

T04 / T04P03 - Mass protests of new millennia as a challenge to social theory

Topic : T04 / Public, problem and agenda setting

Chair : Nina Belyaeva (Global Nomad University)

Second Chair : Nick Mahony (The Open University)

Third Chair : GIUSEPPE MASTRUZZO (INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF TURIN)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

For this panel we expect papers of three different aspects: focused on concept theory, focused on last decade mass protests and focused on different publics as new social actor. In first type of papers we will strongly encourage those authors who are interested to elaborate on the problem of "the life of the concept" : emerging of the new concept, its full development, its further maturity, its gradual getting out of date and inability to explain social events at list it does not cover all cases across the globe). The examples here might be – Geo-centric system of universe, " Marxist concept of "economic basis of political life ", Fukuyama's concept of "end of history" and among recent ones, though may still having its followers –" transition theory". In theoretical papers it would be very important to follow the changing scope of views of the theory proved by examples in academic literature and equally important – in policy papers. Second type of the papers we welcome to this panel are the ones focused on latest nation-wide protests in countries like Egypt, Tunisia, Turkey, Brazil, Russia, Ukraine, Bulgaria. But with the specific focus: in which cases those protests did resemble "traditional social movements - with all features described by Tilly and Tarrow, particularly with the all the stages of the movement development from the active nucleus to spreading , dissemination and mass consolidation, and in which cases those protests do not have features of social movement, but resemble other types of social organizations: network of local communities, interest groups, spontaneous publics, support groups of certain political actors. Third type of papers we welcome - should be on phenomena of public as a social actor –despite of its often spontaneous nature, been its able to consolidate and express common social needs, and to formulate alternative policy agendas. The combination of three types of contributions will help us to see if - and to which extent – latest mass social and political protests are allowing us to formulate different concept – the one of "protesting public".

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel aims to focus on "Protest Publics"- those diverse or consolidated "publics", who "make social problems visible" by going out into streets and squares in protest against injustice - and to see if those " protest publics " can be adequately described by social movement theories. The main theoretical question is : which features DIFFER immediate and spontaneous "protest publics" from slowly consolidating "social movements"? And what makes "protest publics" effective in articulating social problems and bringing them into agenda? The need for the new analytical instruments often comes all over sudden, when some unexpected social events are happening and analysts are trying to explain it with the theoretical concepts and research frameworks they had used to apply before and they realize, - if they are honest with themselves - that those old instruments do not fully explain what is going on. This is exactly how it happened right after the beginning of the mass public protests in Russia. Though, similar mass protest events were already happening in many places before - in Arab World -Tunisia, in Egypt, in Libia, and in Europe, like in Bulgaria and first Maidan in Ukraine, as well as in post-Soviet Asia, like in Kyrgyzia or Kazakhstan, almost each time it happened in such a place, that as a environment for mass rallies was unthinkable before the events actually took place. All those events then develop so quickly that it does not give much time to analysts to develop new research instruments by the time they may disappear – and the new events, even more hard to conceptualize, would appeared in the same place. Since the very first lasting mass protests in Russia and other countries, there were many attempts made to somehow define, 'who were all those people', when protesters were first called 'angry citizens', but it was not too clear, angry with what, as the protest was clearly shifting its focus, as the first polls had reported a significant number of wealthy people involved, growing protest events were called 'middle – class uprising' or even 'fur-coat revolution', but this was not adequate either, as there were many people with quite low income among protesters, finally, recognizing high level of education among protesters, all the participants were referred to as "creative class", but this also happened to be only part of the truth, so the question "who are all those people", participating in mass protests in Russia during winter 2010-2011 and in other countries, still remains open. In approach this question, there are two conventional theoretical models, that seem to be most adequate to be applied : civil society concept and social movement theory, but the claim of this panel is, that none of them can fully grasp the nature of those mass protest. Theoretical concept of 'civil society' presupposes an intense and long-lasting organizational work for societies prior to common action, as the 'civil society 'itself is commonly understood as 'space between family, market and the state,' (Salamon 2004) but filled with plethora of multiple voluntary associations', which in practical sense of most research projects is reduced to 'organized society', or studying of NGO's (Heinrich 2004; Aleskerov F., Belyaeva N. 2008; Belyaeva, Proskuryakova 2008) - weather formal or informal - but all having some clear organizational structure and regularly working with their members and constituencies. In case of Russia 2010 it was clearly not the case – neither in terms of 'prior organization' of protest events, nor even in terms of mass NGO members participating. Another concept, that seem to be adequate to be applied, is social movement theory, that look on civil participation in a more dynamic way and define social movement itself on the base of what is understood as campaign , which itself is defined as ' organized public effort, making a collective claim on the target audience' (Tilly, Tarrow 2006;

Kleiman 2013) Social Movement often employ many different forms of political actions, from petitions to mass rallies and demonstrations, but they always do so through a lot of prior organizational work , including creation of stable organizational structures, or 'special purpose coalitions', that can insure 'a sustained and organized' manner of collective actions. Participants of social movements are usually clear about their own common identity, as one of the major claims, that they make to the other political actors and to the broader public is on 'who we are', or 'a name for 'us' –'Cherokees', 'Diamond Cutters' - that are called 'standing claims' distinguishing members from non-members, as well as 'program claims' that are been addressed to their target audience. (Tilly, 2004) In our opinion, social movement theory also have a limited application to Russian protest and mass protests in other countries, because it does not explain the very fact of those protest emergence, as there were no prior 'claimants' with any clearly set 'program claims' and even participants themselves, when questioned about the reasons for their participation, had very different explanations, which makes it hard to speak about their common identity. To be able to catch the very essence of Bolotnaya events and similar lasting and mass protests in other countries there are new theoretical concepts needed, which we suggest to be a newly emerging 'theory of publics' and their particular type – 'active public' or agent public , that is capable to perform as a social actor – without prior organizational work, performed either by civil society organizations or social movement organizers. (See more Warner 2002, Mahony, Clark 2013). It is an important novelty, that protest publics bring to the scope of participatory practices – almost total absence of prior organization, that was believed to be necessary. This makes them a valuable object to study and requires new conceptual framework, which we will seek to develop.

T04 / T04P03 - Mass protests of new millennia as a challenge to social theory

Chair : Nina Belyaeva (Global Nomad University)

Second Chair : Nick Mahony (The Open University)

Third Chair : GIUSEPPE MASTRUZZO (INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF TURIN)

Session 1

Beyond representative democracy: Mass protest as cognitive participation

GIUSEPPE MASTRUZZO (INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF TURIN)

Mass protest can be also seen as a form of involvement in participatory democracy, beyond the limits of representation. In recent years, many are the socially crucial instances and issues on which mass participation has drawn an attention that representative democracy had not been able to develop itself. One of these issues is the rights of Nature. Another parallel issue is that of the rights of future generations, èparticularly central to the whole discourse on the Commons. When pointing out at these issues mass protests become a form of social responsibility. Speaking in the name of Nature is saving ourselves. The interests of Nature and the future generation are the interests of the current generation (e.g.: measures to prevent global warming now for the future offer both short and long-term benefits to the current generation as well). This requires not only awareness of how present actions affect the lives (and resources) of future generations, but also its protection and assertion as a fundamental constitutional right. Responsibility: the defence and promotion of the commons not only involve public actors and authorities but also necessarily require the direct involvement of citizens capable and willing not only to represent their own interests but the interest of Nature and future generations. This direct involvement may even require citizens to denounce current laws that justify the continuing plunder of the commons as unjust. Citizens are defined by their duties – not only by their rights. We need a broad notion of generative property that implies elements of involvement and participation that are more duties than rights. We need property forms able to support more participatory ways of resource management and decision making. Indeed the essence of extractive as opposed to generative property is that it concentrates decision-making power in just one individual – at the exclusion and cost of the collective. Commons means generative property. Nature is meaningless without its generative properties. Participatory schemes are crucial for power diffusion. They are essential to develop a generative property structure. The commons is not only a type of more participatory form of property, but is also a set of alternative values of collective interests, participation, inclusivity and diffusion of power in the control and management of fundamental resources. Deregulation of the financial system has brought the economy to the brink of catastrophe. Laissez-faire capitalism has replaced dictatorship as the main threat to global democracy. The divorce of policy making from moral behaviour is now a threat to freedom itself.

Conceptualising publics in contexts of public change

Nick Mahony (The Open University)

During times of pervasive crisis publics are called on to perform in a growing range of ways, from protest events and to participatory budgeting through to consultation exercises and public assemblies. This paper introduces a flexible and reflexive framework designed to help researchers to conceptualise publics in contextually specific and theoretically informed ways. The framework draws on and relates three distinct and usefully different traditions of scholarship on the topic of the public. Illustrating how this framework has been used to investigate the contemporary field of public participation initiatives the paper will highlight relationships and tensions that exist between different forms of emerging public practice. In these ways the paper will reflect on a set of challenges and possibilities linked to theorising 21st Century publics and understanding how publics can affect political change.

Protest Public as a Social Actor: from m other world possible"

Nina Belyaeva (Global Nomad University)

Sanjay Rajhans (Higher School of Economics)

This paper is devoted to analysis of mass lasting protest and suggests to recognize their participants as new collective social actor – protest public - that emerge as counter public against dominating social and political discourse and practice of citizen denial. Based on the previous research, considering the view on 'the public' as a social actor, we develop new conceptual frame for protest events analysis, which allows to identify the type of publics, assembled for particular protest, including its 'qualities of actorness' and its 'transformative potential'. This frame is then applied to two cases of lasting protests in Russia – in St. Petersburg 2006-2010 and in Moscow 2011-2012, connecting qualities of those counter publics

to their ability of sustaining themselves and changing dominating discourse. The results include new interpretation of protest activities, with the key focus on the ability of protest publics to create, sustain and transmit to the wider society an alternative vision of desired future, that can have deep impact on both members of counter public itself, on broader society and on policy process, including various fields of social policy. Key words: public sphere, the public, social actor, social movement, protest public, Ethic-based protest

Who does the Devil Shift? Predictors for Demonizing Opponents

Colette Sophie Vogeler (Technische Universität Braunschweig)

Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

Escalated conflicts tend to provoke a “devil shift” (Sabatier et al. 1987). The concept of the devil shift is used in the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) to explain the polarization of competing groups but is not operationalized in detail (Sabatier/Jenkins-Smith 1993). It remains relatively unexplored if there is a variance between different types of individuals to demonize their opponents. Devil shift includes two dimensions: Actors see their opponents as very powerful and they attribute negative intentions to their opponents. Three types of variables may predict individuals’ devil shift. Firstly the affiliation of individuals to organizations might be relevant as the ACF proposes that members of bureaucracy are less likely to experience a devil shift than party affiliates or members of societal groups (Sabatier et al. 1987). Secondly the policy core beliefs might contribute to an explanation as actors with highly diverging beliefs tend to overemphasize negative aspects and see their opponents as evil (Sabatier et al. 1987). Thirdly the paper will analyze personal characteristics by applying the short version of the Neo-FFI. The Neo-FFI is a method developed by psychologists that allows for a categorization of the characteristics of actors. We assume that certain personal characteristics will affect the likelihood to see ones opponents as evil. The hypotheses are tested empirically using standardized questionnaires handed to actors of a selected case study which has shown a devil shift recently. Our case is the German infrastructure and railway conflict "Stuttgart 21" that reached a high level of escalation (Brettschneider 2011). Actors are asked how they assess the power and motivations of their opponents and which type of organization they represent. Policy core beliefs and personal characteristics are operationalized by standardized sets of questionnaires. References: Brettschneider, Frank (2011) Kommunikation und Meinungsbildung bei Großprojekten. In: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, No. 61, pp. 40-7 Sabatier, Paul A.; Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. (1993) Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach. Westview Press, Boulder Sabatier, Paul A.; Hunter, Susan; McLaughlin, Susan (1987) The Devil Shift: Perceptions and Misperceptions of Opponents. In: The Western Political Quarterly, Vol. 40, No. 3 pp. 449-76

THE CHALLENGES OF POLICYMAKING

David Edwards

New social movements arise today because their members want their ideas represented in policymaking and/or in policymaking bodies. Recent years have seen a proliferation of such new social movements, ranging from the Occupy Movements (which began in the U.S. but spread rapidly around much of the world) and the “Arab Spring” movements to the anti-austerity movements still convulsing various parts of Europe. Commentators have often criticized these movements for a variety of reasons. The Occupy movements were criticized for failing to present an agenda of desired policy changes from the outset. The Arab Spring movements were criticized for failing to agree upon a program of personnel changes and policy innovations (especially involving employment opportunities) that could unite the various factions that made up the movement in each country. And the anti-austerity movements have been criticized for failing to offer concessions that would satisfy foreign creditors or enable their governments to obtain bailouts from international organizations. These criticisms all suffer from a serious misunderstanding of the complex and evolving nature of representation in contemporary political systems. Both theorists and practitioners have commonly thought that new social movements should spring into existence with policy platforms already formed, and that the political system should then respond to—or refuse to respond to—these proposals for involvement in the policy process and/or for changes in public policy. In fact, the situation is rarely that well-developed as these groups form. Instead, the groups emerge out of the interplay of activists and the dominant powers, with the dominant powers often helping to create the groups by their actions. As this happens, the groups tend to develop ideas about what they want. This was particularly clear in the Occupy movements, which developed special new processes (such as nightly “General Assemblies”) for allowing interests to be expressed and proposals to evolve. Thus the political process involving New Social Movements is much more interactive and evolutionary than conventional ideas of political organization and policymaking processes have expected. And this has led established political bodies to tend to dismiss these groups as less serious and less threatening than conventional political interest groups. However, they do this at their long-term peril, because politics and the policy process are undergoing longterm changes that will pose greater challenges to the established order in years to come. These challenges will become even greater if and when the movements become increasingly transnational—as has already happened to varying degrees in the movements mentioned above.

This paper will develop this argument with specific references to these contemporary new social movements and their ongoing relations with the established order in particular countries.

T04 / T04P03 - Mass protests of new millennia as a challenge to social theory

Chair : Nina Belyaeva (Global Nomad University)

Second Chair : Nick Mahony (The Open University)

Third Chair : GIUSEPPE MASTRUZZO (INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF TURIN)

Session 2

From dissatisfaction to disagreement: how the critical mass comes out (Russian case)

Yulia Baskakova (Institute of sociology, Russian academy of science)

The report focuses on how the social discontent may transform into political forms of protest behavior in modern Russia. The main question is how mass consolidation emerge when the government cannot afford to provide a high level of social protection while insisting on its paternalistic role. So called "paternalistic expectations of masses" are usually considered to be an axiom when discussing political regime in Russia, that implies people willingly giving up political freedoms in exchange for guarantees of stability and security. Sociological data analysis shows however that there is a difference in people's expectations on behavioral and value-normative levels. They remain paternalistic in the second case, but in the first one they are pragmatic. The report examines the main factors of emerging mass consolidation and links is to destructive trends emerging as a result of the state's inability to carry out a high level of social responsibility, state institutions erosion as well as the widening gap between declarations and practices. Widely used indicators of stability like ratings of government leaders or protest activity indexes do not help identify and predict mass protests - if even a tenth of those who year after year has expressed willingness to take part in those, hit the streets, there will be a sweeping wave of mass rallies. The report identifies signs of a distance between the Russian society and government (electoral absenteeism, noncooperation with the state, avoiding any form of political or civic activity). It illustrates, employing a concept of self-organized criticality, how the paternalistic expectations transform into the various forms of destructive political choice. For example, anxiety (anticipation of the crisis) can serve to public mobilization ("Choose or Lose") and in other conditions- lead to protests and non-participation. The empirical base of the report includes a national-wide panel survey and a number of focus-groups conducted in 2011-2014.

New Ukrainian identity retrieved from the discour establishing the public?

Anna Potsar (National Research University Higher School)

Various identities of a human cover the wide scope of individual's self-concepts, including psychological, intellectual, social, emotional, national, other ideological, etc. properties. Some of individual's identities are rather persistent, whilst other can substantially change in the time under the influence of the external factors. Particularly, the ideological identity tends to shift in accordance with the dynamics of social conditions maintaining the relevance to the context and responding to current discursive practices. Ideological identity might be constructed or destroyed by means of ideological discourse established by any influential political actor. This paper focuses on the ideological identities intentionally constructed within the political changes in Ukraine. The ideological split in the Ukrainian society of 2013-2014 is often referred to as the war of identities, mainly represented to the public as the Ukrainian choice between Russia and Europe. This dichotomy was explained in a great number of public utterances in different terms and contexts: the relation towards European values and identity incompatible with the pro-Russian policy of the former government; the conflict with the Soviet past common for Russia and Ukraine; cultural and linguistic independence of Ukrainians imposing the struggle with the Russian influence. Within these contexts, many specific identities were competing in the public sphere in 2013-2014. Worth mentioning, these identities structured in accordance with the relation towards Europe are quite similar to the ideological identities emerging in Russia in times of the required political choice (i.e. elections) – despite all the contradictions between Russia and Ukraine they meet the same issues of identity building. The recent war of identities in Ukraine was most obviously embedded in the war of denominations, this fact is perfectly explained by the logic of the development of the persuasive discourse. Generally, the process of discursive construction of the ideological identity starts with the denominations which label "us" as the group sharing the same values and purposes and "them" as the group(s) hostile to the proclaimed values and the desired worldview. The developed system of ideological denominations is constantly reproduced in various evaluative contexts to establish and support the social/political opposition. According to Yuri Lotman, each text by the specific linguistic tools defines the audience capable to understand its message. Subsequently, the persuasive political message creates either the audience (passively perceiving) or the public (deliberately acting). The question is: how to distinguish the message bolstering the dialogue between actors and publics and the message bolstering violent actions. The answer is defined by the linguistic structures that feature either the dialogical utterance, or the aggressive message. Speaking about Ukrainian discursive wars, researcher hardly can be objective enough, since the conflict is still developing, but one neutral conclusion still can be drawn: the basic discursive weapon in the Ukrainian clash of political interests was mockery, irony, satire, and linguistic game of composing the new

words. Again – similarly to the Russian public protests in 2011-2012. How these means of comic effect the publics and policies needs further discussion.

?Protest Publics? in Egypt and Turkey from 2011 till present days: Aspects on Political Changes

Alexander Anufriev (Higher School of Economics)

Hamid Ait El Caid (Corvinus University of Budapest)

Tatiana Zagumennaia (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

The situation which is taking place in the Middle East for the last several years turns out to be an important issue both for Arab countries and their future development and for international community since the impact of Arab spring on international relations and relationship between different political actors in many countries cannot be underestimated. In this paper the author raises a problem of protest publics' role in political changes in Egypt and Turkey, while proving whether institutional practices in the country conducted by this public have real democratic background and will inevitably lead to the democratization of the state or will cause islamization, the growth of fundamentalism and help on the establishment of the authoritarian regime. In other words, the problem posed in the research is the vagueness of the possibility of Egyptian and Turkish protest public to be a driver of political changes in these countries. Consequently, the main question of the research is: to what extent these protest publics may constitute the driving force of political changes.

The relevance of the paper can be explained by the fact that in modern globalizing world the processes occurring in the Egypt which always claimed to be a leader in the region inevitably concern other countries of the Middle East and influence their policy not mentioning Western countries and Russia where Muslim population fervidly follow the changes caused by Arab Spring. This is also a reason of putting Egypt in the focus of the research: although Arab Spring involved almost all Maghreb countries, only this one considered itself as a leading country that creates trends and vectors of the development for the whole region. The case of Turkey does not touch upon the subject of Arab Spring directly, but may be interpreted as the consequence of the processes in the Middle East. Moreover, due to its geopolitical aspects Turkey has undergone the European influence and from this point of view this country might be perceived as the most European one among the arab-speaking countries, thus analyzing political processes and protest public there and comparing it with Egypt is very possible to give a new way of understanding political changes in the Middle East in the XXI century. During my research the author wants to reach a certain goal, to trace the mechanism of political changes and the role of protest public in this mechanism in the chosen countries. What is more, a chronological period is important in the research. The dates chosen are not the same for both countries. In 2011 Arab Spring hit Egypt and in 2013 protest started in Turkey. These are the key dates which are followed by the analysis of the events right until present days since the specific character of the research focuses on ongoing processes. However, it would be a mistake to think that the research only starts in the years mentioned above. Presuppositions of the changes can be traced back deep into the middle of 20-th century, the historical context plays here a significant role and ignoring it may simply lead to the misunderstanding of what is on the table now. The structure of the paper is strictly defined by the tasks the author raises in each part. The first task is to define protest publics and to prove that it is a specifically new term in political science. It is a concept which bares inside its core the notion of dignity; it's a regular cyclical protest, which is based on common values. Moreover, the first chapter is dedicated to the introduction of tools and technique that will be used while analyzing the cases. By building this framework the author will be able to proceed with analyzing particular cases announced in the topic of the research. The second chapter, following the tasks, will be dedicated to Egypt and the third one to Turkey. The actual task of each chapter is to show a specific role of protest publics in two countries, these publics became a counter-trend in political life, an opposite to the main track of political elites.

Ukrainian Protests (2013-2014) in the context of Multiple Cleavages factors and foundations

Vladimir Kozlov (Higher School of Economics)

Dmitry Zaytsev (University of Notre Dame at Tantar)

Anastasia Galina (National Research University- Higher School of Economics)

According to the theory of cleavages proposed by Lipset & Rokkan (1990) "conflicts and controversies can arise out of a great variety of relationships in the social structure, but only a few of these tend to polarize the politics of any given system". They distinguish four critical lines of cleavage: Centre-Periphery, State-Church, Rural-Urban, Employers-Workers cleavages. The Lipset & Rokkan theoretical framework was relevant for the analysis of nation Building in the European States "including Southern Europe (excluding the Balkans) and Nordic Europe (Scandinavia and Finland) but excluding Eastern Europe (orthodox countries as well as Hungary although occasionally including Poland and Russia" (1990). The authors use Lipset & Rokkan theoretical framework to study protest events in Ukraine 2013-2014, which could be seen in the context of "National Revolution", that take place in the country. The theory gives the basic explanation of party system construction and the political attitudes in modern Ukraine, and, what is the most important, predicts the possible cleavages of nation-building and democratic development. Also, to highlight the new changes in society other social cleavages were developed: materialism vs post-materialism, winners and losers of integration and globalization ((Bartolini and Mair 1990; Bartolini 2000; Karvonen and Kuhnle 2000; Rogowski 1989). The authors argue that "new cleavages" could be more relevant to explain current social and political situation in Ukraine. In the paper the main research question is to find out social, political, economic, and cultural foundations for cleavages in Ukrainian society: supporters and antagonists of Euromaidan. By our hypothesis the above mentioned division in Ukrainian society on supporters and antagonists of Euromaidan is mainly explained by the materialism vs post-materialism and globalists vs. anti-globalists cleavages than by traditional Lipset & Rokkan ones. To test this hypothesis we should use objective data (number of capturing of administrative buildings by the Euromaidan activists;

number of activists participated in the Euromaidan my protests; statistics of social and economic development, language status, nationality; electoral statistics) and subjective data (political preferences and values from European Social Survey 2012, sociological data of all-Ukrainian mass surveys). For the units of analysis the authors use both individuals (citizens of Ukraine) and Ukrainian regions. As the methods of research we use correlation, cluster, factor and regression (multilevel regression) analysis. One of the important outcomes of the research will be falsification of widespread stereotype in common academic and analytical discourses about the strict West-East dimension that influence on Ukrainian political development and political changes.

?Je suis Charlie? as mass protest: analytical reconstruction and in global level

Shota Kakabadze (INTELCORP: Research & Development)

Katerina Uzoikina (National Research University, Higher School of Economics)

What distinguishes mass protests from mass solidarity actions? Regular research frame suggests, that mass protests are usually connected with democratic transit, with change or correction of political regime on the whole or one of its institutions, like elections, courts, governments, etc. What we see in case of "Je suis Charlie" mass assemblies - in almost all big cities all around France - and growing international movement in social media, that is uniting not only civil society and global NGOs, but also heads of states and international intergovernmental organizations - this traditional scheme does not work, suggesting, that here we may be witnessing events of the different nature. What usually causes mass protests: - dissatisfaction with functioning of certain state institutions - dissatisfaction with social and political status of particular social group - dissatisfaction with current political regime as a whole - certain social events, that trigger public awareness about sharp social injustice - lack of institutional channels of social and political representation None of those cases seem to work for "Je suis Charlie" How can we qualify or conceptualize mass public actions of French citizens in solidarity with journalists shot at their job places at magazine Charly Edbo? Apparently, those mass actions are showing a lack of fear of the savage attack by Islamic extremists on journalists of cartoon magazine. In essence, these mass demonstrations are held in defense of freedom of expression and as a whole - in defense of democratic values. Is this movement - a protest? If so, against what? This paper will explore the emergence of "Charlie Public" and attempt to reconstruct, according of Michael Werner's vision of emerging publics, what kind of "social message" caused this public to existence and which message this public have created in response.

T04 / T04P03 - Mass protests of new millennia as a challenge to social theory

Chair : Nina Belyaeva (Global Nomad University)

Second Chair : Nick Mahony (The Open University)

Third Chair : GIUSEPPE MASTRUZZO (INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF TURIN)

Session 3

Anticorruption and mass protests in contemporary Russia

Sergey Parkhomenko (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Corruption is considered to be one of the most important problems of Russia. It is officially admitted that corruption causes significant instability in the system of public administration, prevents the governments of both federal and regional level from achieving the goals of most public policies. The negative consequences of corruption for all the levels of governance and all the communities are obvious. The municipal or local levels are also considerably affected by corruption and suffer its negative effects. The anticorruption reforms initiated in Russia in 2008 provide examples of complex yet not complete attempts of changing the corrupt traditions at various levels of the state administration. Most aspects of public activities are affected by the reforms, including the agenda-setting and policy-making and policy-implementation processes. Notwithstanding this generally positive fact the situation in Russia is not without controversy. The recent political mobilization efforts of the Government resulted not only in the unfavorable political and economic environment changes but also caused the urge for further securing the positions of the present political and bureaucratic regime. From this perspective corruption becomes a threatening factor, which has the potential to destabilize the situation in the country. Thus the Government began the attempts to monopolize the right to utilize the corruption agenda. This process took considerable time in fact. The first changes became evident when the public participation in the development of the anticorruption reforms began to decline after the initially wider participation at the beginning of the reform period. By now the situation in Russia is quite complicated and could be described in the following way. Russian opposition traditionally lacked clear and easily understandable agenda. Political opposition being objectively weaker than it is necessary to cause any changes in the political environment could not become a driver for its formulation and lost the positions in the political environment. At the same time the expert community in most cases does not have opportunities to publicly provide and defend counter-arguments to the official agenda and cannot influence the policy-making process. In most cases the government, or in other words the bureaucracy, pretends to have the legal and moral right to ignore such attempts. Mass protests remain the most potent means of demonstrating dissatisfaction of the society with the political changes in the country. Corruption of the state became one of the most influential points for criticism. Anticorruption is the significant component of mass protest "ideology" in Russia. The main leaders of the protests use the corruption motive to appeal to the interests of the general public. Anticorruption argument can be considered to be an example of the rare universally appealing argument, because corruption in Russia is in some sense equivalent to political and administrative power: those who associate themselves with the power benefit from corruption, those who do not – suffer the negative consequences. Anticorruption ideology has the potential to unite. Both the expert community and the general public are dissatisfied with the present situation with corruption in Russia. Consequently, fighting corruption appeals to the majority of the publics (which do not associate themselves with the government). Taking into account these peculiarities of the situation it is easy to explain the reasons why Alexey Navalny, who is well-known for his anticorruption initiatives, became one of the most distinguished leaders of the mass protests. Considering anticorruption as a political resource it is much easier to analyze the case of his prosecution. It is probably the most straightforward attempt to undermine Navalny's influence among those, who sympathize and share anticorruption values. Alexey Navalny was found guilty on embezzlement charges in 2013 and 2014 and received a suspended sentence. The last case is especially remarkable as his brother and co-defendant Oleg Navalny was sentenced to 3,5 years in jail. As far as Alexey Navalny impersonalizes the protest movement (to a significant degree) and is perceived as a vigorous anticorruption activist by the public opinion, it seems to be the easiest way to neutralize or at least to weaken the whole process. Unfortunately the mass protests are only the visible part of the iceberg and this tactic effect will be easily surpassed by the negative mid-term and strategic consequences: the political diversity is once again threatened, the anticorruption agenda is significantly undermined, and the civil society potential decreased.

The transformation of war and war as a mass p

Boris Kashnikov (National Research University Higher

The transformation of war (Creveld, Mueller, Kaldor), especially in terms of the demise of its Trinitarian nature (Clausewitz) provides a challenge to the social science as well as to the public policy analysis and practice. War as waged by a political state, as hierarchically structured, professionally organized institute and as a system based on special values, norms and principles is close to extinction. What comes to substitute it is another, yet not sufficiently understandable form of massive violence, but totally different to what we used to know as war. The "new wars" are not

truly wars, since they do not have the necessary features of the classical war. It is a new form of massive violence, which tends to merge with other forms of massive violence like genocide, police operation, criminal violence and what constitute the interest of this panel - mass protest. Of course, in this case we refer to the special stage in the development of the mass protest, namely - violent mass protest. It has always been the case, that violent mass protests have been transformed into civil war or uprising. The seminal "Damned of the Earth" by Fanon provides the point of departure here. Still, the contemporary transformation of war makes it extremely close to the violent mass protest and the other way around, the contemporary mass protest is much more "warlike" from the start. The following features of the contemporary war merges it with the violent mass protest: The wars are waged by networks rather than states. The contemporary wars, even if they are not total wars tend to merge public and private agents (private military companies, criminal world, business). The contemporary wars are progressively waged for the private, rather than public interest. They are waged against civilians rather than combatants. Last but not least, wars are losing the political nature. On the contrary, the violent mass protests adopt the feature, which used to be more characteristic of wars. The violent mass protests of today are relatively much more structured from the very start. It has the global links. It is closely related to the information warfare. Unlike wars (which are dropping their political nature), mass protests are progressively adopting political nature. To sum up, the distinction of war and violent mass protest tends to blur, with the political and moral consequences yet unpredictable.

How protest public affected development of volunteering organizations in Russia? Example of mass protests in 2011-2012

Artem Uldanov (Higher School of Economics Moscow)

How protest public affected development of volunteering organizations in Russia? Example of mass protests in 2011-2012 Artem Uldanov. Higher School of Economics. Moscow art.uldanov@gmail.com In my paper I will focus on level of impact which was caused by protest public formed in 2011-2012 on development of volunteering movement in Russia. These protests became a driver for creation a very specific vital environment for different civil initiatives and some of them launched a number of volunteering organizations which are still active and create working mechanisms for problem solving and spread their activities from local to federal level. I must underline, that usually, under volunteer organization (especially in Russia) I meant special social network, with horizontal organization and not directly hierarchical structure. Current theoretical approaches in the field of social capital and social movements (Lin, Sansenbernar, Coleman) points that there is a close connection between social capital, network theories and volunteering studies, based on social ties analysis. Social network analysis suggests that the number, kind and level of ties correlates with levels of communication which people have, and this is the key to determining the range of opportunities, influence and power of these people. In this logic, high level of communication with strong social ties creates a vital environment for networks creation and these networks in cause of their nature, usually will be more or less volunteering. This idea contains some simplification, because it is important to note that networks can be different and their differences arise from type of the social capital which has been used on their occurrence, but in general, on specific example of Russian protests, we can see how theory reflects in social reality. There are number of factors which more or less affect social movements in general and volunteering organizations in particular. We can roughly divide them on external, such as political regime, legal framework, political culture and level of trust between citizens and internal factors, such as organizational culture, leadership and informal regulative norms, motivation. For this paper I took several cases of organizations, which were formed in the wake of the growing protest movement, but established not as just volunteering network for support activists or civil education. Examples of these organizations show us that protest activity and things closely related to this field cannot serves as a ground for development of sustainable volunteering organization, but protest as itself is important for such development, because directly or indirectly peaceful protest activity leads to growth of trust and social capital, particularly for citizens whom involved in this activity.

Occupy Protest Movement(s) as a C

Viktorija Mladenovi? (Higher School of E

Heather McRobie (Oxford University)

korhan ozan agbas (Higher School of Ec

Social movements' studies, as a sub-field of political sociology, have extensively been reshaped with fruitful work of two respectful scholars, Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow, whose attempts to bring an order and deeper understanding to this discipline[1] have been crowned with their last book "Contentious Politics".[2] In the light of numerous social and political protests taking place nowadays, comprehensive studies of social movements have passed a point of being appealing to academic community and became a necessity. Since 2011 Occupy protest at Wall Street, there have been a spontaneous movements around the globe suggesting a connecting and inter-causality between them. This paper is puzzled by the inter-connectivity between separate cases of Occupy protest movement via focusing on five particular cases: Occupy Wall Street (USA), Occupy London (UK), Occupy Brazil (Brazil), Occupy Gezi (Turkey), and Occupy Central (Hong Kong, China). Reasoning behind the extraction of precisely these five examples is the idea to cover as wide as possible global scope (different continents) and thus far more or less diverse cultures in the research. The most common understanding of Occupy protest movement is a one labelling it as an international movement that aimed to demonstrate against economic and, consequently, social inequality all around the world. However, in reality different #Occupies have initially been triggered by local/national policies such as state solution for economic crisis of credit banks (USA and UK), increased unemployment and seemingly unnecessary investment to the World Cup (Brazil), construction and urban concerns (Turkey) etc. The global characteristic that has been attributed to these social movements (in plural) is not essentially inherent to a (national level) movement (in singular) but is rather categorical due to several similarities and lately established links usually via usage of social media, organizational structure (horizontal), protest type, global perspective of components etc. With a number of protests labelled as #Occupy rising and being witnessed across the globe, new aspects, goals and strategies are revealed, and so the discussion about this phenomenon is getting even

more complex. The purpose of this paper is, thus, to analyse five above-mentioned cases of Occupy protest movement through the array of concepts and tools of analysis offered by Tilly and Tarrow while at the same time acknowledging special theoretical frameworks offered for the #Occupy. [3] Furthermore, one could say that #Occupy has opened a new chapter in new social movements' studies via making localized demands with calling for global solidarity[4]. This paper will try to give an empirical support to such claims and further open a channel for discussing whether this novelty is sort of a challenge to social theory and if it, perhaps, could better be explained through the concept of "protesting publics". Existing theories have not been able to provide a strong insight about the new profile that came up with Occupy movements which is simply togetherness of different identities, races, ethnicities, ages, genders under the common political demands with economical and, perhaps more important, urban dimensions. This paper will, finally, examine how 'occupy' itself as a concept is directly linked to the "space/land" which gives us an important clue about the changing paradigm on social movement theories. Bibliography Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly. Dynamics of Contention. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Michael Albert, Mandisi Majavu. Occupy Theory. First ZBooks/ZCommunications Edition, 2012. Schechner, Richard. "Occupy solidarity." The Drama Review, Volume 56, Number 1, 2012. Tarrow, Charles Tilly and Sidney. Contentious Politics. Boulder: Paradigm Press, 2006. [1] McAdam D., Tarrow S., Tilly C.: Dynamics of Contention, 2002 [2] Tarrow S., Tilly C., Contentious Politics, 2006. [3] Albert A., Majavu M., Occupy Theory, 2012 [4] Schechner R., Occupy solidarity, 2012