparing the Green Bans in Sydney with the urban social movement trying to protect traditional working-class housing in the Ruhr area of Germany. In both cases, heritage activism played an important role in the prevention of urban renewal measures. Wicke suggests three different perspectives on the relations between collective memory and social movements: the role of memory within social movements, how social movements are publicly remembered, and how historical cultures have been shaped by social movements. He demonstrates that these three sets of social movement memory are in practice intertwined, and that this connection is dependent on movement leadership, as particular activists assume greater agency in generating and prolonging memory.

As Wicke shows in his chapter, the discovery of postindustrial aesthetics and rediscovery of West Germany's working-class past in the context of the radical student movement and the emergence of new social movements paved the way for the conservation of industrial heritage in the Ruhr from the late 1960s. Sarah Langwald's chapter, however, highlights the stark anti-Communism of the previous decade in West-German history and the attempts of a small band of activists to use the memory of anti-fascism in order to counter the prevalent anti-Communism in mainstream West-German society during the 1950s and into the 1960s. Looking at trials of Communists in West Germany, she shows how the defence of the accused Communists tried to mediate between the Communist memory of the National Socialist past and the judges' memory – with many judges having already served as judges under National Socialism. The judges' insistence on juridifying the trials, Langwald argues, was one way of deflecting from their own perpetratorship in the years before 1945. While the Communist defendants, with the help of the East-German government, attempted to de-mask the judges, the left-liberal attorneys, often with the help of the liberal media in West Germany, attempted to open a space where the National Socialist past could be discussed more widely in German society, thereby helping to pave the way for a different memory discourse in Germany that was to break the long silence about the complicity of West German elites in the barbarous Nazi regime.

In the following chapter we stay with the German labour movement but move backwards in time, to the Weimar Republic. Jule Ehms here asks about the memory of those workers who had died in the defence of the republic against the right-wing Kapp Putsch in March 1920. Often that memory was closely connected to longer-term memorial practices within the labour movement going back to the pre-First World War years, when the labour movement regularly remembered those who had fallen in the German revolution of 1848/9 and the victims of persecution under the Anti-Socialist Laws between 1878 and 1890. While initially the divided labour movement in Weimar remembered the victims of right-wing violence together, very soon the memory politics of Social Democrats, Communists and Anarcho-Syndicalists began to diverge sharply. The memory of those who died in March 1920 was now underpinning very different narratives about the republic and the attitude of the left towards the republic – foreshadowing the lack of unity in the defence of Weimar in the early 1930s. Memory in this chapter is revealed as a potential divisive force within social movements that does not only unite but also underpins splits and divisions.

The next three chapters of the book all stick with labour movement memory. Liam Byrne uses autobiographical accounts of two prominent Australian Labour leaders to show how they carried out memory battles as interventions in contemporary Australian politics in the 1960s. He focusses on the memory of the famous 1916 referendum on conscription, which ended with the trade unions playing a decisive role in bringing about a 'no' vote for conscription – against the wishes of the Labor government at the time, which led to the ousting of the then Labor Prime Minister from the party and a party split. In the debates, 50 years later,

surrounding conscription for the Vietnam War in the 1960s, two completely contradictory accounts of 1916 were published by the Labour reformist Jack Holloway and the Communist radical May Brodney, who both had been opposed to conscription in 1916. Byrne underlines how their memory narratives were active interventions in the politics of the 1960s showing how different wings of the labour movement used different memory narratives in order to push through particular policies also against other wings of the same movement. The Australian story from the 1960s thus nicely mirrors the story from Weimar Germany by Jule Ehms.

Sean Scalmer's chapter examines the place of 'memory' in an earlier period of Australian labour history: the struggle for the eight-hour day. Male craftworkers in Australia won the eight-hour day from the later 1850s, subsequently celebrating their achievements in annual mass processions of increasing scope and sophistication. Scalmer recovers the elaborate form of this memory politics and argues for its import to successful industrial mobilization, as other sections of the workforce also sought to win this key demand. He suggests that the annual processions served to assert publicly the value of the eight-hour standard, to draw attention to the (increasing) number of beneficiaries, to demonstrate the strength of the movement, to establish the worthiness and skills of Australian workers, to promote their unity, and to convey to labour's supporters the value of ongoing political and industrial struggle. His chapter also considers the place of generations in the memory of the eight-hour struggle, as a self-identified generation of 'eight-hour pioneers', sought to win greater recognition with the movement, and to imprint their achievements on Australian public culture.

Stefan Berger, in his chapter on the memory of the German trade union movement, provides an overview of the role that memory played as a resource for the trade unions from Imperial Germany to the present day. He argues that memory played an important role for the identity and self-assurance of the union movement in Germany until the 1970s. In Imperial Germany it was tied to the memorialization of struggles and of persecution, but with the clear perspective that ultimately victory would be theirs. In Weimar they celebrated the move of reformist trade unionism to the centre of German society – with important laws recognizing trade unions and giving them a say over social and industrial policy. After the disastrous National Socialist years, the memory of ideological divisions of trade unionism led to the formation, for the first time in German history, of a united free trade union movement in West Germany. Up until the 1970s the memory of important struggles and victories as well as defeats served as inspiration for the movement to continue on its path to improve the situation of their members and ensure better working and living conditions. However, with the economic crisis of the 1970s and the erosion of the prospects for further advances as well as the attacks on trade unionism itself, the future suddenly began to look much less bright and trade unions, focussing on defending themselves, hardly referred to memory as a resource anymore – a situation that played in the hands of its adversaries, as Berger argues.

The penultimate chapter in this volume sticks with Germany but looks at the long-term changes to German memory politics vis-à-vis its National Socialist past. It highlights the importance of organized memory activism in sustaining momentum behind the agenda of changing the paradigm of how to remember German fascism. In other words – social movements from the heart of civil society were key to long-term changes in German memory culture. However, Jenny Wüstenberg also highlights what she calls, with Aristide Zolberg, 'moments of madness', that is, specific 'impact events' (Anne Fuchs), which crystallize change and have a major transformative quality with regard to memory regimes. The dialectic between longer-term movement activities and event-based changes leads her to discuss different temporalities, which account for changes in memory paradigms brought about by memory activism.

Fitzhugh Brundage also considers long-term memory politics in a magisterial examination of the contest over history, memory and slavery in the South of the US. Placing contemporary struggles over monuments – such as the events in Charlottesville in 2017 – in a longer historical context, Brundage surveys the struggle over the Southern past from the aftermath of the Civil War until the present. In a three-step analysis, he first traces the efforts of white southerners – white clerics, Confederate veterans, white southern women – to sacralize the Civil War and to celebrate Confederate heroism and sacrifice, further establishing how this shaped the public spaces of the South and the character of its civic life. Brundage then considers the efforts of black southerners to remember and to promote black history, through the celebration of notable holidays, public processions, and especially through work within black public schools and colleges. Finally, he traces a white counter-mobilization that gathered strength from the 1980s, acting as a defender of Confederate 'heritage', and winning the increasing support of the Republican party and its elected officials. Brundage's contribution showcases the process of contentious struggle over 'memory', as well as the special value of an historical perspective on contemporary forms of memory activism.

In a stimulating epilogue, Ann Rigney – an eminent figure in memory studies – offers a rich commentary on the papers that also raises questions for further research. Overall, the chapters in this volume should be read as case studies highlighting how fruitful the bringing together of social movement studies and memory studies can be in a diversity of different ways. Methodologically, they show how a wide range of written, oral and visual material, ranging from written documents in state archives, reports by government commissions, legal documents, newspaper and other media coverage, interviews, ego-documents, such as autobiography, social movement archives, museums, monuments, as well as songs, film and television can all be used very effectively to explore the interrelationships between memory and social movements. Memory clearly had a huge role to play in the formation and endurance of social movements, and inversely, social movements made active use of memory politics in order to achieve their goals and ambitions. Examining the relationship between social movements and memory further in years to come will surely yield rich results.

Notes

1 Carol Gluck, 'Operations of Memory: 'Comfort Women' and the World,' in *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory, and the Post-Cold War in Asia*, eds. Sheila Miyoshi Jager, and Rana Mitter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 47–77, here: 57; good examples of studies on memory activism are Jenny Wüstenberg, *Civil Society and Memory in Post-War Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); and Yifat Gutman, *Memory Activism: Reimagining the Past for the Future in Israel/Palestine* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2017).

2 Alexander Etkind, *Warped Mourning: Stories of the Undead in the Land of the Unburied* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013), Chapter 9.

3 Erik Neveu, 'Memory Battles over May 68,' in *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research*, eds. Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ulrich (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 275–299, here: 277, 295.

4 As noted in: Timothy Kubal and Rene Becerra, 'Social Movements and Collective Memory,' *Sociology Compass* 8, no. 6 (2014): 865; Frederick C. Harris, 'It Takes a Tragedy to Arouse Them: Collective Memory and Collective Action during the Civil Rights Movement,' *Social Movement Studies* 5, no. 1 (2006): 19–43, here: 19.

5 Pierre Nora, *Les Lieux de Mémoire* (7 vols.) (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–92).

6 Most notably, a shift from what Hobsbawm called 'primitive' rebellions to the modern social movements (Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959)) and what Rudé called a transformation from 'pre-industrial' to 'industrial' collective action (George Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England 1730–1848* (New York: Wiley, 1964)). The most influential study of all was unquestionably: E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963).

7 Sidney Tarrow, *The Language of Contention: Revolutions in Words, 1688–2012* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Charles Tilly, *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650–2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Craig Calhoun, *The Roots of Radicalism: Tradition, the Public Sphere and Early Nineteenth-Century Social Movements* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

8 Alain Tourraine, *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Alberto Melucci, *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1989).

9 Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow, *Contentious Politics* (2nd rev. edn.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds., *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

10 Nicole Doerr, 'Memory and Culture in Social Movements,' in *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research*, eds. Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ullrich (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 206–226.

11 As has been pointed out by several contributions to Antimo L. Farro and Henri Lustiger-Thaler, eds., *Reimagining Social Movements. From Collectives to Individuals* (Avebury: Ashgate, 2014), especially those in Part 1 entitled 'Subjectivity, Memory and Collective Action,' 15–118.

12 Ron Eyerman, 'Social Movements and Memory,' in *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*, eds. Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen (London: Routledge, 2015), 79–83.

13 Lorenzo Zamponi, *Social Movements, Memory and Media: Narrative in Action in the Italian and Spanish Student Movements* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2019). On the interrelationship between digital media, cultural memory and social movements, see also Samuel Merrill, Emily Keightley and Priska Daphi, eds., *Social Movements,*

Cultural Memory and Digital Media. Mobilising Mediated Remembrance (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2020).

14 Priska Daphi, *Becoming a Movement. Identity, Narrative and Memory in the European Global Justice Movement* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017).

15 Priska Daphi and Lorenzo Zamponi, eds., *Movements and Memory*, special issue on memory and social movements of *Mobilization* 24, no. 4 (2019): 399–524.

16 Donatella della Porta and Massimiliano Andretta, *Tiago Fernandes, Eduardo Romanos and Markos Vogiatzoglou, Legacies and Memories in Movements: Justice and Democracy in Southern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

17 Lara Leigh Kelland, *Clio's Foot Soldiers: Twentieth-Century US Social Movements and Collective Memory* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2018).

18 Luca Manucci, *Populism and Collective Memory: Comparing Fascist Legacies in Western Europe* (London: Routledge, 2020).

19 See online, https://rememberingactivism.eu/ (accessed 19 April 2020). See also Ann Rigney, 'Remembering Hope: Transnational Activism beyond the Traumatic,' *Memory Studies* 11, no. 3 (2018): 368–380.

20 See footnote 1.

21 This is most evident in the work of Alain Touraine, as he emphasizes in: Alain Touraine, 'The Importance of Social Movements,' *Social Movement Studies* 1, no.1 (2002): 89–95, here: 89.

22 Bruno Latour, *Re-assembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). For examples of its application to social movement studies, see the special issue of *Social Movement Studies* 17, no. 3, 'Reassembling Activism, Activating Assemblages' (2018). For Bourdieu: Neil Fligstein and Doug McAdam, *A Theory of Fields* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); John Michael Roberts, 'Expressive Free Speech, the State and the Public Sphere, A Bakhtinian-Deluezian Analysis of 'Public Speech' at Hyde Park,' *Social Movement Studies* 7, no. 2 (2008): 101–119. On Lefebvre's rhythmanalysis, see Samuel Merrill and Simon Lindgreen, 'The Rhythms of Social Movement Memories: The Mobilization of Silvio Meier's Activist Remembrance across Platforms,' *Social Movement Studies* (2018), doi: 10.1080/14742837.2018.1534680.

23 Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1952), originally published in *Les Travaux de L'Année Sociologique* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1925).

24 For the broader transformation of the discipline, and the increasing hegemony of operationalized social science, based on social surveys, see Andrew Abbott's fascinating history of the *American Journal of Sociology* and the Chicago Sociology Department, *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999), especially 78, 82, 173–175. On the import of the computer to the rise of quantitative approaches in sociology, and especially social movement studies, see: John T. Crist and John D. McCarthy, ''If I Had a Hammer': The Changing Methodological Repertoire of Collective Behavior and Social Movements Research,' *Mobilization* 1, no. 1 (1996): 88–92.

25 On grounded theory, see, for example: B.G. Glaser and A.L. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Chicago, IL: Aldine, 1967). Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory* (Los Angeles, CA and London: SAGE, 2007).

26 Paula Hamilton and Lynda Shopes, eds., *Oral History and Public Memories* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2008); see also: Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (2nd edn) (London: Routledge, 2016).

27 'Opening Statement,' *Social Movement Studies* 1, no. 1 (2002): 5.

28 Note, for example, that of the four 'most read' articles published in *Social Movement Studies*, as assessed in February 2018, were two studies of 'Occupy' (Jenny Pickerill and John Krinsky, 'Why Does Occupy Matter?' *Social Movement Studies* 11, no. 3–4 (2012): 279–287; Sasha Costanza-Chock, 'Mic Check! Media Cultures and the

Occupy Movement,' *Social Movement Studies* 11, no. 3–4 (2012): 375–385); a third a study of alternative lifestyle movements (Ross Haenfler, Brett Johnson, and Ellis Jones, 'Lifestyle Movements: Exploring the Intersection of Lifestyle and Social Movements,' *Social Movment Studies* 11, no. 1 (2012): 1–20); and a fourth a study of 'prefiguration' in social movements that draws upon the alter-globalization movement in Barcelona (Luke Yates, 'Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics, and Goals in Social Movements,' *Social Movement Studies* 14, no. 1 (2015): 1–21).

29 For examples of a shifting of theoretical investment in 'global movements' as successors to 'new social movements', see: Michel Wieviorka, 'After New Social Movements,' *Social Movement Studies* 4, no. 1 (2005): 1–19; Kevin McDonald, *Global Movements: Action and Culture* (Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 2006).

30 Laurajane Smith's book *Uses of Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2006) has been influential in that regard, distinguishing between authorized and non-authorized articulations of heritage. Heritage activism has also been explored in the context of de-industrialization, see, for example, Ilinca Păun Constantinescu, Dragoş Dascălu, and Cristina Sucală, 'An Activist Perspective on Industrial Heritage in Petrila, a Romanian Mining City,' in *The Public Historian* 39, no. 4 (special issue Deindustrialization, Heritage and Representations of Identity, edited by Christian Wicke, Stefan Berger, and Jana Golombek): 114–141. For recent work directly on activism over cultural heritage, see, for example, Tod Jones (eds.). *Heritage Movements in Asia: Cultural Heritage Activism, Politics, and Identity* (New York: Berghahn: 2019), K. Fouseki and M. Shehade, 'Heritage Activism and Cultural Rights: The Case of the New Acropolis Museum,' in *Heritage in Action*, eds. H. Silverman, E. Waterton, and S. Watson (Cham: Springer, 2017); Sarah De Nardi. 'Everyday Heritage Activism in Swat Valley: Ethnographic Reflections on a Politics of Hope,' *Heritage & Society* 10, no. 3 (2017): 237–258.

31 https://www.memorystudiesassociation.org/madrid-conference-2019-info-program/ [accessed 15 June 2019]

32 Endless variants of Nora's project on France have been published in the meantime and there is hardly a nation left that has not produced its variants of national realms of memory. For a review of the enormous success of the concept of 'realms of memory', see Stefan Berger and Joanna Seiffert, eds., *Erinnerungsorte: Chance, Grenzen und Perspektiven eines Erfolgskonzepts in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Essen: Klartext, 2014).

33 On war see, for example, Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975); Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory: Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); on genocide compare, for example, Jutta Lindert and Armen T. Maarsobian, eds., *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Memory and Genocide* (London: Springer, 2018).

34 Christian Wicke and Ben Wellings, 'History Wars in Germany and Australia: National Museums and the Relegitimisation of Nationhood,' in *The Palgrave Handbook of State-Sponsored History after 1945*, eds. Berber Bervernage and Nico Wouters (Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 431–445.

35 Jeffrey Alexander, 'Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma,' in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 1–30. Wulf Kansteiner. 'Genealogy of a Category Mistake: A Critical Intellectual History of the Cultural Trauma Metaphor,' *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice* 8, no. 2 (2004): 193–221. See also Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). The growing attention to trauma is noted in a recent survey: Kate Darian-Smith and Paula Hamilton, 'Memory and History in Twenty-first Century Australia: A Survey of the Field,' *Memory Studies* 6, no. 3 (2013): 375.

36 The strong affinity of memory studies to traumatic events such as war and genocide has also been noted by Paula Hamilton, 'The Knife Edge: Debates about Memory and History,' in *Memory and History in Twentieth Century Australia*, eds. Kate Darian-Smith and Paula Hamilton (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994), 16.

37 Melissa Nobles, *The Politics of Official Apologies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
38 Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977). See also: Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, 'Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices,' *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998): 108, 126; James Mark, *The Unfinished Revolution: Making Sense of the Communist Past in Central-eastern Europe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), xxii.
39 Ernest Renan, *Ou'est-ce qu'une nation? [Lecture at Sorbonne, 11 March 1882] in Discours et Conferences* (Paris: Caiman-Levy, 1887), 277–310; Paul Ricoer, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
40 Marcel van der Linden, Walking Fish: How Conservative Behaviour Generates and Processes Radical Change (Valedictory Lecture, University of Amsterdam, 27 October 2017. Published in Newsletter International Social History Association 6, no. 1 (2018): 9–14.
41 Kurt Forster, 'Aby Warburg's History of Art: Collective Memory and the Social Mediation of Images,' *Daedalus* 105, no. 1 (1976): 169–176.
42 Andreas Huyssen, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia* (London: Routledge, 1995), 2 f.
43 Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Anchor Books, 1966).
44 Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Arts of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
45 See, for example, Elizabeth Jelin, *State Repression and the Labor of Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Richard A. Wilson, *The Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: Legitimizing the Post-apartheid State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
46 Guy Beiner, *Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
47 Janet Polasky, *Revolutions without Borders* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2015), 25–27.
48 Maarten Prak, *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World, c. 1000–1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 44–45.
49 Joep Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).
50 Robert Gildea, James Mark and Annette Warring, eds., *Europe's 1968: Voices of Revolt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); see also Ingo Cornlis and Sarah Waters, eds., *Memories of 1968: International Perspectives* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010).
51 Renee C. Romano and Leigh Raiford, eds., *The Civil Rights Movement in American Memory* (Athens and Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 2006).
52 Andrea Hajek, *Negotiating Memory of Protest in Western Europe: The Case of Italy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013). One of the most canonical works in the field of memory studies unpacks the various ways in which the death of an Italian Communist has been remembered: Alessandro Portelli, *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).
53 Berber Bevernage, *History, Memory and State-Sponsored Violence. Time and Justice* (London: Routledge, 2012).
54 Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney, eds., *Mediation, Remediation and the Dynamics of Cultural Memories* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009).
55 Christian Wicke, Stefan Berger, and Jana Golombek, eds., *Industrial Heritage and Regional Identities* (London: Routledge, 2018).
56 https://petapixel.com/2017/01/21/artist-shames-disrespectful-holocaust-memorial-tourists-using-photoshop/ [accessed 15 June 2019]

57 Richard Vinen, *The Long '68: Radical Protest and Its Enemies* (London: Allen Lane, 2018), quotes on 7 and 11.
58 Charles Tilly, 'Getting it Together in Burgundy, 1675–1975,' *Theory and Society* 4, no. 4 (1977): 479–504.
59 Charles Tilly, *Regimes and Repertoires* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 35.
60 Tilly sometimes called it the 'social movement repertoire'. For example, Charles Tilly, *Social Movements, 1768–2004* (Boulder, CO and London: Paradigm Publishers, 2004), 31. His major works on the repertoire include: Charles Tilly, *The Contentious French: Four Centuries of Popular Struggle* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986); Charles Tilly, *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Tilly, *Regimes and Repertoires*; Charles Tilly, *Contentious Performances* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
61 Tilly, *Contentious Performances*, 45.
62 Sean Scalmer, *Gandhi in the West: The Mahatma and the Rise of Radical Protest* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Sean Chabot, 'Transnational Diffusion and the African American Reinvention of the Gandhian Repertoire,' *Mobilization* 5, no. 2 (2000): 201–216.
63 Michael Biggs, 'How Repertoires Evolve: The Diffusion of Suicide Protest in the Twentieth Century,' *Mobilization* 18, no. 4 (2013): 407–428.
64 Jeroen Van Laer and Peter Van Aelst, 'Internet and Social Movement Action Repertoires: Opportunities and limitations,' *Information, Communication and Society* 13 (2010): 1146–1171.
65 Graham St John, 'Protestival: Global Days of Action and Carnivalized Politics in the Present,' *Social Movement Studies* 7, no. 2 (2008): 167–190.
66 Daniel J. Sherman, 'Disruption or Convention? A Process-based Explanation of Divergent Repertoires of Contention among Opponents to Low-level Radioactive Waste Disposal Sites,' *Social Movement Studies* 7, no. 3 (2008): 265–280.
67 Theresa Ann Hunt, 'A Movement Divided: SlutWalks, Protest Repertoires and the Privilege of Nudity,' *Social Movement Studies* 17, no. 5 (2018): 541–557.
68 Lee A. Smithey and Michael P. Young, 'Parading Protest: Orange Parades in Northern Ireland and Temperance Parades in Antebellum America,' *Social Movement Studies* 9, no. 4 (2010): 393–410.
69 A point made in Biggs, 'How Repertoires Evolve, 407.
70 See especially: James M. Jasper and Jan Willem Duyvendak, eds., *Players and Arenas: The Interactive Dynamics of Protest* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015). Jasper notes (approvingly) the move to 'micro' studies in his introductory chapter to that volume, 'Introduction: Playing the Game,' 9–10. The strategic approach has especially been advanced by James Jasper in works such as: 'A Strategic Approach to Collective Action: Looking for Agency in Social-Movement Choices,' *Mobilization* 9 (2004): 1–16 and *Getting Your Way: Strategic Dilemmas in the Real World* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006).
71 Ruth Cardoso, 'Building Senses of "Community": Social Memory, Popular Movements, and Political Participation,' *Vibrant: Virtual Brazilian Anthropology* 10, no. 1 (2013), https://doi.org/10.1590/S1809-43412013000100006**,** [accessed 2 June 2020].
72 Raluca Abăseacă, 'Collective Memory and Social Movements in Times of Crisis: The Case of Romania,' *Nationalities Papers* 46, no. 4 (2018): 671–684.
73 Kubal and Becerra, 'Social Movements and Collective Memory,' 865–875.
74 Ann Rigney, 'Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory,' *Journal of European Studies* 35, no. 1 (2005): 11–28, here: 16.
75 Within the field of 'memory studies' this is most influentially put in Michael Rothberg's emphasis on 'multi-directional memory' and the borrowing of memories and

strategies between groups. See: Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonisation* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).

76 Charles Tilly, 'Event Catalogs as Theories,' *Sociological Theory* 20, no. 2 (2002): 248–254.

77 See, for example: William H. Sewell, Jr., 'Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille,' *Theory and Society* 25 (1996): 841–881; Doug McAdam and William H. Sewell Jr., 'It's About Time: Temporality in the Study of Social Movements and Revolutions,' in *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, ed. Ronald R. Aminzade, et al. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

78 Sewell, 'Historical events,' 844.

79 Ibid., 844.

80 Ibid., 861, 871.

81 Ibid., 861, 865, 867–868.

82 Ibid., 859.

83 Ibid., 852–853.

84 This relatively exclusive interest in the 'ongoing interpretation of events' is also evident in the otherwise insightful discussion advanced in McAdam and Sewell, 'It's About Time,' 118.

85 Etkind, *Warped Mourning*, Chapter 9.

86 Anne Fuchs, *After the Dresden Bombing: Pathways of Memory 1945 to the Present* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 10.

87 Helmut Schelsky, *Die Skeptische Generation: Soziologie der deutschen Jugend* (Dusseldorf and Cologne: Diederichs, 1957); Dirk Moses, *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

88 Christoph H. Schwarz, 'Collective Memory and Intergenerational Transmission in Social Movements: The "Grandparents' Movement" iaioflautas, the indignados Protests, and the Spanish Transition,' *Memory Studies*, published online 19 June 2019, https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698019856058.

89 Kimberly A. Longfellow, 'Social Movements and Memory: Education, Age and the Memories of the Women's Movement,' *Gettysburg Social Sciences Review* 1, no. 1 (2017), https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/gssr/vol1/iss1/3 [accessed 2 June 2020].

90 Hélène le Dantec Lowrie and Ambre Ivol, eds., *Generations of Social Movements: The Left and Historical Memory in the USA and France* (London: Routledge, 2016).

91 Anna Wiemann, 'Making Memory by Disassociating the Past from the Present: Narratives of Movement Intellectuals of the Post-Fukushima Protest Cycle in Japan. Research Note,' *International Quarterly for Asian Studies* 50, no. 1–2 (2019): 157–169.

92 Karl Mannheim, 'The Problem of Generations,' in *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge: Collected Works* (Volume 5), ed. Paul Kecskemeti (New York: Routledge, 1952), 276–322. Originally published in German in 1928. The quote is on 286 f.

93 Lutz Niethammer, *Kollektive Identität: Heimliche Quellen einer unheimliche Konjunktur* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2000).

94 John R. Gillis, 'Identity and Memory: The History of a Relationship,' Introduction to *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 3–24; Jan Assmann, 'Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität,' in *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, eds. Jan Assmann and Tonio Hölscher (Frankfurt am Main 1988), 9–19.

95 Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White, eds., *Self, Identity and Social Movements* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000); David S. Meyer, Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robnett, eds., *Social Movements: Identity, Culture and the State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Jo Reger, Daniel J. Myers, and Rachel L. Einwohner, eds., *Identity Work in Social Movements* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

96 Christina Flesher Fominaya, 'Collective Identity in Social Movements: Central Concepts and Debates,' *Sociology Compass* 4 (2010): 393–404.
97 Dieter Rucht, Kollektive Identität: Konzeptionelle Überlegungen zum Desiderat in der Bewegungsforschung, *Forschungsjournal NSB* 8, no. 1 (1995): 9–23.
98 Alexander Kluge and Oskar Negt, *The Proletarian Public Sphere as a Historical Counterconcept to the Bourgeois Public Sphere* (London: Verso, 2016).
99 Bart van der Steen and Knut Andreesen, *A European Youth Revolt: European Perspectives on Youth Protest and Social Movements in the 1980s* (Basingtoke: Palgrave, 2016).
100 Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Suzanna M. Crage, 'Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth,' *American Sociological Review* 71, no. 5 (2006): 724–751.
101 Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
102 James Jasper, 'Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research,' *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 (2011): 285–303.
103 For example, Alex Sergeui Oushakine, 'Remembering the Public: On the Affective Management of History,' *Ab Imperio* 1 (2013): 269–302.
104 Ute Frevert, 'Comment: History of Emotions,' in *Debating New Approaches to History*, eds. Tamm and Burke (London and Oxford: Bloomsbury, 2018), 202–208; see also Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History: Lost and Found* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001); Ute Frevert, ed., *Emotional Lexicons. Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling, 1700 – 2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
105 William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling. A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 144 ff.
106 Deborah B. Gould, *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight against AIDS* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009).
107 Randall Collins, 'Social Movements and the Focus of Emotional Attention,' in *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*, eds. Jeff Goodwin, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001), Chapter 1.
108 Daniel Reisberg and Paul Hertel, eds., *Memory and Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
109 Tea Sindbæck Anderson and Barbara Törnquist Plewa, eds., *Disputed Memory: Emotions and Memory Politics in Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe* (Berlin: De-Gruyter, 2016).
110 Mihaela Mihai, *Negative Emotions and Transitional Justice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).
111 On human rights and memory compare Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, *Human Rights and Memory* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010).
112 Compare also Red Chidgey, *Feminist Afterlives: Assemblage Memory in Activist Times* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018), on how popular feminist memories have travelled through a diversity of media and institutions in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.
113 See also Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison, *Music and Social Movements. Mobilizing Traditions in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).