

WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung



Britta Baumgarten
and Peter Ullrich

Discourse, Power and Governmentality. Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault

Discussion Paper

SP IV 2012–401

April 2012

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)

Research Area

Civil Society, Conflicts and Democracy

Project Group

Civil Engagement

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany
www.wzb.eu

Copyright remains with the author(s).

Discussion papers of the WZB serve to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. Inclusion of a paper in the discussion paper series does not constitute publication and should not limit publication in any other venue. The discussion papers published by the WZB represent the views of the respective author(s) and not of the institute as a whole.

Britta Baumgarten und Peter Ullrich
Discourse, Power and Governmentality.
Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault
Discussion Paper SP IV 2012-401
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (2012)

Contact and affiliation of the authors other than WZB:

Britta Baumgarten
Dr. phil., ISCTE - Lisbon University Institute, Portugal
brbaumgarten@yahoo.com

Peter Ullrich
Dr. phil. Dr. rer. med.
ullrich@wzb.eu

Abstract

**Discourse, Power and Governmentality.
Social Movement Research
with and beyond Foucault**

by Britta Baumgarten and Peter Ullrich

In this article some ideas will be outlined, on how protest research can be stimulated, enriched and reformulated by (post-)Foucaultian thinking. We argue that Foucault and his very concepts of discourse and power provide a perspective on social movements that avoids too simple rational actor concepts, is more long-term oriented and pays more attention to the diverse aspects of the context of social movement action than does mainstream social movement research.

We focus on four types of processes that can be analysed from a Foucaultian perspective.

1. Discourses define the boundaries for what can be thought of and communicated at a given point of time in a given society. These boundaries also apply for social movement actors.
2. Within these boundaries of the generally unthinkable we can analyse the framing of social movements and how they contribute to *discourses*.
3. Further, there are internal communicative practices of movement knowledge generation. These can be viewed as a set of (productive as well as restrictive) discursive regularities.
4. Discourses shape the subjectivity of the people, and thus impact on the mobilizing potential of social movements. Referring to governmentality studies we show how changing rationalities may influence the likelihood of social critique and protest.

Keywords: social movements, protest, discourse, Foucault, governmentality, power, knowledge, framing

Zusammenfassung

Diskurs, Macht und Gouvernementalität. Bewegungsforschung mit und nach Foucault

von Britta Baumgarten und Peter Ullrich

Foucault und die vielen theoretischen und empirischen Arbeiten, die auf seinen Gedanken aufbauen, erfreuen sich momentan innerhalb der Sozialwissenschaften großer Resonanz. Aus diesem Grund ist es sehr verwunderlich, dass dies bisher kaum Einfluss auf den Mainstream der Bewegungs- und Protestforschung hatte. Wir stellen hier einige Ideen vor, wie die bewegungs- und Protestforschung durch (post-)foucault'sche Konzepte und Gedanken bereichert und verändert werden könnte. Wir argumentieren, dass Foucault, insbesondere seine Konzepte von Diskurs und Macht, eine Perspektive auf soziale Bewegungen und Protest nahelegt, die vereinfachende Konzepte von rationalen Akteuren vermeidet, stärker an langfristigen Entwicklungen interessiert ist und bestimmte Kontextbedingungen von Aktivismus stärker berücksichtigt als der bisherige Mainstream der Bewegungsforschung.

Wir betrachten in diesem Artikel vier Zusammenhänge von sozialen Bewegungen und Diskursen aus einer Foucault'schen Perspektive:

1. Diskurse bestimmen die Grenzen des in einer bestimmten Gesellschaft zu einer bestimmten Zeit Denk- und Sagbaren. Diese Grenzen gelten auch für Akteure sozialer Bewegungen.
2. Innerhalb dieser Grenzen des generell Denk- und Sagbaren können wir die Rahmungs- bzw. Deutungsprozesse sozialer Bewegungen analysieren und betrachten, wie diese wiederum Einfluss auf Diskurse ausüben.
3. Es lassen sich interne Kommunikationspraktiken innerhalb von Bewegungen analysieren, durch die Bewegungswissen entsteht. Diese können als Set von (ermöglichenden und begrenzenden) diskursiven Regeln betrachtet werden.
4. Diskurse prägen Subjekte und beeinflussen damit das Mobilisierungspotential von sozialen Bewegungen. Angelehnt an die Gouvernementalitätsforschung zeigen wir, welchen Einfluss Wandlungen der Regierungsweisen auf die Möglichkeit von Sozialkritik und Protest haben.

Schlüsselwörter: Soziale Bewegungen, Protest, Diskurs, Foucault, Gouvernementalität, Macht, Wissen, Deutungsmusteranalyse

1. Introduction

Foucault and the rich field of theoretical and empirical work inspired by his thinking currently play a prominent role in the social sciences. It is therefore more than surprising that, with few exceptions (Death 2010; Sandberg 2006; Ullrich 2008, 2010; Baumgarten 2010, Heßdörfer et al 2010), they have had virtually no impact on the mainstream of research into social movements and protest. In this article we outline some ideas on how protest research can be stimulated, enriched and reformulated out of the vast quarry of (post-) Foucaultian thinking.


It is Foucault's analysis of power, not least his concept of power as a productive force that helps to bring societal macro structures back into social movement research, helping to improve our understanding of the boundaries and sometimes even the non-appearance of protest. Power cannot be easily located in certain actors or institutions. Power creates knowledge and forms subjects who are restricted as well as enabled by its omnipresent force (Foucault 1979). Social movements are actors that by definition challenge power (Raschke 1991). Consequently, changes in the conceptualisation of power are especially important for the study of social movements. Foucault's concept of power is central to his studies of discourse and governmentality. The two concepts will be discussed in connection with various questions raised by the study of social movements, protest and contentious politics. From this vantage point it is possible to highlight non-strategic aspects of protest, such as its subjective preconditions and the world views of (potential) social movement actors. It contradicts the idea of rational movement actors, focuses on long-term processes and pays more attention to the diverse aspects of the action context of social movements than does mainstream social movement research. These new perspectives also engender several new research questions.

Following the development of Foucault's thinking, we first broach the issue of the knowledge-power complex. The social movement researcher, asking with Foucault what societies consider to be 'normal' (or not), what they are able to communicate (or cannot even imagine) due to the discursive regulation of knowledge production, gains new insights into the discourse in which social movements are embedded and thus into the context of their ideational processes. Yet, later – our second main issue – Foucault combined this interest in the social production of knowledge with another perspective. Analysing neoliberalism, Foucault and others showed how knowledge and related practices are spread and maintained by governmental techniques of subjectification and especially through techniques of governing the self. Thus, we propose a specific link between micro and macro levels, or between structure and subjectivity.

With discourse, power, and governmentality, we focus only on the aspects of Foucault's complex and disparate opus that we consider particularly fruitful for social movement research, necessarily ignoring other facets. We will go beyond

Foucault's theory, drawing on the vast field of governmentality studies, Boltanski's sociology of critique, and the concepts of cultural opportunity structures.

Four types of process can be analysed from a Foucaultian perspective (see figure below) within the common distinction of macro (society), meso (movements, networks), and micro levels (individual constituents and bystanders).



- 1) Discourses define the boundaries of what can be thought of and communicated at a given time in a given society. The suffragettes of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, for example, did not demand equal distribution of childcare between men and women, because at that time it was still generally unthinkable. They did, however, call for equal political rights, e.g. the right to vote. These claims fit well into the historical context of institutional reforms that extended the franchise.¹ Discourse as *a room for manoeuvre* for social movements thus restricts and enables specific worldviews. Social movements not only observe discourse and strategically shape their communication accordingly. They *are* the product of discourse, too.

¹ The first substantive parliamentary debate on women's suffrage in England took place in May 1867, when women supported by John Stuart Mill insisted that women's suffrage should become part of the electoral reform agenda (Offen 2000, 142). But only in 1919 were British women (over the age of 30) granted the vote (Offen 2000: xxvi).

- 2) Within the boundaries of what is generally conceivable we can analyse the framing of social movements and how they contribute to *discourses*. The resonance of framing depends not only on cultural factors but also on the arenas and the roles of speakers. In a long-term perspective we observe shifts in discourse and in how movements' communication strategies relate to these shifts. We can observe *how movements* influence the boundaries of what is generally conceivable, either by promoting thinking that is not established in the mainstream discourse or is even antagonistic to it, or by creating new issues and concepts through their practices. One example is the partial success of post-structuralist feminism and queer theory with their ideas of (social) gender and many biological sexes (Butler 1993) in challenging the hegemonic idea of only two biologically determined sexes.
- 3) Furthermore, there are internal communicative practices of movement knowledge generation. These can be seen as a set of both productive and restrictive discursive regularities, which emerge at the movement level in the course of a movement's history. This discursive sociology of knowledge approach regards the communication of social movements, e.g. their leaflets, symbols, not merely as goal-oriented, instrumental action, but as expressing their identity and thus their internal system of knowledge (Ullrich 2012). It is important to point out that internal discourses are more than strategic power games played by actors within a movement. Movements develop their own specific discursive mechanisms that enable but also restrict the framing of actors within the movement. To capture the nonstrategic aspects, it is important to reconstruct the development of this internal discourse over time.
- 4) Discourses and other practices in power regulation, such as practices of government and the government of the self, shape the subjectivity of the people. In Foucaultian terms, they shape the individual's relations to itself and thus affect the mobilisation potential of social movements. With regard to governmentality studies, we show how changing rationalities of a liberal government influence the likelihood of social critique and protest through subjectification processes. These processes are initiated through discourses that see the social in economic terms only, individualise responsibility, and which may thus form subjects that see all plight as individual fault — which delegitimises protest.

Although we distinguish these four basic processes for heuristic reasons, our detailed discussion will be bisected in accordance with the two focal points of Foucault's thinking:

- The next chapter focuses on the first three points mentioned above. It links the *communication of social movements* with discourse. For this purpose we borrow from earlier works by Foucault (1974; 2002).

- The following chapter deals with the fourth point mentioned. It reflects on Foucault's work from the late seventies onwards and its lively reception over the past two decades under the heading "governmentality studies." Addressing the discursive formation of subjects, it gives insight into the *emergence, strength, or absence of protest*, thus providing a link between the macro and micro level.

2. Social movements and discourse

A constructivist approach is the basis of Foucault's oeuvre. He was interested in how knowledge is generated. Among his most basic questions were: What is considered 'normal' and what is not? What can be thought of and communicated and what cannot? What (discursive) practices produce these restrictive as well as enabling structures? According to Foucault, modern societies create "regimes of truth": truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. Every society thus has its own 'police' — mechanisms that distinguish 'true' from 'false' statements (Foucault 1980: 38). Within this Foucaultian view, one specific locus for this 'police' cannot be identified. Discursive formations concern *all* actors. They nevertheless result in some actors resonating better than others. In what follows, we argue that discourse is thought of as an action guidance for social movements. Actors do not reflect on most of the aspects of the discourse guiding their action, and some things are beyond their imagination. To some extent, however, a movement can relate its framing to discourses in a rational way. This applies for aspects of the discourse that movement actors reflect upon. We cite Foucault's (1974) "Archaeology of Knowledge" and a number of his ideas in "The Order of Things" (Foucault 2002) as useful for social movement scholars in specifying relations between movement communication and their framework conditions (including its effects on the actor) and thus in overcoming some of the shortcomings of research on social movements. We argue that Foucault helps specify the concepts of cultural/discursive opportunity structure and provides strong arguments against the existing bias in social movement research that favours a rational actor concept.

2.1 Discursive mechanisms

Foucault investigated long-term processes in the development of discursive structures in search of regularities that affect all statements in a discourse – discursive formations (Foucault 1974). Discursive formations break the concept of the discourse down into different aspects and thus draw our attention to aspects of the discourse that are often omitted in analysing a social movement's context of action. In "The Archaeology of Knowledge" Foucault distinguishes four

discursive formations that help us understand the power of discourse to create what we consider truth: the formation of 1) objects, 2) enunciative modalities, 3) concepts and 4) strategies (Foucault 1974). “Objects” are what talking is about. The formation of objects describes rules for shaping objects, e.g. their initial creation, the authorities responsible for the objects and their relation to other authorities, their classification and their relation to other objects. “Unemployment” for example is an object that did not emerge in Germany until the late 19th century. Who is regarded as unemployed and how to deal with unemployment have since been very controversial and have changed over time and from area to area (Zimmermann 2006).

The “formation of enunciative modalities” refers either to the speakers or the arenas where discourse takes place or to the position of the subject. The status of speakers is particularly important, as it authorises speakers to have their say in a specific way and determines the issues that can be raised. Discourse arenas and speakers’ roles are closely connected. A hospital, for example, authorises a doctor to speak about an illness in a specific way (Foucault 1974: 50–55) and it has become a commonplace that the status of a professor enhances the impression of expertise. Thus far, these Foucauldian insights add nothing new to the field of social movement research (Ferree et al. 2002; Gerhards 1992), but Foucault’s analysis of discourse goes beyond this observation. He also introduces the “formation of concepts”, which addresses the question of how statements are connected: their dependence on rhetorical schemata of combining statements, how things are ordered in other discursive fields, and the field of presence (all statements that have been made in the past) (Foucault 1974: 56–63). It includes, for example, the dominant way of describing and specifying objects at a certain time and place. In earlier years, to give an example, the unemployed were mainly discussed in terms of activation, and debates on the welfare state were dominated by economic rationality (Baumgarten 2010).

The “formation of strategies” concept describes the mechanisms that connect the grand theories of a society. We can observe, for example, that many grand theories are today strongly influenced by the concept of the rational individual. The idea of divine providence has lost its importance in Western Europe. Concepts that rely on this idea are thus out of step with current discourses. We consider discursive formations to be important factors in the creation of the episteme. Episteme are the historical a priori of discourse (including the grand theories), allowing for a certain structure of knowledge and basic modes of thinking in a certain epoch, e.g. the establishment of science over and against a pre-scientific level. They affect the thinking of subjects, but their impact does not have to be reflected on a conscious level (Foucault 1974: 189–192). The concept of episteme reminds the movement researcher to see social movements as embedded in their time and culture.

Discursive formations delimit the totality of all possible statements – the archive (Foucault 1974). But there is room for manoeuvre within the limits set by discursive mechanisms. To capture how these mechanisms exert power, Foucault

chooses a long-term perspective. For analytical reasons, he proposes to look for *points of diffraction of discourses, points of incompatibility*, and alternatives that are both equivalent and incompatible (Foucault 1974: 65). Diffractions point to societal change and alternatives to the dominant worldviews.²

2.2 Implications for research on the communication of social movements

The communication of social movements is predominantly examined by framing approaches. Such approaches have been developed to highlight the importance of interpretation processes (often in a strategic sense) within social movements to explain mobilisation (Snow 2004: 382–384; Snow and Benford 1988: 198). Framing processes are always situated in a specific context, which is specified in various ways. One crucial methodological question is how to connect the discourse level of context (macro) with the framing of social movements at the meso level (Sandberg 2006). In research on social movements the level that we call the “discourse level” is usually taken into account as a cultural or discursive opportunity structure (both concepts derived from “political opportunity structures”) (McAdam 1994; Snow 2004: 403). Culture in framing research is mostly conceptualised in various ways, but not systematically specified (Hart 1996: 88; Swidler 1986; d’Anjou and van Male 1998; Benford and Snow 2000; McCammon et al. 2007). The concept of discursive opportunity structures builds on this concept of culture as a toolkit: opportunities for mobilisation are seen as deriving from cultural factors, such as dominant values or ideological contradictions (Mc Adam 1994; Koopmans and Olzak 2004; Ferree et al. 2002). Discursive or cultural opportunity structures function as incentives for, or restrictions on, choosing frames. Regrettably, the terms tend to be used as underspecified catchall expressions and are thus not very useful.³ Furthermore, the strong bias towards rational action inherent in this concept is criticised (Pettenkofer 2010: 48, Ullrich 2012). In what follows we take the concepts of discursive and cultural opportunity structures as a starting point and show how the study of social movement communication can be elaborated in Foucaultian terms.

2 In some cases social movements are able to alter what can be imagined: E.P. Thompson, for instance, although he did not work in a Foucauldian tradition, showed how the concept of the working class was created by the worker’s movement. The idea of such a collective had not previously existed. It was spawned by the expression of common interests (Thompson 1968).

3 Approaches of this kind limit the context to some selected factors favourable to mobilisation. Benford and Snow, for example, list the following aspects as important contextual factors for social movements: “counter framing by movements’ opponents, bystanders, and the media; frame disputes within movements; and the dialectic between frames and events” (Benford and Snow 2000: 625). McCammon, et al. 2007 speak about legal and traditional gendered discursive opportunity structures.

1) Foucault contributes to explaining why some frames are more resonant than others.

In order to be successful, most social movement researchers argue that a movement's framing has to be "culturally resonant", e.g. in correspondence to a "master frame" (Swart 1995: 466)⁴, by addressing central values, or through the social position of its actors (Benford 1997, 418 ff.). The criteria for the selection of macro phenomena considered important for framing remain largely obscure (Pettenkofer 2010: 71-74). In research practice, the connection between movements' strategies and discursive opportunity structure is drawn without specifying the broader range of possible structures. Framing processes are often investigated at the movement level and then placed in relation to selected macro level phenomena, solely relying on the plausibility of the established connection (Ferree et al. 2002; Gamson 1988b; Gusfield 1996; Neidhardt 1994; Oliver and Johnston 2005; Snow 2008).⁵ Foucault does not provide factors decisive for the cultural resonance of a movement. However, his analysis of the formation of concepts, the formation of strategies, and his concept of episteme, which we have described above, helps to specify the context that contributes to framing success, e.g. a specific structure of knowledge or specific ways of connecting statements, etc.

2) The analysis of discursive opportunity structures can profit from Foucault by considering power relations and dispositives.

A thorough description of the discursive mechanisms for a given time and space is one possibility for embedding a social movement's framing in this specific context of action.⁶ Although it is impossible to describe in detail social movement actors' room for manoeuvre, Foucault helps us to define some important structures that are usually left out of consideration. It contributes mainly to the question of legitimacy of a speaker's position and could thus be used in addition to other approaches structuring opportunity structures (e.g. Ferree et al. 2002). Taking Foucault's concept of discourse, context analysis in social movement research could be guided by the following questions: 1) what can be adequately stated, 2) by whom, 3) in what discursive arena, and 4) how. The communication of a social movement may influence and be influenced by all four aspects. Movements can, for example, shape an issue to fit the discourse, avoid aspects of an issue that have no chance of positive response, or provoke other actors by raising non-adequate issues. They can focus on their speaker position, for example by claiming

4 Some researchers in the field of radical movements, however, stress that radical movements are successful because of their radicalism (Fitzgerald/Rodgers 2000). The degree of radicalism of action and rhetoric versus resonance necessary for success and the definition of success differ in the literature.

5 In many empirical studies the framing as well as the context is restricted to the media discourse (Gusfield 1981; Gamson 1988; Gerhards 1992; Donati 1992).

6 Discourse according to Foucault is a macrostructure in its own right. This contrasts with the concept of ideology, which is basically (though in a dialectic relationship) understood as an expression of an underlying (e.g. economic) structure, which it conceals or interprets from a particularistic perspective. Discourse does not conceal reality – it is reality.

expertise or by increasing their threat potential. They can adjust the framing of their claims with regard to the arena, e.g. a demonstration or a congress. They can choose the arenas for placing their claims but they are often also denied access. Thus using Foucault also helps to understand why movement actors are sometimes excluded from certain arenas. By specifying the context of framing this way, Foucaultian approaches help empirical research into framing across movements, time and space (Marullo, Pagnucco and Smith 1996; Mooney and Hunt 1996; Ellingson 1995). Shifts and national differences can be observed in a more structured way with regard to the four aspects mentioned above. Integrating Foucault in the mainstream research on framing this way seems quite unproblematic. It is just a way to specify different aspects that determine success of a movement's communication efforts. The movement itself might even be conceptualised as a strategic actor if we use Foucault only with regard to the discursive opportunity structure this way. Following Foucault's concept of discourse, however, we should be aware of the shortcomings of such a strategic actor concept.

3) The notion of episteme and Foucault's stress on structural elements point to the strong constraints on actors' freedom.

The framing approach has been criticised for not taking seriously enough the cultural constraints of movement framing, the influence of the context on the actors' worldviews, and the actors' interpretation of this context (Swidler 1986; Hart 1996; d'Anjou et al. 1998; Crossley 2002: 139–142). Owing to the strategic bias of most social movement research, movements' ideologies and framing are seen as outcome-oriented variables. As a result, cultural opportunities are mostly conceptualised as something interpreted and used strategically by a rational actor. This conception is criticised because actors cannot freely choose how they perceive the world (Steinberg 1999; Sandberg 2006). In the light of this objection, it is worth asking what frames have a chance of being selected because of their cultural or discursive roots. This shifts attention to the conditions for forming movements' world views and not their success. Steinberg, for example, uses the concept 'discursive fields' (Steinberg 1999: 748). He systematically contextualises frames with reference to Foucault's ideas. His discursive fields are framework conditions comprising cultural factors and the actor constellation. Actors create and shape meaning within the boundaries of these framework conditions. Social movement actors also largely take for granted what can be adequately stated, by whom, in what discursive arena, and how.

Following Foucault we must also keep in mind that social movements are not only driven by the expected success of their claims. Social movements as a field with its own inner dynamics in producing world views have been largely neglected. Such a movement is nevertheless also a knowledge system based on specific societal conditions that emerge from and develop during discussion of contested issues (Spillmann 1995: 139; Wuthnow 1989: 13). With reference to Foucaultian concepts, Ullrich (2008, 2012) shows how different discursive opportunity structures in Germany and Great Britain lead to different frames regarding the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict. These frames – far from being strategically adapted to the movements' aims – are highly disputed and contradictory within the German left (as is the mainstream discourse due to its interconnectedness with the discourse on the German past) while there is relative unanimity within the British left, where no other discourse causes ruptures. Foucault thus directs our attention to internal processes of movement communication that follow from their society's discursive structure.

The following chapter deals with another aspect of social movement research, namely changes in the mobilising potential of a movement due to changes in discourse. There is no smooth linearity in Foucault's thinking between the concepts dealt with in the next section and this section. The two chapters belong to two different phases of his work, which he himself never explicitly connected. There is some continuity, however, due to the concept of productive power and there are further arguments against the strategic bias. We argue that research can gain new insights and ask new questions with the aid of Foucaultian approaches that show how protest movements are embedded in societies' episteme owing to subjectification of their constituents under given circumstances. Thus, with Foucault, we propose a specific link between the micro and macro levels of the social, or between structure and subjectivity.

3. Governmentality and subjectivity, or: why (not) protest?

Among the most thriving fields of research heavily influenced by Michel Foucault apart from discourse analysis is so-called governmentality studies with their concern for the *strategies, techniques, programmes, and rationalities of government and the respective subject positions*.⁷ It is surprising that governmentality studies have not yet had much impact on theorising social movements and protest.⁸ The popularity of governmentality as a part of the Foucault industry has hardly been reflected in mainstream movement and protest research. The occasional mention of the term governmentality in protest-related literature mostly refers to a very general idea without elaborating the concept's specific implications. Yet the governmentality perspective helps us to see the strong interconnectedness of movements and power. Consequently it facilitates overcoming the presupposition implicit in the mainstream literature on protest and social movements that the contestator and the contested in the field of protest be separated as two distinct or

7 It is important to note that Foucault's analyses concentrated on the governing aspects, while the (post-) Foucaultian governmentality studies step by step increasingly valued the subjectivity aspects, which were part of Foucault's thinking, but not so much of his thorough analysis.

8 Cf. Rose, O'Malley, and Valverde (2006, 100). For the few exceptions see the recent reader (Heßdörfer, Pabst, and Ullrich 2010; especially Ullrich 2010, where the perspective presented here was been firstly outlined) and Death (2010).

antagonistic social entities. In this we rely upon the notion presented above that the discursive structures of a society have a strong impact on social movements.

Studies in modern governmentality are strongly interested in programmes promoting subtle techniques of government. They recently note the growing importance of self-governing in modern neo-liberal, advanced-liberal (Rose 1996) or neo-social (Lessenich 2008) societies, which most likely affects grievances, critique and mobilisation.⁹ In the following section we discuss the concept of governmentality from its origins in Foucault's panoptism to the lively post-Foucaultian debate on the subjectifying processes of "governing the self". The subsequent section analyses implications for protest research, especially the potential of subjectification processes for hindering protest. We posit that specific modes of subjectification infringe upon the likelihood of protest by creating subjects trained to attribute the causes of problems to the individual rather than to society. These subjects thus tend to forego social critique and making demands on society.¹⁰

3.1 Governmentality and subjectivity: two key concepts

The concept of governmentality goes back to Foucault's (1979) groundbreaking work "Discipline and Punish". He describes the panoptic principle of the unequal distribution of seeing and being seen as the mechanism by which modern societies provide discipline. As prototypical for this he analyses Jeremy Bentham's *Panopticon*, an architectural solution for optimising surveillance. The disciplining effects of the tower-like structure, designed for prisons as well as factories, hospitals or schools, stems from its regime of visibility. Those under surveillance are situated in cells located in a circle around the building's centre. While prisoners are unable to see into the central part of the tower, the surveillant situated there is able to look into the cells. In this situation round-the-clock surveillance is not necessary to establish discipline, Foucault argues, because of the implicit uncertainty of the object of surveillance whether it is momentarily under surveillance. It is this uncertainty that makes inmates reflect on the costs of misbehaviour, leading to the slow incorporation of the surveillant's gaze and thus discipline.

Although Foucault is preoccupied in this book with discipline in the modernising societies of the 18th and 19th centuries, he also provides the conceptual basis for more recent forms of (self-) control to which he later turns his attention. The

9 To mark the difference from the classic neo-liberalism of the Chicago school and to make clear that the societal changes observed are not a withdrawal of the (welfare) state but an enormous restructuring of state activities, we follow Lessenich's (2008) recommendation for calling this "neo-social", although "neo-liberal" is a common attribute in this discourse.

10 We will not focus on governmentality within movements. In our view this runs the risk of overstressing the meaning of the term and weakening its inherent relation to government.

Panopticon produces an active, reflexive subject that functions properly. (Reflexive) panoptic discipline needs to be distinguished from the older sovereign power as well as from discipline achieved by direct force or threat. In a way, what later became governmentality studies – with its broad concept of government analysing the “linkages between abstract political rationalities and empirical micro-techniques of everyday life”¹¹ (Lemke 2000: 31) — examines the generalisation of this principle (to govern the people with their taking an active role in it) in modern societies.¹² This important role of the governed individuals’ reflexivity and incorporation of the social is described by the term subjectivity – the second central concept of governmentality studies and the other side of government. Foucault argues against the older philosophical discourse on subjects that there is no substance or universal form of the subject, which, on the contrary, has to be conceived as historically contingent. It is the practices of an epoch that make the specific subject type.

For Foucault, subjectification is always subjection, too. His research hence concentrated on the power relations in which the subject’s body and soul are formed (Foucault 1998).¹³ For governmentality studies it is central to explore the forms of subjectivity that are produced in accordance with changing forms of power regulation, whether these subjectivities are conventional and conformist, resistant or perhaps hybrid in this respect. And this is where social movement and protest research comes in. The governmentality studies’ concept of subjectivity provides a micro-macro link between social structure and/or change on the one hand and motivation to protest – or not – on the other.

There is a lively scientific discourse on *current modes of government* among scholars strongly affected by Foucaultian thinking, which is relevant for protest research interested in current phenomena. Following Foucault’s analysis of the rise of neo-liberalism, much effort was invested in analysing the governments of contemporary Western societies, which are characterised by the ever increasing commodification of the social¹⁴, the retreat of the welfare state from formerly guaranteed social spending, obeisance to the free market, and orientation on the principles of activation, responsabilisation, autonomy, and (self-) management, thus tapering developments Foucault had already observed.

11 Own translation.

12 Governmentality studies’ scope of interest reaches much farther back in history. Foucault analysed political thought from ancient times and government back to feudal regimes to specify its modern form. Within this field he was particularly interested in the development of liberalism, the development of the policy, the emergence of the reason of state and the newly discovered problem of population. Here we rely more on the post-Foucaultian shape that governmentality studies took from the early nineties, focusing on techniques of governing at a distance and governing the self (Rose, O’Malley, and Valverde 2006, 89).

13 For a detailed elaboration of Foucault’s subject theory see Foucault (1982), Paulus (2009) and Lemke (2005).

14 Foucault describes this liberal rationality as “the inversion of the relationships of the social to the economic” (Foucault 2008: 240).

Current processes of subjectification can no longer be completely explained by the panoptical model, because it is a relatively fixed arrangement. Subjectification today corresponds to a subtler, more incoherent, more complex, more infinite, indeed more productive type of government and regime of visibility. Neo-social governmentality creates subjects that consider themselves managers of their market performance, or as Bröckling put it, enterprising selves (Bröckling 2005). On the state level, the transformations observed signify changes *within* welfare states, changing their character fundamentally. The character of state intervention changed from a mode of guaranteed provision oriented on solidarity to intervention focusing on activating citizens to feel responsible for their own well-being, and incorporating mid-level regulators as relatively autonomous agents (though still also acting in heteronomy, because they are governed “at a distance” (Miller und Rose 1990, 9).

Many current governmental measures are inherently ambiguous, comprising both choice and force.¹⁵ For this reason such modes of government have been described as ‘governing through freedom’ (Rose 1996). Subjects are free to take decisions (and bear the consequences) and are sometimes even left in relative uncertainty about the demands of power (cf. Heßdörfer/Bachmann 2009), which again aims to make subjects think and act on their own — enabled by a higher level of reasoning, the incorporation of the demands of power and the obligation to be free (Rose, O'Malley, und Valverde 2006, 89). These logics of governing through self-government are exactly what much of governmentality studies is concerned with. For protest research, this basically poses the question of how much of the power side (in the traditional ‘power vs. contestator’ view) is to be found on the side of movements and activists themselves.

3.2 Implications for protest research

If such specific subjectification forms exist as a reflection of specific forms of current governmentality, it is necessary to investigate their implications for protest. Drawing on the rich work outlined in section 3.1, protest research will find many aspects likely to affect protest. The task is to link the observed forms of governmentality, related subjectivity or their development, enforcement and change with protest motivation, behaviour, likelihood and success.

In a certain manner, the new perspective we would like to suggest here ties in with older currents in social movement research. Despite tremendous theoretical

15 Typical examples are the British and German unemployment regulation and healthcare reforms following the activating “rights and responsibilities” paradigm of the Blair/Schröder Manifesto of 1999. Many measures contain disciplinary measures (= negative incentives): cuts and restrictions of services in general and all the more in the case of non-compliance, as well as extensive control mechanisms on the one hand, and activating strategies like rewards for good behaviour (= positive incentives), expanding rights of information access, co-determination, further education, training programmes, etc. on the other.

disparities they often focused on macro societal conditions to explain protest, especially its existence. This holds true for analysis of movements as phenomena of mass societies, the break-down model, structural functionalist, Marxist and collective behaviour approaches. They all emphasised current social structure or social change as causes for the existence of social movements, which was often seen as grounded in social grievances, dissatisfaction, or anomie (Buechler 2004). The New Social Movement (NSM) debate (esp. Tourraine, cf. Buechler 1999, Roth/Rucht 1987) was particularly interested in the subjectivity of (potential) protesters. It was constituted by the emergence of movements that made their subjectivity the reason per se for protest and that seem to have come into being in reaction to cultural conflicts in (post-) industrial societies. This focus on subjectivity as a way to perceive and handle structural change, hence a way to link structure and agency, provides a link to the governmentality approach.

However, governmentality studies draw our attention to different questions. They highlight specific aspects of the structural context of a social movement and not only help find answers to why protest developed but may also help us understand why protest is weak or even absent.

It seems obvious that current societal transformations give rise to much discontent, especially in global justice movements, protesting, for example, against privatisation and cuts in the welfare state. And there have been eruptions of protest when aspects of neo-social reforms have lacked public legitimacy. In Germany, for instance, a wave of protest emerged in 2004 against new unemployment legislation that suddenly imposed severe cuts and accelerated the regime of control and activation (Lahusen/Baumgarten 2010). On the other hand, protest quickly ebbed. Are the causes also to be found in the social conditions against which protest was directed? Can governmentality studies help understand this?

To begin with, our proposal to link governmentality studies with protest research opens up a perspective for examining social movements together with conditions for protest. Yet, several kinds of relations are conceivable between neo-social government of the self and the field of protest, yielding various and even opposing effects.

- 1) Neo-social governmentality infringes on the likelihood of protest by undermining one of its elementary preconditions: the existence and legitimacy of social critique (Boltanski/Chiapello 2001) and the legitimacy of addressing it vis-à-vis society.

Neo-socially activated subjects who see all their conduct as an investment in their future performance may prefer the economic question whether their wishes are affordable or realisable to whether they are worth pursuing. The question required to generate protest of “what is wrong in society” may to some extent have been replaced by the question “what have I done wrong”. Heteronomous and often excessive demands for prevention and activation may be internalised and

taken personally by people who experience a discourse that stresses personal effort. Workfare, activation programmes, fitness training, healthy food, lifelong learning, active ageing, etc., illustrate this shift. Crucially, little of this is perceived as imposed upon actors, because it is presented as being in their own interest, as an investment in the personal self.¹⁶ Protest and critique, in the Foucaultian sense of affirming negation (Pickett 1996: 451), would have to transcend this economic framework that is the underlying principle of modern governmentality. Yet, specificities of the liberal, and even more so the neo-social relationship between government and the governed make this difficult.

2) Neo-social governmentality might be a source of dissatisfaction and low-level forms of protest.

Never-ending demands for prevention, activation and responsabilisation can breed protest if these demands are perceived as excessive. But the high degree of control and self-control as well as the individualisation associated with precarious work and living conditions give such protest a specific form. These multiple reactions, more likely situated on the sub-movement level, have been analysed under the Foucaultian term counter-conduct (Philipps/Hechler 2008, Kastner 2008). They may be resistant or even just hesitant behaviour. Philipps (2008) reports such tactics by people obliged to work in workfare programmes. For example, they worked extremely slowly or did not dress properly (they were not provided with work wear) and thus avoided outdoor work in bad weather. Counter-conduct is the resistant behaviour that appears on the borders of the governed space. It is the form of protest still possible.

3) Protest can even be a source of and support for neo-social transformations.

Boltanski and Chiapello (2001) showed the share autonomist 'artistic' critique of the protest movements had since the seventies in the precarisation of working conditions and the emergence of a "freedom discourse" that delegitimised social critique.¹⁷ Community policing and vigilante groups such as the self-organised anti-immigration Minuteman border patrols are another expression of such neo-social governmentalisation from below (Walsh 2008). This perspective raises the question of the presuppositions of society and those who protest to change it. 'Prevention' for example, is one of the most salient facets of neo-social governmentality and decisive for its subjectifying powers (Ullrich 2010). Yet, social movements — at least those not primarily aiming to redistribute material goods or life chances, like the environmental and the peace movements — often

16 See, for example, Ullrich (2009; 2010) for a more detailed account of the subjectification effects of medical preventionism or Bröckling (2003) on contemporary feedback techniques and how these discourses undermine social critique. See Bröckling (2005) for the general perspective of the enterprising self.

17 Though from a different theoretical background than Foucault, Boltanski and Chiapello share a common interest in the question why people find the state and form of modern capitalist society legitimate or even desirable (Boltanski/Chiapello 2001: 462/463 Lorey 2006, Kastner 2008: 50)

use the same (preventive) rhetoric. They are thus clearly designated as sharing that episteme of their context society and reiterate it.

All three aspects need further theoretical and empirical elaboration. There are protest-theorising approaches with which they can be linked. This applies especially for the “discursive” or “cultural opportunity structure”, which take into consideration the impact of deeply rooted cultural patterns on protest and their discursive change (Ullrich 2008). Although he does not mention the term governmentality, Goldberg (2001) gives us ideas about how to link questions of governmentality with protest through opportunity structures. In his case study, subjectification caused empowering group-coherence and had an impact on the perception of workers’ rights. Goldberg investigated the regulation of unemployment in New York, which had shifted from welfare to workfare. The older welfare system had been based on the distinction between workers and welfare recipients. The transformation challenged this common distinction because of the growing dependence of the city on ‘non-workers’ and because of a change in their self-perception. Although workfare staff were poorly paid and equipped in comparison with normal workers, their fields of operation have tended to converge, enhancing the self-esteem of workfare staff. They have hence increasingly felt legitimised to organise in their interest. This example shows that neo-social governmentality (of which workfare is a central feature) does not necessarily only hinder protest. It depends on concrete conditions whether protest is caused or hindered. But it is obvious what important a role legitimacy plays for organising protest and it is highly probable that changes in governmentality can have a significant effect on the perceived legitimacy of protest.

It seems practical and fruitful to investigate the emergence and non-emergence of protest under neo-social governmentality in limited spaces as demonstrated by Goldberg (2001).¹⁸ But it is much more challenging to investigate the general macro-level hypothesis of neo-social governmentality as a condition for hindering protest by undermining the legitimacy of social critique.

One empirical problem of such a macro perspective is the isolation of neo-social governmentality as a cause within the variety of social developments. This holds especially true due to the structural ambivalence of these changes composed of liberation and discipline. The continuous uncertainty of governmental demands also makes uniform reactions in the field of protest unlikely. So the question is more in the nature of a theoretically inspired perspective to be applied in a variety of research designs. Within its scope, research on the individual level of activists and non-activists is necessary. Researchers would have to explore to what extent the subjectivities promoted by neo-social governmentality (to be measured through internalized values) correlate with sympathy for and the disposition to protest. Discourse-oriented or re-constructive designs also come

18 The same applies for Tullney’s (2010) analysis of the individualising and protest-hindering effects of workplace surveillance.

into question, investigating changes in movement discourse in the way that Boltanski/Chiapello (2001) have examined modes of critique in management literature. It has to be investigated whether social critique is losing ground compared with individualised artistic critique, as was shown for social movements (cf. Neumann 2008, for an account of the alternative economy movement). Elements of neo-social governmentality (and resistance to it) can be traced within movement discourse, while the timing and conditions of their appearance need to be scrutinised. Another approach would be to organise interviews or group discussions with activists to reconstruct changes in their activist lives that reflect governmental subjectivities and the changing (self-) perception of protest legitimacy. New fields of research or at least different perspectives on existing ones come into focus. Of special interest seem to be subjectification processes in confrontation with surveillance, taming, delegitimisation, and repression (see e.g. Boyle 2010, Leach/Haunss 2010). New control technologies, such as the CCTV surveillance of demonstrations, bureaucratisation of the right of assembly, spatial policing strategies, data retention, mobile phone tracking, anti-terror-lists, and many more have to be explored. With Foucault and his disciples, society can be brought back into social movement research, and this can be achieved in a manner that links macro phenomena with subjects on the micro level and addresses the effects on the meso (movement) level.

4. Conclusion

Social movement research and especially discursive opportunity structures approaches can profit from Foucault. Foucault's approaches help to specify the context of framing processes and remind us to analyse social movement outcomes in a more long-term perspective. Foucault should be interpreted as a warning to not rely too heavily on the concept of the rational actor with a high degree of freedom to act. Besides strategically influencing discourse, contentious subjects are always influenced by governmental rationalities and the discourse themselves. Thus they cannot freely use discourse as a toolkit. As outlined in this text, Foucault observed that knowledge is always structured by power relations and that the scope of what can be imagined is limited. Social movement actors are embedded in these structures, which enable but also restrict their claims. We can think about such processes of restriction/enablement within the rational paradigm: movement actors shape their claims with an eye on discursive mechanisms: e.g. placing the right claim in the right arena and trying to positively influence the movement actors' speaker position. But Foucault particularly points to processes that cannot be explained by a rational actor model. Discourse also restricts/enables a movement's possible claims and frames: claims and frames outside the room for manoeuvre are not thought about at all by movement actors. These claims and frames may have been excluded by the

movement internal communicative practices or by the discursive structures in which the movement is embedded.

Governmentality studies are especially helpful in investigating the relation between discourse/societal practices and the formation of subjects and thus the very conditions for the possibility of protest. Currently, society can be conceptualised as being shaped by an economic rationality producing 'enterprising selves'. Depending on the specific context, these new ways of governing the self can either prevent the subject from mobilising or cause changing protest behaviour.

There is indeed much more to say about Foucault, social movements and protest than the scope of this article allows. This is partly because Foucault was not only a theorist but also an upright political activist. And although he did indeed spend much more time writing about power, resistance in various forms was always among his concerns. Even more, it was an object of his embrace (Pickett 1996). The various forms of resistance he contemplated (spirituality, contestation, transgression, revolution, resistance, counter-conduct, etc.) have been inspiring for movements themselves and political philosophy. This has led some scholars to analyse the "boundaries of power" (Hechler/Philipps 2008) on the basis of Foucaultian concepts, as well as the more subtle forms of contestation or 'counter-conduct' they enable on the fringes, despite the mutually constitutive relationship of power and resistance (Death 2010). Our examples have permitted us to show that, by drawing on Foucault, research on social movements can gain new perspectives worth exploring, while certain approaches to social movements need to be reassessed and more Foucaultian perspectives for social movement research can be developed in the future.

References

- Baumgarten, Britta. 2010. *Interessenvertretung aus dem Abseits. Erwerbsloseninitiativen im Diskurs über Arbeitslosigkeit*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Benford, Robert D. 1997. "An insider's critique of the social movement framing perspective." *Sociological Inquiry* 67:409-430.
- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology (ARS)* 26:611-639.
- Boltanski, Luc and Eve Chiapello. 2001. "Die Rolle der Kritik in der Dynamik des Kapitalismus und der normative Wandel." *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 11:459-477.
- Boyle, Michael Shane. 2010. "The Criminalization of Dissent. Protest Violence, Activist Performance, and the Curious Case of the VolxTheaterKarawane in Genoa." In: *Prevent and tame. Protest under (self-)control*, RLS Manuskripte, ed. by Florian Heßdörfer, Andrea Pabst, and Peter Ullrich. Berlin: Dietz, pp. 55-72.
- Bröckling, Ulrich. 2003. "Das demokratisierte Panopticon. Subjektivierung und Kontrolle im 360°-Feedback." In: *Michel Foucault. Zwischenbilanz einer Rezeption. Frankfurter Foucault-Konferenz 2001*, ed. by Axel Honneth and Martin Saar. Frankfurt/New York: Campus, pp. 77-93.
- Bröckling, Ulrich. 2005. "Gendering the Enterprising Self. Subjectification Programs and Gender Differences in Guides to Success. Distinktion." *Scandinavian Journal for Social Theory* 11 (2):7-25.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1999. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buechler, Steven M., 2004. "The Strange Career of Strain and Breakdown Theories of Collective Action." In: *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, ed. by David A. Snow, Sarah Anne Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi, pp. 47-66.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. London: Routledge.
- Crossley, Nick. 2002. *Making sense of social movements*. Buckingham: Open Univ. Press.
- d'Anjou, Leo and John van Male. 1998. "Between Old and New. Social Movements and Cultural Change." *Mobilization* 3: 207-226.
- Death, Carl. 2010. "Counter-conducts. A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest." *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest* 9: 235-251.
- Donati, Paolo. 1992. "Political Discourse Analysis." In: *Studying Collective Action*, ed. by Mario Diani, and Ron Eyermann. London: Sage, pp. 136-167.

- Ellingson, Stephen. 1995. "Understanding the Dialectic of Discourse and Collective Action - Public Debate and Rioting in Antebellum Cincinnati." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:100-144.
- Ferree, Myra M., William A. Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping abortion discourse. Democracy and the public sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzgerald, Kathleen und Diane Rodgers. 2000. "Radical Social Movement Organizations: A Theoretical Model." *The Sociological Quarterly* 41 (4): 573-592.
- Foucault, Michel. 1974. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- . 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- . 1982. "The Subject and Power", *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4): 777-795.
- . 1979. *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1998. *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin.
- . 2002. *The order of things. An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge.
- . 2005. *Analytik der Macht*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- . 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*. ed. by Michael Sennellart. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gamson, William. 1988. "Political Discourse and Collective Action." In: *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures. International Social Movement Research*, ed. by Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow. London: JAI Press, pp. 219-244.
- Gerhards, Jürgen. 1992. "Dimensionen und Strategien öffentlicher Diskurse." *Journal für Sozialforschung* 3:307-318.
- Goldberg, Chad Allan. 2001. "Welfare Recipients or Workers? Contesting the Workfare State in New York City." *Social Theory* 19:187-218.
- Guigni, Marco, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds). 1999. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gusfield, Joseph. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems. Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996. *Contested Meanings. The Construction of Alcohol Problems*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hart, Stephen. 1996. "The Cultural Dimension of Social Movements. A Theoretical Reassessment and Literature Review." *Sociology of Religion* 57:87-100.
- Hechler, Daniel and Axel Philipps (eds.). 2008. *Widerstand denken. Michel Foucault und die Grenzen der Macht*. Bielefeld: transcript.

- Heßdörfer, Florian and Jan Bachmann. 2009. "ASBO. Die Gesellschaft existiert." In: Leipziger Kamera (ed.), *Kontrollverluste. Interventionen gegen Überwachung*. Münster, pp. 168-173.
- Heßdörfer, Florian, Andrea Pabst, and Peter Ullrich (eds.). 2010. *Prevent and tame. Protest under (self-)control*. Berlin: Dietz.
- Kastner, Jens. 2008. "Was heißt Gegenverhalten im Neoliberalismus?" In: *Widerstand denken. Michel Foucault und die Grenzen der Macht*, ed. by Daniel Hechler and Axel Philipps. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 39-56.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Susan Olzak. 2004. "Discursive Opportunities and the Evolution of Right-Wing Violence in Germany." *AJS* 110:198-230.
- Lahusen, Christian and Britta Baumgarten. 2010. *Das Ende des sozialen Friedens? Politik und Protest in Zeiten der Hartz-Reformen*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Leach, Darcy K., and Sebastian Haunss. 2010. "»Wichtig ist der Widerstand«. Rituals of Taming and Tolerance in Movement Responses to the Violence Question." In: *Prevent and tame. Protest under (self-)control*, ed. by Florian Heßdörfer, Andrea Pabst, and Peter Ullrich. Berlin: Dietz, pp. 73-98.
- Lembke, Robert. 2005. „Der Mensch als Untertan. Zum Begriff der Subjektivierung bei Michel Foucault.“ *Tabula Rasa. Jenenser Zeitschrift für kritisches Denken* 23, Oktober. <http://www.tabvlarasa.de/23/lembke.php> (accessed October 20, 2010).
- Lemke, Thomas. 2000. "Die Regierung der Risiken. Von der Eugenik zur genetischen Gouvernementalität." In: *Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen*, ed. by Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasemann, and Thomas Lemke. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 227-264.
- Lessenich, Stephan. 2008. *Die Neuerfindung des Sozialen*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Lorey, Isabell. 2006. "Gouvernementalität und Selbst-Prekarisierung." <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/1106/lorey/de#redir> (accessed October 11, 2010).
- Marullo, Sam, Ron Pagnucco, and Jackie Smith. 1996. "Frame Changes and Social Movement Contradiction. U.S. Peace Movement Framing After the Cold War." *Sociological Inquiry* 66:1-28.
- Mc Adam, Doug. 1994. "Culture and Social Movements." In: *New Social Movements. From Ideology to Identity*, ed. by E. Laraña, H. Johnston, and J. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 36-57.
- McCammon, Holly, Courtney S. Muse, Harmony Newman, and Teresa Terrell. 2007. "Movement Framing and Discourse Opportunity Structures. The Political Successes of the U.S. Women's Jury Movements." *ASR* 72:725-749.
- Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. 1990. "Governing economic life." *Economy and Society* 19 (1): 1-31. doi: 10.1080/03085149000000001.

- Mooney, Patrick H. and Scott A. Hunt. 1996. "A repertoire of interpretations: Master frames and ideological continuity in US agrarian mobilization." *The Sociological Quarterly* 37:177-197.
- Neidhardt, Friedhelm (ed.). 1994. *Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung, soziale Bewegungen*, Sonderheft 34. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie (KZfSS).
- Neumann, Arndt. 2008. *Kleine geile Firmen. Alternativprojekte zwischen Revolte und Management*. Hamburg: Edition Nautilus.
- Offen, Karen. 2000. *European Feminisms 1700-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Oliver, Pamela and Hank Johnston. 2005. "What a good Idea! Ideologies and Frames in Social Movement Research." In: *Frames of Protest. Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*, ed. by H. Johnston, and J. Noakes. Boston, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 185-204.
- Pettenkofer, Andreas. 2010. *Radikaler Protest*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Paulus, Markus. 2009. "Die Stellung des Subjekts bei Foucault und Habermas." *Tabula Rasa. Jenenser Zeitschrift für kritisches Denken* 38, Oktober. <http://www.tabvlarasa.de/38/Paulus.php> (accessed December 29, 2009).
- Philipps, Axel. 2008. "Proteste und Resistenzen der Erwerbslosen." In: *Widerstand denken. Michel Foucault und die Grenzen der Macht*, ed. by Daniel Hechler and Axel Philipps. Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 261-275.
- Philipps, Axel and Daniel Hechler (eds.). 2008. *Widerstand denken. Michel Foucault und die Grenzen der Macht*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Pickett, Brent L. 1996. „Foucault and the Politics of Resistance.“ *Polity* 4 (28):445-466.
- Raschke, Joachim. 1991. "Zum Begriff der sozialen Bewegung." In: *Neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, ed. by Roland Roth and Dieter Rucht. Frankfurt: Campus, pp. 31-39.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1996. "Governing »Advanced« Liberal Democracies" in *Foucault and political reason*, ed. by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose. Chicago/London: UCL Press.
- , Pat O'Malley, and Mariana Valverde. 2006. "Governmentality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2, Nr. 1 (12): 83-104. doi: 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.2.081805.105900.
- Roth, Roland and Dieter Rucht (eds.). 1987. *Neue Soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2006. "Fighting Neo-liberalism with Neo-liberal Discourse: ATTAC." *Social Movement Studies* 5 (3):209-228.

- Snow, David A. 2004. "Framing Processes, Ideology and Discursive Fields." In: *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, ed. by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden: Blackwell Publ., pp. 380-412.
- . 2008. "Elaborating the Discursive Contexts of Framing. Discursive Fields and Spaces." *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 30:3-28.
- . and Robert Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." In: *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures. International Social Movement Research*, ed. by Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow. London: JAI Press, pp. 197-217.
- Spillmann, Lynn. 1995. "Culture, Social Structures, and Discursive Fields." *Current Perspectives in Social Theory* 15:129-154.
- Steinberg, Marc (1999), "The Talk and Back Talk of Collective Action: A Dialogic Analysis of Repertoires of Discourse among Nineteenth-Century English Cotton Spinners", in: *AJS*, Bd. 105, November, 736-780.
- Swart, William J. 1995. "The League of Nations and the Irish Question. Master Frames, Cycles of Protest, and 'Master Frame Alignment'." *Sociological Quarterly* 36:465-481.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.
- Thompson, Edward P. 1968. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Pelican Books.
- Tullney, Marco. 2010. "Organizing Employees Under Surveillance. My Boss is Spying on Me, So I Better Keep My Mouth Shut" in *Prevent and tame. Protest under (self-)control*, RLS Manuskripte, ed. by Florian Heßdörfer, Andrea Pabst, and Peter Ullrich. Berlin: Dietz.
- Ullrich, Peter. 2008. *Die Linke, Israel und Palästina. Nahostdiskurse in Großbritannien und Deutschland*. Berlin: Dietz.
- . 2009. "Überwachung und Prävention. Oder: Das Ende der Kritik." In: *Kontrollverluste. Interventionen gegen Überwachung*, ed. by Leipziger Kamera. Münster: Unrast, pp. 57-67.
- . 2010. "Preventionism and Obstacles for Protest in Neoliberalism. Linking Governmentality Studies and Protest Research." In: *Prevent and tame. Protest under (self-)control*, ed. by Florian Heßdörfer, Andrea Pabst, and Peter Ullrich. Berlin: Dietz, pp. 14-23.
- . 2012 (in print). „Kulturvergleich, diskursive Gelegenheitsstrukturen und linke Nahostdiskurse. Entwurf einer wissenssoziologischen und diskurstheoretischen Perspektive für die Protestforschung“ in *Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse: Exemplarische Anwendungen* Bd. 1, ed. by Reiner Keller, and Inga Truschkat. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

- Walsh, James. 2008. "Community, surveillance and border control. The case of the Minuteman project." *Sociology of crime, law and deviance* 10:11-34.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1989. *Communities of discourse. Ideology and social structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European socialism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Zimmermann, Bénédicte. 2006. *Arbeitslosigkeit in Deutschland. Zur Entstehung einer sozialen Kategorie*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Discussion Papers of the Area Civil Society, Conflicts and Democracy 2012

Project Group: **Civil Engagement**

Britta Baumgarten and Peter Ullrich

Discourse, Power and Governmentality.

Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault

SP IV 2012-401