

# From Solidarity to Disillusionment

*Frédéric Royall*

University of Limerick (<[frederic.royall@ul.ie](mailto:frederic.royall@ul.ie)>)

*Abstract:*

This article focuses on the mobilization cycle of Occupy in Ireland. It looks first at factors which facilitated the building of group solidarity before turning attention to some of the processes which led participants to become disillusioned and, ultimately, to demobilize. I argue that, in the short term, Occupy was of particular importance to many of the occupiers – and the more socially fragile participants notably – because it helped them to make their voices heard and to deal with their day-to-day personal concerns. Such a process was also of assistance to create a form of group identity and solidarity. In the longer term, however, the Occupy camps became beset by a number of unintended – and interrelated – complications. These relate to the rise in increasingly destabilizing power struggles and to the upsurge in doubts about the ways the camps were run. Both these issues undermined group solidarity and contributed, ultimately, to widespread disillusionment and to demobilization.

*Keywords:* Collective Action, Disillusionment, Ireland, Occupy, Solidarity

## *1. Introduction*

In the years following the 2008 economic and financial meltdown, in the Republic of Ireland many people took to the streets to protest against the declining standards of living and to oppose the implementation of austerity measures<sup>1</sup>. Even if there were fewer anti-austerity protests in Ireland than in

<sup>1</sup> Eurobarometer surveys show that the percentage of the Irish that considered the financial situation of their household to be “rather bad” or “very bad” increased from 34% in 2008 to 45% in 2011. See Standard Eurobarometers, 70-76, 2008-2011, <[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/cf/step1.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/cf/step1.cfm)> (05/2017).

other European crisis-hit countries (Benski *et al.* 2013; Flesher Fominaya and Cox 2013; Rüdiger and Karyotis 2013; Geary 2016) the number of protesters was quite remarkable from an historical standpoint (Kirby 2010). Civil society responses to the crisis led to a lively debate since many specialists as well as casual observers have generally described the Irish as passive and demobilized owing to historical and socio-cultural factors (Mair 2010; Murphy 2011; O'Brien 2011; Storey 2012). Power (2016) in particular suggests that collective memories played a role in mitigating civil unrest in general and in the post-2008 years in particular. By contrast, an increasing number of commentators have argued that a politics of community grass roots protest and empowerment has emerged in recent years and that there are notable examples of a rise in civil society militancy (Cox 2012; O'Flynn *et al.* 2013): "People are no longer looking to their politician to fix their problem, they are taking action themselves, through protest. This is a massive change"<sup>2</sup>. One interesting example of recent civil society militancy was the occupation of public spaces in a number of the country's major cities as of October 2011 by which occupiers sought to denounce the country's democratic deficit, lost sovereignty and rising levels of inequality and poverty.

Recent civil society mobilizations – including Occupy in Ireland as elsewhere – has led to a growing body of literature which has sought to understand what they meant from social and political standpoints and/or why and how they came about despite the major obstacles that protesters usually face such as the lack of material resources or the difficulty of securing political and/or civil society allies (Cox 2012; Kriesi 2012; Benski *et al.* 2013; Flesher Fominaya and Cox 2013; Gamson and Sifry 2013; Streeck and Schäfer 2013; Chabanet and Royall 2014; Gould-Wartofsky 2015; Ancelovici, Dufour, Nez 2016). As Le Texier (2006), Péchu (2006), Chabanet and Faniel (2012), Mattoni and Vogiatzoglou (2014) or Renouard (2014) have shown in the cases of undocumented migrants in the United States, precarious workers in Greece and Italy, the homeless in France, the unemployed across Europe or Gypsies in Finland respectively, the people involved in such movements seek to 'voice' their concerns through collective action. Additionally, studies of this type have tried to move away from the classical view of the constraining effects of Social Movement Organizations (SMO) on "poor people" (Piven Fox and Cloward 1977) and to focus instead on the opportunities that are available for mobilization and/or on cognitive processes so as to understand the micro-interactions that take place between protesters and their environment (Ketelaars 2016). My approach has affinities with these types of studies. I argue that in the short term, the occupation of public spaces was important at the level of the individuals involved. Many of the occupiers – and the more

<sup>2</sup> Rory Hearne, quoted in *The Sunday Times*, 23 November 2014.

socially fragile occupiers in particular – felt that they were now able to express their frustration, outrage or anger; that they were able to overcome the stigma to which they were subjected; that they were in a better position to deal with their everyday problems; and that they sensed that they were doing something useful for the community that could help change the way society was organized. Such a process helped to create a form of group identity and solidarity. I also argue that there were some unintended – though perhaps not fully unexpected – outcomes in the longer term. These relate to the increasingly contentious power struggles which developed and to many occupiers' rising doubts about operational procedures. These processes undermined group solidarity and contributed, ultimately, to disillusionment and, thus, to demobilization processes.

This article is a qualitative sociological study that draws on my research on Occupy and on a number of anti-austerity events in Ireland from 2011 to 2015. I carried out over 50 open-ended and semi-structured interviews – occupy activists, trade union officers and community and voluntary activists – between 2011 and 2013 in Limerick, Galway and Dublin with some people interviewed on two or more occasions. I made over 15 follow-on interviews with former occupiers in Galway and in Dublin in 2014 and 2015 which allowed me to gain their insights with the benefit of time<sup>3</sup>. The research also involved participant observations during several marches between 2011 and 2014. Finally, I analyzed a wide range of Occupy documents from printed and electronic sources as well as specialist academic and media publications.

The article is structured as follows. The first section assesses some of the issues raised by social movement scholars as they relate to many of today's contentious collective actions such as Occupy. The next section describes Occupy in Ireland and focuses on the camps' inner-workings. The final section analyzes the short- and long-term effects of the occupations' dynamics and discusses in particular the rise of two unintended developments: power struggles and disquiet about fixed practices.

## *2. Alternative forms of mobilization*

Social movements are generally and broadly understood to be the collective challenges taken by ordinary people against elites or authorities. Resource mobilization scholars suggest that SMOs are the formal and organized elements of social movements which share the movements' goals and which

<sup>3</sup> All the interviewees were actively involved at varying levels of the occupations and they were recruited randomly. I relied on snowball sampling and then added new interviewees so as to increase the sample's diversity. The interviews varied in duration but lasted on average 45 minutes. They were held on a one-to-one basis and were conducted face-to-face and, where not possible, by telephone.

help them to ensure their long-term sustainability (Zald and Ash 1966). And as Zald and McCarthy have noted:

Whether we study revolutionary movements, broad or narrow social reform movements, or religious movements, we find a variety of SMOs or groups, linked to various segments of supporting constituencies (both institutional and individual), competing among themselves for resources and symbolic leadership, sharing facilities and resources at other times, developing stable and many times differentiated functions, occasionally merging into unified ad hoc coalitions, and occasionally engaging in all-out war against each other. (2009, 161)

This said SMOs are important from two points of view. First, they often use protest-related tools and actions – repertoires – during contentious interactions with elites, opponents or authorities when they consider that the decisions taken are unjust or threatening. Second, SMOs also often provide a range of services for their constituents’ benefit (and also to help them to develop as individuals).

In terms of SMO repertoires, sit-ins, mass demonstrations, barricades or traffic blockages are some of the more easily recognized actions. Drawing on Goffman (1975), Cohen (2014) argues that marches and occupations are especially useful for socially fragile people when their SMOs seek to change power relations and to turn stigmas into positive attributes. In terms of the provision of services, SMOs often make available physical spaces where people can meet their peers and find relational and moral support: listening to others’ experiences, talking about coping strategies, reviewing their rights and entitlements or learning/improving practical and social skills such as word processing, interview preparation and submission, job hunting, personal finance management and so on. Cohen (2014) maintains that such services are particularly useful for socially fragile people since they help them to try to overturn the negative connotations associated with their status. McGinn and Allen (1991) have shown the importance and the relevance of such services in the case of the unemployed in Ireland, even if the benefits for end-users can only be assessed weeks or even months later. SMOs thereby often provide vital and non-quantifiable services that help people to gain a ‘voice’, to “express” themselves, to be “heard” and, consequently, to help them cope with their daily experiences and to try to change others’ perception of their status (Hirschman 1970).

Research on many of today’s contentious collective actions – including Occupy – also shows that they must be understood and framed in their longer-term national, historical and political contexts (cultural continuity and of collective learning processes) and that such protests strengthen or deepen previously existing practices (Flesher Fominaya and Cox 2013; Cox 2016). But recent research has shown that something may be slightly different with many of today’s mobilizations. For instance, Peterson *et al.*

suggest that Occupy in a number of countries was “significantly different from ‘traditional’ European anti-austerity protests with respect to socio-demographic composition as well as organizational embeddedness” (2013, 3). Many of today’s contentious collective actions are “new, new” movements as Langman (2013) describes them and they are driven by complex and horizontal decision-making processes, by decentralization and by specific power relations including the rejection of leaders (della Porta and Rucht 2013). Grasso and Giugni (2015) are more circumspect. In analyzing a number of recent anti-austerity movements across seven European countries, they offer a mixed picture and suggest that participants share some traits with both “old” movements (i.e. labor) and “new” (post-materialist) movements that focus on identity, lifestyle and culture (e.g. ecology, human rights, pacifism, feminism, etc.). Nonetheless, it is true that many Occupy movements began as a result of specific local contexts, they availed of favorable political opportunities and they used a range of repertoires of action including, notably, the occupation of public spaces where the general public was invited to join others in their opposition to the perceived injustices of the economic and political system (Dufour *et al.* 2016). But while acknowledging that Occupy movements share similarities with earlier social movements, Nez underlines that their novelty “lies mainly in the forms of commitment, the greater number of individuals and in the singular attention carried in the practices of internal democracy” (Nez 2016, 181). Thus occupiers in Ireland – as in many other countries – were profoundly committed, in practice and in discourse, to the principles of direct, deliberative and participative democracy: no leaders, no spokesperson, no formal structures, no strict norms, no formal rites, and so on (Szolucha 2013; Kiersey 2014; Gould-Wartofsky 2015). One important consequence is that they made a point in rejecting all formal representative organizations – SMOs, political parties or trade unions – that could structure protests or provide services.

In short, many of today’s mobilizations – including Occupy – that are structured around alternative forms are slightly different from their predecessors to the extent that they focus very much on an organizational culture based on the values of diversity, subjectivity, transparency, and open/democratic decision-making processes. To paraphrase della Porta (2005), they place “ideological contamination” ahead of dogma. They are not however exempt from a number of unintended – though perhaps not unexpected – developments which inevitably arise when people come together to protest. In Occupy these came about in two interlinked areas in my view. The first relates to the power struggles that slowly developed between distinct groups owing to the occupiers’ sociological make-up: on the one hand, the mobilization *entrepreneurs* – that is the people endowed with higher levels of social, cultural or political capital – and the “ordinary” occupiers, on the other (Sutherland *et al.* 2013). The second unintended development relates to some of the oc-

cupiers' rising doubts about the way Occupy evolved. Both points are discussed in greater detail in section four.

### *3. Structuring the cause and trying to empower occupiers*

Occupy in Ireland was framed by distinct political and mobilization contexts. From the late 1980s Ireland enjoyed an unprecedented period of economic growth and labor peace. A key contributing factor is that the prevailing political culture and institutions were based on political conservatism and complacency and on consensus-oriented centralism. Another distinctive feature of Irish political life is the historical weakness of the political left although recent electoral results tend to show that this trait is waning somewhat (Mair 2010; Little 2011). These elements were reinforced by a centralized bargaining structure known as social partnership encompassing employer groups, trade unions and a good number of civil society organizations. The upshot is that the consensus-led political culture had fostered an environment in which inter-actions were effectively de-politicized and dissent muted (Meade 2005). But the 2008 economic and financial crisis put an end this extended period of growth and brought to the fore the possibility of a more conflict-oriented atmosphere. In terms of the mobilization context, the pre-2008 period was also characterized by a de-politicized and non-ideological discourse framework and by a weak protest culture (O'Connor 2017). In the 2008-2010 period there were a few trade union-led protests in response to the government's ineffective anti-crisis policies and to its acceptance of a rescue package – and the consequent implementation of 'austerity' measures – from a so-called troika: the European Commission, the European Central Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (Donovan and Murphy 2013). But by and large, these initial protests against austerity continued to be relatively de-politicized and fragmented. However, by 2010 the situation had started to evolve. In his analysis of the various protests from 2008 to 2016, O'Connor argues that they slowly became more focused and tangible culminating in the 2014 anti-water charges movement. This anti-austerity protest soon became "the largest popular mobilization witnessed in modern Irish history" (2017, 83) and it "disavowed the simplistic narrative that there was no opposition to austerity in Ireland" (*ibidem*, 89).

It is framed by these political and mobilization contexts that Occupy emerged in Ireland in late 2011. Loosely inspired by Occupy Wall Street (OWS) and by the *Indignados* movement in Spain, Occupy in Ireland also became part of an international wave of mobilization (Calhoun 2013, 27-28). As elsewhere people took to the streets to protest and to carry out symbolic occupations of public spaces. Occupy Dame Street (ODS, Dublin) started on 8 October 2011, soon followed the occupation of public spaces in all of the Republic's major cities (Campbell 2012; Szolucha 2013; Kiersey 2014).

ODS was launched by a group of politically active people, many of which were loosely linked to anarchist and environmental groups and to left-leaning political or trade union organizations. Organizers had called for the Irish to resist the effects of neo-liberal policies and to join with others to celebrate the upcoming international day of solidarity with the global Occupy movement. In Dublin, a number of these initiators were in fact young Spanish residents who had been motivated by the M-15 movement in Spain and who were associated with the Irish spin-off of 'Democracia Real Ya! – Real Democracy Now'<sup>4</sup>. These activists had been organizing weekly meetings and had been in contact with each other via social media to discuss the *Indignados* movement and to see if it could be replicated in Ireland. They had also wished to set up forums where people could have a chance to express their grievances and to discuss how to change society<sup>5</sup>. Examples of Real Democracy Now-organized events include a protest on 21 May 2011 in favor of 'True Democracy', a march on 19 June against the European Union Pact and a demonstration on 13 July to protest against a visit to Dublin by International Monetary Fund representatives.

The camps varied in size and in duration. ODS was the largest, bringing together several dozen 'full-time' occupiers at one stage and, at most, several dozen 'occasional' occupiers<sup>6</sup>. Limerick's was the smallest with only a few occupiers. The occupations lasted several weeks in Limerick, slightly over four months in Waterford, five months in Cork and Dublin and seven months in Galway. Initial occupiers in Dublin, Galway and elsewhere were of a similar sociological make-up to what has been noted in many Occupy movements around the world (Benski *et al.* 2013, 548-550; Peterson *et al.* 2013). They were young and old, men and women, employed and unemployed, politically affiliated and non-affiliated, educated and less well educated. Many were students, artists, academics, trade union activists, service workers, local community organizers, and seasoned political, social and environmental activists. Most of the initial occupiers were Irish of course, but some Euro-

<sup>4</sup> Interview, Mo..., female, employee, 25+, Dublin, 26 November 2014. In order to preserve the integrity and privacy of the interviewees, references to them have been anonymized.

<sup>5</sup> Real Democracy Now activists wanted to get as many people as possible to come together and to protest and to show their outrage, anger or frustration. "We are ordinary people. We are like you. We are a group of citizens of different ages, nationalities and social backgrounds. We get up every morning to study, to look after our homes, to go to work, or to look for work. We all work hard every day at building a better future for ourselves and for the people around us. But all of us are worried and angry about what is unfolding, politically and economically, in our society. ... For all the above we are outraged", <<http://www.politicalworld.org/showthread.php?8664-For-Real-Democracy-Now!-Draft-Manifesto-Ireland#.VPRhC47y3fc>> (05/2017).

<sup>6</sup> Indicative data on country-wide participation rates are notably unreliable as there are no official records of the number of people involved. The figures given here are based on various media reports and on participants' informal estimates.

pean backpackers who had been involved in Occupy in their home country also visited the camps and stayed for short periods. Some of the ODS occupiers knew each other prior to the occupation because of their involvement in Real Democracy Now or in other left-leaning organizations, but most of the occupiers met for the first time during Occupy.

The occupations were held located in high visibility public spaces in most of the cities from where, occupiers felt, they could not be evicted or arrested for trespassing. One occupier specified that such public places “belong to everybody and to nobody at the same time”<sup>7</sup>. The Dublin camp was formed in an open space in front of the Central Bank of Ireland in the city center. In Galway, it was set up on the city’s main square: “We are in Eyre Square because the public owns the square and because the protest is a visual statement”<sup>8</sup>. Cork protesters set up camp at a main intersection in the heart of the city. In Waterford the camp was located on the quays next to the main thoroughfare. By contrast, the Limerick camp suffered from a ‘lack of visibility’ since it was situated in a by-street, far removed from the city’s busy shopping district and away from through-traffic. By skilfully choosing high-visibility places, occupiers felt that they could be in the best location to meet the general public so as to explain their views and, ultimately, to garner support and sympathy for their cause. Since the camps were located in such central places, occupiers were also able to get the attention of the media and, by becoming better known, they received various types of help<sup>9</sup>. Local businesses gave food and allowed occupiers to use their toilet facilities. Academics provided free public lectures. Tradesmen offered their expertise and building material. The general public donated money, food, sleeping bags and tents<sup>10</sup>. In time, these material and symbolic resources enabled small-scale support services for some homeless people or for ‘short-term’ occupiers:

People have come with blankets and food and words of encouragement, others stay for a while in solidarity. ... Even people who are opposed to what we do, when we explain what we are about see what we are getting at.<sup>11</sup>

As the occupations moved from autumn to winter and then to spring, the number of occupiers and their profile changed, with the Dublin camp in particular becoming increasingly a refuge for very young, unemployed and/or homeless people. “The older, part-time, middle-class occupiers went away”<sup>12</sup> and were re-

<sup>7</sup> Interview, Ch..., male, unemployed, 25+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in Andrews 2011.

<sup>9</sup> <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bCpoilSLBS8>> (05/2017).

<sup>10</sup> Interview, Gi..., male, unemployed, 50+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted in Andrews 2011.

<sup>12</sup> Interview, Mo..., female, employee, 25+, Dublin, 26 November 2014.



placed by “a good number of crazies” as two disgruntled occupiers commented<sup>13</sup>:

It is true that the place did start to attract people who had nothing to do with it. Just people who thought it was a good place to pan-handle ... You just get professional beggars turning up. This was bound to happen. I don't see this as anything particular to the Occupy movement. ... All body-politics get infiltrated by parasites. The Occupy movement is nothing special in that case.<sup>14</sup>

By December, we noticed that most of the permanent occupiers were in fact homeless young men. They weren't really interested in the movement. All they really wanted was a place to sleep and to get warm. ... This led to a lot of problems.<sup>15</sup>

Occupiers' were determined to ensure that the camps remained open to the general public and run according to “direct” democratic principles with decisions taken by consensus so as to reinforce members' commitment to the cause and their belief of having a communal fate. This is a common occurrence in similar types of mobilizations (Traïni and Siméant 2009, 14-19). Occupiers also sought to promote group solidarity and to channel the participants' expectations towards Occupy symbols. Occupiers thereby organized public meetings, rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins and musical and poetic performances. In ODS as elsewhere, the public was invited to participate in all of these events as well as to attend general assemblies, to take part in the daily activities and to join in the various workgroups (finance, action, media, security, food, events and so on). In the early days, trade unionists, academics, political activists and the general public were often invited to participate in debates on current issues.

Occupiers were requested to obey basic rules: no violence, alcohol, drugs or political party/trade union banners or flags. Likewise, they were strongly discouraged from framing their discourse in class terms<sup>16</sup>. Because of the blanket “no politics” stance, occupiers refused to be drawn into alliances with political parties or with civil society or trade union organizations. Political parties in particular were indiscriminately accused of pursuing self-serving agendas, of corruption, of incompetence or of kowtowing to international capital. As one Waterford “facilitator” explained: “People are sick and tired of the party politics. [The parties] are in bed with the bankers. It's obvious”<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> Interview, He..., female, retired, 65+, Dublin, 19 November 2012.

<sup>14</sup> Interview, Da..., male, independent filmmaker, 35+, Dublin, 19 February 2013.

<sup>15</sup> Interview, Mo..., female, employee, 25+, Dublin, 8 January 2013.

<sup>16</sup> *Socialist Voice* (November 2011), <<http://www.comunistpartyofireland.ie/sv2011-11/03-dame-st-2.html>> (05/2017).

<sup>17</sup> “Occupy Waterford” (2011), <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bCpoilSLBS8>> (05/2017).

Another Galway occupier stated: “We are not a political group”<sup>18</sup>. Occupiers also kept well away from the trade-union organized anti-austerity protests in late 2011 and early 2012 because many of them felt that nothing would come of colluding with such protesters. In any event, many of the occupiers distrusted trade unions and they were extremely wary of being infiltrated by radical political activists as one disillusioned occupier explained: “There was an obsession with a ban on political and trade union banners and literature. There was fear of any organization bringing its own agenda into this movement” (Sheehan 2012, 3). Another occupier pointed out that:

In Galway, we took a pragmatic stance. We let the various parties or organisations that gravitated around Occupy access to the camp but they couldn’t use it as a platform to get recruits for themselves because we were not linked to anyone and we didn’t share the Socialist Workers’ Party’s political views.<sup>19</sup>

Public opinion was initially favorable to Occupy but soon became somewhat indifferent and gradually negative. The occupations were at times dismissed as public disturbances initiated by small groups of socially, economically and politically marginalized/disadvantaged people<sup>20</sup>. Occupiers refused to accept such portrayals and worked tirelessly to justify and to clarify their actions. As one Waterford occupier-blogger posted:

Why is everyone so negative towards this movement??? Its great that people are getting up and standing for what they believe... all the people here who are being negative just stand and take what the governments throw at them... for a change you could get out here and support us instead of being against us... we are all one and we are all fighting for the same thing... it makes no sense giving out and doin nothing about it, be supportive of this peacefull protest its a great thing and its about time it started Waterford needs it [*sic*].<sup>21</sup>

One way occupiers challenged the ways they were commonly portrayed was by making the public aware of the reasons they had joined the camps. Many occupiers indicated that they simply wanted to raise awareness that the austerity measures overwhelmingly targeted the poor and the weak while those responsible for the country’s economic collapse were not held to task. A recurring comment in the interviews was that occupiers wanted to make sure that Ireland became a better place: “Irish children could have a future

<sup>18</sup> Interview, Gi..., male, unemployed, 50+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>19</sup> Interview, Ch..., male, unemployed, 25+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>20</sup> *Broadsheet* (30 October 2011), <<http://www.broadsheet.ie/2012/03/08/occupy-dame-street-gone/>> (05/2017).

<sup>21</sup> *Politics.ie*, <<http://www.politics.ie/forum/waterford/174912-occupy-waterford-protest-7.html>> (05/2017).

other than to join dole queues or to emigrate”<sup>22</sup>. When asked if she had ever protested before Occupy, a young student and former Occupy Galway activist answered: “No, this was the first time. I just became fed-up with the lies. I was sickened by what was happening around me. I wanted to do something this time”<sup>23</sup>. Another occupier stated that she wanted to show how “frustrated” she was by the state of social and political affairs<sup>24</sup>. One occupier saw his participation as a first step in “kicking out the government and the politicians in power”<sup>25</sup>. Still another stated that she came to understand that greed and corruption were at the root of the country’s problems<sup>26</sup>. In airing his “outrage”, “anger” or “despair” at the institutional failings, an unemployed occupier wanted the public to understand that his actions were legitimate and focused on the reckless investments and on the greed culture that had been tolerated<sup>27</sup>. A political novice indicated that he felt that the occupations helped to expose the contradictions in neo-liberal democracies<sup>28</sup>. For all these occupiers, Occupy became a means by which to show the general public that the political class had failed to protect citizens’ interests.

#### 4. *Unintended developments*

As noted, a number of people committed to Occupy because they believed deeply that the crisis and subsequent ill-advised political decisions – and notably the imposition of austerity measures – were at the root of their problems. Once involved in Occupy, however, many of them were unsure what to do in terms of offering concrete, alternative solutions or of ensuring widespread support for the cause. Arguably, the occupation of public spaces until eviction was the extent of the radical measures they took leading one displeased Dublin occupier to claim that: “The camp was too inward looking and it drained away from the movement”<sup>29</sup>. This dissenter’s comment points to some of the intractable issues facing the occupiers in a short space of time and to the problems of ensuring that many people remained loyal to the cause, as is common in many social movements (Fillieule 2005; 2013). This is akin to what Tarrow describes in his reference to the 1848 Revolution in France:

<sup>22</sup> Interview, St..., male, unemployed, 35+, Cork, 8 December 2012.

<sup>23</sup> Interview, El..., female, student, 20+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>24</sup> Interview, Fi..., female, student, 20+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>25</sup> Interview, Ch..., male, unemployed, 25+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>26</sup> Interview, Gr..., female, unemployed, 30+, Dublin, 3 February 2013.

<sup>27</sup> Interview, Br..., male, unemployed, 55+, Dublin, 2 February 2013.

<sup>28</sup> Interview, Eo..., male, unemployed, 45+, Dublin, 30 March 2013.

<sup>29</sup> Interview, He..., female, retired, 65+, Dublin, 19 November 2012.

The initial euphoria of the ‘springtime of peoples’ soon evaporated; people wearied of life in the streets; some went home, others joined liberal governments, still other turned to reaction. ‘*Post coitum omnia animal triste*,’ writes Aristote Zolbert, quoting the old adage to reflect the disillusionment that follows waves of contention. (2011, 198)

The short-dynamics and the long-term effects – power struggles and fixed practices – are worthy of note in this regard.

In the short term, the occupations did help people from a wide social and economic spectrum to find the internal fortitude to make public their indignation, outrage, frustration or disappointment. The occupations also helped many of the occupiers to find comfort and security through their interactions with their peers. This has affinities with Jasper’s discussion of social movement participants’ shared and reciprocal emotions (2009, 182)<sup>30</sup>. But it should not be assumed that because people took part in Occupy, they automatically acquired the vital skills to gain a ‘voice’ or to ‘express’ themselves. This is because the occupiers were likely to fall trap to the divisions of labor and to the social relations of domination that are prevalent in the wider world. As Dunezat (2009) has argued, it is often the case in a collective action that only a limited number of people (frequently men) with the relevant social and cultural capital are vested with the duties of carrying out key organizational, administrative or public speaking tasks. In such circumstances, the least socially-endowed people – that is those with the lowest levels of social or cultural capital or those with very limited experience in social or political militancy – are the least likely to take up active roles and are often confined to the least taxing – and least socially viable – tasks such as doing minor administrative or housekeeping chores. Such divisions of labor or social relations of domination may in turn compromise many people’s active participation in long-term mobilizations and may be detrimental to the objective of ensuring that all people gain a ‘voice’ through collective action.

But all is not negative and people do derive a number of personal advantages from participating in a collective action such as Occupy. Much depends

<sup>30</sup> “Some of the emotions generated within a social movement – call them *reciprocal* – concern participants’ ongoing feelings towards each other. These are the close affective ties of friendship, love, solidarity and loyalty, and the more specific emotions they give rise to. ... Other emotions – call them *shared* – are consciously held by a group at the same time, but they do not have the other group members as their objects. The group nurtures anger towards outsiders, or outrage towards government policies. Reciprocal and shared emotions, although distinct, reinforce each other, thereby building a movement’s culture. Each measure of shared outrage towards a nuclear plant reinforces the shared fondness for others specifically because they feel the same way. They are like us; they understand. Conversely, mutual affection is one context in which new shared emotions are easily created. Because you are fond of others, you want to adopt their feelings. Both kinds of collective emotions foster solidarity within a protest group. They are key resources of identification with a movement”.

on the extent to which this person takes part as Maurer (2001) has highlighted. For instance, did he/she participate in the daily tasks which require specific skills and knowledge/familiarity with the codes and rules including speaking in public? As Cohen (2014) has shown, socially fragile people are more likely to take an active role during a mobilization's intense phases and when it is weakly structured – in an occupation for example. The extent of a person's commitment results therefore in contrasting feelings of empowerment. For mobilization *entrepreneurs*, this empowerment process (including raising self-esteem) is rather straightforward. Such people are deemed to be useful to the cause and their peers respect and listen to them<sup>31</sup>. But over time, mobilization *entrepreneurs* may well feel 'trapped' by the repetitive nature of the tasks they do on behalf of others. The more common activists/occupiers may also find great value in the work they do (cooking, cleaning, getting food, building shelters, dealing with security and so on) even if other people may not consider that their chores are all that important and/or indispensable. But such duties are not necessarily degrading or embarrassing since they are extremely important from the point of view of making the people who carry them out believe that they are doing something that is socially constructive and personally satisfying. Performing such duties is part of the empowerment process and helps these people to improve their lot in life: links are made, feelings of belonging are established. In the short term, such people gain confidence in themselves. They find renewed energy by virtue of the tasks they do and that they find meaningful and rewarding or by virtue of their day-to-day interactions with their peers.

In this regard, a recurring theme drawn from the interviews is that many of the occupiers believed that the camps made them feel loyal to the cause and to their peers and that they were now in a better position to deal with their day-to-day personal issues. These occupiers felt that participation had a therapeutic effect on them in that, for once, they were able to give public voice to their concerns and to find comfort in doing so<sup>32</sup>. Participating in the occupations also helped them to move away from negative feelings of anger, annoyance, loneliness, failure, guilt, solitude and/or despondency<sup>33</sup>. As such, the camps became for them havens of help and of solidarity. Some occupiers said that they learned how to do creative and useful tasks such as building tents, dealing with the police, talking to the media or learning mediation skills in dealing with disruptive local residents, passers-by and late-night revelers<sup>34</sup>. Despite despairing at the prevailing level of passivity in Irish society,

<sup>31</sup> On this general concept see McCarthy and Zald 1977.

<sup>32</sup> Interview, Th..., male, unemployed, 40+, Cork, 15 December 2012.

<sup>33</sup> Interview, Fi..., female, student, 20+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>34</sup> Interview, Ao..., female, student, 20+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

a Galway occupier indicated that the camp was for her a “wake-up call” and that the camp helped her to begin to play a greater part in her community and to do something positive for the country<sup>35</sup>. Another occupier in Dublin stated that “At least we were doing something and weren’t complaining or being apathetic”<sup>36</sup>. Many of the younger occupiers who had never before been members of a community or voluntary association or who had never before participated in a collective action stated that they were keen to learn from others how to become politically active and how to raise public awareness about the “awful” state of the nation<sup>37</sup>.

In the longer term, however, emerging power struggles and rising doubts about operational procedures made the situation more complex – a common occurrence in many mobilizations as discussed above. The camps slowly became bogged down by issues arising from the occupiers’ sociological diversity and their increasingly incompatible sets of objectives – all of which slowly undermined group solidarity. In ODS, for instance, a number of the original mobilization *entrepreneurs* – ‘middle-class’ occupiers – felt that they were being pushed to the camp’s fringes. These ‘middle-class’ occupiers believed that the mobilization would ultimately fail because too many occupiers refused to frame their claims in class-based terms and to set up alliances. It is true that refusing alliances may well have worked in the camps’ favor in the very short term in the sense that it helped to foster group solidarity. Some felt that by refusing to become aligned they could not be accused of political favoritism and/or of diluting the purity of the cause. But refusing to set-up alliances may well have compromised Occupy’s longer term prospects. As Lipsky’s explains: powerless people “depend for success not upon direct utilization of power, but upon activating other groups to enter the political arena [on their behalf]” (1970, 1). For example, an occupier with extensive political or trade union experience considered that the “no politics” and the “no alliances” stances were naive and ultimately destructive<sup>38</sup>. Another politically engaged activist felt that her younger – and politically disengaged – colleagues failed to appreciate the history of the left and of the trade union movement in Ireland: “It was as if all protest started in October 2011”<sup>39</sup>. Petty disputes also undermined morale. Cliques soon formed and tensions between ‘full-time’ and ‘occasional’ occupiers became ever-present, particularly in ODS:

<sup>35</sup> Interview, El..., female, student, 20+, Galway, 17 November 2012.

<sup>36</sup> Interview, Mo..., male, employee, Dublin, 8 January 2013.

<sup>37</sup> Interview, Se..., male, student, 25+, Dublin, 16 February 2013.

<sup>38</sup> Interview, Ge..., male, employee, 50+, Dublin, 5 January 2013.

<sup>39</sup> Interview, He..., female, retired, 65+, Dublin, 19 November 2012.

Some of those camping became obsessed with the camp and with an inflated image of themselves as the core of this movement. ... One habitually referred to himself and others in the camp as ‘heroes of the revolution’ ... I believed that a camp obsession, even narcissism, was subverting the attempt to build a movement. (Sheehan 2012, 7)

In some ways, clique formations and petty disputes were linked to social class. In ODS for instance, some “working-class” occupiers felt that the “middle-class” occupiers were doing all of the easy tasks but that they were not carrying out their share of the more difficult hands-on duties such as getting food, building shelters or dealing with security issues<sup>40</sup>:

Some resented those who came for the talks and assemblies, but did not camp. ... From their point of view, they were outside in the cold, the rain and the dark when others were home asleep in their warm beds. They were vulnerable to the drunks, junkies, thieves and crazies on the city streets when others were secure in their homes. They were up all night on security duty while others arrived after a good night’s sleep seeking interesting company and intellectual conversation. (*Ibidem*, 7)

Another source of rising tension was linked to questions surrounding the use of the open/democratic decision-making format. Unquestionably, all the occupiers were committed to such a format but some felt that the ways it was used was counter-productive. For instance, a Dublin occupier suggested that the general assemblies were ineffective because they became bogged down in “tortuous discussions”<sup>41</sup>. A Galway occupier claimed that the “full-time” occupiers dominated proceedings and “silenced the occasional occupiers”<sup>42</sup>. These types of issues highlight the problems that many occupiers increasingly had in talking to and in understanding one another and, ultimately, in ensuring solidarity and commitment to the cause. To some extent, the camps soon became ends in themselves, generating an exclusionary group dynamic and contradicting the slogan: “We are the 99%”.

## 5. Conclusion

In this article I have sought to consider the issues of mobilization and disillusionment as they refer to Occupy in Ireland. Occupy emerged at a time of major social and economic turmoil in the country and its emergence validates in part the case of a rise in civil society resistance to austerity in the post-2008 period. I noted that the occupations enabled many people from very wide socio-demographic backgrounds to come together to express their

<sup>40</sup> Interview, Mo..., female, employee, 25+, Dublin, 26 November 2014.

<sup>41</sup> Interview, He..., female, retired, 65+, Dublin, 19 November 2012.

<sup>42</sup> Interview, Th..., male, employee, 30+, Galway, 25 May 2013.

concerns. Initially, a relatively good number of ‘middle-class’ people (high levels of social and cultural capital) took part in the mobilization but, as the occupations lasted over time, the camps became increasingly populated by socially fragile individuals. The occupations were also somewhat different from ‘traditional’ protests notably because the occupiers were very much committed to the principles of direct, deliberative and participative democracy: no leaders, no spokesperson, no formal structures, no strict norms, no formal rites, and so on. One outcome is that there were no SMOs to organize protests or to provide services. In the short term, therefore, Occupy was important because it helped all occupiers – rich and poor, educated and less well educated, young and old – to challenge the perceived injustices in society and to give voice to their frustration, outrage or anger. Occupy also enabled many of these participants to deal with their day-to-day personal issues and/or to do creative and useful tasks. The process helped to create a form of group identity and solidarity. In the longer term, however, the camps became beset by a number of unintended problems and, particularly, by the upsurge in destabilizing power struggles and by rising doubts about the ways they operated. Both these issues undermined group solidarity and contributed, ultimately, to disillusionment and then to demobilization.

I would like to conclude this article by returning to a few issues that may be of interest and relevance to a wider audience. The first issue relates to the collective action cycles of precarious people – including Occupy and similar movements. Although there is a growing body of literature on such mobilizations, further research could focus on comparative analyses of the cycles of protest in order to assess the dynamics that take place over time within and across countries. Another strand of research could look at what becomes of the neo-activists that have acquired vital, social, organizational and political knowledge through collective action. Have these people withdrawn from militancy or have they moved on to populate alternative social and/or political movements as sites and sources of resistance? If they are still active, what do they bring to these new movements/issues?<sup>43</sup> Further research could thus analyze the effects that neo-activists may have on the various SMOs. Finally, this article supports the view that there has been an increasing pattern of resistance to austerity in Ireland. Further research could focus on the state of play of the political and mobilization contexts in the country. Has there been an irremediable change in the country or are we simply witnessing a ‘false springtime of discontent’? Further research on all these points could provide for interesting points of comparison, discussion and analysis.

<sup>43</sup> My follow-on interviews with many of the neo-activists that participated in Occupy confirm that they now play a role in a number of organizations that are involved in a range of social issues.



*Works Cited*

- Ancelovici Marcos, Dufour Pascale, Nez Héloïse, eds (2016), *Street Politics in the Age of Austerity*, Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam Press.
- Andrews Kernan (2011), "Occupy Galway vows to stay as long as it takes", *Galway Advertiser*, 10 October, <<http://www.advertiser.ie/galway/article/45361/occupy-galway-vows-to-stay-as-long-as-it-takes>> (05/2017).
- Benski Tova, Langman Lauren, Perugorria Ignacia, Tejerina Benjamín (2013), "From the Streets and Squares to Social Movement Studies: What Have We Learned?", *Current Sociology* 61, 4, 541-561.
- Broadsheet* (2011), 30 October, <<http://www.broadsheet.ie/2012/03/08/occupy-dame-street-gone/>> (05/2017).
- Calhoun Craig (2013), "Occupy Wall Street in Perspective", *British Journal of Sociology* 64, 1, 26-38.
- Campbell Sarah (2012), "Does the Occupy Movement have a Future? Lessons from History", *Working Papers in History and Policy* 1, <<http://historyhub.ie/does-the-occupy-movement-have-a-future>> (05/2017).
- Chabanet Didier, Faniel Jean, eds (2012), *The Mobilization of the Unemployed in Europe: From Acquiescence to Protest?*, London, Palgrave.
- Chabanet Didier, Royall Frédéric, eds (2014), *From Silence to Protest: International Perspectives on Weakly Resourced Groups*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Cohen Valérie (2014), "Militer ça donne des forces: Potentiel transformateur et intégrateur de l'action collective des chômeurs", *Travail et emploi* 138, 117-128.
- Cox Laurence (2012), "Challenging Austerity in Ireland: Community and Movements Responses", *Concept: The Journal of Contemporary Community Education Practice Theory* 3, 2, <<http://concept.lib.ed.ac.uk/index.php/Concept/issue/view/24>> (05/2017).
- Cox Laurence (2016), "Studying Movements in a Movement-become-state: Research and Practice in Post-Colonial Ireland", in Olivier Fillieule, Guya Accornero (eds), *Social Movement Studies in Europe: The State of the Art*, New York, Berghahn Books, 303-318.
- della Porta Donatella (2005), "Deliberation in Movement: Why and How to Study Deliberative Democracy and Social Movements", *Acta Politica* 40, 336-350.
- della Porta Donatella, Rucht Dieter, eds (2013), *Meeting Democracy: Power and Deliberation in Global Justice Movements*, New York, Cambridge UP.
- Donovan Donal, Murphy A.E. (2013), *The Fall of the Celtic Tiger: Ireland and the Euro Debt Crisis*, Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Dufour Pascale, Nez Héloïse, Ancelovici Marcos (2016), "From the Indignados to Occupy: Prospects for Comparison", in Marcos Ancelovici, Pascale Dufour, Héloïse Nez (eds), *Street Politics in the Age of Austerity: From the Indignados to Occupy*, Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam Press, 11-40.
- Dunezat Xavier (2009), "La production du désengagement dans les mobilisations des sans", in Sandrine Nicourd (ed.), *Le Travail militant*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 107-116.
- Eurostat (2013), "At Risk of Poverty or Social Exclusion in the EU 27", *news release* 171, 3 December, <[http://csdle.lex.unict.it/Archive/LW/Press%20releases/EUROSTAT%20press%20releases/20121211-125128\\_2012\\_171pdf](http://csdle.lex.unict.it/Archive/LW/Press%20releases/EUROSTAT%20press%20releases/20121211-125128_2012_171pdf)> (05/2017).

- Fillieule Olivier, ed. (2005), *Le Désengagement militant*, Paris, Belin.
- Fillieule Olivier (2013), "Demobilization", in D.A. Snow, Donatella della Porta, Bert Klandermans, Doug McAdam (eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, Hoboken, Blackwell Publishing, 3 vols.
- Flesher Fominaya Cristina, Cox Laurence, eds (2013), *Understanding European Movements: New Social Movements, Global Justice Struggles, Anti-Austerity Protest*, London, Routledge.
- Gamson W.A., Sifry M.L. (2013), "The #Occupy Movement: An Introduction", *The Sociological Quarterly* 54, 2, 159-163.
- Geary John (2016), "Economic Crisis, Austerity and Trade Union Responses: The Irish Case in Comparative Perspective", *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 22, 2, 131-147.
- Goffman Erving (1975 [1963]), *Stigmaté: Les usages sociaux des handicaps*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- Gould-Wartofsky M.A. (2015), *The Occupiers: The Making of the 99 Percent Movement*, Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Grasso Maria, Giugni Marco (2015), "Are Anti-Austerity Movements 'Old' or 'New'?", in Marco Giugni, Maria Grasso (eds), *Austerity and Protest: Popular Contention in Times of Economic Crisis*, Farnham, Ashgate, 57-82.
- Hirschman A.O. (1970), *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*, Cambridge-London, Harvard UP.
- Jasper J.M. (2009 [1989]), "The Emotions of Protest", in Jeff Goodwin, J.M. Jasper (eds), *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 175-184.
- Ketelaars Pauline (2016) "Bridging the Protest Macro-Micro Gap: Investigating the Link between Motivations and Political Context", in Marco Giugni, Maria Grasso (eds), *Austerity and Protest: Popular Contention in Times of Economic Crisis*, Farnham, Ashgate, 111-132.
- Kiersey Nicholas (2014), "Occupy Dame Street as Slow-Motion General Strike?: Justifying Optimism in the Wake of Ireland's Failed Multitudinal Moment", *Global Discourse* 4, 2-3, 141-158.
- Kirby Peadar (2010), "Civil Society, Social Movements and the Irish State", *Irish Journal of Sociology* 18, 2, 1-21.
- Kriesi Hanspeter (2012), "The Political Consequences of the Financial and Economic Crisis in Europe: Electoral Punishment and Popular Protest", *Swiss Political Science Review* 18, 4, 518-522.
- Langman Lauren (2013), "Occupy: A New New Social Movement", *Current Sociology* 61, 4, 510-524.
- Le Texier Emmanuelle (2006), *Quand les exclus font de la politique. Le barrio mexicain de San Diego, Californie*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po.
- Lipsky Michael (1970), *Protest in City Politics: Rent Strikes, Housing and the Power of the Poor*, Chicago, Rand MacNally.
- Little Conor (2011), "The General Election of 2011 in the Republic of Ireland: All Changed Utterly?", *West European Politics* 34, 6, 1304-1313.
- Mair Peter (2010), "Paradoxes and Problems of Modern Irish Politics", Unpublished paper, MacGill Summer School, <<https://politicalreform.ie/macgill-papers/>> (05/2017).

- Mattoni Alice, Vogiatzoglou Markos (2014), “‘Today we are Precarious: Tomorrow, We Will be Unbeatable’: Early Struggles of Precarious Workers in Italy and Greece”, in Didier Chabanet, Frédéric Royall (eds), *From Silence to Protest: International Perspectives on Weakly Resourced Groups*, Farnham, Ashgate, 67-82.
- Maurer Sophie (2001), *Les Chômeurs en action (décembre 1997-mars 1998): Mobilisation collective et ressources compensatoires*, Paris, L’Harmattan.
- McCarthy John, Zald Mayer (1977), “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory”, *American Journal of Sociology* 82, 6, 1212-1241.
- McGinn Pat, Allen Mike (1991), *Organizing Against Unemployment: The Strength and Weaknesses of Organisations of the Unemployed in Ireland*, Dublin, Irish National Organisation of the Unemployed.
- Meade Rosie (2005), “We Hate it Here, Please Let us Stay! Irish Social Partnership and the Community/Voluntary Sector’s Conflicted Experiences of Recognition”, *Critical Social Policy* 25, 3, 349-373.
- Murphy Mary (2011), “Civil Society in the Shadow of the Irish State”, *Irish Journal of Sociology* 19, 2, 170-187.
- Nez Héloïse (2016), “Social Movements Facing the Crisis: Indignados and Occupiers in Europe”, in Olivier Fillieule, Guya Accornero (eds), *Social Movement Studies in Europe: The State of the Art*, New York, Berghahn, 173-187.
- O’Brien Dan (2011), “Searching for the Source of Perpetual Passivity”, *The Irish Times*, 19 February, <<http://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/searching-for-the-source-of-perpetual-passivity-1.576805>> (05/2017).
- “Occupy Waterford” (2011), <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bCpoilSLBS8>> (05/2017).
- O’Connor Francis (2017), “The Presence and Absence of Protest in Austerity Ireland”, in Donatella della Porta, Massimiliano Andretta, Tiago Fernandes, *et al.* (eds), *Late Neoliberalism and its Discontents in the Economic Crisis*, London, Palgrave, 65-98.
- O’Flynn Micheal, Power M.J., McCabe Conor, Silke Henry (2013), “Class Politics in Post-Boom Ireland: A Burgeoning Resistance?”, University of Limerick, Department of Sociology Working Paper Series, WP2013-04, <<http://www.ul.ie/sociology/pubs/wp2013-04.pdf>> (05/2017).
- Péchu Cécile (2006), *Droit au logement: Genèse et sociologie d’une mobilisation*, Paris, Dalloz.
- Peterson Abby, Wahlström Mattias, Wennerhag Magnus (2013), “Is there New Wine in the New Bottles? Participants in European Anti-Austerity Protests 2010-2012”, Paper presented at the European Consortium for Political Research General Conference, Bordeaux, <[ecpr.eu/filestore/paperproposal/a1555da5-b8c1-42f4-bda8-68a223a7f2a6.pdf](http://ecpr.eu/filestore/paperproposal/a1555da5-b8c1-42f4-bda8-68a223a7f2a6.pdf)> (05/2017).
- Piven Fox Frances, Cloward R.A. (1977), *Poor People’s Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*, New York, Pantheon Books.
- Politics.ie*, <<http://www.politics.ie/forum/waterford/174912-occupy-waterford-protest-7.html>> (05/2017).
- Power Séamus (2016), “A Violent Past but a Peaceful Present: The Cultural Psychology of an Irish Recession”, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 22, 1, 60-66.
- Real Democracy Now, <<http://www.politicalworld.org/showthread.php?8664-For-Real-Democracy-Now!-Draft-Manifesto-Ireland#.VPRhC47y3fc>> (05/2017).

- Renouard A.-C. (2014), "Constructing a Roma Cause in Contemporary Finland and Italy: The Social and Cultural Significance of Roma and Pro-Roma Mobilizations", in Didier Chabanet, Frédéric Royall (eds), *From Silence to Protest: International Perspectives on Weakly Resourced Groups*, Farnham, Ashgate, 119-140.
- Rüdiger Wolfgang, Karyotis Georgios (2014), "Who Protests in Greece? Mass Opposition to Austerity", *British Journal of Political Science* 44, 3, 487-513.
- Sheehan Helena (2012), "Occupying Dublin: Considerations at the Crossroads", *Irish Left Review*, <<http://www.irishleftreview.org/2012/01/19/occupying-dublin-considerations-crossroads/>> (05/2017).
- Socialist Voice* (November 2011), <<http://www.comunistpartyofireland.ie/sv2011-11/03-dame-st-2.html>> (05/2017).
- Standard Eurobarometers (2008-2011), 70-76, <[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/cf/step1.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/cf/step1.cfm)> (05/2017).
- Storey Andy (2012), "The Dog not Barking: The Curious Case of Irish Protest or Lack of it", *Crisis, Austerity and Resistance Conference*, Limerick, 25-26 April, unpublished paper, <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WiOfDBwGAY8>> (05/2017).
- Streeck Wolfgang, Schäfer Armin, eds (2013), *Politics in the Age of Austerity*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Sutherland Neil, Land Christopher, Böhm Steffen (2014), "Anti-leaders(hip) in Social Movement Organizations: The Case of Autonomous Grassroots Groups", *Organization* 21, 6, 759-781.
- Szolucha Anna (2013), "Learning Consensus Decision-Making in Occupy: Uncertainty, Responsibility, Commitment", in Patrick Coy (ed.), *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 36, Bingley, Emerald Publishing, 205-234.
- Tarrow Sidney (2011 [1994]), *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Traïni Christophe, Siméant Johanna (2009), "Pourquoi et Comment Sensibiliser à la Cause?", in Christophe Traïni (ed.), *Émotion... Mobilisations!*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 11-34.
- Zald Mayer, Ash Roberta (1966), "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change", *Social Forces* 44, 3, 327-341.
- Zald Mayer, McCarthy John (2009 [1987]), *Social Movements in an Organizational Society: Collected Essays*, New Brunswick-London, Transaction Publishers.