

Protests as Critical Junctures: Some reflections towards a momentous approach to social movements

Donatella della Porta, Scuola Normale Superiore

To cite this article: Donatella della Porta (2018): Protests as critical junctures: some reflections towards a momentous approach to social movements, *Social Movement Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2018.1555458 To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1555458>

Moments and Movements: an introduction

Starting in late May 2013, the protests in and around Gezi Park in Istanbul grew suddenly and quickly. As an activist recollected, “Over the night of May 27th, around 10 p.m., an e-mail was circulated by IMECE Societal Urban Movement with the message: ‘they are cutting the trees’. 10-15 people went to the park immediately; from 7 a.m. the next morning, calls for support were announced; those who came were the ones already involved in the network; we were around 30 people in the next morning. At the beginning, we did not know what would happen, but we were thinking that we had to stay and sit down here” (cited in Atak 2014, 262). As the police intervened against the protestors, “the numbers taking part rose from tens to hundreds and then thousands between 27 and 30 May, finally reaching hundreds of thousands on the night of 31 May, as a sea of protesters crowded İstiklal Street and other boulevards around Taksim, building barricades and trying to reach the square itself and Gezi Park, which were then surrounded by police. Protests spread to other parts of Istanbul: thousands managed to cross the Bosphorus Bridge from the Anatolian side, reaching Taksim” (Yörük and Yüksel 2014, 104). Under the slogan “everywhere is Taksim, everywhere is resistance,” people protested in 79 cities (Erkan and Oguz 2014). According to the Ministry of the Interior, 3,545,000 citizens participated in 4,725 protest events, in all but two cities in the country; others estimate participation at about 12 percent of the entire population in Turkey, which means more than 8 million people; about 1.5 million participated in Istanbul (16% of the population over 18 years old) and half a million in Izmir (Yörük and Yüksel 2014).

Like May 27th 2013 for the Gezi Park movement in Turkey, many dates are imprinted in the collective memory of social movements. Just within the last decade, we can cite several examples: January 25th, 2011, as what was called as a routine protest in Cairo developed into the occupation of Tahrir Square, ending with the breakdown of Mubarak’s regime; May 15th, 2011 in Madrid, as an unplanned occupation to contest state repression developed into the encampment of Puerta del Sol in Madrid, triggering the broadest wave of protests in Spain; or March 31st, 2016, when Nuit debout spread from a camp in Place de la République in Paris to mobilize over 400,000 activists all over France. In fact, we frequently hear references to special moments as well as momentous events, as calls for what was expected to be routine protest created triggered portentous waves of

contentious politics.

In Newtonian mechanics, momentum is “the product of the mass and velocity of an object. It is a three-dimensional vector quantity, possessing a magnitude and a direction” (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Momentum>). In the language of political activism, “momentum” is now evoked as an act that dares to challenge existing structures, through massive support and at great velocity. Significantly, Momentum is the name of the left-wing British political organization, founded in 2015, shortly after Jeremy Corbyn's successful campaign for the Labour Party leadership, which describes itself as oriented to build on “the energy and enthusiasm from the Jeremy Corbyn for Labour Leader campaign, to increase participatory democracy, solidarity, and grassroots power and help Labour become the transformative governing party of the 21st century” (cit. in [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Momentum_\(organisation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Momentum_(organisation))). To cite another example, in 2018 the fiftieth anniversary of 1968 is celebrated with references to a “political moment” triggering deep and long-lasting changes in culture, politics, and society. Among the scholars who have reflected on the importance of discontinuities and ruptures, Jacques Rancière defined political moments as signaling the very essence of politics:

Politics cannot be deduced from the necessity of gathering people into communities. It is an exception to the principles according to which this gathering operates. The 'normal' order of things is that human communities gather together under the rule of those qualified to rule – whose qualifications are legitimated by the very fact that they are ruling. These governmental qualifications may be summed up according to two central principles: The first refers society to the order of filiation, both human and divine. This is the power of birth. The second refers society to the vital principle of its activities. This is the power of wealth. Thus, the 'normal' evolution of society comes to us in the progression from a government of birth to a government of wealth. Politics exists as a deviation from this normal order of things. It is this anomaly that is expressed in the nature of political subjects who are not social groups but rather forms of inscription of 'the (ac)count of the unaccounted-for' (Rancière 2001).

Recent times have been defined as momentous: great transformation, great recession as well as great regression have been frequently used short-cut terms to characterize the period following the financial breakdown of 2008. Moments of rupture are thus recognized as most important in defining new paths, as “What is important are the significant *breaks* – where old lines of thought are disrupted, older constellations displaced, and elements, old and new, are regrouped around a different set of premises and themes” (Hall 1980, 33). Bridged with the concept of crisis, these terms have been used to highlight sudden changes. In the social sciences, scholars have attempted to address these periods by reflecting on the social perception of time – especially of time acceleration in modernization processes (Scheuerman 2004), as the routinized, predictable period of the welfare state is replaced by the uncertain, fluid, or disjointed time of today's capitalism (Sennett 1998; Bauman 1998). Some have pointed at the role of new technologies in bringing about an acceleration that spirals with acceleration in social communication as well as in everyday life (Castells 1996; Rosa 2013).

Reference to moments of change can indeed be found in different approaches addressing them from the macro, meso, and micro levels. At the macro level, in neoinstitutional approaches, the *critical juncture* is one of the concepts most often used to describe times of deep changes. A critical juncture is defined as “(1) a major episode of institutional innovation, (2) occurring in distinct ways, (3) and generating an enduring legacy” (Collier and Munck 2017, 2). In their influential

analysis of political incorporation in Latin American, Collier and Collier reflected on “a type of discontinuous political change in which critical junctures ‘dislodge’ older institutional patterns” (1991, 36). While the term “critical juncture” has been stretched to cover a heterogeneous range of phenomena, it convincingly points at the need to distinguish in the analysis of contentious politics between times of continuity and times of change, normal times and intense times. Among those who have studied the evolution of social movements and parties, Kenneth Roberts (2015, 65) has characterized critical junctures as periods of “crisis or strain that existing policies and institutions are ill-suited to resolve” – and therefore different from normal politics, when “institutional continuity or incremental change can be taken for granted.”

While neoinstitutional approaches have looked at extraordinary times from a macro perspective, the Chicago School had addressed change from a micro perspective, looking at the sudden breaking of established paths, the reproduction of ruptures, and their stabilization. Collective behavior was the concept used to define forms of social behavior in which “usual conventions cease to guide social action and people collectively transcend, bypass or subvert established institutional patterns and structures” (Turner and Killian 1987, 3). Although the collapsing of social movements and crowds within a common category has received much criticism, some insights of that approach could be usefully discussed in order to explain social movements in extraordinary times. Not by chance, this approach has now been revisited. Social movement studies have since the 1970s looked at movements in stable democracies, within analytic approaches aimed at embedding movements in normal political circumstances. But as Hank Johnston (2018) noted, there are times and places in which protests and social movements are emerging phenomena which, as Ralph Turner (1996) suggested long ago, are emergent insofar as they produce new norms. In fact, as symbolic interactionist approaches had outlined, social movements trigger social change through the spreading of emergent norms that, by defining “what’s going on here,” “guide new and different ways that participants express their attitudes, beliefs, and values” (Johnston 2018, 8).

An emerging concern in social movement studies with “great transformations” as well as protests that, like those mentioned in the incipit, triggered big mobilizations (della Porta 2015) can also be seen at the meso level. While research on protests has focused on the analytic concepts of long waves (Markoff 2016) as well as short(er) cycles (Tarrow 1989), the reflection on the relevance of some specific protest moments as catalysts for change speaks to the capacity of social movements to contribute to emerging norms by breaking routine and introducing new ethical concerns. Although still largely a silence in social movement studies, researchers have reflected on protests as momentous events, in particular by looking at contentious politics as triggering an intensification of the perception of time (della Porta 2017). As Mark Beissinger (2007) noted in analyzing *extraordinary times* in the development of nationalism, protest events are in fact “contentious and potentially subversive practices that challenge normalized practices, modes of causation, or system of authority” (Beissinger 2002, 14).

In this article, developing a meso perspective that focuses on social movements, I will argue that some eventful protests trigger critical junctures, producing abrupt changes which develop contingently and become path dependent. While routinized protests proliferate in normal times, some protests – or moments of protest – act as exogenous shocks, catalyzing intense and massive waves of protest. Referring to the debate on critical junctures, and bridging it with social movement studies, I will thematize a sequence of processes of *cracking*, as the production of sudden ruptures; *vibrating*, as contingently reproducing those ruptures; and *sedimenting*, as the stabilization of the

legacy of the rupture. With the aim of mapping some relevant questions, rather than providing answers, I will refer for illustration to research I carried out on movements in democratic transitions (della Porta 2014) during economic, political, and social crises (della Porta, Andretta et al. 2017; della Porta 2017a), as well as their legacy (della Porta 2017b; della Porta, O'Connor et al. 2017; della Porta, Fernandez et al. 2017) and memory (della Porta, Andretta et al. 2018; della Porta 2018).

Protest cracks

In the first days of the revolution we were able to mobilize thousands in the streets, as we addressed the needs of people ... people were eager to go in the streets. ... The 25th of January 2011 was the first day, we were in Midan Tahrir against the regime. There were from 10,000 to 20,000 people that day. Later on the 28th of January you found huge amounts of people in the streets to express their anger against the cops. After that day numbers increased again because the regime committed crimes against people, known as the camel massacres. These events played a big role in mobilizing people onto the streets again, after they saw peaceful protesters being killed. ... After the downfall of Mubarak, we made many million-people protests in the streets ...

Nobody was prepared, even those who thought this might be a revolution ... the 25th of January turned out to be much bigger than anybody thought. ... The 28th was the day of the revolution when everything changed (in della Porta 2017a, 205, 305).

As these quotes from two interviews with Egyptian activists remind us, protests are – to different extents – interruptions of routines, some of them producing sudden changes. Reflection on critical junctures can help in conceptualizing the abrupt transformations that some protest events produce as forms of synoptic, quick changes, rather than incremental, extended ones. As Collier and Munck (2017, 3) note, “The critical juncture may be a *concentrated* episode of ‘synoptic’ policy innovation, as with some of the episodes of neoliberal transformation over the past few decades.” Even those scholars who define critical junctures as including incremental change recognize the importance of shocks as triggers for transformation. In fact, “To the extent that the critical juncture is a *polarizing event* that produces intense political reactions and counterreactions, the crystallization of the legacy does not necessarily occur immediately, but rather may consist of a sequence of intervening steps that respond to these reactions and counterreactions” (Collier and Collier 1991, 37, emphasis added).

While the literature on critical junctures in particular has reflected on the importance of sudden shocks for institutional changes, their micro-dynamics have also been addressed within the tradition of collective behavior in which collective action is triggered by extraordinary events that mobilize existing social groups. In this tradition, Parks and Burgess talked of the social contagion fueled by excitement at milling in the crowd (1921, 866), and Blumer (1951, 171) singled out circular reactions triggered under conditions of restlessness that becomes contagious, leading to social unrest. A protest crack can therefore be seen as an “extraordinary event that orients people to others for an interpretation and response” (Buchler 2016, 70). Addressing the question of *What is an event*, Robin Wagner Pacifici (2017, 1) has recently pointed at the sense of uncertainty growing from the need to “unknow” and “reknow” in what she called *rupturing moments*:

Crowds storm a building, thousands of protesters amass in a square, airplanes fly into skyscrapers, financial markets go into free fall. Such occurrences can set off a series of actions that only gradually and with difficulty cohere into an event that can be categorized, located in time and space, and given a name. In experiencing such rupturing moments, we may pause in our daily activities, consult communications media of various kinds, confer with each other, and feel somewhat dislocated and disoriented, even if we are distant from the points of rupture or immune from their immediate impact. The point is, we're not sure. If we sense something eventful is happening, we may be both drawn in and repulsed by the prospect of a world transforming. Historical events provoke an enormous sense of uncertainty. The world seems out of whack, and everyday routines are, at the least, disrupted. People often experience a vertiginous sensation that a new reality or era may be in the making, but it is one that does not yet have a clear shape and trajectory, or determined consequences.

In social movement studies, as well, some protest events have been considered as particularly capable of triggering abrupt transformation. As ruptures of routine, protests aim at producing a momentous effect, challenging the established order. Especially at the beginning of a mobilization, the aim is to create a fissure or a “crack” (Holloway 2010). Looking at events as carriers of a specific conception of time, William Sewell has suggested the concept of *eventful temporality* to indicate moments in which actions change structures rather than being constrained by them. In his vision, “eventful temporality recognizes the power of events in history” (1996, 262). If events are a “relatively rare subclass of happenings that *significantly transform structure*,” an eventful conception of temporality is “one that takes into account the transformation of structures by events” (ibid., emphasis added). With reference to “eventful temporality,” the concept of the “transformative event” has singled out those events with a particularly high capacity to catalyze change. They “become turning points in structural change, concentrated moments of political and cultural creativity when the logic of historical development is reconfigured by human action but by no means abolished” (McAdam and Sewell 2001, 102).

In the histories of movements, some events are especially transformative, catalyzing attention, and then outrage and resistance. Moments of concentrated transformations – such as the taking of the Bastille for the French Revolution or the Montgomery Bus Boycott for the American Civil Rights movement – have been highlighted especially in those highly visible moments that end up symbolizing entire social movements. As McAdam and Sewell observed, “no narrative account of a social movement or revolution can leave out events. ... But the study of social movements or revolutions – at least as normally carried out by sociologists or political scientists – has rarely paid analytic attention to the contingent features and causal significance of particular contentious events such as these” (2001, 101).

Beyond these few turning points, many protest events have cognitive, affective, and relational impacts on the very movements that carry them out (della Porta 2008). If research on social movement outcomes has mainly focused on external outcomes, I have suggested looking at *eventful protests* as (also) capable of transforming relations within social movements and between movements and their contexts, through raising emotional and cognitive mechanisms (della Porta 2004; 2014). While events are usually constrained by the external, structural conditions, some events can redefine the conditions for a successive chain of events. Eventful protests thus reproduce, rather than just consuming, resources of solidarity and collective identification, fueling positive emotions of empowerment. During eventful protests, participants experiment with new

tactics, send and receive signals about the possibility of collective action, and create and experience feelings of belonging as occasions for interactions multiply. In fact, the perception of time accelerates, as what had seemed impossible now appears possible (della Porta 2017a). As was the case in Egypt, Tunisia, Spain, Greece, or the United States at the beginning of the waves of protests against austerity (della Porta 2013; 2015; della Porta and Mattoni, 2014), an initial protest event is able to produce a crack in the institutional assets, altering the cultural meanings or signification of political and social categories and fundamentally shaping people's collective loyalties and actions.

If we zoom in these events, we notice some specific mechanisms at stake. Emotionally, during these first episodes of protest, protestors describe excitement as fueling hope for change. Surprise at the breadth and intensity of relations is often mentioned in recent protest events that triggered intense moments of protest, together with the exhilaration of living in an exceptional historical moment. Gezi is thus described as a "spontaneous coming together in a moment of 'irruption,' when disparate heterotopic groups suddenly see, if only for a fleeting moment, the possibilities of collective action to create something radically different" (Harvey 2012, xvii). Indeed, "surprise" is a frequently used word at the beginning of episodes of revolution or other exceptional events (della Porta 2014; Goodwin 2011). The rapidly increasing numbers of participants empower new participants, who are reassured and stimulated by others' courage.

From the cognitive point of view, the assessment of living in exceptional moments brings about the breaking of routines, leaving hope for what was once considered impossible. Through what has been termed "cognitive liberation" (McAdam 1988), activists see in their convergence in large numbers a sign that change is possible through people's agency, and that what had seemed strong and stable might actually break down "as a house of cards." As Wagner-Pacifici and Ruggero (2018, 2) noted in research on the Occupy movement in the United States, "When faced with an emerging event, individual decisions about whether (or not) to continue adhering to normal schedules of organizational and personal life become charged and consequential."

Emotional intensity and cognitive opening are fueled by and fuel relational mechanisms. In many historical moments, abrupt protest events have contributed to change the perception of time, through an intensification of networking as the very space of the protests opens up for multiple encounters. As shown by my comparative analysis of democratization in Central Eastern Europe in 1989 and the Arab Spring in 2011 (della Porta 2014 and 2017), eventful protests have emergent relational impacts by intensifying and transforming interactions among different actors. Rather than being spontaneous, they are produced through a convergence of preexisting nets and contribute to building new ones at great speed.

If the collective behavior approach, then, looked at the crowd as the space for emotional rather than rational processes, the protest cracks seem instead to develop from the coexistence of affective and cognitive dynamics within dense formal and informal nets.

Protest vibration

We are gathered in the public square following the demonstrations against the Jobs Act and thanks to the initiative of *Nuit et Jour* *debut*. We do not wish to privatize this square; to the contrary, we want to share it so that everyone may reappropriate the *res-publica*, the common good. This desire to reappropriate does not have to hide differences that distinguish us: our force is our capability to change notwithstanding our divergent points

of view so as to materialize a convergence of struggles. ... we came here to talk about our dreams, to experience democracy, to build and create (Nuit debout Orleans 2016, cit in della Porta and Felicetti 2018).

As in the case of Nuit debout, protest shocks then reverberate in a number of cognate events that often reproduce the model of the first one: thus, hundreds of Tahrirs were created in Egypt, acampadas in Spain, and Occupy camps in the United States. For protests to acquire momentum, after an initial crack, the combination of mass and velocity must be reproduced in an intensification of the number of protest events. As through sound vibrations, breaks need to broaden their effects, triggering waves that transform the existing environment in unexpected and at least partly contingent directions.

Pointing in this direction, literature on critical junctures has mentioned conjunctural dynamics and choice points. Although critical junctures are rooted within structures, they are structurally underdetermined, characterized by high levels of uncertainty and political contingency. While transformations are constrained by preexisting structures and critical antecedent conditions are certainly salient (Slater and Simmons 2010), in some moments the path of change is less structured by external circumstances. Transitions from authoritarian rule are illustrations of “underdetermined social change, of large-scale transformations which occur when there are insufficient structural or behavioral parameters to guide and predict the outcome” (O’Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 363). Critical junctures are considered *open-ended*, as “the range of plausible choices available to powerful political actors expands substantially” (Capoccia and Kelemen 2007, 343). During these periods, different degrees and forms of contention could develop, as “instead of connecting initial conditions to outcomes, events carry the potential to transform the X–Y relation, neutralizing the reversing effects that initial conditions would have otherwise produced” (Collier and Mazzuca 2008, 485).

In some visions, in particular, contingency is central for the very definition of the critical juncture (Kaufman 2017, 16). As Collier and Munck (2017, 4) synthesized, “Some scholars view the uncertainty of outcomes and substantial degrees of freedom in actor choices as a defining feature of critical junctures. For them, it is precisely this contingency that is seen as making the critical juncture a point of inflection.” Referring to his own work on the neoliberal critical juncture in Latin America, Kenneth Roberts (2017, 13) suggested that “antecedent conditions predisposed cases to experience a critical juncture in particular ways, but they did not determine institutional outcomes; instead, outcomes were shaped by more contingent alignments or configurations of actors during the critical juncture and the strategic choices they made to support or oppose market reforms.”

Contingency acquires relevance, as choices must be made in a situation that challenges routine answers. In fact, “changes are abrupt because critical junctures contain decisive ‘choice points’ when major reforms are debated, policy choices are made, and institutions are created, reconfigured, or displaced” (Roberts 2015, 65). In these moments, “uncertainty as to the future of an institutional arrangement allows for political agency and choice to play a decisive causal role in setting the institution on a certain path of development, a path that then persists over a long period of time” (Capoccia 2015, 148). Choice points are therefore of particular importance in the evolution of a critical juncture, since different actors’ responses to specific challenges tend to reconstitute relations.

In addressing broad political and social institutions, neoinstitutionalism points at the importance

of understanding these choice points that are triggered by the (endogenous or exogenous) shock, with a focus on at the micro-dynamics of change; while the Chicago School had suggested that, after the trigger breaks routines, emerging norms allows the aggregation of heterogeneity in crowds, developing in particular when there is a widespread impression that unjust conditions can be corrected (Johnston 2018), as well as a sense of urgency in addressing some problematic situations. While uncertainty is reproduced, making times unsettled or restless (Wagner-Pacifici 2010), the reproduction of the crack fluidifies relations, allowing for de-structuration and then re-structuration (Gusfield 1994). In social movements, emergent configurations of interaction build an ethical definition of what is right and what is wrong, what is legitimate and what is not (Turner and Killian 1987; see also Cefai 2007).

Focusing on the meso level, research on eventful protests has stressed that, in some historical moments, contingency – and therefore agency – challenge structural constraints (Beissinger 2007). The events have a transformative effect, in that they “transform structures largely by constituting and empowering new groups of actors or by re-empowering existing groups in new ways” (Sewell 1996, 271). That is, they are not determined by their context, but constitute arenas in which collective experiences develop through the interactions of the different individual and collective actors that, with different roles and aims, take part in them (della Porta 2017a). Through eventful protests, contingency affects the given structures by fueling mechanisms of social change: organizational networks develop; frames are bridged; personal links foster reciprocal trust.

In research on eventful transitions to democracy (della Porta 2015), participants remember uncertainty as pushing toward quick adjustments under stress, thinking about but not daring to predict potential moves by influential actors. If in normal times, context plays a role in determining the course of the events, in intense times chance encounters could make a difference in the development of the process. The narratives of activists often point at this open-ended character of eventful democratization, in which contingent events influence the process of fluidification and reproduction (della Porta 2017a). While strategic approaches assume at least constrained rationality, with relations based upon some information and expectation about others’ behavior, in intense times decisions are based more on clues than on knowledge, as the identities, preferences, and interests of the involved actors shift and change. While calculations require fixed identities on the basis of which to assess long term benefits (Pizzorno 1993) and rooted expectations about others’ behaviors, the very speed of change challenges these conditions. Predictability is radically reduced by constantly moving targets and lack of routines. As expectations of others’ behavior have weak foundations, bets must be made about opponents’ reactions.

In addition, the intensity of extraordinary times reduces the availability of the time that would be necessary to collect information, to reflect, to deliberate. In these intense times, activists report, crucial decisions have to be made quickly, in the heat of the moment. Time accelerates because of the breaking down of previous institutions, rules, and norms. Rather than being based on routines, which are perceived as no longer effective, decisions often favor creativity and innovation, and the capacity of movement actors to occupy these spaces, changing them in the process. Through a series of micro-decisions with uncertain effects, particular individuals or small groups can acquire unexpected influence (della Porta 2017a).

In particular, as protests spread after the cracking event, new norms tend to emerge in the open spaces created by the social movements themselves. Open spaces of encounter allow for the development of intense emotion as well as the spreading of alternative visions through various forms of prefigurative politics – oriented to practice changes now (Wagner-Pacifici and Ruggiero

2018). In anti-austerity protests, the development of a “new spirit” has been noted particularly in the occupied squares that represented the space for the formation of new subjectivity, based on the recomposition of former cleavages and the emergence of new identifications. These spaces have been defined, in fact, as spaces of becoming, as “Recomposition is also connected to the emergence of new subjectivities and social practices, and eventually to the emergence of new norms as well” (Karakayalı and Yaka 2014, 118-119). New identities emerge through practices that stress the importance of encounters – often celebrating the diversity of people in the various squares, giving its participants a “belonging in becoming” (Zengin 2013). In fact, “eventfulness is as much about the transformation of temporal orientations and commitments among participants as it is about the transformation of structures” (Wagner-Pacifici and Ruggiero 2018, 19). As existing rules are temporarily suspended, statements like “This has never happened before; what is happening here is amazing” were frequently heard (della Porta and Atak 2017). With cognitive opening and emotional intensification spreading through a multiplication of the sites of protest, new norms and identity thus emerge.

Protest sedimentation

The experience of the Polytechnic Rebellion is so strong that we carry it throughout the Metapolitefsi [transition to democracy] period, the left as well as the anarchists. It’s not coincidental that we have the commemoration protest every year, and that the buildings of the Polytechnic School are to be found in the area where the clash with the police most commonly takes place. During the anti-austerity mobilizations we heard the slogan “Bread-Education-Freedom– the junta did not end in 1973” (in della Porta et al. 2018, 122-3).

As this Greek activist points out, eventful protests tend to remain in the memories of the movements to come. In fact, long-term effects triggered by eventful protests have to sediment outside, but also inside social movements.

Theorists of critical junctures converge in considering legacies as an essential definitional aspect. Concepts like self-replicating causal structure, freezing, path dependence, lock-in, and stickiness have been used to refer to the institutionalization of abrupt changes. As Collier and Munck (2017, 7) noted, change must be reproduced: “The legacy is an enduring, self-perpetuating institutional inheritance of the critical juncture that persists and is stable for a substantial period. If a legacy in this sense does not emerge, then the prior episode is not considered a critical juncture. In parallel with *mechanisms of production* that generate the legacy, scholars also analyze *mechanisms of reproduction* that account for its stability.” If various mechanisms might reproduce the outcomes over time (Mahoney and Schensul 2006, 456), this reproduction is not automatic, as “the legacy often does not emerge directly from the critical juncture. Instead, we observe steps that occur in-between and are important in shaping the legacy” (Collier and Munck 2017, 6). As Tarrow (2018, 39) noted in an analysis of the legacy of 1968, “critical junctures are a combination of dramatic breaks and the incremental changes that they trigger.” However, the degree of institutional change is not necessarily correlated with the size of the shock – as “the degree of fire and brimstone of a synoptic shock may not predict the intensity of the critical juncture that follows” (ibid.). So, for instance, in the French case, the crack in 1968 was most intense, but the legacies weaker than, for instance, in Italy or the United States (ibid.). In sum, “the major determinant of the ‘reproducibility’ of significant change is not the shock itself but antecedent conditions like the strength of the state and the enduring strength of the social movements that are spawned by the

initial shock.” In addition, sedimentation can happen in different arenas, as critical junctures could bring about broader systemic changes but also be concentrated “on relatively limited institutional arenas such as legislatures or judicial and criminal justice systems, or on specific policies such as those related to pensions, health, or education” (Kaufman 2017, 17; see also Boas 2017).

If neoinstitutionalists point at the importance of studying these mechanisms of reproduction at the institutional level, collective behavior scholars gave particular importance to micro-level dynamics in the sedimentation of a sudden rupture. While crowds are considered as aimless, suggestible, and irritable, social movements can be stabilized through cultural drifts oriented to establish some new life order (Blumer 1951, 199). In particular, they noted that, starting as unrests and popular excitement, movements can then achieve a state of formalization and institutionalization. Mechanisms such the building of an *esprit de corps*, a morality (as belief in the rectitude of the collective purpose), and a group ideology are at the basis of this stabilization. As Hank Johnston (2018, 8) recently summarized, emergent norms produce social cohesion as they “guide collective actions among people who are not normally familiar with each other nor accustomed with acting together; They define the limits of behavior: what is possible and what is not possible; They make up a developing and, in various degrees, shared understanding of appropriate behavior in new situations.” Through intense emotion and cognitive liberation but also the stabilization of new sets of relations, norms emerge and spread, and then consolidate.

In the contentious politics approach, focusing on a relational and processual analysis, scholars have observed that some movement-induced transformations tend to stabilize, as “Once a process (e.g. a revolution) has occurred and acquired a name, both the name and the one or more representations of the process become available as signals, models, threats and/or aspirations for later actors” (Tilly 2006, 421). In fact, “the first stages of critical junctures *produce* major changes, but true critical junctures must also *re-produce* themselves in *legacies* that differ significantly from the antecedent system; ... while critical junctures first occur in assaults on institutions, one of the major properties of such junctures is that they enter and transform institutional politics from within” (Tarrow 2018, 43; see also Tarrow 2017).

For social movement studies, it is indeed important to reflect on the mechanisms that contribute to stabilize the endogenous effects of eventful protests on social movements themselves. Research on legacies of eventful democratization has indicated that intensification of time does not last, as time normalization is expected and even desired. In several cases of eventful democratization in Central Eastern Europe and in the Mediterranean and North African regions (della Porta 2017a), intense times were then overcome by routine and a return to private life. Nevertheless, protest cracks and ensuing vibrations leave their legacies after time normalizes. The intense time of the transition left an institutional legacy, through mechanisms of *legislation*, with the creation of laws and regulations (particularly on the issues that are central for the movements), as well as through *legitimation* (recognition of particular actors and forms of action). These processes affect civil, political, and social rights as well as the forms of contentious politics (della Porta 2017a). Critical junctures pave the way for changes, which then become stabilized as institutional and normative codes are set. Morally constraining, but also legally binding norms are consolidated as culture and power are embedded in the institutional and oppositional networks of relations established during consolidation. Eventful protests constitute spaces in which old structures are overcome and new ones emerge: some of them are transitory, while others are there to stay. When eventful protests influence institutions, *institutional legacies* are produced. The characteristics of social movement participation during transition to democracy have a particular relevance for the development of

inclusive forms of democracy (Fernandes 2013; Fishman 2013). Research on democratization has noted that moments of fluidity and uncertainty, such as transitions, shape the political access of different groups under the ensuing democratic regimes (O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986; Shain and Linz 1995).

If eventful protests shape future movements through their institutional legacies, they also do so by affecting movements' memories. In addition, eventful protests during transitions to democracy are particularly transformative as they constitute norms, solidarity, and networks that provide for resources and constraints for social movements (della Porta 2014). While rarely acknowledged by social movement studies (Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich 1983), social movements are important actors in the construction of collective memory, defined as "the set of symbols and practices referring to the past which are shared by a community of people" (Zamponi 2013, 1). Past events are memory building blocks for the construction of collective identities at each new wave of protest, with a mix of tradition and innovation. As Hobsbawm and Ranger noted (1983, 13), in order to increase their legitimacy, movements tend to back "their innovations by reference to a 'people's past,' ... to traditions of revolution ... and to [their] own heroes and martyrs." Movement groups can be considered as mnemonic communities (Zerubavel 1996), within which "mnemonic socialization" happens. Within social movements, activists reinforce their preferred stories through sermons and speeches, songs and slogans (Meyer 2006, 206). As Neveu (2014, 276) noted, "By a combined process of selection, hierarchization, and evaluation, memory transforms the chaos of events into a coherent story, with its heroes and villains"; thus, "memory solidifies narratives and legacies, in relation to which we must adopt a position." As social movements develop their own selective memories, transformative events are particularly relevant in the construction of the past, as "meaning emerges and is sustained through the dynamic interaction between the content of historical events and the forms of collective memory available to those intent on their preservation and public inscription" (Wagner-Pacifici 1996, 301). Within memory struggles, social movements are often the carriers of *counter-memory*: "Agents of memory often participate in 'mnemonic battles' over how to interpret the past, who should be remembered, and the form that a historical narrative ought to take" (Jansen 2007, 959; also, Peterson and Reiter 2015).

Memories seem particularly relevant in unsettled times, as they can work to re-establish solidarities but also to unsettle existing ones (della Porta 2015; della Porta et al. 2018). In fact, "since most movements lack political power (this is precisely why they use unconventional political tactics) they can reshape the world more effectively through redefining its terms rather than rearranging its sanctions" (Swidler 1995, 34). Remaining with the examples of democratic transitions, the most eventful transitions – in which protest plays a more important role – offer more opportunities for left-libertarian movements to refer to them in their memory work, looking for resonance with past myths in various symbols, including places and heroes (della Porta 2015; della Porta 2017a, della Porta et al. 2018). The degree to which a positive memory of the role of contention in the democratic transition is shared affects the capacity of social movements to refer to it, especially in critical moments, in order to claim legitimacy. This was particularly the case in Portugal, as the memory of the Carnation Revolution of April 25, 1974, was celebrated during the anti-austerity protests in the 2010s with an emotional but also a cognitive reference to a common rebellious past.

Concluding remarks

In social movement studies, a (re)emerging focus on abrupt changes challenges the vision of social movements as “normal” politics that had developed, in part, to contrast their definition as “exceptional” – if not pathological – forms of collective behavior. With the focus on political opportunities and the mobilization of resources, researchers moved away from the attempts to understand movements as promoters of breaks with routine that had characterized some of the previous approaches to collective behavior (Johnston 2018). In fact, a narrative of normalization corresponded to some trends at the time as, in stable democracies, protest was no longer unconventional and social movements were becoming accepted actors in the mobilization and representation of collective interests. In times of crisis and rapid transformation, more reflection is certainly needed on the role of protest as a time intensifier. While the Chicago School posed the question of movements as promoters of emergent norms, with a focus on micro-dynamics, the understanding of movements in exceptional time also requires attention to the meso- and macro levels. In particular, I have suggested that a dialogue with research on critical junctures could be very fruitful in understanding eventful protests. I have developed this argument by looking at protest cracks, as protests trigger systemic shocks, vibrating in catalyzing moments of intensified interactions and later sedimenting in changes that are stabilized inside and outside social movements.

As mentioned, the aim was to map what we know about these three stages, more in order to state questions than to provide definitive answers. In particular, I have pointed at some characteristics of the protest “crack,” looking at what various approaches have defined as shocks or triggers. During moment of crisis, emotional excitement but also cognitive liberation spreads quickly during the encounters of (unexpectedly) large masses of protesters. A crack reverberates when similar forms of protests are reproduced, contributing to feelings of empowerment and cognitive innovations through intense networking in quickly multiplying protest sites. As structures weaken and conjuncture acquires relevance, choice points influence the open-ended process of reproducing the crack through fluidification but also emergent norms. Sedimentation of changes induced by eventful protests is then embedded in the consolidation of collective identities and social networks. Eventful protests as critical junctures in fact imply a process of institutionalization of the innovations through continuous interactions among various players and in multiple arenas, including “innovators” but also a conservative, backlash orientation. In fact, it is only ex-post that the relevance of some protests can be assessed.

Further research is needed in order to investigate, first of all, the conditions under which a crack happens, is reproduced, and then (at least in part) sediments. The analysis should address in particular the critical moments in which new norms emerge, especially in unsettled times, when “the accepted norms of behavior, the ones that guide behaviors in everyday, institutionalized, normal, quotidian activities, don’t apply because of unusual or atypical social contexts: a catastrophe, a suddenly imposed grievance, a moral shock, a disaster. Social actors turn to each other to make sense of the situation, not to some objective and compelling character of reality” (Johnston 2018, 8). To reiterate, while social movements have been studied mainly in normal times, and increasingly as “normal politics,” we now inhabit intense times in which eventful protests can trigger long-lasting transformations.

Research is also needed to connect the reflections on eventful protest with an emerging field of research on time in social movements. With no pretense of completeness, I suggest three lines for further investigation that resonate respectively with the suggested observations on cracks, vibrations, and sedimentations: anticipation, prefiguration, and restlessness.

Time intensification of eventful protest interacts with the process of anticipation of the consequences of (collective) action – how the present connects with the future. As Tavory and Eliasoph (2013, 909) noted, anticipation implies consideration of three modes of future coordination: “a) protentions, or moment-by-moment anticipations that actors usually take for granted; b) actors’ trajectories through time, which proceed in ways that are more or less culturally predictable; and c) plans and temporal landscapes, overarching temporal orientations that actors experience as inevitable and even natural.” As they note, the different modes can enter in tension with each other, especially when coherent visions of the future are challenged, jeopardizing the capacity of anticipation as “especially in dramatic moments of historical change, actors are not sure what temporal landscape they are on. Facing the unformed, floating, ‘inchoate’ aspects of events, they have to ‘puzzle out’ the potential new temporal landscape together, collectively reading clues into their environment or, in a much darker scenario, sometimes bringing into being precisely the temporal landscape they were trying to avoid” (ibid., 934). What I have called “protest cracks” act through changing the perceptions and feelings about all three modes of future coordination in ways that require specific empirical research to be understood.

A further concept that has acquired popularity in recent studies on time in contentious politics is prefiguration – implying, to a certain extent, the enactment of the future in the present. If some scholars have contrasted prefigurative politics with political strategy (e.g. Smucker 2014), others have instead considered it as a specific form of strategic action that links means and aims. In this sense, prefiguration might instead be considered as “the most strategic means for bringing about the social change” that movement activists aim at achieving, as it removes “the temporal distinction between the struggle in the present and the goal in the future; instead the struggle and the goal, the real and the ideal, become one in the present” (Maeckerbergh 2011, 2, 4). Beyond the conception of ethical practices (in which the means are not in tension with the aims), prefiguration is linked to the experimentation with concrete utopias (Gordon 2017), “reaching ahead and acting as if a goal has already been achieved” (Swain 2017, 6). The crack is thus reproduced in multiple protest sites in which community is built within sort of laboratories of experiences (Yates 2015). The empirical analysis of prefiguration is in fact most important when looking at the vibration – the reproduction and spread – of the protests after the initial shocks. In fact, sites of protest like the camps were defined as asserting a “counter-temporality” against the one-off mode of other protests, challenging the very temporality of (turbo)capitalism (Petrick 2017, 1).

A final concept relevant for understanding the role of memory in the sedimentation of eventful protests, but also in their redefinition by movements later on, refers to the restless nature of events. Defining events as constructed, transforming relations in durable ways, Robin Wagner-Pacifici (2010) wrote that “Historical transitions are composed of eventful transactions that have consequences for individual and group identities and life chances” (ibid., 1357). In fact, memory of the past in the present is (at least to a certain extent) malleable:

Regardless of such aims and pretensions toward stabilization, historic events are rampant and generative. In fact, they are veritably protean in form, appearance, and consequence. Historic events are bodied forth through and in a variety of media and genres. They can be termed restless, insofar as they must take perceptible form, and insofar as these forms are necessarily multiple, reiterated, and situated. ... Once set in motion (and motion is a key term here), historic events are essentially a relay of signs and symbols, gestures and exchanges, images and texts. The restlessness, or instability, of the flows of power through historic events is intermingled with their mutability of meanings, and they are so in ways

that must always be empirically discovered (ibid., 1366).

So, “The restlessness of events is a function of the ongoing interpretive and interactional competitions and contestations among principal actors and witnesses” (ibid., 1374). The analysis of the commemoration but also the re-enacting of previous eventful protests in other movements is a most important topic that has only started to receive due attention.

In sum, the aim of this contribution is to map some ways of looking at protests – reflecting on the role of the future in the present, but also of the past in the present – through a dialogue among different approaches within and outside of social movement studies. I hope this is a path along which others will continue in the future.

Bibliographic references

Atak, Kivanc. 2014. “Flap of the Butterfly: Turkey’s June Uprisings.” In *Spreading Protest: Social Movements in Times of Crisis*, edited by Donatella della Porta and Alice Mattoni, 253-276. Colchester, UK: ECPR Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beissinger, Mark R. 2002. *Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beissinger, Mark R. 2007. “Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 5(2): 259–76.

Blumer, Herbert. 1951. “The Field of Collective Behaviour.” In A.M. Lee (ed.) *Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 167-222.

Boas, Taylor C. 2017. “Potential Mistakes, Plausible Options: Establishing the Legacy of Hypothesized Critical Junctures.” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*, 15(1), 18-20.

Buchler, Steven M. 2016. *Understanding Social Movements. Theories from the Classical Era to the present*. London: Routledge.

Capoccia, Giovanni. 2015. “Critical Junctures and Institutional Change.” In *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*, edited by James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen. New York, Cambridge University Press, 147-179.

Capoccia, Giovanni and Kelemen, R. Daniel. 2007. “The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism.” *World Politics* 59(3) (April): 341–369.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cefai, Daniel. 2007. *Porquoi se mobilise-t-on? Thes théories de l’action collective*. Paris: La Découverte.

Collier, David, and Gerardo L. Munck. 2017. “Building Blocks and Methodological Challenges: A Framework for Studying Critical Junctures.” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 15(1): 2-8.

- Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Collier, Ruth Berins, and Sebastián Mazzuca. 2008. “Does History Repeat?,” in Robert E. Goodwin and Charles Tilly (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 472–89.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2008. “Eventful Protest, Global Conflict”. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 17: 26-27.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2004. “Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities and the Construction of Another Politics: Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Fora,” in Donatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow (eds.), *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 175–202.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2013. *Can Democracy be Saved?*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2014. *Mobilizing for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2015. *Social Movements in Times of Austerity. Bringing Capitalism Back into Protest Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2017a. *Where did the Revolution Go?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella (ed.). 2017 *The Global Diffusion of Protest*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella (ed.). 2018. *Sessantotto. Passato e Presente dell’anno ribelle*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Massimiliano Andretta, Tiago Fernandes, Francis O’Connor, Eduardo Romanos, Markos Votgiatzoglou. 2017. *Late Neoliberalism and its Discontent*. London: Palgrave.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Massimiliano Andretta, Tiago Fernandes, Eduardo Romanos, and Markos Votgiatzoglou. 2018. *Memories in Movements*. Oxford University Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Kivanc Atak. 2017. “The Spirit of Gezi. A Relational Approach to Eventful Protest and Its Challenges”. In Donatella della Porta (ed.) *The Diffusion of Protest*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press: 31-58.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Andrea Felicetti. 2018. “Between Deliberation and Contestation: the Convergence of Struggles against Austerity and Its World in the Nuit Debout Movement.” *Social Movement Studies*, forthcoming.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Joseba Fernandez, Hara Kouki, and Lorenzo Mosca. 2017. *Movement Parties in Times of Crisis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Alice Mattoni (eds.). 2014. *Spreading Protest. Social Movements in Times of Crisis*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Francis O’Connor, Martin Portos, and Anna Subirats. 2017. *Social Movements and Referendums from Below: Direct Democracy in the Neoliberal Crisis*. Bristol: Policy Press.

- Erkan, Fuat, and Şebnem Oğuz. 2015. "From Gezi Resistance to Soma Massacre: Capital Accumulation and Class Struggle in Turkey." *Socialist Register* 51: 114-135.
- Fernandes, Tiago. 2013. "Rethinking Pathways to Democracy: Civil Society in Portugal and Spain, 1960s–2000s," paper presented at the Luso-American Foundation for Development (FLAD) Workshop Inequality, Civil Society and Democracy: Cross-Regional Comparisons, 1970s–2000s, Lisbon, June 7–8.
- Firat, Fishman, Robert M. 2013. "How Civil Society Matters in Democratization: Theorizing the Iberian Divergence," paper presented at the Conference of CES, Amsterdam, June 25–27.
- Goodwin, Jeff. 2011. *No Other Way Out*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Uri. 2017. "Prefigurative Politics between Ethical Practice and Absent Promise." *Political Studies* 66: 521-537
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1994. "The Reflexivity of Social Movements: Collective Behavior and Mass Society Theory Revisited," in Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield (eds.), *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 58-78.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," in Richard Collins et al., *Media, Culture, and Society: A Critical Reader*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Harvey, David. 2012. *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso.
- Holloway, John. 2010. *Crack Capitalism*. London: Zed Books.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger (eds.). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jansen, Robert S. 2007. "Resurrection and Appropriation: Reputational Trajectories, Memory Work and the Political Use of Historical Figures." *American Journal of Sociology* 112(4): 953–1007.
- Johnston, Hank. 2018. *The Revenge of Turner and Killian: Paradigm, State, and Repertoire in Social Movement Research*. Paper presented at the conference on "1968: 50 Years After." Florence, Cosmos, Scuola Normale Superiore, May.
- Karakayalı, Serhat, and Özge Yaka. 2014. "The Spirit of Gezi: The Recomposition of Political Subjectivities in Turkey." *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/theory/politics* 83 (1): 117-138.
- Kaufman, Robert R. 2017. "Latin America in the Twenty-First Century," *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 15(1): 16-18.
- McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, Doug and Sewell, William H. 2001. "It's About Time: Temporality in the Study of Social Movements and Revolutions," in Ronald R. Aminzade, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth J. Perry, William H. Sewell Jr., Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 89–125.
- Maeckelbergh, Marianne. 2011. "Doing is Believing: Prefiguration as Strategic Practice in the Alterglobalization Movement." *Social Movement Studies* 10(1), 1–20.
- Mahoney, James and Schensul, Daniel 2006. "Historical Context and Path Dependence," in Robert

- E. Goodwin and Charles Tilly (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maines, David R., Nurene M. Sugrue, and Michael A. Katovich. 1983. "The Sociological Import of G. H. Mead's Theory of the Past." *American Sociological Review* 48: 161–73.
- Markoff, John. 2016. "Historical Analysis and Social Movement Research," in Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, David S. 2006. "Claiming Credit: Stories of Movement Influence as Outcomes." *Mobilization* 11(3): 201–29.
- Neveu, Erik. 2014. "Memory Battles over Mai 68: Interpretative Struggles as a Cultural Re-Play of Social Movements." In *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research*, edited by Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ullrich, 275–99. London: Palgrave, 2014.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo A., and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule. Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Parks, Robert, and Ernest Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersen, Abby, and Herbert Reiter (eds.). 2015. *The Ritual of May Day in Western Europe: Past, Present and Future*. Abingdon, UK, and New York: Routledge.
- Petrick, Kamilla. 2017. "Occupy and the Temporal Politics of Prefigurative Democracy." *Triple C: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 15(2), 492–506.
- Pizzorno, Alessandro (ed.). 1993. *Le Radici della Politica Assoluta e Altri Saggi*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2001. Ten Theses on Politics | Theory & Event 5:3 <http://www.after1968.org/app/webroot/uploads/RanciereTHESESONPOLITICS.pdf>
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2015. *Changing Courses. Party Systems in Latin America's Neoliberal Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2017. "Pitfalls and Opportunities: Lessons from the Study of Critical Junctures in Latin America Great Transformations but no Critical Juncture?" *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 15(1): 13-16.
- Rosa, Hartmut. 2013. *Social Acceleration. A New Theory of Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scheuerman, William E. 2004. *Liberal Democracy and the Acceleration of Time*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sewell, William H. 1996. "Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology," in Terence J. McDonald (ed.), *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 245–80.
- Shain, Yossi, and Juan J. Linz. 1995. *Between States: Interim Governments and Democratic Transitions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sennett, Richard. 1998. *The Corrosion of Character*. New York: Norton.

- Slater, Dan, and Erica Simmons. 2010. "Informative Regress: Critical Antecedents in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* vol. 43(7): 886-917.
- Smucker, Jonathan M. 2014. "Can Prefigurative Politics Replace Political Strategy?" *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 58: 74–82.
- Swain, Dan 2017. "Not Not but Not Yet: Present and Future in Prefigurative Politics." *Political Studies* 1–16.
- Swidler, Ann. 1995 "Cultural Power and Social Movements." In Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans (eds.). *Social Movements and Culture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 25–40.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1989. *Democracy and Disorder*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2017. "The World Changed Today!" Can We Recognize Critical Junctures When We See Them?" *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 15(1): 9-12.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2018. "Il 1968 come momento critico," in Donatella della Porta (ed.), *Sessantotto. Passato e Presente dell'anno ribelle*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 39-56.
- Tavory, Iddo, and Nina Eliasoph. 2013. "Coordinating Futures: Toward a Theory of Anticipation." *The American Journal of Sociology* 118(4): 908–942.
- Tilly, Charles. 2006. *Regimes and Repertoires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Ralph. 1996. "The Moral Issue in Collective Action." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 1: 1-15
- Turner, Ralph, and Killian, Lewis. 1987 [1974, 1957]: *Collective Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin. 1996. "Memories in the Making: The Shapes of Things That Went." *Qualitative Sociology* 19(3): 301–21.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin. 2010. "Theorizing the Restlessness of Events." *The American Journal of Sociology* 115(5): 1351–1386.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin. 2017. *What is an Event?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin, & E. Colin Ruggero. 2018. "Temporal Blindspots in Occupy Philadelphia," *Social Movement Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2018.1474096.
- Yates, Luke. 2015. "Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics and Goals in Social Movements." *Social Movement Studies* 14(1): 1–21.
- Yörük, Erdem, and Murat Yüksel. 2014. "Class and Politics in Turkey's Gezi Protests." *New Left Review* 89 (Sept.-Oct.): 103-123.
- Zamponi, Lorenzo. 2013. "Collective Memory and Social Movements." In *Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political and Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Donatella della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam. Oxford: Blackwell, 225–29.
- Zengin, Asli. 2013. "What Is Queer about Gezi?" *Cultural Anthropology*, October. www.culanth.org/fijieldsights/407-what-is-queer-about-gezi.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1996. "Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past." *Qualitative Sociology* 19(3): 283–99.