

**Professor Craig Calhoun**

***Social Movements and Social Change***

**Ralph Miliband Programme: movement, protest and social change**

**27 November 2012**

---

Well, thank you all for being here and let me begin by saying what an honour it is to be involved in the Ralph Miliband programme. Ralph Miliband was one of the great intellectuals of the middle and second half of the twentieth century, part of the sort of firmament of major figures as I was a postgraduate student and a young scholar entering my early work. It's quite extraordinary to have grown up into the old person who gets to give the Ralph Miliband lectures. So, this is a delight and let me plunge into it.

What I want to do is not so much tell you about my book, which is in a way about the 19th century, but about the way we think about radicalism and movements. Now, I'll touch on something from the book but I want to talk in a way that is in a sense overlapping the last part of the book, and thinking more generally about the issue of movements and how they matter in social change.

I'm going to guess that when we think about social movements that this is what we think of most of the time: we think of the range of different kinds of public events, and you're going to be able to guess where most of these places are, and be able to think about the people who were involved. You probably are some of the people who are involved in some of these and have a direct familiarity to a range of these. You've certainly seen it on television, you've certainly followed parts of this kind of activism. All of these are protest events and one of the things I want to speak about is the relationship but also distinction between protest events and social movements.

The most visible face of movements to most of us most of the time is those sorts of big, crowd-based protest events. They're part of a story but they're not all. They're ubiquitous right now. We're in an era where there are a lot of these and they're all over. I'm going to suggest, among other things, that that's not historically unique, that this is a recurrent pattern, and try to explore a little bit about how to think about movements in that sense.

In the series of pictures that I gave, which came from all of those cities, note how strongly students and young people, mainly white, in big cities, shape those pictures. I should think that sort of naturally a picture of social movements around us. But there are really different ones. The workers striking at the Lonmin Platinum Mine outside of Johannesburg are a different picture of movement activity, fit into different kinds of narratives and not quite the same stereotype in various ways.

The protest movements of our period are interesting in a lot of fronts. One of them is that they involve innovative tactics in protest and a variety of ways in which protest movements produce visual images, grasp people's memories, engage in efforts to keep competing with each other for attention and for media and all of

these. They keep coming up with tactics. My personal favourite of the recent ones is the kissing in Chile, the idea of protest that will just aggravate people to death by kissing in the streets, and making this part of a broadly student protest originally occasioned by sort of neoliberal reforms in universities and a few structures but with a broader remit and so forth.

Among the points that can be made here is that one of the ways in which we can read movements wrongly is to read them completely instrumentally, to read them as though they are only about tactical efforts to achieve certain sorts of political or economic or other objectives, and miss the extent to which they can be fun. Social scientists contribute to that. I've contributed to that myself by using phrases like social selective in sentences to describe what we really mean when we say movements can be fun, that is, it's nice to be with other people out doing these things.

That itself is among the first lessons I learned about social movements during the brief period at the end of the 1960s when I was part of the SDS and had to wrestle with my conscience because I knew that this was partly a deep political commitment and partly that the protests were the best place to meet girls. Some of the same kinds of people turn up everywhere in movements and have an interesting, symbolic place in it.

This guy, for example, Guy Fawkes, is a recurrent character who shows up and reveals to us some of the sort of symbolic politics of the movements. An interesting historical analogy that is probably potentially more potent in Britain, but these pictures were from different countries where Guy Fawkes appeared. Here's a guy, an older guy who also has been a ubiquitous figure in social movements up here in this case in North Africa.

The Che Guevarra stencils, the Guy Fawkes masks, all of these things have various sorts of meanings. In these cases, they're pretty transportable symbols. One of the things they clue us into is the global fluid character of these movements. These movements also have more local sides. Notice the national connection to Che in this particular setting, and the extent to which I think you can't interpret the movements of the Arab Spring as simply sort of tokens of a global type.

They are very situated movements, they are national, they're even national in the sense to which one of the features of the Egyptian version of the Arab Spring was how could those Tunisians do it first? We're Egyptians, where is our national pride? We should be out protesting. We should be leading the way in this sort of action. Movements have a national and an international character, sometimes in terms of the local character, there are symbolic forms that circulate in these movements and they help to clue us in to some of the meanings and in modern forms, but I will suggest very briefly, throughout modern history of social movements, they're very visual.

One of the things that we miss about movements with the more or less completely instrumental accounts is the extent to which movements work with visual symbolism and iconography and how throughout modern history. That's not my main theme tonight, but it's sort of worthwhile noting, and it's not just from the era of TV.

Protests do manifestly play the global media and they are shaped by global media in their response to global media in various ways. We can get any number of versions of this. They have in common with many treatments of visual phenomena that there are titles, that is, there's a framing process. It's just like going to a museum, looking at a Kandinsky painting and then looking at the title and saying, "Oh, that's what it was." Here you're told people from all walks of life are protesting regardless of age, gender or religion, that's a message net of the photograph, the visual imagery here. And Al Jazeera's account of Tahrir Square on what's going on.

There are other versions of playing the media and they encourage various responses from the international media. In the case of the Arab Spring, it encouraged a response in much of the world that made this seem more interpretable in completely western or global northern categories missing some of what was going on. It made it look like it was all about us. It was actually reassuring to a variety of people in Europe and the United States to think that this was a Facebook revolution. It was made possible by our technology, our software.

We actually are doing it and they are on the path of progress that we want them to be on, which was actually a misleading interpretation in many ways, misleading in the first place about where the agency was. Who was making this protest and to what extent with their own understandings in mind? But also misleading about this sort of simple, progressive understanding of this. Police are actually important actors in movements. Police have then colluders in movements in significant ways. Usually inadvertent, I think, but so often that it's not clear to me that it's always inadvertent in this that police will help protesters win sympathy.

This is an Occupy Wall Street protest as police action lends itself to the photograph, lends itself to certain accounts, is played into other narratives. This is not Wall Street. This is the University of California at Davis. That is a university setting where these students who are sitting down are being sprayed with mace by a sort of gratuitously aggressive police officer on the orders of the chancellor of the University of California at Davis to get rid of the students.

There are a variety of bits to the story and, believe it or not, all of these are just meant to be introduction to a slightly or densely argued account of this. One of them is that protests depend on spaces, relatively free spaces in which to do things. The very visible protests actually depends on public squares, depends on university campuses which are not as intensively policed in many ways, usually. This is an exception. It depends on an opportunity to seize these free public spaces and repurpose them in the course of protest. Where these are eliminated or eroded or made subject to new kinds of surveillance as indeed in London, this becomes an issue for the future of protest.

Another part of the story is that the protests that evolve, evolve in a sort of co-dependent relationship to the authorities who are being protested in various ways. They're never explicable entirely from inside; they're always in a back and forth, an interactive relationship with those being protested or the forces of order who are trying to police the protests and so forth.

Not least in the sort of introductory little quick tour to just evoke protests and get it in mind, we should remember that protests are not always on the left. There are a variety of different protests. One of the issues for the academic study of social movements and contentious politics is that academics are very over selective for movements that they like. They tend not to select as much from movements they don't like. So, not as much for the Tea Party, for Nationalist China, for people who are engaged in active protest, not for these folks in British politics. That the academic study of social movements is written by people sympathetic to social movements and just proportionately to certain sorts of social movements, and this shapes what's going on.

Studies of protests are skewed then, and they're skewed by what the researchers like. Now let me begin into the argument, having introduced visually a bunch of stuff, a little bit more of a set of claims that wouldn't be simply familiarisation. And the first one is, the question form, is a protest movement. I mean by that, as you would guess from the rhetorical question, that it's not. It's not obvious that a protest should be called a movement, we tend to do that. It's not obvious how to think about protests.

Is this protest, for example, part of a movement? What movement? It's mainly a protest occasioned by the government cuts, a big one. It's partly Free Gaza, it's a variety of different things. How do we think about that? I'm going to go try just in a very superficial way, untangle a little bit of that. But the punch line is, simply, it is typically the case that protests now are multi vocal, that they have multiple messages interacting. Sometimes, they are clear alliance structures, several different groups get together and lots of major modern protests that go on today are made by multiple different groups.

It's actually rarer to find a protest that has a single sponsor. There are, you'll see protests or others that have a major group but almost always behind these are in fact lots of collaborating groups. It's very difficult to contain the message because there are people who want to get out there other message. This is actually organised by people with one message. People with a sort of turquoise signs and then there are the No-cuts message.

This is a No-cuts protest. There are simply people who are piggy-backing on the No-cuts protest with a variety of other issues. That's the norm; that's not an exception in modern protests. It's just the way it works. I want to stress that that's actually what we'll do, too. Again, a movement, this is taken outside my former apartment in New York. I felt that this was a protest that I immediately identified with until it occurred

to me that I was probably the target of this protest. It's actually an off shoot of Occupy, it's why Occupy came up to Washington Square.

Now, the idea of a social movement is incompletely linked up with protest. We speak sometimes interchangeably, or sometimes we make protest into an adjective, a protest movement. But I think this is complicated. The idea that social movement should communicate to us something more than protest, something more than mobilisation, opposition, challenge. Lots of academic sociology and political science of social movements in recent years has assimilated them to contentious politics. This is a form of contentious politics. I'm going to touch on that and suggest yes.

But more than that, partly because it was fun. Partly because I could be doing ubiquitous sound tracks. This is more than politics; there's other things going on, culturally and effectively, in movements. Partly this is more than strategic, instrumental action. It gains its effect and its impact from being more than simply strategic, instrumental action.

A lot of the literature is focused, if you will, on how to. That is, how did people get mobilised? How did messages get out? How did all of those people get those turquoise signs? And so forth and so on. There's a whole literature that is basically interested in the mechanics. It assumes that people are normally going about their business, that it's unusual to protest in some sense, and therefore that the explanatory puzzle is how do they get going? There are other explanatory puzzles. I'll have to say that already from my tangential experience in the 1960s which I alluded to before, that the puzzle that it left me with was where did it go when it vanished?

That is, my experience of this was not of the people who made the 1960s movements, who went to university several years earlier than I did, who helped this grow, who are part of the early years of the SDS, the Port Huron statement, the building of the new left, Britain or in the US. And saw something grow, and grow beyond their initial imaginings and beyond their ability to control it, exciting at first, worrying sometimes. But then it was the experience of someone who grew up with that. I started university in 1969 and fairly quickly, this peaked and then it began to fade. It wasn't clear at that time what that meant but it left a sort of enduring puzzle.

How could something seem to be so big, moving everybody, moving people deeply, capturing their emotions, generating their commitment and then, fade away so quickly. This happens recurrently. The main book that I wrote about protest movement is about the Tiananmen Square Movement in China in 1989, the same sort of story. There's a thrill of the coming about of this. It's going to echo some other themes because there are earlier precursors and so forth, but there's a thrill for the people who plotted to have a little bit of a protest and found it taking root beyond what they expected. "Well, we'll go out on April 15th and we will do something for a day. Well, maybe two days. Maybe we could do something again on May 4th." It's a famous holiday and an anniversary, and it takes off, though it becomes scary. By the end of it, most of the original protagonists are gone.

It takes on other meanings and other identities in reaction to the authorities in relation to the TV cameras in a variety of other settings. It also disappears. The enduring impact of the Tiananmen Square Protest may yet turn out to be bringing democracy to China in the long term. The most substantial enduring impact, so far, is helping to motivate the government around 1992 to decide to loosen credit and in other ways, create the institutional conditions for the dramatic economic take-off that has made Communist China the world's fastest growing capitalist country.

That a large part of that turn to decide it was worth taking the risks of making credit easy, of opening up the possibilities of joint venture companies, of breaking down all the constraints on labour policies and on the ties between residential units and work places and so forth. Taking those risks seem worthwhile when the alternative looked like very challenging political protests. The impact of the protest movement is a different kind of movement. A movement of social change with a different course.

What I want to suggest is the way to understand protest movements and all social movements is to situate them in relationship to social change and the very idea of participating in society. And the distinctiveness of a sort of participatory society model that is a model in which you think of ordinary people having the chance to participate including by going out and protests, the chance to shape their history. But of course, always the challenge that history tends to go places that are not fully anticipated even by its protagonists. Protests are only one aspect of social movements, moreover. They are literally demonstrations, manifestations, as this word suggests.

Charles Tilly, a great scholar of social movements, called them WUNC displays, not a very elegant term. What did he mean by this? A part of what's going on with every one of these manifestations, these demonstrations, is public as a demonstration of the group's worthiness. One of the things you'll see, you saw it in Tahrir Square, you saw it in 1989 in Tiananmen Square is the group performing rituals of orderliness. Cleaning up Tahrir Square after the protests, arranging tent encampments in rows or circles that were well-formed so that it showed a capacity of the people who were mobilised to be orderly, to be well-organised, to organise themselves. It's a kind of demonstration: we don't need the government to enable us to be orderly; we can do that for ourselves. We're worthy of the opportunity to make our own future. Unity is demonstrated.

It's part of the thrill of being in a big protest, losing yourself in a crowd, feeling emotionally the connections to other people who are there. But it's also a communicative demonstration, the very numbers since protests are staged by people who generally aren't inside the closed doors of the real, on the centres of power. The primary way of claiming power is to claim a broader constituency and commitment. We'll back and back again and again. We'll be in Tahrir Square every day until the regime falls. So, it's a display, it's performance, and it's very important in the life of movements and not all of it.

Protests are relatively ephemeral events. Even the big and well, the enduring ones, are ephemeral events. They require a lot more organisation than sometimes thought, so there's sometimes a naïve notion of the spontaneous protest as EP Thompson, argued long ago.

A food riot takes a lot of organisation. It's hardly ever the case that major protest events simply happens spontaneously. There's planning, there's organisation, people prepare the leaflets, people make the alliance structures with various movements to get everybody to turn out. They plan the event, they circulate the event. It can be done on Facebook. It can be done on paper. It can be done face-to-face. There's an organisational infrastructure.

One of the things that was impressive in 1989 in China is the extent to which that organisational infrastructure was the pre-existing social relations and organisational structure of students. It was there classes in the university. We are the second year students of Japanese. We are the third year economic students. We are the post graduate law students. People marched in contingents like that, and it's very much like trade union marches, if you see them which are very seldom, historically. There are more now. But now, they are sort of often, lots of people who just come by from different parts of London get there and they protest.

Historically, trade union marches were almost always organised by different union groups and different locales carrying the banners of where they came from. Demonstrating, among other things, that orderliness and that organisation. But also the extent to which the non-protest, part of their lives, gave structuring capacity to the protests that were being staged. They were pageants in an important way, that depended a lot of organisation.

Our key question for movements is how well can they knit together protests and other kinds of activities, other sorts of elements over the longer term in order to produce social change? Protest by itself almost never produces major social change. That doesn't mean movements don't. But the protest has to be coupled with other things.

For the remainder of this talk, I have five points which I'll foreshadow, among other things. In case we'll run out of time, you'll know where I was headed. Movements have multiple time scales. Movements are not just ephemeral events. They have multiple time scales. Movement activism comes in waves, and it comes in waves not just within movements but across movements in general in societies. What happens between waves is crucial.

The illusion of the protest movements, and all those pictures I showed at the beginning, that some of the illusion for many ordinary participants is that this all happens very suddenly, and is not very connected to previous histories. In fact, movements typically are in wave structures and between the waves, lots of work is done. What makes possible each phase of the movement is in large part work that was done when the movement wasn't very visible, in between. This is key activist

work. This is where relatively dedicated activists keep movements and memory alive between the moments of high activity.

I could put this another way in Gramsci's terms, remember Gramsci's distinction of the War of Manoeuvre and the War of Position. There is a hell of a lot more War of Position than War of Manoeuvre that is much more time is spent in that position. Fourth, or third rather. Waves have long been international. What we saw in the last couple of years, my picture's documented, is actually common to modern movements. It becomes true, they're more and more international, but they've been international for a long time. This is not all new.

Fourth, movements seldom win immediate victories. We pretty much said that but they do shape history. Fifth, movements are basic to participatory society. They are a normal part of participatory society, not an abnormal thing to be explained as that. They are basic in ways that often influence state policy but often work outside of the state through culture in the public sphere.

By multiple time scales, as I've said, events can mislead us because they look more spontaneous. They are campaigns, for want of a better word. They are putting together a whole phase of this, a year of activity, two years of activity and so forth. These are almost always the product of social movement organisations. It's almost impossible to carry out a campaign, a concerted action for a period of time without strong organisational infrastructures which means that you have leaders increasing in the modern day. You have more or less professional leaders. That is, you have people whose jobs it is to do this work.

People work for purpose which just opened its London office or a variety of other organisations of this kind. There's a directed role in this, and that goes way back. It goes back to the whole history of the trade union movement, socialism and so forth. There are longer histories like those with recurrent faces of intense activism, trade unions, socialism which also have this pattern.

What happens in the spaces between the campaigns is key to the long term impact. Part of what can happen is fading away, a failure to reproduce from face to face. The real action for the movements that have an enduring impact is the ability to reproduce between the periods of high activism. Part of what happens is in fact social science research which helps to keep the movements alive, advance the tactics, deepen the understanding.

When does Marx, as it were, retreat into the British Museum reading room in order to do the work that culminates in writing capital and changes social science after the defeats of 1848. Marx retreats. Marx feels the space between movements with an intense period of deepened study in 1848- 1871, basically.

Or again, what are the Sidney and Beatrice Webb up to in founding the London School of Economics? Among other things, they are up to establishing some of the



staying power that keeps movements moving between the periods when there are big popular efflorescences.

If movements were only protests, it would win or lose in the moment of high activism. But in fact, movements are histories. The histories are made in part by the way in which there's continuing work on issues, in which there is training for new people, in which there is memory, in which the very memory of the movement that has gone before is passed onto new generations. Then, of course, the Webbs are also in the business of participating in the movement in a different way. Not centred on protest, but centred on building the state and building capacity in the state to be able to do the work of building a different kind of society.

We should not confuse any one protest with a movement as suggested. So, for example, we could speak of any anti-war protest, a protest against the invasion of Iraq, for example, any sort of anti-war protest as an event. Something like the campaign for nuclear disarmament, which basically took off in the late 1950s in a fairly short archaic campaign from 1958-61 that was active, memorable. I was a child but many of you will remember it. The Ban the Bomb movement, in the first period of this. The Committee of 100 in Britain. The resurgence of this campaign in 1979, the early 1980s appeared when EP Thompson became a central figure. The anti-nuclear weapons campaign and the Women of Greenham Common in a way fused feminist activism and peace activism making a central moment in the movement. So, all that sort of campaign.

There's a much larger and longer peace movement, and as I suggested, intersected with other movements like feminism. That is at least three different time scales going on. Or again, take the charter made famous by the Chartists. The people's charter that dates from 1837-38, William Lovett, the proposal that's there. Here is the biggest wave of protest of the first half of 19th century Britain, the biggest wave before the organisation of Britain's modern political parties before the organisation, the trade union movement, before most of the structures that will be the enduring features of British politics in the present day.

What are the proposals that are being struggled for in the 1830s? Universal suffrage. No property qualification to vote. Annual parliaments. Equal representation, that is how sort of rotten boroughs are highly unequal on electoral districts. Payment of member's vote by ballot- the famous six points. The six points for the six points get enacted and it takes a very long struggle to make this happen. The Chartists don't succeed in winning the charter but they do succeed in shaping a history in which many of the points of the charter will get one in due course.

The second point about movements coming in waves. We tend to think of movements like much else, as simply building. When we narrate the history of it, we read back on the history and say, here were various forefathers or foremothers and it sort of seems to grow in a cumulative path. But the actual history are almost always wave patterns. Periods of very high activity and periods between them. In each wave, it is typical that there are multiple movements. Remember, I said that for

all these movements today, using that one slide as an example, it's almost always the case that a number of different groups are campaigning at the same time and in some tension with each other trying to claim the same protest for different goals. Here is a protest against cuts. No, wait, it's Free Gaza.

That's actually the normal pattern in this. There are lots of movements, varying degrees to which they coalesce. This is significant in terms of some of the academic studies, academic studies in social movements because of its relationship to a misleading idea, the idea of new social movements. This was an idea that was produced basically in the wake of the 1960s era of protests. The notion was that there was an old social movement, the Labour Movement. It had gotten old, literally.

The new social movements, vaguely linked to the new left, had other characteristics. By the 70s and 80s, these other characteristics were being described. The new social movements were movements that were plural, there were a bunch of them. There wasn't just a social movement. They were movements that were self-limiting; people didn't actually have the vision of completely remaking society, just changing a bit of it. There were movements that were highly innovative in tactics instead of stable.

We could go on with the stories, new social movements linked to thinkers like Alan Turing and Alberto Melucci, but the important point is it's sort of an illusion. It's about movements during the period when they're new and that coalesced into a larger structure. It's not a new kind of movement that arose in the 1980s. It is rather that movements have a cyclical pattern of the new, highly diverse and plural; lots of different things going on in eras of efflorescent action. The 60s. Some of them achieved a certain amount of dominance but almost never as much as we tend to read back into their stories, historically. That is, they're almost never that dominant.

There was no point in modern European history, for example, when the labour movement was simply the social movement that dominated everything. There were always other movements going on. The closest to that was the post war boom years that we actually think of as among the least movement-oriented times when labour unions were relatively, stably being integrated into governments, from the Attlee government forward in Britain, for example. Movements in these high activity periods influence each other, they disseminate tactics, they compete for adherence and attention.

One chapter of my book focuses partly on the interaction between socialists and religious thinkers and other kinds of movements. For example, a great debate that was held between Robert Owen, the great British socialist, Alexander Campbell, a key figure of American frontier religion and circuit-riding Protestant, a revivalist who held camp meetings. The two of them staged a debate in Cincinnati, Ohio. Without the aid of microphones, they spoke for four hours to a crowd of 10,000 people. The people liked it and came back for five successive days of such debates. This is almost hard for us to imagine but just note, that means it's entertainment, among other things, but it's also an interesting debate. The debates are transcribed because Gregg, the founder of the Gregg's shorthand system, was himself a resident in the

New Harmony, Indiana commune which at that time was an Owenite socialist commune. Gregg converted in the course of this but also transcribed the events in his new shorthand technique.

The debates are interesting. For example, the evangelical minister are used for the equality of the sexes which is denied by Robert Owen, the socialist. He had other things going on in the debate. So, the alignments and the pictures are being shaken up. This is typical. There's a lot of competition, essentially who are you going to join in this period?

Well, let's talk about three waves really quickly in this. There's a wave in the late 18th and early 19th century in Britain which manifests this pattern in many ways. Radical republicanism was probably if you had to pick one movement or one ideological structure, the central one, linked to figures like Tom Paine, the famous debates of Tom Paine with Edmund Burke.

The work that Tom Paine did in the context of the American revolution and then in Britain, of course, and France. So, radical republicanism just kind of travelled. Paine himself travelled. Paine is British. He goes off to America, becomes a key figure in the American Revolution, returns to Britain, then goes to France where he's made an honorary citizen in France and he's active for revolution which isn't quite radical enough on democracy for his tastes. This goes on, he's an international figure in this. Indeed, at some point he says "I have no country but the world, and no religion but doing good." He articulates a kind of LSE cosmopolitanism that could have been voiced in the 1990s or the present day.

At the same time, there are other movements. The Anti-slavery Movement has its first great flowering in this period. There's been opposition to slavery before, various people have said slavery seems like a bad thing. But the first really significant, organised wave of Anti-slavery agitation takes place. It takes place with John Wesley, linked to the what would become the Methodist religion in this context, a large scale spread of Wesleyanism. Wilberforce is a sort of respectable parliamentarian radical who's leading part of this, the Anti-slavery Movement flowers, particularly from the 1790s up to 1806 when there's a major campaign that moves it: Catholic emancipation is a big issue.

We have the early versions of the campaign, the rights of Catholics. In England, at this time, Catholics could not vote and Catholics suffered a variety of other civil impairments. This is their beginning of a significant campaign to try to win civic equality for Catholics, and for Catholics who should understand Irish in very large parts and see this as linked to a kind of internal colonialism that is being practised in Great Britain. This is a period that could be cited, there are other cases, as one of the births of feminism. Feminism gets born many times and in the several early births, there's not a lot of continuity between the births. Part of when we know that feminism is taking off is when feminism, or women's movement, becomes able to narrate its own history. That is, it's no longer sort of starting over with various

founding mothers who can be celebrated by later women historians. Here was a nun in 15th century Austria who was in some ways, a precursor.

The difference between a precursor and a founder is figuring into a more continuous narrative. Mary Wollstonecraft was in writing the rights of women in response to Tom Paine is in fact as close to a durable starting point as you're likely to pick for this. It's interesting again, note, it's a pamphlet written in response to another pamphlet by a differently defined movement. Paine has written *The Rights of Men* central to the democratic activism, Wollstone doesn't so much disagree about the rights but the leaving out of women, the failure to articulate this. It's a contest in the movement for adherence.

There are multiple smaller movements; the Luddites, just five years after the peak of the Anti-slavery Movement in 1811. The Luddites craft radicalism generally, a very big deal. There are lots of movements that haven't yet become trade unions, they haven't yet become a working class movement in a strong sense. But they are bringing a combination of economic and political grievances, resisting early capitalism and important senses, usually not articulated in anything like socialism but articulating resistance to capitalism.

There is the birth of modern conservatism where Burke is a salient founder to a movement that actually has a similar wave pattern moving through the modern world, building a kind of conservative thought that will coalesce in various ways. There's another wave, in the US, a generation later, associated with what's often called the Second Great Awakening. That term is going slightly out of fashion among historians. But if through the great religious revival, as there had been one in the 18th century, this includes a variety of things.

The birth of Mormonism, Mitt Romney's religion, is now a major, more or less respectable, global religion. I say more or less because it's debated intensely in the election. A variety of conservatives may not have turned out to vote in equal numbers because Romney was not an evangelical Christian but a Mormon. This is an indigenous American religious tradition that grows up in a period of huge revival. In this period of revival, there are lots of revival ministers who feature a whole variety of people who are out. There's camp meetings in religion, emotional enthusiasm, religion as the entertainment in town. In this, low church Protestantism takes off in big waves around the country.

It's a shopkeeper's millennium, and the title of one famous history book about this. This sort of lower middle class is at the centre of this, the American's small property holder in various ways figures crucially in this take-off of religion. This take-off of religion is related to other things, related to a mass anti Catholic sentiment. So that, actually, at a very time when there is a peak in Catholic, in franchise mid campaigns in Britain, in the US, there's an anti-Catholic campaign. This is a light motif of American history, generally not narrated into it. It will culminate in the founding of the Klu Klux Klan. The Klu Klux Klan recall was founded to get rid of Catholics. It later

added blacks to the list but it's also to get rid of them. But the original problem was Southern European and Irish immigrants and Catholicism in America.

The Second Great Awakening influences other things. It influences the Anti-slavery Movement which takes off in new waves. As the Protestant ministers begin to define slavery as a national sin, and tell their followers that if you participate in any way in the life of the country, you share personal culpability and eternal damnation whether you own slaves or not. Because you're sharing in the wealth of the country that is based in some part on this immoral kind of exploitation. It helps to precipitate the civil war so that major parts of the run-up to this see, the radical abolitionist movement, the John Brown and things like this is driven by religious fervour in the context among both slaves and flight sympathisers, religion is prominent but especially among the white sympathisers in giving a boost to the Anti-slavery Movement is central to abolitionism.

It's also a key period of Utopian Socialism I already alluded to. There are Fourierist communes around the United States. You'll remember Charles Fourier, the man who said the oceans will be made of lemonade. The Owenite Movement with Robert Owens's parallelograms of progress that is, his rationally laid out factories and the highly ordered villages that were going to be the pattern for socialism and eventually gave way into the cooperative movement. The Amana Movement. Americans will recognise this as an important refrigerator brand, but that refrigerator brand ascends directly from a Utopian Socialist communal movement. The Shakers have given their name to a style of furniture but they don't live on in many numbers because of their refusal to procreate. So, there are a variety of Utopian Socialist movements.

The Shakers reveal something about what it means to be a Utopian Socialist movement by the idea that utopia would come fast enough that you didn't need to procreate. This kind of movement is the opposite of Catholicism and I should say. But in any case, the Temperance Movement is another part of this; again, influenced by religion but not limited to it, and goes in Britain at the same time. Women disgusted with their drunk husbands, women angry when their drunk husbands beat them, women convinced that this was producing sins in a variety of different ways. But women also claiming a voice as women closely linked to then to another of a founding moments to women's movement, the Seneca Falls, one of the first major public gatherings organised to begin to oppress distinctively a case of women's liberation overlapping, of course, with Temperance and all of that.

A more familiar way, a little closer to historical memory though I'm conscious that it's more my memory than yours in all of these, the 60s. Again, think of the number of different things going on. The Civil Rights Movement reaches its peak, growing throughout the 1950s. The peak actions happen in the 1960s. Things like Martin Luther King's famous "I have a dream" speech, the march in Washington. The new left and student movements kept going in this older routes in relationship to an older left, a remaking of the left. A movement that takes off criticising the older movement for being not a movement.

The basic position of the Port Huron statement, the basic position that founded the new left, is that the old left had stopped being a movement. It had become institutionalised and more or less conventional. The AFL-CIO, the labour unions, were just entering into bargains with capitalists over the distribution of income to their members. They were not really campaigning to change society. The new left would transform the unions and engage in a broader social transformation on different grounds. It would also be grounds that extended the class-based grounds. So that this would link to student movements since by and large while students will identify as the downtrodden of the Earth, they are really the middle classes of the Earth, just middle classes in a temporary waiting period before all of the goods of middle class are restored on them.

You heard the Peace Movement in its Anti-Vietnam war incarnation overlapping the earlier Ban the Bomb Movement, counter culture and New Age sorts of things. Everybody's dressed in tie-dyes, using various kinds of drugs. Those were the days. The women's movement taking off, yet again, in another version of this in the 1960s with a new and growing kind of activism. We have figures like Betty Friedan, we have bra burning, we have a variety of early versions of this.

We also have a lot of women who, as it were, are put in the backrooms of the male dominated Peace and Anti-war Movements to lick the envelopes, and do various sorts of not-front-line labour in support of the movement, while the men go out and give speeches and so forth. This generates women with a grievance who know how to organise because they've, in fact, been doing this in these other movements as well as sometimes in churches or in labour unions or in various other settings. One of the things that the previous movements do to each new wave is they generate and they sort of give to the next wave some people with organising experience. People who have been organising in some other context then know how to do a lot of organisational work that newcomers won't because a launch of the environment movement; you can trace this in different ways or earlier periods.

This is the first Earth Day and a wave of environmental activism that will, more or less, continue with ups and downs to the present day. This is the take-off of the charismatic movement, the movement of charismatic Christians resembling Pentecostals but often evangelical in a theological structure but charismatic religion which will grow enormously influential which starts off with both left wing and right wing versions. The left wing version stays mostly small in the US and Britain although in Latin America, it will be linked to liberation theology and so forth. A dominant right wing version will grow as the new Christian right in the United States later. It's a 60s product, too.

Lots of things come out of the wave, they play out over longer period of time. Of course, we can see versions of this now, lots of other things, different sorts of movements. Even this. Now, movement waves start international. Even waves of nationalism are international and you'll see it right now. Nationalism in many different countries. Nationalism influencing nationalism. You would think nationals

would just look inside their countries for inspiration, but no. They look to other countries for inspiration. They look to other nationalist movements, they share in a variety of ways. So it has been and so it was in the middle of the 19th century, so it was in the era of World War I, so it is today.

Let's look briefly at these movements I just described three waves. Look at the international character. The late 18th, early 19th century. The French and American revolutions, radicalism in Britain, the sort of 1790s corresponding society era. Think of Haiti as another example of the revolution that is suppressed. Revolutionary France suppresses the revolution in Haiti. Haiti led military successes against both Britain and France. These two rival empires are both determined to put down the revolution in Haiti, eventually France succeeds.

Wesley and Anti-slavery Movements keep growing globally. The medallion that says "Am I not a man and a brother?" a key slogan of the Anti-slavery movement evoking both the incipient ideology of human rights and the long standing Christian ideal of brotherhood as two sorts of claims for the Anti-slavery Movement is in this case struck by Josiah Wedgwood, the china manufacturer based on the seal of the Anti-slavery Society that is, of course again, Tom Paine up in the corner.

The second of these phases of movement, the Second Great Awakening in the US coincides with the 1848 revolutions in Europe. That's actually a Berlin version of it in the picture. This is significant because it produces lots of immigrants to the United States who found some of those Utopian Socialist communities, found socialism, found the American magazine for which Karl Marx wrote most of his newspapers for founded by German immigrants following the 1848 revolution, closely interconnected in various ways with religious revitalisation temperance again that the cartoon and the Drunkard's Progress echoing back to Milton and the Pilgrims Progress and forward to the Ten-Step Movements of the future is a part of the Temperance Movement which will then recur.

In the 1960s, we see this again, the Peace Movement globally, counter culture, rock movement, the anti-imperialist movements, the era of much of the world women's movements, the Prague Spring which is in the lower right hand corner of the cultural revolution. In each of its meanings, echoing from China. China wasn't so much influenced by what was going on in the rest of the world but it had an influence on what was going on in the rest of the world in this era in important ways.

The fourth point of movement: seldom win immediate victories. We'll just evoke with Zhou Enlai's famous comment, probably not completely apocryphal, lots of debate about that. When asked by Richard Nixon what he thought of the French Revolution, it's too soon to tell. When in fact now, accounts of this by people who were there, the key translator says, actually it was a confusion. Nixon was talking about 1789, Zhou Enlai was talking about 1968. In any case, it's often too soon to tell what's going to be the long term impact. The Anti-Slavery and Abolition Movements won their initial battles but only after 100 years of campaigning in this sense. In the present world, issues of slavery and trafficking of people remain.

There hasn't been a complete eradication movements participate. The women's movement, lots and lots of victories, lots and lots of setbacks. Two steps forward, one step back as Lenin said in another context. A whole history of a variety of campaigns. Campaigns which have partial success, none of them complete success. The Suffrage Movement coming closest to an outright success in its goals, you know this.

Now, last point but the sort of core claim I want to make in this. All of this reflects the development of a participatory society. Movements don't just exist because people have grievances and they don't just exist because they know how to mobilise and organise. People had grievances throughout history and there have been slave revolts and there have been various kinds of activities. In the modern era, we have a society that is built around participation in different ways. Even market institutions that are participatory. They may not be equal, they may not be nice in various ways but they engage lots of people in participating in them.

The reformation brought widespread lay participation, all that the reformation era did in Europe was get people walking 10 miles to hear sermons. Yet, people actively engaged in a series of it. Get lay people actively engaged prior to the reformation. Almost all the major debates in the history of Christianity were primarily among clergy, between about the fourth century and the 15th century. We get these major debates with lots of lay people participating in them in various ways, participatory in the new sense. The written word, we get printed Bibles.

We get national states and national states are organised with the new way of thinking about legitimacy. Not simply the inheritance through the king's line, but upward from the people. The state is legitimate if it serves the people, a powerful idea for movements. We get citizen armies, occasionally, there are rebellions. We get eventually welfare situations and welfare states. Throughout all of these, the state is a key support for participation.

Part of the story that we should see charted in all those movements I mentioned, and I can make many more of those stories, is the growth of the state all the way right through Sidney and Beatrice Webb. They are on board, they want the state. Anarchists need not apply to the London School of Economics in 1895. This is a project of building an effective state to be able to make social change that way. Most of modern movement history trade union history and the history of these movements that I've charted here is in close relationship to the growth of the state as the dominant institution in modern societies.

There are changes in how society itself gets to find the word used to mean what it means in the newspapers. The society pages that used to be all about elites becomes about everybody else in various ways, is famously critiqued by Hannah Arendt. It's shaped by the idea of taking society as a project, not a found artefact. That is, it's not just there; society is something we want to make, we want to build a project of doing better, a way of having progress. In a variety of different settings, movement



activists are trying to change the terms of the social contract. They're trying to insist that we can make society over again better. The general crusade they're saying jobs and dignity.

On the Hustings, that's actually Covent Garden, by the way, just next to here, the 1806 election is an election hotly contested among other things because of Wesley and the Anti-Slavery and the Wilberforce campaign. There are all these people in the background. It was a popular constituency in that period. There are lots of voters. Participation's growing. Progress.

The expectation of progress and the hope for progress comes, and shapes the whole of this long era when the state is growing. Sometimes, it's treated as an inevitable trend, and sometimes there's a demand for action, and often, there's both. Karl Marx essentially says both. Karl Marx says the revolution will definitely come, you don't have to worry but you do have to get out on the barricades. You might ask, well, why do I have to get on the barricades Isn't that risky? Can't I just wait for it to come inevitably? But the message is no, of course. You do have to get out on the barricades, and this is common. This is common to a long standing religious tradition. God will save you but you have to confess. You have to embrace it. You have to ask, and so forth.

It sets out the movements in this period; increasingly to remake the basic conditions of life, asserting that they're being remade anyway. That society is changing but then asserting we can shape how they're remade. This becomes a key thing for social science. Movements are definitive in shaping 19th and early 20th century social science. What we inherit as social science, core disciplines and much of what we do is deeply shaped by relationship to social movements, to the idea of progress, evolutionary progress in some cases but often aided by movement, mobilisation movement action, religious movements, political movements, economic movements, all sorts. Social reform projects which call forth the desire for and need for social science.

This is what the Webbs are up to after all. They see social science as an essential means of bringing about the transition to socialism by producing the educated actors who will make this possible in the progressive era. Progress is a huge dominant period. It's hard actually almost to remember that people didn't always think of it this way, they often thought of history as cyclical. They often thought of history as fluctuating up and down and up and down but not going anywhere. Or they thought of it as linear, going somewhere but where it was going was not necessarily good. The idea of progress had to be served. Linear but also some place good that you're going at the end of that.

To many people, where things were headed seemed threatening but more and more people, especially in the 19th century, but really onto most of the modern area, claim a sense of progress. The Works Progress Administration, the WPA of the Roosevelt era American project of putting people to work in the Depression is an interesting label of that. It's not just the Works Administration, get a job here; it's the

Works Progress Administration: join the team of progress, get a job, don't begin to believe that just because we've had the largest depression anyone can remember, that somehow the onward march of progress has been derailed. It is Obama's infrastructure plans for spending on growth. It is a variety of somewhere, thanks to history.

Of course, one person's progress can be another's threat. We might remember that the London School of Economics had a significant engagement in the Eugenics Movement which was seen as a progressive movement for social change. This happens to be the moment of tomorrow really, of the anniversary of the Beveridge Report, a key and signal moment where the former director of the school plays a crucial part in creating the welfare state in Britain, but Beveridge was a lifelong member of the Eugenics Society, campaigning to make society better by making the actual biological people in it better.

Progress has met with disillusionment more recently, Nietzschean disillusionment among the more academically and post-structuralist inclined about various kinds of disillusionment. This isn't new, either, we should remember again. The 1930s, the eras when there were other disillusioned anti-progress voices who were common, and this goes on. But we face now a variety of different reasons to be worried. For example, to be worried that our best ideas about how to deal with inequality and economic progress and problems runs straight in the face of our understanding of environmental issues. That we say no more cuts, austerity is a disaster, it's promoting inequality in human suffering, we need growth. Oh, wait a minute. What about the limits to growth? What about the environmental damage? Not that kind of growth. And we're caught in a dilemma that has gone around and around throughout this period.

The ideal of progress has met with a lot of disillusionment. Most of those western protesters in Zuccotti Park, in Syntagma Square, in these various key sites of protests were disillusioned about progress, not sure where there are covenant. In much of the world, it is still the dominant ideology in China, India, Brazil, much of Africa. It is literally a secular ideal, not just about religion but in world time, secular means, originally, temporal in this linear time. Old ways are defining the good by eternal values are out. Progress is in. With progress the exultation of ordinary happiness, the idea that value is not transcending material want but getting what you need to live a good life with your family.

Basic change that goes on in the modern era is a redefinition at least in Christendom of a basic way of thinking. It's not about heaven and it's not about all of the ways in which a kind of future of a different life offers the solace of putting up with this one. It's about making this life better here and now. It's about movements like the Housewives Alliance for proper inspection of meat. That movement politics becomes lots of different movements, each with various agendas of delivering rather specific goods. The rise of social movements, then, means innumerable projects to better the situation of specific groups in society.

Ralph Miliband, in fact, famously distinguished trade union activism from socialism on just these grounds. Trade union activism was a campaign to better the situation of specific groups, union members. Socialism was a campaign to transform society in collective action to better society as such. But of course, it's not just socialists. There are different versions of that, and there are efforts to reshape the institutions of society.

We're in a period where I think institutions are at the centre. I think much of what is at stake in movements today is the disappearance, the tearing apart, the unfunding, the damage to institutions. We are feeling more and more that the institutions we depend on for our lives and our welfare aren't there for us in various ways. I wrote this, these are all educational institutions. People like the upper right hand corner which is Chelmsford Workers Education Association marching in pageantry with its band in the front, reminding us the thing, institutions that we take for granted were built in popular struggles. We're not just all big struggles over big issues but struggles to build institutions that was whole housing in the upper left by the way.

In closing, movements work in three ways. I'm just going to say this really fast, we can come back to it if you want. Some movements work to shape state policy. Think of the Webbs. Think of Fabian socialism is a movement that exists to have its effect by shaping the way state policy is made. Other movements work to create non-state institutions of various kinds. In the heyday of trade unions in the late 19th, early 20th centuries had often evolved trade union schools, trade union libraries, a whole variety of institutions for workers, operated from within the union movement in various ways on the assumption that existing states weren't going to provide those things to workers.

There are other non-state institutions with the role of churches and religious movements and founding of schools and hospitals and colleges and so forth. Movements, in this sense, are a crucial part of civil society. Many movements, finally, achieved their greatest effects by shaping cultural change through public communication. You can't imagine the great successes of the women's movement except as bound up with a transformation of the way people think over a very long period of time through a series of struggles in which the immediate tactical struggles are often lost.

The cumulative effect is one of reshaping culture, perhaps not enough but rather dramatically in various ways. This includes changing the very identities and solidarities that people find salient. For example, the extent to which the very identity worker isn't an obvious identity. The beginning of worker's movements is not worker's self-interest. It's workers identify themselves with that collective self, the working class deciding that's the important identity. Not Methodist that's the important identity. Not woman that's the important identity. Not a particular sectional craft unit and so forth. Identity politics doesn't follow from settled identities, it is the politics in which it is determined which identities will be salient and motivate us in struggle.

Now, I close with a question. Are states on their way down? Are states losing their salience, becoming less significant? Big mobilisations, religious mobilisations, anarchist mobilisations in a variety of these urban areas...if you look at Barcelona protesters, you will not say, the Spanish state. The story. You'd have very different vision of how this works.

Environmental activism is overwhelmingly aimed at lifestyle, only sometimes at policy. Alternative people's economies that barter. New kinds of exchange relations are being formed everywhere. So are other kinds of movements like what's called prepping, that is preparing for the end of the state by stockpiling a lot of canned food in the basement and tanks of gas and kerosene and so forth so that you will be able to survive.

A lot of guns usually go along with that in these visions of the alternative future. As states suffer fiscal and other crises, they lose a lot of their capacity and they are less and less often the object of movements. Nobody's convinced that the states will be able to deliver what the movements want. Yet, states are still the main objects of the Arab Spring movements. Europe's fiscal crisis has brought the peculiarity of much less Europeaness almost overnight.

After the 2008 events, people who had been enthusiastically talking about Europe, right here at LSE began to talk like those Greeks, and the Germans are doing this. What about the Italians, it's always that way there, isn't it? Suddenly it seemed as though national character was everybody's favourite explanation of what was going on. The discussion was hugely national, not just in academic settings but in the movements and in political discourse.

In the voice of Angela Merkel, in the voice of the protesters in Greece about Angela Merkel, a return of this it brought a response aimed at states as though people couldn't figure out how else to pursue their objectives of the first states. Occupy Wall Street was completely unclear about its targets. In fact, most of the hopes for grappling with concerted economic power were vested in states, and obviously states are the main part of the national movements.

I close by leaving that question open because I actually, genuinely am not sure what to say. We've had a lot of theorisation of the decline of the state. My general view is that most of it is, as we said of Mark Twain's death, premature. That is not at all obvious that states are losing their power. Some states are losing their power. The Greek state is losing a lot of its power. The Chinese state is not losing a lot of its power. That we have a sort of faulty generalisation promulgated and it should reshape the way we think about movements.

You don't have to read all of this, but it's from a locomotive fireman's magazine in 1894 where the writer basically says there are political movements that try to change the structure of politics and they often leave the social issues untouched. Poverty is still there and inequality is still there, there's just some change in politics. And then there are the social movements which manage to change society

sometimes imperceptibly with leaving the political system intact. The women's movement didn't really transform the political system. Suffrage was predicted, too. Lots of people were. Women can vote, the end of the world. In fact, it had relatively low impacts until, of course, the recent American election when it was absolutely decisive Obama's election, thank goodness. But, says Frank Borland, it happens that political and social movements sometimes become blended and are carried on together. When that occurs, we have times that try man's souls. Thank you.