



Department of Political and Social Sciences

**The welfare state we're in.
Organisations of the unemployed in action
in Paris and Berlin**

Zorn, Annika

Thesis submitted for assessment with a view to obtaining the degree of
Doctor of Political and Social Sciences of the European University
Institute

Florence, February 2010

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE
Department of Political and Social Sciences

The welfare state we're in.

**Organisations of the unemployed in action
in Paris and Berlin**

Annika Zorn

Thesis submitted for assessment with a view to obtaining the degree of
Doctor of Political and Social Sciences of the European University Institute

Examining Board:

Prof. Donatella della Porta, European University Institute (EUI Supervisor)
Prof. Klaus Eder, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (External Co-Supervisor)
Prof. Colin Crouch, Warwick University (Internal Examiner)
Dr. Marco Giugni, Université de Genève (External Examiner)

© 2010, Annika Zorn

No part of this thesis may be copied, reproduced or
transmitted without prior permission of the author

Acknowledgements

A PhD is certainly more than just a piece of written work. This might explain the urgent desire to express gratitude to all those who accompanied me in this project in one way or another. It is practically impossible to consider the following thesis as the work of one individual, too many people have helped me, changed my way of thinking, and left their mark somewhere the text.

Thank you to all the unemployed activists who have shared their time, knowledge, experiences, views (especially those beautiful ones of Paris), cakes and lentil soup with me. I have met many people for whom I admire for being engaged in creating a better democracy.

A thank you to my two supervisors Donatella della Porta and Klaus Eder. Donatella was not only an excellent source of support in all phases of the PhD –and there are indeed so many different phases – but was also there when it was not all about writing. This was exceptional and I would like to say a big thank you to her. Klaus Eder, as he did when I was his student at Humboldt university, provided stimulating feedback every time I approached him. He is so inspiring that I was sometimes fearful of having too many ideas and not being able to cope with them - and I hope he will now forgive those periods of silence and reflection.

Sometimes, one small sentence is enough to help you through an important project. One of the seminars I attended was taught by Prof. Colin Crouch, and in one of the first sessions he said something I was so grateful for during the years to come: do not make your Phd the academic project of your life. He reminded me that if we want to work as academics we have the rest of our lives to take part in academic projects. Thank you for that wisdom.

I would also like to thank Roland Roth, Dieter Rucht, Marco Giugni, Paul Statham, Britta Baumgarten, Manlio Cinalli and Manuela Caiani, who discussed my project in its early stages or gave me important feedback at various conferences. Further thanks must go to Claudius Wagemann for his sharing his QCA expertise with me and for his

excellent didactical skills. Didier Chabanet was very generous in helping me with my research activities in France, thank you, Didier.

I wish to thank Catherine, Christine, and Jantina for many discussions on serious and less serious topics, and the many beautiful moments we spent together in Florence. I also wish to thank the scuolina team, first, Volker, Daniela and Vaida, I could not have wished for better company in the office. We shared so many important moments of our lives as researchers, and beyond that we became (even) close(r) friends. Thanks too to Herwig, Michele, Roch, Arnout and Thomas. The scuola team all made life at the Institute much more fun and scientifically enjoyable.

I am also grateful to the Donatella team: all of those people writing their PhDs or articles with Donatella have given me important feedback on my work and always provided a stimulating, enjoyable and unique academic atmosphere. Louisa and Alice became very good friends, and I am sure our shared interests in academic and other things will keep us in close contact in the future.

Just for being there I would like to thank Adda, Morten and Madicken, Kessi, Uli, Gianni, Helena, Teo and Nicole, Denise and Edward, Mara, Markus and Naima.

A special thank goes to my parents and to my two brothers Dirk and Hendrik and their families (Imke, Rina, Marta and Wilma), who were there with constant loving support in this project. From the bottom of my heart I wish to thank Paolo who always had the right balance of patience and hustle that were so important to get me through this experience in the best way possible. He always believed in my capacities even when I did not. And last but certainly not least, to our daughter Lara Lina who made the last stretch of this road such a sunny one to walk along.

So lets start.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
--------------------	---

First Part

Preparing the analysis: Studying local organisations of the unemployed and political, discursive, and contentious contexts	9
---	----------

Introduction to the first part.....	9
Chapter 1 From unemployed observers to unemployed participants. Explaining action on unemployment.	13
1.1 ‘Grievances are everywhere – protest not’. Explaining the absence of contentious action by the unemployed	15
1.2 Contentious agency of the unemployed, new insights.	20
1.3 Organisations and protest action. The local roots of unemployed action and the power of disruptive action.....	23
Discussion.....	29
Chapter 2 Studying unemployed people’s activism. Some comments on data collection and analysis	31
Discussion.....	47
Chapter 3 The contentious field of unemployment: Unemployment policies, the public discourse on unemployment, and movements of the unemployed in France and Germany	49
3.1 The continental dilemma: France and Germany	50
3.2 The contentious politics of unemployment	64
3.3 Unemployed people’s movements in France and Germany	72
Discussion.....	85
Conclusion of the first part	91

Second Part

Reconstructing fields of unemployed people’s actors: Local infrastructure, organisations’ action strategies and features of a local struggle.....	95
--	-----------

Introduction to the second part	95
Chapter 4 Contentious fields for local organisations of the unemployed. Organisational infrastructure, unemployed people’s movements and issues raised.....	99
4.1 “That is typically French.” Comparing some general characteristics of the two fields in Paris and Berlin	100
4.2 “Let’s found an organisation”: founding stories and contexts for foundations	108
4.3 What is wrong with unemployment? Or the many claims of organisations of the unemployed in Berlin	116
Discussion.....	132
Chapter 5 Walking and talking together: daily routines and collective actions of organisations of the unemployed	143
5.1 “We care”: taking into account the individual needs of unemployed people	148
5.2 Social and political empowering: motivating the unemployed for resistance.....	159
5.3 Cultural and instrumental protest forms.....	168
Discussion.....	174
Chapter 6 The struggle for an unemployed people’s ticket in Berlin. When and how do unemployed actors interfere?.....	177
6.1 Social and unemployed tickets in Berlin	180
6.2 First phase: the abolition of social and unemployed people’s tickets in 1996.....	181
6.3 Second phase: protest cycle 1998 and the aftermath of the cycle	184
6.4 Third phase of the struggle: Passing the buck and the introduction of a ticket	186
6.5 Fourth phase of the struggle: pre-2004, 2004 and aftermath Flexibility and mobility.....	190
6.6 Summing up.....	196
Discussion.....	200
Conclusion of the second part.....	203

Third Part

Professional Service Providers and the Disruptive Poor? Explaining Tactical Choices of Organisations of the Unemployed.	209
Introduction to the third part	209
Chapter 7 ... Poor, excluded, counter-cultural, and experienced? - Discussing the best conditions for becoming disruptive	217
7.1 <i>The lack of resources and collective action</i>	218
7.2 <i>External support and access to centres of political and discursive power</i>	224
7.3 <i>Peer group pressure and the importance of social networks? Making a collective actor.</i> ...	230
7.4 <i>Middle-class radicalism or the disruptive poor? Experienced activists and tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed</i>	236
7.5 <i>Summing up the discussion</i>	239
Chapter 8 Empirical description of the four conditions	243
8.1 <i>Organisations of the unemployed accessing resources</i>	243
8.2 <i>Access to institutionalised actors</i>	250
8.3 <i>Peer group pressure and making a collective actor</i>	258
8.4 <i>Movement activists becoming unemployed and experience in movement action</i>	267
Discussion	273
Chapter 9 There's more than one way to skin a cat. Studying organisations of the unemployed as configurations with QCA	285
9.1 <i>Preparing the analysis: configurations of set memberships and ideal configurations</i>	286
9.2 <i>Analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions</i>	292
9.3 <i>Analysing the negation of the outcome: organisations of the unemployed that do not use disruptive strategies</i>	297
Discussion	301
Conclusion of the third part	311
 Conclusion	313
 Appendix A List of Organisations of the Unemployed	331
A.1 Definition of the population	331
A.2 List of organisations of the unemployed	331
Appendix B List of semi-structured interviews with founders or long-term members of local organisations of the unemployed	337
Appendix C Semi-structured interview guide	339
Appendix D Individual Survey	345
D.1 German Survey	345
D. 2 French Survey	356
Appendix E Comparing Berlin and Paris. Some general economic features of Paris and Berlin.	367
Appendix F Calibration rules for fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis	369
 Bibliography	373

Table of Illustrations

Table 3.1 - Harmonised unemployment rates and gross social expenditure (per cent of the GDP).....	51
Table 3.2 - Types of actors participating in the contentious politics over unemployment between 1995 and 2002	67
Table 3.3 - Issues raised in contentious politics of unemployment between 1995 and 2002	70
Table 4.1 - General characteristics of the two contentious fields	102
Image 4.1 - Date of foundation of local organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris, major reforms, national protest waves on the issue unemployment, and elections	112
Table 4.2 - Movement family identities of unemployed activists	130
Table 4.3 - Areas of previous movement engagement by unemployed activists	131
Table 5.1 - Importance given to caring activities and protest action by organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	157
Table 5.2 - Social and political empowerment strategies of organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	166
Table 5.3 - Logic of protest action by organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin.....	173
Table 6.1 - Characteristics of the first phase of the struggle	183
Table 6.2 - Characteristics of the second phase of the struggle.....	185
Table 6.3 - Characteristics of the third phase of the struggle	188
Table 6.4 - Characteristics of the fourth phase of the struggle	195
Table 6.5 - Structural opportunities and characteristics of the struggle for an unemployed people's ticket in Berlin during the four phases from 1996 - 2005	198
Table 7.1 - Presumed impact of the four conditions (resources, institutionalised field, counterculture, experiences) on preferred strategies	241
Table 8.1 - Access to resources and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	247
Table 8.2 - Access to resources and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	249
Table 8.3 - Access to the field of institutionalised actors and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	256
Table 8.4 - Access to the field of institutionalised actors and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	257
Table 8.5 - Embeddedness in countercultural network and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	266
Table 8.6 - Embeddedness in countercultural network and use of caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	267
Table 8.7 - Movement experience and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin	272
Table 8.8 - Movement experience and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin.....	273
Table 9.1 - Fuzzy-set membership values of four properties and disruptive strategies of organisations of the unemployed.....	288

Truth Table 9.2 - Ideal types of configurations of organisation characteristics and number of organisations best described by that ideal configuration.....	290
Truth Table 9.3 - Ideal configurations, number of cases best described by an ideal configuration, consistency values, and sufficient conditions for the outcome disruptive activities.....	292
Table 9.4 - Consistency and coverage values for necessary conditions for outcome D	293
Table 9.5 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), conservative solution	295
Table 9.6 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), parsimonious solution 1	296
Table 9.7 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), parsimonious solution 2.....	296
Truth Table 9.8 - Ideal configurations, number of organisations best described by that ideal configuration, consistency values, and sufficient conditions for the outcome non- disruptive activities	298
Table 9.9 - Consistency and coverage values for necessary conditions for outcome d.....	299
Table 9.10 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome d), conservative solution.....	299
Table 9.11 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), parsimonious solution.....	300
Table E.1 - Employment, social and civic characteristics of the regions Paris (Île-de-France) and Berlin, 2005 (%), NUTS level 2	368

Introduction

Unemployment has become one of the most difficult challenges for European welfare states. Over past decades this topic have received ever more attention from political parties: convincing electorates that unemployment rates could be reduced or full employment realised with the right political decisions became a crucial and necessary condition for electoral success. In fact, in 2005 – during the period of my empirical investigation - unemployment was considered by 81 per cent of Germans as the most or second most important issue facing the country (European commission 2005:26). This is hardly surprising considering the broad area of policy issues connected to unemployment, such as fiscal policy, pensions and labour market reforms, not to mention those aspects of unemployment that concern the area of social policy. Indeed, this issue is a concern of many other interest groups and social actors, such as trade unions, welfare and religious organisations, who put topics on the agenda other than the often more technical problem definitions of governing actors. From time to time these organisations act as advocates for weak interests (Willems and Winter 2000; Bode 2000), reminding us of the negative consequences of mass unemployment not only for society as a whole, but also and in particular for the individuals unemployed.

Ever since unemployment became a structural challenge, the issue has been strongly contested in public debate. Yet while a number of political and social actors, such as trade unions, political parties, governing institutions and employers organisations have participated in the ‘contentious politics of unemployment’¹, the unemployed as those most directly affected by unemployment politics, did not participate. In a document written in 2006 on the occasion of their 20th birthday, the French umbrella organisation of the unemployed *Mouvement National de Chômeurs*

¹ The contentious politics of unemployment describes the relationship between political institutional approaches to employment policy and political conflicts by collective actors over unemployment in the public domain (Giugni and Statham 2002).

et Précaires (MNCP) comments: “*Pas un jour sans que le chômage soit le sujet de déclarations, de reportages, d’avis plus ou moins autorisés et pas un jour sans que cette vérité ne se vérifie: les chômeurs et précaires sont les éternels exclus du débat public.*”² Summarising their experiences of the public debates on the issue unemployment in recent decades, the French organisation emphasises the continuing exclusion of unemployed people from the public sphere. Unemployed people seem to be ignored - at least in their guise as actors who have a right to speak. For a long time, unemployed people were observers and those observed rather than participants in the debate.

While this consideration holds true until the mid 1990s – up until this point the unemployed were virtually excluded from public debates - some unemployed voices have entered into the debate here and there over the past decade. Through disruptive collective actions unemployed people have - albeit marginally - entered the debate as participants. That is, via protest activities those usually excluded from debates can gain access to the public sphere and promote political and social change.

One of the first and most prominent waves of protest took place in France in winter 1997 – 1998, when unemployed people from all over France started to occupy the offices of the Assedic³. After unemployed people occupied more than a dozen Assedic offices all over France to claim a Christmas allowance and mobilise against social exclusion, they appeared in the major national newspapers and news broadcasts during the Christmas period (Demazière and Pignoni 1998; Maurer 2001). The successful French mobilisations – successful in terms of access to the public debate and the outcome of the mobilisations – were important forerunners for mobilisations in other countries. For German unemployed people in particular the French mobilisations served as a role model. In Germany, a couple of months after the French unemployed people had started their protest, a national coordination of trade union organisations of the unemployed called for action. In February 1998 a protest wave lasting several months mobilised thousands of unemployed people (for a detailed description see *Chapter 3*). In other European countries, such as Italy (Baglioni et al.

² Internal paper by the Mouvement National de chômeurs et précaires (MNCP): “20 ans de lutte contre le chômage et la précarité.”, page 2.

³ Assedic denotes the Association pour l’Emploi dans l’Industrie et le Commerce (Association for Employment in Industry and Trade). Until 2009 this was the state agency in charge of the unemployment insurance system, it subsequently merged with another agency to become the Pôle emploi.

2008) and even at the European level (Chabanet 2008), the unemployed successfully mobilised for protest actions.

Thus, in a number of European countries the struggle over the social meaning of unemployment has been given a new and challenging interpretation since the unemployed entered the public debate by means of protest actions. Some years have passed since the unemployed began to break the silent social agreement that they are to be 'cared for' and have to be 'activated' - victims of, or accommodated within unfavourable structures. The definition of what unemployment is about has been given a new and challenging interpretation through the participation of unemployed collective actors in public debate. In the following research these unemployed challengers, their forms of social and political engagement and their ambitions for change form the centre of attention. In fact, since the unemployed have entered the public sphere as collective actors, their activities have attracted increasing attention from academics. In recent years researchers from various European countries have contributed to our knowledge of the contentious politics of unemployment and the protest activities of unemployed people. Particularly in France where AC!, the platform against unemployment, organised a huge protest march through France as early as the mid-1990s, research on unemployed peoples' protests provides many interesting insights into how unemployed people overcame obstacles to protest.

However, as I will argue in *chapter 1*, most of this research concentrates either exclusively on the French case or - when comparing different countries - is limited to a macro-perspective. In the following research an additional perspective on unemployed people's contentious activities is offered by shifting the focus to the micro- and meso-levels, focusing on the activities of local organisations of the unemployed and their everyday contentious activities. In my research my first aim is the description and reconstruction of unemployed peoples' actions at the local level and, second, to explain the conditions under which the unemployed successfully use strategies that aim to disrupt the everyday business of welfare politics.

The thesis is divided into three parts. The **first part** describes and defines the context of the empirical investigation. *Chapter 1* discusses the conceptual limits of past research and reviews recent insights on unemployed peoples' mobilisations, specifying the gap in the research on unemployed action. On the basis of the

discussion of the literature, *chapter 2* translates the general research interest into concrete research questions, specifying the empirical approach and presenting the methodological tools used to gather and analyse the empirical data. Relatively open tools of qualitative data gathering and analysis are selected that allow the researcher to uncover the heterogeneous action repertoire of collective actors of the unemployed, and in particular take the meaning of these activities into account. Alongside my interest in building (ideal) typologies, I am interested in explaining the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed for a middle-sized N (N = 19). Qualitative Comparative Analysis, developed by Charles Ragin (1987; Ragin 2000) offers a research strategy that proves useful for a middle-sized N study that aims to combine a number of arguments from different theoretical approaches. *Chapter 2* introduces this research strategy presenting its main concepts. In the subsequent *chapter 3* the institutional contexts within which French and German organisations of the unemployed are embedded are described. The chapter presents the general and specific political contexts in which organisations of the unemployed act. The German and French institutions of the unemployment benefit system and major reforms in the two Bismarckian welfare states, as well as strategies for dealing with the problem of unemployment will be described. Secondly, the chapter describes the discursive context in which organisations of the unemployed are embedded and describes the different success of German and French unemployed to enter the public debate. Finally, the chapter describes the major national protest waves on the issue of unemployment in Germany in order to pinpoint the limits to explanations of these protest waves referring exclusively to changes in the policy field. The first part therefore aims to prepare the analysis, define the research interest, discuss the empirical approach and present the limitations posed by explanations of unemployed action based on changes in the field of unemployment policy.

In the **second part** I provide a detailed picture of unemployed actions in Paris and Berlin based on the empirical material gathered on organisations of the unemployed in these two cities. *Chapter 4* describes the contentious fields of local organisations of the unemployed on both sides of the river Rhine in more detail. The chapter presents the differences and similarities of the two organisational fields of unemployed actors in Paris and Berlin, and discusses these differences on the basis of insights on the political opportunity structures of both countries with particular emphasis on

contentious traditions, that is, the presence and absence of protest politics by the labour movement and new social movements. The chapter also gives insights into the relationships between organisations of the unemployed and social movements, and describes the framing activities and major claims of organisations of the unemployed. The chapter therefore aims to describe some of the main characteristics of the two contentious fields of organisations of the unemployed. In *chapter 5*, a typology of organisations of the unemployed is built on the basis of the main activities organisations engage in. The different logics of action are composed of social, cultural, and political activities and describe the main logics of action of the local organisations. A particular emphasis is placed on the meaning organisations of the unemployed assign to various activities, which confers them with different logics. Chapter 6 provides an in-depth analysis of a local struggle for a transport ticket for the unemployed in Berlin to analyse the interactive dynamics between unemployed actors and other social movement organisations and other collective actors.

Alongside my interest in providing a detailed account of the activities of local organisations of the unemployed and how they gain a place in the field of actors engaged on social issues at local levels, I am particularly interested in explaining the tactical choices of local organisations of the unemployed. Following the suit of Piven and Cloward (1977) on the importance of disruptive action for poor actors, in the **third part** I combine a number of arguments from different theoretical frameworks in order to explain the presumed moderation of unemployed action. In *chapter 7* I discuss the arguments advanced by the resource mobilisation approach (and particularly the resource derivation debate), the political opportunity approach, and the collective identity perspective, and present ideal types linking presumed conditions to tactical choices. In *chapter 8* I then empirically trace which organisations of the unemployed are best represented by each ideal type in order to assess the impact of each condition on tactical choices. Integrating all four of the conditions argued to lead to the outcome of disruptive strategies by organisations of the unemployed, in a final step I present a Qualitative Comparative Analysis of the nineteen cases, and discusses two types of actors that prefer disruptive actions. Social movement research has so far concentrated on single variables or bundles of variables to explain collective actions. QCA integrates these various approaches in order to pinpoint which factors are necessary and which are sufficient to a specific outcome

and in which specific combinations (see Ragin 2000). Thus, the third part aims to develop social movement theory – with special regard to activities of ‘poor’ actors - by integrating a number of theoretical perspectives and looking at the interaction of various conditions.

FIRST PART

Preparing the analysis: Studying local organisations of the unemployed and political, discursive, and contentious contexts

Introduction to the first part

In July 2004 a single person from Magdeburg started what became one of the biggest mass demonstrations in post-war Germany. Andreas Erholdt, a 42 year old long-term unemployed man went to the city centre and glued small pieces of paper to the walls of houses. The papers called on the population of Magdeburg to act against the newest labour market reform introduced by the government in 2002. Mr. Erholdt's call for action against the so-called 'Hartz reform' was successful. Some days later around 600 people gathered in the streets of Magdeburg to make their grievances heard. On his T-Shirt Mr. Erholdt had written the famous citation by Brecht *'People who fight may lose. People who do not fight have already lost.'* One week later the gatherings had grown to several thousand people. From then on every Monday people gathered in German cities. Two months later the protest had spread to more than 230 cities in West and East Germany and more than one million people had participated in the protests against the Hartz reform. The mobilisation of broad parts of society was quick and massive all over Germany, though initially more successful in East Germany. The protest wave against the Hartz reform in 2004 was as big as the mass mobilisations for peace in the 1980s in West Germany, one of the most important mobilisations of the new social movements at that time.

The Hartz IV protest wave of summer 2004 was directed against the Hartz reform, an attempt both to modernise crucial labour market institutions and to reform the benefit allowances for long-term unemployed people (see *chapter 3*). It was developed by a commission set up by the former chancellor Schroeder in 2002, and

implemented by the German government in steps until 2005. The most contested aspects of the reform were a new means-test for assessing the economic and social situation of the recipients of unemployment and social assistance, the limited duration of unemployment insurance benefits and - probably most importantly - the adjustment of unemployment and social assistance to 345 Euros in West and 311 Euros in East Germany. Long-term unemployed people, that is, those people remaining out of work for a period longer than 12 months, was the group most affected by the reform.

Does the impact of the Hartz reform on the lives of unemployed people explain the massive wave of protest of summer 2004? The protests against the fourth package of the so-called Hartz reform were marked by a return of the social question, and claims also seemed to be strongly motivated by the grievances of unemployed people. However, while relative deprivation (Gurr 1970) explains some aspects of the protest wave, for example the unexpectedly strong levels of participation by unemployed people and the older male generation, there is much left to explain and discover about the contentious agency of unemployed people.

Let me mention three aspects that weaken the intuitive assumption of a direct causal link between grievances and social unrest of which the 'Hartz reform' seems such a strong confirmation.

Firstly, in summer 2004 the fourth package of the 'Hartz reform', which would change the benefit allowances of long-term unemployed people and social benefit recipients had not yet been implemented. The protestors were not, therefore, reacting to a deterioration in conditions, but – if at all - to presumed impacts on their lives in the near future. Furthermore, the regulation of unemployment benefits - that is the amount of the benefit, the conditions and sanctions for entitlement, and the duration of entitlement - had been worsening for a long time. For example, the eligibility criteria had already been limited to those people that had exhausted their unemployment insurance in the 1990s. The protest was not therefore provoked only by worsening material conditions.

Secondly, while the media described the Hartz IV protest as a losers' protest, that is, a protest by older, male East Germans, long-term unemployed and with bad chances on the labour market, data gathered on the protest participants describes a more nuanced composition (Rucht and Yang 2004). Although the participation of the

older generation was particularly strong and 40 per cent of the protesters were in fact unemployed, on average protesters had rather high levels of education.⁴ Research has usually pointed out that the higher the level of education, the smaller the risk of becoming unemployed, especially in the long term. Furthermore, while most people (87%) mentioned that they counted unemployed people in their close social networks, most protesters were not themselves unemployed. The majority of protesters were thus people advocating the social interests of others.

Thirdly, other mobilisations on unemployment and other social topics - although not as famous as the 2004 episode - had taken place before, such as the unemployment protest wave in 1998. No specific welfare reform or labour market reform had been introduced then. The 1998 protest was more generally directed against increasing unemployment rates, and an attempt to bring down the conservative government that had been in power for 16 years and considered guilty of the difficult labour market situation and the retrenching of the welfare state.

The following thesis aims to advance knowledge on the driving forces being the contentious actions of the unemployed: the local organisations of the unemployed, for example, that were crucial to the massive and quick diffusion of the protest against the Hartz reform. Yet, as I will argue in *chapter 1*, despite the fact that we have important insights into unemployed people's protests, no studies are available on the various local organisations of the unemployed, particularly in a comparative perspective.

The first part of the thesis sets the scene for investigating local organisations of the unemployed. In *chapter 1* I discuss the reasons given for the weakness or absence of struggles of the unemployed and other 'poor' actors. These insights will be discussed in the light of recent investigations into protest politics by 'poor' actors with particular regard to unemployed people. On the basis of this discussion the research agenda of the thesis will be described. That is, while we have gained new and interesting insights into the general ability of unemployed people to protest, some features of unemployed action remain understudied, particularly comparative studies, the local roots of the broader mobilisation waves considered crucial driving forces, and, the disruptive strategies that are assumed to be a crucial tool for 'poor' actors.

⁴ Compared to average German protester the Hartz IV protesters are twice as likely to hold a university degree. Furthermore, 10 per cent of the protesters hold a PhD (Rucht and Yang 2004).

Combining these three aspects, the following study provides insights into the various activities and characteristics of local organisations of the unemployed.

In *chapter 2* the method of empirical investigation is explained. The thesis follows a comparative logic but moves beyond the common comparisons of national movements and the different national opportunity structures they are confronted with: instead, it compares the single organisations at the heart of the study. I will also further argue the tools for data collection chosen and the type of analysis carried out.

In the last chapter of the first part three aspects of the contentious politics of the unemployed are described in order to outline the context in which local groups of the unemployed move. Firstly, I describe some features of the economic performances of France and Germany, as well as of Paris and Berlin, and describe changes in unemployment policies. Secondly, I describe the discursive opportunity structure, that is, the types of collective actor involved in the contentious politics of unemployment as it manifested in the public discourse and the issues raised by these actors. Lastly, I describe the emergence of national organisations of the unemployed and national waves of protest on the topic of unemployment carried out by unemployed people in Germany and in France to discuss the explanatory limits of changes in unemployment policy to explain national protest waves of the unemployed.

Chapter 1

From unemployed observers to unemployed participants. Explaining action on unemployment.

As argued above, the protests against the Hartz reform cannot simply be considered as popular unrest by unemployed people responding to grievances, as most mainstream media outlets tried to suggest (Rucht and Yang 2004). Indeed, social movement studies have often stressed that grievances are everywhere, while protest is not, emphasising that the existence of grievances is not enough to explain the emergence of protest. Protests by and for the unemployed over the last decade have indeed surprised movement scholars. Usually, unemployed people are assumed to lack a range of tools usually considered necessary for mobilisation. Western democracies seemed to provide favourable contexts for others instead: protest politics has been dominated by middle-class actors engaged in identity struggles beyond their class positions, placing topics other than social questions on the public agenda (Eder 1993). While unemployment became an ever more present characteristic of Western democracies, unemployed people were for a long time observers rather than participants in the public debate on unemployment.

Indeed, research on interest groups points out that marginalised social groups, although this is less the case now, are more weakly represented than other collective interests. These ‘weak interests’ (Willems and Winter 2000) of social groups at the bottom of the socio-economic order, such as the homeless or stigmatized groups such as people with AIDS, have fewer organisations to represent their claims. Even though these weak interests have gained some momentum over the past decade, the asymmetries continue to exist and raise questions about the causes and forms of articulation and organisation of weak interests (Willems and Winter 2000; Gallas 1994).

Further, these have-nots⁵ seldom mobilize on their own behalf in unconventional ways (Roth 1997; Bagguley 1991).⁶ After unemployed people mobilised in various countries during the 1920s and 1930s (Richards 2002; Chabanet and Faniel forthcoming 2010; Gallas 1994; Bagguley 1991) no further protests were seen in post-war Europe for several decades. Therefore, for some collective actors not only is formal access to political channels via interest politics limited, but the so-called unconventional ways of ‘making politics with other means’ (Gamson 1975) - mainly used by social movements - also seem difficult. The empirical manifestations of the so-called ‘poor people’ (Piven and Cloward 1977)⁷ who do not have the usual power resources of challengers are the exception rather than the rule.

Many scholars have attempted to understand the private and political lives of poor people or stigmatized groups in order to explain the absence of the unemployed from interest politics as well as protest politics. In the following I will describe various explanations that have been given for the weakness or absence of contentious activities by unemployed people. Most importantly, I focus on the two dominant theoretical frameworks of social movement theory – resource mobilisation and the new social movement approach - and explain the absence or weakness of collective action by the unemployed on the basis of their central assumptions. In a subsequent step I will focus on new insights on unemployed people’s contentious actions. As unemployed people have mobilized over the past 15 years, new empirical insights and adaptations of theoretical arguments have been provided. However, most research focuses either on the French movement or uses a macro-sociological perspective to explain the emergence of national mobilisations of the unemployed. While local organisations of the unemployed are considered crucial driving forces, no insights on these actors exists in a comparative perspective. The present study aims to fill this gap

⁵ Unemployed people’s movements are best described by the French term ‘les mouvements de sans’, such as the ‘sans-papiers’, the ‘sans-emplois’, and the ‘sans-logements’. These social movements of have-nots are collective actors that place their lack of a central social-integrative aspect of modern life (a place to live, work, health, citizenship or a residence permit) at the centre of their contentious action, but are at the same time categorized by the wider society according to this lacking characteristic. See also the work by Mouchard (2001) who emphasises the excluded position of these actors in politics.

⁶ The analytical distinction by Kitschelt (2003) mentions three forms of interest representation: political parties, interest groups and social movements. Since some actors or topics neither gain access to political decision makers, nor interest organisations, they look for alternative ways to influence politics or public opinion such as protest politics.

⁷ The term ‘poor people’s movements’ refers to the book of the same name by Piven and Cloward (1977). In this book the two authors systematically compare - for the first time - American collective actors of the 20th century who are not middle-class but located at the lower end of the socio-economic scale.

in the knowledge. In the last section I specify the question I address in this research on local groups by discussing the link between organisations and social movements and the role of disruptive strategies.

1.1 ‘Grievances are everywhere – protest not’. Explaining the absence of contentious action by the unemployed

Unemployed people are assumed to face obstacles to mobilisation on the individual and collective levels. Firstly, unemployed people are said to lack the motivational disposition to protest. Further, they are considered a group with a particular structural position in society that does not allow them to pose a threat to power holders. From the perspective of social movement theory, the unemployed form a social group unlikely to organise major protest actions, lacking in resources, and unable to construct a collective identity. Let me specify these aspects in more detail.

Psychological explanations for the absence of poor people from the political stage emphasise that most unemployed people suffer from various psychological problems and are socially isolated (Morgenroth 2003). This disturbed state of mind is assumed to lead to a further weakening of social networks (Jahoda 1982). Most of this work relies on the famous study on unemployed people in Marienthal, a small town in Austria whose entire population was unemployed during the 1930s (Jahoda, Lazarsfeld, and Zeisel 1975 [1933]). As the Marienthal study shows, more time does not always produce more activism, since this assumes that people can use their time in a meaningful manner for themselves. As Jahoda et al. (1975 [1933]) mention, despite the amount of free time at their disposition, activity in the social democratic party decreased, as did the number of books borrowed from the workers’ library. *“Losgelöst von ihrer Arbeit und ohne Kontakt mit der Außenwelt, haben die Arbeiter die moralischen und materiellen Möglichkeiten eingebüßt, die Zeit zu verwenden”* (Jahoda et al. 1980 [1930]:83). Most of the unemployed remained trapped in a kind of vicious circle, in which they become increasingly depressed and passive and felt unable to contact other people.⁸

⁸ Yet, as I will explain below, in social movement studies even where motivational resources are available these have to be translated into collective resources, as anger is not considered sufficient for collective protest action.

Instead of focusing on the individual level, Offe (1972) explains how social groups organize their interests collectively from a structural perspective. According to Offe, the conflictuality of a group interest is defined by the ‘process of realised output’ (Leistungsverwertungsprozess): those at the border or outside this process have reduced powers of self-assertion. In a study carried out with Wiesensthal (Offe and Wiesensthal 1980), the authors argue that two different logics underlie the collective action of workers and owners of capital. These two collective actors, although both are organized collectively, have different kinds of power expressed through the different sanctions they can use. While workers and owners of capital are already characterised by an unequal distribution of power, unemployed people, in contrast, have no tools of power whatsoever at their disposition. Due to their position in the system of production, unemployed people are unable to challenge power holders with sanctions. Although they may be organized in some way, that is, certain social groups do not have the possibility to create conflict: *“Konfliktfähigkeit beruht auf der Fähigkeit einer Organisation bzw. der ihr entsprechenden Funktionsgruppe, kollektiv die Leistungen zu verweigern bzw. systemrelevante Leistungsverweigerungen glaubhaft anzudrohen. Eine Reihe von Status- und Funktionsgruppen ist zwar organisationsfähig, aber nicht konfliktfähig... Beispiele sind Gruppen der Hausfrauen, der Schüler und Studenten, der Arbeitslosen, der Pensionäre, der Kriminellen und Geisteskranken und ethnischer Minderheiten”* (Offe 1972:146f). The unemployed are therefore able to organize in various ways, but lack the power to threaten power holders with sanctions.⁹ Poor people are considered part of a category of social groups, such as pensioners, housewives, or disabled people, that have difficulties in organizing collectively and challenging powerful actors.

Another perspective on the (in-)ability of poor and stigmatized groups to be ‘seen and heard’ in society (Touraine 1981) is that of social movement research. Over the past few decades social movement theory has developed a theoretical framework to explain the emergence, dynamics and success of collective action, looking at the explanatory power of various analytical levels.¹⁰ Movement emergence and strength, for example, are explained by the resources of collective actors and organisations

⁹ Offe’s view differs therefore from an interpretation of collective protest as resource of power in itself as proposed by Piven and Cloward (1977).

¹⁰ For good overviews of the several approaches used to grasp the different analytical levels (micro, macro and meso-level) see the book edited by Hellmann and Koopmans (1998) or the book by Della Porta and Diani (della Porta and Diani 2006).

involved in conflicts (McCarthy and Zald 1977), the role a movement plays in society as a carrier of a central social conflict (Touraine 1983), and aspects of the political context (Kriesi et al. 1995).

Two perspectives provide arguments about why the unemployed in particular have difficulties in mobilising for collective protest action. The two dominant approaches (Neidhardt and Rucht 1993), the American resource mobilization approach and the European new social movement approach (which dealt with groups at the border of the usual political channels of policy making) give different answers for the absence of unemployed people's movements from the public stage.

The American resource mobilization approach, that provides an instrumental understanding of collective actors, explains the absence of poor people's actors in making politics by other means through their lack of resources. Although resources may be theoretically available in the social environment, they must be "*accessible to potential collective actors*" (2004:118) in order to be exploited. The difficulty in accessing the resources necessary to organise collective action has been argued to be a major reason for the absence or weakness of protest by certain social groups. That is, resources are unequally distributed between different social groups in society, so that "*middle-class groups remain privileged in their access*" (Edwards, 2004:117) and are the dominant carriers of social conflicts. The difficulty for unemployed people to access and use both material and immaterial resources makes it difficult for them to become a challenging actor.

The European new social movement approach, on the other hand, stresses structural cleavages that account for specific topics and collective actors, and provides conceptual tools to understand the more expressive forms of collective action. Collective identity as a concept to understand social movements became prominent in the context of this stream of research.¹¹ Indeed, new social movement politics was understood to mark a shift from issue-politics to identity politics (Eder 1993). New social movements no longer formulated social claims in line with former movements-

¹¹ For some empirical manifestations of collective actors the approach developed in the European research context provides better conceptual tools, for example in the case of the feminist movement and those of other groups seeking collective identity, such as AIDS activists. While the resource mobilization approach is helpful in analyzing the strategic decisions of collective actors, the new social movement approach argues that some movements follow a much more expressive logic in which collective action and identities become ends in themselves (Melucci 1989).

the expression of class-based actors expressing their socio-economic position in society- but as actors seeking new collective identities beyond their class positions.¹² The dominance of ecological and other topics, and the absence of social claims, were first explained by the welfare state, which defused social distress.

Alongside these structural changes and the pacification of the social question, the new social movement approach stressed the difficulty for unemployed people to construct a collective identity. A collective identity is assumed to be a crucial factor in mobilization processes, whether one considers it as a pre-condition or as a goal in itself (Melucci 1989). Identification with a wider group not only overcomes the problem of collective action, but provides the group with the necessary forms of solidarity important for more radical forms of collective action. Most unemployed people, however, refuse to belong to the group of the unemployed (Truninger 1990).¹³ They avoid, for example, meeting with other unemployed people (Rein 1997).¹⁴ As Melucci (1995) points out, the construction of mobilization potential is dependent on the successful integration of a personal and a collective identity.

The identity poor people are assumed to adopt – or better, are ascribed - is an identity that plays an important role in the politics of the welfare state. Gans (1992) argues that poor people, such as the unemployed, fulfil a function in that political failures are simply projected onto the excluded themselves, and therefore no longer appear as political failures (Gans 1992:52ff). This strategy of ‘blaming the victim’ is used by politicians to label people without work by relying on the resentment of the middle class, whose members see little reason to finance the unemployed (Mau 2001). In an analysis of the German debate on the ‘abuse of benefits’, Oschmiansky (2003) shows that a debate about the ‘lazy unemployed’ gains ground in periods of economic

¹² The new social movements were conceptualized as opposed to the social question of the old labour movement, replacing distributional claims. The ‘new’ aspect was stressed to highlight their differences with old movements, especially the labour movement. Against the image of actors that are primarily interested in material gains, the post-materialistic values of these actors were stressed (Inglehart 1977).

¹³ In an interview by the Tageszeitung (German newspaper) a researcher interested in the lives of unemployed people mentions how difficult it is to study people without work, since they do not consider themselves as part of a group of ‘unemployed’: *“Die Leute ohne Arbeit empfinden sich selbst gar nicht als richtige Arbeitslose... Die erklären ganz sachlich, warum die Stelle weggefallen ist, und sagen, dass sie in ein paar Monaten wieder einen Job haben. Wir Forscher kriegen dann zu Hören: Suchen Sie die wirklichen Arbeitslosen, die sitzen im Schwimmbad.”* (Taz, vom 14.09.1998, p. 2)

¹⁴ In the beginning of the 1990s in Germany only 1-2% of all unemployed people were members of one of the many different projects for and run by the unemployed (Arbeitslosenprojekt) (see Rein 1997).

stagnation.¹⁵ While during the 1950s and 1960s there was no reason to complain about people that did not work, with the mass unemployment of 1975 the former minister Arendt began a discourse to place responsibility with the individual. To identify with the social group of ‘the unemployed’ could therefore have negative consequences for the unemployed person: as ‘unemployed’ the person became the target of political rhetoric, and the reason for the malfunctioning of social institutions of the welfare state. To identify with ‘the unemployed’ implies a burden rather than a goal or an asset, it seems.

The fact that the identity is not chosen but ascribed by others may also make an important difference. Being unemployed means being recognized as part of a stigmatized group where ‘group members’ have not taken any actual decision to belong to this group. Belonging to the group of unemployed people is therefore something forced on its member, while the positive connotations of a collective identity depend on a positive image that is actively constructed.¹⁶

There are then a variety of obstacles at the individual and collective levels that face the unemployed in becoming a challenging collective actor. Resource mobilisation theory and the new social movement approach look at different aspects to explain their absence: while the resource mobilisation approach stresses the difficulties of accessing resources from the environment considered necessary for protest mobilisation, the new social movement approach stresses the difficulties met in constructing a collective identity. The unemployed lack the motivational disposition to get politically involved, belong to a stigmatised social group, with no resources at their disposition, have claims considered of questionable legitimacy by the public opinion, and are unable to threaten power-holders with sanctions (Piven and Cloward 1977; Offe 1972) – all of which are considered major obstacles to the unemployed becoming a challenging force.

¹⁵ In an illustrative example Oschmiansky cites a member of the Bavarian conservative party in a recent statement: “*Das soziale Netz... [ist] für viele eine Hängematte- man möchte sagen: eine Sänfte geworden.... ; eine Sänfte, in der man sich von Steuern und Sozialabgaben zahlender Bürger unseres Landes von Demonstration zu Demonstration, von Hausbesetzung zu Hausbesetzung, von Molotow-Cocktail-Party zu Molotow-Cocktail-Party und dann zum Schluss zur Erholung nach Mallorca oder sonst wohin tragen lässt.*” (Riedl, CSU, nach: Oschmiansky 2003:12).

¹⁶ While for some actions such as cutting financial benefits welfare state institutions can be targeted, there is no clear target to criticize an ascribed identity. Through identities such as the homeless, the unemployed, and Aids victims, people are given an unquestioned place in society by an abstract enemy. J. Gamson (1989) argues that the actions of gay Aids activists can be best understood by looking at the invisible enemy, understood as the ‘normalization process’.

1.2 Contentious agency of the unemployed, new insights.

Over the last few years, however, unemployed people in Europe have increasingly adopted collective protest strategies. Unemployed people have protested in various European countries on the local, but also increasingly on the national level. In France, for example, since the beginning of the 1990s the unemployed have organised various marches and took part in the so-called ‘mouvement de sans’ in the mid-1990s. The protest of the unemployed in France had its peak in winter 1997/98 when all over France unemployed people occupied job centres to claim a Christmas benefit (Maurer 2001; Mouchard 2001). In other European countries too the unemployed entered the public debate on unemployment with spectacular actions, as in Naples (Baglioni 2003), or by mass demonstrations as in Germany and Sweden (Zorn 2004) (Lahusen and Baumgarten 2006).

Unemployed people’s activists even co-operated across national borders and in 1997 marched to Amsterdam to protest for a social Europe (Chabanet 2001). Unemployed people thus became one of the few examples of what can be called a European social movement. Further, unemployed people’s activists are also present in the field of social movement politics in the new ‘global’ movements, where social topics explicitly return to the agenda. Not only are social topics considered important by these movements, but the excluded groups themselves form a part of these movements (Andretta et al. 2003) or successfully use the frames of global movements to mobilize on the local level (Baglioni 2003).

Successful mobilisations of unemployed people point, therefore, to the fact that from time to time unemployed people overcome obstacles such as the “*resource inequalities*” (Edwards and McCarthy 2004:118) that exist between different social groups in society, and successfully construct a collective actor of the unemployed to mobilise for protest action. In fact, both of the theoretical frameworks presented above emphasise the agency of actors instead of proposing deterministic arguments as to why the unemployed are per se unable to mobilise. From the perspective of resource mobilisation, for example, some social groups simply have more difficulty in accessing resources. But this access can be granted by benevolent actors or redistributive institutions, for example (Edwards and McCarthy 2004). Further, the role of collective identity and the way it is constructed varies depending on the type of actor one looks at (Gamson 1992). Unemployed people themselves have indeed

challenged the image of vulnerable victims exposed to structural oppression and queuing up for charity by stressing their ability to act (Royall 1998) and struggle for their rights (Maurer and Pierru 2001).

Thus, while at first sight the empirical fact that poor people have entered the political stage seems to contradict the theoretical assumptions of movement theory, the empirical studies on unemployed people's protests simply suggest we specify the roles of certain conditions for mobilisation processes.

Indeed, studies on the role of resources in poor people's movements have argued for the reversal of the role of resources. While material resources are often considered important at the outset of protest, Cohen and Wagner (1991) show that homeless people gained material resources as an outcome of the mobilisation process. These actors transformed the immaterial resources available to them at the outset into material resources. Maurer's study (2001) on the 1997 mobilisation wave in France further highlights the various individual resources the unemployed are able to bring to the situation of unemployment – that is that individuals are able to contribute to protest actions. In addition, recent studies on the activities and claims of unemployed people suggest a more heterogeneous composition of an unemployed people's movement. This suggests that the process of constructing a collective actor may follow various different paths. Often, studies on the unemployed start from the implicit assumption that the unemployed form a homogenous class or group sharing a common interest.¹⁷ It seems, however, that the contentious unemployed are composed of various social groups with different interests and claims 'lumped together' (Gamson 1989) in targeting the problem of unemployment.

Compared to previous decades, studies on contentious action by the unemployed have mushroomed in more recent years. In France in particular, following the mobilisation of the unemployed in winter 1997/98, much research on the unemployed was carried out. Most of these studies indeed deal with the mobilisation wave of winter 1997/98, or study one of the major national French organisations involved in the protest wave. One comparative study on the contentious politics of unemployment

¹⁷ Most of the time implicit assumptions are made about who the unemployed person is, such as poor, depressed, and politically apathetic. Being 'unemployed' does however first and foremost describe a person without work looking for employment.

(Unempol)¹⁸ provides us with insights on unemployed people as contentious agents. The research project has a broader focus than this one in that the project includes various different actors and activities and gives important insights about the mobilisation successes of the unemployed in a comparative perspective. Giugni (2009) in particular translates the concept of concrete political opportunities to the field of the contentious politics of unemployment to explain the various levels of mobilisation in different European countries.

These new empirical insights on the mobilisation successes of the unemployed provide important insights into contentious agency. However, most studies focus either on the French case, often looking at just one major organisation, or provide insights in a macro-sociological perspective to explain national mobilisation waves. Further, most studies rely on one particular framework of movement studies to explain the emergence of the contentious agency of the unemployed. While previously the dominant interest was to provide explanations for the absence of protest action, research over past years has tried to answer why the unemployed mobilised despite obstacles.

Yet the studies mention the crucial role of local organisations of the unemployed for the national protest waves in France and Germany. That is, although national organisations of the unemployed were important in lifting the protests to a national and European level, networks of local organisations of the unemployed are assumed to be crucial for the mobilisation of the unemployed. However, no systematic insights on these local actors are available. The present study, instead of adding to the various explanations of why and how unemployed protest overcome obstacles, aims to contribute to our knowledge on who these local groups of the movement of the unemployment are. What do these local organisations of the unemployed do and how can one describe and explain the activities these actors are engaged in?

Thus, the currently available literature provides us with important insights into unemployed people's protest, mostly through descriptive accounts of empirical

¹⁸ The project title is "The Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe: Political Claim-Making, Policy Deliberation and Exclusion from the Labour Market (UNEMPOL)" and looks at the relationship between political institutional approaches to employment policy and political conflicts over unemployment by collective actors in the public domain. The research was carried out on six European countries (UK, Switzerland, France, Italy, Germany and Sweden) at a cross-national comparative level and a transnational European level, see (Giugni and Statham 2002).

manifestations of unemployed protest and the elaboration of theoretical frameworks to explain the emergence of the contentious agency of the unemployed. However, we still lack, first, comparative studies; second, a focus on the local roots of the broader mobilisation waves considered crucial driving forces; and, thirdly, insights into the various activities of these local groups. In the following I specify the interest in local organisations of the unemployed by discussing the link between organisations and social movements (Clemens and Minkoff 2004). As I will argue, particularly within studies of poor people's movements, a critique of organisations was formulated, stating that organisations deprive poor people of their most important tool, disruption. As we will see, a more nuanced understanding of different types of organisations reveals local groups as important carriers of this protest form, particularly at the outset of protest waves.

1.3 Organisations and protest action. The local roots of unemployed action and the power of disruptive action

In the following section I will look in more detail at the role of organisations of the unemployed in challenging power holders. A critique of organisations has been formulated by students of poor people's movements, who consider organisations to deprive the poor of their most important power tool: disruptive action. More recent studies on movement organisations have, however, moved beyond these opposing concepts by emphasising the heterogeneity of actors and the forms of action organisations are engaged in. Indeed, local organisations are considered to be important carriers of disruptive action, particularly at the outset of protest waves. Let me review the role of organisations in more detail to specify the research questions of the present study.

Although this did not appear to be the case at the outset of the Hartz IV protest, political and social protest activities are – in contrast to collective behaviour – the result of organisational efforts. While this protest wave was initiated by the actions of a single person, local organisations of the unemployed contributed to the quick and massive diffusion of the protest. Indeed, protest events are the product of coordinated action by individuals and groups. The outcome of these coordinated efforts may turn out to be different from the intentions of movement activists, due, for example, to the absence of a central decision-making body controlling all collective actions, the different aims of movements activists, or to the various unintended consequences of

these coordinating efforts. However, even though protest events may resemble chaotic, spontaneous, or reactive behaviour by the masses to an outside observer, most of the time protest events are planned long in advance by loosely connected networks of individuals and organisations.

While organisations are considered as different from *a social movement*¹⁹, organisations are part of social movements and participate in protest events (but see Oliver 1989). Newspaper reports on demonstration marches or petitions often mention the names of the organisations mobilising for these protest events. The organisations named in an article are usually only the tip of the iceberg of the many groups and organisations participating in an event. That is, only a small part and often only the particularly well-known organisations are mentioned in newspaper reports.

However, while there is general agreement that protest politics are the outcome of organisational efforts and (social movement) organisations belonging to social movements, the precise relationship between organisations and social movements has long been contested. Some students of social movements considered organisations as the crucial agents and promoters of protest politics; others considered organisations as the opposite of spontaneous protest. For these students of social movements, organisations are the formalised outcome of previous movement action, and define the end of contentious action.

In movement studies mistrust in the importance of organisations, and particularly mass membership organisations, has long existed. One concern is whether formal organisations should be understood as institutionalised political forces, and whether this very fact contradicts the logic of social movements. One classic concern regarding the relationship between movements and organisations is expressed by Michels' 'iron law of oligarchy' (Michels 1987 [1908]). Michels asks whether social movements in time translate into formalised mass membership organisations, thereby abandoning their original movement characteristics and aims. Michels' analysis of a particular historical case – the German labour movement and the role of the Social Democratic Party – describes such a transformation from a movement to mass membership organisation.

¹⁹ Zald and Ash (1966) introduced the distinction between social movements and social movement organisations.

In their famous book on various American poor people's movements in the 20th century - the unemployed, industrial workers, civil and welfare rights movements - Piven and Cloward (1977) follow up Michels' conclusion that formal mass membership organisations prevent social change. In their study, Piven and Cloward argue that the most important factor in poor people gaining at least something has to be seen in their ability to disrupt institutions through spontaneous mass protests that are however difficult to stabilise over time. When people orient their energy towards building up mass membership organisations, poor people's movements lose militancy as their main power resource.²⁰ The authors emphasize that formal mass membership organisations suppress the capacity of disruption - and thus the only power at the disposal of the poor.²¹ (McAdam 1983; Lipsky 1968; Piven and Cloward 1992) The capacity to disrupt the everyday business of politics is also considered an important precursor of a healthy egalitarian democracy and a crucial power tool of active citizens to challenge the power of business interests on political parties and governments (Crouch 2004:123).

Some authors thus assume that formal organisations and protest bring out the worst in each other. *"Eventually movement organizations become players in the conventional political process thereby losing their initial character as challengers to the status quo and the forces in power"* (Rucht 1999:153). Since social movements are social forces that aim at change by means of collective action characterised by the transgression and challenge of social institutions, mass membership organisations and their formalised – and institutionalised – ways of dealing with power-holders are considered to contradict movement aims. That is, the existence of disruptive actions, in the sense of forces that question political and social institutions, is seen as a defining characteristic of a social movement.

The strong critique of the dominant belief that the old left organisations provided the only possibility for disorganised and marginalised interests to challenge

²⁰ The authors stress their refusal of mass membership organisations for the poor to challenge the political system as a reaction to some parts of the Left in the United States, which considered this form of organisation as the best way to include poor people in the pluralist system (see the preface of the 1979 edition).

²¹ As the authors point out, these four movements are exceptional cases of mass agitation by the poor. Usually, these social groups are powerless since they are excluded from participation in social institutions, which also deprives them of any possibility to threaten sanctions. The only thing these groups can deny is their passive forbearance. While poor people usually comply with social and political institutions during moments of structural instability, these actors are able to disrupt public institutions.

established institutions is often portrayed as a strand of movement research that questions the role of organisations in movement activities in general. *“In the stark terms in which their claims were stylized in the literature, Piven and Cloward came to stand for representation of organizations as antithetical to effective mobilization.”* (Clemens and Minkoff 2004:155). Indeed, the book marked the starting point for critical reflection on the explanatory power of the resource mobilization approach and its assumption of the crucial role of organisations in mobilisation processes.²²

In the same period, resource mobilization theorists stressed the vital role of organisations in translating grievances into effective protest. Resource mobilisation theory stands for the guise of studies on social movements in which organisations are the necessary condition for social movement activities to take place. McCarthy and Zald (1977) emphasize that resources brought under control by organisations facilitate rather than suppress mobilization. In stark contrast to Michels’ iron law, Zald and Ash (1966) suggested as early as the 1960s that there is no law for the institutionalisation of organisations and the displacement of their initial goals, and that organisations are indeed the crucial driving forces of any social movement activity.²³

Gamson and Schmeidler (1984) strongly disagree with Piven and Cloward’s thesis, pointing out that labeling protest rather than organisations as the main power resource of the poor is to question one of the central arguments of the resource mobilization approach. The proposed contradiction of ‘organisation versus protest’ gives the impression that organisational efforts are not necessary to challenge power holders. As the authors show in re-discussing two examples of strikes mentioned in the Piven and Cloward book, the role of organisations is either underestimated or neglected. This, according to Gamson and Schmeidler, undermines the main hypothesis of the

²² The authors did not initially stress the limits of some of the assumptions of resource mobilization, and indeed referred to it in many parts of the book (Cloward and Piven 1984). Also, many of those that built the resource mobilization approach welcomed the book warmly and considered it an important contribution to the theoretical understanding of collective action (see for an irritated comment on this fact (Gamson and Schmeidler 1984).

²³ The resource mobilization approach, – a reaction to mass psychology that considered protest as a conscious-less, uncontrolled, and social pathological phenomenon - shifted attention towards organisations and their rational use of resources to intentionally pursue movement goals. The focus was on organisations and their control over resources available in the environment. The approach focuses on resources and how these are brought under control by organisations, showing that the successes of movement activists *“... are consistently related to the greater presence of available resources in their broader environment.”* (Edwards and McCarthy 2004:116). These works emphasized the rational use of resources by social movement organisations and targeted and coordinated collective activities. Thus, the resource mobilisation approach mainly considered formal organisations, which were considered powerful tools to challenge political and social institutions.

book, namely, that disruption and not organisation accounts for successful mobilization. In neglecting the role of organisations in mobilization, the authors would rely on the old war horse of breakdown theories (Gamson and Schmeidler 1984), in which people behave only irrationally and react in a pathological manner: “... *they (Piven and Cloward, A.Z.) depend on it (collective behavior theory, A.Z.) and share its premises more than they realize, but this is through assumptions that they do not make explicit*” (Gamson and Schmeidler 1984:571).

This debate illustrates two cornerstones of interest in the role of disruptive action: while both sides ascribe disruptive actions a crucial role in challenging institutions, they ascribe different roles to organisations, which either promote or prevent disruptive action. According to Gamson and Schmeidler an organisation “*is a critical component in sustaining and spreading*” (Gamson and Schmeidler 1984:573) disruptive forms of action, while according to Piven and Cloward organisations suppress the capacity to disrupt. Though Piven and Cloward give a more nuanced understanding of the role of organisations – indeed, the authors engaged in organising the poor – the result of the debate was “*a choice between the thin and homogenized sense of organization within resource mobilization research and the distrust of organization that stemmed from an emphasis on disruption and spontaneity*” (Clemens and Minkoff 2004:155).²⁴

Over the past decade movement theory has moved beyond these narrow concepts of organisations and movements (Clemens and Minkoff 2004). Questions have been raised, for example, about how organisations contribute to the formation, mobilisation, maintenance, and outcome of social movements, instead of either

²⁴ Few studies have attempted to clarify the role of organisations in mobilising for protest activities in detail. Compared to the extensive interest in the role of organisations in social movements, there is little systematic empirical work available that provides insights on both aspects. While Michel’s analysis of the German labour movement stimulated much reflection about movement development, Rucht (1999) summarises the literature at the end of the 1990s by stating that despite the interest in Michel’s analysis and the inclination to identify similar developments for other movements, little empirical work has been done that connects protest activities and organisations systematically. The fact that there is little systematic information available on the relation between organisations and protest is mainly due to the fact that social movement organisations and their management of resources and social movements and their protest activities have mostly been studied separately: the resource mobilization approach is most often concerned about the more formal organisations in the American context; protest event analysis studies protest events as the best indicator for the strength (and existence) of social movements (Rucht, Koopmans, and Neidhardt 1998). While resource mobilisation research has provided few insights on the dynamics of social movements as a whole, protest event analysis has given us only a little information on the organisational infrastructures at the basis of protest events.

simply denying the role of organisations or stressing their role as indispensable. Reviewing the literature on organisational aspects of social movements, Clemens and Minkoff (2004) identify different areas of research that offer a more nuanced understanding of organisations, for example, symbolic interactionism and social constructivism, which stress organisations as places of interaction and construction sites for collective action.

Organisational forms in particular have aroused academic attention, connecting questions of organisational development to research in organisational sociology (Davis et al. 2005). An interest in the variety of organisational forms emerged, substituting the duality of formal organisations versus grassroots disruption, for which the resource mobilization approach and the work of Piven and Cloward came to stand. Instead, Clemens (1993) shows that organisations can draw on an organisational repertoire, similar to the action repertoire introduced by Tilly (1986).

It seems, for example, that particularly loosely structured and often informal local organisations are important carriers of disruptive action.²⁵ Decentralised movement groups were found to be sources of innovation, flexibility and direct action (Staggenborg 1991). These activities take place at the outset of major protest waves, carried out by pioneer activists. As Koopmans states in comparing various protest waves in Western democracies: *“The action forms employed by pioneer activists across the Western world ... shared many features. The initial action repertoire did not consist of mass demonstrations, lobbying, or violence, but of disruptive actions like bus boycotts, faculty occupations, or sit-ins”* (Koopmans 1995:112). These disruptive activities are different from radical and violent actions emerging during later stages of movement cycles (della Porta and Tarrow 1987), in that disruptive actions try to wake-up, to irritate, rather than to promote confrontation and refusal. Thus, disruptive actions are important at the beginning of protest waves.

Starting from the assumption that disruptive activities are important for new challengers in general, and particularly important for ‘poor’ actors, the present study aims to contribute to our understanding of the role of local organisations for this action form. Local groups of the unemployed are indeed considered as the important

²⁵ One defining characteristic of social movements was indeed the contentious character of the activities and claims of collective actors. Movements are defined as conflictual collective action that breaks institutionalised norms and rules.

local roots of nation-wide protest waves in France and Germany, and as crucial carriers of the beginnings of the protest wave (Lahusen and Baumgarten 2006).²⁶ While national organisations managed to lift protest to the national level, local organisations of the unemployed formed the local roots. It is often argued, however, that after protest cycles slow down, local organisations either disappear or moderate their action repertoires.

Discussion

Over the years we have gained insights into the abilities and national variations of unemployed people's protests. However, there remain gaps in the research on the contentious action of the unemployed, particularly with respect to comparative studies, a focus on the local level and the role of local organisations of the unemployed in disrupting welfare policies. The discussion on the link between organisation and social movements suggests that a more nuanced concept of organisations can reveal an important role for local organisations in disruptive strategies.

Combining these various aspects the present study looks at local organisations of the unemployed in a comparative perspective with special regard to the types of activities these groups are engaged in. The first question the present study raises is whether these carriers of contentious unemployed action disappeared after the protest cycle slowed down, and what role did these groups play during the mobilisation wave? Secondly, where local organisations of the unemployed have survived the protest waves, the study asks whether these local organisations have given up their protest activities? More broadly, the present study asks what activities the local organisations of the unemployed carry out? Furthermore, the study looks at how and when unemployed people enter the public sphere to ask for the roles organisations of the unemployed groups took up during the crisis of traditional actors such as trade unions and social-democratic parties? Finally, the study looks at the conditions that encourage or discourage local organisations of the unemployed to engage in disruptive strategies.

²⁶ Many students of contemporary unemployed people's movements consider local groups as the most important carriers and organisers of national and local protest events organised on behalf of the unemployed (Lahusen and Baumgarten 2006). To look at local organisations of the unemployed is thus particularly promising in order to understand the national mobilisations and developments of waves of protest on the issue of unemployment.

In order to answer these questions, *chapter 4* compares two contentious fields, Berlin and Paris, giving a detailed description of the two fields of actors, their similarities and differences. In a subsequent chapter the study proposes categories for the various activities the organisations are engaged in, in order to build typologies of local organisations of the unemployed. Here the focus shifts to the level of the single groups that are at the heart of the thesis. Subsequently, I analyse a struggle in Berlin in order to describe the entrance of local organisations of the unemployed into contentious welfare politics. In the third part, I explain that the various conditions assumed to moderate the activities of protesters are linked to the use of disruptive strategies and caring activities.

Chapter 2

Studying unemployed people's activism. Some comments on data collection and analysis

The following thesis aims to contribute to our understanding of unemployed people's action by providing knowledge on local organisations of the unemployed. To answer the questions raised above, empirical research on local groups of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin was carried out. Studying the local groups of the unemployed in a micro- and meso-organisational perspective provided me with a perspective on the moving power of unemployed action, considering their crucial role for protest waves and national and European mobilisations.

Focusing on social movement organisations entails limiting and expanding the focus of study at the same time. On the one hand organisations “*anchor processes of social movement emergence and development*” (Minkoff 2002:260). Social movement organisations are usually considered as the collection point of resources and relationships, and as an access point to the movement environment due to their organisational visibility. This also means that organisations are the more stable and formal parts of social movements. On the other hand, however, looking at organisations means uncovering information not only about spectacular events that make it into the newspapers, but about the everyday activities of movement activists and the organisations they are engaged in. The focus is more limited in that it focuses on a fraction of social movements, while the focus is broader in that it provides knowledge on different processes such as getting unemployed people involved in action and the roles protest waves play for local organisations.

I therefore study a different aspect of unemployed action than that often found in accounts of national protest waves or social movements. While studying local groups brought me into contact with many experienced activists, confident about the historic importance of their engagement, studying these local groups also meant getting information on unemployed people that were not professional full-time activists. In the following, I will explain the empirical analysis and provide insights into the logic of the empirical investigation, as well as describe its implications on data collection

and analysis. After some comments on the logic and levels of comparison in the present study, I define the population, present the data collection tools and describe the analysis.

Level and logic of comparison

Comparative analysis has increasingly gained ground over the past decade. Various European research projects have been completed and several volumes have been published comparing European social movements cross-nationally, often comprising half a dozen countries or more (della Porta 2002). This research contributes most importantly to understand the impact of political (and more recently the discursive) contexts on the strength and action forms of social movements.

In the present study I follow in the tracks of comparative research, in that I aim to produce knowledge by systematic comparison. However, firstly I limit my focus to the more ‘organised’ part of social movements, that is, I focus on organisations of the unemployed rather than on whole social movements. Secondly, I limit my focus to two cities (Paris and Berlin), studying the full sample of organisations of the unemployed present in the two cities. Thirdly- and perhaps most importantly - instead of focusing on distant factors such as political and discursive opportunities, I focus on several ‘close’ factors - access to resources, access to institutionalised actors, the protest experiences of individual activists, and network position - to explain the strategic choices of these actors. Political opportunity structure is considered as one factor among others, but it is re-conceptualised as ‘access to institutionalised actors’ in that only those aspects that are of relevance to the single groups and are perceived by these groups are included in the explanation.

Usually, a distinction between variable-oriented and case-oriented research is made (della Porta 2008). That is, studies either aim at generalisations with a study based on large N, or studies are based on few cases and aim at a thick description of these, questioning or arguing for certain causal mechanisms (Ragin 1987). That is, while case studies are useful to falsify theoretical assumptions and are particularly helpful to describe how causal mechanisms work, it is difficult on the basis of these research designs to make generalizations. Indeed, case studies are usually more interested in the complexity of cases and underline the uniqueness of one or a few particular cases. Statistical analyses based on a large N, on the contrary, describe

broad patterns of phenomena but are unable to give answers on causal mechanisms and what role single variables play in different cases. These research designs risk singling out factors that may not tell us anything, and are arbitrary where they are not based on solid theoretical reasoning. Social scientists, for example, have been accused of being able to find causal mechanisms in almost anything, such as the number of storks causing the number of births (Höfer, Przyrembel, and Verleger 2004).²⁷

The following study is neither a case study (Snow and Trom 2002), nor a statistical analysis. Although closer to a case study approach, the research strategy advanced here seeks a middle ground between the in-depth knowledge of a few cases and generalisations on the basis of probability calculations. With 19 cases, that is, the whole sample of local organisations of the unemployed, it is impossible to carry out a statistical analysis. Particularly when assessing the role of four different conditions in explaining group strategies, as will be done in the *third part* of the thesis. On the other hand, 19 cases are too many for detailed in-depth knowledge and a comparison of each case with the others in a case-study approach. Indeed, the number of cases in my study lends itself to an analysis that strikes a balance between in-depth case studies and large-N statistical analyses.

In my thesis I therefore draw on a research strategy that allows me to get the most out of the organisations studied, while at the same time looking for categories and patterns that also hold true for other local contexts. The empirical analysis draws heavily on typologies (Kluge 1999) that is, typologies are built on the basis of the empirical material. In the *second part* of the thesis organisations of the unemployed are, for example, grouped together according their role in protest waves. More importantly, in the *second part* organisation types are built on the basis of the strategies organisations of the unemployed most frequently adopt to respond to the problem of unemployment. The *third part*, on the other hand, works with ideal types to argue for relationships between certain conditions. The Qualitative Comparative Analysis (Ragin 1987, 2000) applied in the final chapter of part three is the most advanced research strategy for dealing with middle-sized N studies. One can argue that this research strategy also builds on typologies (configurations of conditions as I

²⁷ The article *New Evidence for the Theory of the Stork* links the decline of the birth rate to the decline of the stork population around Berlin. The article is part of a long tradition of statistical analysis correlating the stork population to the birth rate, to highlight the problem of the interpretation of parallel data, correlation, as a causal relationship.

will describe in detail below). Its particular strength is however to move beyond one-dimensional explanations to more complex explanations based on typologies.

The research strategy has implications for the types of data collection instruments to be used and the data analysis to be carried out. These will be described in detail in the following. I will first describe the tools of data collection and then specify the analysis carried out on the basis of the data collected. Considering the comparatively rare use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis, I will dedicate an entire section to explaining some of the main assumptions and terminologies of that approach.

Why did I select France and Germany?

Unemployed people's mobilisations are rare phenomena compared those of other challenging actors. Indeed, for decades social movement researchers attempted to explain the absence of unemployed people's protest in the second half of the century (Bagguley 1991) while they were part of European and US American contention during the "Modern Times" as told so excellently in the Charlie Chaplin film of the same name for the USA of the 1930s. Yet, while for a long time the few existing organisations of the unemployed that emerged in France and Germany in the 1980s did not make it into the public sphere, both countries have experienced strong waves of unemployment mobilisations over the past decade.

Starting in France in the early 1990s, a network of left activists, critical unionists and organisations of the unemployed organised a march of unemployed people through France, and some years later the unemployed mobilised for a protest wave that even spread to Germany a couple of months later. The French mobilisation of winter 1997/98 and the nine month German protest wave in 1998 (and later in summer 2004 with the Hartz protest wave) made France and Germany the most contentious countries on the topic unemployment, with unemployed people participating as the most crucial actors in these battles (see *chapter 3*, section 3.3 for a detailed account).

Tools of data collection

The analysis is based on three main tools of data collection: semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and - where available – the written material of the

organisations, including homepages.²⁸ These data collection techniques were combined for the analysis described below. Some further data was collected from individual surveys given to members of the organisations of the unemployed in order to get more information on rank-and-file members. However, the return rate was rather low and this is why the results of the survey are reported in *chapter 3* but not used for the more comprehensive analysis in the third part of the thesis.

Population

I examine the research questions with data gathered during fieldwork conducted between 2004 and 2006 in Berlin and Paris. A full sample of all local organisations of the unemployed in both cities was surveyed ($N = 19$).²⁹ The population of organisations of the unemployed is defined as following: *organisations of the unemployed are defined those groups being composed of at least half unemployed people, engaging on the topic of unemployment as one of their most important missions and using of protest actions, and working on the level of the city or a district of the city.* These local groups of the unemployed are formal, but more often informal organisations. That is, sometimes they have formal members belonging to the group and have a directing board, but most of the time these groups are simply networks of people meeting on a regular basis, giving their 'arena of interaction' (Clemens 1993) coherence by having chosen a group name.

Access to the field

Access to local organisations in Berlin was at the outset more difficult than in France. Most organisations are not organised within national branches and are thus difficult to locate. Furthermore, as disadvantaged actors these organisations are less visible than other more established and professional actors. Internet research on alternative media sites gave me hints on some groups that subsequently led me to other groups. I thus used a snow-ball system until I could not discover any new groups. In France, primary contact was easier, as I could contact national organisations of the unemployed that provided me with information on their local

²⁸ The data collection tools and type of analysis can make an important difference to the results obtained. For example, Robnett's (1996) interviews with African American women revealed a certain type of grassroots leadership in the civil rights movement, different from the insights of previous studies based on documents and sources generated by mainstream civil rights organisations.

²⁹ In Berlin I identified sixteen groups, and in Paris eight groups. In Berlin two groups are missing from the analysis, in Paris three groups are missing, see Table 4.1 for further information.

groups. The internet sites of the national organisations also contained information on the names and address of local organisations.

While most groups showed me great hospitality, some group members felt uncomfortable that I visited as a researcher. People usually feel exposed to checks by state administrations and some felt irritated about being questioned or observed. Further, for some groups meetings are considered as intimate places where people share personal concerns and things they may not find it easy to talk about. As one unemployed activist said: *“And the unemployed have few people they can talk to about their fundamental problems and fears. And every second week we make a special day, where no topic is decided ... and the colleagues can tell about the things they are concerned about ...and sometimes these are quite personal things. these are days where we can't easily invite somebody who writes his doctoral thesis. The people want to be among themselves”* (Interview 10:6). On the one hand this need for intimate spaces tells us a lot about the challenges unemployed people face when organising as collective actors, as trust and solidarity with people you know is also needed for more moderate action. On the other hand, it may also mean that participant observation is distorted as people would not speak as much about their personal concerns as they would usually during group meetings.

Semi-structured interviews

The bulk of the data was gathered by interviewing key informants, that is, founders or long-term group members, of the local organisations of the groups. Interviews are central to social movement research as a means to generate data on the activities of social movement organisations (Blee and Taylor 2002:92). The semi-structured interview relies on an interview guide (see the Appendix) including a set of questions structured according to the main topics of interest: information on the interviewee, the founding of the group and its development, information on the group members, the resources at the disposal of the group, contacts with other organisations and common activities with other organisations, and finally perceptions of discursive and political opportunities. Most interviews were face-to-face except in some cases where no appointment could be organised during my stays in Berlin and Paris due to cost and time restrictions. In these few cases telephone interviews were carried out. The interviews usually took between 1 and 2 hours, but sometimes I met the member of

the local group a second time where not all questions could be approached during the first interview.

Semi-structured interviews provided me with in-depth information on these aspects of the organisations without committing to prolonged involvement in their activities. Excluding these more committed research strategies, interviews offered the only possibility to access information on these often loosely organised, sometimes short-lived groups. In contrast to other movements composed of well-resourced organisations with written records of their activities, no such documentary analysis would have been possible in the case of organisations of the unemployed. Furthermore, basing an analysis mainly on written documents would also have meant giving well-resourced and professional actors a voice. As Blee and Taylor mention: *“the writings and statements of those who are prominent, wealthy, or influential in society are more likely to be recorded and preserved over time, which disproportionately favors men over women, higher-class participants over those from lower classes, and movement leaders or spokespersons over rank-and-file participants”* (Blee and Taylor 2002:93f). My research seeks to explore the tentative attempts of a marginalised social group to voice their concerns. To base my study on written documents would probably have distorted the results. Thus, the voices of these people engaged at the local level were not filtered through the voices of others. Indeed, written records are not available for all groups: while some with high levels of volunteers manage to run a webpage or write summary reports of their activities, not all groups are able to draft these documents.

A further advantage of this data collection instrument is that it gives the possibility to interviewees to clarify categories and offer new interpretations to my own categories. The semi-structured interviews therefore allowed me to grasp the meaning of certain categories for interviewees, and the framing strategies connected to them. Often, for example, the contexts in which activities are embedded give meaning to them (see the discussion below). Finally, interviews gave me a better understanding of everyday framing strategies. Rather than strategically managed framing attempts by professional organisations, I got access to those injustice frames that also form part of the interpretations of the world of activists during periods of relative quiescence.

Expert interviews

Unemployment experts - that is, other unemployed activists familiar with the contentious field, often engaged either in various groups or acting as individuals - were interviewed in order to gain a better understanding of the two contentious fields (N = 14). These key informants were selected according to the presumed knowledge they could provide of the local contentious field. These unemployed experts also provided me with further insights on the contentious field of unemployed actors in a historical perspective. Since little documentary evidence has been preserved in general, the interviews with these experts provided accounts of past protest waves and events in Berlin and Paris. Where key informants also participated in the semi-structured interviews, two distinct interviews were usually carried out on two different days.

Participant observation

Further, participant observation was carried out, that is, “*research in which the researcher observes and to some degree participates in the action being studied, as the action is happening*” (Lichterhan 2002:120). I visited most of the groups once or several times during meetings and opening hours. I also attended several public events in Berlin and Paris, such as the now institutionalised annual mobilisation in Paris at the end of the year, or the regular monthly mobilisations of organisations of the unemployed in Berlin, as well as public discussions organised as joint activities by organisations of the unemployed and other supporting groups.³⁰ While visiting these sites I took field notes on those aspects that seemed interesting and new to me as well as on the categories that were also part of the interview guide. The goal of participant observation was not to study all possible aspects of the local groups – that is carrying out participant observation until all points were covered - but to complete the picture given from other data. Participant observation offered me further insights into the meanings of actions and into the everyday interactions between members, actions and

³⁰ Using these different empirical sources of information the material gathered was systematized and analysed in two documents. The first document tackles the dependent variable, distinguishing dimensions of the action repertoire of unemployed people's groups. In the second document all organisations are systematically compared according to the same categories of independent variables. Each organisation was analysed for the same broad theoretical categories (such as the availability of resources), but I was empirically guided in the formulation of different sub-dimensions within these broader categories. To grasp those resources mobilised by organisations of the unemployed I thus followed the empirical analysis of Cress and Snow (1996).

framing activities during group meetings, as well as into cooperation and conflicts between different actors in public events.

Written documents

To complete the information from the interviews with the local organisations, written documents were used where available. Some groups have their own webpages on which activities are announced and documents made available to other activists and unemployed people. Other groups had collected material in files on past activities. In a few cases organisations wrote detailed accounts of the history of their organisations, specifying past activities and collaborations with other actors.

The written documents provided very different types of information. The existence of a homepage for example was used as an indicator of available resources. The information contained on the site indicated whether the group was engaged in caring activities, or in certain protest activities. Sometimes documents also clarified concepts mentioned during the interviews and thus allowed me to better interpret the transcripts.

Qualitative content analysis

To add a more systematic perspective in a historical view *chapter 6* mostly draws on newspaper reports. The description of the battle for an unemployed public transport ticket in Berlin is based on the analysis of two newspapers (the Berliner Zeitung and the local section of the Tageszeitung) between 1 January 1990 and 1 October 2005 (N = 266). All articles that contained the words 'unemployed people's ticket' ('Erwerbslosenticket', or 'Arbeitslosenticket') were consulted, and those articles that contained information usually used for claims analyses were selected (Koopmans and Statham 1999). Although no standardised claim analysis was carried out, that is the coding of different actors (i.e. politicians, trade unions, parties, collective actors, unemployed people) and their activities (such as verbal statements, political decisions, and protest activity) the information was used for a thick description of the battle over the past decade. Additional information was added from internet sites, interviews with experts of the unemployed movement and with activists from local organisations of the unemployed engaged in the struggle, as well as material from local groups where available. Since interviews are retrospective, implying the risk that more recent events are remembered in more detail than events

that took place some years ago, I relied mainly on newspaper reports in order to avoid distorting the results.

Individual surveys

The survey was distributed to individuals who are members of the local organisations of the unemployed. The survey aimed to gather information on the most active members of organisations of the unemployed. The survey was distributed during group meetings and collected by myself or an activist who then sent them back to me, having provided the stamps. The survey asks about the present and past activities of the activist, information on unemployment and employment status, demographic information, networks with other people and organisations, and attitudes on issues relevant for unemployed people's activism (see the *appendix*).

The original aim was to distribute the survey to the whole population of unemployed people involved in groups in Paris and Berlin instead of sampling. Indeed, a sampling procedure would not have been feasible considering the impossibility of obtaining the relevant information for carrying out a sampling procedure of single activists (see comments on access to the field above). Due to organisational time and cost restrictions the return rate was about 27% (63 respondents of 235).³¹ The percentage of the return rate is therefore not much lower than what may be obtained with individual surveys, that is, up to 30 per cent (Klandermans and Smith 2002:17). People were usually only willing to complete the survey where I had visited the group twice. However, from the 19 groups studied, I received surveys from eleven, with the lowest number of 1 survey per organisation. Of the 63 respondents only 9 respondents were from French organisations of the unemployed. There is no clear pattern to explain the non-response of some unemployed activists, though there is the tendency of those organisations only visited once to be absent from the list of respondents.

Due to the limited number of organisations represented by the survey, the data was therefore used for the third part, that is, in approaching the topic of the amount of movement experience available in each organisation. Some results from the survey are however described in *chapter 4* in order to give a picture of the past activities and

³¹ The total number of activists does not include those from one organisation in Paris. Where no precise number could be indicated for single organisations, a number in between those mentioned was chosen.

types of activities the respondents had been engaged in before becoming unemployed activists.

Analysing the data: broadening the focus and merging the methods of analysis

The middle-sized N of my study had consequences on the type of data analysis employed. On the one hand I could not do an in-depth analysis of each case, that is, on each single organisation of the unemployed. 19 cases were too many to allow me to build categories for each interview in various steps, and take enough of the information contained in the interviews into account. On the other hand 19 cases were too few to analyse the data in a categorical manner and draw broad conclusions beyond those groups studied. The risk of losing the most interesting insights by forcing the organisations into conceptual corsets would have been too costly.

In the analysis therefore I followed neither a strictly qualitative approach nor a strictly quantitative approach. Alongside describing the two contentious fields, the goal was to build typologies of the groups based on the most important activities I could find in the field of actors, and to explain the use of disruptive tactics.

In a first step the transcripts of the interviews were analysed in detail, taking into consideration the meanings given to different tactics by the organisations. In various steps - moving back and forth between the empirical material and theoretically guided questions - several dimensions were developed to distinguish different aspects of groups' strategies, access to resources, the characteristics of group members and the perceptions of resources and opportunities. The interviews were coded according to these categories, developed during the study and analysis of the interview transcripts.

Using these different empirical sources of information the material was systematized and analysed in two documents. The first grasps the various (framing) activities and the meanings of the activities of organisations of the unemployed. In a second document all of the organisations are systematically compared following the same broad theoretical categories, but empirically guided in the formulation of different sub-dimensions within these broader categories. These documents left me with more than 400 pages of detailed description of the local organisations of the unemployed.

Let me illustrate two examples of how I approached the transcripts in order to discover, for example, the meaning of activities. Firstly, to be able to fully grasp the meanings of the words and actions of organisations of the unemployed I merged the analyses of protest actions and framing activities, using an interpretative form of analysis. Collective actions and frames have most often been analysed as two distinct features of collective action. The protest activities of social movements have been described as more or less radical, institutionalised, or as happening outside institutional channels, and as able to mobilise more or less people in collective action. Frames were the continuous efforts of social movement actors to make sense of the world and its problems, ascribing new meanings to well known phenomena, challenging dominant interpretations of problems, and shifting attention to other sources of problems to be tackled. This strong distinction between the two features - activities and frames - is also mirrored in the development of two forms of empirical analysis. Protest analysis stresses the collective action forms used by collective actors, and is usually done as a quantitative analysis. Frame analysis stresses problem identification, attribution, solution, and the motivational power of frames developed by collective actors and is usually done as a qualitative analysis.

Stepping inside the empirical material I had collected, however, I found I had major problems distinguishing activities from problem interpretations, and frames from the protest strategies chosen.³² For example, some organisations of the unemployed distribute leaflets to mobilise people for protest actions. This is not very different from many other social movement organisations: the distribution of leaflets is crucially important for mobilising people for collective action and probably the most widespread means of doing so. Yet, for some of the organisations of the unemployed I study this action is directly connected to how they perceive the problem of 'unemployment', and what it is about. That is, some groups do not want to mobilise just any people, their major aim is to mobilise unemployed people for collective action. The main 'unemployment problem' for these activists is that no real interest representation exists for the unemployed, and that they should be empowered by forms of self-organisation and self-representation. The action form 'distributing leaflets' underlines this problem of interpretation, and at the same time provides the

³² Indeed, as Noake and Johnston mention: "*Tactical choices can also serve to amplify a frame*" (Noakes and Johnston 2005:9).

collective answer to solve that problem. Another group employs the same moderate action of distributing leaflets. In this case however, the distribution of leaflets is used to communicate a different strategy. Unemployed people are assumed to be at the mercy of 'inhuman bureaucratic state structures', and the information contained in the leaflets attempts to empower the unemployed with knowledge and information to answer back. In this case too the group adapts a protest strategy that is closely entwined with the problem. Leaflets are used as a form of radical counselling to empower unemployed people to answer back. In the first case, the group mobilises and defines a collective actor by distributing leaflets. The second group is engaged in a caring activity, developing strategies to empower the unemployed. Ignoring the qualitative dimension ascribed to these collective actions and the framing strategies that lie at their core would mean missing the most important aspect of the contentious agency of the unemployed. Thus, in the analysis of the interview transcripts I did not use activities to describe groups' strategies, and frames to describe framing strategies, but rather integrated the two to give groups' words and actions more meaning.

A second approach to extracting information on meaning from the interviews was to focus on the narratives in the interviews (Polletta 2006). For example, during the interviews images of 'the unemployed person' were woven into stories. These short stories play different roles - for example expressing a group's injustice frame or describing the construction of a collective identity. Where the 'unemployed person' story is told to describe an injustice frame, these stories outline the way a group would prefer individual distress to be taken into account. These stories always follow a certain form and have some plot. The narratives were a common characteristic of most interviews, indeed narratives seem to be particularly important for disadvantaged groups (Polletta 2006).

The configurational approach of Qualitative Comparative Analysis

Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), introduced by Charles Ragin (Ragin 1987) in the end 1980s and further developed in the following years (Ragin 2000) offers a useful research design to study various conditions in a medium-sized N study. In his later work Ragin (2000) also specifies a configurational approach, in which cases are seen as specific configurations of aspects and features. *"In essence, this*

strategy is an extension of the single-case study to multiple cases with an eye toward configurations of similarities and differences. In this approach, in-depth knowledge of cases provides the basis for constructing limited generalizations that hold for the cases studied” (Ragin 2000:22). The analysis in part three considers the local organisations of the unemployed as configurations of group characteristics, looking at similarities and differences between groups and how these are linked to disruptive strategies. Instead of looking at single variables, this approach thus considers various conditions together in order to explain an outcome.

Qualitative Comparative Analysis provides tools to compare the 19 organisations of the unemployed studied here, taking various different conditions into account and placing single conditions in context by studying cases as configurations of conditions. In the following, a short overview of the core concepts of Qualitative Comparative Analysis will be given. This overview underlines the main differences of the approach as compared to the analysis that will be carried out earlier in part three. While in the preceding analysis single variables (or conditions) are linked to disruptive strategies, in the Qualitative Comparative analysis four conditions are assessed together for their effects on the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed.

Indeed, in the social sciences the importance of single variables is often put into context when discussed with a background of more in-depth information on single cases. This is also so for theoretical frameworks on social movements. Studies on social movements often give detailed empirical proof of single variables, but are particularly rich in that they offer accounts of case studies where single conditions are put into context. For example, in their discussion on the role of political opportunities – in particular on national strategies - to account for the repertoires of action of social movements della Porta and Diani conclude that *“while national strategies do have a certain influence on the repertoires of action adopted by social movements, they are not sufficient to explain the strategic choices they make”* (della Porta and Diani 2006:210). On the one hand national strategies are not strong enough to explain repertoires, yet on the other hand they are not obsolete. Other factors have to be taken into account to understand and explain social movement strategies.

Della Porta and Diani’s (2006) conclusion on the role of political opportunities in the strategic choices of movement activists hints at an important aspect of QCA that

serves as a useful starting point for its introduction. That is, the authors specify a specific feature of the condition by saying that it is *'not sufficient to explain'* (della Porta and Diani 2006:210). From time to time, social scientists use the ideas of sufficiency and necessity to specify the roles of conditions for mobilization processes, as Kriesi does in stating: *"Tilly's (1978) CATNET is not only a necessary structural precondition for a mobilization process to take place, in some instances it may also supply sufficient organizational capacity to mobilize the shared grievances of those linked by more or less informal network ties"* (Kriesi 1988:42). That is, single conditions are ascribed a particular role in explaining the strategic choices of movement actors or mobilization processes, either a sufficient or a necessary role, or as in Kriesi's case both.

The concepts of necessary and sufficient conditions lie at the core of Qualitative Comparative Analysis. According to Ragin (2000) the terminology of sufficient and necessary conditions and its implications are often ignored in social sciences – even though many studies could be framed in this terminology and thus specify necessity and sufficiency in their results. To specify conditions as either necessary or sufficient could increase the analytical strength of studies explaining social phenomena.

Ragin (2000) clarifies the logical implications of distinguishing between necessary and sufficient conditions as follows. Sufficient conditions are conditions that always imply the outcome. That is, there may be other conditions that equally lead to the outcome, but where the condition is present, the outcome is too. For example, one could argue that in repressive states, if there is a popular revolt, it will always be violent. The existence of a revolt in a repressive state describes a sufficient condition for a violent revolt. On the contrary, necessary conditions are always present where the outcome is observed. That is, a necessary condition may not lead to the outcome where other conditions are missing, but in all cases where the outcome is present the necessary condition is so also. For example, one might argue that the breakdown of a repressive regime is a necessary condition for a popular revolt. In each instance of a popular revolt a state breakdown took place, however not every state breakdown is followed by a popular revolt. State breakdown it is not enough to lead to a revolt.

It is not only the focus on necessary and sufficient conditions that distinguishes this approach from others. The focus on complex causality is also specific to the

approach. This idea can be described by three different aspects: equifinality, conjunctural causation and asymmetric causality (Wagemann 2007).

Equifinality means that there may be different sufficient conditions – or, more often, configurations of conditions – that imply the outcome. Indeed, the fact that a condition is defined as sufficient always hints that other conditions may also imply the outcome: the sufficient condition is enough to explain the outcome, but the outcome can be present without the sufficient condition. Other sufficient expressions must therefore explain the outcome. The QCA approach allows the researcher to identify these different causal paths by proposing various configurations of conditions as sufficient. Qualitative Comparative Analysis therefore advances a theoretical reasoning that takes different explanations into account. Instead of simply making statements about the importance of single variables, the approach gives the possibility to find different paths to explain the same outcome.

Conjunctural causation refers to the fact that often a single condition is not enough to explain the outcome. Instead, a condition leads to the outcome only in combination with another condition. Depending on the context of a single condition, it may even have the opposite effect. Certain initiatives for stabilising a democracy, for example, may work well in one country, but have the opposite effect in another. The ability of the QCA approach to shed light on conjunctural causality is also the reason why the approach does not speak of cases but configurations. Cases are deconstructed into their constituent units. Thus, one of the main strengths of the approach is that single conditions are considered in the context of other conditions. That is, conditions may play a different role for disruptive strategies, depending on the presence or absence of other conditions. For example, it may be that having no resources only encourages organisations of the unemployed to use disruptive strategies in combination with a lot of movement capital, or, as Schneider and Wagemann put it “*single conditions have a different causal role depending on the context*” (Schneider and Wagemann forthcoming 2010). Furthermore, even though single conditions may have a positive influence on an outcome, in combination with another it could prevent the very same. For example, a lack of resources might encourage groups to use disruptive strategies, but where groups have access to institutionalised actors they may tend to avoid using disruptive strategies in order not to upset their institutional allies. Thus, conditions

play a different role for outcomes depending on the presence and absence of other conditions.

The third aspect of causal complexity considered by the QCA approach is *asymmetric causation*. This expression refers to the fact that pinpointing the conditions that lead to an outcome does not necessarily mean we know which conditions imply the opposite.³³ Indeed, to complement the following analysis the negation of outcomes will also be looked at, and the conditions leading to the use of moderate strategies described.

QCA is thus a research strategy that strikes a balance between the causal complexity of single cases and abstract generalisations on the impacts of variables. The empirical discussion of single variables in the previous chapter suggested that certain conditions do not add to the explanation of the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. A separate focus on single variables could however exclude a factor from an explanation simply because it does not appear to be *necessary*. The following analysis attempts instead to assess the role of conditions in terms of sufficiency and necessity. More precisely, the following analysis uses fuzzy-set QCA, an elaboration of the previous crisp-set analysis able to account for different nuances in conditions, rather than simply considering them as present or absent (see Ragin 2000). However, due to the complexity of the analysis I limit the focus to disruptive strategies. Instead of looking at the configurations of conditions the lead to service provision, I provide an analysis of the use of non-disruptive strategies. The analysis of the negative outcome is indeed standard good practice in Qualitative Comparative Analysis (Schneider and Wagemann forthcoming 2010)). Thus, in the final part the main results about the use of disruptive strategies, or for not doing so, are discussed.

Discussion

The present study is based on a medium-sized N. Studying the full sample of local organisations of the unemployed in a comparative perspective had consequences for the types of data collection instruments and the types of data analyses carried out.

³³ To turn the results upside down according to the DeMorgan Law is only possible in a study without limited diversity (Schneider and Wagemann 2007).

The study works mainly with typologies, that is empirically guided typologies and ideal typologies. Further, the number of cases lends itself to carrying out a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). In taking into account various conditions in order to explain the strategic choices of the groups studied, QCA is the only research strategy that allows me to systematically compare 19 cases.

The basis for the analysis is data gathered with different tools. Firstly, semi-structured interviews were carried out with key informants from each organisation. Interviews provided a useful tool for gathering data considering the number of groups as well as the type of actor studied, that is, poorly equipped actors assumed to produce few written documents. This data was triangulated with insights from participant observation and written documents where available. Further data was available from a qualitative content analysis of newspapers, an individual survey of activists and expert interviews. This rich empirical information was analysed taking the meaning of various aspects into account, by, for example, merging the analysis of frames and activities and relying on stories told during interviews. However, due to the number of cases, no in-depth qualitative analysis could be carried out for each group in terms of developing categories from each interview. Instead, interviews were analysed on the basis of broad theoretical categories and further analysed by building empirical sub-categories as suggested by the empirical sources.

The following study provides more and more detailed information on the organisations in Berlin in some parts. This is partly due to the number of organisations present in Berlin compared to Paris. In the last part of *chapter 3* I will, for example, only discuss the German waves of unemployed protest to exemplify the limits of explaining unemployed action with grievances and changes in the unemployment policy. Similarly, in the second part I investigate the ability of unemployed actors to enter the public sphere in a case study on a local battle taking place in Berlin.

A final note on the citations of the interviews. To further protect the identity of the interviewees I decided for one neutral form of referring to the interviewees. That is, as the author of this PhD is female I decided to refer to all interviewees in the female form.

Chapter 3

The contentious field of unemployment: Unemployment policies, the public discourse on unemployment, and movements of the unemployed in France and Germany

In the introduction to the first part I argued that the reform of the unemployment insurance system only partly explains the protest wave against Hartz IV. In fact, as I will show in the following, transformations of the welfare state with regard to unemployment policies had taken place in both France and Germany since the beginning of the 1990s. As we will see, three major national waves of mobilization in France and Germany - in France in 1997 and in Germany in 1998 and 2004 - cannot be explained simply by the introduction of these reforms. While a radical change of unemployment policy could provide the spark to light the fire in one case, there is much left to explain.

Nor is the level of grievances, that is the unemployment rates, enough to explain the contentious actions of the unemployed. Unemployment rates may explain some differences in that areas affected by higher unemployment rates are more often centres of unrest, but this is only one among many other factors that account for the protests of the unemployed. As Giugni (2005) points out, the unemployment rate is unable, for example, to explain the patterns of the contentious debate on unemployment in various European countries. Giugni maintains that while the presence of a potential for mobilization may well play a role institutional and discursive factors must intervene in order for such a potential to transform into actual mobilisation. Thus, other conditions must be present for a protest wave to emerge.

In the following chapter I will describe some aspects of the concrete opportunities and their effects on different social and political actors wishing to enter a public discourse on unemployment. In a first part I will argue that France and Germany can be considered similar in various respects that form part of a 'concrete opportunity structure for unemployed people' (Giugni 2008). That is, both countries can be considered very similar as regards welfare state arrangements and unemployment regimes. As Giugni et al. (2008) argue, these concrete opportunities "*give the social*

and political actors the motivation to mount collective action or, on the contrary, rob them of such motivation” (Giugni, Michel, and Fueglistler 2009:147). However, as I will show in the subsequent part, both countries nevertheless display some differences as to which actors have gained public visibility in the contentious field of unemployment. This suggests that although the countries have many similarities in terms of the arrangement of their unemployment policies, there also seem to be some important differences between the two. I suggest that we explain the different levels of success of the unemployed in gaining visibility by the different roles trade unions play in the social security systems, and the importance of questions of social exclusion in the French debate. Finally, the presentation of national protest waves on the issue of unemployment in Germany discuss the role of changes in unemployment policy to account for these protest waves.

The discussion of these three aspects, concrete political opportunities, visibility in the public discourse and national mobilisations describes the context in which local organisations of the unemployed move. While the comparison of these national contexts does not form the central pillar of the study, the description of similarities and differences describes the context for studying the contentious agency of organisations of the unemployed in a local perspective.

3.1 The continental dilemma: France and Germany

Over the decades, welfare states have been faced with many challenges, such as increasing public deficits, major demographic shifts, and mass unemployment. Unemployment in particular, with its financial, social, and political implications, is perceived as a major challenge for Western European democracies. While full employment and increasing wealth characterised the 1950s and 1960s, after the oil crisis in the 1970s Western European countries suffered economic recession and increasing unemployment.

Western European countries' economic performances do differ however (Scharpf 2001): while some countries, such as France and Germany, face increasing unemployment and comparatively high levels of social expenditure, others maintain high employment ratios compared to the European average. Among other factors, how each country responds to these challenges depends on the welfare state institutions it has developed.

France and Germany are considered very similar in terms of their welfare arrangements and type of labour market structure (Palier 2006; Scharpf 2001).³⁴ Both countries suffer rising levels of long-term unemployment, mainly affecting unskilled workers and young job seekers. Furthermore, both countries display similar unemployment ratios and levels of social spending.

As shown in *table 3.1* both countries suffer from unemployment rates above the European average: France had an unemployment rate of 9.3 per cent in 2006³⁵ and Germany of 9.8 per cent, while the European average was 8.0 per cent.

Table 3.1 Harmonised unemployment rates and gross social expenditure (per cent of the GDP)

	Unemployment rate (2006)*	Gross social expenditure, aggregated data (2005)**		
		Total	Old age	Unemployment
France	9.3	26.7	11.0	1.7
Germany	9.8	29.2	11.2	1.7
OECD countries	8.0***	20.6	7.3	n.a.

* OECD Labour force statistics, Harmonised Unemployment Rates and Levels, data extracted on 13th August 2009 from OECD.Stat

** OECD (2008), Social Expenditure Database, 1980-2005, on http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=SOCX_AGG, data extracted on 5th January 2010.

*** OECD-Europe

In addition, both countries spend comparatively high amounts on social expenditure: more than one third of the GDP in France and Germany is destined for social expenses - the average expenditure for OECD countries is only one fifth of GDP. The two key drivers of increases in social spending over the last 25 years were the support for the growing retired population and health expenditure. Thus, while the costs of social spending have become a financial burden for most Western countries, France and Germany face a particular challenge to finance their social protection systems. In fact, the share of GDP destined for social expenses has risen steadily over the past decades. In France, for example, the proportion of social protection

³⁴ As Esping-Andersen (1990) argues, labour market structures are closely tied to welfare state regimes. Rather than a single post-industrial employment path, Esping-Andersen proposes three qualitatively different trajectories, each of which owes its dynamic to the structure of the welfare state.

³⁵ France is the only developed economy where the unemployment rate has exceeded 9% for over a quarter of a century (Chabanet and Fay 2005).

expenditure from GDP grew from 19.4 percent in 1974 to nearly 28 per cent in 1992 (Palier 2006:113).

The combination of high unemployment rates and high social spending is the reason Scharpf (2001) speaks of the continental dilemma, of which France and Germany are the most prominent examples. This dilemma consists in the fact that although these countries have a comparatively high share of social spending, the economic performances of the two are comparatively weak.³⁶

The two data shown in *table 3.1*, unemployment rates and social expenditure, also describe the problem both countries are facing in terms of financing the system: on the one hand high unemployment rates means less resources for the system as fewer people contribute to it, and on the other it means more payments to unemployed people and other costs, such as early retirement programmes to free positions in the labour market. In fact, in Germany in 2005, the number of persons receiving state transfers for the first time outnumbered the number of contributors.

Financing the social protection system has been a major difficulty in both France and Germany, as huge deficits in the social protection systems have emerged. Not only has the regulation of supply and demand of the labour market been in crisis since then, but the structural challenge of mass unemployment continues to pose serious problems for fiscal policy. Increasing unemployment and less and less people

³⁶ Scharpf (2001) argues therefore that high social spending is not a good indicator to assess the economic performance of a country. Comparing the economic performance of the United States with different European economies, Scharpf (2001) speaks of the continental dilemma, that is, countries with high social spending and high unemployment rates. That is, although similar rates of social spending and employment could indicate a relation between these two characteristics of the labour market, Scharpf (2001) shows that there is no statistical connection between employment ratios and social expenditure. While the USA has high levels of employment and low social spending, Scandinavian countries combine high social spending with high employment rates, while Germany and France are somewhere in the middle. *“How, then, might one account for the fact that the most expensive welfare states with the highest tax burden among OECD countries and with powerful unions should be doing just as well in employment terms as the United States ...?”* (Scharpf 2001:272) Scharpf resolves this dilemma with reference to the structural problems of the middle way of continental welfare states. In France and Germany there is no deregulation as in the US, with increasing risks of poverty and marginalisation, but at the same time these countries do not follow the path of high taxes as in Sweden. Germany also keeps the costs of labour high, which slows down social services. The money is then transferred to groups of the population with spending habits that are not relevant for employment (for example pensioners and unemployed households). In other words no negative correlation exists between social expenditure and employment in sectors of the economy competing internationally. It is rather the areas of social services and the local economy where Germany as well as France differ from the US. Comparing types of employment in the service sector combined with social spending, France and Germany fall somewhere between the case of the US private local economy and the Scandinavian publicly financed social services sector.

financing the insurance system via their contributions has led to persistent financial deficits in social protection institutions.

Indeed, while the social and political implications of mass unemployment are crucial, in debates on the reform of welfare states the rising costs of social expenditure are often used as an argument to justify radical reform of the welfare state and the introduction of further measures such as active labour market policies and further reductions in unemployment benefits. Although spending for income support for long-term unemployed people is small compared to the amount of money spent for short term unemployment income support, and much smaller than the amount spent on pensions, in public debates the money required to balance the budget is critically observed.³⁷

Yet financing the system is only one of the many problems connected to unemployment. As Palier (2006) points out, the French welfare state has also increasingly been questioned for its emphasis on worker solidarity at the expense of excluding other social groups from the system, and also over the legitimacy of the managers of the system (see below).

Most countries have moved from passive benefit payments to policies that stress the importance of high employment ratios. France and Germany, like many other OECD countries, have adopted measures to bolster employment and transfer benefits to the gainfully employed and tax payers, often referred to as ‘activation’ measures. Although both countries were considered strong welfare states difficult to reform, since the beginning of the 1990s both have incrementally introduced reforms that changed the underlying logics of their welfare systems.

³⁷ Public debates rarely mention that it is mainly the share of old people in populations, and therefore demographic reasons that are behind increasing social expenditure. Indeed, social spending in Germany mainly consists of pensions spending, while the amount of income-tested public assistance programs formed only about 8% of the social budget in 2000 (Adema et al., 2003). Furthermore, even if one only considers spending for people receiving income support, the highest amount is not paid for long-term unemployment and social assistance benefits. Considering the three forms of income support in Germany, the highest amount of money is spent on unemployment insurance, that is on people that lose their job for a short time and re-enter the labour market quickly. This money - as insurance that is only ‘managed’ by state institutions - is not considered part of public assistance spending, but is calculated as an extra item in the total amount of social expenditure. In 2001 6% of the total budget for social expenditure was paid as unemployment insurance (Adema, Gray, and Kahl 2003:6). Although the number of 2.7 million clients is significantly higher than unemployment insurance with 1.7 million people receiving benefits, spending here was almost three times as high as spending on social assistance in 2000 (Adema, Gray, and Kahl 2003:11).

These policies are characterised by their emphasis on active programmes for labour market integration instead of passive benefit payments, moving from a logic of welfare without work and status protection to a logic of conditional and flat-rate benefits for the long-term unemployed. These policies underline an erosion of the traditional separation between the spheres of social protection and labour market policy (Clasen and Clegg 2003). Indeed, as will be described below, in Germany the two previously separate systems of income support for social benefit recipients and the long-term unemployed have been merged. In the following the institutions available in both countries to protect people against unemployment and recent reforms will be described.

Although the French and German Bismarckian welfare states have been said to offer the least promising contexts for policy innovation due to trade unions occupying key positions in protection systems and this actor's interest in limiting change, major welfare and labour market reforms have been introduced over the past decade in both countries. In France reforms were mainly introduced through a mix of incremental changes in logic and some major reforms; in Germany unemployment policies, social policies and labour market policies were profoundly altered through the step-wise introduction of the Hartz concept. In the following I will describe these changes in the two countries in more detail.

Income support for unemployed people in France and recent reforms

In the decades following the Second World War, social policies in France expanded as social spending was considered to favour economic growth, employment and social peace. The social security system was introduced in 1945 “*through an ambiguous mix of Beveridgean goals (universality of coverage, unicity of the system) and Bismarckian means (social insurance)*” (Palier 2006:108). Although the initial idea was to introduce a universal state-run system, social insurance schemes remained within an employment related insurance framework due to resistance from the CGT trade union and other interest groups. In 1958 unemployment benefits were introduced alongside previously existing income support schemes for health care, work place accidents, retirement and family allowances. As in Germany (see below) social protection for the unemployed is based on a social insurance system, in that most benefits are earnings-related and entitlements are conditional upon contribution

records. Previous position in the labour market was thus crucial for social security. Since this usually meant that married men provided their wives with income and social security, the social protection system was often characterised by the term “male breadwinner model”, pointing to the unprotected status of women in the system.³⁸ However, during the 1970s social protection for previously uninsured persons, such as orphans, the handicapped, and single parents, was introduced (Palier 2006). Furthermore, in 1988 a new social benefit, the Revenue Minimum d’Insertion (RMI), was created to respond to new social problems, such as the lack of jobs, and youth and long-term unemployment.³⁹

One major difference of the French system as compared to the German is that the unemployment benefit system is organised jointly by the social partners. That is, the social protection system is managed by the official trade unions and employers organisations through the Assédics (Association pour l’emploi dans l’industrie et le commerce). In France 30 Assédics exist, and each is composed of an administrative body equally comprised of the five official trade unions (CGT, CGT-FO, CFDT, CFTC, CGE-CGC) and employers organisations (MEDEF, CGPME, UPA). These associations are coordinated on the national level by the Unedic (Union nationale interprofessionnelle pour l’emploi dans l’industrie et le commerce),⁴⁰ created in 1958. Until recently (2009) the agency provided unemployed people with social benefits and was responsible for the financing of the unemployment insurance system.

Every three years, negotiations between the social partners take place to set the amounts and duration of unemployment benefits, contributions from employed people and employers, and other modalities of the system.⁴¹ While the corporatist organisation of the French social protection system was previously considered to contribute to social peace, the dominant role of the social partners, and in particular the trade unions, was criticised by politicians in the 1990s, as it was believed the State could manage expenditure more efficiently.

³⁸ Meaning that women are “*a husband away from poverty*” (Ostner 1995:3) as Ostner reminds us, using the expression coined by US American feminists to criticise the male underpinnings of the welfare system.

³⁹ As Palier (2006) describes, in France in 2005 the RMI was one of seven other social minimum income programmes. In 2005 10% of the French population was receiving one of these benefits.

⁴⁰ National Interprofessional Union for Employment in Industry and Trade.

⁴¹ As in Germany’s former “Bundesanstalt für Arbeit”, the UNEDIC attracted a lot of negative attention due to the high amounts of debts the organisation accumulated over the years.

As Palier (2006) points out, trade unions thus have a rather strong role within the French social protection system, a role sometimes considered as compensation for their weak role in the realm of production. Since they are responsible for the social security system, French trade unions thus often “*act as the representatives and defenders of the system*” (Palier 2006:111) Indeed strong opposition to reform did not come from opposition political parties, but from trade unions and social mobilisations.

Following the mid-1970s the French social protection system was increasingly questioned and transformed. While up to the early 1990s changes were introduced that did not question the importance and functioning of the Bismarckian welfare state in France, the system was subsequently questioned and reformed in such a way that Palier (2006) speaks of a paradigmatic shift in social policy in France. As the author shows, in recent years French politicians have introduced three reforms in order to render the welfare system less costly and more employment friendly.

For example, while during the 1970s and 1980s the financial deficit was balanced by increasing resources instead of cutting costs, this solution lost favour in the 1990s.⁴² Until the 1990s opposition from the whole population and the trade unions was feared by both left and right governments, and unemployment insurance benefits were increased or at best stabilized. To balance the budget, governments tried to increase their resources by raising taxes on employers and employees.

After the introduction of the Maastricht criteria in the beginning of the 1990s, the French state was obliged to control its public deficit. This also meant reducing the costs of social expenditure. France, like many other European countries, introduced welfare reforms, such as the reform of French unemployment insurance in 1992. Under the constraints of the Maastricht criteria, the French state - with support of one of the trade unions, the CFDT - started to reduce the level of social benefits instead of increasing social contributions.

In 1992 the unemployment insurance system was reformed by an agreement between the CFDT trade union and employer’s associations. This new insurance

⁴² There was also a lot of opposition from the unions in France. As Palier (2006) describes, the social security deficit was interpreted differently by the unions who stressed that the reason for the deficit was that the state paid non-contributory benefits out of that budget (such as social minima of the poor) while the state could provide its own welfare policies.

scheme⁴³ replaced all the previous types. Unemployment benefits were from then on payable for a limited period only, a maximum of 30 months, and dependent on contribution records. After unemployment benefits end, recipients have to rely on tax-financed means-tested benefits. After its introduction the level and volume of the insurance, as well as the means-tested income support, started to fall. However, as Palier (2006) points out, the reform of unemployment insurance, as well as the reforms effected the pensions and health care systems, continued to follow the logic of the Bismarckian welfare system. *“these reforms are not made in the in the spirit of criticism of welfare redistribution, but in the name of necessity to restore their viability”* (Palier, 2006:117) The difference with previous policies, however, is that social expenditure is now reduced by cutting benefits, while previously this was not perceived as a policy option.

However, in the 1990s criticisms of the welfare state system were increasingly expressed, considering the welfare state not as a victim of the crisis but as its cause. For example, critics pointed out that the system would reinforce social exclusion as a result of its form as insurance: since the system was not intended to cope with mass unemployment, more and more people, such as young unemployed people who had never contributed to the insurance system and the long-term unemployed, were excluded from benefits. Other criticisms were expressed regarding management arrangements: the social partners were accused by the French government of hijacking the social security funds and abusing their position within the system at the expense of the common good (Palier 2006:119). While one major aim of the Bismarckian welfare state was to pacify society and decrease the risk of violent opposition from below, the system increasingly provoked demonstrations and mobilisations (for a critical account of this role of the welfare state see Narr and Offe 1975).

Changing the welfare system was then the target of policy makers. Often, these changes were introduced incrementally, their importance often becoming visible only after some years. However, major reforms were also introduced, such as the Pare (Plan d’aide et de Retour à l’Emploi) in 2000, when social partners signed an agreement to reform the unemployment insurance system. The Pare introduced an individualised contract for each job seeker to ensure they would be accompanied in

⁴³ The Allocation Unique Dégressive (AUD).

their search for work. The social partners thus agreed that unemployment insurance should encourage people to find a new job. *“One can see here that welfare reform in France strives to spur the unemployed into productive activity, making a u-turn from welfare without work strategy to employment friendly restructuring of the system”* (Palier 2006:121). For many unemployed activists the new Unedic agreement, which came into effect on 1 July 2001, is perceived as one of the most damaging reforms of the unemployment insurance system.

Another important shift in the French welfare system is the decreasing importance of the social partners in the social security system. Since the introduction of a new tax to finance social protection system in the 1990s the link between employment and entitlement has weakened. At the same time, the legitimacy of the social partners as managers of the system was questioned as a result of increasing social protection expenditures financed from taxes rather than contributions. French politicians saw the problem of containing social expenditure in the lack of state control over funds. Reforms were thus implemented to empower the state at the expense of the social partners, such as the constitutional amendment of 1996 which obliged the parliament to approve the social security budget every year.

In France various actors have participated in the reforms, from civil servants to governments to trade unions. However, trade union positions have differed. The CFDT changed its political and strategic position to a cooperative and reformist one, as one of the most important proponents of re-insertion policies. Other unions, such as the CGT and the FO, remained defensive, opposing all reform proposals. In 2002 the social partners, that is the Medef (the employers representative) together with three of the trade unions (CFDT, CFTC and the CGC - that is three out of the five official unions) decided to reform the unemployment insurance system. The reform was then introduced in January 2004. This reform mainly concerns the limitation of the duration of unemployment benefit, but also a reduction of the ASS (allocation solidarite specifique), the benefit for those who have already exhausted their right to unemployment benefits from the Unedic.

The French system thus moved away from a system that guaranteed status and income by moving towards the introduction of tax-financed benefit programmes that are means-tested. First, a distinction between assistance and insurance was

introduced, with form playing an ever more important role. The welfare system thus moved in the direction of flat-rate benefits instead of status protection. At the same time the system also moved towards activation measures in that benefits were made conditional on professional activities in order to increase the incentive to work.

Income support for unemployed people in Germany and recent reforms

Like France the German welfare state was considered a strong and stable welfare state, difficult to reform. Although Germany experienced several changes in its political system since the introduction of the Bismarckian model, these different political regimes had little effect on the social institutions of the welfare state. Nevertheless, in the more recent democratic history of Germany welfare policy became much stronger and more institutionalised, especially with the incorporation of the interest organisations of capital and labour into the political process.

The German social protection system is mainly based on social insurance, for illness, long-term care and old age, while family support is mainly provided through the tax system (Adema, Gray, and Kahl 2003). Unemployment insurance was introduced late in 1927, and was one of the last Bismarckian reforms of social protection against labour risks. Today, this unemployment insurance is a core element of the German labour market policy due its limiting the increasing risk of unemployment for individuals. Indeed social policy in Germany is mainly based on the definition of the ‘Arbeiterfrage’ as a basic social problem, another elaboration of the French ‘male breadwinner model’ (Lewis and Ostner 1994).

In post-war Germany the welfare state was extended regarding the social protection offered to German citizens and more and more people were included in the social protection system (Alber 1982). In 1962 social assistance was introduced as a last resort resource for those without any direct social insurance entitlement. Furthermore, compensatory passive labour market policies of income support for the unemployed was widened by active labour market politics in the Federal Republic of Germany. In 1969 the “Arbeitsförderungsgesetz” (labour support program) proposed different measures to introduce the preventative control of labour market developments in order to keep a high employment level and avoid a mismatch of qualifications. The active labour market policy was revised several times, the tenth amendment having been effected by the conservative government in 1993.

However, active labour market policy was considered to have reached its limits when unemployment became a structural challenge (Gottschall and Dingeldey 2000). The recent Hartz reform - named after committee chair Mr. Hartz, the former human resources director of Volkswagen AG - was introduced gradually from 2003 onwards.

It legally integrated unemployment and social policies into one area in the “Sozialgesetzbuch” (social statute book). Active labour market policy is therefore considered part of the same issue complex as social assistance.

In Germany three income support programs existed until the so-called Hartz reform was introduced (see below): unemployment insurance, the unemployment assistance and social assistance. The German model mostly relied on earnings-related income-transfers. Unemployment insurance is the most important transfer in terms of the total amount of money redistributed among social groups, namely employed and recently employed persons.

While social assistance was not originally designed to support employable persons, the increased duration of unemployment forced the unemployed to apply for social assistance: “... *unemployment is the main reason for social assistance receipt in almost half the cases, while about 1 of 6 of the unemployment assistance claimants also receive a regular social assistance payment. Hence the distinction between unemployment assistance and social assistance programmes is more and more difficult to make*” (Adema et al. 2003:7). Still, the largest expense is unemployment insurance benefits that are income related.

Assistance was until recently based on a mix of insurance membership and a household-based means-test. Social assistance is paid to those people that do not have any entitlement to unemployment insurance or assistance.⁴⁴ With the integration of unemployment and social assistance, welfare recipients that are considered able to work now form part of the group of the unemployment benefit system II. While from a financial point of view social assistance recipients are better off under the new regulations, they are now also targeted by state programs to bring people back into labour market. That is they are subject to a system of sanctions where they refuse to

⁴⁴ In the federal state of Germany, public responsibilities are divided among the federal, state and local tiers of the government (Adema et al. 2003). While unemployment insurance is paid and regulated at the national level, the responsibility for social and unemployment assistance lies with the municipalities. The implementation of the social policy varies across municipalities and sometimes even across different social assistance offices. The ‘Sozialhilfeleitfaden’ (guide to social services) provided by civil society organisations - many of them organisations of the unemployed - is therefore of importance for unemployed people and welfare recipients who want to get informed about the social policy in their home town. Yet, to discourage mobility between the different cities due to high discrepancies between the social benefits and services provided, but probably also due to an understanding of the fair distribution of social assistance, a certain minimum standard in provision is maintained across the country. The basic rules of entitlement are laid down in the Federal Social Assistance Act, but the policy is then implemented at the local level.

participate in these programs, which aim to make the people ‘fit for the labour market’.⁴⁵

The German social security system has thus mainly been based on the principle of equivalence - benefits depend on previous income. The German benefit system works in a selective way, in that benefits are first related to the position of the person in the labour market, unlike systems based on equality of benefits such as that in Great Britain, where unemployed benefits are paid as a flat rate. Until recently (before January 2005) the first two types of benefits - unemployment insurance and unemployment assistance - were both related to contributory credits. Now the latter has changed from an income-related logic of distribution to a flat rate system.

In Germany the tendency to redefine the role of the state, but also to transform corporate distributive mechanisms to the advantage of market supervision, is obvious in “Agenda 2010” and the “Hartz-Kommission” (Opielka 2004).⁴⁶ As early as 1998 experts proposed to delegate decisions to a group of experts in order to make reforms that would otherwise be blocked by the negative consequences for the governing parties at elections possible. The commission set up in 1998 (Bündnis für Arbeit) did not however have the desired impact. In 2002 a second commission⁴⁷, set up by the former chancellor Schröder, presented a report for the reform of German employment policies considered as “*the most ambitious German reform project in social insurance policy since World war II*” (Kemmerling and Bruttel 2005:1). Agenda 2010, announced in March 2003, in particular is considered the biggest change in the German social security system since its consolidation in the 1950s. The original target of high employment rates and qualified employment were abandoned in this paper and the new model of self-responsibility was formulated.

⁴⁵ Prior to 1996 sanctions were rarely applied, but with the integration of the two offices benefit conditions have been more vigorously enforced. However, in 2000 about 10% of all social assistance claimants who were offered a job were sanctioned for refusing to accept. This process had, however, already started during the 1990s when the eligibility criteria for unemployment assistance was tightened and limited to people who had exhausted their unemployment insurance.

⁴⁶ However, the reduction of social transfers in Germany is no new development. In 1982 a paper by the liberal politician Mr. Graf Lambsdorff also contained a proposal for a drastic reduction of social transfers. Yet, while at that time it caused the end of the social-liberal governing coalition (Opielka 2004), during the 1990s the term “*activation*” also convinced the majority of the previously sceptical socialists and social-democrats (ibid 2004:88).

⁴⁷ The commission was called “Kommission zum Abbau der Arbeitslosigkeit und zur Umstrukturierung der Bundesanstalt fuer Arbeit”, but became famous under the name ‘Hartz commission’ after its chairman Peter Hartz. The whole reform project developed by the commission consists of four packages, called the four Hartz-packages by the public. The fourth reform package, with the most important consequences for unemployed people, is therefore called Hartz IV-reform.

In Germany the report of the Hartz commission⁴⁸ and the reforms that followed were oriented at the activation and reform of the administrations of the labour market. The reforms brought a new dynamic into the labour market, and the reformers responsible did not balk even in renaming the administrations to indicate the new dynamic and major changes taking place. The ‘Bundesanstalt für Arbeit’- ‘National institute for labour’ became the national agency of labour - Bundesagentur für Arbeit, and the local administrative levels are now called ‘Personal service agencies’.

Initially, the commission was set up to reform only the Public Employment Service (Bundesagentur für Arbeit)⁴⁹. A scandal in the Service Agency – who had been manipulating unemployment statistics - saw the severe criticism of this institutions, also seen as highly inefficient. The manipulation scandal was a window of opportunity for the government to reform this inefficient and expensive institution. The 15 members of the Hartz commission were drawn from a broad spectrum of society, including the sciences, social partners, business consulting companies, large enterprises and politics. This composition indicated a shift away from former tripartite reform approaches, such as in the Alliance for Jobs (Bündnis für Arbeit) from 1998-2001 (Streeck and Hassel 2003).

Three separate reform outcomes can be distinguished (Kemmerling and Bruttel 2005): the introduction and further strengthening of New Public Management ideas; the change of the unemployment insurance system; and some other smaller policy measures to increase labour market participation, often referred to as activation measures. The first refers to the organisational reform of the Federal Agency for Employment and is not therefore of interest here. The other two reforms concern the unemployment benefit system.

Firstly, Hartz proposed a reform of the unemployment benefit system. In the past three income support systems existed: unemployment insurance, unemployment assistance and social assistance. The Hartz concept and its implementation radically reformed this system of benefits. Income-related unemployment insurance is now only paid for a maximum of 12 months. After this period unemployment assistance is paid, that is at the level of the social assistance benefit: *“This departure from the*

⁴⁸ Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung (BMAS) (ed.) 2002: Bericht der Kommission “Moderne Dienstleistungen am Arbeitsmarkt” o.O. (o.J.)

⁴⁹ The federal Agency for Employment was formerly called the Federal Institute for Employment (Bundesanstalt für Arbeit).

former income is the actual break from previous practice, because workers who earned good salaries before becoming unemployed will now face a drastic decline in their benefits in comparison with the former unemployment assistance” (Kemmerling and Bruttel 2005:6). Those most affected by the reform are therefore those that when employed earned relatively high wages, but have scarce chances of re-entering the job market within 12 months. This unemployment benefit II is administered by consortia of the local offices of the Federal Agency of Employment and the municipalities.

Secondly, the reform emphasised activation measures. Germany has a low effective labour supply compared to other European countries. Only 65% of the employable population is currently working, while the Lisbon strategy aims at an employment rate of 70% for the year 2010. New measures to boost employment include the reduction of tax burdens to allow self-employment and individual tailored assistance combined with a stricter regime and a new definition of suitable work. That is, once unemployed people are out of work for more than a year they are obliged to take any job regardless of the wage level. The law explicitly states that a new job cannot be refused simply because it would be inferior to previous formal qualifications or occupied positions. This is very different from the situation before, when relatively few jobseekers were sanctioned compared to other European countries.⁵⁰

3.2 The contentious politics of unemployment

Welfare state arrangements and the radical reform of unemployment policies, that is, the de-emphasising of status protection and the introduction of activation measures, seem to be similar in many respects in France and Germany. As we will see in the following, these concrete opportunities nevertheless allowed different actors to

⁵⁰ Since the implementation of the Hartz reform continuous smaller changes have been introduced, usually argued to lower the costs of the reform. The most recent reform, introduced on 1st August 2006, was the ‘Optimierungsgesetz’ (optimising law). See the “Gesetz zur Fortentwicklung der Grundsicherung fuer Arbeitssuchende”, version adopted by the German parliament at second and third readings on 1st June 2006, to be implemented 1st August 2006. This reform, far from attempting to remedy any of the short-comings described in the first evaluations of the implementation of Hartz - aim at further tightening social spending through increased sanctions and the stricter application of the so-called communities in need (Bedarfsgemeinschaften). These optimising reforms include for example the following points: currently the income support for recipients of the unemployment II benefit consists of an agreement to pay a maximum of 360 Euro for a single household. Where the unemployed person lives in a cheaper flat and decides to move, the state will only agree to pay the previous level of rent. Further, the sanctions are tightened: if an unemployed person fails to take a job or state financed work (the so-called 1-Euro jobs) three times, income support is completely withdrawn.

become publicly visible. Different collective actors gained different degrees of “*public visibility and resonance as well as of political legitimacy of certain actors, identities and claims*” (Giugni 2009:147). In the following, I will describe the differences in the types of actors and issues characterising the French and German discourses on unemployment.

Generally speaking, increasing unemployment rates is a high-salience policy issue, that is, high unemployment rates is an issue seen as very important by political authorities (Duyvendak 1995). In summer 2009, for example, unemployment was once again a major topic in the German election campaign. The two major parties, the CDU and the SPD, frequently refer to this topic of popular concern to get voter’s support, announcing new policy measures for full employment. During the last national elections a new party was founded with unemployment as their main topic of concern on the political agenda. This party, in a joint effort with the socialist party PDS, successfully entered the parliament as the fourth strongest party with 8.7 per cent.

Since unemployment became a structural challenge in the 1970s, the topic has become important not only for political parties, but also for other political actors such as state institutions, interest organisations, and especially trade unions. The interest of the main political actors is not very surprising if one considers the broad area of policy issues that are connected to unemployment, such as fiscal policy, pension and labour market reforms, not to mention the broad area of social policy and the institutionalised conflict between capital and labour.

Not only is unemployment a political conflict considered important by political actors, the prominent place the topic occupied during the election campaign also indicates that it is of popular concern. In fact, the Hartz reform was also a major topic for the public at large. ‘Hartz IV’, the synonym for the fourth package of the Hartz reform, was selected as the buzzword of the year in 2004 by the society for German language (Kemmerling and Bruttel 2005:5). Furthermore, opinion polls repeatedly described the high political saliency of the topic for individuals.⁵¹ Asked for the two most important problems in German politics, 81 per cent of Germans mentioned

⁵¹ The collection of individual estimations of the political saliency of various political topics is purposely not called ‘public opinion’. While opinion polls give information on collections of individual opinions, the term public opinion describes public struggles by collective and individual actors on the meaning of various topics.

unemployment as the most or second most important topic in 2005. Compared to other European countries the share of people considering unemployment as an important political issue is thus highest in Germany. In France 67 per cent mention unemployment as the most or second most important topic - the second highest rate of all West European countries. In contrast in Great Britain only 11% of the population consider the topic as crucial (European Commission 2005:25ff).

Unemployment is perceived as a serious threat by political actors and individuals alike. The high-saliency of the topic for established actors and individuals suggests that unemployment and the reforms addressing unemployment are comprehensively talked about in public. Indeed, the reforms of the welfare state and labour policies described in the previous section did not go unnoticed. While various actors were involved in its elaboration, many actors also engaged in a public debate criticizing the reforms or mobilized to oppose unemployment policies and change. In the following I will complete the picture of unemployment politics by describing the main features of the contentious politics of unemployment, that is the claims-making of social and political actors on the topic of unemployment. Presenting the types of actors involved in contentious public debates on unemployment and the issues raised by these actors in France and Germany highlights some major differences in the contentious politics of unemployment in France and Germany.

The cross-national comparative research project on the ‘Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe (Unempol)’ currently provides the only systematic data available to describe features of the French and German contentious fields. Comparing six European countries (UK, Switzerland, France, Italy, Germany and Sweden) the project links the analysis of the policy field of labour and employment to the analysis of political contention in public debate, that is “*the relationships between political institutional approaches to unemployment policy and political conflicts mobilized by collective actors over unemployment in the public domain*” (Giugni and Statham 2005:3). Among others, information on the types of actors and the main issues of the contentious politics of unemployment are available for the years between 1995 and 2002. The following tables and discussion summarise the insights of the German and French country reports.

Regarding actors, *table 3.2* shows that in France as well as in Germany trade unions and employer's organisations play an important role in the contentious politics of unemployment. In Germany trade unions and employer's organisations together account for as many claims as the state actors, and underpin the role of the social partners in that country. The participation in the debate does by no means mean that these actors raise claims in favour of the unemployed or process claims for benefit (see also Table 3.3 below). Distinguishing the discursive position of various actors the German team of the Unepol project describes different favourable and disadvantageous claims raised by the different actors: while welfare organisations and pro-unemployed organisations generally raise benevolent claims for the unemployed constituency, employers organisations do much less so and the judiciary is a clear opponent of unemployed people's interest in the public discourse.

However, in Germany trade unions participate less in the contentious claims making on unemployment (16.9%) as compared to France (23,6%). French unions, probably due to their different role in the social security system as described in the previous section, are more visible in the public debate on unemployment.

Table 3.2 - Types of actors participating in the contentious politics over unemployment between 1995 and 2002

Actor	Germany	France
State actors (%)	32.7	22,7
Political parties (%)	12.3	15,1
Unions (%)	16.9	23,6
Employer's organisations (%)	15.2	11,2
Welfare organisations (%)	1.3	3,8
Unemployed organisations (%)	1.0	14,2
Other civil society actors and groups (%)	7.8	7,7
Other actors (%)	12,8	1,7
Total (%)	100	100

Source: UNEMPOL (2005) Final report in Germany (Baum, Baumgarten, and Lahusen 2005) and UNEMPOL (2005) Final report France (Chabanet and Fay 2005),
The total N of claims where a speaker could be clearly identified is not mentioned in both reports.

Furthermore, in France state actors are less visible in contentious politics compared to Germany, where state actors account for nearly 34 per cent of all claims. In France only one fourth (22.7 per cent) of all interventions come from state actors.

The most striking difference lies in the different levels of success on the part of organisations of the unemployed in entering the debate in France and in Germany. In Germany only 1 per cent of claims are raised by those most affected by the problem. This data confirms the widespread assumption that organisations of the unemployed have difficulty entering into public debate. Indeed, organisations of the unemployed form only a small part of all collective actors that make claims regarding the topic ‘unemployment’ in most countries studied in the Unempol project. In Great Britain, for example, they account for only 0,5% and in Italy 1,6% of all claims raised on the topic. It seems that the strong roles of other established actors pushes them out of public debate and into a marginal role, while trade unions and employers organisations have polarized the debate. Indeed, as Baum et al (2005) summarise their findings for the German case: “ *claim-making is monopolized largely by the state and the social partner, to the detriment of social NGOs (e.g. welfare organizations) and non-organized interests* “ (Baum et al. 2005:21). As the authors also describes, in interviews with major organisations of the unemployed, the interviewees “*name only a very small number of organizations as influential actors that illustrates that political deliberations in the field of labour market policies are highly exclusive*” (Baum et al. 2005:21).

However, as shown in *table 3.2* organisations of the unemployed in France entered the public domain comparatively successfully. After state actors, trade unions and political parties they accounted for the fourth largest share in claims on unemployment with 14.2 per cent. In France organisations of the unemployed seem to be important participants in the contentious debate on unemployment. Considering that the analysis covers a period of eight years, the strong participation of the French activists is not due to the mobilisation wave of winter 1997. Organisations of the unemployed must have better structural access to the debate than their German counterparts and others from the countries studied in the Unempol project.

The political opportunity approach indeed argues that challenging actors can enter the political domain only where the administrative arena is fragmented and a lack of

internal coordination exists. Then, the political system opens access points to outsiders. In these cases the administration may seek private interlocutors in the system of interest mediation. But this does not mean that it opens up automatically to social movements, only if interest groups are equally weak. *“On the contrary, a well-resourced, coherently structured, and professionalized system of interest groups may also be able to prevent outside challengers from having access to the state. Moreover, highly institutionalized, encompassing arrangements of policy negotiations between the public administration and private interest associations will be both quite inaccessible to challengers and able to act”* (Koopmans and Kriesi 1995:31). That is, although the political system may be open to challenging actors, if this space is occupied by other, more professional organisations, it is difficult if not impossible for challenging actors to have their voice heard.

Looking at the main issue areas discussed in the contentious politics of unemployment, *table 3.3* again shows some major differences between the two countries. The German field is strongly dominated by macro-economic issues, and to a much lesser extent by topics regarding the unemployed as a social group or institutions of the welfare state. This image suggests that advocates such as trade unions and welfare associations are rather reluctant to make claims on behalf of the unemployed, which probably makes it even more difficult for unemployed people to mobilise for action. In France, the debate puts the unemployed as a social group at its centre. Again, probably due to the different role of trade unions and employers organisations within the social security system, the issue of the welfare state and social benefits is much more important in French contentious politics than in German unemployment politics.

The difference in the issues is most probably due to the success of the French unemployed in shaping the debate. However, issues concerning the welfare state and social benefits may also provide better opportunities to enter the debate, since these are topics on which the unemployed can speak as concerned experts.

Table 3.3 - Issues raised in contentious politics of unemployment between 1995 and 2002

Issues	Germany	France
Socio-economic issues regarding the labour market (%)	79.8	37.0
Welfare systems and social benefits (%)	6.9	35.8
Individual insertion in the labour market (%)	10.6	14.1
Issues regarding the unemployed (%)	1.7*	11.6**
Other issues (%)	1.0	1.5
Total (%)	100	100
Total N	3859	687

Source: UNEMPOL Final report Germany (Baum, Baumgarten, and Lahusen 2005) and UNEMPOL Final report France (Chabanet and Fay 2005)

own calculations

* N = 66

** N = 80

Thus, in Germany not only are institutionalised actors the most present participants in the debate on the problem of unemployment, but the topic is also mainly talked about in macro-sociological terms. The unemployment issue is usually dealt with in the context of neo-corporatist debates on active and passive labour market policies. Political parties, for example, stress the fiscal burdens for the state caused by high unemployment rates, and unions fear a loss of power due to the increasing offer of working power. Of course, the advocates of weak interests - the church and welfare organisations - put topics other than often technical problem definitions, such as fiscal questions and the labour market reforms of political actors, on the agenda. However, in quantitative terms the contribution of welfare organisations, the church and other actors is marginal. Most topics concern fiscal policy, welfare institutions or the conflict between capital and labour. In their newspaper analysis Baum (et al. 2005) show that unemployment is mainly discussed as a general and abstract social problem, rather than an issue that affects tangible constituencies. Very little reference is made to unemployed people, although unemployment is proved to be a difficult situation for those affected by unemployment in economic, social and psychological terms. Thus, the debate remains within the institutionalised channels of policy making with the participation of established political and social actors, while others are excluded from the struggle over meaning. The grievances of the unemployed did not play a major

role in these debates. Rather, a strategy of ‘blaming the victim’ took place, depriving the unemployed of legitimacy over their own concerns (Oschmiansky 2003).⁵²

Overall, it seems that French organisations of the unemployed found it easier to enter the debate between 1995 and 2002 than their German counterparts. Unemployed activists only entered the debate now and then, even when some political opportunities were available, such as the electoral campaign against the conservative government in 1998, as will be shown in the next section. Further, in Germany the new social movements did not seem to take up the issue of unemployment. Although new social movements have been important for conflicts in the German context, it is mainly the social partners that deal with the topic, leaving no space for other actors. On the contrary, in France weak interests play an important role in public debate. Indeed, France is the country for which the topic of social exclusion has been most prominent over the past years. The French fight against poverty “...steht seit langem im Zentrum der französischen Sozialpolitik” (Bode 2000:291). While the countries seem to be very similar in terms of unemployment policies, different issues have dominated their public discourses. Indeed, as Chabanet and Fay point out “*to evaluate the French model solely in terms of its corporative compulsory insurance aspect is to downplay the model born of the French revolution*” (Chabanet and Fay 2005:4), when the rights of the poor over society were claimed. This difference may open up discursive opportunities for the unemployed to raise their claims in France, while in Germany the technical and marco-sociological character of debate makes it more difficult for the unemployed to take part. While rational arguments might be necessary for a public discourse, first one has to become a participant in the debate: a difficult enterprise for the German organisations of the unemployed.

⁵² As, for example, with the campaigns against unemployed people by former Chancellor Schröder in 2002, when he spoke of lazy unemployed people. In summer 2005 the former Federal minister for economics Mr. Clement announced an even more aggressive campaign to fight the misuse of social benefits. The campaign was announced in October 2005 under the title: "Vorrang für die Anständigen - Gegen Missbrauch, Abzocke und Selbstbedienung im Sozialstaat" ("Priority for decent people - against misuse, rackets and self-service in the welfare state.") where he speaks of ‘parasites’, using the language of the national-socialists, as well as using racist terminology in the paper and calling on citizens to spy on each other.

3.3 Unemployed people's movements in France and Germany

To engage in the contentious politics of unemployment actors may use different action forms; while actors sometimes make verbal statements to criticise a decision or respond to policy initiatives, at other times they mobilise in collective actions such as demonstrations or marches. In the Unempol project therefore five categories of action forms are distinguished: political decisions, verbal statements, and three forms of protest activities (conventional protest, demonstrative protest and confrontational or violent protest). In the six countries studied, only about 9% of all claims are made through protest actions, and the large majority of claims - 89%- are verbal statements or political decisions (della Porta 2008). In general most action forms in the contentious politics of unemployment are thus quite conventional.

However, linking the different types of actors to the five action forms, della Porta (2005) shows that there is also a pattern where some actors predominantly use one specific action form. While parties, for example, chose in more than 91 per cent of all cases to make verbal statements, organisations of the unemployed chose in nearly 76 per cent of all cases to use one of the three protest forms, most often demonstrative protest. Thus, organisations of the unemployed engage in the contentious politics of unemployment most of the time via the use of protest actions. This data confirms my own investigation into the German debate on unemployment between 1993 and 2000, where I found that organisations of the unemployed most often entered the debate via protest actions (Zorn 2004).

Indeed, challenging or powerless actors lacking access to institutional channels of policy making usually have to fall back on protest as a tool to gain publicly visibility or influence policy makers (Lipsky 1970). As the following description of the French organisations of the unemployed shows, unemployment became publicly visible through their successful mobilisations, especially in 1997, when all over France the unemployed occupied job centres to fight for a Christmas dole payment. The comparatively large share of claims by French unemployed people in the contentious politics of unemployment - taking into consideration that the data analysis covers a period from 1995 to 2002 - suggests however that there was also some continuity of unemployed protest over time. Further, the moderate share of claims by German organisations of the unemployed also hides a major national mobilisation wave in 1998.

The following section therefore attempts to reveal what lies behind the numbers in *table 2.2* which describes major national mobilisations of the unemployed in the two countries. That is, since the beginning of the 1990s unemployed people in France have participated in various protest events and mobilisations on social issues, culminating in the above-mentioned protest of the unemployed in winter 1997/1998. Some months after the protest wave was triggered in France, the German unemployed initiated a nation wide seven-month protest wave in 1998. Only some years later, in summer 2004, did the unemployed organise one of the biggest demonstrations of post-war Germany against the Hartz reform, as introduced in the first section of the chapter. The description of the protest waves as contentious contexts should complete the picture of the concrete political and discursive contexts in which the local organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin move.

The movement of the unemployed in France

In France four national organisations of the unemployed exist, all of which were founded between 1981 and 1993. In 1981 the first union of the unemployed, the Syndicat national des chômeurs was founded by people from the Christian left. The organisation was the first to engage in disruptive activities such as the occupation of Assedics in France. Some years after its foundation, this organisation resulted in the foundation of the national movement of the unemployed MNCP (Mouvement nationale des chômeurs et précaires), an umbrella organisation of local organisations of the unemployed from all over France which represented more than 100 local organisations at the time of my empirical investigations. Some union unemployed organisations were also founded within the CGT (Confédération générale du travail) union during the 1980s, and are closely linked to union activism and its communist-oriented ideology. Further, during the 1980s the Apeis (Association pour l'Emploi, l'information et la solidarité) organization was founded, in 1987 to be exact, a federation of local organisations situated all over France but mainly active in the traditional communist bastions of the greater Paris region (Chabanet and Faniel forthcoming 2010).

The foundation of AC! (Agir ensemble contre le chômage) in autumn 1993 was crucial for the contentious agency of the unemployed in France. It ensured that the issue of unemployment was placed within a wider framework of social and political

struggles (Royall 2004). AC! was founded by political and union activists who had been in contact with one another since the late 1980s through the critical union magazine *Collectif*. In fact, the idea of abolishing unemployment was first formulated during the annual meeting of the magazine *Collectif* when the social partners were about to sign the new unemployment insurance regulation. Most activists came from critical strands on the left and radical left within the CFDT union, but union activists from other unions such as the CGT and the younger SUD union also joined AC! (Cohen 2008). The aim was to provide a platform for the many unemployed people who remained unrepresented by the unions and to critically revitalise French union policy. After AC! called for action and organised a national protest march in 1994 (see below) the organisation of the unemployed grew significantly in size and more than 200 local organisations were founded all over France, coordinated by a national office in Paris. These local organisations were no longer composed solely of political and union activists, but also of unemployed people.⁵³

While the existence of an organisational infrastructure is necessary for contentious agency to develop, it is not sufficient, as both the French and German cases show. In both countries organisations of the unemployed existed during the 1980s (see also the description of the German case below), yet no major protest activities took place in either country. Protest activities of the French organisations of the unemployed did take place occasionally, but lacked a “*structured format principally because the links between the organisations were too fragmented and differences in policy and strategy continued to prevail*” (Royall 2004:56).

The contentious agency of the unemployed changed significantly from the end 1980s and over the next decade however (Royall 2004): while some people linked to the Syndicat des chômeurs gathered in front of the French ministry of Finance in 1989, several thousand unemployed people participated in the ‘March nationale contre le chômage’ in 1994. In 2001 organisations of the unemployed formally met

⁵³ While the original aim was to abolish unemployment and fight for wealth and work, the network recently split into two parts: one strand of AC! continues to organise as local organisations with a national office and cooperates closely with other organisations of the unemployed, and is interested in the original idea of renewing French union policy. The second strand is composed of a network that rejects national coordination. This AC ! network refuses to cooperate with political parties and unions and criticises the contemporary conceptions of work and employment (Cohen 2008). As Cohen (2008) describes, the criticism of unemployment policy is increasingly connected to more radical claims such as a minimum income as proposed by the group Cargo.

with Ministry of employment officials to discuss unemployment policy measures and thus even gained access to conventional political channels.

However, as mentioned in the introduction to the thesis, the protest wave that gained the most public attention took place in winter 1997/98. While social issues had been contested since the beginning of the 1990s, it was not until winter 1997/98 that unemployment became a major protest topic, with the emergence of a long and large protest wave. This is not to say that unemployment had not been a protest topic before, as described above: in fact, in 1994 AC ! called for action and a national protest march was organised in France. This first march consisted of five smaller marches starting out from major French cities to gather in March 1994 in Paris, where about 20,000 activists participated in the protest march in the capital city.

Since this march, protest activities on the topic of unemployment and by the unemployed have been organised more frequently. While in the early 1990s contentious agency took place mainly at the local level, from 1996 onwards protest activities have been organised on a national scale. Most national protest activities are organised as joint activities between the major organisations of the unemployed, that is, AC!, Apeis, CGT chômeur and MNCP - the local organisations forming a crucial anchor for these protest activities.

In 1996, during the negotiations for the renewal of unemployment insurance managed by Unedic, the movement of the unemployed opposed the introduction of the 'Allocation unique dégressive (AUD)' a new system for the allocation of unemployment benefit. From October 1996 to December 1996 protest gatherings, demonstration marches and occupations were organised all over France until a new agreement was signed. The new agreement provided some improvements for the unemployed, and was thus considered as a successful recognition of the protest activities of the unemployed. The invitation to the organisations of the unemployed to participate in the development of a law against exclusion by the subsequent government further reinforced the positive consideration of the battle (Cohen 2008). Further, during 1997 organisations of the unemployed organised and participated in the European marches against unemployment. Organisations of the unemployed became one of the most important contact points of the European protest network that organised various European protest activities in following years (see Chabanet 2001).

However, it was not until winter 1997 that the unemployed became publicly visible to any great extent. Shortly after unemployment rates reached a historic level, with 12.6 per cent of the population being unemployed in June 1997 (Chabanet, 2005:129), the unemployed organised national protest events all over France. Two distinct activities triggered this series of protests. Firstly, on December 4 several thousand people participated in a protest march in Marseille organised by unemployed union groups to claim a Christmas allowance for unemployed people. Just a few days later eight offices of the Assedic were occupied in Bouches-de-Rhône. Secondly, AC!, MNCP, Apeis and other organisations of have-nots called for a social emergency action week, calling for a different social minimum income. These organisations also occupied offices of the Assedic. Both battles converged in a protest wave, so that at the end of December 1997 more than 30 were registered all over France and protest activities took place in more than 50 cities. In January more than 50,000 people participated in a national protest march. Due to its strength and duration the protests of the French unemployed received broad public attention not only in France but in other European countries as well.

While unemployment protests also took place in later years, they never gained the same levels of strength or the same media attention as the protests of winter 1997/98. In winter 1998, for example, the unemployed also organised protest activities, and in the two following years they targeted the new measures of unemployment policy that tightened the control system and rights of the unemployed. In fact, the PARE (Plan d'aide au retour à l'emploi, introduced in July 2001) is considered as one of the worst developments in French unemployment policy by many French unemployment activists. Since these battles, the action repertoire of the unemployed became more diverse and no longer has the effect of strengthening local organisational infrastructures, as was the case for the activities between 1994 and 1997. Local organisations of the AC! Have either disappeared or lost many of their activists (Cohen 2008).

It was only in 2003 that protest actions gained new strength with the battle of the 'recalculated', as a consequence of the tightening of rights to unemployment benefits. Between 180.000 and 250.000 unemployed people previously included in the

UNEDIC system lost the entitlement to unemployment benefits⁵⁴. These people only had the right to the social minimum income. From September 2003 to January 2004 national action days were coordinated by the main organisations of the unemployed. However, this time legal complaints were added as one other important action form in defence of the rights of the unemployed. In May 2004 Mr. Borloo, former minister of labour, had to announce the suspension of the law and the re-integration of the unemployed people affected into the system, after the court of justice upheld their rights.

In December 2006 I participated in a national mobilisation of unemployed people's organisations. This protest march had been organised for the fourth time, having been organised in 2003 for the first time when the Medef and the five official unions signed an end of year agreement on unemployment benefits – as they do every second year. This had been taken as an occasion to organise a national protest day. Alongside this institutionalised annual protest, contentious agency of the unemployed over the past years has mainly been of a local nature. In Paris, for example, one important battle was for free public transport for certain social benefit recipients and the long-term unemployed. As Cohen (2008) mentions, over the past years local organisation - though less visible in the public sphere – has played an important role in providing access points for unemployed people to get information and help (see the discussion of these caring activities in *chapter 5*). The role of local organisations as service providers for the unemployed was however already important in the 1980s (see Royall 2004).

Protest of the unemployed in France must be understood in the context of other mobilisations on social and political issues. In fact, in France social topics had formed the subject matter of major protest waves since the beginning of the 1990s. In 1993 a protest by students opposed a policy proposal by the right wing Balladure government on the reform of university contracts for new academic staff. In 1995 another student protest quickly spread throughout French society. In an alliance of public sector workers, students, the unemployed and marginally employed and with the support of the media, the social question re-entered the public debate. Provoked by public announcements about the too good status quo of employed people, protesters

⁵⁴ L'Humanite, April 3, 2004.

organised a strike that blocked France for several weeks, targeting the retrenchment of the welfare state.

Shortly after these mobilisations, in 1996,, the movement of the have-nots, the so-called ‘movement de sans’, began. Including a variety of different actors such as migrants, the homeless and the unemployed, this movement aims to defend the rights of the socially and politically excluded. The movement is even supported by the unions, exceptionally supporting another issue area than their own. The movement of the have-nots can be considered as the real start of unemployed people’s mobilisations. Indeed, these mobilisations are often mentioned as a reference point by unemployed activists in Paris.

One of the main differences between France and Germany is the intertwining of mobilisations on various topics in Paris and the fragmented or independent mobilisations in Berlin. The history of the unemployed movement – alongside the fact that French activists are confident that the unemployment movement exists, while most German activists are not (see Chapter 3) - is told in the context of mobilisations that brought the whole of France to a standstill in the mid-1990s. *“The strike we began in the end of 1996, and then quickly we began to organise the European marches. But that was in the air, that was all within one dynamic. One has to start from one thing and the others come on the top. And there everything started and there was no need to force yourself. Every day, every day, every, day, we were like workers, each day we have been on the streets. We only got back to sleep, at home, and the next morning we were there again.”* (Interview 38:3) All major mobilisations in France are perceived to belong to one history of battles, such as the unemployed march in 1994, the student protests in the mid-1990s, the month-long strike, the European marches, the protest of the have-nots, and the unemployment mobilisations of Christmas 1997.

The movement of the unemployed in Germany

In the 1970s, in response to the new phenomena of mass unemployment, various social actors started to care for the unemployed. Unemployment affected people in a threatening way, causing poverty and the loss of a stable social environment. Furthermore, some social groups already occupying disadvantaged positions in society were especially affected by unemployment, such as older people, women and

disabled people. The church and welfare organisations, traditionally considered as the allies of the poor and the weak, started to orient part of their activities to help unemployed people and criticise the passive and active labour market policies of the government. This was also because the trade unions - although the number of unemployed members was rising constantly - did not consider themselves the mouthpiece of the unemployed.

While institutionalised representatives of weak interests started to voice the concerns of the unemployed in the 1980s, some organisations of the unemployed also emerged. Organisations of the unemployed were founded all over Germany during the 1980s, and some still exist today. These organisations of the unemployed developed according to trade unions, as unemployed groups within welfare organisations or within the protestant church, but many were also founded as independent groups.⁵⁵ In West Germany the first meeting of representatives of various organisations of the unemployed beyond regional borders took place in 1977 (Gallas 1994). While some attempts were made to organise a national umbrella organisation or a national interest group these plans faced strong opposition from most organisations of the unemployed.⁵⁶ This and subsequent meetings in 1982 and 1988 served mainly as a forum for unemployment activists to exchange experiences (Wolski-Prenger 1997). The strong opposition against a formal organisation was due to the grassroots character of the unemployed network in Germany. Indeed, the organisational structure of organisations of the unemployed during the 1980s shows a great deal of similarity with the new social movement organisations, in that they preferred flat hierarchies and basic democratic forms of decision-making. The West German field of organisations of the unemployed is rather unstructured, with no clear centre, and generally the organisations were rather loosely connected.

The emergence of these organisations of the unemployed and the various small successful activities, especially on the local level, are however considered as marginal by students of unemployment contention (Wolski-Prenger 1997). While many

⁵⁵ The estimations about the number of organisations of the unemployed differ according to their definition and the way in which the group's number was estimated. Wolski-Prenger (1997) and Wolf (1991) come to different conclusions, depending on their assumptions of how many groups are politically active. Gallas (1994:292, footnote 8), who employs a similar definition of the population of organisations of the unemployed to mine, estimates that about 1000-1200 local organisations of the unemployed existed in the beginning of the 1990s.

⁵⁶ The proposal to found an unemployed union was particularly opposed in the unemployed conference of 1982.

organisations on the local, regional and national levels existed, no major nationwide mobilisations took place, despite a decentralised protest day in autumn 1988 against the means test for those receiving welfare benefits or unemployment assistance (Wolf 1991), a failed march of the unemployed to Bonn, and the few national meetings mentioned above (Gallas 1994). Also, unemployed experts mentioned in the beginning of the 1990s that less unemployed people were active during the second half of the 1980s.⁵⁷ In the first half of the 1990s Gallas (1994) therefore concludes that the West German unemployed people's movement was, compared to the success of the British movement of the 1920s and 1930s, but also to the German unemployed contention of the Weimar republic, only successful in terms of the recruitment of long-term members for their organisations. Organisations of the unemployed, although many have existed since the 1980s, observed rather than participated in the German debate on unemployment for nearly two decades.

Unemployment as a topic of social protest, and unemployed people as a collective actor were not visible until February 1998. In 1998 organisations of the unemployed mobilised in a seven month lasting protest wave all over Germany. On 5 February the first of nine national protest gatherings took place in more than 200 cities throughout Germany. Every month until the elections in September, protest gatherings and demonstration marches took place all over the country. Many protest actions were organised by local organisations of the unemployed and had a local character. But the protest actions all over Germany were also coordinated by the Koordinierungsstelle gewerkschaftlicher Erwerbslosenarbeit (KOS, the coordination centre for union unemployed groups). The peak of the mobilisations was reached in May 1998 with protest actions in more than 350 cities, supported by the major trade unions and the cooperation of organisations of the unemployed and the protestant church. Some of these decentralised events mobilised up to 5000 people in one place.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Gallas (1994) estimates that no more than 1% of the unemployed were ever politically active in one of the various organisations of the unemployed. He distinguishes those unemployed who come to the group as inactive permanent visitors, and those who come for counselling services or other types of services provided, from the politically active.

⁵⁸ Very little systematic evidence on the protest cycles exists (but see Zorn, 2004). This is the case because unemployment protest has a local character and research has mainly focused on national newspapers. In a content analysis of a national German newspaper only ten claims of organisations of the unemployed groups were found in the period between 1996 and 2000 (Baumgarten 2004). All claims were protest actions or announcements of protest action, four of them organised jointly with unions, in the framework of the so-called 'Jagoda-Tage'.

The protests targeted the right-wing government, accused of being responsible for the retrenchment of the welfare state. As one unemployed activist remembers: *“In 1998 there was the electoral campaign. And there was an atmosphere in the population that the CDU government should be dropped. One just didn’t know where it would go. But one knew that it is the end of Kohl. During this time slot you tried to manifest a social movement, your political claims, so that these claims are not forgotten. And there were concrete cutbacks for the unemployed”* (Interview 13:14) The conservative party had been in government for sixteen years and various political forces hoped for change.⁵⁹

In Berlin a round table of local organisations of the unemployed groups (Runder Tisch der Berliner Erwerbslosen) was founded in the beginning of 1998, with the participation of union organisations of the unemployed, some independent organisations of the unemployed, and the DGB. This coordination between unions and organisations of the unemployed was the main organising force behind the Berlin-wide protest actions on the Jagoda-days, when the unemployed gathered in front of job centres throughout Berlin. As in the rest of Germany, protest gatherings took place regularly on the days when the latest unemployment figures were announced, from February to September 1998. From the fourth protest event onwards, these protest events were named ‘Jagoda-Tage’ (Jagoda-days), when Mr. Jagoda, president of the public labour agency, announced the unemployment rates at a monthly press conference. This day of the announcement of new unemployment rates was taken as the occasion for protest. Up to 2000 people participated at these protest events in Berlin. One of the most active groups in Berlin, was the organisations of the unemployed named ‘Hängematten’ (Hammocks), ironically referring to a complaint by the former chancellor Kohl that the unemployed were simply lazing around in the social hammocks of the welfare state. This independent organisation of the unemployed was founded in the East Berlin district of Friedrichshain one year before

⁵⁹ Some unemployment activists mentioned that the support of unions was also a form of exploiting the unemployed people’s protest ; *“1998, before the election, there were the unemployed protests. Once a month, when the unemployment rate was announced ... a demonstration was organised. And also then there existed a round table of unemployed, only that at that time the unions sat at the table. There was the CDU government and they had an interest that it is the turn of the SPD. The protest of the unemployed were a bit exploited for that. There was this atmosphere “Kohl has to go”. That was the anchor of the whole protest.”* (Interview 9:5).

the protests started.⁶⁰ Students also organised strikes during this period, and some students supported the activities of the action network of the unemployed protests (Aktionsbündnis Erwerbslosenproteste).

The sympathetic reports penned by some journalists during the initial phase of the protests offered organisations of the unemployed a forum to legitimise their claims. After the KOS announced the first national day of unemployed resistance in Germany, interviews with other spokespersons of national organisations of the unemployed, such as the Arbeitslosenverein e. V. (ALV) and the 'Förderverein gewerkschaftlicher Arbeitslosenarbeit' followed. For the first time these groups were given a public space to raise their voices and formulate their points of view on the unemployment debate. Established organisations such as the DGB, the German peak organisation of the unions, and the protestant church, decided to support the protests against mass unemployment shortly after this increase in public attention towards these new challengers. Because of the central role of the KOS and the trade unions as both supporters and mobilisers, the cycle of protest is considered as organised mainly 'from above' in that established organisations called for and organised protests.

After the elections the protest wave decreased. The hopes of left wing challengers that a red-green government would follow a completely different path of labour market politics were disappointed however: *"Before 1998 there have been high hopes for a political change in social policies by a change of government. The unions and the jobless demonstrated together for this change. But the government disappointed these hopes by further cuts in the social welfare system"* (Baumgarten 2004). The silence of the peak union organisation, the DGB, on the politics of the new government was particularly disappointing for many of the groups that had been engaged in the protest wave.

Until 2002 protest events in Berlin were mainly isolated activities. They were a combination of sporadic protest gatherings and indoor meetings, such as conferences, cultural events and discussions.⁶¹ During these indoor meetings unemployment activists gave lectures or reported on poverty and contributed to stabilising the movement infrastructure that had emerged the year before. Other, more cultural

⁶⁰ The active role during the protest events stimulated the foundation of further groups in other Berlin districts, such as the Erwin group in Neukölln.

⁶¹ One of these is the congress on "working differently or not at all", a congress that resulted in the foundation of the group of the same name in 1999.

events also took place. In 2000 in the Volksbühne, a social-critical theatre company staged a play entitled ‘The right to be lazy’, an answer to the claims of former chancellor Schroeder that unemployed and social benefit recipients did not have the right to refuse work if they were able to work, which resulted in the publication of a book. Sporadic protest events also took place (Jäger, Koschwitz, and Treusch-Dieter 2001).⁶² Some organisations of the unemployed continued their protests in front of the job centres in February of 1999. Other activities such as symbolic actions were seen in October 1998, thus one month after the electoral success of the red-green government, at the “world savings day” in front of a shopping centre.

From 2002 social protest started up again, this time with a stronger emphasis on entering the streets. Although the peak of the protest wave on the Hartz reform was not to come until summer 2004, some protest activities started in 2002. As one unemployment activist remembers: *“And then the situation changed, since 2002 ... in May 2002 the Hartz protests started. There was a congress organised by the DGB, then there were protest activities. When the Hartz commission was initiated the round table of unemployed was founded. ... That was during the election year, in October 2002. And until the elections various demonstrations and actions had been organised, that were however poorly attended”* (Interview 9:1). A roundtable made up mainly of unemployment activists and the Anti-Hartz alliance, one of the many initiatives opposing the reform was founded in October 2002, and also included other actors such as left wing unionists and groups, but also unemployed people.

In 2003 the protest activities continued when Agenda 2010 was debated at a special party conference of the SPD. The Agenda was criticised for its social implications by many party members as well as the peak union organisation DGB. A major national demonstration was organised in November 2003 in which a hundred thousand people took to the streets in Berlin, a protest mainly organised by local initiatives from below. In April 2004, this time with the support of the unions - the first time that a German trade union participated in a major demonstration against a social-democratic government - another protest event was organised, being the biggest event ever set up by a union against a Social-Democratic government, as more than half a million people gathered simultaneously in Berlin, Stuttgart, and Köln.

⁶² The content analysis this information is taken from ends in 1999 (Zorn, 2004). The local activities seem however to have continued according to various interviews with unemployment activists.

The participation of the unions in the protest was however an isolated event. Although the unions did participate in mobilisations in the spring of 2004, joining for the first time protest actions against a left-wing government, the DGB as an organisation was not present as a mobilising force during the summer 2004 protest wave. Only some local branches of the DGB participated in the protest, and the DGB did not officially call for the action. The unions, rather than being considered an ally in the 2004 protest, instead became the target of action due to their active role in the Hartz-commission. For example, the union member from ver.di on the commission was criticised by organisations of the unemployed for his position during the bargaining process. The unions, although they were important allies for the unemployed during the 1998 protests, agreed with the policy of the red-green government and even supported cuts in social assistance for young unemployed people if they refused to take part in state apprenticeship programs. While before 1998 the Kohl government was held responsible for growing unemployment figures and increasing social inequality by the unions, no such claims could be found after the elections until 2000, as a content analysis of the Süddeutsche newspaper shows (Baum, Baumgarten, and Lahusen 2005). From September 1998 until the end December 2000 there are no major accusations from the unions towards the government registered. Many unemployment activists criticise this withdrawal from protest politics just before the fourth package of the reform was introduced.

Unemployed people took matters into their own hands however. One unemployed person tells the story of the initial phase of the protest, when all over Germany people took to the streets: *“And then surprisingly... In summer the law passed the Bundesrat (upper house of the German parliament, A. Z.) in the beginning of July, and ten days later the questionnaire, the application form was already sent out. And then people became aware of it. And then also in the media a lot of reports that the law was passed was published. ... I remember well, I was in Dresden at the summer academy of attac, and the people from Senftenberg came where they had been to a demonstration, one of the very first demonstrations, and were enthusiastic “wow that’s corky, the people go to the streets. And then it also started in Berlin [...] That was amazing, that so many people immediately went off to the streets, that was phenomenal. No single leaflet was printed, there were no posters, nothing. Only through the media and the concern and anger of the people, they went off to the*

streets.” (Interview 27:5f). The protest cycle started from the grassroots level, and was organised only loosely on a local level in the form of social forums or roundtables, with no central coordination as in 1998. No major organisations or groups initially called for action, with established organisations and politicians joining the protest wave only later. The big organisations however never dominated the events. The constituency of the protest cycle was not only unemployed people, but also students and employed people supporting the protest. A variety of social movement organisations, such as the global movement organisation Attac, also joined the mobilisations. Regional elections in the two eastern federal states of Saxony and Brandenburg also resulted in participation by politicians. Participation in these protest events was popular, since most of the population was critical of the labour market reform. Furthermore, a new leftwing political party (WASG), a gathering of left social democrats disappointed by the governing social democrats, was founded in 2003, stressing social justice and employment as their main political targets, supported the protest marches. Indeed many individuals unsatisfied with the political decisions of their trade unions or the social-democratic party engaged in the various Anti-Hartz alliances founded since the announcement of the reform.⁶³

Discussion

Comparing the welfare state characteristics of France and Germany, and more specifically comparing their unemployment benefit systems, provides us with a better understanding of the different contexts in which unemployed actors move. Although France and Germany are similar in many respects regarding unemployment rates, insurance based unemployment benefit payments, and radical changes in unemployment policies, the discussion suggests that there are some important differences between the two countries.

It seems that the importance of the topic of social exclusion and the diverse roles of trade unions in the management of unemployment benefits in France provide organisations of the unemployed with better chances to enter the public debate. That is, in France unions are more visible in the field of unemployment politics. Unions fighting to retain their important role in the French social security system are probably

⁶³ As one unemployment expert mentions: *“Previously the unemployed initiatives stew in their own juice. There was a different precondition with the Hartz reform, for the initiatives, because of the Hartz movement, since there also employed people engaged, also people from unions joined, critical unionists”* (Interview 25:13).

important in the different issues dominating the French debate as compared to Germany. The issues debated in the contentious politics of unemployment in France are mostly issues concerning the welfare state and social benefits, whereas the German debate is dominated by social-economic questions. Although trade unions may not defend the rights of the unemployed, the emphasis of the public debate on the welfare system and social benefits seems to be favourable for the unemployed to enter the debate as concerned experts. Therefore a debate that is generally dominated by issues such as social benefits, social exclusion, and the welfare state appears to provide the unemployed with better opportunities to enter the debate and be heard, while a technical and abstract debate seems to assign them only a marginal role.

Regarding the national mobilisation waves in France and Germany, the dynamic opportunities of the unemployment policies only partly explain the timing of major mobilisation waves. As described in the first section of the chapter, since the beginning of the 1990s France and Germany have faced major changes in their welfare states. These changes worsened the situation of unemployed people in that benefits were reduced and measures introduced that made benefits conditional on active job seeking, often implying checks on unemployed people and the duty to take up jobs regardless of qualifications. These changes in unemployment protection and labour market reform in Germany and France did not, however, simply translate into protest politics. In France, for example, activation measures were introduced during the 1990s and targeted activation measures expanded in the late 1990s and generalised between 2000 and 2001. Only in 2004 was a protest wave washing over Germany, targeting a specific reform project.

In France it seems that the general critic at left parties and traditional unions provided a fruitful ground for a broad alliances of activists to forcefully put social issues on the public agenda. Though unions did not always act as a reliable alliance partner – in fact, some unions are rather the target of unemployed people's activities – the fact the many activists came from a critical union background gave the topic unemployment a specific connotation. Unemployment was framed as a social issues and/or unemployed considered, despite the framing of some minority organisations – as previously employed. Unemployment was therefore either considered as a topic to be taken care of by new forms of union activism or the 'social' was emphasized so that an alliance with all groups that were considered to be excluded from French

society – the so-called have-nots – was built. Both types of collective actions and framings connected to it were favoured by a climate of broad critique at traditional union policy in France and the public debate on social exclusion.

Two favourable conditions came together in 1998 that may explain the first large unemployment mobilisation in post-war Germany: a cognitive re-structuring of the field and a dynamic political opportunity. Firstly, the French mobilisation of the unemployed that preceded the German protest wave showed the unemployed that they were able to protest. Secondly, the campaign for national elections in September 1998 provided a dynamic favourable opportunity structure.

The German protests took place immediately after the French unemployed occupied job centres all over France. The successful French protest mobilisation was extensively reported in Germany from December 1997 onwards. Only one month later, at the end of January 1998, the German coordination of union unemployed groups (KOS), with around 900 groups all over Germany, called for a national demonstration day.⁶⁴ The French protests swept over the border in a ‘cross-national diffusion of protest’ (Kriesi et al 1995) via the indirect channel of newspaper reports⁶⁵, but also via direct channels where French activists were invited to meetings of organisations of the unemployed. Some of the German protest actions at the peak of the German mobilisations in May 1998 were in fact joint actions by German and French organisations at the French-German border. In the same month another trans-national protest day was also jointly organised by German, Belgian, French and Dutch unemployed people.⁶⁶

The French protest wave, although it displayed very different dynamics, showed the Germans that they were able to fight against further reductions in unemployment and social benefits and the tightening of employment measures. The French protest cycle, which was taken up by German organisations of the unemployed, worked as a process of the cognitive restructuring of the action field (della Porta 2005). It created injustice frames, so that individual grievances could be translated into anger,

⁶⁴ Taz 23.1.1998

⁶⁵ In an interview with the German weekly ‘Spiegel’ some of the main organisers of the protests in 1998 mention that they got the idea to organise unemployment protests themselves after watching the news about French protests on the television (see Baumgarten 2004:14).

⁶⁶ At the European level too the European network of the unemployed (ENU) invited representatives of unemployment initiatives in April 1999.

but also gave actors a feeling of being able to challenge the dominant interpretation, and especially about their ability to act collectively and become a collective actor. While in France it was a coalition of the moral left of the middle class and the labour movement that empowered the unemployed to mobilise by changing their self-perceptions during the broader protest wave of the ‘mouvement de sans’ (Royall 1998), it was those empowered French actors that had a similar effect on the German jobless. By showing the unemployed that they *could* mobilise was to activate a self-fulfilling prophecy.

A second important condition was the national elections of September 1998. In Germany a climate of labour market crisis had dominated the political debates, and the conservative government in power for the previous 16 years was held responsible. The hope to topple the conservative government and replace it with a social-democratic that would be much more sympathetic towards the unions made the unions a strong ally of the opposition election campaign. After the unions’ unemployed groups first announced their protests, the peak organisation DGB followed up with sympathetic public statements shortly after.

As Kriesi and his colleagues (1995) show, a socialist party in opposition during an electoral campaign is a rather favourable political opportunity for mobilisations. During the election campaign the unions remained important allies of the unemployed mobilisations. The unions had a great interest in a change of government from the conservative CDU to the Social democrats, also indicated by the main slogan of the protest wave: ‘Kohl has to go’.⁶⁷

However, the political opportunity structure tells only half the story. That is, while the political opportunity structure seems to have been more open to organisations of the unemployed during the 1998-cycle of protest, with a conservative Christian

⁶⁷ That is, the political opportunity approach was used to define the level of mobilisation and the forms of collective activities used by different types of social movements (see Kriesi et al 1995). There are general patterns of a political system that are assumed to facilitate levels of mobilisation, such as the openness and closure of the political system. Usually, the political opportunity approach assumes mobilisations will be stronger during periods of centre-right government. However, this assumption does not hold for the mobilisations in France, or in Italy, where the left wing government was perceived as betraying left wing ideas (della Porta 2006). The contentious unemployment politics in Germany is another example, while the 1998 mobilisation follows the pattern of a mobilisation enjoying the support of left wing allies during an election campaign to substitute a centre-right government, this is not the case for the 2004 mobilisation. Here, as in France and Italy, the politics of the red-green government are perceived as hurting the left wing principles of social justice and defence of the rights of the formerly employed. Much more important than left-wing allies for the mobilisation’s success was the support of public opinion.

democratic party in government and the unions as allies, the protest wave of 2004 was nevertheless much stronger. For organisations of the unemployed, as weak actors, support from established actors is assumed to be important, although “... *the support [by established actors] will often be superficial and easily withdrawn. Overall this will lead to a lower and less stable level of mobilisation for new challengers*” (Koopmans 1992:14). This is indeed what happened after the social-democratic party came into power in 1998. After the disappointment of unemployed activists over the unions’ withdrawal from protest activities precisely when the implementation of the fourth and most important package of the reform was to be decided in the national parliament, organisations of the unemployed were forced to take matters into their own hands. That is, while in 1998 support from trade unions and social-democrats in the opposition seemed to be important conditions for the strength of the protest wave, in 2004 the mobilisation did not suffer from the withdrawal of the union’s support. Once the unemployed had cognitively restructured their field of action, they seemed to be more independent from established actors as supporters in the second cycle of protest.

Thus, it seems that for unemployed people to successfully organise protest actions and enter the public debate on unemployment in a sustainable manner, concrete opportunities as well as more general favourable conditions must be combined. The existence of national interest organisations of the unemployed did indeed not provide a sufficient conditions for major protest waves to evolve, but certain favourable contexts had to develop and be developed by the actors to provide a fruitful ground for contentious agency of the unemployed. Having said that, however, it is often not clear how and whether these contentious contexts stabilize over time. As I will show in the following two parts of the thesis, local organisations of the unemployed are the roots of this contentious agency and are not only spaces where joint activities are organised, but also places where disruptive action as a main power tool for this movement of have-nots is stabilised over time.

Conclusion of the first part

Grievances did not cause the protests against the Hartz reform, nor did unemployment rates or a specific reform project alone cause popular unrest among the unemployed. An important pre-condition seems to be the responses of the two governments on the challenges posed by unemployment, and the associated radical changes. As the discussion of the social movement literature and the national mobilisation waves suggests, however, different opportunities have to come together for the unemployed to be able to raise public attention via protest actions.

The discussion of the national protest waves, the changes in unemployment policies and the types of actors involved in a contentious debate on unemployment provided insights into some important differences between the two countries. In France, the role of trade unions in both the system of social security protection and public debate provided the unemployed with a more favourable setting to enter the public debate in a sustainable way. While official trade unions in both countries were ambivalent allies for the unemployed, the discussion suggested that in France the unions - despite the crucial support of the non-official unions unavailable in Germany – indirectly provide important support.

The present study does not however aim to contribute to the theoretical and empirical studies on national mobilisations of the unemployed. The discussion of these national protest waves, the changes in unemployment politics and features of the public debates simply describes the wider context in which the local organisations of the unemployed move.

The contentious field of unemployment – that is organisations of the unemployed, pro-unemployed organisations and other actors mobilising on behalf of the unemployed, as well as other organisations engaged in the topic of 'unemployment' is made up of many different organisations, from small informal groups to more formal organisations. Many different organisations and individuals from various organisational and non-organisational backgrounds are involved with the topic of unemployment and describe themselves as belonging to a collective actor of unemployed. Local organisations of the unemployed are but a small sector of the movement. They will be at the centre of the empirical discussions in the next two parts.

As I have argued, while we have gained important insights into the national protest waves and the major organisations involved, we lack knowledge about the local roots of the contentious agency of the unemployed. There are no studies that give insights into the types of actors present on the local level, nor into the activities these local organisations are engaged in, particularly in a comparative perspective. The special focus of the present study is the disruptive strategies used by these local organisations that are assumed to be crucial power tools for poor people's actors. Combining various arguments from different theoretical perspectives from social movement studies, I aim to explain the moderation of groups' tactics, or their inclination to use disruptive strategies instead.

SECOND PART

Reconstructing fields of unemployed people's actors: Local infrastructure, organisations' action strategies and features of a local struggle

Introduction to the second part

In *chapter 1*, organisations were categorised into two main forms (Clemens and Minkoff 2004). Criticising mass membership organisations of the old left, Piven and Cloward (1977) argue that organisations are disadvantageous for social movement activity. According to this view, organisations are the opposite of successful movement activity, which is understood as the ability of actors to disrupt the business of everyday politics. In contrast, the second form conceives social movements as the critical element in distinguishing “*ineffective grievances from potentially consequential protest*” (Clemens and Minkoff 2004:155). Resource mobilisation, however, focuses on a specific type of organisation without taking into account the various forms and roles of the different types of organisations for social movement activity. As Clemens and Minkoff (2004) point out, however, studies on social movement organisations has moved beyond these opposing concepts over the past few years by identifying different forms of organisations and looking at organisations as arenas for developing practices and identities for activism. The second part of this thesis aims to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between different types of organisations and their role in protest waves, as well as places where and how various forms of contentious agency of the unemployed develops.

As described in *chapter 3*, different types of organisations of the unemployed and supporting organisations are engaged in unemployed people's movements in France and Germany. Whilst well-structured organisations with formal membership, such as unions and political parties, are often part of social movements, local networks of small informal organisations, such as small grass-roots organisations or citizens

committees, also form a crucial part. Indeed, local networks of organisations of the unemployed have often played a significant role in the national mobilisation of the unemployed (Lahusen and Baumgarten 2006). For this reason, local organisations of the unemployed are at the heart of the empirical investigation in the second and third part of the thesis.

The second part of this thesis aims to provide an insight into the activities of these local actors (i.e. local organisations of the unemployed) in order to gain a better understanding of what these local organisations do and how they engage in movements of the unemployed. It focuses, in particular, on how unemployed people respond to the question of ‘how shall we organise’ (Clemens 1996) and ‘what shall we do’ and how the response to this question leads to different types of organisations of the unemployed.

The second part aims to answer three interrelated questions. Firstly, it examines the relationship between local organisations of the unemployed and their involvement in social movement activity. More specifically, it aims to describe the relationship between organisations, social movements and collective protest action. Secondly, it aims to describe the extent to which protest activity of the unemployed has developed roots to the extent that one could speak of the institutionalisation of unemployed action. Thirdly, it will describe when and how unemployed people enter the public space in order to deal with their affairs and how other collective actors provide a space for unemployed people to do so.

Thus, in the second part of this thesis, the local organisations of the unemployed and the context in which they mobilise will be described in more detail. *Chapter 4* introduces the local organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin. The differences and similarities of: (i) the organisational infrastructure, (ii) the characteristics of the movements, and (iii) the main activities of local organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin are presented in *table 4.1*. Specific aspects of the three dimensions of the contentious fields are investigated in subsequent parts of this thesis. Particular attention is paid to the different political opportunities in both countries and how they help to explain unemployed action in these countries, as well as the particularities of unemployed action in general beyond these differences.

In *chapter 5*, a more systematic analysis of the different forms of collective action the organisations are engaged in is provided. *Chapter 5* develops different types of organisations of the unemployed based on the different social, political and cultural strategies of the organisations. The chapter focuses on organisations as sites constructing a number of action strategies, as well as the different meaning the same action can have for different organisations. In fact, it will be shown that local organisations differ significantly in the way that they assign meaning to activities and how this leads to different types of organisations.

Finally, *chapter 6* provides an in-depth account of the struggle for a transport ticket for unemployed people in Berlin, which was one of the main topics discussed in the Berlin field of contention. *Chapter 6* aims to describe the different dynamics of the struggle, pointing to the reorganisation of the field of actors engaged in this domain and, in particular, the possibility for unemployed people to participate in the debate. This chapter is particularly useful for analysing the linkages between unemployed actors and other actors, for example, looking at how other actors might occupy public spaces or provide entry points for unemployed actors to engage in the debates. Thus, a more dynamic view on the interaction between different actors is central to *chapter 6*, with a specific focus on unemployed people and their ability to enter the public space. Focussing on a struggle instead of focussing on local organisations is particularly useful to trace dynamics in the field of unemployed actors.

Apart from *chapter 5* and the first two sections of *chapter 4*, the second part of this thesis provides more detailed information on the contentious field in Berlin. References will also be made to organisations in Paris in the following sections in order to place the Berlin analysis in context. The concluding section will elaborate on the features that are common to both fields of contention and local organisations of unemployed people beyond the context of Berlin.

Chapter 4

Contentious fields for local organisations of the unemployed. Organisational infrastructure, unemployed people's movements and issues raised

The study of unemployed people's activism in Paris and Berlin required extensive discussions during the process of data collection with unemployed activists on the similarities and differences between both countries. German activists, who have organised protest activities since 1998 (see above), pay close attention to the activities of their French 'fellow sufferers'. French mobilisation often served as a role model for the unemployed people's movement in Germany. The protests in France in the winter of 1997 were viewed as an example of good protest practice and it was an important factor in enabling a national protest wave of unemployed people in Germany. On the other side of the river Rhine, French activists spoke about their collaboration with German activists in the context of the European march in 1997. Protest friendships developed between the activists in the context of the first *Euromarch* events in 1997 and the French-German axis was crucial in the organisation of the subsequent *Euromarch* in 2007. French activists also proudly speak about the joint protests of French and German unemployed activists in 1998 during which they showed their German counterparts how to occupy a job centre in Bonn. Most French and German activists agree that French unemployed activists "*are - similar to other protest politics - one step ahead*" (Interview 6:5). Most of them also agree that an unemployed people's movement exists, while no such movement exists at present in Germany (see below).

This chapter firstly compares some of the general characteristics of the two fields in Berlin and Paris. Thus, before turning to the individual organisations of unemployed people's actors in Paris and Berlin, I will firstly describe some of the characteristics of the two fields of contention in order to describe the general similarities and differences between the two fields of unemployed actors. Specific aspects of each of these dimensions will be addressed in *chapter 4*, as well as in subsequent chapters. The *table 4.1* introduces some of the major characteristics of the

two fields of actors and the most important of these will be subsequently discussed in more detail. I will then link the founding of the organisations to the major protest waves on unemployment and other more structural features in both countries in order to identify the different types of organisations with regard to the role that they play within social movements. In this regard, I aim to develop a more nuanced understanding of the different types of local organisations of the unemployed as social movement actors (see Clemens and Minkoff, 2004). In the next section, I will describe in more detail some framing attempts of the organisations of the unemployed, namely, their ‘diagnostic framing’ (Snow and Benford 1988), and their attempt to translate individual distress into a political language. This section aims to describe the type of framing activities the organisations of the unemployed are engaged in and the issues these actors mainly deal with at the local level to challenge the assumption of (local) actors being primarily concerned with material claims and only transcend their material world when they are linked to more general cycles of protest or global movements. I will then see to respond to the question of whether the issue of unemployment is mainly considered as a conflict to be dealt with by the old or new social movements. In the final section, I will discuss the differences and similarities in light of the general opportunities and the specific contentious cultures in both countries.

4.1 “That is typically French.” Comparing some general characteristics of the two fields in Paris and Berlin

Table 4.1 provides an overview of some of the characteristics of the two fields of contention in both cities. The table compares the following three dimensions of the two fields of contention in Paris and Berlin: the organisational infrastructure, the characteristics of the contentious field, and the main activities used by organisations of the unemployed.

Organisational infrastructure

The table firstly describes some characteristics of the organisational field, namely, the number of local organisations of the unemployed engaged in both cities, the presence of other national organisations of the unemployed, and the organisational identity of the local organisations (i.e. whether the organisations have a strong affiliation or belong to established organisations such as unions or left-wing political parties). Furthermore, regarding the organisational infrastructure, the age of the

organisations and the ‘foundation dynamic’ - in other words, the issue of whether organisations are founded *ad-hoc* and only survive for a short period of time or whether they have existed for a long time - will be examined.

The table indicates, firstly, that more local organisations of the unemployed exist in Berlin in comparison to Paris. In Berlin, 16 organisations were identified during the period of empirical investigation, while only six local organisations of the unemployed were identified in Paris.⁶⁸ Due to the centralised structure of the French political system, all national organisations representing the interests of unemployed are based in Paris, while this is not the case in Berlin. In Germany, the national office of the east German interest organisation, *ALV Deutschland*, and the coordination office of the union organisations of the unemployed *KOS*, have been located in Berlin for many years, while other national networks and organisations (such as the *Netzwerk Grundeinkommen*⁶⁹, a network mobilising for the basic income *BAG-SHI*, and an interest organisation of social and unemployment benefit recipients) are located in other German cities.

Table 4.1 also shows the different organisational identity of local organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin. In Berlin, five union organisation of the unemployed are active; in Paris, an unemployed people’s organisation was only founded within the *CGT* union. Furthermore, one organisation in Paris and two organisations in Berlin are affiliated to radical left-wing parties, although they do not officially belong to these parties.

⁶⁸ For further information on the definition of the population see the Appendix.

⁶⁹ The network does not actually have an office, its work is carried out by individuals throughout Germany.

Table 4.1– General characteristics of the two contentious fields

	Paris	Berlin
Organisational infrastructure		
Number of local organisations of the unemployed	8 organisations* (Apeis ⁷⁰ , Assol, CPP, CGT chômeur, AC!, AC! 19-20, AC! nord ouest, AC! collectif)	16 organisations** (Elvis, Erwin, Sige, Erwerbslose Verdi, Erwerbslose Metall, Soziales Aktionsbündnis, Erwerbslose GEW, Anders arbeiten, Ermutigungskreis, Erwerbslose Bau, Kampagne, no service, Anti-Hartz Bündnis, Erwerbslose NGG)
Presence of national organisations of the unemployed	MNCP, Apeis nationale, CGT chômeur nationale.	ALV Deutschland, KOS
Organisational identity of local organisations	-1 trade union organisation -1 close to radical left party -3 organisations with no organisational identity -All organisations belong to a national organisation/ network	-5 trade union organisations of the unemployed -2 organisations close to radical left-wing parties -7 organisations with no organisational identity -6 organisations belonging to a national organisation/ network
Life span and foundation dynamic	Relatively stable organisational infrastructure: old organisations, new organisations are rarely established	Relatively unstable regarding organisations; relatively stable regarding single activists, many new organisations established, few old organisations
Characteristics of movements		
Perceived existence of a movement?	Yes	No
Major protest waves and national mobilisation	Institutionalised national mass mobilisation in Paris organised by the same unemployed people's organisations on an annual basis.	Sporadic national mass mobilisation in Berlin organised by different organisations and networks.
Main issues	Many topics relating to poverty such as electricity, housing and transport Social Europe, struggles relating to the "recalculated," the "question d'urgence social" and transport.	Many different topics such as activation measures and control, struggles relating to transport, the so-called 1-Euro-jobs, self-representation and evictions
Activities of local organisations of the unemployed		
Use of disruptive activities and frames	3 out of 5 organisations	6 out of 14 organisations
Provision of services	3 out of 5 organisations	6 out of 14 organisations

* The following organisations of the unemployed in Paris have not been included in this study: AC! nord ouest; AC! 19-20; AC! collectif. In the following sections, reference will be made exclusively to the organisations that are part of the study.

** The following organisations of the unemployed in Berlin have not been included in this study: Montagsdemo; Arbeitslosenverband Berlin (ALV Berlin). As mentioned above, reference will only be made to the organisations that are under investigation in this study

⁷⁰ The full names of the organisations are listed in the 'List of organisations' in the Appendix.

While unemployed activists in Germany have tried in vain since the 1980s to organise the many unemployed organisations into (one) national interest organisation(s), this was not very difficult to achieve in France. In Paris, all organisations of the unemployed belong to national organisations or national networks. In Paris, there are two member organisations of the national organisation of the unemployed, *MNCP*.⁷¹ *Apeis Paris* is the local branch of the national organisation, *Apeis nationale*. Furthermore, *AC!* is considered as a platform in that it has a horizontal network structure, but local organisations similar to those belonging to other national organisations, identify with *AC!* and are formal members of the network.⁷² Finally, the union organisation of the unemployed, *CGT chômeur*, is also based in Paris, which, as mentioned above, is part of the CGT trade union. In Germany only six organisations belong to a national organisation or network, of which five are trade union organisations of the unemployed. This means that non-union organisations of the unemployed in Berlin act as independent local or regional organisations but do not ally with national organisations or networks. This is not the case in Paris, where non-union organisations also align with national organisations, such as the *MNCP*, *Apeis* or *AC!*. *Aktionsbündnis Sozialproteste* is the only organisation that belongs to a national network, *Sozialprotest*⁷³, which is the most active national network organising protest activity on social topics.

The German field of unemployed people's actors has been divided into three main strands based on the broader organisational background of these organisations (Wolski-Prenger 1997; Gallas 1994) This includes, firstly, the organisations of the unemployed which developed within the framework of the charity and engagement of the church and/or welfare organisations for excluded or poor people. Secondly, unemployed people began to organise themselves within the unions in order to ensure that their interests were represented. Thirdly, so-called independent organisations also

⁷¹ The national organisation of the unemployed developed as a collection of various local organisations of the unemployed. Although a well-structured national organisation exists today, local organisations develop in very different ways, often depending on the local context in which they emerge. At present, most of the organisations in the smaller cities are member organisations of the *MNCP* (there are currently 39 local associations). Whilst member organisations of the *MNCP* are independent to a large degree with regard to their activities, they must all agree on a common statute.

⁷² *AC!* received a lot of media attention in the 1990s, and was one - if not the most important - organisations of the unemployed in the wave of protests of the winter of 1997. During the 1990s, it comprised of many different social actors. The mobilisation in the context of this platform mainly involved activists from the radical left. For more information, see *chapter 3* on unemployed people's movements in France and Germany.

⁷³ See <http://www.die-soziale-bewegung.de>

exist within the German field of contention, which are not connected to any major interest organisation.

All three types of organisations of the unemployed are available in the two fields of unemployed people's actors in Berlin and Paris. There is a heterogeneous network of formal unemployed people's organisations, informal organisations, individuals and networks who protest, publish, lobby, and try in many different ways to raise a voice from below on the topic of unemployment. In comparison to Paris, Berlin shows a more decentralised organisational infrastructure. While the third type of actor is the most common type of unemployed people's actor in Berlin, this type - although present - is just one of many in Paris. Thus, in Berlin, local as well as national mobilisation seems to rely on a loose and decentralised organisational infrastructure, comprising a large number of organisations and associations. Not all of the organisations consider themselves as unemployment initiatives or are carried out mainly by unemployed people. In Paris, large protest events are instead organised by the national branches of *Apeis*, *MNCP*, *AC!* and *CGT chômeur*.⁷⁴

Thus, the French organisational landscape seems to be more clearly arranged than the German field of contestation, as the latter does not have any major national organisations to which the local organisations belong. Whilst a heterogeneous and decentralised field of unemployed organisations exists in Germany, the unemployed are organised in a national unemployed interest organisation in France. Furthermore, the field of unemployed people's actors in Paris is made up of an older organisational

⁷⁴ Furthermore, 'social movement experts' are part of the networks and connect people and organisations with each other in both cities. During my field studies, I had the impression that there is a major difference between Paris and Berlin in that there is a clearer organisational division, which is also present at the level of the individual. In other words, while in Berlin individual activists are essential for connecting organisations and are often loosely connected to various organisations, in Paris, core unemployment activists do not seem to engage in organisations belonging to different national groupings. Indeed, as Della Porta and Diani have stated: "*people do not usually join organizations which perceive each other as radically incompatible ...*" (della Porta and Diani, 2006:116) In Paris, although organisations of the unemployed are unified as a collective actor, they nevertheless emphasise the different organisational identities of the various organisations. In Berlin, it seems that overlapping membership is more frequent as more organisations are independent groups whose organisational identity is not based on the identity of an established organisation, such as a union, welfare organisation or a political party. At the same time, this leads to tensions regarding who speaks on behalf of whom. During the various organisation and network meetings in Berlin, there were some disagreements about the ways in which people should speak - as individuals or as representatives of organisations. In Paris, these conflicts were not as prominent. For instance, one unemployment activist stated that it is usually clear on behalf of whom you are speaking: "*You can have two hats but you always know at which moment you are going to have to put on which [organisational] hat*" (Interview 15:9).

structure than the field in Berlin. I will discuss this aspect in more detail in *section 4.2* on the founding stories below.

Characteristics of the movements

Table 4.1 also compares some characteristics of the contentious fields: firstly, the perception of the actors of the existence of a movement of the unemployed; secondly, the existence of major protest waves on the topic of unemployment or similar issues; and thirdly, the main issues raised by organisations engaged in the subject of unemployment in Paris and Berlin.

Table 4.1 shows that unemployed activists in France and Germany perceive the existence of an unemployed people's movement differently. In Berlin, there were two protest waves during the past decade and many local protests also took place in between these peaks of mobilisation. Nevertheless, most of the unemployed activists in the field of contention in Berlin do not refer to a 'social movement of and for the unemployed'. This does not mean that the unemployed activists do not mention any collective activities or other organisations engaged within the field. Despite the many social protests that have taken place since 1998 and the comparably dense organisational infrastructure, no common ground has been defined for these collective actors in terms of a social movement or a common collective actor. Even after one of the strongest mobilisation waves in post-war Germany - the mobilisation wave of the summer of 2004 - the unemployed movement is perceived as rather weak. Some unemployed activists even deny the existence of a movement altogether. In this vein, unemployed experts also refer to the need *"... to speak of an unemployed movement. [...] For a city of 3 million people, we have relatively weak unemployment protests compared to other cities. They occur from time to time, in different constellations makes different activities. But a real unemployed movement? I find it difficult to call it that. Not that we have been inactive, we have managed to do some things, it is not that we have been dormant. But it is always a very small circle of people in Berlin that triggers that off. In different accentuations and different institutional interlockings [...] it is a small circle of people that initiates something, also the Monday demonstration of Berlin was initiated by 15 to 20 people"* (Interview 25:5). In contrast, unemployed people's actors in Paris do not usually question the existence of such a movement. French unemployed activists mention conflicts between

organisations but at the same time, French activists stress the need for a unified actor of the unemployed.

Furthermore, *Table 4.1* outlines the main issues that were raised by unemployed activists during the period of empirical investigation. In France, unemployed activists were engaged mainly on issues relating to social exclusion and struggles to defend the social rights of unemployed people, in particular, with regard to social assistance. Attempts to cut off the electricity of people who could not pay their bills or to evict people from their homes in cases where they could not afford their rent any longer were among the most important issues in France. Indeed, in the French context, being on social welfare is connected to other poverty issues. As one activist states: *“To say that unemployment is a problem of employment is not completely true. In the end, solving the problem of unemployment involves not only providing ‘employment’. Solving unemployment also means solving the housing problem, better health, better access to health, better access to education. It requires taking the person into consideration, helping people to regain the capacity to find employment again”* (Interview 16:14) The problem of unemployment is mainly connected to the individual situation of distress in its various components, such as problems relating to housing, health and education. Further, a major struggle concerned the so-called “recalculated”, which involved supporting unemployed people who were at risk of falling out of categories guaranteeing the right to social benefits.

In Berlin, the most important struggles concerned the new Hartz reform in terms of its controlling mechanisms and activation measures. Furthermore, the fight against the so-called “1-Euro-jobs” was significant in that it was framed as being forced to work. The struggle for a transport ticket for the unemployed was an important issue for organisations engaged on the topic of unemployment, as well as the organisations of the unemployed, framing the conflict in many different ways. Finally, the issue of self-determination and self-representation were important topics in the Berlin field. I will discuss these topics of the Berlin contentious field in more detail in *section 4.3*. French activists tend to frame the topic of unemployment in terms of class conflict and social exclusion. In contrast, many German activists describe the problem of unemployment in tradition with topics crucial for the new social movements, such as state control, self-determination and alternative life forms, and a critic at representative forms of policy making.

The role of the European Union is viewed differently by local actors in Paris and Berlin. Whilst I did not recognise that the European Union was of major interest to the unemployed actors in Berlin neither as a target of their activities nor as a political space to look for alliances, the first person I interviewed in Paris had been engaged in the European Marches for the past ten years. In addition, one person based in the office of the national network of the unemployed organisations is specialised in the subject of the organisation of European Marches. Indeed the *MNCP* orients a major part of its activities towards the European level by also organising a European Network March.

An important similarity that is not mentioned in the table above relates to the perception that the ‘traditional’ moderate left-wing parties (social-democrats in Germany and socialists in France) have betrayed left-wing ideas. Unemployed activists in both countries criticise the role that these political actors played during the introduction of welfare reform in their countries and are extremely critical of the traditional left parties, forming a challenge from the left.

Main activities

The third section of *table 4.1* describes the main strategies used by organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin. While organisations can usually draw on a broad range of collective action – protest and non-protest activities – organisations usually only combine a few forms of action. The specific combination described somehow the main characteristic of the organisations compared to others.

Table 4.1 does not list all of the possible activities and strategies used by the organisations of the unemployed. The most important strategies and how these form various types of organisations will be discussed in detail in the next chapter. Instead two crucial forms of action have been selected, which are regarded as being of particular importance for social movement organisations, particularly for poor actors. The table describes, firstly, how many organisations use disruptive activities and frames. Disruptive strategies, as it was argued in the first chapter, are of particular importance for poor actors as they provide the movement’s power by disturbing the everyday welfare politics. As shown in *table 4.1* three out of five organisations use disruptive strategies in France, while six out of 14 organisations occasionally use disruptive strategies in Germany. Secondly, *table 4.1* shows how many organisations

provide caring activities to address the distress of unemployed people. This form of action is considered to be important as it is assumed to indicate an organisation's loss of political agency and a move to become an apolitical service provider. In Paris, three out of five organisations provide caring activities, while six of 14 organisations carry out such activities in Berlin. Thus, disruptive strategies as well as caring activities seem to be important for local organisations of the unemployed in both countries.

4.2 “Let's found an organisation”: founding stories and contexts for foundations

In the following section, the foundation of organisations of the unemployed will be traced. The foundation of organisations of the unemployed will be firstly illustrated by some of the founding stories of unemployed activists. Subsequently, these founding stories will be embedded in the context in which they emerge, with particular regard to the presence of waves of mobilisation, electoral campaigns and legal reform. In other words, the point in time in which the organisation was founded will be linked to national and local elections, national protest waves on the issue of unemployment and whether a major welfare reform was introduced.

Movement organisations and political initiatives of the unemployed are founded for many different reasons and emerge in various ways. Sometimes activists - engaged in other issues – become interested in the topic of unemployment and decide to found an initiative in order to ensure the continuity and visibility of their engagement. Other unemployed people feel alienated within a union-based organisation and want to become recognised as a social organisation and thus establish a working organisation of unemployed union people. In other cases, organisations of the unemployed are initiated from above within a larger organisation (e.g. union, welfare organisation, church) and are subsequently taken over by unemployed members. Sometimes organisations working on similar issues change their profile and decide to focus on the topic of unemployment. On some occasions, organisations initially established as self-help organisations have become more political over time and also engage in protest activities and other forms of collective action. Thus, there are many different paths that organisations may take in becoming an unemployed people's organisation.

During the interviews, the founding members often connect the establishment of the organisation to their own situation “... *of being personally concerned*” (Interview 4:1). The stories of unemployed activists combine personal experiences and the foundation of an organisation of unemployed people. Often, unemployed people connect the foundation of the unemployed people’s organisation to their own unemployment – even in cases where the activists did not experience unemployment for the first time or had already been unemployed since some time. One activist, for example, after having cared for her grandmother and mother for several years found it difficult to get back into the labour market. “*I took some time off for the simple reason that my grandmother was 95 and my mother got very ill, cancer in the final stage. For three years I was a domestic carer. [...] After this period, I was in a difficult situation and did not gain ground again and had to ask for social assistance. I did what the state asks us to do: engagement, caring for the family. But in the end, I was penalised for that with the loss of my existence*” (Interview 4:2) Having lost all of her contacts in the world of labour, the activist could not get back into the labour market and had to ask for income support. Once the activist entered the social welfare system, she experienced a sense of helplessness and a lack of information on the rights of the unemployed people in the job centres. “*I was in the awkward situation of having to ask for social assistance myself. And then I recognised how helpless people are, and I said I have to do something. [...] With some people we sat together and thought about what we could do. And then I said we could set up a counselling service, we could organise an unemployed breakfast. That was [some years ago], there the founding idea emerged*” (Interview 4:1) The motivation to found the organisation was inspired by the activist’s own experience of being affected by unemployment, rather than considering unemployment as an important issue and establishing an organisation in aid of unemployed people.

Telling founding stories and connecting them to personal experiences helps to give the activities of the organisation meaning and explain the specific strategies employed. Indeed, the plot of the story centres on the moment when the founder recognised how many people were in a situation of helplessness and lacking information. “*I recognised during encounters in the social assistance office that only very few people were able to answer back. For example, they would say, ‘If I answer back, I am worse off’. And most of the people did not know what they were entitled to.*

The information and counselling service that the social assistance office is obliged to offer did not take place in the past and takes place even less today” (Interview 4:3). The organisation’s most important activity consists of informing people about their social rights and putting them in a position to answer back.

Although personal concerns might be an important part of a person’s motivation to set up an unemployed people’s organisation, it is not sufficient. The above-mentioned activist was not simply unemployed; she was also engaged in the local office of a radical left-wing party and in previous protests in the city. The activist was also connected to other social movement activists in her locality. In addition, personal concern is not the only motivation to found an unemployed people’s organisation. Another unemployed activist for example mentions the need *“to do something about the incredible Hartz reform”* (Interview 1:3) The activist refers to the new legislation and the urgent need to organise opposition from below. The activist had been unemployed for several years but never considered engaging on the issue before. The idea to found a political initiative emerged in the spring of 2004 in the context of a critical debate from below during the incremental introduction of the Hartz reform by the German government. The idea to found an organisation was raised after some people met to discuss the issue of *“domination and free cooperation”* (Interview 1:3). An activist later stated that *“We are discussing here about abstract terms. But with Hartz IV we will be confronted with incredible things and nobody is doing anything about it”*(Interview 1:3) Thus, the initial idea of some unemployed people was to found an organisation that challenges the national welfare reform of the social-democratic government from below. Even though the founding members were unemployed as well, this was not the key motivating factor in establishing the organisation. Instead social movement activists who had been engaged on similar issues before decided to found organisation that specifically addressed the new welfare reform.

Some organisations are also founded from previously existing initiatives. Before and during the protest wave in Germany in 1998, many different initiatives, alliances and projects were founded and from which many other organisations emerged. Sometimes broad alliances existed in the beginning to organise some of the larger protest events. During these meetings, for example at a Round Table, people who

shared an interest in a certain type of activity founded an unemployed people's organisation, as was the case with the previously existing Piqueteros.

Another activist stated that the key motivation for founding an unemployed people's organisation was to carry the protest alliances that developed on a Berlin wide level to their local district. From the beginning, the main idea was that “...*we should also approach the unemployed in [our district]. So they can bestir themselves*” (Interview 5:1). Indeed the discussion of who should get involved and represent the interests of the unemployed was one of the main issues of conflict during the mobilisation in 1998. In Berlin, a tension had already emerged during the first mobilisation wave regarding self-representation and social movement actors advocating the interests of the unemployed. This is why an activist stated later in the interview “*We said, what is the use of a Round Table if you do not work at the local level?*” (Interview 5:13). The organisation thus stresses the importance of a close relationship with the people affected by unemployment and indicates that the foundation of an organisation is motivated by the desire to develop the capacity of unemployed people for political action.

These are some of the many founding stories that unemployed activists have shared in order to describe their motivation for establishing an organisation and to call for certain activities considered necessary to respond to the situation of unemployed people. However, it was only during certain periods that their ambitions could be translated into action. In other words, while there are various motivations for founding organisations of the unemployed, it could be argued that there are certain points in time that favour the emergence of a specific local movement structure. In the following *image 4.1*, the point in time in which the organisations were founded is linked to the presence of national protest waves in order to see what role protest waves have in foundation dynamics and the other way round. In *image 4.1* other contextual factors are also shown, such as the issue of whether a major reform was introduced that worsened the conditions of unemployed people and whether local or national elections had taken place. After discussing some general insights into the foundation dynamics of organisations of the unemployed, I will briefly discuss the interaction between protest waves and the foundations of organisations.

Image 4.1 – Date of foundation of local organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris, major reforms, national protest waves on the issue unemployment, and elections

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (LZW) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Movement research often points to the fluid borders and temporary character of local social movement organisations compared to other more formalised organisations, such as welfare organisations or unions (see, for example, della Porta and Diani, 2006). Indeed, the dynamic character of local organisations of the unemployed was observed during the empirical investigation. New organisations of the unemployed emerged during the two-year period of empirical investigation, while other organisations disappeared. Organisations also changed characteristics, some becoming rather big, while others shrank in size or changed their main goals and strategies.

The *image 4.1* describes, firstly, the lifespan and the point in time of the organisation's foundation. In Berlin, only one non-union organisation that had been founded during the protest wave in 1998 still existed during the period of the data collection. Erwin, a local unemployed people's organisation, is the only organisation founded at the beginning of the protest wave of 1998 that still existed during the time of my empirical investigations. Most of the non-union organisations are rather new and were founded in a relatively short time span of around two years between 2002 and the summer of 2004 and thus were founded shortly before the mobilisation wave against the Hartz reform, which started in July 2004. Considering that minor protests were already taking place in 2003 in Berlin, most organisations were thus founded during an atmosphere of increasing tension. In contrast, most union organisations were founded during the 1990s and before the protest wave of 1998.⁷⁵

Unlike Germany, all of the organisations had existed since the mobilisation wave in 1997 or even longer in Paris.⁷⁶ Most local organisations in Paris were founded before a major national protest wave in 1995, often considered as the forerunner of the unemployed people's protest in 1997 (see also *chapter 3*). *Assol* is the only local organisation of the unemployed founded in the 1980s. The local organisation, *Apeis*, was founded in 1994, and the *AC!* was mainly active in Paris in 1994 and *CPP* in

⁷⁵ Furthermore, a number of organisations are not shown in the image since they do not belong to the population of local organisations of the unemployed. They include: the regional branch of the East German unemployed interest organisation *ALV* founded at the beginning of the 1990s, and the unemployed service centre *BALZ* initiated by the church. Thus, most of the organisations that were founded before the first major protest wave in 1998 are formal organisations. They are union organisations of the unemployed, third sector organisations that assist unemployed people under the auspices of the Protestant Church, and the East German unemployed interest organisation, *ALV*.

⁷⁶ Recently some radical left activists have split from the *AC!* Platform, occupying the former offices of the national organisations and founding a new *AC!* collective (Cohen 2008).

1995. Only the union organisation of the unemployed *CGT chômeur* was founded in the year of the national protest wave of the unemployed.

Image 4.1 shows that the combination of local and presidential elections and a major protest wave on labour and social issues in Paris were preceded by the foundation of local organisations of the unemployed. Elections and the possibility to built alliances during these periods are indeed one of the favourable conditions of the ‘dynamic opportunity structure’ (Kriesi 1995) that enable protest waves to emerge. The atmosphere of increasing tension seems to have motivated the foundation of local organisations of the unemployed in Paris. Furthermore, all organisations were founded before the protest wave of the unemployed in the winter of 1997. This means that the protest wave itself did not result in the foundation of organisations, but the image suggests that the existence of these local organisations was important for the emergence of a protest wave on unemployment. It is also interesting to note that a major reform concerning unemployed people did not lead to the foundation of organisations. It appears that organisations were thus founded during periods of increasing waves of protest that addressed a much broader range of topics than simply unemployment. It could be argued, however, that the protest wave in France in the winter of 1997 was so strong because the organisations founded previously had already participated in a major protest wave and had gathered essential resources and experience for mobilisation. The existence of a movement infrastructure was however not enough to inspire major protest activities when the reform was announced and introduced.

In Berlin, similarly only one organisation of the unemployed was founded just before a national protest wave of the unemployed. However, it seems as though there were many more organisations active during that period in Berlin that did not survive until my empirical investigations started as the many organisations mentioned during the investigations suggest (as for example, a organisation founded in a West Berlin district by one unemployed activist, Hängematten, Glückliche Arbeitslose, Party of Schliengensief, union unemployed organisation of GEW, Monday demo II, Action alliance I II and III, Euromarsch, Piqueteros and others). Some of the previously existing organisations - even though they had only existed for a short period of time or consisted of not more than a handful of activists - were important reference points for newly emerging organisations. Two German organisations, No service and Erwin,

for example, refer to the activities of the Happy Unemployed, an organisation that only consisted of three people but successfully intervened in the public debate with new and provoking claims.

Most organisations, as stated above, were founded in the three years preceding the major protest wave against the Hartz IV reform. In this case, the combination of a major reform and a national protest wave is preceded by the foundation of local organisations of the unemployed. It seems as though the announcement of a reform, contrary to Paris, inspired the foundation of organisations. For example, the Campaign and the union organisation, Bau, were explicitly founded to deal with the subject of the Hartz reform. Similarly, the Anit-Hartz alliance was founded after the programme of the reform was publicly announced in 2002. Similar to Paris, national elections and a major protest waves were preceded by the foundation of organisations.

I propose identifying four different types of foundations of organisations, distinguished by the role or relationship of the organisations to the waves of mobilisation.

Catalysers

The first group of organisations is composed of organisations that are founded before the major mobilisation waves during periods of increased tension. These organisations could be regarded as a kind of a seismograph for measuring the mobilising potential in society some time before the actual protest actually takes place. Usually individuals belonging to larger organisations encourage the foundation of organisations during these phases by setting up organisations either within a larger organisation or beyond. The latter may consist of people who identify with other formal organisations but do not have their organisational home in a formal organisation, nor do the individuals act on behalf of another organisation. These organisations seem to consist of the most active movement entrepreneurs.

Surfers

The second group of organisations is composed of organisations founded in the beginning or during a major protest wave. These organisations use the mobilisation wave as an opportunity to get involved in politics from below, using the atmosphere of departure to encourage members of the public or people affected by unemployment to become politically involved. For these organisations the ‘take-off’ of protest

activities is an important founding resource. It is interesting to note that a self-help organisation in Berlin used the mobilisation wave to encourage people to join the organisation although the organisation does not engage and criticises the classical protest repertoire.

Submerged

Thirdly, there are organisations that are founded independently of the mobilisation waves. These organisations are also active during the latent phases of mobilisation (Melucci 1989), organising meetings and public events. These organisations are similar to social movement organisations of other movements belonging to a left-wing subculture and movement infrastructure. Sometimes these organisations have dealt with similar topics before, for example, a critique of corporate politics, and then take up the issue of unemployment when it becomes more contentious.

Occasional participants

The fourth type is composed of organisations that existed long before the mobilisation waves. These organisations participate in the mobilisation waves when there is the opportunity to do so, but also turn to other activities once the mobilisation wave is over. Occasionally, these organisations politicise their activities for a longer period or renew their political resources during these protest waves.

4.3 What is wrong with unemployment? Or the many claims of organisations of the unemployed in Berlin

Two implicit assumptions are often made about the unemployed people's claims. Firstly, it is assumed that the central aim of unemployed people's protest is material gain. The French unemployed protest wave in the winter of 1997 has been portrayed as such and many newspaper articles on the German protest wave also describe the unemployed activists as people fighting for their financial survival. Financial distress is certainly one of the issues raised by unemployed people's organisations; however, as suggested in *table 4.1*, it is far too limited to describe the range of claims of unemployed activists. Secondly, unemployed people's protest is assumed to be a defensive protest mainly against social welfare cutbacks, increased control or loss of entitlements. As a sceptical unemployed activist states: *"What would the programme of an unemployed movement be? That can be only a defensive programme"* (Interview 33:5) Thus, even unemployed experts sometimes doubt the creative and

manifold claims that unemployed people could put forward. However, as the discussion of *Image 4.1* in the previous section suggests, organisations of the unemployed were not necessarily founded as a reaction to major reform initiatives. This suggests that organisations of the unemployed might deal with more issues than simply the defence of their entitlements.

Indeed, unemployed people's protest consists of more than defensive, short-term, and material claims. Describing the contentious field of unemployment protest in Italy, della Porta (2006) identifies three different types of protest on unemployment based on the constituency, the type of action and the topics that are framed in the protest actions. These include firstly, the activities of the long-term unemployed who act primarily at the local level and fight for material benefits, secondly, protests against massive redundancies of former workers and recently employed people, and thirdly, protests for fair-jobs and new forms of work within general protest cycles. In relation to the third type, a variety of social actors participate in the contentious politics on unemployment, such as social movement organisations, unions and political parties.

However, as we will see in the following section, these general protest cycles not only advance a broad spectrum of claims but local unemployed actors also touch upon many of the aspects relating to the topic of unemployment. Local organisations of the unemployed raise claims against social welfare cutbacks but at the same time, they also raise claims for recognition, the defence of the welfare state, the right of political and social participation, as well as perform new forms of active solidarity. Unemployment also tends to put the issues of marginalisation and the process of exclusion at the centre of interest.⁷⁷ Social exclusion is also discussed as undermining civil rights, namely the social rights of the citizens. Social rights are referred to also at the city level, considering unemployment as a form of local exclusion, leaving some people outside the social life of a city. Further, unemployed people's actors in Berlin combine many of the claims that the new social movements have put onto the agenda since the 1970s in Germany, such as the criticism of the output side of policy,

⁷⁷ One thread of debate considers unemployment mainly as a process of exclusion that shuts people out of important processes of individual identity formation and self-realisation. Employment is seen as a major source of integration in society and self-realisation as the most important element of modern life.

advancing claims for participative democracy and promoting idea of the ‘primacy of the concerned’ (Roth 1997).

In the following section, I will describe some framing activities of organisations of the unemployed, as exemplified by the names of organisations and by the translation of individual grievances into a political language. Subsequently, I will describe the five most important topics discussed by local organisations of the unemployed. The discussion suggests that a conflict exists, in particular, between union and non-union organisations. In the final part, I will therefore address the question of whether individual activists view the issue of unemployment as a conflict of the old or rather the new social movements.

What is the problem of unemployment about? Examining the names of organisations

The first section of *table 4.1* lists the names of the local organisations of the unemployed.⁷⁸ These names give some preliminary ideas about the aims and activities of organisations of the unemployed.⁷⁹ Most organisations of the unemployed use names that are easy to remember. In France, six out of eight organisations that belong to a national network or organisation use the name of their umbrella organisation. Only two organisations that are part of the network of organisations of the unemployed *MNCP* do not refer to the organisation to they belong to. This includes: *CPP*, which stands for *Chômeurs et Precaires de Paris* and indicates the constituency of the social actor they act for, building a bridge between the two collective actors of unemployed and precarious people; and *Assol*, which stands for *Association de solidarité pour l’emploi, la formation et la créativité*. Thus, the organisation's name already indicates that its non-profit aim of helping unemployed people to find work is one of its main objectives.

In particular, the names of organisations in Berlin already give some indication about the self-perception, the underlying problem or the proposed solution. The

⁷⁸ As stated above, the full names of all organisations are available in the ‘List of organisations’ in the Appendix.

⁷⁹ In the past unemployed and precarious people also chose colourful names to give their organisations an identity. One organisation of the unemployed is called ‘Die Ueberflüssigen’ (the superfluous), another was called *Hängematten* (hammocks, ironically referring to the expression of Ex-Chancellor Schroeder that people should not be allowed to rest in the social hammock of society). One of the most famous organisations of the unemployed was the *Glueckliche Arbeitslose* (the happy unemployed). In Berlin, the organisation *Piqueteros* (which existed prior to the start of my empirical investigations) was named after the Argentinian unemployment protests of the *Piqueteros*.

organisations that are not working in a specific district but consider that they are acting at a Berlin-wide level mention the aim of their activities or the preferred forms of action. These organisations refer in their name to a particular action of social movement or typical organisation of social movement, such as the *Kampagne gegen Hartz IV* (Campaign against Hartz IV) or the *Aktionsbündnis Sozialprotest* (Action Alliance Social Protest). The *Kampagne* thus refers to an important form of action to oppose a particular reform, while the *Aktionsbündnis* refers to the importance of network forms of organisation. Furthermore, *anders arbeiten- oder gar nicht* (working differently - or not at all) refers to a particular issue and proposes a solution in name of the organisation.

The organisations working in a small district often use short and simple abbreviations, such *Erwin*, *Elvis* and *Sige*. It is interesting to note that two organisations from West Berlin use outdated names - that is names of a certain male generation they target with their organisation activities. The former West German welfare state was indeed designed for male employee earning money for the whole family, the so-called male breadwinner model. By choosing this kind of name, the organisation refers to this specific constituency. The former East Berlin organisation *Sige* refers to a different kind of constituency and its main action strategy: a self-help organisation of the working poor and unemployed in Pankow. As one unemployed activist has stated, the name means a whole agenda insofar as the name already states that it is not about the unemployed, but all people with low income. This is an exception in the Berlin, which differs from France where a poor people's actor (*Mouvement des sans*) was successfully created; no such collective actor exists in Germany. Unlike France, unemployment is rarely viewed as being connected to poverty issues and a collective body of the poor does not exist in Germany.

Thus, despite the presumed difficulty for unemployed people's actors to create a collective identity of the unemployed – given that they are ascribed a strongly stigmatised image – organisations of the unemployed have made great efforts to find creative names for their activities and aims. By giving themselves a name, they give their activity a location and an identity: unemployed people have a variety of names that indicate their degree of professionalism, organisational group, geographical location, as well as the issue that is at stake and their model for unemployed people's action.

Translating the individual grievances of unemployed activists

Movement studies often assign an important role to organisations during periods of mobilisation, underlining the capacities of organisations to bring resources under their control and to transform bystanders into activists (Snow and Benford 1988). Movement organisations are also said to translate grievances into protest by offering a political and contentious interpretation to problems or by defining a problem in the first place.

Organisations of the unemployed are indeed engaged in re-framing the dominant perception of the problem of unemployment and the stereotypical image of unemployed people. They propose interpretations and solutions to translate individual concerns into a political language and political activities. Although there is a different level of openness towards unemployed people who are not familiar with collective action – organisations are characterised by a process of locating individual experiences within a shared experience of other members of the organisation. By doing this, organisations are able to identify different approaches to the problem.

In contrast to other contentious fields such as peace or environment, it is that unemployed people overcome their feeling of being personally responsible for their situation. Organisations thus strongly refuse the attempt by politicians to blame the unemployed for the problem ‘unemployment’.⁸⁰ One crucial way of doing this is to re-frame the origin of the problem. For example, the reform of the labour market is characterised as a failure by unemployed activists in Berlin, which has only increased the pressure on unemployed people instead of offering solutions to the problem of “unemployment”: *“The Hartz concept deals with unemployment as a placement problem. True is, that job centres in Berlin and Brandenburg have been able for years to offer 2 to 3 jobs to 100 job-seeking people. We would like to have a better service of social assistance offices and job centres, but instead the service is privatised and made business-friendly in order to harass employed and unemployed people even more. There is a danger of pauperisation and a situation of forced labour. Every claim for decent work and life is not realised. We think that everybody has the right to a dignified and secure existence, regardless of whether the person is in employment*

⁸⁰ One important strategy for politicians is to blame the unemployed for their situation, suggesting they are too lazy, inflexible or poorly educated to find work.

or not” (Interview 19:12). Thus, unemployed activists point to other aspects of the reform, connecting it to a universal right of social existence.

Unemployed activists analyse media reports on unemployed people and the problem of unemployment and try to present an alternative view of the dominant perceptions. Indeed, unemployed activists dedicate a significant amount of time to highlight other sources of the problem, refusing to accept the responsibility of unemployed people for their situation, and describing the situation as a political one that could be changed. *“The picture of unemployed in the media is that the unemployed person is responsible for his/her situation. It is not the fault of the society or the economy, no! The people affected by unemployment are to blame for their situation. But that is not the case! The social reality is completely different. [...] I experienced it myself when I applied for a job [...]. You are too old. You are not enforceable in the company. And that does not only happen to a person over 50, but also people over 30 don’t find a job any more. We are not to blame for that situation, but the conditions. We have to change the conditions. The bad thing in our society is not that society is so poor that society could not finance us. Society is rich. The rich would not even allow a small amount of their petty cash to finance that. It is not wanted politically. That is the core problem”* (Interview 19:24). This quote is an example of a short story that aims to re-frame the problem of enabling people to take social and political action. Indeed, movement research highlights the importance of perceiving that change is possible and that this is an important condition for political action. In this short story, the interviewee introduces a problem, frames his/her own experiences within the dominant interpretation and ends with a description of the problem as a political one, rather than as personal behaviour.

Not all unemployed people’s activists point to the negative image portrayed by politicians or the media. Nevertheless, some organisations give the problem a political meaning: *“There is a political organisation that deals with the topic of ‘the future of work’. They include all forms of work in their definition and claim that all work should be recognised and also valued. The limitation of a payment of a wage in return for labour is not sustainable. How should we value education or nursing? They haven’t come that far, they still have to figure that out. But to start with you have to want to, then you also have to find a way. Similar to the reduction of working time. [...] That also did not simply happen. 70 hours per week was the case once upon a*

time. The collapse of the economy has been predicted every time that the working time has been reduced. This is the same today. But it never happened because of a reduction in working time; on the contrary, economic crises have occurred due to overproduction” (Interview 5:22) As above, the interviewee describes the problem as a political rather than as a personal problem and indicates a possible solution to the problem, in this case by comparing it to a successful story of the labour movement, reminding the other activists of the obstacles that other forms of resistance had to overcome.

In another case, an unemployed activist simply translates the individual feeling of discontent into a social phenomenon by connecting it to an atmosphere of (economic) depression. *“It is about [...] getting back on your feet again [...] Such a lack of structure also leads to a situation of depression. Even though only marginally. But I think we generally are in a situation of depression in Germany. It is about to getting out of that. I would like to give some ideas of how to can get us there. How we can get out of that situation.”* (Interview 12:6) The state of mind that is assumed to be typical for unemployed people is simply transferred to the society as a whole, connecting it to the term of economic depression.

Unemployed activists also use mainstream interpretations and re-frame the problem that is at stake. For example, at the time of the Hartz IV reform, newspaper articles often recalled the mass unemployment protest of the Weimar Republic that preceded Hitler’s rise to power. These articles thus suggest a causal link from mass unemployment protest to the National Socialist ideology. The inhuman national socialist ideology is taken as one important reference point by various organisations to discuss the problem of unemployment. Some unemployed organisations repeatedly stress the parallel between the national socialist ideology in considering some people as superfluous- or recalling the inhuman language of the national socialists of ‘not valuable to live’ (lebensunwertes Leben).⁸¹ Other unemployed activists stress the

⁸¹ This reference is probably also due to a public debate suggesting a direct causal link between unemployment and right-wing extremism, recording the high unemployment rates of the Weimar Republic as the most important factor in Hitler’s rise to power in the 1930s. Some newspaper articles argue that unemployed people who are politically frustrated tend to elect right-wing parties and public discussions about unemployment are therefore mainly led by extreme right-wing organisations. While the argument is made every time the unemployment rates pass a symbolic mark, the parallel was discussed extensively during the Hartz IV protests in 2004, suggesting that high unemployment rates would lead to increasing right wing extremism and to the participation of right-wing organisations in the protest wave. The parallel is however problematic in two respects: firstly, the 1930s protests by

importance of unemployed people becoming politically active and thus strengthening democracy. One unemployed activist mentions: “[*The rest of the people criticise*] they say it is shit but you cannot change it. They say all politicians and parties are shit. We already had that in Germany in 1932” (Interview 5:26). Thus, the idea of caring about the issue and doing something to get people politically involved is important for unemployed activists.

These quotes provide examples of the process by which organisations of the unemployed re-frame the problem as a political problem, refusing the interpretation of unemployed being the cause of the problem. All of these quotes indicate different framing strategies. However, all of the organisations refuse to frame the problem of unemployment as a problem caused by unemployed people, and connect their interpretation to different forms of activities, be it political forms of self-help, radical activities or other more moderate collective actions. Some organisations emphasise the unemployed person’s point of view instead, for example, the difficulty in finding a daily structure without work or the difficulty in finding a job, but this is not the case for the major part of the organisations that refuse to reinforce the stereotypical image of unemployed people as people in need of institutionalised care.

Key topics discussed by organisations of the unemployed in Berlin

In the field of contentious politics of unemployed in Berlin during the period of empirical investigation, five key issues were discussed by unemployed activists: ‘1-Euro-jobs’, basic income, unemployed people’s ticket, self-organisation/ self-representation and evictions. The issues of the 1-Euro jobs and basic income - the interpretation and solution to the problem - were strongly contested by different actors. In contrast, the topic of the unemployed people’s ticket provided an opportunity to create strong linkages between different kinds of organisations by serving as a master frame through which many different actors could connect their different claims (see also *chapter 6* that discusses the conflict in detail). A topic that only emerged at a late stage during my empirical studies - forced eviction - enabled unemployed people’s actors to establish relations with other actors such as tenants’ protection associations. In the following section, these issues will be described briefly.

unemployed people were out carried by socialists (see Gallas 1994) and secondly, the Hartz protest only marginally included the radical right (as well as the radical left) in protest events (Rucht and Yang 2004).

These issues are described in order to illustrate the opportunities for building alliances but also the difficulties that some of these issues have created. Subsequently, I briefly mention some of the framing strategies of organisations of the unemployed in order to demonstrate the attempts to translate grievances into action and to define the problem of unemployment.

1 – Euro jobs

The so-called 1-Euro jobs (in fact MAE jobs)⁸² have been offered to a large extent to long-term unemployed people since the Hartz IV reform. In official documents, these job opportunities aim to qualify unemployed people for the labour market.⁸³ The introduction of these additional job opportunities for long-term unemployed has been criticised for various reasons by unemployed activists. There is a general scepticism about the effort to make unemployed people ‘fit’ for the first labour market. Unemployed activists firstly stress the stereotypical image that lies at the core of these measures – that is, unemployed people need to get used to the rhythm of a working day and a working discipline.

Unemployed people’s actors also criticise the lack of knowledge of the unintended and intended consequences of the legislation. Organisations have also been critical of the fact that months after its implementation, information was not available on the effects for the individual as well as negative effects on the local labour market. One unemployed people’s organisation in Berlin systematically complained about this lack of knowledge. The organisation organised 1-Euro job walks, visiting the places in Berlin where these employment opportunities of the ‘second’ labour market were introduced. In the reports that were published on the Internet of the Labournet-

⁸² In fact “Arbeitsgelegenheit mit Mehraufwandsentschaedigung” (a job opportunity with additional cost compensation) have existed in other forms for decades, but did not play an important role in the public debate as they were only rarely offered in the past. These jobs aim to integrate unemployed people into the labour market. The term 1-Euro job is used in the public debate as unemployed people earn between 1.20 Euro and 2.50 Euro for one hour’s work, in addition to their unemployment benefits.

⁸³ Unemployment activists who published the following internal strategy paper by the federal agency of labour from August 2004 pointed out that the official position did not always match the internal strategy paper. *“Even though the initiative of additional labour does not fully match the existing logic of regulation, no regulation of the result, and additionally activation of this organisation is to be carried out for superior political reasons »* (Auch wenn diese Initiative fuer die zusaetzliche Beschaeftigung bei den Arbeitslosenhilfebeziehenden nicht im vollem Umfang der bestehenden Steuerungslogik entspricht, keine Ergebnissteuerung, ist aus uebergeordneten politischen Gruenden eine zusaetzliche Aktivierung dieses Personenkreises zu erreichen.” (Zentral der BA, 9th August 2004:”Initiative fuer die zusaetzliche Beschaeftigung von Arbeitslosenhilfebeziehenden.”, source: www.hartzkampagne.de/pdfs/2004_08_09_ba_arbeitsgelegenheiten_a.pdf), accessed on 5th March 2006.

Homepage, the organisation describes the stories told by people working in these programmes and discovers places where these jobs are not additional but competing with jobs of the first labour market.⁸⁴ For example, the organisation tells of several places where people were sacked and replaced by MAE workers. Furthermore, organisations criticise the extent to which people are forced to do these jobs because they fear a penalty that is equal to 30% cuts in their social benefits.

However, other organisations emphasise different problems connected to these jobs for unemployed people. Union organisations of the unemployed and a number of other organisations are particularly critical of these additional jobs due to the threat that they pose for employed people. These low-paid jobs may put pressure on the income of employed people by creating a low-income sector and undermining the rights of employed people. Indeed, in Germany, unemployed people were used in some cities as strikebreakers: unemployed people were employed, for example, for the disposal of waste while the workers were on strike. Other organisations of the unemployed put the issue of being forced to work and control at the centre of the debate. These organisations emphasise the inability of unemployed people to choose the type of work that they will engage in or to refuse MAE jobs in fact means that they are forced to work. However, some organisations of the unemployed link the social need for these jobs to a general discussion of work and society. These actors stress the need for social and civil work and the necessary and fair remuneration for different kinds of work. Furthermore, some organisations highlight the psychological and material benefits of 1-Euro jobs for unemployed people. These organisations emphasise many unemployed people would welcome the opportunity to do something rather than staying at home. Furthermore, many unemployed people would welcome the opportunity to receive an additional 200 Euro (per month). Therefore, as it has been shown above, the issue is highly contested by different types of organisations depending on whether the interests of employed, long-term unemployed or poor are at the forefront of the discussion.

Basic income

⁸⁴]As one interviewee critical of the 1-euro jobs mentions, workers would all do renovation work, while on their papers they would only be allowed to write certain things. For example, paintwork, for example, is referred to as 'improvement of the corridor'. Officially they are not allowed to do paintwork because this is not additional work and should be left to the first labour market (see Interview 28:5).

The topic of basic income and the way in which it is discussed in the German field is particularly important for understanding conflicts between many union unemployed activists and other non-union organisations of the unemployed.⁸⁵ The basic income is a significant source of tension between union organisation of the unemployed and some of the social movement organisations. Most unions would like to go back to the previous system of unemployment benefits and unemployment money and promote a strategy of ‘thinking small’. The rights of all excluded persons are not the main issue here but the rights of those who have previously worked. While other organisations of the unemployed usually stress the importance of de-coupling income and employment, union organisations of the unemployed oppose this idea. This does not mean, however, that union organisations of the unemployed are not in favour of an increase in unemployment benefit allowance. Often the conflict becomes manifest in the amount of the monthly benefit for unemployed people and the conditions attached to it – such as the obligation to continue looking for work. In this case, the interest of unions and those organised outside unions again appears to be different and creates a lot of tension.

Unemployed people’s ticket

In Berlin, one of the most important protest campaigns called for an unemployed people’s ticket for the use on the local transport system at a reduced fare. For many organisations, this campaign led to initial contacts among organisations, which enabled them to cooperate with each other at a later stage. *“For some socio-political activities, we try to reactivate our contacts with our old alliance partners, or a part of them. The organisations that fought for the social ticket, their contacts still exist”* (Interview 10:11) One of the union organisations of the unemployed was actually founded during this campaign for a social ticket - although it had previously existed as a loose gathering of people before that. The campaign for an unemployed people’s ticket is interesting not only regarding its capacity to bring different groups together, but because many of the organisations fought for the ticket at some point and participated in very different ways in this struggle. The various forms of participation included lobbying activities, the collection of signatures, protest or symbolic action, as well as the use of disruptive forms such as the disobeying rules. As mentioned

⁸⁵ The conflict line does not lie between union and non-union organisations in all cases. One union organisation of unemployed people discussed the topic during one of its meetings.

above, the struggle for an unemployed people's ticket will be described in detail in *chapter 6* below.

Self-organisation and self-representation

Another crucial conflict in the field in Berlin is the question of self-organisation and self-representation of the unemployed versus advocating forms of interest representation. In Berlin, one of the important conflicts during the protest wave in 1998 centred on the question of the self-representation and representation of the interests of the unemployed. The question was whether activists should politicise the conflict by joining forces with an opponent of the new left, or whether the unemployed should be mobilised to speak on their own behalf. Some organisations criticised the claim of some individual organisations to speak on behalf of the unemployed, since they considered them the first and most important organisation of people that should raise the concern.

The issue of self-representation has emerged, in particular, in cases where established organisations took part in the preparation of public events. In 1998, a major conflict emerged during the wave of protest on the question of which social actor should voice concern in the first place. As in many other cities, action committees were founded in Berlin to prepare the protest events. In Berlin, a Round Table⁸⁶ was set up with the participation of union initiatives of the unemployed, independent initiatives of the unemployed and union representatives for the purposes of organising the monthly protest events in front of the job centres.⁸⁷ However, some organisations had doubts about whether it was right for unions or some single organisations to speak on behalf of 'the unemployed'. The resentment of some unemployed activists was also due to a general difficulty that some of the protesters felt towards the dominant role of sections of the DGB in Berlin. While it seems that this is a traditional concern of the new social movements, the topic also creates conflicts between different strands of the non-union organisations. The question of self-representation is also strongly contested between non-union organisations, in that

⁸⁶ The 'Round Table' procedure was originally used in Poland during the transformation of the communist regime to a democratic state. It was also an important procedure in 1990 at the end of the GDR. The term is used if representatives from different institutions and organisations come together on an equal footing to discuss a specific issue (or issues).

⁸⁷ Generally, the protest wave was supported by many established organisations, such as the peak organisation of the DGB union, several other unions, the Green Party, the PDS and the church. See the section on the 1998 mobilisation wave above for a description.

some organisations refuse to acknowledge the dominant role of some new social movement activists and union organisations as representing ‘the unemployed’ and emphasise instead the importance of mobilising the unemployed to speak on their own behalf.

Evictions

Since January 2006, the “Ausfuehrungsvorschriften zur Ermittlung angemessener Wohnkosten der Wohnung gemaess §22 SGB II” (*hereinafter referred to as the ‘AV Wohnen’*) has been in force in Berlin. The law provides for a benchmark, which guides communities in the process of defining the cost of adequate housing and heating for people receiving unemployment assistance. Unemployed people who received unemployment support were entitled to the real costs of their rent and heating for one year. After the first year, only the adequate costs were paid. Since January 2006, many unemployed people who had received the real costs in the previous year now fall under the new regulation of the ‘AV Wohnen’. This means that unemployed people received a letter from their job centre stating that they had to move out of their apartment or that they would receive a lower amount for their rent.

Unemployed activists are critical of the fact that the benchmarks were enacted without any reliable data, even though information would have been available in the job centres. The communities that are responsible for deciding on the ‘adequate housing costs’ do not have any reliable data to fix these costs. Activists are concerned that against the background of high debts in many communities, the decision on the amount of support for living costs may have been motivated by an attempt to save funds, rather than on the basis of the real costs. Recent case law has confirmed that eviction may be possible two months after the rent has not been paid.

Since the beginning of 2006, various organisations coordinated protest activities against the ‘AV Wohnen’. A ‘campaign against eviction’ was initiated and carried out by union-friendly individuals, tenants’ organisations, unemployed counselling services, the Berlin social forum, AntiFa (an anti-fascist radical left organisation), the newly-founded party WASG and other initiatives.⁸⁸ This issue, similar to the ticket for unemployed people described above, has been able to build bridges between many different organisations.

⁸⁸ See ‘Widerstand gegen Vertreibung und Verarmung’ by Peter Grottian and Thomas Rudek in MieterEcho, Sonderausgabe Juni 2006.

Unemployment in Berlin: a new or old social movement conflict?

The issues discussed in this chapter suggest that there is a major conflict between non-union and union organisations of the unemployed.⁸⁹ In other words, the conflicts between union organisations of the unemployed and independent organisations seem to revolve around the question of which movement is best suited to deal with the problem of unemployment. Are the new social movements the right place to deal with the topic of unemployment or should this be the task of the unions?

In fact, the contentious politics of unemployment is interesting if one wishes to define the relationship between union and protest politics of new social movements (della Porta 2006). With the rise of neo-corporatist politics and the institutionalisation of labour movements, new social movements and labour movements were considered as two different collective actors *“A network structure, strong solidarity, the use of disruptive repertoires of action, and conflictual aims were among the main characteristics of the new movements; bureaucratic and hierarchical organizations, representation of interests, concerted decision-making, and compromise seemed to permeate more and more the labour movement”* (della Porta 2006:72). While the strategic interactions between union and non-union organisations were emphasised in the previous section, I will shift the focus to the micro-level in the following section in order to find out whether this conflict is perceived in a similar way at an individual level. In other words, I will look at whether unemployed activists describe themselves as belonging to either the unions or new social movements and also explore whether there is a major conflict between these two different collective actors.

Unemployed individuals may perceive the conflict within the two movement family identities that they are open to them: either they consider the conflict as a labour conflict or they use the specific topics and concerns of the new social

⁸⁹ In Berlin, rather than personal conflicts (although often described as such by activists during meetings or in interviews), there is a conflict between different types of organisations of the unemployed. The organisations may share the same aims, employ similar strategies and have similar organisational structures, but there is a strongly rooted mistrust between two types of organisations. On the one hand, union organisations of the unemployed claim that other groups are ‘disorganised’ and chaotic, and refuse the strong role some individuals play in the movements; on the other hand, the unions are criticised for not being radical enough in their statements. This may also be due to the different movement identities of the organisations of the unemployed. While the collective identity of union organisations of the unemployed is usually that of their parent organisation, some non-union organisations develop an identity that is entirely different from those of established actors. Similarly, Wolski-Prenger (1997) has stated that the establishment of independent organisations of the unemployed was motivated by the desire among some actors to escape the paternalistic nature of the religious organisations of the unemployed during the 1980s.

movements that have been in existence since the 1970s. In order to characterise the conflict over unemployment, I will firstly describe the movement identity expressed by the individuals. Secondly, I describe the issues on which unemployed activists have engaged in the past in order to see whether they stem from engagement in labour issues or topics of the new social movements.

During the empirical research, one of the questions posed in the survey (see Appendix) was the feeling of belonging to one or both of the dominant movement families. The results indicate that out of 63 unemployed activists, 38 state they feel a sense of belonging to the workers' movement, while 34 feel that they belong to the new social movements. However, 28 unemployed activists altogether stated that they belong to both kinds of movement families. Thus, it is surprising that many activists claim to belong to both movement families. At an individual level, activists do not necessarily feel that they belong to one movement alone, but have multiple identities (della Porta 2004; Andretta et al. 2003).

Table 4.2 Movement family identities of unemployed activists

Movement family identity	Number of persons feeling that they belong to a movement family	Total (N)
New social movements	34	63
Labour movement	38	63
Both movement families	28	63

There might be a difference, however, between what people say and what they do. For this reason, the survey also addressed people's activities in the past. *Table 4.2* lists the participation of unemployed activists in 3 main issue areas. These areas cover past activities in the area of labour conflicts, new social movement activities, and engagement on issues of social injustice and poor people's movements. As shown in *table 4.2* unemployed activists have been engaged on a variety of other topics in the past:

Table 4.3 - Areas of previous movement engagement by unemployed activists

Issue	Yes	Total**
(Global) social justice and poor people's issues	42	63
Social justice	36	63
Unemployment	29	63
Immigration and human rights	13	63
Homelessness	9	63
Globalisation	21	63
New social movement issues	25	63
Nuclear energy	11	63
Ecology	19	63
Peace	20	63
Women	11	63
Gay	4	63
Anti-fascism	13	63
Labour issues	27	63
Working conditions	27	63
Labour issues	23	63

* Missing N = 8

The key finding in this table is that most of the activists had participated in collective action on other topics in the past. This is in line with the finding of many other empirical studies, namely, that most movement activists have already been politically active in the past (for an overview see Giugni, 2004). The previous social movement activities of unemployed activists cover a broad range of issues. 47 out of 63 actors have been active in at least one other issue area. Most of the actors have been active on the following issue areas before entering the unemployed people's organisation: social justice, unemployment, globalisation, ecology and peace. Furthermore, working conditions and labour issues were also important past activities for nearly half of the activists.

The data from the individual survey does not confirm the assumption that the old and new social movements are competing for allegiance of individual activists: one-third (N = 21) of the activists were engaged on both labour issues and new social movement topics. For individual participants, there is no zero-sum game between old social movement politics and new social movement politics. Many unemployed activists have been active in the past on issues concerning working conditions and

activities of the workers' movement, as well as on topics of the new social movements.

Discussion

In the following section, I will discuss three different insights of the chapter. Firstly, I will outline the main differences between the two fields and discuss these differences in light of the political opportunity approach. Secondly, I will discuss the relationship between organisations and social movements as suggested in the analysis of the founding periods of organisations of the unemployed. Finally, I will discuss the specific framing strategies of the unemployed and the claims advanced by the latter in order to point to some particularities in this field.

(1) The field of unemployed action in Paris and Berlin are characterised by differences and similarities. One of the most striking features of the Berlin field of contention is the fragmented and competitive character of unemployment in comparison to Paris. In general, there seems to be a clear division of labour with regard to the organisation of protest events in Paris, whereas the field of actors in Berlin is much more dispersed and there are no major organisations that are responsible for organising large-scale events. An unemployment expert describes the difference between the two cities by stating that the French context is usually good in terms of their success in mass mobilisation, while this is not necessarily the case in Berlin. However, she states that there are *"little remaining effects"* (Interview 6:13) referring to the less populated organisational field. Another unemployed activist also states: *"It is typically French [that there are mobilisations] from time to time. But relatively little structures remain after these protests. While in Berlin, there are many organisations, but there is a weak record of successful mobilisation"* (Interview 6:12f). While the successful mobilisation of high numbers of unemployed people as well as the emphasis on the representation of unemployed people's interests – as expressed by radical forms of protest such as the occupation of local labour offices – is viewed as a positive example by the German unemployed activists, a surprisingly small number of local organisations of the unemployed are active in Paris.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ However, although the capacity for mobilisation is high in Paris compared to other European capitals, one French unemployment activist stated that mobilisation is much easier in smaller towns than in the three major French cities (Paris, Lyon, and Marseille). When asked about the existence of organisations of the unemployed other cities, an activist from the national organisation, the *MNCP*,

Furthermore, unemployed activists from Paris highlight the importance of tackling the issue of unemployment at the national level. One unemployed activist, for example, mentions that the debates on a new employment policy and on the specific claims are carried out at the level of their umbrella organisation as unemployment policy is a national policy issue: *“This is because of the type of the contentious topics, which are national topics. We are here at the local level so we cannot change a national decision”* (Interview 16:6). Subsequently, it was stated that *“It is true that we cannot achieve big things all on our own. The demonstration on Saturday seeks to change things but it is the togetherness of all the organisations of the unemployed that might be able to bring about change”* (ibid). Unemployed people’s actors in Paris are firstly convinced about the national scope of their struggle and secondly about the importance of a unified collective actor of the unemployed to bring about change.

The two contentious fields also differ with regard to their founding dynamics. It is usually assumed that looking at the organisational field retrospectively at certain point in time means that one has to look at more stable and persistent organisations.⁹¹ For the alternative organisation sector in Berlin, Rucht et al. (1997) found that on average the life-span of an alternative organisation is approximately eight years: *“Diese Daten zeigen, dass es sich im Durchschnitt keineswegs, wie verschiedentlich behauptet, ueberwiegend um ad hoc gegrueendete und zumeist kurzlebige Gruppen handelt”* (Rucht et al, 1997:100). In Paris, most organisations had existed for more than a decade when I started my field work. However, the majority of organisations of the unemployed in Berlin are quite new compared to the organisations in Paris and Berlin seems to be characterised by a more dynamic organisational infrastructure regarding the founding dynamics. Until now, organisations seem to have a shorter life-span than the study of Rucht et al. (1997) describe for the alternative sector. This impression is further strengthened by the fact that a lot of organisations were mentioned during the interviews that had been founded during the first mobilisation wave and no longer existed at the time of the empirical investigations.

The organisations in the field of unemployment politics from below in Berlin do not seem to have the same life-span as alternative organisations in Berlin. Thus, it

mentioned that organisations of the unemployed are more present in smaller towns than in the three major cities.

⁹¹ Usually, when observing organisations at a single point in time, one can expect organisations with longer life-spans to be over-represented.

seems as through there is a more dynamic organisational infrastructure in Berlin.⁹² In contrast, in France the organisational infrastructure seems to be more stable and organisations are not being established on a regular basis..

Although there are conflicts within the French field, these are less pronounced in Paris. This might be due to the above-mentioned importance for French unemployed activists to organise themselves within the framework a national collective actor of the unemployed. Many activists in Paris indeed refer to the importance of taking part in a common struggle. For example, one of the banners of a national demonstration march during the mobilisation in 1998 stated: *“Tous ensemble on continue”*⁹³ and was signed by the four major national organisations *AC!*, *Apeis*, *MNCP*, and *CGT chômeur*. Most unemployed activists from Paris to whom I spoke stated that in the end it is not so important where you are engaged as unemployed organisations will only have the power to change something if they act together. In contrast, in Germany it does not seem to be possible to refer to a collective organisation for unemployed people. As one unemployed person points out, people seem to find it difficult to protest for their social needs: *“And that is certainly the usual problem, to make your own needs heard. That always fails. The people protest against motorways, animal transport. [...] They stand up for everything that affects ecology and all that, but they do not stand up for their own basic needs. [...] Well, I also say, I also do not want to be reduced to what I am dependent on. I also want to make my own claims. That is why one million people come to a peace demonstration, but only 100 or 500 come to an unemployment protest ”* (Interview 19:14). The situation is different in France where people are *“angry”* (Interview 14:1) about the political decisions that have been made concerning unemployment.⁹⁴

⁹² In Berlin most of the organisations have only recently been founded: this either means that organisations live for shorter periods, having shorter life-spans than other organisations in the alternative sector, as suggested by the many references to organisations that no longer existed when my empirical investigations started; or, the period between 2003 and 2004 is very specific and organisations ordinarily survive for longer periods. This could be answered were another case study to be carried out in a few years.

⁹³ MNCP document *“20 ans de lutte contre le chômage et la précarité”* (2006).

⁹⁴ However, if we consider that unemployed people have successfully mobilised for two major protest waves as well as for many local protest events in Germany, it could be argued that the perception of a strong and unified collective actor is not essential for collective action. As we will see in *chapter 6*, organisations of the unemployed and activists in Berlin have nevertheless used the issue of a reduced transport fare for unemployed people to organise various kinds of activities for the unemployed.

It seems as though the major differences between the two organisational fields can be explained by the different political opportunity structures of both countries, particularly with respect to the presence of the old left and protest activities of the labour movement. This relates to the presence of the old class conflict, the type of available allies and mobilisation patterns, as well as more general patterns such as the more centralised structure of the French system and new access points for unemployed people to engage with the social welfare system since the protest wave in 1997.

Firstly, the centralisation of the French system is reflected in the organisational structure of organisations of the unemployed in both countries. Due to the centralised political structure in France, there is a crucial role for national umbrella organisations or national networks. French actors insist on the need for a movement of the unemployed, as well as the importance of the unity of that actor. However, the relatively long life-span of French organisations might also be due to the new access points, the so-called “comités de liaison de l’ANPE”⁹⁵, which allow unemployed people to engage directly with the social welfare system (Demazière 2002). These consist of institutionalised meetings between the organisations of the unemployed and the ANPE at the local level. It could be argued that access to one of the most important institutions of French unemployment policy might encourage the organisational stability of local organisations of the unemployed.

Furthermore, although Germany and France are often considered as similar types of welfare states (compare *chapter 3*), social movement researchers point to the differences in contentious politics in both countries, particularly regarding the success of new social movements. Over the past few decades, there have also been opposing trends in France and Germany regarding the characteristics and strength of the old and new social movements. Kriesi et al. (1995) illustrate, for example, that the success of the old and new social movements differ in both countries and that this can be explained by the type of conventional politics in the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary arena. Comparing the form and strength of mobilisation in France and Germany, the authors indicate the relative lack of success of some forms of

⁹⁵ ANPE stands for the “agence nationale pour l’emploi” and was until recently (December 2008) the central institution for publicizing job offers, generating unemployment statistics and providing resources to help unemployed people find a job.

mobilisation. France has experienced, for example, exceptionally high levels of radical protest (Fillieule 1997). Indeed, France is characterised as an exclusive state with rather closed political opportunities and as a place where the mechanisms for protest have been institutionalised (Kitschelt 1986).

The ability of the environmental movement to mobilise - which is regarded as an example of the success of a new social movement to claim the streets - has been more successful in Germany than in France. In France, the movement remained rather marginal and never gained the same importance as in Germany. Although some important protests were organised by the environmental movement in the 1970s, especially anti-nuclear campaigns, the movement rapidly lost its significance during the 1980s (Duyvendak 1995). In France, a general decline of all movement activities was reported during the 1980s by the national newspaper *Le Monde* after the victory of the Socialist Party in the 1981 elections.⁹⁶ In particular, Fillieule (2003) refers to the unfavourable political opportunities for the new social movements following the election of Mitterrand in 1981. *"... the development of an unfavourable pattern of political opportunities was correlated with a significant decline in the number of mobilisations initiated by new social movements of all kinds"* (Fillieule, 2003:66).⁹⁷ Fillieule (1998) disagrees with the assumption that the new social movements became the dominant actor during the 1980s. While middle class actors played an important role in the protests during the 1980s, *"... two facts attack the hypothesis about new social movements: workers are the ones that take to the streets most often and the acknowledged identities of the protestors are almost always professional, corporatist, and thus linked to earnings and the job"* (Fillieule 1998:217) In reality, the French protests of the 1980s were dominated by traditional organisations, especially the trade

⁹⁶ Fillieule (1998) states that the decline in newspaper reports on contentious events is also due to a number of protest events involving only small numbers of protestors, especially those taking place in the provinces. These 'micro-mobilisations' (Fillieule 1998:208) increased during the 1980s. *"In particular it [research based on press reports] underestimates 'micro-mobilisations', which bring together small numbers of protestors, but we have found that 'Le Monde' never mentions them, especially when they take place in the provinces."* (Fillieule 1998:208). The decline is thus not specific to environmental protests but should be seen in the context of a general trend in France towards an increased number of micro-mobilisations (i.e. protests of between 200 and 500 people) (Fillieule 2003).

⁹⁷ It could also be argued that some of the decline in protest events may be due to biases in newspaper reports. Fillieule (2003:67) reports that the coverage of environmental protest events in the newspaper *Le Monde* was higher during highly sensitive periods. *"When ecology becomes prominent from a political or an institutional point of view, it is likely that the number of protest events covered will increase."* (Fillieule, 2003:67) For example, when the ecologists in France agreed to enter into an alliance with the Socialist Party and the Communist Party in the wake of the left's defeat in the presidential elections in 1995, the newspaper began to increase its coverage of environment issues.

unions, and the contentious issues centred on the problem of employment and earnings, rather than the post-materialistic issues that the New Social Movements are concerned with. During the 1980s “... *the street was dominated ... by the traditional organisations, especially the trade unions. ... most of the demonstrations revolved around the problem of employment and demands concerning earnings*” (Fillieule 2003:66). Unions are, in fact, the organisations that have most often had recourse to street protests (Fillieule 1998:218).

Thus, in sharp contrast with some authors who assume that traditional forms of activities - partisan and union mediation – have witnessed a decline in France, and contradicting the assumption of changed modes of political engagement, such as the fluidity of individual participation outside traditional movements, Fillieule argues instead that the 1980s in France were marked by great stability of actors and their claims.

The weak success in the mobilisation of the new social movements in France is explained by the constant role of the labour mobilisations in France. “*A high salience of old cleavages in politics presents an enormous obstacle to the entrance of new issues on the political agenda. More specifically, our findings show that, as a result of the fact that most new issues are conceptualized as “left-wing” topics, this constraining effect is particularly strong where traditional class conflicts are highly salient*” (Koopmans and Duyvendak 1995:241). According to the authors, the presence of the class conflict is the most significant obstacles for the potential of new social movements to enter the scene. Class conflict is also source of competition for new social movements as the old and new left compete for similar topics, as well as for the same constituency. Indeed the data on protest events by different movements shows a zero-sum relationship between existing cleavages and new conflicts. For example, in France, the strong role of the old and new left means that new social movement actors have to gain their own space for public protest. This leads to relatively weak mobilisation by new social movements in comparison to other countries, whereas unemployment continues to be an important issue in street protests.

As France has not managed to pacify its class cleavage, the socialist and communist party compete for the same constituency as the new social movement

actors, and also continue to frame various issues as a class conflict. In the other countries, such as Germany, class conflict has been pacified and depoliticised. This difference perhaps explains at least partly the diverse claims and orientation of the movement. I would argue that, in France, the topic of unemployment is still framed mainly in a language that is compatible with the labour movement, therefore, claims that are connected to social issues are particularly successful. For example, in France, the movement of the unemployed mobilised with other poor people's actors on the issue of social exclusion. On the other hand, in Germany, the movement's claims are more successful in mobilising people when framed as issues that are also important to the new social movements. The particularity of the contentious topic of unemployment is its ability, however, to provide a link between these two spheres of collective activism.

(2) The chapter further suggests that while it is often argued that organisations are important if not crucial for mobilisation, it is also the case that mobilisation is important for local organisations. The role of local organisations and initiatives is highlighted in the various studies on protest waves. Although more formal organisations participate in protest waves particularly at a later stage, protest waves are often carried by small informal organisations at the outset.

However, not all local organisations play a catalysing role. Insufficient attention is paid to the different roles played by organisations during the protest waves, as well as the effect that mobilisation waves might have on the organisations. In this regard, it has been stated that "*resources are often created (or re-created) in action*" (della Porta and Caiani 2009:137; Juris 2008). Underlining the crucial role of organisations in mobilisation processes does not clarify the whole interactive dynamic between mobilisation and a specific field of actors, for example, the question of whether mobilisation waves may also constitute or offer important founding resources for some organisations.

As it was shown above, organisations play a very different role during contentious phases. By distinguishing among four different types of organisations defined by the relationship of organisations to major protest waves, the diverse roles played by organisations in social movements become apparent. Mobilisation waves or campaigns are central to the founding of some organisations and are crucial the

revival of other organisations. Mobilisation waves also provide more established organisations with an opportunity to politicise their activities. The relationship between mobilisation waves and organisations are thus heterogeneous. Firstly, there are organisations that are founded during phases of increased contention. The flexible foundation of these organisations helps to mobilise the field of unemployment during such phases. More established actors can use the mobilisation waves to substantially change their repertoire of activities, although most of the activities are carried out internally (e.g. counselling), rather than taking the form of confrontational protests. Furthermore, there are also some organisations that rely on mobilisation waves as a founding resource. Finally, some organisations belong to a more stable infrastructure and adapt their main topics of interest to the dominant protest wave.

(3) Regarding the framing strategies of organisations of the unemployed, the chapter shows that organisations are involved in a process in which diagnostic frames are intertwined with efforts to construct a collective actor. In fact, similar to other collective actors, the unemployed have to adapt to the difficulty of constructing a collective actor on the basis of a stigmatised identity. Other stigmatised groups also follow a complex path towards the construction of a more positive (collective) identity. Identities are avowed or rejected, for example, by homeless peoples' groups (Snow and Anderson 1993) or groups representing homosexual people with HIV/AIDS, who on the one hand, reject the identity that has been ascribed to them and, on the other hand, provide new interpretations via the process of 'tertiary deviation', which describes the *"confrontation, assessment, and rejection of the negative identity... and the transformation of that identity into a positive or viable self-conception"*. (Kitsuse 1980:9) Empirical investigation shows that the interaction between a personal and a collective identity is much more complex than the stereotypical image of the apathetic unemployed person or the deviant homeless person that might be evoked in political discourse. On the one hand, research on the unemployed has shown that the ability to deal with the situation of being unemployed varies enormously. Research studies in the UK and the Netherlands shows that some unemployed people give rather positive feedback about their situation (Kronauer

1997:56).⁹⁸ Furthermore, some organisations deal with the problem in a positive manner in so far as they describe the problem as a social rather than a personal one.

Research on AIDS activists (Gamson 1989), the homeless (Cress and Snow 2000) and the unemployed (Maurer 2001) shows that the forms that poor people adopt, use and transform to understand ‘their identity’ and how far it is useful for collective actions as a pre-condition is not always the same. In the case of poor people, frames and identity are connected in the sense that a successful frame to indicate the problem is connected to a process of positive identification within the goals of an organisation, a movement or civil society organisation. Both of these aspects, namely, ‘collective identity’ and ‘frames’, are one and the same process in the case of the poor people or other marginalised groups. It is not only personal, collective or cultural levels that mesh in the process of creating mobilisation potentials (Gamson 1992); in the case of poor people, identity and cognition also mesh. For poor people, it becomes obvious that the person and the problem are two sides of the same coin: personal identity and the social problem are embodied in the same person, as denoted by the term ‘unemployed’. On the one hand, ‘unemployed’ describes the situation of a person without work. It defines the problem that the person is assumed to be confronted with (frame). On the other hand, it ascribes the person with an identity by assuming that ‘unemployed’ form some kind of group that share some common characteristics (identity). The ‘diagnostic frame’ (Snow and Benford 1988) is intertwined with the personal and the collective identity of the group’s members. The construction of frames that indicate the problem and the solution therefore also requires critical reflection on the issue of identity.

This heterogeneity of the social organisation (with fuzzy boundaries) of the unemployed people, is mirrored by the claims and bonding tactics of unemployed people. Indeed, to point out the heterogeneity of the unemployed is indeed an important - if not the most important- re-framing strategy of unemployed activists.

Furthermore, the discussion illustrates that unemployed actors deal with more than simply the defence of material interests, for example, in cases where reductions in

⁹⁸ Although the author assumes that work has a key social integrative function in modern societies, very diverse approaches to unemployment are found. This seems to confirm the results of the Marienthal study (Jahoda, Lazarsfeld, and Zeisel 1975 [1933]), in which four different reactions from families regarding their new situation of being unemployed are described. Unfortunately only the most frequent - the apathy of the long-term unemployed - is cited in many works.

benefits are contested. Indeed, there are many examples of claims for universal social rights and criticism of labour market policy in general. Most of the time, these diverse claims cannot be assigned to a single organisation, however, some local unemployed organisations, for example, who call for the introduction of a social transport ticket are also engaged in collective action that criticises the government for its lack of engagement on the issue of unemployment, and also seek to defend the welfare state. Some of the most important issues have either served to bring organisations closer together or split organisations into opposing camps with competing claims. The discussion of these five topics is not exhaustive. However, it covers the main issues that were addressed during campaigns and other coordinated efforts by organisations of the unemployed. Moreover, these are the topics that either allowed organisations to join forces or inspired individuals to establish an unemployed people's organisation in order to deal with the issue.

Chapter 5

Walking and talking together: daily routines and collective actions of organisations of the unemployed

Research on poor people's movements indicates that there are many similarities in the mobilisation process of homeless people, immigrants and unemployed people, and other collective actors. Research has shown, for example, similarities in some forms of collective action and organisational forms between poor people's movements and new social movements (Roth 1997).]⁹⁹ Indeed, when poor people act collectively, they face similar challenges to other organisations. For example, as with other organisations, they have to translate individual grievances into collective protest, they need opportunities that are beneficial to organise collective unrest, they need an organisational infrastructure bringing resources under their control and engage in framing activities to mobilise a sympathetic public and benevolent third parties. Many organisations have faced the challenge of overcoming obstacles to mobilisation and this is not specific to unemployed actors.

However, there also seems to be something distinctive about the collective protest of the unemployed. Although poor people sometimes use the classical protest methods of former social movements, they only do so sporadically and also rely on other forms of action referred to as 'weapons of the weak' (Scott 1985).

Empirical investigation into the political and cultural life of marginalised people have for example pointed to a broad variety of individualised instances of opposition and coping strategies (Steinert and Pilgram 2003). These are activities that are carried out by those who are at the bottom of the social order in an individualistic manner, but collectively shared, such as a private refusal to collaborate with state institutions, as described by Jordan in the case of English welfare recipients (Jordan 1998) and unemployed people in Germany by Rein and Scherer (1993).¹⁰⁰ These forms of

⁹⁹ The protest behavior of welfare recipients does not differ at an individual level from other segments of society (Berkel, Coenen, and Vlek 1998).

¹⁰⁰ Rein and Scherer (1993) offer one of the very few examples of studies on political unrest among the unemployed in Germany at the beginning of the 1990s. The authors are critical of social movement approaches that take too much account of public forms of unrest and offer an explanation of the

opposition are, although shared by marginalised people, individual instances of opposition. These individualised forms of resistance are, nevertheless, instructive for broadening the view on possible forms of opposition that may be equally hidden, but carried out in a collective way. Though they are not a form of collective action, they point to the fact that there might be other forms of opposition at the disposal of unemployed people. The question is, therefore, whether less visible but collective forms of opposition are available to unemployed people and what kind of activities they engage in.

Further, as Baumgarten (2008) shows in a recent study on pro-unemployed organisations, these type of actors adopts particular communicative strategies. Aiming to become a legitimate speaker in the field of actors engaged on the issue unemployment, pro-unemployed organisations invest a lot of effort in describing their competence and experience. Often, the provision of services - as I will indeed argued below - is an attempt by some organisations to achieve such a legitimate status in the field of actors.

The recent increase of social movement-like politics by excluded people - similar to the individual coping and protest strategies - might only be the tip of the iceberg that reveals other forms of conflicts expressed in a collective way by marginalised people. Furthermore, unlike new social movements, poor people's actors re-introduce social topics and research emphasises the material gains of these collective actors. Thus, poor people act as collective actors, but they do it less often in comparison to some other collective actors and they tend to widen the range of activities usually referred to by new and old social movements.

The aim of this chapter is to analyse the main dimensions of the various activities carried out by local organisations of the unemployed with a special emphasis on the meaning that these activities have for the organisations of the unemployed, as well as the differences between the organisations. Organisations of the unemployed do more than newspaper reports on large-scale protests suggest, firstly, because people

political revolt by unemployed people at the individual level: „*Viele scheinbar unverständliche oder ‚unpolitische‘ Reaktionsweisen können durch eine Sichtweise des reinen Widerstandes nicht identifiziert werden. Aber gerade die Protagonisten von solcherart Aufsässigkeit sind es, die mit ihren individuellen, unorganisierten Alltagskampf den normalen gesellschaftlichen Stumpfsinn unterlaufen.... Auf dieser Ebene des individuellen Verweigerns fehlt es den meisten allerdings auch an der Einsicht, durch kollektive Protestaktionen ihre Situation grundsätzlich zu verbessern.*“ (Rein and Scherer 1993:255f).

organise protest activities that do not enter - or may not aim to enter - the public space, and secondly, because organisations are engaged in other activities besides protest activities. I will specify both of these points below, before describing three dimensions of strategies of organisations of the unemployed in more detail.

(1) Demonstration marches and public gatherings were the most visible collective action forms of the two main protest cycles in 1998 and 2004 in Germany, while occupations of public institutions seemed to dominate the French unemployed people's protest of the winter of 1997. However, the forms of action at their disposal are much more colourful than these reports on mass demonstrations and disruptive events suggest. These organisations also undertook similar protest activities before, during and after the major protest waves. For example, the so-called 'Monday demonstrations'¹⁰¹ were still taking place in Berlin once a month during the period of my empirical research in February 2006. The unemployed people's movement has organised a national demonstration march at the end of each year in Paris since 2003. Unemployed people organise counselling services in front of the job centres, publish newspapers, get involved in theatre and dance, and invite well-known personalities to public discussions. The traditional forms of protest that have been used by the labour movement are also part of the action repertoire of the unemployed, such as organising strike pickets in front of companies that threaten mass redundancies. Many of these local protest events do not always make it into the public sphere.

The recent increase in protest politics by the unemployed in Germany might be part of a wider process with other forms of protest. As one unemployed activist mentions commenting on the media attention during the mobilisation against the Hartz IV reform in Germany: *"When the demonstrations started [in the summer of 2004, A.Z.] the media witnessed a huge wave of mobilisation and were eager to know how it was developing. But the media also quickly called its death. It was quickly dead, and for the media, the protest was dead. But there were other forms of protest that they did not notice. Some of them just sat in the starting position, waiting for the scandalous information, the big visible protest and did not see all the other forms, the other aspect of protest that is more silent. This is expressed through continuous work,*

¹⁰¹ The term 'Monday demonstration' was used for the protest events in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) in 1989 resulting in the fall of the Berlin wall. These protest events, as the name indicates, took place every Monday. The usage of this term for the protest wave in 2004 against social cuts was hotly contested within the movement as well as by outside observers.

tough informing, counselling of the people affected, and also support for people who want to make a legal complaint. That is something different from what the media likes to show” (Interview 27:26) Thus, not only are there many protest activities taking place outside major waves of protest, but there are also protest activities with other kinds of characteristics. While the action repertoire used in the contentious politics of unemployment is very broad – drawing on protest repertoires of the old and new social movements - it is further enlarged by the use of other more silent forms of action that are used on a daily basis but do not receive the attention of the media. As I will show in the discussion below, some unemployed activists avoid symbolic confrontations as protest strategies, but nevertheless question institutional arrangements.

As we will see in the following chapter, organisations of the unemployed employ different logics of action including more outward oriented protest activities targeting state institutions and other cultural forms of opposition that do not aim to influence public opinion but seek to change (political) culture. While certain activities are organised strategically to enter the public sphere responding to the specific needs of the media (Rucht, Koopmans, and Neidhardt 1998), using the logic of numbers, or logic of damage, for example, (della Porta and Diani, 2006:170ff) other activities seek to change individual behaviour or the change institutionalised behaviour within public or other institutions.

(2) The fact that this thesis does not look at social movements and thus at protest as an action form that defines its existence - but looks instead at organisations as units of analysis - broadens the focus of possible action forms. In general, very few organisations solely organise protest events. In a study on organisational infrastructure in Berlin in the 1990s, Rucht et al. (1997:104f) state that only a few organisations refer to protest activities as their most or even second most important activity. Most activities of the organisations studied by these authors were relatively conventional and moderate such as providing training courses, or publishing books and newspapers.

Organisations of the unemployed might similarly combine different forms of action, particularly if they have enough resources and organisational support to carry out daily activity, which serves as a regular contact between the activists. These daily

activities - although they might also be viewed as challenging activities (see discussion below) - do not consist of organising regular mass protests or symbolic actions, which, in fact, rarely happens even during highly mobilised periods. The more formalised part of social movements thus confronts us with a different picture of organisation strategies that sometimes simply consists in keeping the movement infrastructure alive (Roth 1994).

Thus, firstly public protest activities are only one part of the ‘action repertoire’ (Tilly 1977) of organisations of the unemployed as they also engage in other more inward-oriented or cultural activities. Secondly, contentious activities (such as protests) are not always the most important activities in some organisations. Local organisations of the unemployed, similar to the organisational infrastructure studied by Rucht et al. (1997), might be primarily engaged in other forms of activities.

This raises the question what organisations actually do when they are not involved in organising protest activities. The aim of this chapter is thus firstly to broaden the focus beyond protest activities by examining the most important activities carried out by organisations of the unemployed. The most important activities of local organisations of unemployed people were identified on the basis of an in-depth analysis of the various activities of organisations of the unemployed (see *chapter 2*). Categories were then developed to systematise and describe these activities. The meaning that organisations assign to their activities is crucial for understanding the various activities and the differences between individual organisations. In other words, it will be argued that although organisations may be engaged in the very same type of activity, the activity can have completely different meanings for the organisations. These differences will be taken into account by providing concepts of collective action that take the meaning of activities for the organisations into account. The following chapter presents the results of the in-depth analysis of the daily routines and protest activities and the meaning attached to them describing three different logics of action.

The categories that best describe the most important logics of activities of organisations of the unemployed are the following: the social and political logic, the logic of social and political empowering, and the logic of orientation of activities. In

the following, I will present three different tables, each of which describes the organisations engagement in these three logics of action.

The first *table 5.1* describes the existence of social and political logics of action. Considering the fact that ‘unemployed people’ are usually perceived as socially, economically or otherwise deprived, the need to support unemployed people in distress is taken into account by some organisations, for example, by offering counselling services or providing space for self-help activities for organisation members. Often considered as the opposite of political activities, the table shows the importance that organisations assign to caring activities, on the one hand, and protest activities, on the other hand. *Table 5.2* looks at the logic of empowering. In other words, while some organisations simply provide help to unemployed people in distress, others try to encourage unemployed people to defend their social or political rights i.e. to empower them to claim their social and political rights. The third *table 5.3* looks firstly at the target of protest activities, that is whether the activities of the organisations can be characterised either as cultural protest action or as instrumental protest action and secondly, at the degree of disruptiveness, that is, whether organisations employ rather moderate or disruptive strategies. Considering that contentious activities are given a high importance by organisations of the unemployed compared to the organisations studied by Rucht et al. (1997), these two aspects describe two crucial characteristics of protest actions. These aspects describe, firstly, the emphasis and, secondly, the orientation of activities. Each table thus proposes two dimensions that combine into four different types¹⁰² of organisations of the unemployed.

5.1 “We care”: taking into account the individual needs of unemployed people

In the following section, the strategies that point to the importance of taking the individual distress of unemployed people into account, on the one hand, and the importance that is given to political action in the form of protest politics from below, on the other hand, will be described.

¹⁰² A typology is the result of a process in which objects are sorted according to one or several features (Kluge 1999). Every type is defined by a specific combination of these features. In my study, the three individual categories have not been integrated further but are instead presented separately.

The fact that unemployed people are assumed to face various material, psychological or social problems has called many non-profit organisations to action. The voluntary sector, composed of professional and voluntary welfare organisations, address a variety of problems that many people (including the unemployed) are assumed to suffer from (Royall 2009). In France, for example, more than 8,000 organisations are reported to care for the unemployed (Maurer and Pierru 2001). Counselling, for example, has been an important service for unemployed people since the 1980s. Welfare organisations, the church, and union organisations of the unemployed also offer legal or other technical advice on how to deal with specific problems relating to unemployment. This advice can be simply informative and practical, for example, where and how to apply for additional social benefits other than unemployed assistance. It can also include legal support or advice on how to react to active labour market measures that are considered disadvantageous for the unemployed.

Political actors targeting state institutions and using protest activities are usually distinguished from caring activities of welfare and voluntary organisations. While political actors might be similarly altruistic in taking the interests of other social organisations and actors into account and mobilising on their behalf, the action logic is different from that of voluntary organisations. According to Passy (2001), providing assistance or voluntary services to the disadvantaged is not a form of political altruism as these organisations lack the political cleavage upon which their activities are based. In other words, organisations caring for the unemployed, as well as self-help organisations, do not seek to bring about political and social change. Instead the caring activities are motivated by the desire to relieve individual distress. While these activities might fulfil a political role in society, these voluntary organisations “... *do not engage in political claim-making, nor in social change*” (Passy, 2001:7). Welfare organisations offer advice and support, as do self-help organisations, where unemployed people meet each other to escape social isolation; social movement organisations carry out political activities and politicise the issue of unemployment. While welfare organisations take care of the individual problems of the unemployed, social movements organisations take care of the political ones.

As this study is focused only on the latter type of actors - that is those organisations of the unemployed that are active on the topic of unemployment using

contentious forms of action to promote social or political change - I did not expect to find counselling and self-caring activities. When entering the field of challenging actors, I soon discovered that the distinction of social, or more precisely, caring activities and political actions, or more precisely protest action is not easy to maintain for the organisational level. On the one hand, for example, the Unemployment Centre Berlin (BALZ), a third sector organisation financed by the Protestant Church of Berlin and the most important service point for unemployed people and trainer of counsellors, was involved in different protest activities of the unemployed people's movement, as was a religious community from a district in Berlin. On the other hand, organisations of the unemployed are in fact recognised as important service providers, as for example the local unemployed initiative, Elvis, which is listed as one of few independent counselling service points in Berlin. However, the organisation developed with a clear political agenda and understands its activities as promoting social change through collective action. Thus, while some third sector organisations are considered to belong to the unemployed people's movement, some unemployed people's organisations provide services to unemployed people that are often considered – but not always as we will see below - as apolitical activities.

The distress unemployed individuals face does indeed not remain outside the doors of the organisations of the unemployed. As one unemployed activist mentions, the distress of being unemployed often enters the dynamics of organisations. *“The social climate is not stopping outside our doors. This tension also leads to conflicts within the organisation as people are frustrated. The existential distress that also has an impact on our political work”* (Interview 9:22). Unemployed activists - often equally concerned by long-term unemployment themselves - describe the psychological distress, their difficulties of material survival and the social isolation experienced by unemployed people. For example, an activist describes the low spirits of unemployed people arriving at one of the organisation's service points: *“When unemployed people come here for the first time, they are prostrated, they look at their shoes”* (Interview 16:14). Unemployed people coming to the service point of the organisation are perceived as socially isolated persons who are ashamed of receiving social assistance.

Thus, not only professional charity organisations, unemployed activists also refer to the distress unemployed people are assumed to suffer.¹⁰³

Since the 1980s when increasing mass unemployment became a structural challenge for most Western democracies instead of being a transitory phenomenon, organisations emerged at the local level to address the problems of unemployed people. Describing the situation when the first unemployed people's organisations emerged in France in the 1980s, an unemployed activist states: *"The unemployed could not do much in the 1980s. They were left alone to deal with their individual problems and could not defend themselves. The aim was to have a place where you could meet the unemployed and help them"* (Interview 16:3) That is, unemployed people lacked a physical place to go - but even more an organisational home.

Some organisations translate their concerns into specific caring activities for the unemployed. The unemployed activist who spoke about the prostrated unemployed people coming to their organisations for the first time indeed continues: *"... and after two days, some weeks, well, they lift their head and their smile comes back. And that is already half of the work. Because if a person is all on her own she does not have the possibility to rebuild relationships. They do not get out of that all on their own"* (Interview 16:14) It seems therefore that one of the aims of the organisation is to make unemployed people feel better and get a smile back on their face. One of the main activities of this unemployed people's organisation is indeed to get unemployed people into contact with each other and also provides psychological support.

While some organisations respond to unemployed people's needs spontaneously during their meetings, the caring activities of other organisations are reflected in their organisational structure. Union organisations of the unemployed, adapting the tradition of unions to offer legal support for employed people, often distinguish political activities of interest representation from caring activities provided for unemployed colleagues carried out by unemployed union volunteers.

Some unemployed activists mention that they would take over the core tasks that the welfare state and welfare organisations are not willing to carry out (any more),

¹⁰³ Although referring to the unemployed in distress is ambivalent for most organisations of the unemployed. One aim of unemployed people's actions is indeed to fight against the stereotyped images of unemployed people. Some organisations, for example, oppose the public image of unemployed people as in need of care and support, criticising paternalistic procedures that aim to 'help and care' for the unemployed, framing them as a form of 'care persecution'. See also the following footnote.

and thus being one of the few remaining social forces caring for unemployed people. In this way, unemployed activists seem to highlight the role of caring activities as a moral resource. Considering that moral arguments are probably the most important powerful tool of the unemployed to enter the public sphere, caring activities can then be seen as a crucial activity of poor actors. At the same time, caring activities are also used as a diagnostic frame (Benford and Snow 2000) indicating the problem of unemployment (retrenchment of the welfare state).

A core caring activity of some organisations of the unemployed consists of providing unemployed people with information. French and German unemployed organisations point out that administrative bodies do not comply with their duty to inform people about their social entitlements. When asked about the most important activity for unemployed organisations, a French activist states: *“Informing! Informing! I have the regulations of the Assedic here on my computer [...] where it is spelled out that the Assedic has to inform people about their rights. But they never inform. Never!”* (Interview 14:6) The administration fails to provide unemployed people with information, therefore, the organisation takes over the information activities that the administration is supposed to do. Often the lack of information on their rights and entitlements puts unemployed people at the mercy of civil servants in the social administration or job centres.

People from the lower strata of society, in particular, tend to claim their rights more seldom, often simply because they are not aware of their entitlements. It is not only the case that administrative bodies fail to provide benefit recipients with the necessary knowledge to claim their entitlements but sometimes the unemployed are confronted with civil servants who are not informed about particular regulations or new developments. In particular, in situations where income support system is very fragmented and unemployed people with low income are entitled to claim different financial support for electricity, water and the like, it is a problem for unemployed people if the *information is not circulating*” (Interview 6:5) and civil servants might deprive unemployed people of social assistance because of their lack of knowledge. Thus, for both French and German unemployed activists informing unemployed people is one of the most important caring activities that they carry out.

Unemployed people are, for example, informed about their entitlements, such as the duration of unemployment benefits or the different possibilities of additional financial support (e.g. for electricity or housing). One of the stories told during an interview is about a woman who came to the organisations three years ago. The person resigned from a job as a result of employer's racist views. After a trial, her former employer had to admit this in the letter of dismissal and as a result, the woman had the right to receive social assistance from the Assedic. *"She came to us in despair. We examined her file. And we found an article in the convention of the UNEDIC that stated, in this case, she had the right to get unemployment benefit. I accompanied her to the ASSEDIC and at the end of 30 minute discussion, she was informed that she would receive 15,000 Euro. Alone she would have had nothing"* (Interview 14:5). Organisations of the unemployed thus support unemployed people to claim their social rights.

Furthermore, unemployed people are informed about possibilities for professional legal advice. Unemployment initiatives rely on information on the Internet where several well-known unemployment initiatives provide a list of lawyers who take on unemployed people's cases. In Germany, organisations of the unemployed are also active on the issue of the so-called "1-Euro jobs". People receive support to look for a 1-Euro job that they choose themselves, rather than being assigned it by the job centre, or are informed about strategies to avoid doing these jobs at all as most activists consider that it is essentially being forced to do (meaningless) work.

Furthermore, one unemployed people's organisation in Berlin organised communication courses to help unemployed people feel better equipped when claiming their rights as unemployment benefit recipients in job centres. Unemployed people are also accompanied to the job centres. Although legal advice can only be given by legal experts with special permission, unemployment initiatives may provide tips on how to behave to avoid sanctions of the job centres – such as the cut of social benefits -, to inform individuals about the conditions for accepting a 1-Euro job and other useful matters (e.g. informing people that they are not obliged to let job centre official into their apartments to check whether they are living in a partnership with a person receiving a regular income). In the German context, one important topic where unemployed people need a lot of advice are the regulations for re-integration (the so-called 'Eingliederungsvereinbarungen'), which unemployed people are obliged to

sign. Many of the caring activities are indeed motivated by the idea to ‘protecting’ people from the faceless administration, the lack of knowledge of state employees, or the measures taken to control or sanction unemployed people. Unemployed activists in Germany even coined word of the ‘persecuting care’¹⁰⁴ (Verfolgungsbetreuung, insert Fetzter, in Schwarzbuch Hartz IV, page 31-45) to de-legitimise the attempts of job centres to ‘activate’ people.

Thus, putting an emphasis on the difficulties of unemployed individuals, some organisations translate their concerns into various caring activities. For some organisations, taking the distress of unemployed individuals into account even becomes one of the most important aims of their activities. One unemployed activist who explains the priority given to addressing individual problems, for example, states: *“It is important that we prioritise. Our main priority is that we want to be a self-employed organisation, a discussion organisation in the first instance, but different from these other organisations [...], we emphasise the need to inform people, to consult people, to help people”* (Interview 4:18). Thus, similar to non-profit organisations, these organisations also provide services to the unemployed. However, in contrast to established charity organisations, organisations of the unemployed also raise claims for political or social change through protest activities.

However, as the *table 5.1* below shows, not all organisations take into account the need to help unemployed individuals. Some organisations are reluctant to consider the social deprivation of unemployed people, which requires spending time, money and energy to defend the rights of individuals without politicising the problem. Instead, they expect other collective actors and the welfare state to provide these services. These other organisations - even though they might refer to the individual problems of unemployed people – stress the importance of activities that politicise the issue through the use of protest activities. These unemployed organisations carry out, for example, regular symbolic protest activities in front of the job centres. These organisations also set up information stands for unemployed people going to the job centre, however, the primary aim of these actions is not to offer a service to

¹⁰⁴ The word was first used by members of the union, Verdi, who were working in a job centre in Bochum. The term describes the *“zielgerichtete und absichtlich erwerblose Menschen durch überzogene Anforderungen, z.B. an den Umfang ihrer Bewerbungsbemühungen, an ihre Flexibilität oder durch verschärfte Kontrollen, aus dem Leistungsbezug auszugrenzen, bzw. Ihnen die Leistungen zu kürzen.”* (Fetzter 2006:31).

unemployed people, but to raise public awareness in the (alternative) media - often invited for the purpose of that event.

For some organisations, the refusal to carry out caring activities is closely linked to the importance given to protest activities. Some organisations not only distinguish caring activities from political actions, but also refuse to get involved in the former activities, considering their political activities as being opposed to charity. One unemployed activist, asked her organisation to cooperate with other collective actors and institutions to organise activities in the contentious field of unemployment, such as welfare organisations states. This proposal was strongly contested and resulted in the drop-out of some members of the organisation. Indeed, not all organisations of the unemployed agree about welfare organisations belonging to the same contentious field, as one unemployed activists states, for example: *“What kind of activities do welfare organisations engage in? They collect food so it is not thrown away and distribute it. But we never participated in that kind of activities”* (Interview 5:14) Alleviating the distress of unemployed people by charity activities is not part of the perceived forms of collective action of these organisations. Another unemployed activist stated when asked for possible cooperation with the church states: *“The church is also active for homeless and people in distress. [...] That shows that we are not alone. We do not simply give advice or alleviate distress. Alleviating distress is not a solution. That is where we are different from others. Not that we want to depreciate the work of others, if they help people in distress. That is all necessary. Not that we look down at the church, because the do not work politically. That is their frame in which they are active”* (Interview 5:9) The activities of the church are considered to belong to a kind of collective actor. These activities might be considered necessary but are also considered to belong to other organisation’s action repertoire.

While some organisations consider protest politics and caring activities explicitly as opposing forms of social action, some at least symbolically integrate individual concerns into their collective activities. I once visited a meeting of an unemployed people’s organisation where part of the debate was dedicated to the problems of an unemployed person. Announced as the ‘report of a concerned person’ in the agenda of the meeting, the unemployed person spoke about her experience with the job centre. Although unemployed people rarely feel comfortable talking about their problems as

they do not want to be cared for by the other organisation members, some organisations regularly dedicate some of their time to the experiences of concerned people. These reports are, however, not used to solve the individual problem, but are important informative resources to politicise the topic and formulate injustice frames. Indeed, activists of the organisation are rather reluctant to integrate unemployed newcomers into the protest activities, mentioning how the pessimistic view and lacking knowledge about how protest politics works slows down the organisation of activities. The stories of individual people are however crucial to politicise the issue of unemployment, giving it a personal face and thus, again, using the moral as a resource to enter the public sphere.

Thus, organisations of unemployed do not necessarily agree on the issue of addressing the individual distress of unemployed people. Whether these needs should become a core focus of unemployed social movement organisations, is one of the main conflicts between different organisations of the unemployed. While some organisations clearly refer to a specific ideological strand to refuse to carry out service activities, other organisations simply state that providing help to an individual is not a solution. While giving help to unemployed people is defined by some organisations as an important aspect of resolving the problem of unemployment - often connected to the statement that the welfare state has given up its crucial tasks - other organisations criticise the unemployed people's movement for taking over the role of a fire brigade, considering its difficulty in becoming a political actor. Yet, this aspect is less pronounced in France, where social topics are more easily politicised and protest activities organised around social topics.

Thus, not all organisations give priority to assisting unemployed people who are in distress, but instead make the issue of unemployment a public and political issue. Other organisations of the unemployed consider the individual dimension as important.

Table 5.1 below, firstly, describes the importance organisations of the unemployed give to activities that put individual distress at the centre of attention, aiming to alleviate these personal concerns, and secondly, illustrates the importance of political action for these organisations.

Table 5.1 – Importance given to caring activities and protest action by organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

importance of caring activities	importance of protest activities	
	+	++
-	Kampagne No service Anders arbeiten <i>AC!*</i> N = 4	Anti-Hartz Bündnis EL GEW Aktionsbündnis EL NGG Erwin <i>CGT chômeur</i> N = 6
+	Elvis EL Verdi Selbsthilfe Pankow Ermutigungskreis <i>Assol</i> N = 5	EL Bau EL Metall <i>CPP</i> <i>Apeis</i> N = 4

* In order to distinguish between the organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin, the French organisations appear in italics in this table and all subsequent tables.

In *table 5.1*, both of these dimensions are combined to a four-fold typology. The organisations in the upper left and upper right box strongly refuse the idea of providing services being part of the fight against unemployment. Organisations belonging to this type refuse to take over tasks of the welfare state or other charity organisations. This does not always mean that these organisations completely refuse to take individual matters into account, but even if they do so these organisations only dedicate a small amount of time to unemployed people's social needs compared to other organisations and the individual encounters with administrative bodies are not considered as a central part of the struggle. The organisations in the upper right box do not engage in caring for the unemployed individual. These organisations do not engage in these activities as they consider political activities as being opposed to

social caring activities, while the former though engaged in public protest activities do not exclusively organise protest as a strategy to politicise the issue of unemployment.

Nearly half of the organisations of the unemployed (N = 9) have instead regular office hours where unemployed people can drop in and get some form of help - including self-help activities during the meetings. Providing some form of services gives their activities a daily continuity. The third type of organisations in the lower right box stresses the need for social support for unemployed people, in addition to political activities. Often these organisations reflect this distinction in their organisational structure, consisting of a political and a social strand. One unemployed activists explains this coexistence of both forms of activities: *“The counselling service takes place on a personal level. The people who have problems come here. That is the unemployed people’s cuddle organisation. While in the other part of the organisation we first have to take up the cuddling. The cuddling is rather in the background there and the political in the foreground, the information and the political activities”* (Interview 3:13) Indeed many organisations integrate counselling service into their daily activities, even though they may give them different weight. Finally, the organisations that put an emphasis on taking the individual distress into account and only occasionally participate in protest activities are located in the lower-left box. Protest activities are part of the action repertoire of the organisation but it is not one of the foremost aims of these organisations being engaged in other types of activities.

Though both types of activities, namely, caring activities and protest mobilisation, have very different targets they share an important similarity. That is, both types of activities give the organisation’s activities a continuity holding the organisation together and alive. That is, the provision of services such as counselling requires regular offices hours, as do the opening hours for unemployed meetings places. This continuity is even more the case in Paris, where the ‘Maison de chômeurs’ are usually open the daily during the whole week, while organisations in Berlin only offer a counselling service, for example, twice a week for a couple of hours. Unemployed people are present during the regular opening hours, constantly have to acquire new expertise and get familiar with new regulations.

Similar to some organisations who give their organisation activities a more continuous character by providing services, other organisations guarantee this continuity by going to all kinds of demonstrations more or less connected to the topic of unemployment. In France, organisations of the unemployed participate at various social conflicts, such as the movement of the CPE, activities of the immigrant community unified in the “mouvement des sans”, and various strikes, while in Germany, the identity of some organisations to belong to the family of new social movements allows them to participate also at peace demonstrations. *“In the meantime we do all kinds of demonstrations, for example peace demonstrations and so on”* (Interview 13:5) Thus, while some organisations guarantee a continuity to their work by providing office hours, other organisations engage in movement politics to conciliate between the tension of occasional unemployed protests and an organisation’s social cohesion.

One particularly interesting aspect in studying the various activities of organisations of the unemployed are the many small narratives described in the interviews. As the citations on caring activities, for example, indicate, the type of caring activities organisations of the unemployed are engaged in are often told as short narratives. These short narratives described in the interviews characterise the fight of the unemployed David against the bureaucratic Goliath and emphasise the smaller and bigger successes the organisations of the unemployed have in their struggle. As Poletta (2006) has shown, these narratives seem to be particularly important for actions of disadvantaged social groups.

5.2 Social and political empowering: motivating the unemployed for resistance

In the following section, organisations of the unemployed activities that address in one way or the other unemployed people’s marginalised position will be looked at in more detail. While in the previous section, the aim was to simply describe the importance organisations of the unemployed give to caring activities and protest activities, in the following the focus will be shifted to the meaning of these activities that is given to them by organisations of the unemployed.

As described in the previous section, one particularity of the organisations of the unemployed – probably different to most other social movements - seems to be their

emphasis on individual needs and supposed characteristics of individuals assumed to belong to the same social group. One assumes that unemployed people are deprived of something: their material security, their social contacts and cultural life. Unemployed people are also assumed to be politically marginalised, having no access to public debate or institutionalised channels of (corporate) policy making. They are therefore addressed as political actors being deprived of their ‘droit de parole’¹⁰⁵, their corporate interest representation, or else it is assumed that unemployed people deprive themselves politically by withdrawing from public and political life by becoming increasingly isolated and politically disinterested.

The social and political deprivation of unemployed people is addressed by different strategies of organisations of the unemployed. As shown in the previous section in *table 5.1*, nine out of 19 organisations consider caring activities as important and thus respond to the presumed social deprivation of unemployed people. For example, some organisations of the unemployed provide meeting spaces for unemployed people, thus, offering them a place to go when everybody else goes to work. Other organisations, however, use these meetings as a place to mobilise unemployed people for collective action. Some organisations are critical of those who become professional service providers and are considered simply as a service for unemployed consumers. As one unemployed activist states: *“It is important to help people to change. ... But it is important that people do not come here in the same way as they go to other public institutions or social workers to claim something. Unfortunately that is still what happens sometimes but that our activities are a trampoline that mobilises the people”* (Interview 16:5) Caring activities are viewed by some organisations as more than simply helping the unemployed individual in distress. Services are provided to the unemployed to access unemployed people to mobilise them for political action instead. In the case of the above-cited organisation of the unemployed, the main aim of caring activities is to empower unemployed people, to help them to answer back, to take matters into their own hands, and to give them means to defend their rights.

Indeed, there are various instances where organisations of the unemployed respond to the social and political deprivation of the unemployed and aim to empower the

¹⁰⁵ See Pierre Bourdieu (with Viansson-Ponté, P) (1977) ‘Le droit à la parole’ and ‘La culture, pour qui and pourquoi?’ *Le Monde*, 11 and 12 October, page 1-2

unemployed for action and the defence of their rights. Service points in front of the job centre are sometimes simply information desks where organisations of the unemployed offer information and advice. However, these information stands are sometimes used to mobilise unemployed people or to provide unemployed people with information that will put the job centre under pressure.

This strategy of using knowledge as a form of power has been mainly used in Germany since the Hartz reform in Germany, which was implemented in the beginning of 2005, and in France since the attempts to tighten up the unemployment statistics by ‘recalculating’ and therefore excluding people from unemployment benefits. *“The case of the ‘recalculated’ took place in 2004 when the UNEDIC decided to suppress the rights of unemployed people. Unemployed people then came to see us to invoke social justice. There were more than 200 cases filed. And there we won and the state immediately shifted down a gear”* (Interview 14:4) Local organisations played an active role in the struggle of individual unemployed people to claim their right to not be “recalculated”. These services for individuals were clearly seen as a political strategy to put the state under pressure. As one unemployed activist explains: *“In Paris, 70 dossiers had been disputed in 2004; these cases have never been called. The state withdrew its articles in advance, it felt the boisterous wind and said: Holà. Since it knew that there were more than 2,000 dossiers being prepared in France. You could not deposit all the files. There was a first batch of files and these cases had been called; you could not deposit the others. That would have been a hindrance. [...] Then, each time you had to wait until the court handed down its decision before presenting a new file. And the government felt the icy wind passing and immediately changed the articles”* (Interview 14:4). Thus, informing the unemployed is used as a strategy to challenge public institutions, in particular, by encouraging individuals to claim their social rights.

The provision of self-help structures may mean very different things to different organisations. Usually, self-help initiatives are considered to be apolitical gatherings of people who meet to improve their own personal situation. The people who face difficulties do not seek to change anything outside, but only their individual approach to something. However, one unemployed organisation views self-help as a form of ‘empowering’ unemployed people by enabling them to exit a political system that treats them as dependent. This organisation aims to give people back the ability to

take care of themselves and in this regard, it strongly opposes the paternalistic reaction of state institutions in cases where people claim their social rights. These unemployed people exit the control of institutions to some extent, but they do so through a joint activity, claiming at the same time their local cultural space.

Some unemployed activists like to take care of themselves in form of self-empowering activities and mutual counselling activities. *“For many concerned people, there is a demand to meet each other, for various reasons. There is a demand for counselling because the practice of job centres and job agencies have become more rigorous. For that reason, many people wanted to move in the direction of a self-help organisation”* (Interview 7:22) These meetings are, however, motivated by the idea of empowering unemployed people by giving them a knowledge advantage over state employees in the job and social assistance centres and, thereby, putting the system under pressure.

Another example is an organisation that was established with the aim of helping unemployed people. The foundation was motivated by one of the activist’s own experience of the unemployment services and the feeling of being at their mercy. After resigning from her job to care of her mother and grandmother, the activist got into a difficult situation and had to make a claim for social benefits. Out of this experience the organisation came into being. The activist transformed her own experience of helplessness into strategies to put unemployed in a position to answer back when dealing with state authorities. The story about the personal experience of the activist focuses on taking the personal situation of the unemployed into account and empowering them to answer back. These caring activities, which are central for the organisation’s activities, differ from other service providers for the unemployed. The counselling service offered by these organisations is given a contentious character: *“The work of our organisation was relatively continuous. We started quickly in the first half of the year distributing leaflets. We then appeared in the bourgeois media like a ghost: [...] a revolution in the district. It was terrible what happened here, a real agitation. And we recognised that our work is right, we cannot just offer counselling services; we have to go public. On the basis of this experience, we went public; we went in front of social assistance and job centres and aggressively distributed leaflets and initiated counselling services on the streets. With varying success. There were difficulties with the administrations, we were sent away quickly,*

and there was trouble with the police. We registered our stands [...] then it worked. We are able to have a stand once a month in front of the social assistance or job centres to inform about Hartz IV and to indicate the possibilities for support and help” (Interview 4:4) As the interviewee explains, the main aim is to raise the political consciousness of unemployed people to oppose a situation they are being accused of but they are firstly not responsible for and secondly the first victims of.¹⁰⁶ The aim of the organisation is twofold. On the one hand, it tries to put unemployed in the position to claim their rights. The organisation informs unemployed assistance recipients about their social and civil rights as this knowledge is not easily available or obvious to most people. On the other hand, it attempts to fight the bureaucratic structure that controls and sanctions unemployed people by the means of its institutionalised procedures. It could be argued that informing the unemployed about their rights and putting them in a position to oppose the often over-stretched state employees runs the risk of making the system of income support for unemployed, and thus the whole system of passive and active labour market policy, vulnerable (see next section). The organisation thus challenges the institutions of income support by challenging the relationship between the unemployed and bureaucracy. By its service provision the organisation empowers unemployed people to claim their social and civil rights, however, without necessarily motivating people to take part in collective protest activities. People are rather given tools to exercise power and oppose the welfare state institutions that deny unemployed people their rights, exert power over them and stigmatise them through their procedures.

Some organisations try to help unemployed people to become more assertive through a form of a cognitive liberation: *“It is about finding the right language. As long as I am still angry about the loss and the bad treatment by social benefit institutions, I cannot comment. They do not take me seriously. [...] It makes no sense to sit together and lament or to complain about the state like a group of people in the pub. That is not the right approach. It is about freeing yourself from that and finding new ways of thinking”* (Interview 12:7) The organisations engages in raising consciousness and helping unemployed people to get back on their feet in order to

¹⁰⁶ In Germany, being unemployed is a strongly stigmatising identity. The populist discourses of politicians make this situation even worse. There is for example the well-known image of the ‘welfare queens’, known as the ‘Florida-Rolf’. In Germany, the strategy of blaming the victim is especially used during periods of recession, as shown by Oschmiansky (2003).

improve individual agency so that they can get out of a “*vicious circle of capitalist system of production, searching for a job, being employed for a short time and after several months finding oneself again on the dole*” (Interview 12: 9) The unemployed activist, who had previously worked as a volunteer counsellor helping to get people back into the labour market, became critical of her work over time and emphasises the need to develop alternative forms of work.

Some of these organisations try to ‘softly’ motivate people for political action during their opening hours. One unemployment organisation mentions that although they do not make the service provision dependent on people’s engagement, they inform people about activities that are going on and try to motivate them to get involved. Organisations of the unemployed consider that a meeting place is important for motivating people to take part in political activities. For example, they can exchange ideas and information, and plan collective action during breakfast or lunch meetings. During several visits to bi-weekly unemployed breakfasts organised by a local unemployment initiative in Berlin, it was noted that the organisation mostly discussed strategies of how unemployed people of the district could be mobilised for collective action. During the discussions, as well as during the interview and through the organisation’s activities, the organisation expressed its perception of the unemployed, first and foremost, as political citizens. As one of the unemployed activists explained: “*We meet and consult each other about what we could do to get more people to stand up for their own interests. That is the sense of our organisation, and the ... [protest action, A.Z.] make for this*” (Interview 5:16). For this local unemployed initiative, mobilising the unemployed for public action involves motivating people to engage in democratic activities. This requires a form of self-organisation of unemployed people and enabling them to their matters in their own hands by participating in protest activities. The organisation’s strategy is motivated by a conception of democracy as an everyday political praxis. From the beginning, the organisation’s idea was to approach the unemployed in their district to mobilise them for protest action. Often the organisation distributes leaflets in front of the job centre with the aim of including unemployed people in discussions and convincing them to get involved in protest activities. The organisation also seeks to make the contact with unemployed people during protest marches, explaining to them the importance of doing something together as a collective actor.

For some organisations, the underlying assumption is that the mass phenomenon of unemployment should translate into widespread protest, and this requires the mobilisation of unemployed people. The organisation's support therefore constitutes a form of political support that attempts to transform the organisation of unemployed people into a self-organised and collective actor.

Thus, while the various caring activities mentioned in the previous section are sometimes simply part of unemployed people's "*material survival strategies*" (Snow and Anderson, 1993:110), these activities might also be used to empower unemployed people to answer back and to defend their social, political and civil rights.

Caring activities have indeed been part of social movement activities in the past. Identifying state institutions as part of the problem - and thus not as part of the solution - has motivated some social movements to turn away and respond with more creative forms of self-organisation. The women's movement is probably the most prominent example of a movement that occasionally uses caring activities as its most important strategy. Feminists have organised grass-roots activism of self-reliance in many western democracies due to their perception of the traditional political system as deeply patriarchal and their opposition to organisational forms of hierarchy. In the 1970s, the emerging social women's movement quickly "*... moved from theoretical debates to practical concerns such as organising anti-authoritarian collective childcare*" (Rucht 2003:245). Defining the state and its activities as being at the source of the problem and re-framing the private as political, women's movements expanded the conception of what can be considered as political action. This shelter movement, for example, offered victims of domestic violence an autonomous space of mutual support and an escape from male violence. It "*... became an essential grass-roots component of women's liberation movements*" (Elman 2003:95). In fact, caring activities and self-reliance were at one time the most important strategies of the feminist movement.

Table 5.2 – Social and political empowerment strategies of organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

Social empowerment	Political empowerment	
	-	+
-	Aktionsbündnis Kampagne Anti-Hartz Bündnis EL GEW EL NGG EL Verdi Ermutigungskreis <i>AC!</i> N = 7	Anders arbeiten Erwin EL Bau <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> <i>CGT chômeur</i> N = 6
+	 Elvis Selbsthilfe Pankow	 No service EL Metall <i>Apeis</i>

For some organisations of the unemployed, caring activities are not considered to be apolitical acts. The provision of caring activities can be integrated into more political movement strategies instead. As in the case of the women's movement, caring activities are given a contentious character and the distinction between social and political activities is intentionally blurred. However, it seems in contrast to the women's movement, these organisations of the unemployed are able to employ social and political empowering strategies at the same time.

However, the caring activities of unemployed activists do not always form part of the contentious work of grass-roots organisations. While taking care of unemployed people is viewed by some organisations as a strategic tool to empower them to defend their rights and take their matters in their own hands, other organisations offer services to unemployed people simply like a service-provider.

Organisations of the unemployed aim to empower unemployed people in two main ways. The first strategy is to mobilise unemployed people for political action. For example, access to an organisation's premises during its opening hours is believed to "*softly mobilise unemployed people*" (Interview 14:5). Similarly, breakfasts for unemployed people are used to organise protest activities and also provide a way to introduce new members. A second strategy of empowering consists of providing unemployed with a voice when interacting with the state administration or when claiming their social rights. Unemployed people are viewed here not as potential political actors, but as a tool to put public institutions under pressure through the mass behaviour of individuals.

Table 5.2 describes these different empowerment strategies of the organisations of the unemployed. The table shows that some organisations consider the social empowerment of unemployed people to be essential. There are five organisations of this kind: three of these are also engaged in empowering unemployed people as political actors and two mainly deal with unemployed people when they are interacting with public bodies. Most organisations do not consider that there is a need for the social empowerment of unemployed people (N = 14). The majority of these organisations do not consider empowering unemployed as political actors - apart from six organisations, which do engage in this type of activity.

From an analysis of the empowering strategies, it is interesting to note that organisations use narratives to explain a certain type of engagement. In some cases, unemployed people are portrayed as a mass of apolitical people that is not interested in becoming politically involved and for this reason, political mobilisation does not play a major role for these organisations. For others, the unemployed individual is described as being in a specific situation where he/she is in need of a cognitive liberation (McAdam 1982) or the right framing (Benford and Snow 2000) that translates individual distress into the collective grievance of an organisation. Organisations of the unemployed tend to give meaning to the type of activity in which they are involved through these narratives, which also serve to justify their type of engagement (see also Poletta, 2006).

5.3 Cultural and instrumental protest forms

As stated in the introduction, only a few organisations engaged in the alternative sector of Berlin refer to protest as the most or second most important activity of the organisation. However, in comparison to the alternative sector in Berlin studied by Rucht et al. (1997), the local organisations of the unemployed studied in this thesis participate regularly in various kinds of contentious activities. However, they do so in different ways. In light of the importance of protest activities for local organisations of the unemployed and the various ways in which organisations engage in contentious action, the final section will focus on two aspects of protest activities. This includes: firstly, the orientation or main target of activities (in other words, whether the main activities of the organisations should be understood as either cultural or instrumental collective actions) and, secondly, it will look at the disruptiveness of the activities of organisations of the unemployed.

As described in the previous section, caring activities might also seek to change the behaviour of the unemployed. In the same way as parts of the environmental movement have attempted to raise the environmental consciousness of people, some organisations of the unemployed attempt to raise the consciousness of unemployed people in order to bring about social change from below. In contrast to the previous section, which centred on the issue of changing the behaviour of unemployed people to enable them to answer back, the following section will focus on the issue of contentious collective action. Organisations do not always exercise collective action with the aim of addressing power holders, but instead attempt to bring about a more long-lasting and cultural change by addressing the individual's behaviour, as well as social institutions.

Indeed, although all organisations of the unemployed participate in various protest activities, not all organisations consider public protest actions as the best strategy to promote social or political change for unemployed people. Some organisations of the unemployed are particularly critical of the *"... old politics, whether it is in form of party politics or in the form of the social forum or whatever, ... that you try to analyse the political situation, at the most organising a demonstration and then go home. That is such a worship of the demonstration as a magic bullet"* (Interview 2:8) In Germany, several organisations mention the reluctance of the people to use the 'old forms of political struggle' that *"... most of the people find the specific forms of*

political interventions so antiquated, or cannot find anything in it any more" (Interview 6:13). In several other interviews, unemployed activists also mention that people are tired of 'old forms of movement politics'. *"In general one would think that there should be more happening with so many organisations and initiatives around. But it is not. I think the contrary is the case. Most people are a bit annoyed by specific forms of political intervention. Or have no use for it"* (Interview 6:13). Being annoyed with old protest forms but also sceptical whether protest activities are the best way to put the subject of unemployment onto the agenda, these organisations often engage in other activities. *"... and the new thing is that this political interest these forms of the old politics, that this is complemented with other forms, as for example occupying places that are entrusted in our care"* (Interview 2:8). In this case, an organisation of the unemployed proposes contentious alternatives to public mass protest activities.

While the new social movements have always adopted other more innovative forms of protest and symbolic action and whole movements have often been described as being either an instrumental or cultural movement, unemployed action seems to be characterised by both logics of activity. While unemployed action is often described as an instrumental movement targeting state institutions and power holders, there are also many activities that rather describe a cultural logic. These activities do not aim to attract the attention of the media and complement the more outward-oriented and instrumental protest activities that are also part of the contentious politics of unemployment.

Indeed, empirical research on the political and cultural life of marginalised people has indicated a broad variety of hidden forms of political and social activities. The protest repertoire seems to be enlarged by other forms of action, which are referred to by Scott (1985) as the 'weapons of the weak'. In Scott's study these weapons describe the 'every-day forms of resistance' that were created by the peasantry during periods where there was no major political change as a means of challenging the more powerful members of society. *"Most forms of this struggle stop well short of outright collective defiance... foot dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so on. These Brechtian- or Schweikian- forms of class struggle have certain features in common. They require little or no coordination or planning, they make use of implicit understandings and*

informal networks; they often represent a form of individual self-help; they typically avoid any direct, symbolic confrontation with authority” (Scott 1985:XVI). This means that encounters with unjust authority (Gamson, Rytina, and Fireman 1982) may be different for powerless and resourceless actors or stigmatised organisations than for others actors. Furthermore, as unemployed people have a clientele relationship with the state, they may be inclined to use other targets for their action.

Thus, in some contexts or for some types of actors it may make more sense to employ cultural forms of resistance. Marginalised and powerless actors or people who mobilise in a hostile cultural or political context might broaden the range of action to include less visible and more discursive or cultural forms of resistance. Unemployed people in France and Germany act in a democratic political context; however, unemployed actors usually lack legitimacy and are confronted with different degrees of closure within a political and cultural space. The fact that being unemployed often means being ascribed a stigmatised identity, being confronted with a high-salience political issues, and hostile public opinion in some countries (such as Germany) might motivate some organisations of unemployed people to look for less visible forms of action.

Two unusual examples of this less visible form of collective action of unemployed organisations can be found in Berlin. The first example consists of a counselling service offered by an unemployed organisation and the second example involves an self-help organisation for unemployed people.

Caring activities, as outlined in *Section 5.1*, aim to protect unemployed people against the abuse of power by state authorities and to enable unemployed to claim their rights, as argued in *Section 5.2*. Caring activities, although they may be the same for the unemployed individuals who are looking for support, can mean very different things for the unemployed organisation that is engaged in this kind of activity. In Berlin, one unemployed organisation offers counselling for unemployed people to ‘help the unemployed’ but also to empower them. At the same time, the counselling is a strategy to attack the implementation of the new labour market reform. *“People who received an official letter (to take up a job of public utility paid with a symbolic salary, A.Z.) and were satisfied with it. We nevertheless recommended filing an objection because the letter would violate the constitutional law. These objections*

cause major problems for the job centres as they do not know how to react to them ... we dispose of general and specific examples that help us writing an appeal”¹⁰⁷. The organisation encourages unemployed people not to sign the contracts for the newly-introduced procedures of profiling and to refuse the ‘obligatory jobs’ offered by the job centre. These strategies of individual collective disruption target administrative procedures by attempting to put severe pressure on the system and thereby, to provoke social and political change. It does not achieve this, however, through mass legal action as in the case of the French “recalculated” or in the context of protests in Berlin where organisations asked for the delayed mass filing of requests for unemployment assistance prior to the implementation of the Hartz IV reform in January 2005. Instead, the organisation aims to the change institutional cultures through the action of unemployed individuals.

These strategies are similar to the poor people’s protest of Piven and Cloward, (1977:301ff) although they had a more elaborate strategy for changing the social system. The authors attempted to mobilise the whole population of welfare recipients in New York to claim their benefits. This massive request for financial assistance would have resulted in a fiscal crisis in the city and it was hoped that it would become an incentive for the state to take up the issue and to guarantee a basic income. This comprehensive strategy to bring down the entire social system is not the case for these unemployed movements, but the logic of the activities remains the same. The main target of the activities is the behaviour of unemployed individuals with the specific aim of challenging institutions from below.

The second example is a self-help unemployed organisation, symbolically occupying public spaces for its organisation’s activities and proposes this lifestyle to other people.¹⁰⁸ Even though the organisation is characterised by the retreat from specific state institutions, the activities are, nevertheless, directed towards challenging the procedures of the institutions responsible for income support through self-managed civil engagement. The organisation of self-help structures is described as the only possible way in which unemployed people can get their autonomy from paternal

¹⁰⁷ Leaflet of the Elvis organisation of the unemployed.

¹⁰⁸ The criterion of including various social activities as part of unemployment contention is thus that the organisation agrees collectively on a strategy that criticises institutional arrangements. In contrast to the ‘radical counseling service’, ‘radical self-help’ is a strategy where the organisation retreats from the social institutions that ‘deal’ with the unemployed.

state administrations.¹⁰⁹ While the former organisation is engaged in changing the behaviour of unemployed people to be able to answer back, the latter organisation withdraws from interaction with the state administration by proposing their alternative lifestyle to other people in their district.¹¹⁰ Indeed, social movements have been distinguished according their logic of action: *“It has been noted that the activities of social movements are in part expressive; in part instrumental; in part directed at their own members; in part designated to transform the external environment”* (della Porta and Diani, 1999:195). While some organisation propose their way of life to other unemployed people (i.e. by withdrawing from the public and contentious relationships with the state), the strategy of the radical counselling service is to fight against bureaucratic state structures in the form of an individualised collective resistance. However, both forms are similar in their invisible way of tackling the problem of unemployment by changing society without raising the attention of the media or third parties addressing power holders on their behalf.

Some organisations prefer instead to encourage strong opposition by putting pressure on the political system. Depending on whether the organisations join forces to organise a broad coalition of opposition or whether they put the unemployed at the centre of attention, the organisations develop different alliance building strategies. However, the aim of these actors is to pose a challenge by organising public protest activities including mass protests and innovative protest forms. Thus, these different activities are indicated by organisations targeting political decision-making bodies other than the administrations, addressing the relationship between unemployed people and the political sphere or by addressing primarily the behaviour of unemployed individuals.

Table 5.3 illustrates the organisations’ preference for either cultural or political protest forms.

¹⁰⁹ One unemployed activist for example refers to the political self-help orientation of unemployed activists in the Weimar Republic (Interview 2:5).

¹¹⁰ Thus cultural forms of opposition cut across empowering strategies.

Table 5.3 – Logic of protest action by organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

importance of disruptive action	cultural or instrumental logics of action	
	cultural	political
-	Selbsthilfe Pankow Ermutigungskreis	Aktionsbündnis Anti-Hartz Bündnis EL GEW EL NGG Erwin EL Verdi <i>Assol</i> <i>CPP</i>
+	No service Elvis Anders arbeiten	Kampagne EL Bau EL Metall <i>Apeis</i> <i>CGT chômeur</i> <i>AC!</i>

While five organisations employ cultural contentious logics, most of the organisations (N = 14) use political protest activities, that is, contentious action whose primary aim is to make it into the public discourse addressing power holders.

A second dimension shown in the table is the degree of disruptiveness of organisations of the unemployed. Even though research pointed at the generally ‘soft’ nature of the organisations’ collective activities (see i.e. Rucht 1997:105) organisations differ in their propensity to use moderate versus more challenging or disruptive activities. Considering the presumed importance of disruptive activities for poor people’s actors, it is would be interesting to know whether indeed unemployed actors use disruptive strategies. While it might be (theoretically and practically) important for unemployed people’s actors to use radical activities to achieve their objectives, empirically, it is an open question as to whether they do so or not.

Organisations in fact differ in the extent to which they use more challenging forms of action. As one German unemployed activist states: “*There are those standing in front of the job centre and those that enter: that is the difference*” (Interview 6:17f). A

French activist mentions the fact some organisations are willing to cross borders whereas others are not: *“Some go in and some remain outside”* (Interview 14:12). These organisations are instead more disruptive in the type of frames they advance: *“We have different political aims. I was horrified when I went to a meeting there ... on the question of the fight over unemployment They have the same nuclear fights as in the past - ‘we have to create employment’. We really do not always see things in the same way”* (Interview 18:12). Thus, also organisations of the unemployed distinguish among actors that are more challenging or radical in their activities and frames from those that are not.

In *table 5.3*, the tendency of organisations of the unemployed to use protest activities is shown. Disruptive strategies seem to be, in fact, one of the main strategies for organisations of the unemployed as nine out of 19 organisations use disruptive frames and activities.

Discussion

Organisations of the unemployed differ in the ways that they decide to tackle the problem of unemployment. In this chapter, I distinguished three main logics of action that were found to describe the main activities that organisations of the unemployed are engaged in. Firstly, organisations of the unemployed engage in either caring or protest activities, or indeed in both activities at the same time. Organisations that give different levels of importance to both types of activities are present in both Paris and Berlin. Secondly, unemployed people’s actors aim to empower unemployed people as political actors or claimants of social rights. It is interesting to note that there are no organisations in Paris that combine social and political empowerment strategies; in fact, only one organisation targets the social citizenship of the unemployed. Most French organisations aim to empower the unemployed politically instead. Thirdly, protest activities - which seem to be an important activity for local organisations of the unemployed - follow different logics of action that combine outward and inward (cultural and instrumental) oriented strategies with different degrees of disruptiveness. The differences between organisations in France and Germany were noted: in Paris, organisations of the unemployed do not engage in cultural activities as their main activity. Organisations of the unemployed in Paris are best characterised as instrumental actors, while in Berlin all types of organisations combining the different targets of activity and moderate or disruptive strategies exist.

Three points of particular interest emerge from the discussion of the activities of the organisations of the unemployed.

Firstly, unemployed people's actors provide selective incentives to unemployed people of their district to engage in their organisations. The use of caring activities to mobilise people for political action is a novel form of activity for movement organisations and seems to be specific to organisations of the unemployed. In addition to responding to the distress of the unemployed individuals, organisations can also use caring activities to transform a group of unemployed people into a collective actor. Most importantly, unemployed actors blur the distinction between social and political action by empowering the unemployed to defend their social and political rights. Caring activities – which are usually assumed to be the opposite of political action (Passy 2001) - are linked to empowering strategies and aim to transform unemployed people into political actions. Indeed, as Clemens (1997) also describes, the creative transformation of familiar but apolitical models of organisations made it possible for relatively disadvantaged organisations to mobilise in new ways. It seems as though caring activities might not only be an important moral resource for unemployed people, but also a powerful tool to get unemployed involved in political activism.

Secondly, it could be argued that the most demanding strategy is the attempt by some organisations to mobilise those affected by unemployment into some kind of collective body or actor. Compared to other organisations, unemployed activists do something far more difficult than simply mobilising sympathisers. As unemployed people are perceived as being apolitical, right-wing, and badly educated, the mobilising efforts seek also to define a counter-frame to the dominant legitimising frame, which is not only used by the political authorities to blame the victims, but a popular image of 'the unemployed' rooted in a social discourse. The longer a coherent image of "the unemployed" is portrayed in the discourse and also with negative connotations, the more difficult it will become for unemployed activists to break it. In the words of Gamson, there is a 'legitimizing frame' by the authorities at work that is widely accepted without question. Since *"...people do not necessarily choose between the legitimating frame and the injustice frame, but may hold both to some degree, wavering back and forth"* (Gamson et al. 1982:123). Unemployed activists spend a lot of their time justifying what they are doing and why. By mobilising the

unemployed, they attempt to break the legitimating frame in stressing the (political) agency of unemployed people.

Thirdly, while research on unemployed people's protests carried out in recent years suggests more similarities than differences between the mobilisation process of the unemployed and new social movement actors regarding the forms of protest and organisational forms (Roth 1997), the discussion specifies this general assumption. On the basis of the strategies described above, it seems as though organisations of the unemployed are more contentious than other organisations of the alternative sector (Rucht et al., 1997). Organisations of the unemployed give contentious activities a high priority and are more inclined to use disruptive activities. Furthermore, unemployed actors combine the characteristics of various social movements. Unemployed activities are sometimes similar to the activities of the new social movements, but there are action forms that go beyond the new social movement activities as well as the classical repertoire of the labour movement. In contrast to the activities of feminist movements against male violence, for example, organisations of the unemployed only partly integrate caring activities as part of their action repertoire. While the feminist movement - at least initially - refused to allow patriarchal state institutions to take over the care of victims of domestic violence, organisations of the unemployed in Germany and France have different positions regarding who is responsible for the tasks the welfare state is supposed to carry out. Not all organisations have included caring activities in their strategies and even if they do, they combine it with other forms of contentious tactics. Some organisations employ more instrumental activities, claiming, for example, material benefits or defending welfare state institutions by addressing state bodies or public opinion, similar to the environmental movement, while other organisations orient their activities to cultural and social encounters. Furthermore, unemployed actors enlarge their action repertoire through activities that seem to have been typically used by poor people's actors. These are the hidden forms of opposition to institutional arrangements that unemployed people are confronted with in their daily life.

Chapter 6

The struggle for an unemployed people's ticket in Berlin. When and how do unemployed actors interfere?

In Germany, the retrenchment of the welfare state - characteristic of most Western European countries - and particularly the reform of the labour market institutions and the previously described Hartz reform, had a major impact at the local level. The reform involved a re-structuring of local social offices and job centres leading to a sometimes difficult cooperation between local and national institutions, and meant new cost burdens for the already deeply indebted city of Berlin. Local unemployed activists nevertheless – or perhaps because of that - requested a positive sign from local politics, pointing out that unemployed people are those most affected by these new measures. Unemployed organisations urged the city authorities to soften the negative consequences of social and labour market reforms and the saving policy for unemployed people by local social policy initiatives.

One of the most important local struggles in the area of local social policy in Berlin related to the issue of a reduced fare ticket for social benefit recipients and unemployed people. Various protest activities have taken place over the past decades in the context of the contentious politics of unemployment, when the social ticket (for welfare recipients) or the unemployed people's ticket (for unemployed people) were at risk or abolished. In this chapter, I will describe the struggle for a social and unemployed people's ticket in Berlin. This local struggle - one of the most important regarding the duration and number of organisations of the unemployed involved - will be analysed regarding the type of actors involved, the preferred strategies of the different types of actors and the structural opportunities in which these activities emerged and developed.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ The following description of the struggle for an unemployed transport ticket in Berlin is based on an analysis of two newspapers (Berliner Zeitung and the local section of the Tageszeitung) between 1st January 1990 and 1st October 2005 (N=266). Additional information was added from internet sites, interviews with experts on the unemployment movement and with activists from local organisations of the unemployed, as well as material from these local organisations.

The forerunners: Protest and public transport in Berlin

Protest against the local public transport system has had a long contentious tradition in Berlin. Since the 1970s, various types of organisations and activists participated in the fight for better local public transport, putting different issues at the centre of attention.

A first small protest wave, supported by traditional organisations such as the local public transport section of the peak union organisation DGB, was triggered off in March 1972 by several thousand people demonstrating against the increase of ticket fares. These moderate claims and activities were paralleled by more radical claims and activities. Activists, supported by the popular German left-alternative rock band “Ton Steine Scherben”, called for the introduction of a free-fare ticket; and many individual and dispersed radical activities were carried out throughout the city, such as pulling the emergency brake, calling on people to dodge the fare, or blocking street crossings. The violent protest hit its peak at the end of the month with a bomb attack on the building of the local public transport company, *Berliner Verkehrsbetriebe*, (in the following *BVG*) hurting two of its employees.

Only some months later another more radical and militant campaign - regarding the types of organisations involved and the actions forms used - started against the increase in transport fares. Again demonstrations were organised, this time by students and young union and party members. During this second peak of protest actions, the demonstrations became more aggressive. Stones, coloured eggs and Molotov cocktails were thrown at the building of the public transport company. Other protest actions were organised by communist organisations, the Spontis¹¹², and the so-called ‘leisure time terrorists’, a radical left organisation. The activists distributed more than one hundred thousand fake tickets. At the same time, a women’s organisation destroyed ticket machines in Berlin.

Five years later, in response to the radical and militant actions of the past that were thought to isolate the population of Berlin, some organisations organised more moderate protest activities. However, this did not stop the militant organisation

¹¹² The term ‘Spontis’ (from spontaneous) describes left radical activists who, unlike communist activists, considered spontaneous public action as the most important form of public intervention and revolution.

'Revolutionäre Zellen' from attacking the BVG building. The room where the records of people who had dodged transport fares were stored was completely burned down.

While the 1970s were characterised by radical and violent actions by all kinds of actors, when also new union and party organisations were characterised by a rather radical action repertoire (and some marginal attempts to organise moderate protest activities), the range of action forms became more moderate during the 1980s. An increasing number of organisations participated in the protest against the public transport system, now stressing the environmentally friendly aspects of public transport compared to private cars. *"While in the 1970s, mainly young communists, anarchists and the so-called Spontis led the protest, in the 1980s environmental organisations, such as the BUND, unions and parties, such as the Alternative Liste or the Graue Panther increasingly participated in the protest activities"*¹¹³ During the 1980s, the initiative 'Save the BVG' that claimed the introduction of an environmental ticket- supported by more than 30 organisations - was very active.

It was not until the mid 1990s that a major fight against transport fares was triggered off again. However, the protest was not sparked off by concerns over ticket fares or the environmental friendliness of public transport, this time the protest was provoked by the abolition of tickets with a reduced fare for some groups of low income people. Since the abolition of social and unemployed tickets, the fight for a different kind of public transport system changed its focus, putting the social aspect of public transport at the centre of attention and continued do so over the next decade. Since the mid 1990s, protest for a different public transport system has emphasised the link between public transport and issues relating to social exclusion and poverty.

For more than a decade many different actors, ticket-aggrieved people as well as activists participate with their various action forms and claims in the struggle(s). In the following section, the final decade of social protest for a fairer public transport system and its dynamic will be described in more detail. The main focus will be on the actors participating in the struggle and the way in which the topic is framed, particularly from the point of view of the ticket-aggrieved people, that is the unemployed people's activists and – to a lesser extent - by social benefit recipients. I will look at the particular forms of solidarity activities that are employed during this

¹¹³ Taz, 26.7.2005, page 19.

struggle in order to understand the kind of solidarity actions that are developed and the structural opportunities in which they develop. Four different phases of the struggle for an unemployed and social ticket can be broadly distinguished, defined by small protest waves on the topic, the kind of actors participating and the forms of protest used. As we will see, different forms of solidarity actions were used during each phase. After a short introduction on the local social transport policy in Berlin, these four phases of a struggle will be described in more detail.

6.1 Social and unemployed tickets in Berlin

In 1990, the red-green government¹¹⁴ introduced reduced fare tickets for some low income groups: A ‘social ticket’ for social benefit recipients for approximately 5 Euro and two slightly more expensive ‘unemployed tickets’ for unemployed people in East and West Berlin respectively were introduced. Even though the ticket prices rose significantly over the next years and relatively few people made use of the tickets with a reduced fare¹¹⁵, the tickets were questioned time and again either by the Berlin government and the transport companies stressing the financial burden for the Berlin household or the transport company respectively.

However, it was not until the summer of 1996 - after which the Berlin government did not provide for funds for the tickets - that the transport company of Berlin announced the abolition of both tickets for the first time. After a two-month protest (see below) a social ticket was re-introduced for social benefit recipients, but the unemployed ticket remained cancelled. The unemployed ticket did not enter the public agenda again until the end of 1990s. In 1999, at a discussion round of union unemployed organisations during the final stage of the electoral campaign for the Berlin House of Representatives, the re-introduction of an unemployed people’s ticket was announced by the public transport company and the participating politicians. Shortly afterwards - only two weeks ahead of the election to the Berlin House of Representatives - the majority of the Berlin parliament voted unanimously for the proposal of the conservative party to charge the new Berlin government with the introduction of the ticket. Indeed, the decision became part of the coalition agreement between the conservative party and the social-democratic party after the elections.

¹¹⁴ The red-green government of West Berlin. Until the end of the 1990s, there was a double government in East and West Berlin, see below.

¹¹⁵ For example in 1994 only about 5% of all Berlin’s unemployed people purchased the unemployed ticket. (see Berliner Zeitung from 17.11.1994, page 18).

After much negotiation between the Berlin government and the public transport company as to who should finally provide the policy for its re-introduction, the ticket was finally re-introduced in the summer of 2000 for a trial period of one year. However, as short-term unemployed people who receive unemployment assistance do not fall into the category of 'unemployed benefit recipients', to whom the new regulation applied, a large proportion of unemployed people were excluded from the offer. Furthermore, as many unemployed benefit recipients receive additional support from the social assistance offices, most people who are the target organisation of the new ticket already have the right to the cheaper social ticket that had existed since 1990s.¹¹⁶ The new concept was thus target of many polemics and criticisms. Finally, in January 2004, the social ticket, which had existed for nearly 15 years was abolished, followed by the new abolition of the unemployed people's ticket. Even though a new social and unemployed ticket was re-introduced a year later, a noticeable price increase made the purchase of the ticket impossible for many social benefit recipients and constituted a quasi-abolition of the ticket for income poor transport users.

In the following section, I will examine the protest activities that provoked, accompanied, or were a result of this ticket policy. The first phase covers a short period in 1996, the second the aftermath of a national unemployed protest wave in 1998 until the elections in 1999. The third phase covers the period from 2000 until 2003, just before national protest in the field of unemployment contention emerges anew. The fourth period covers this second wave of unemployment contention until the summer of 2005.

6.2 First phase: the abolition of social and unemployed people's tickets in 1996

As described above, reduced fare tickets had existed for social benefit recipients and unemployed benefit recipients since 1990 in Berlin.¹¹⁷ These tickets were abolished by the public transport company, BVG, in July 1996 after the conservative/social-democratic government cancelled the financial support for these

¹¹⁶ Of the 170,000 unemployed people in Berlin, about 100,000 would have the right to the ticket, but since 100,000 unemployed benefit recipients also receive social assistance, they already have the right to the existing social ticket.

¹¹⁷ A reduced fare ticket also existed for some other social organisations, such as pensioners and asylum seekers.

tickets. The game of ‘passing the buck’ between the Berlin Senate and the public transport company would characterise the subsequent years. The governing body continued to proclaim its inability to influence the public company’s decision on where to save the money and pointed to the huge amount of financial subsidies the company receives annually, while the company accused the saving policy of the Senate that would not provide allowances for tickets for lower income people. As stated by the spokesperson of the company: *“Unfortunately we are not a social- but a transport company that has to prepare itself for the competitive situation in 2000”*¹¹⁸.

However, the public statements by the transport company only received the attention of the media after pressure from below increased and an alliance of advocating organisations, such as welfare organisations and unions, and - most importantly - the districts of Berlin criticised the decision.¹¹⁹ The peak welfare organisation criticised a criminalisation of unemployed people and asked the Senate to re-introduce the social ticket. Some welfare organisations and a humanist organisation build an “action alliance social ticket” to coordinate activities against the abolition. Furthermore, the society for homeless people criticised the decision of the Berlin Senate and asked it to plead for the withdrawal of the decision of the BVG to abolish the reduced fare tickets. The organisation was concerned about homeless people dodging the fare and automatically sliding into criminality.

Local social offices also criticised the decision of the government to abolish the social ticket fearing an overload of work as they now had to verify individual cases. The local social offices also doubt the saving effect of the abolition, since the social benefit recipients now would apply for the reimbursement from the social offices. In this regard, a local politician from Kreuzberg - a district of Berlin - states: *“The social offices now spend the money that was cancelled for the BVG on the social ticket”*¹²⁰. The Burgomasters of the districts protested strongly against the decision and organised a special meeting, however not so much against the abolition of the ticket,

¹¹⁸ Taz, 12.6.1996, page 24, own translation.

¹¹⁹ The only organisation mentioned in the newspapers that intervened in 1994 - when the continuation of the unemployed and social tickets was questioned by the East Germans – was the interest organisation of unemployed people ALV (Arbeitslosenverband Deutschland). They announced protest activities should the Berlin senate abolish the transport ticket. This did not happen, in the end financial allowances were increased.

¹²⁰ Cited in Berliner Zeitung, 10.7.1996, page 20.

than against the enormous workload the social offices would be confronted with if they had to check every single request for reimbursement.

Table 6.1 - Characteristics of the first phase of the struggle

Government	Big coalition: conservative-social-democratic, elections in 1990 and 1995
Initial situation	Abolition of both tickets
Type of activities and type of actors	Two months of verbal opposition by the districts of Berlin, welfare organisations, unions, society for homeless people; foundation of action alliance by welfare organisation and humanist organisation, one protest gathering by social benefit recipients and unemployed people, collection of signatures by unemployed union organisation
Change in ticket policy?	Re-introduction of social ticket, no re-introduction of unemployment ticket

The mainly verbal interventions by unions, welfare organisations, and Berlin districts were accompanied by some minor protest events. At the West Berlin train station, approximately one hundred people gathered for a protest organised on short notice for the preservation of the social ticket, in which many social benefit recipients participated. A local unemployed union organisation¹²¹ collected signatures for the reversal of the decision and protests against the agreed compromise of a slightly more expensive social ticket. The ticket fare would be too expensive, one activist of the action alliance stated: *“When the red-green government introduced the ticket in 1990 it cost 10 DM (approx. 5 Euro, A.Z.) ... in six years, the price has increased by 400%. In no other area was such an increased was asked for”*¹²².

After two months of struggle with the districts of Berlin and huge criticism from welfare organisations, unions and benefit recipients, the transport company re-introduced the social ticket. Even though the protest activities from below called for the re-introduction of both tickets, the protests seemed to have been more vocal about the re-introduction of a social ticket. This is particularly the case for the statements of welfare organisations and even more clearly by the districts that would bear the costs in case the city did not provide for the social ticket.

¹²¹ Erwerbslosenausschuss Kreuzberg/ Schöneberg ÖTV

¹²² Cited in Berliner Zeitung, 20.7.1996, page 18.

6.3 Second phase: protest cycle 1998 and the aftermath of the cycle

A second struggle for the right to mobility in Berlin began shortly after a major national wave of unemployed protests. In 1998, a seven-month unemployed people's protest wave swept over Germany, imitating the successful unemployed movement of their fellow French activists (see also *chapter 3*). The protests of the German unemployed activists were the first noteworthy unemployed movement activities since the emergence of the organisations of the unemployed in the 1980s. Tens of thousands of, mostly long-term, unemployed people participated in these events in over 250 German cities (KOS 1998). As in the rest of Germany, protest gatherings took place regularly in Berlin on the days when the new unemployed figures were announced. These protest events were called 'Jagoda-Days', as Mr. Jagoda, president of the public labour agency, was responsible for reporting the new (and most of the time) increasing unemployment rates at press conferences.¹²³ The protest wave lasted from February 1998 until the national elections in September 1998, when the conservative government was voted out of office and a red-green government was elected.

After the Berlin protest activities slowed down notably in the autumn of 1998- but did not cease completely as was the case for national protest activities- (see Lahusen and Baumgarten, 2006) unemployed activists became increasingly concerned and discussed strategies to mobilise unemployed people to take their matters in their own hands. After some months of minor activities, in February 1999, the Jagoda protests were organised anew. The difficulty in mobilising unemployed people for that event resulted in strategic discussions about how particularly unemployed people were to be mobilised. In the context of these new attempts to mobilise for unemployed protests, unemployed activists decided to limit the range of their movement's claims. The importance of getting unemployed people to participate in democratic activities from below to represent their interests, favoured a strategy of thinking small, rather than thinking big. *"Given the fact that an 'unemployed movement' could not be organised, it was considered to not pose common claims for the unemployed, but to pick out some claims that would be supported by more [unemployed, A.Z] colleagues. The unemployed ticket that existed until 1994 [...] was one such example. In light of the*

¹²³ These protest events were later called 'Florians-Tage' (Florians-days), after the first name of the successful president of the labour agency. The first name rather than the surname was chosen to remind people of the Saint Florian-principle, where instead of solving a problem, someone else is blamed.

permanently increasing ticket fares and the decreasing financial income support the claim for a ticket with a reduced fare was put in the foreground”¹²⁴. Thus, unemployed activists pointed to the importance of claims that took into consideration the immediate deprivation of unemployed people and being able to relate the claims to the living conditions and everyday life. One of the unemployed activists described the considerations of unemployed activists in the aftermath of the national protest wave: “... if we want to get the unemployed to move then it has to be something obvious. Where the unemployed immediately say, ‘yes, I need that’. And then we said: The public transport fare, the unemployed ticket! ... The number of unemployed had increased dramatically but they took the unemployed ticket away from us. However, at that time, no unemployed organisation existed to fight against it. But now these organisations were there, and we wrote this on our banners, and said, we get on that” (Interview 5:16) During the national mobilisation wave, on the one hand, new local unemployed organisations had indeed emerged, and on the other hand, organisations that already existed politicised their action repertoire. These organisations now took up the issue of the unemployed ticket. The fight for an unemployed ticket was considered as the glue that would connect the mobilising efforts to the needs of the unemployed population in Berlin.

Thus, in 1999, during the electoral campaign for the election to the Berlin House of Representatives, an action alliance of unemployed people organised protest actions to claim the re-introduction of the unemployed ticket. In March 1999, two protest gatherings were organised in front of the building of the Senator for transport by the round table of unemployed people, an alliance of the Arbeitslosenverband (ALV), independent organisations of the unemployed (Erwin, Haengematten) and union organisations of unemployed people¹²⁵. Furthermore, an initiative for an unemployed ticket started collecting signatures on 1st May 1999. The collection of signatures was an effort by independent unemployed organisations, the union organisations of the unemployed, and with the support of unions and the church, although the collection was mainly carried by two organisations of the unemployed, one independent and one union organisation of unemployed people.

Table 6.2 - Characteristics of the second phase of the struggle

¹²⁴ Document ‘The History of Erwin’ Internal paper.

¹²⁵ Union organisations of the unemployed of the following unions: HBV, IG Medien, IG Metall and NGG.

Government	Big coalition: conservative-social-democratic re-confirmed in elections of 1999,
Initial situation	Re-enters the public agenda, enter coalition-agreement
Type of activities and type of actors	protest events organised action alliance of unemployed activists, round table of unemployed people, and the ALV and local organisations of the unemployed (union and non-union), collection of signatures, by organisations of the unemployed, union invites for discussion round before the elections
Change in ticket policy?	Return of topic of the 'unemployed ticket' on the public agenda in 1999

The main aim of the unemployed activists was to remind political parties of the interests of the unemployed population of Berlin and stated that *“Mobility is for unemployed essential for quality of life. Mobility is also a pre-condition for a new working place. But high ticket fares limit mobility. Prohibitively expensive ticket fares make unemployed become couch potatoes and people who dodge the fare”*¹²⁶

The protest became more widespread with the addition of new and more diverse actors shortly before the election in Berlin in October 1999. In September 1999, the HBV union invited the spokespersons of the four parliamentary parties and representatives of the peak organisation and public transport companies to a discussion about the unemployed ticket. Two weeks before the election, the conservative party called for the re-introduction of the unemployed ticket that had been abolished during their time in office.¹²⁷ The result was a unanimous decision of the Berlin House of Representatives to charge the new government with the re-introduction of the ticket as of January 2000. Indeed, the introduction of an unemployed ticket was included in the coalition agreement of the conservative and social-democratic parties, after the parties were re-elected and joined forces once more as governing parties.

6.4 Third phase of the struggle: Passing the buck and the introduction of a ticket

Even though the unemployed ticket was included the coalition agreement, protesters continued their protest actions. The proclaimed intentions to refrain from

¹²⁶ Document, “Pressemitteilung. Unterschriftensammlung fuer ein Arbeitslosenticket”, July 1999.

¹²⁷ This strategic move during a very tense phase of the electoral campaign indicates that the issue of the ‘unemployed ticket’ had become very popular, at least during the electoral campaign.

stopping protesters mobilise after the favourable political opportunities (success of their protest activities and end of the electoral campaign) disappeared. In November 1999, the DGB Berlin, representatives of unemployment initiatives, and a student organisation called for a student protest for an "Unemployed ticket- Now" in front of the Berlin House of representatives.¹²⁸

The decision of the Berlin House of Representatives was postponed several times, mainly due to disagreement on who would bear the costs. In January, the BVG announced the re-introduction of the ticket in the summer of 2000. Activists from the unemployed ticket initiative welcomed this step pointing out the support of their claims by the social democratic Senator for transport. However, in January the conflict between the Berlin Senate and the public transport company increased regarding the issue of who would bear the costs of the ticket. Articles in some mainstream and alternative newspapers supported the claims of the unemployed, criticising the Berlin government and the transport companies for their reluctance to implement the political decision. *"It would have been a surprise if the quick implementation of the unemployed people's ticket would have gone smoothly. [...] the BVG as well as the S-Bahn GmbH maintain that the unemployed people's ticket is a loss-making business. In the opinion of the unemployed but even according to traffic experts this is nonsense. Unemployed people mostly dodge the fare. The less courageous remain at home in their non-self-chosen isolation! Cheaper tickets get the company paying clients! More than 62,000 unemployed people call for the re-introduction of the unemployed ticket with a reduced fare. There are 62,000 potential clients!"*¹²⁹.

Thus, the protest activities of organisations of the unemployed continued in 2000. Several protest actions, including individuals from large and small organisations and initiatives organised various protest events, pointing out the non-implementation of a democratic decision. In February 2000, approximately 80 people from union unemployed organisations, associations and parties started a campaign of action for the re-introduction of the unemployed ticket. Other protest organisations came together in the form of an action alliance and called for the immediate introduction of

¹²⁸ The traditional political channels seem to remain rather open, since protesters are invited to visit politicians who do not yet hold office during this initial phase.

¹²⁹ "Arbeitslosenticket jetzt" in: Scheinschlag, 2/2000.

the unemployed ticket to enable unemployed people participate in the social life of Berlin. Unemployed and other activists organised in the “Action alliance unemployed protests” meeting in front of the transport company to call for an “unemployed ticket-now” in March 2000. The protest targeted the financial senator of Berlin who wanted the transport company rather than the city of Berlin to bear the costs.

Further, the ecumenical council wrote to Berlin’s Burgomaster Diepgen and other politicians and the BVG in a public letter of the poverty conference to protest against the discrimination of unemployed people if they could no longer use the public transport. Other more radical actors - amongst others the organisation ‘reclaim the streets’ - organised non-registered protest events and called upon people to organise street blockades with the slogan: “Zero fare - for more mobility in everyday life”, framing the claim for a transport ticket as a human right to mobility. These advocates - in contrast to previous calls for a “Nulltarif” - now explicitly criticised the lack of mobility of marginalised people in the city.

During the third phase of the struggle, claims for an unemployed ticket became broader, pointing to the need for unemployed to be mobile while looking for a job, on the one hand, and the difficulties that emerge for an unemployed individual when being excluded from mobility, on the other. The various activities that unemployed people would be interested in taking part in if they had an unemployment ticket were highlighted. One major focus was a strong refusal of unemployed people being a financial burden, indicating the possibility of getting even more clients for the BVG. *“About 270,000 people in Berlin are unemployed because their company closed down or their company had been sold or was rationalised in favour of higher profits. These 270,000 people could make a lot in city such as Berlin. They could give themselves further education, visit museums, do sports, care for their social contacts, and get new ideas and stimuli. But they can neither pay for these activities nor the ticket to get there. They become lonely and not only feel excluded, but they are in fact excluded since they are under a quasi house arrest. For what are they penalised?”*¹³⁰ The general focus of the claims are different from the claims raised a couple of years later that put the right to mobility at the centre of attention.

Table 6.3 - Characteristics of the third phase of the struggle

¹³⁰ “Arbeitslosenticket- jetzt”, in: Scheinschlag 2/2000.

Government	Big coalition: conservative-social-democratic until the summer of 2001 (banking scandal)
Initial situation	No change beforehand
Type of activities and type of actors	Various moderate protest activities by broad alliances of different organisations (peak union organisation, organisations of the unemployed and students, associations, parties), supporting comments by mainstream and alternative media, verbal support by ecumenical council, disruptive activities by reclaim the streets
Change in ticket policy?	Introduction of the ticket in the summer of 2000, after months of discussion between the Berlin government and the transport companies

When the public transport company finally presented a proposal for the introduction of an unemployed ticket in April, it simultaneously announced a further increase in transport fares. The transport company thus suggested that other people were to bear the costs of the introduction of the reduced fare for unemployed people. This connection is also made by the decision to link the ticket price to the fare of a normal environmental ticket. However, approximately 60 protesters from the initiative “unemployed ticket- now” gathered in front of the company and denounced instead the price policy. Their action framed the problem and its solution very differently, making the transport company responsible for the price increase, by pointing out that the company would increase transport fees while at the same time the company plans spending millions on a ‘modernisation’ of the transport system by introducing electronic barriers.

In August 2000, the ticket for unemployment benefit recipients was re-introduced. However, activists did not give up their protest actions following its introduction. Shortly after the new ticket has been introduced, moderate public actions by the initiative “unemployed ticket-now” and the DGB were organised, such as demonstrations and the handing over of tens of thousands of signatures to the Senator for transport, Mr. Strieder. The alliance of organisations of the unemployed criticised the new unemployed ticket as a weak package that did not implement what had been decided in the coalition agreement. The two points of criticism related to the application criteria that only allow unemployed benefit recipients to purchase the ticket, and the ticket fare, which was considered to be too expensive. In particular, there was strong criticism of the way in which the transport company had increased

the ‘normal’ ticket fare at precisely the same time as the unemployed ticket was introduced. Furthermore, due to linkage of the unemployed ticket price to the ‘normal’ environmental ticket, the price increase of the ‘normal’ ticket was also criticised. The protest continued in February 2001, when approximately 150 people gathered in front of the regional transport company to protest against the price increase and claim the right for all unemployed to purchase the ticket and not only unemployed benefit recipients. The separation of the unemployed assistance recipients and unemployed benefit recipients was a particular focus of the discontent, stating that “*unemployed is unemployed*”¹³¹. The participating organisations included, among others, the DGB and the ALV, the pensioner party ‘Graue Panther’, and the student initiative for a student ticket, Semtix.

6.5 Fourth phase of the struggle: pre-2004, 2004 and aftermath Flexibility and mobility

In July 2001, a banking scandal in Berlin led to a vote of no confidence, and the conservative senators and the Burgomaster, Mr. Diepgen, lost their seats. Following the elections in October, the social democrats and the socialist party built a red-red government in Berlin. The banking scandal confronted Berlin with an even more difficult budgetary situation. However, the abolition of social tickets was not an absolute necessity, or a zero-sum game, according to the protesters. A major criticism of the public transport system related to their new control policy with electronic gates that would cost the company several million Euro. Yet, the question as to who is to blame for the failure to engage with the low income and unemployed population of Berlin was contested in the unemployed movement. Thus, the question of whether the Berlin senate or the transport company should be the target of protest activities was the subject of much debate during that time and some activists withdrew from the protests on the social ticket.

During the following years, public protest actions were organised sporadically. However, a new wave of protest for a social and unemployed ticket emerged after the Berlin Senate did not provide the agreed financial support in the new budget and the transport companies abolished the social ticket as of January 2004. Even though the socialist social affairs senator, Mrs. Knake-Werner, immediately initiated a debate on the re-introduction of the social ticket, her proposal for the ticket fare was about

¹³¹ Leaflet Erwin.

twice as high as the previous social ticket (39 Euro as compared to 20 Euro). Furthermore, the attempt by the social senator was accompanied by comments of other power holders that opposed the supporters of the social tickets. The spokesperson of the Senate reminded people that nobody had to go by foot, since there is a single case checking, and de-legitimised the claim for a monthly transport ticket.¹³²,

By the end of January, a re-introduction of the ticket was announced, however the price of the ticket fare and the application criteria - that is which groups of people will be the beneficiaries of the new social ticket - were contested over the next months. After several months of discussion, the red-red government of Berlin and the transport companies agreed to re-introduce a common ticket for social and unemployed benefit recipients at a cost of 32 Euro as of January 2005. Due to the major reform of social and unemployment benefit (also due to come into effect as of January 2005) , for the first time, only one social and unemployed people's ticket was planned. However, in 2004, the Berlin Senate and the transport companies continued to disagree about who would bear the increased 'costs' of a social ticket. The transport company expected the Senate to bear the increased 'costs' in the cheaper version.

Although the S-Bahn Berlin had already re-signed the agreement providing for a social ticket (the so-called Card S) in October 2002, it was not until January 2004 - just after the ticket for social assistance recipients had been abolished- that public protest actions were planned and public statements were made by unions and welfare organisations. The year of 2004 was characterised by a lot of public statements that criticised the transport company as well as the Berlin government for their reluctance to provide for a social ticket at a fair price. At the beginning of 2004, during a three-month period after both tickets were abolished, the protest grew larger and various organisations, from unions to social movement activists as well as welfare recipients and unemployed people, participated in the struggle for a right to mobility. A protestant community of Kreuzberg criticised the abolition of the social ticket,

¹³² However the costs for a transport ticket are only paid in cases of so-called 'justified trips', for example going to the job centre, to the doctor and the like. Other social, cultural, and political activities that go beyond the concept of a "person without a job" or a "person in need of care" are not provided for. Further, more aggressive statements that are part of a strategy of blaming victims are advanced as well as strategies to de-legitimise the claims for such a ticket. Mr. Sarrazin, former Senator in Berlin, for example, publicly states that he expects people who cannot afford the transport ticket to walk. Due to the fact that Berlin is a city state and distances are not great, people could reach their destination by foot.

pointing out that many homeless people did not come to the self-help and activity organisations any longer. Homeless organisations and unemployment initiatives, but also unions and welfare organisations called upon the red-red government to re-introduce the social ticket. The Liga of the peak organisations of welfare asked for a guarantee to mobility for people in need, and even the environmental organisation “Grüne Radler” (Green cyclists) supported the claim for a social ticket and organised a cycling and skating protest in the city of Berlin. All of these claims against the social policy of the Berlin Senate were claimed during a major European-wide protest event against social retrenchment on 3rd April, in which approximately 250,000 people participated and just before a second national protest wave was triggered off (the so-called Hartz IV protests, see *chapter 3*).

In the struggle for a social ticket, the year 2004 was not only characterised by many public statement by public actors, but also radical public actions. Public statements by activists that called for the radicalisation of the protest activities began to enter the public debate. In January 2004, an action alliance - initiated by a Professor from a Berlin university - called for a ‘right to mobility’, that was later taken up also by other action networks. The activists- mostly students - organised protest activities on the issue of a social ticket and called upon people who receive less than 700 Euro per month to - as the organisation’s name already suggests (right to mobility) to dodge the transport fare.¹³³ The protest activity evolved out of the idea of involving students in areas that concern not only their immediate interest but also enable them to stand up also for those who cannot afford a transport ticket. *“These activities were an attempt to link the student protests with the social protests of the city. [...] We organised several big demonstrations with about 15,000 to 20,000 people in January 2003, together with other organisations, such as unions, welfare organisations and women’s initiatives. And we organised the activities “dodging the fare” that were about poverty and the right to mobility. With homeless organisations in Berlin we called for people to dodge the fare for a whole day to claim the re-introduction of the social ticket. These protest activities got a lot of publicity”* (Interview 25:17) The activists targeted the politics and their policy of ‘social clear-cutting’ with a form of civil disobedience (or illegal action) and the transport company alike. Those activists who could not pay the fine were reimbursed by the

¹³³ According to the poverty report, this concerned more than 400,000 people in Berlin.

protest organisation. This form of 'little trespassing' was repeated several times during the year, with more than 100 protesters participating. The strategy was to use the public transport without paying the fare and to make the abolition of the social ticket public, by talking loudly in the subway, distributing leaflets or by controlling the inspectors - that is following the inspectors, revealing them to other public transport users and preventing them from doing their work, in other words, preventing them from controlling.

The DGB asked the Senator for economic affairs and the Senator for social affairs to re-introduce the social ticket. The DGB made two joint public statements on this issue together with the welfare organisation, Diakonie. Union organisations of the unemployed called for a social ticket of 10 Euro, instead of the discussed fare of 33 to 40 Euro, and several organisations collected 40,000 signatures to support the request a 10 Euro ticket, referring to the new reform that calculated only 19 Euro per month for all forms of transport costs. The Senators, in response, continued to point out the disastrous financial situation in Berlin since the banking scandal.

After the announcement that the tickets would be re-introduced as of January 2005, the DGB, the Greens and the social forum Berlin principally welcomed this move. However, they criticised the fare as being too expensive for marginalised people and announced further protest activities, characterising the reluctance to provide for a social ticket as a cancellation of the social policy of the city of Berlin.

In the context of the struggle for a social ticket, there were various protest campaigns on the topic "right to mobility" in 2005. The initiative "Drive pink" and the campaign "I will give you a lift", as well as the "drive dodging the fare- activities" highlighted the difficulty for some people to pay the ticket fare, stressing different aspects and employing slightly different strategies. Furthermore, in the preparation of the May Day protests, radical left organisations put the topic of social exclusion and unemployment at the centre of their attention. Furthermore, Diakonie, the welfare organisation of the protestant church, started to collect bicycles to be distributed to ticket-aggrieved people over the next months.

In April 2005, the social forum Berlin, *attac Berlin*, an anti-capitalist action organisation, and a musician's initiative started the campaign "I will give you a lift". The action was further supported by one of the oldest institutions for the unemployed,

the Berlin unemployed centre. Every Saturday, activists distributed leaflets and small buttons to users of the public transport in Berlin. On the button, there was a picture of a big brown bear - the symbol of Berlin - that carries another bear on its back. The aim of this moderate protest action is to inform regular users of the public transport about the possibility to give other people a lift with their monthly ticket¹³⁴ and to oppose the mobility constraints posed by the high price of a transport ticket, especially for people with low income. The activists informed the travellers through their leaflets; by wearing the button on their clothes people could indicate their willingness to allow other ticketless people travel with them. On their common leaflets, the organisations formulated three claims: (i) mobility justice, which refers to the right to mobility for all people (in Berlin); (ii) the refusal of a privatisation of the public transport system and instead public responsibility for guaranteeing mobility for everybody¹³⁵ and (iii) the environmental advantages of public transport. The first point is the most important one, combining the call for a right to mobility with the concrete offer to care for ticketless people: *“It is necessary to be mobile, to be able to participate in social, economic, cultural and political life. Furthermore, society and economy claim people to be flexible and mobile. ... If travelling becomes difficult for some parts of the population then they are hugely limited in their life. Therefore we ask the BVG and the Senate that nobody be excluded from mobility”*¹³⁶. The aim of the social forum was to bring the social back to the local level, promoting ‘social subsidiarity actions’, as I would call them. The protest activity is moderate in its action forms and its claims, addressing the ‘normal’ transport users, stressing the needs of other people and calling on them to care for these people. Furthermore, the inclusion of the claim against privatisation attempted to overcome the gap between employed and unemployed people’s interests.

This action - in a situation of increasing budget constraints in the city of Berlin - proposes a new form of solidarity. The aim is twofold: on the one hand, it relates to

¹³⁴ With the so-called ‘environmental ticket’, a transport ticket valid for one month, travellers could take another adult and up to five children with them on their trip after 8pm, in the evening and on weekends. The ticket was thus mainly targetted at families with children. Through the public action, the family as a form of a ‘small community of solidarity’ that gives better access to mobility was widened to the ‘abstract other in Berlin’. Most of the ticket holders were not aware of this possibility even though the spokesperson for the public transport company announced that there was no need to provide any additional information on this policy.

¹³⁵ While the increasing privatisation of public companies led to a huge wave of mobilisation in the mid 1990s in France, the topic seemed to be of minor concern to the German public.

¹³⁶ Leaflet “Common statement on the initiative ‘I’ll give you a lift’, 2005.

the concrete support of people in need and, on the other hand, the action has a symbolic dimension as to indicate the principal need of solidarity activities. These activities thus do not, as it is often argued point the blame at state institutions and their claims for social protection, but encourage civil engagement and the integration of the population of Berlin to take matters also in their hands.

Table 6.4 - Characteristics of the fourth phase of the struggle

Government	(Banking scandal in 2001) since then red-red government
Initial situation	Abolition of both tickets in 2004
Type of actors and type of activities	Mainly public statements by unions, welfare organisations, Green Party; solidarity actions by the Diakonie; protest activities by organisations of the unemployed; various students and movement organisations and the Berlin unemployed centre claim a right to mobility with moderate solidarity actions and disruptive dodging the fare- actions, the topic is also taken up by radical left organisations after the 1 st May
Change in ticket policy?	Introduction of a common ticket for social and unemployed benefit recipients

The action campaign “I drive pink”¹³⁷ that calls upon people to dodge the fare also started in the spring of 2005. The activists wore small pink buttons to indicate that they were travelling without a ticket or to show solidarity with those dodging the fare. This public action draws on the successful public action of the 1970s, the so-called “red point” campaign. In another German city, red points were used to protest against the public transport and used by car divers and people looking for a lift. The campaign was more radical and openly called upon people to break rules. As the activists stated, *“Driving pink is a good thing, but it is not permitted”*¹³⁸. That is why the activists did not suggest the action form to people who might have with problems with their residence permit. The activists thus adapt action forms of the 1970s, but do so by putting the social in the centre their political actions. *“Against the aggravation of living conditions, exclusion, and prohibitively expensive tickets, we are bringing solidarity back from below.”*¹³⁹

¹³⁷ The expression refers to the German expression to “drive black” that is, to dodge the transport fare.

¹³⁸ <http://berlinumsonst.twoday.net>, 25th August 2005, downloaded 1st August 2006.

¹³⁹ <http://berlinumsonst.twoday.net>

The campaign “pink point” was more disruptive in its claims and action forms. It was started by a network of activists that also called for other public services to be provided free of charge, for example, free swimming pools. That is, the campaign was part of a long tradition and various actions known as “we want all” by asking for a radical re-orientation of public services.

6.6 Summing up

The struggle against the local public transport developed from a protest against price increases and (state) control in the 1970s to environmental aspects of the public transport in the 1980s and then to a support of people in need since the mid 1990s. During the social protest, several layers of small activities, national protest waves and local protests enabled an increasing number of diverse actors to participate. Even though the protest lost most of the support of the better organised and resource-strong environmental organisations in the 1990s, the protest grew stronger and more stable.

Table 6.5 summarises the four phases of the protest wave since 1996, describing the characteristics of the struggle and the structural opportunities in which it evolves. It developed over one decade from a struggle characterised mainly by verbal statements to a struggle combining different forms of public intervention. While in the beginning, well-established organisations dominated the contentious politics over an unemployed people’s ticket, a more colourful protest constituency became involved in the fight over the years. After a national protest wave, the unemployed entered the field of actors, taking up the issue of an unemployed people’s ticket as a means of bringing local initiatives together. The most heterogeneous protest actors were involved in the third phase of the struggle: from unions to parties, to the ecumenical council, to the self-representation of unions and other organisations of the unemployed, as well as the radical left. A broad range of claims were made during this phase: from speakers that moderately pointed to the discrimination of unemployed people, to those claiming a right to mobility and zero fare and thus advancing more disruptive claims. In the last phase, disruptive activities increased through the involvement of student organisations and local initiatives, as well as left-wing organisations of various types.

The most important change since the start of protest activities on the unemployed and social ticket was the successful self-representation of unemployed people’s

actors. From a rather advocating verbal protest culture over the years a mixture of advocating and self-representing organisations emerged, with the unemployed being able to mobilise very different actors to support their struggle for an unemployed people's ticket.

Linking the dynamics of the struggle to the structural opportunities, *table 6.5* firstly shows that the level of grievances cannot explain the different peaks of the protest for a ticket for the unemployed. While the verbal opposition during the first phase was prompted by the abolition of the tickets, the subsequent two phases did not show that dynamic. Only in 2004 the abolition of the social ticket triggered off a new phase of the protest. Similar to 1996, welfare organisations and unions mainly intervened verbally on these issues. This time the struggle took on different forms, however, as several other organisations were engaged simultaneously with various protest activities. The fourth phase was therefore characterised by a broad alliance of actors and various forms of interventions in the public debate. The phase was more pronounced as different organisations had been engaged on the issues for many years and the interest in the issue had never ceased completely. Thus, in cases where an alert protest infrastructure was available, radical decisions by the Berlin House of Representatives were followed by prompt mobilisation.

Table 6.5 – Structural opportunities and characteristics of the struggle for an unemployed people's ticket in Berlin during the four phases from 1996 - 2005

Phases of the struggle	First phase June until August 1996	Second phase February until October 1999	Third phase Autumn 1999 until February 2001	Fourth phase January 2004 until spring 2005
Structural opportunities				
Grievances	Abolition of both tickets	--	Limited re-introduction	Abolition of both tickets
Form of government	Big coalition	Big coalition	Big coalition	Red-red government since banking scandal in 2001
Elections in Berlin	--	October 1999	--	--
Protest wave	--	1998 national unemployment protest	--	2004 national unemployment protest
Characteristics of the struggle				
Types of actors	Verbal claims by unions, welfare organisations and districts of Berlin, isolated protest event by unemployed and social benefit recipients	Action alliance and Berlin Round Table of Organisations of the unemployed organise continuous protest events; support by union	Various action alliances by unemployed, associations, unions, parties, and students organise protest gatherings; supportive comments by the media, verbal support by ecumenical council; disruptive actions by reclaim the streets	Mainly verbal protest by unions and welfare organisations; broad alliance of actors organise moderate activities, participation also of green cyclists; movements organisations, radical left organisations and students organise continuous disruptive actions, moderate innovative solidarity actions by Berlin Social Forum and other organisations
Types of claims	Poverty, criminalisation	Mobility to work	New clients, no costs, right to mobility, zero fare	Right to mobility, solidarity actions from below

While grievances alone do not explain the emergence of protest activities, political decisions nevertheless impact on the claims and type of activities carried out. The delay of the coalition agreement in re-introducing an unemployed people's ticket and efforts to pass the buck between Berlin and the transport company as who is to bear the costs mobilised a broad alliance that criticised the non-implementation of a democratic decision. However, since the public discourse was dominated by cost-based arguments, the actors from below turned the argument upside down by stressing

the fact that unemployed people would become clients that would simply dodge the fare without an unemployed people's ticket. Furthermore, during the final phase when the public discourse in Berlin was dominated by the disastrous financial situation of the city, activists did not give up the claim for a local social policy, but organised solidarity actions for ticket-aggrieved people. Movement activists thus reacted to political decision and the dominant public discourse. They did so, however, by turning arguments upside down and providing new answers.

Looking at the political opportunities, the election of the Berlin House of Representatives in October 1999 seemed to offer the only possibility of bringing the issue of the unemployment ticket onto the public agenda. This phase combined two opportunities, that of a preceding national protest wave and that of the election of the Berlin House of Representatives. This combination allowed the protest to be taken over mainly by organisations of the unemployed that gained strength during the national protest wave. In contrast, the early election in 2001 did not seem to be an occasion for raising public awareness of the issue. Indeed, movement organisations had been engaged for months informing people about the so-called banking scandal that resulted in the early election and the red-red government of Berlin. The attention of movement activists seems to have been absorbed by other issues, and unemployed movement organisations of the 1998 protest wave were not able to put the issue on the public agenda at that time. Organisations of the unemployed were however still engaged at the local level. With the participation of other organisations, and particularly movement organisations in 2004, unemployed people successfully engaged on the topic of an unemployed people's ticket.

Thus, *table 6.5* suggests that there is no single opportunity that might explain attempts to mobilise on a specific issue. Considering the context and the development of the struggle, the combination of various opportunities and the existence of an active movement, structures seem to be crucial factors. Unemployed people's actors gained strength during the national protest wave and combined with elections taking place shortly afterwards provide an opportunity for this actor to represent its claims at the local level. Unemployed actors then were always involved in the subsequent struggles, but they were not alone, in particular, as other movement organisations and initiatives took up the social and joined the fight for an unemployed people's ticket.

Discussion

The struggle for the ticket is by far the most significant issue that has been taken up by unemployed people's actors, but it also had an important role for different organisations of the unemployed as well as for the dynamic of the local unemployed people's movement. The campaign on the unemployed ticket was the main campaign given its duration, and particularly regarding its mobilising capacity. The topic served as a useful master-frame (Benford and Snow 2000) where many different organisations could formulate their claims, framing them within a contentious tradition or constructing new frames and trying out new forms of activities.

A diverse range of actors with very different claims participated in the protest. Some of them advocating, others representing their interests, some calling for radical claims as the 'zero fare', others simply for the re-introduction of the previous social ticket, some using strategies of scandalising and public criticism, others just bringing the topic out into the open. Most of the activities for a social or an unemployed ticket are not really new. There is a long tradition that makes it easy for different organisations to participate, for example, the red points action in the 1970s.

However, the focus of the target organisation has shifted, and the socially excluded are explicitly mentioned. It seems that the social has explicitly (re)entered the field of movement politics during the 1990s (Roth 1997). Indeed, unemployed activists in Berlin mention that the social finally re-entered the movement politics in Berlin: *"It was good that the left got more interested in social questions. Since they recognised that they are also concerned. They could not close their eyes in front of that"* (Interview 9:28). While previously the left-wing circles were not interested in taking up social issues since they were perceived as being engrossed by the state, they now took up the issues and engaged increasingly on these topics.

The description of the struggle firstly indicates a re-organisation of the field of actors engaged on welfare and employment issues. Institutionalised actors that have had until recently a rather clearly defined role within the welfare state have to compete for public attention with self-representation of unemployed people and activities of other movements and radical left organisations. This general dynamic of a re-organisation of the field of actors engaged on social issues is also described in other studies. In a study on the activities of unemployed actors at various political

levels, I have shown the increasing strength of self-representing initiatives of unemployed people at the local, national, and European level (Zorn 2007). This changing role of actors engaged in social and employment politics seems to be particularly visible in the contentious politics of unemployment. In this field of contentious politics, new actors have entered the field, bringing new dynamics into corporate structures. However, new alliances between workers and social movement actors also emerge in other issue areas, thereby, challenging neo-corporatist politics (della Porta 2006).

In particular, the changing role of unions and their difficulties in adapting to challenges posed by increasing unemployment and precariousness, and the challenge to their until recently legitimate dominant role in labour and unemployment politics.¹⁴⁰ A return of wild strikes beyond and against the control of unions are examples of this changing role of union politics, for example, by Ataf drivers and Alitalia employees in Italy (della Porta 2006; Curcio 2005), by Opel workers in Germany, or by employees of the transport system in New York, United States. These conflicts indicate a changing role of social movements, critical unions and the re-awakening of the basis of unions in the issue fields concerning labour and unemployment.

Unions have thus far played an ambivalent role in representing and supporting the claims of unemployed people (Berkel, Coenen, and Vlek 1998). Unions seem to be particularly reluctant or unable to take up the interest of the unemployed, or formerly employed.¹⁴¹ As Faniel states, although unions aim *“to be representatives of the working class as a whole, the interprofessional unions [adopt] an encompassing discourse, including the unemployed”* (Faniel 2009:114), they traditionally represent a very specific part of the working population and of those at risk of losing their job.

¹⁴⁰ Unions traditionally provide important resources for generating solidarity. The fact that unions not only generate solidarity, but are at the same time particularly dependent on solidarity actions by their members (constituted as a collective actor), bring these changes to the fore. Unions have been challenged from the outside and within.

¹⁴¹ For example, at a general meeting of the German peak organisation, DGB, in May 2006, a proposal to formally integrate the unemployed into the charter was rejected. One union unemployment activist in Berlin describes how the interests of employed and unemployed people are indeed in conflict: *“Actually, there is a conflict of interest. That is, those who have employment want to keep it and they make compromises regarding working time for example. What we [the unemployed people, A.Z.] think is counter-productive.”* (Interview 27:5) The solidarity between employed and formerly employed people is thus undermined by the union's decision not to include the formerly employed. It seems that union unemployed people have to generate their very own forms of solidarity, since they cannot rely on unions as institutionalised actors of solidarity.

Unemployed union activists rarely look for allying partners outside the unions. They focus instead on the union's collective identity. This also means, however, that solidarity with social benefit recipients does not develop, even though long-term unemployed are now in the same target organisation as social benefit recipients able to work since the implementation of the welfare reform in 2005. These social benefit recipients are not included in the claims raised by union unemployed activists. *"We would prefer to go back [to the old system of income support]. For us, we are better off with the former income support, since it is related to the previous income"* (Interview 3:12). That is, unemployed union people favour a specific interest representation only for those who were previously entitled to income support (as former employed people). These claims do not relate to other organisations of people with low income, although the topic of poverty is often raised as the most important threat to long-term unemployment. These actors would rather return to the previous system, leaving the social benefit recipients where they were.¹⁴² The reluctance of some unemployed union members to show solidarity with social benefit recipients reveals similarly a crisis of institutionalised forms of solidarity. Solidarity exists as an abstract category rather than being practiced and learned anew. New topics of solidarity and social justice have instead entered (global) social movements (della Porta and Diani, 2006), indeed referred to as global social justice movements (Andretta et al. 2002).

Thus, the struggle for an unemployed people's ticket seems to mirror more general trends in the re-organisation of the field of actors engaged on the topic of unemployment and the type of actors that take up the social. Furthermore, the ability of unemployed people's actors to represent their interests has gained strength and continuity in that other movement organisations are involved in the struggle and give it new impulses when favourable opportunities combine.

¹⁴² Other low income organisations could be included, for example, by making claims for a basic income for all those with low income.

Conclusion of the second part

Over the past decade, the contentious field of unemployment politics has increasingly involved more actors and topics. As the discussion in *chapter 6* suggests, unemployed actors successfully entered the public stage to defend their rights as a social group. The discussion suggests that traditional actors of the welfare state, such as unions and welfare organisations lost the legitimacy to speak on behalf of the unemployed, and through the involvement of unemployed actors the protest repertoire has started to widen and become more contentious. It is particularly interesting to note that other social movement organisations took up the issue of the unemployed and kept the topic on the agenda after the unemployed people's organisations withdrew as a dominant carrier of the conflict.

Thus, the discussion of the struggle for an unemployed ticket empirically confirms a tendency that Roth (1997) formulated as a hopeful promise in 1997: *“Neue Akteure haben- neben den klassisch diesen Bereich dominierenden Gewerkschaften, Kirchen und Wohlfahrtsverbänden- die sozialpolitische Agenda betreten. Ihre basis- und projektorientierte Praxis, ihre organisatorische Orientierung an vernetzten Strukturen und ihre Bereitschaft zu Protest und zivilem Ungehorsam rückt sie in die Nähe dessen, was wir von den neuen sozialen Bewegungen kennen. Vielleicht können sie Bewegung in die lähmende korporatistischen Tradition der Sozialpolitik bringen”* (Roth 1997:44). Not only have other social movement actors taken up social topics, but those who are most concerned successfully enter the public stage and take over the role of other traditional actors. While for unemployed actors, the struggle for an unemployed ticket served as an important means to mobilise the unemployed constituency, other social movement actors used the topic in a similar way to revive their own movement activism. A specific issue thus serves very different aims and can be connected to a variety of different topics and claims. The social as well as the carrier of one social question have re-entered the field of movement politics.

In contrast to other issues, it seems that the topic of unemployment is capable of involving ordinary citizens in active citizenship (Crouch 2004). That is, one important asset of unemployed actors participating in the contentious politics of unemployment is their ability – though slightly different in both countries and in a crab-like manner – to construct a social actor of a disadvantaged social group. Unemployed actors

successfully construct a new identity of a marginalised organisation, which is not an easy task given the decline in the importance of the working class identity as a political force over the past decades (Crouch 2004). While national movements of the unemployed only appear occasionally on the political scene, local organisations of the unemployed are engaged in an everyday effort to construct a collective actor of the unemployed, though as I have shown, they do so in a number of ways.

The second part introduces the local organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris and reconstructs the ways in which these organisations are engaged in unemployment activism. As argued in the discussion of *chapter 4*, some differences can be explained by political opportunities. Looking at the organisational fields available within both contentious fields, I found very different landscapes of organisations of the unemployed. The weak success of the relatively populated organisational landscape in Berlin contrasts with a handful of organisations in Paris that successfully became a participant in the contentious debate on unemployment (compare *chapter 3*). Thus, while organisations are important for the success of unemployed people to raise claims, their existence does not seem to be sufficient. Instead, contextual factors have to intervene to offer opportunities for organisations to become claim-makers in the public debate.

The centralised nature of the French political system is also reflected in the organisational structure in Paris, and I argue that access to welfare institutions at the local level – thus, an aspect of the concrete opportunities (Giugni, Michel, and Fueglistler 2009) - further contributes to the longer life span of local organisations of the unemployed in Paris compared to Berlin. However, most important seems to be the contentious traditions in both countries to account for differences in the type of claims and some preferred action forms. In Paris, claims relating to social topics and social exclusion seem to dominate the contentious politics of unemployment, while in Berlin, topics such as being forced to work, domination, and control are important. Furthermore, as the discussion of the most important logics of action of local organisations of the unemployed shows, organisations in Paris prefer instrumental logics of action, whereas cultural contentious logics are only present in Berlin. Furthermore, social empowerment, which seeks to enable unemployed people to claim their social rights, is less important for French organisations. As argued in the

discussion of *chapter 4*, it seems that the different role of the old and new social movements in both countries explains these differences.

However, many types of organisations of the unemployed exist in both Berlin and Paris. The importance of integrating caring activities, organising protest activities in general and disruptive protest activities in particular, as well as empowering unemployed people, is witnessed in both fields of unemployed action. Also, while in France, actors perceive the existence of an unemployed movement, in Berlin, unemployed action has similarly developed roots. In other words, here are various paths that lead to successful unemployed action, whose particularities can be best explained by the contentious traditions of the place.

THIRD PART

Professional Service Providers and the Disruptive Poor? Explaining Tactical Choices of Organisations of the Unemployed.

Introduction to the third part

It has often been assumed that it is the foregone destiny of social movements to lose their teeth and be absorbed into conventional politics. They go from protesting to activities such as providing services, using normalised forms of collective action, or become institutionalised political actors. As discussed in *chapter 1*, disruptive activities are however important strategic tools for challenging actors (Lipsky 1968; McAdam 1983). The importance of disruptive strategies has been particularly stressed for the success of poor actors: Piven and Cloward (1977)) argue disruptive action is the only tool available to these social actors.

Following Piven and Cloward (1977) on the importance of disruptive activities for poor actors, research on unemployed people's movements therefore asks about the possible transformation of these disruptive collective actors.¹⁴³ Generally, research on unemployed people's movements points to the transformation of unemployed people's activities over the past decade (Giugni 2009). Royall (Royall 2004), for example, points to the increasing institutionalisation of the unemployed people's movement in France, the moderation of its demands and the loss of the movement's militancy. And it is not only as a collective actor that the unemployed can lose their challenging character, on the individual level too those unemployed people politically involved on the topic unemployment can become increasingly marginalised. In Ireland, for example, pro-unemployed organizations have increasingly professionalized and improved service delivery for the unemployed over past decades.

¹⁴³ Piven and Cloward argue that mass membership organisations deprive movements of the lower-strata of their most important power resource, see also the discussion in *chapter 1*.

At the same time, this professionalisation contributed to the marginalization of unemployed movement activists within similar organizations (Royall 2009). Chabanet and Faniel (forthcoming 2010) for example stress that although some years after unemployed again became contentious they do so in less disruptive forms and rather address the tribunal to defend the rights of the unemployed than occupying public offices.

Is it just the destiny of social movement actors to become players in the conventional political game? In the following, the development of one organisation of the unemployed will be described. This organisation developed from a disruptive poor actor to an organisation that puts a strong emphasis on service provision. However, the story suggests that it is not simply the passing of time explaining the transformation of the organisation, but that certain conditions come together with certain action strategies. After illustrating the organisation's development I will discuss these conditions in more detail.

From disruption to professional service provision

In contrast to the popular image of the disruptiveness of French social movements as compared to their German neighbours, some French organisations clearly prefer moderate activities. One of the organisations of the unemployed engaged in the contentious field of unemployment in Paris participates in demonstration marches, and from time to time organises public activities, but shies away from using more confrontational strategies. Although the organisation considers itself primarily as a political actor, it distinguishes itself strongly from other organisations of the unemployed concentrating on more radical or disruptive activities. During an interview with members of the organisation, unemployed activists told several stories of occasions where the organisation had left protest activities because of other organisations destroying property. *“We have a lot of problems when we do collective actions with other organisations. We often retreat since we are not there to destroy anything. We are there to advance things”* (Interview 15:6). Instead, the organisation prefers

to work with other organisations involved in welfare issues in their district, and other moderate organisations of the unemployed.

However, not only violent actions are refused. Disruptive activities, such as sit-ins, occupations or innovative forms of protest disrupting routine politics, are also discounted as tactical choices. *“For example, there is a person who called yesterday to talk to the lawyer. The person had a problem with the Assedic, with a writ of summons the person did not get. So this person met our lawyer who will formulate an objection. And the Assedic will get back the person’s rights. That is this form of dialogue, there is no need to occupy the Assedic’s for that”* (Interview 15:6). The organisation prefers to provide legal support to unemployed people rather than to politicise the procedural issues unemployed people are confronted with when claiming their benefits. The organisation defines a successful activity as one where unemployed people are helped to exploit their rights. The activists doubt that disruptive activities can serve that aim. Two alternatives of political-disruptive and social-moderate activities are thereby defined. While some organisations employ more confrontational strategies, this particular organisation of the unemployed occasionally participates in demonstrations and stresses the importance of service provision.

While this organisations now prefers to carry out service activities to remedy individual distress, distancing itself from disruptive activities, the organisation’s preferences of collective action forms was different in the past. In its early years the organisation engaged in more confrontational strategies such as occupations and march-ins. At that time the provision of services was simply used as a political tool to make the issue of unemployment known to the public. Unannounced counselling events in front of job centres, or calls to hand in unemployment benefit claims at the latest possible moment in order to overload the bureaucracy with all kinds of requests are examples of these disruptive service activities. These activities were organised in

front of public buildings, and aimed to mobilise the unemployed constituency and raise awareness about unemployed people's concerns. The French unemployed people's organisations also engaged in these and other disruptive strategies, but did not provide services as a means of claiming unemployed people's social rights.

In its later stage this organisations of the unemployed resembles a moderate service provider that occasionally participates at protest events, while in its early years the it was a more challenging actor, including disruptive activities in its action repertoire. The stories of disruptive collective actions are part of the collective memory of the organisation, and members often refer to these activities during their meetings. These shared adventures are the thread that knits the core organisation members together. However, while in the past these disruptive strategies formed a central part of their action strategy, today they are no longer considered desirable.

Yet it is not only the action repertoire of the organisation that has changed over the years. One other feature that has changed is due to the fact that the organisation gained resources by applying for financial support from public institutions, and secured the support of local politicians sympathetic to the organisation's aims. Having gained access to different resources over the past years, the organisation has its own meeting space with a fully-equipped kitchen, an office and a meeting room for the unemployed visitors – in other words, the organisation today is relatively well-off compared to most other local unemployed people's organisations.¹⁴⁴ This enables them to provide a fairly professional service to the unemployed people of the district, with a lawyer working on the premises for several hours every week. In its early

¹⁴⁴ The organisation receives a financial subsidy from the city of Paris to run their premises in the form of three year contracts. This allows the organisation to pay for its own lawyer who provides consultations for unemployed people visiting the premises. Further, the organisations gets donations and membership fees which pays for most of the paper work and the letters that are sent to the members of the organisation. Finally, there is, from time to time, financial support from the regions for specific projects. The group is also connected to the local political infrastructure, getting support from individual politicians and parties.

years the organisation disposed of very few organisational resources, and was forced to meet in coffee houses or other public spaces. It seems the organisation successfully addressed other, more resource rich actors to get access to resources. Furthermore, the organisation gained access to local political decision-making bodies and is involved in debates on welfare and unemployment issues in the district. Finally, the organisation is now embedded in a network of local movement organisations and associations engaged in welfare issues. The organisation regularly plans its activities with other organisations and associations: those actors with whom the organisation prefers to collaborate and those organisations that have more confrontational orientations are clearly distinguished. Thus, this organisation first gained access to resources that allowed it to carry out other activities and engage more ‘professionally’ in service provision. Secondly, the organisation seems to have regular contacts with other more resource rich organisations and institutions who are willing to support its activities and provide access to political bodies. Thirdly, the organisation is embedded in a network of organisations and associations active on welfare issues and not confrontational in their strategies.

This illustration of the organisation’s two stages suggests that certain conditions accompany certain tactical choices. The illustration suggests, for example, that access to resources makes organisations less favourable to disruptive strategies. In fact, the interviewee from the French organisation of the unemployed is convinced that the organisation secured financial and moral support from other actors only because it gave up its more confrontational activities and now concentrates on non-profit activities. The activist describes, for example, the dependence on and responsibility towards those organisations and institutional actors that provide resources to the organisation: *“It is because we decided to help people rather than destroy things that we achieved something”* (Interview 15:6). That is, the organisation today is an important reference point for political actors, other organisations and the unemployed in the district. Over the years the organisation has increasingly distanced itself from other political actors and organisations of the unemployed that organised disruptive

actions in the aftermath of the peak of the cycle of unemployed protest. Stressing the importance of service provision, the interviewee considers that these activities would be at risk if the organisation were to use more disruptive tactics that could upset the money-giving institutions or the local parties supporting their cause: “*You cannot offend somebody who supports you.*” (Interview 15:6) The organisation feel they have the duty not only to avoid upsetting these organisations by using disruptive activities, but also plans activities in order to keep resource channels open in the future.

Thus, instead of assuming there to be a general tendency among social movements (see McCarthy et al 1992) to become less disruptive and to give up their challenging strategies, *part three* discusses conditions that can be argued to affect the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. Indeed, as shown in *part two*, organisations of the unemployed show very different combinations of social, cultural, and political tactics. Most importantly, while all these organisations have years of experience in movement activity and have participated in the same national protest waves, not all have given up their disruptive activities, and others have never considered using disruptive strategies. Differences in organisation characteristics must therefore explain these different tactical choices.

Few systematic empirical insights have been made on the relationship between the organisational characteristics of movement actors and their degree of disruptiveness.¹⁴⁵ In the following part I will discuss the roles of four different conditions, and link these to the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. While the few investigations on poor people’s movement organisations have concentrated on the role of resources, the following chapters integrate arguments from different theoretical frameworks. The first condition to be discussed is the role of access to resources. The question of whether access to resources in general moderates the tactical choices of movement organisations is raised here. The second condition combines arguments from the resource derivation debate with arguments from the political opportunity approach, asking about the role of access to institutional actors in the tactical choices of movement organisations. In a third part I look at the roles of the

¹⁴⁵ Particularly when looking at a great number of protest events across many issues the link between organisation and protest action is unclear (Rucht 1999). While social movement research often takes Michels’ ‘iron law of oligarchy’ (Clemens and Minkoff 2004) for granted, the life cycle of social movements from loose networks to formal organisations and the parallel process of a declining importance of disruptive activities “... *has been inconclusively debated for decades*” (Rucht, 1999:152).

different collective actors the organisations of the unemployed studied describe themselves as belonging to. Here, arguments from relational and network perspectives on social movements are advanced. In a final section I discuss the role of unemployed individuals. Arguments from the resource derivation debate are combined with research on individual resources and experience in movement activists. While research has been done to add knowledge on each of these conditions, research has led to inconclusive results and these various conditions have not been considered in an aggregate level and regarding their interactions.

These four conditions will be linked to two strategies that I presume to be particularly telling in choices of moderate or more challenging strategies. First I link these conditions to disruptive strategies, that is the question of whether organisations use activities or frames that threaten the everyday business of welfare and unemployment policy. Secondly, I link these conditions to the importance organisations of the unemployed give to caring activities. Although caring activities do not exclude the use of disruptive strategies, I presume that at least some attention is drawn away from political activities in general.

Thus, the following part addresses the question of which conditions explain the moderate or disruptive strategies of organisations of the unemployed? In *chapter 7* I discuss the relevant literature for the four conditions and spell out assumptions on their impact on organisations' tactical choices. In *chapter 8* I link the conditions to the two strategies - disruptive strategies and service provision - on the basis of the empirical material gathered. Finally, in *chapter 9* I will look at the interactive dynamic of these four conditions. This chapter relies on the Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), the most appropriate method to study the explanatory power of a number of conditions for a middle-sized N study.

Chapter 7

Poor, excluded, counter-cultural, and experienced? – Discussing the best conditions for becoming disruptive

The development of the French organisation illustrated above suggests that specific action strategies go with certain conditions: access to resources, support from public institutions, and embeddedness in a particular network of actors engaged in issues of welfare and unemployment. The organisation today illustrates an ideal type of a professional service provider, combining certain conditions that seem to favour its moderate profile and the importance it places on the provision of services. The current situation of this organisation of the unemployed is the exact opposite of its early existence. When it was founded, the organisation was a poor and marginalised collective actor engaged in disruptive activities as an important tool to make the claims of the unemployed constituency heard. Thus, the two stages of the organisation of the unemployed illustrate two ideal types of social movement organisations. Firstly, social movement organisations with relatively stable access to resources and regular contacts with supporting organisations that only occasionally participate in moderate protest activities, preferring to provide services to unemployed people. Secondly, poor movement organisations without any support from established actors, using disruptive action forms and refusing to engage in social activities.

Reviewing the broad body of literature on social movements¹⁴⁶, one can argue that resources, support from allies, and the type of network in which a organisation is embedded are crucial for carrying out collective movement action. At the same time, however, some conditions are suspected to deprive movements of their disruptive, innovative and/or political character. For example, while access to resources is argued to be a necessary condition for the maintenance of protest action, access to resources is also argued to change the profile of the organisations that are crucial managers of these resources, as will be argued below.

¹⁴⁶ For an overview see della Porta and Diani (2006).

Organisations of the unemployed are dependent on favourable political opportunities, such as finding allies to organise major national protest waves (Baumgarten and Lahusen forthcoming). Furthermore, unemployed people need to access at least a minimal amount of resources for organising protest activities and the like. The question is whether or not these conditions - once they become more stable characteristics of unemployed action - deprive poor actors of their most important power, disruptive strategies (Piven and Cloward, 1977), leading them to become conventional political and social players in the long run. Organisations of the unemployed are likely to display similar features and be confronted with similar challenges to other social movement organisations. In the subsequent parts I will look at studies that attempt to capture the impacts of four different conditions on the tactical choices of movements.

7.1 The lack of resources and collective action

What is the presumed effect of access to resources on the tactical choices of movement organisations? Resources and unemployed people's activities are described as two opposing categories: unemployed people are usually considered to be particularly deprived of resources. The unavailability of the resources necessary to organise collective action is argued to be the main reason for the absence or weakness of unemployed people's protests.

Unemployed activists also mention that the lack of a satisfactory monthly income is a big reason for the difficulties in mobilising unemployed people. One unemployed activist describes these difficulties: *"They might sit in Marzahn¹⁴⁷ and do not have the money for a transport ticket. Also at the Monday demonstrations people said: 'I would like to come, but I can't every Monday, I really do not have the money to come from Marzahn to Spandau¹⁴⁸.'"* (Interview 5:15) The interviewee explains: *"Since also the transport is now regulated in the new unemployment benefit. In its current calculation of the unemployment benefit, even for buying a newspaper, there is only the money for buying a newspaper every fourth day."* (Interview 19:15) This interviewee explains the difficulty to mobilise by the scarce resources unemployed people have. The unemployed simply do not have enough resources - such as a

¹⁴⁷ A district of Berlin.

¹⁴⁸ A district of Berlin.

monthly income or a transport ticket – to enable even the most highly motivated to actually participate at protest activities.

The importance of resources in mobilising people for collective action is also described by unemployed activists. I visited one organisations of the unemployed several times during their limited opening hours. During the interview one of the activists mentioned that resources are indispensable for organising protest activities: *“It is not that money makes the people come. But if you have a place to meet you can welcome the unemployed. And you can create a place, an atmosphere, where you mobilise people softly, to get them active. Then this is possible. We are only open [twice a week], apart from me [this organisation] does not exist any more”* (Interview 14:4) The organisations of the unemployed does not have its own premises, but is hosted by a left-wing political party who pays for electricity and the telephone. The organisation also lacks any noteworthy financial subsidies, and one of the unemployed activists mentioned that most people are unable to contribute any money. The activist blames the scarce resources of the organisation for their difficulty in getting more unemployed people involved on the topic of unemployment.

Unemployed activists also state that the scarce financial resources of unemployed people have an effect on organisation-generating activities. For example, one activist explained that unemployed people do not participate in socialising events in the pub after official organisation meetings: *“This is between not ‘outen’ yourself and not being able to pay for the beer in the pub. And not to get invited all the time. Often after a organisation meeting people like to go to the pub, that happens really often. Once a week we take a beer in the pub. Well, this coming together is somehow related with the pub (laughs).”* (Interview 19:15). The discomfort caused by not being able to pay for drinks discourages unemployed people from joining these informal meetings. Thus, the scarce resources at the disposition of unemployed people are assumed to make mobilisation for collective action and organisation-generating activities more difficult.

Resources and unemployed people’s protests are further portrayed as two opposing categories, since claims for more individual and collective resources are assumed to

form the main topics of protest from an unemployed constituency.¹⁴⁹ The battle over unemployment is often portrayed as a battle where unemployed people seek to improve their financial situation. That is, the redistribution of resources is assumed to be at the core of the movement's claims. Thus, while on the one hand the absence of resources is used to explain difficulties in mobilisation, on the other it is assumed to be the main motivation for disruption and the core claim of the unemployed constituency. Therefore, a lack of resources is assumed to be the motivational core of unemployed people's protests. At the same time, as also stressed by the unemployed activists, some resources seem to be a necessary condition for organising protest activities.

When searching for explanations for the weakness or absence of collective action by marginalised social organisations, such as the homeless or the unemployed, the unequal distribution of resources is often mentioned as one major obstacle. From the perspective of resource mobilisation theory, it is argued that the success of collective action is related to the presence of resources in the broader environment (Minkoff 1997). The unequal distribution of social and economic resources in society are replicated in patterns of collective action (Kim and Bearman 1997). That is, while the general presence of resources in a society is considered necessary to challenge power-holders, these resources also have to be accessible. However, the control of resources varies between social groups, so that some actors have easier access than others. As Edwards and McCarthy (2004) summarise, in advanced industrial democracies “... *middle-class groups remain privileged in their access to many kinds of resources, and, therefore, not surprisingly social movements that resonate with the concerns of relatively privileged social groups predominate and the mobilizations of the poor groups are quite rare*” (Edwards and McCarthy, 2004:117). Compared to such movements the economically marginalised have greater obstacles to overcome in order to organise collective action. The authors expect a relationship between the resources available to certain constituencies and the strength of their mobilisation. Therefore, unemployed people, who are usually perceived as a social group with

¹⁴⁹ This type of material conflict is distinguished from the claims of the so-called new social movements that have promoted universal values and claims, such as peace, women's rights and environmental issues since the 1970s. These conflicts have been characterised as post-material conflicts that go beyond the promotion of a defined group's interests. Instead, unemployed people's activities are often described as a typical conflict of an economically defined group, such as the worker's movement, fighting for their material better-being.

difficulties in accessing resources, are confronted with more obstacles when organising collective action.

Yet, at the same time, Edwards and McCarthy (2004) point to the importance of the transfer of resources between different social groups by which obstacles are overcome by economically marginalised groups. Indeed, from the perspective of resource mobilisation theory it seems that, especially over the past decade, unemployed people have successfully managed to access resources from their surrounding environment. Unemployed people seem to have overcome “*resource inequalities*” (Edwards and McCarthy, 2004:118).¹⁵⁰

As hinted at in the introduction, the abandoning of disruptive activities and the interest of former movement actors in becoming professional service providers and giving up their political claims has long been a concern. Research on social movement organisations argues, for example, that access to resources explains the transformation from challenger to service provider. Looking at the action repertoire and organisational forms of social movement organisations in the United States, McCarthy (McCarthy, Britt, and Wolfson 1991) finds that most social movement organisations develop into charity organisations.¹⁵¹ The author presumes that access to resources and the regulations this access is related to are responsible for the structural isomorphism of “*social movement organisations regarding their tactics, goals, and organisational forms*” (McCarthy et al. 1991:47). In investigating the reasons behind the heavy increase and dominance of non-profit organisations, McCarthy et al. (1991) identify different mechanisms by which the tactics and forms of social movement organizations are honed and channelled to one specific type of moderate and institutionalised actor. The most important channelling mechanisms the authors identify are the laws regulating non-profit organisations. Here the state defines the borders of an organisational field, and details the special rights and

¹⁵⁰ The early scarcity of resources is furthermore a characteristic of most challenging actors entering the public sphere as new actors. In this respect unemployed people’s movements are in a similar position to most other emerging social movements. In particular, the lack of legitimacy of a new actor’s claims, its marginal position in the field of actors defining and deciding the issue, and the scarce access to financial support also characterises other emerging social movements. Unemployed people’s actors share this lack of resources with other movement actors of the past, such as the women’s movement, or the gay movement, or the contemporary movement of precarious workers in Europe. New political and social actors are usually confronted with a situation where they dispose of only few resources and little institutionalised support.

¹⁵¹ The authors show, for example, that 85% of national and regional poor people’s movement organisations were registered as non-profit actors in the 1980s.

obligations connected to that status. Social movement actors, are ambivalent about adapting to this organisational form. While becoming a non-profit organisation has the advantage of becoming a legitimate actor and profiting from the resources available for these kinds of organisations – such as tax exemption - these organisations are at the same time subject to a variety of regulations defining the types of political and social activities they are allowed to carry out. Social movement organisations that adapt to a non-profit form thus automatically become subject to laws by which the activities of charities are regulated. According to McCarthy et al. (1991) these laws have therefore begun to moderate and influence social movements as a whole. That is, non-profit actors are required to shape their activities to be in line with what are defined as charitable ends and are prohibited from engaging in certain forms of political activism, such as certain forms of resource aggregation and political advocacy.

Thus, McCarthy et al. (1991) assume that social movement organisations are unable to resist the resource benefits provided by the state. Access to these resources is in turn assumed to be intertwined with mechanisms that lead to the professionalisation and moderation of the action repertoires of social movement organisations. When subject to laws regulating the non-profit sector, movement organisations tend to give up their more disruptive activities and political demands. That is, as a consequence of access to resources, the original aims and tactics of a social movement actor are given up where legal frameworks forbid political activities.

The tendency of social movement organisations to become more like professional service providers after gaining access to resources is also described in other studies on social movement organisations. Social movement organisations with many material resources tend, for example, to adopt more formal and professional structures, as della Porta and Mosca (2006) report in looking at various types of global justice movement organisations. Usually, formal organisations are considered less confrontational in their action repertoires than grassroots movements that pursue more disruptive goals and tactics. Since these tendencies can be described for various political contexts, however, there may be other explanations aside from or along with legal frameworks that explain tendencies to professionalisation and the simultaneous moderation of organisations with resources.

Research on cycles of protest has further shown that the decline of a protest cycle is preceded by the securing of resources by movement organisations (Koopmans 1995:123f). Comparing two major protest cycles in Germany and the Netherlands in the 1980s, Koopmans points out that *“the spectacular increase in resources (finances, staff, etc.) available to SMOs [...] did not lead to any increase in mobilization, but was accompanied by a clear decline in the number of protest. The increase in resources, therefore, did not cause mobilisation, but quite to the contrary, was a result of the preceding protest wave”* (Koopmans, 1995:123). This phase of the protest wave is characterised by moderate mass protest and quickly followed by the decline of the protest wave. As Koopmans (1995) argues, the professional social movement organisations that dominate in this phase replace the active involvement of adherents with the contributions of an otherwise passive constituency and the work of a few professionals (since these organisations have access to institutions). That is, not only do disruptive activities decline when social movement organisations access resources, but protest activities in general tend to decline. While this research more generally questions the role of resources for collective action, for my purposes the temporal coincidence of access to resources and the weakness of disruptive activities is of interest.

Indeed, one organisation of the unemployed tells of the difficulties in organising protest activities since the organisation became more professional. The organisation - similarly to the one mentioned above - finds it difficult to mobilise unemployed people for political action. One declared aim of the organisation is to politicise the issue of unemployment so that individual grievances are not considered as only personal. *“It is the sense [of organisations of the unemployed] to make unemployed people to take the matter in their hands and to defend their rights”* (Interview 16:4). Yet, as the activist mentions, social benefit recipients in search for help can hardly be transformed into political claimants. The activist recounts that since the organisation has been run by professional staff and not voluntary activists, it has generally become difficult to organise protest activities. *“It is difficult to ask paid staff to make activists work. They have a role as paid staff and it is difficult for them to carry out political actions”* (Interview 16:4). Since the organisation gained access to resources and became more professional, it has had difficulties in organising spectacular protest events, even though such activities were part of their tactical repertoire in the past.

The development of the French organisation in terms of increasingly taking into account the destinies of their fellow sufferers rather than politicising the issue of ‘unemployment’ seems to describe a change in the organisation from one ideal type to another. Thus, organisations appear to fall back on disruptive activities in order to compensate for a lack of resources. Once organisations have resources they give up disruptive action. Firstly, organisations are exposed to regulating mechanisms that are intertwined with access to resources. Further, organisations acquire more professional players, replacing activists with paid staff for example. Professional social movement organisations tend to be less confrontational. Attention is drawn away from political action towards social activities. Thus, while a minimal amount of resources is probably crucial to carry out any public action, access to wide resources is assumed to moderate a organisation’s strategies and make it less political.

7.2 External support and access to centres of political and discursive power

While levels of resources seem to encourage the use of some action forms while discouraging the use of others, the provenance of these resources may be crucial. Indeed, the story of the French organisation of the unemployed presented above suggests that close contact with public institutions limits the tactical choices of organisations. The organisation described receives financial support from the city council and other governing institutions. Applying for this financial support from state institutions is one possible way for organisations of the unemployed to give their activities continuity. At the same time, however, the French organisation has established a relationship that appears to limit their choice of action alternatives. As the unemployed activist quoted earlier points out, the organisation desists from using disruptive activities in order to avoid offending their supporting organisation. The activist does not consider disruptive activities - and thus activities that are against the common rules of social interaction – to be feasible. It seems that support from state institutions encourages the organisation to use moderate activities and discourages the use of disruptive actions. Furthermore, service provision is widely accepted and helps cultivate good relations with public institutions.

The story of the French organisation of the unemployed thus hints that support from state institutions impacts on a organisation’s preferences in terms of action forms. In fact, the unemployed activist is convinced that the organisation received

support only because it gave up its more confrontational activities. In hopes of keeping these resource channels open in the future, the organisations thus excludes the use of more confrontational action forms in order to not upset donor institutions. However, the activist also mentions that she does not wish to upset organisations that have been supportive in the past.

Access to resources often means approaching external organisations that are able and willing to provide resources to challenging organisations. Resource mobilisation presumes that new actors have to mobilise resources from their surrounding environment in order to mobilise for collective action (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Jenkins 1985). Where there are mechanisms or organisations acting as re-distributors of resources, and guaranteeing access, economically marginalised organisations are also able to organise collective action (Edwards and McCarthy, 2004). As the protest waves in France and Germany suggest, the unemployed have overcome resources inequalities. In fact, as we will see in the empirical discussion below, organisations of the unemployed have successfully managed to access resources via external organisations.

Organisations of the unemployed are particularly needful of other supporting organisations in order to overcome resource inequalities and access resources for collective action. In fact, unemployed people's movements are described as being particularly fragile and highly reliant on external factors. In her comparison of the two German peaks of unemployed people's protests, Baumgarten states that the cycles of protest of these weak actors "*... show once again that the unemployed and their organisations do not have enough power to be heard by the public and influence the discourse on unemployment themselves*" (Baumgarten 2004:2). Although the mobilisations in 2004 in Germany show that organisations of the unemployed have gained self-consciousness and act more independently from other established organisations, national mobilisations in particular remain short-lived phenomena without the support of established organisations. Thus, mobilisations by an unemployed constituency are assumed to depend on the support of allies who mobilise on behalf of the unemployed (but see Zorn 2007).

Research on other poor people's movements similarly stresses the dependence of this type of actor on external support. In a study on homeless mobilisation in the USA

during the 1980s, Cress and Snow assume that “*given their overwhelming poverty, homeless individuals are able to provide little more than their voices and physical presence to SMOs*” (Cress and Snow 1996:1091): these actors must have been able to mobilise resources from external organisations. Indeed, the authors find that external support is crucial to homeless activism: three-quarters of all resources in this movement are derived from external sources, and all but one of the organisations mobilised the majority of their resources from external supporters. The question is whether this access limits the tactical choices of the organisations.

The resource derivation debate indeed suggests that external support from elite organisations has effects on movement activities (Haines 1984; McAdam 1982). More specifically, external support is assumed to come at the cost of organisation autonomy and the moderation of their activities (Jenkins and Eckert 1986). One can assume that these effects will be even more pronounced in the most dependent organisations, such as the unemployed.

Indeed, specifying the role of state resources in the creation of non-profit organisations, Cress (Cress 1997) assumes that dependency on external organisations is a crucial factor in organisations’ moderation of their action repertoires. Not all organisations that adapt to the non-profit sector give up their more disruptive activities. Cress suggests instead that the crucial factor is whether organisations establish a resource-dependent relationship: “... *the critical factor for moderation is whether incorporation is undertaken in the context of establishing a resource-dependent relationship with an external organization*” (Cress, 1997:358) Thus, it is not simply the adaptation to a legal framework that moderates tactical choices, but the existence of dependency on external allies.

Financial support from state institutions is however only one possible form of support from one specific actor. It is one route to gaining resources organisations of the unemployed are assumed to lack and to making contact with an institution on a more or less regular basis. Indeed, the moderating effect on organisation activities has also been formulated with regard to other factors than resource dependency. Since organisations are conceptualised as open systems with relatively permeable and fuzzy borders, organisations’ surrounding environments have also gained increasing attention (McAdam and Scott 2005). The ‘multi-organizational field’ in which

organisations of the unemployed are embedded has gained increasing systematic attention. Within their environments, organisations of the unemployed get in contact with many different actors, for reasons other than simply to access material and financial resources.

Generally speaking unemployed people are considered to be excluded from the contentious field of unemployment. To overcome this, organisations of the unemployed may approach a variety of other organisations to get access to resources they lack. Unemployed people approach other organisations to get a voice in political meetings, or in the decision-making bodies of parties and trade unions, or may contact journalists to intervene in public debate.

Studying the tactical innovations of the civil rights movement in the United States between 1955 and 1970, McAdam (1983) stresses the importance for actors lacking institutional power to devise protest techniques that offset their powerlessness. That is, exclusion is held responsible for the need to use action forms that compensate for a lack of access. The other way round, one could argue that organisations with access to policy making do not need to use demanding and sometimes risky protest forms.

Studying the contentious politics of unemployment, della Porta states that *“protest should be a preferred form of mobilization, especially for those actors who are less endowed with institutional channels of access to policy makers. More resourceful movement actors, should be able to attract the attention of mass media using less disruptive forms of protest, while the claims of the most ‘powerless’ are likely to be covered only if they resort to the most disruptive forms of protest”* (della Porta 2008:279). Indeed, looking at the different forms of intervention in the public debate on unemployment, it seems that unemployed actors use protest activities far more often than other actors, such as established organisations, political parties, and politicians, who use other forms of claims-making to enter the public sphere (Zorn 2004). Yet, while powerless actors may need to use protest activities in order to get public attention, these action forms may also at the same time be widely recognised as legitimate means for doing so. The more powerless and excluded a organisation is, the more probable it seems that the actor must use spectacular disruptive actions.

Other forms of access include, for example, access to political decision-making bodies, access to legitimacy, and access to the public sphere. Aiming to influence

political decisions and public opinion, organisations of the unemployed have to approach more powerful actors that provide them with some form of access to centres of discourse and decision – alongside the resources indispensable to the organisation of collective action. The organisational and institutional environment of organisations of the unemployed provide material support as well as access to top decision-making bodies or the public sphere. The unemployed are usually considered excluded from these centres of political and discursive power, and to make their voice heard they therefore need to fall back on disruptive actions. Yet, I assume that once these actors gain access to institutions unemployed actors give up their disruptive strategies and favour activities that foster their new role as a legitimate speaker in the field. I presume that service provision is one such widely recognised form of collective action that fosters this new role for organisations of the unemployed.

The importance of support from other actors is not limited to periods of mobilisation, but is also crucial during periods of occasional protest activities and for the daily activities of the organisations. Further, while access to legitimacy, decision-making institutions, or the public sphere might be of particular importance for excluded social organisations, the importance of these relationships also holds true for other challenging actors.

From the perspective of the political opportunity approach, success in organising protest activities has been linked, for example, to institutional assets and the availability of allies, (della Porta and Diani, 2006). Yet, not only the success but also the degree of radicalisation of a social movement is examined and explained in the approach. Two aspects are in particular are linked to the tactical choices of social movements.

First, the responses of authorities to protest, that is either the tendency towards repression or facilitation, is assumed to structure the behaviour of movement actors. After authorities have learned to respond to novel activities at the outset of a protest wave, they react with facilitation and repression. The bigger, more moderate section of the movement is facilitated. Actors are supported in their activities and as a consequence (theoretically) moderate collective action forms. At the same time, other sections of the movement that continue to adopt more confrontational forms are repressed, giving rise to a dynamic of increasingly confrontational activities and

further repression (see also della Porta and Diani, 2006:197ff). The argument for moderate forms of activity is the increasing control authorities have over the movement, splitting it into a moderate and a confrontational or radical part. Thus the support or refusal from authorities and other established actors is argued to be a major factor in the moderation or radicalisation of the goals and tactics of different sections of movements.

In addition, the political process model assumes movements that are more successful in their activities to be less confrontational in terms of action forms (Koopmans 1993). This idea can also be linked to the concept of an open or closed political system: political systems offering a large number of access points are considered to be more open. The political opportunity approach considers that the greater the number of actors sharing political power, the greater the chances for movement actors to gain access to the system. Perceiving their own activities as successful, or the impression of responsiveness from a political system, as well as the availability of allies in political office, are crucial. Although the presence of a left-wing party in opposition has also been argued to be a crucial factor for the general success of a social movement, I presume that the general availability of contacts with these actors is also of importance. That is, whether left-wing parties are in government or not, contact with these actors gives movement organisations the possibility to voice their concerns without resorting to spectacular activities to grab public attention. That is, while left-wing parties may be more open to challenging actors when in opposition, I presume that from the perspective of movement organisations the most important point is whether these actors act as allies or not, independently of whether they are in office.

Thus, I assume in general that contact with established actors and public institutions is a crucial factor in the moderation of local organisations' action repertoires. Impacts on tactical choices are not limited to relationships where unemployed people are dependent on financial support. Close contact with institutions is assumed to draw attention away from disruptive action forms, since organisations of the unemployed perceive themselves to be no longer, or are in fact not, excluded. This influence is also assumed to work with respect to media contacts. While organisations usually have to use spectacular actions in order to get coverage in the media, I presume that contacts with journalists that give the unemployed a voice in

the debate draw attention away from more spectacular protest forms. Thus, it is not only resources but also access to centres of political and discursive power that explain the tactical choices of organisations. Access to institutionalised actors is connected to the perception of having something to say and being less excluded. Access to these centres of political and discursive power encourages organisations to use widely accepted forms of collective action, such as the provision of services and caring activities for the unemployed. On the contrary, I assume the absence of access to make organisations more political in that they are not interested in offering social services, since this would divert attention from political strategies.

The role of political and social contexts for organisation choices are certainly not fully represented by direct contacts with organisations and institutions that provide unemployed organisations with some form of access to something they lack.¹⁵² However, I presume direct connections to supporting organisations to be of particular importance. Thus, access to institutionalised actors, such as trade unions, welfare organisations, political parties and the media, are assumed to provide organisations of the unemployed access to something they lack. Although unemployed people are considered particularly excluded from the field of political and discursive power, I presume that once unemployed actors gain the support of external organisations, access to political institutions or to mainstream media, these contacts moderate their tactical choices.

7.3 Peer group pressure and the importance of social networks? Making a collective actor.

Usually, unemployed people are characterised as isolated individuals. The variation within this social group between those unemployed for a short period on the one hand, and the increasingly isolated long-term unemployed people on the other, are considered major difficulties in making a collective actor of the unemployed. In fact, as with the perceived lack of resources and exclusion from political and discursive channels of policy-making, unemployed activists point to their social isolation in order to explain the difficulties of collective action.

Yet, as we will see in the empirical discussion below, most unemployed activists and organisations of the unemployed are well embedded in pre-existing social

¹⁵² One way to deal with this difficulty is for example by using network studies, looking at the meaning of indirect links and the network positions of actors (Diani 2003).

movement structures. Indeed, as movement studies have shown, it is rarely the most disorganised segments of society that are at the forefront of social struggles. Stable neighbourhoods (Ohlemacher 1993) or work contexts, form the fertile ground in which contentious collective actions grow. Although social movements do not exist as clear entities or social bodies, being heterogeneous networks of organisations and individuals with fluid and fuzzy borders, there are strong ties that hold a movement together. Network forms of organisation have even been defined as the distinctive trait of social movements (Diani 1992). Thus, it is structural stability and dense networks rather than disorder that facilitate collective action and the emergence of challenging actors.

Social ties that develop from and enable collective action are said to simultaneously constrain activities. Yet, how they do so and which ties constrain or enable which kinds of activities has not been studied systematically for the organisation level. In the previous part, those ties that constitute a relationship of support were discussed in detail: access to actors that can offer something organisations of the unemployed are assumed to lack formed the centre of attention. In the following, I shift the focus to those ties that define a collective to which organisations of the unemployed describe themselves as belonging to. Thus, a link between those ties among actors that define a collective actor and their tactical choices is provided.

While some studies suggest a relatively weak link between networks and collective action, considering networks as just one resource among others (Jasper 1997), the perspective advanced here assumes that strong ties to certain actors are not only crucial for carrying out collective activities in general, but that these ties influence the tactical choices of individual organisations. Social ties to other actors that define a collective actor are not considered as a resource that is either available or not, but as a necessary condition for any social action. Thus, unemployed movement organisations are embedded in a network of actors: the question is what type of network do organisations of the unemployed describe as favourable to which strategies? And what kind of actors must organisations of the unemployed avoid forming strong ties with if they wish to continue using disruptive activities, and what ties encourage them to do so? The example of the French organisation suggests that actors embedded in a network of professional service-providers, and particularly common activities with

other moderate movement organisations, prevent the organisation from using more disruptive activities. Usually the organisation avoids participating in public activities with organisations that are renowned for more confrontational action forms. Instead, they prefer to plan activities with organisations that prefer cooperative strategies. Furthermore, the organisation clearly distances itself from other organisations using more violent action forms by distinguishing a ‘we’ of organisations that prefer to cooperate with public institutions, and an ‘other’ of organisations that do not.

Other organisations of the unemployed also avoid the use of disruptive strategies because they feel closely tied to other organisations. For example, one unemployed activist tells a story where strategies for a protest event were discussed between different organisations of the unemployed. One idea to delay the proceedings of the implementation of the new unemployment and welfare reform was to encourage unemployed people to overload to the system by submitting their applications at the latest possible moment. *“One approach was to delay the whole thing, to let at least the starting date collapse. Like: ‘Oh, I have the request here and I still have a lot of questions’. To string the staff of the job centres along.”* (Interview 19:9) However, the unemployed activist recounts that one trade union organisation of the unemployed refused this strategy since they *“did not want to annoy their colleagues in the offices”* (Interview 19:13). Affiliation with the trade union organisation is so important that certain strategies are excluded from the outset. Thus, the plot of the story was that some actors - here a trade union organisation of the unemployed – have alliances with, or feel a sense of belonging to, another collective actor that prevents them from choosing more disruptive strategies.

How do social ties to other actors explain movement action? Social ties between movement actors – individuals, small informal organisations and more formal organisations - have long been studied. Comprehensive and systematic research has been carried out in past years, particularly from a network perspective. The network positions of individuals, for example, were found to be crucial for recruitment processes and to affect general commitment to a cause (McAdam 1982). Activists who are centrally located in flows of communication and exchanges within a movement maintain their identification with a movement for a longer period (McAdam and Paulsen 1993).

Another interesting insight is that adhesion to radical political organisations requires particularly strong networks: ties must be strong and numerous for people to engage in costly activities. della Porta (1987), in a study on recruitment processes in clandestine political organisations, shows the importance of individual networks. Involvement in left-wing terrorist organisations in Italy are facilitated by social ties to friends and family. Furthermore, studies on radical political organisations such as the Nazi movement in Germany show that members were embedded in a network of organisations and organisations, but that these were internally dense and secluded from other social and political organisations.

Thus, on an individual level close relations with other movement actors seems to be important for recruitment and a lasting involvement in movement activities. In addition, social ties to political organisations and individuals already engaged in collective action are important, particularly for adhesion to radical political organisations. It seems that radical political activities need strong and numerous relationships. Yet, particularly for radical political forms of engagement, people are involved in networks that are internally dense and secluded from other types of political and social organisations.

Thus, certain ties seem to encourage individuals to use more demanding action forms. At the organisation level, embeddedness in certain networks is also likely to explain the propensity to engage in more demanding strategies.¹⁵³ What possible ties could organisations of the unemployed form that explain the use of disruptive strategies?

A preliminary answer is suggested by looking at the preferred action strategies of different types of movement organisations. Different types of organisation prefer different strategies. An insight into the preferred action strategies of different types of organisations is provided by looking at the dynamics of protest waves. Koopmans (1995), for example, studies the link between the organisational features of different phases of protest waves and the action repertoires dominant during each. Comparing protest waves in various European countries in the mid-1980s the author describes

¹⁵³ There are important differences between the violent or radical activities of, for example, clandestine organisations, and disruptive strategies. Yet considering that disruptive activities are also more demanding forms of collective action than 'normalized' protest behaviour, these strategies probably need a certain level of commitment and thus ties to other groups that see disruptive activities as legitimate forms of resistance.

that the beginnings of a protest wave were “*associated with particularly strong increases in the number of unorganized protests ... these years were also characterized by a particularly high level of confrontational events*” (Koopmans, 1995:129) In the early days of a protest wave small organisations, such as local citizens’ committees, play an important role as disruptive activities are particularly important to gain public attention. While these organisations are important trailblazers for subsequent protests, other actors join in at a later stage. Professional movement organisations and external allies, such as trade unions, political parties and churches initially extend the protest to the mass public, moderate the protest repertoire and then channel the protest into more institutionalised forms of policy making. While at the outset of a protest wave movement actors use disruptive strategies, in the course of the protest wave movements adopt more moderate protest forms. Finally, the movement declines and a process of institutionalisation takes place, while a small part of the movement may radicalise (see (della Porta 1987)). This pattern seems to characterise most protest waves in western hemisphere countries in past decades.

Thus, the participation of different organisations differs during the course of a protest wave, as do the main action strategies adopted by the movement. While in the beginning loosely structured local organisations and individuals pave the way for major protest waves by raising public awareness via spectacular activities demanding high personal commitment, later phases are dominated by the activities of established organisations using institutionalised mass protest actions. It seems that established organisations indeed moderate the action repertoires of movements, while small loosely connected organisations account for the disruptive features of a social movement.

Indeed, movements consist of different organisations and different action strategies. In social movement theory two contradictory conceptions of social movement activity can be found (see also (Ansell 2003)). One strand considers new social movement activities as the ideal of direct participation. This view stresses the interest of movements in contributing to new forms of democracy. In this view movements are the example *par excellence* of participative democracy, where citizens and state institutions collaborate to cater for public and collective goods. Another strand of movement research suggests that movements are less likely to collaborate with state institutions, since movements embrace outsider strategies of grassroots

mobilization rather than insider strategies of lobbying (Staggenborg 1988). In this view, movement actors are linked together in dense networks that are characterised as sub-cultural (Melucci 1989) or counter-cultural. These networks formulate oppositional views to the dominant culture or mainstream political decisions (Fernandez and McAdam 1988), while collaboration with state institutions and societal opponents leads to de-radicalisation and cooptation. Thus, on the one hand movements are seen as promoters of direct democracy, and their links to institutionalised actors are stressed, while on the other their counter-cultural identity is highlighted.

Both perspectives capture some truths about social movements and their propensity to either collaborate with or undermine the political and cultural mainstream. Some authors suggest that different types of movements prefer different strategies. Koopmans (1995), for example, distinguishes between instrumental, sub-cultural, and counter-cultural movements. Yet different streams can also be distinguished within a single movement. Organisations of the unemployed are considered to use different types of logics, as outlined in part two of this thesis. That is, some parts of the movement seek solutions in collaboration with established actors and public institutions. These parts are open and define the collective of organisations engaged on the topic of unemployment as heterogeneous and with permeable borders. Other parts of the movement define the movement of the unemployed in strong opposition to governing institutions, political parties and more established organisations engaged on the issue.

Thus, the question here is not whether movements are better characterised as either one or another type of actor. The question is rather which type of collective actor do the different local organisations of the unemployed see themselves as belonging to? The conceptualisation of social movements as counter-cultural networks suggests that organisations embedded in these networks will use disruptive forms. These actors are not exposed to possible influences of cooptation and de-radicalisation, and are linked to actors that provide legitimacy to disruptive strategies.

Indeed, in a study on collaborative governance among different environmental movement organisations in the San Francisco Bay area, Ansell (2003) looks at the relationship between the embeddedness of the organisations and their openness towards

collaborative governance. Collaborative governance describes a policy approach by public institutions designed to engage stakeholders in a process of dialogue. Ansell (2003) asks how embeddedness in particular networks affects social movements' attitudes to collaboration, arguing that social movement communities that operate as counter-cultures may be less oriented towards cooperation. In fact, he finds that embeddedness in counter-cultural networks affects movement attitudes to collaboration, in that organisations embedded in these networks are less likely to collaborate with state institutions and other opposing organisations.

Thus, it is assumed that commitment to the cause among organisations of the unemployed will be stronger where these organisations are embedded in counter-cultural networks. In order to integrate disruptive strategies into their action and framing repertoires, organisations need to strongly identify with a collective that gives these activities meaning and considers them legitimate.

7.4 Middle-class radicalism or the disruptive poor? Experienced activists and tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed

In the following part, a final unquestioned assumption concerning unemployed individuals will be challenged. It is often assumed that the unemployed, like other poor people, are able to provide *“little more than their voices and physical presence to SMOs”* (Cress and Snow, 1996:1091). In their study on homeless mobilisations, Cress and Snow assume that differences in the accomplishments of homeless SMOs across the USA *“must be partly the result of differential success in mobilizing resources, presumably from external organizations”* (Cress and Snow, 1996:1091). Therefore, their focus is on the efforts of movement organisations to mobilise resources from external organisations willing and able to support their activities.

In the above I have similarly suggested that resources tend to be provided by external organisations. This does not, however, give a complete picture. From the perspective of resource mobilization theory, two different perspectives explain the successful mobilisation of (poor) social organisations. While actors can try to gain access to resources by approaching external organisations, unemployed individuals may also be able to contribute to the activities of organisations of the unemployed. This perspective presumes that unemployed members already have resources when

they become unemployed, which they are then able to contribute to collective activities.

The following discussion provides an overview of the particular resources unemployed people bring to the organisations of the unemployed they become involved in. While certain social traits seem to be important for political engagement in social movements, I argue that former experiences in social movement activities are of particular importance to explain the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed.

In the tradition of resource mobilisation theory, Maurer (Maurer 2001) studies the mobilisation of unemployed people in France in 1997 by comparing the mobilised and non-mobilised unemployed. In doing so, she identifies different individual resources that unemployed activists contributed to the collective efforts to organise protest events. These individual resources distinguish these actors from their non-mobilised unemployed counterparts. According to Maurer it is the misleading conception of a homogenous organisation of unemployed people that distorts our understanding, preventing us from identifying those resources unemployed individuals are able to contribute to collective protest. 'Being unemployed' is not a meaningful category to describe the common traits among those engaged politically on the topic. Maurer distinguishes between different types of unemployed people using different individual resources to participate in collective action. That is, unemployed people contribute to unemployed people's activities with resources they already held when they became unemployed.

Indeed, movement studies have long pointed out that it is rarely individual grievances and desperation that lead to popular unrest. It was the middle-classes rather than poor people that carried the major protest waves in western democracies. Studies on new social movements in western democracies have shown that although single movements, such as the gay, women's or peace movements, pursue different goals, they are predominantly rooted in a specific sector of the middle class, that is, professionals employed in social and cultural services (Kriesi 1988).

Looking at the general social characteristics of unemployed activists, no systematic empirical insights on the constituency of European unemployed people's movements in a comparative perspective exist. However, a study on the protest

activists of the Hartz protest in Germany in 2004 has shown that people with higher levels of education are overrepresented in the constituency of Hartz demonstrators. For protest on unemployment to emerge it seems to be crucial that actions are at least partly carried by middle-class individuals. Unemployment protests may become more likely the more middle-class people are affected by long-term unemployment. The social characteristics of the unemployed as a organisation may favour the emergence of protest on unemployment.

The individual characteristics of movement activists have long been studied. Movement studies on the consequences of activism in movements of the New Left have pointed to a biographical impact on the life of the activist (for an overview see (Giugni 2004)). Reviewing the consequences of previous movement engagement on individual lives, these studies demonstrate the continuous political engagement of former activists. People who were activists usually continue to espouse leftist political attitudes, and define themselves as radical in political orientation. Furthermore, former activists usually remain active in other contemporary movements or other forms of political activism. Thus, former movement activists continue to contribute to political actions.

Indeed, the political experience of unemployment activists is an important tool in the translation of individual grievances into a political problem. This becomes clear, for example, in the case of one French unemployment activist, who is anything but speechless or ashamed, and who began the interview by saying: *“I am really angry. [...] We are not a political organisation. But as an activist I have a political opinion. I am engaged also beyond this organisation, and that is why I say that I am really angry”* (Interview 14:1). To be politically engaged elsewhere offers the unemployed person the tools to define her situation as a political instead of a personal problem. Previous experience in movements or other political engagement are crucial for translating individual grievances into protest. The unemployment activist strongly denies any personal blame for being unemployed, and gives the problem of ‘being unemployed’ a political relevance.

How does the previous experience in movement activities of unemployed members explain the tactical choices of the organisations? Two arguments that explain the use of disruptive strategies by organisations of the unemployed with many

members with movement experience are advanced here. The first argument flows from the resource derivation debate. That is, I presume that the availability of individual resources in a organisation will make it more independent from external resources. While organisational resources were assumed to create dependent relationships that limit tactical choices, the availability of individual resources are instead assumed to broaden the action repertoire. organisations that have individual resources at their disposal are less dependent on other (external) resources, and thus less exposed to strategies of cooptation and channelling mechanisms. Such organisations can choose whether to access additional resources from other organisations or not, but could even ‘control the control’.

The second argument is based on the insights drawn in social movement studies on the types of actors that are involved in high-risk activities. Studies that have focused on activists involved in protest activities have found that people have to devote a lot of time and personality to movement aims if they are to participate in more demanding forms of political action. Thus, I presume that those who have been involved in movement activities for some time are more open to the use of challenging action strategies. Finally, familiarity with many different tactics will allow more experienced members to choose disruptive strategies in a strategic way in order to pursue the movement’s aims. Less experienced members may reject more confrontational forms of action because they lump them together with radical and violent action forms, as suggested by the story in the introduction. The lack of experience in how to obtain media coverage via innovative or disruptive protest forms, and the general lack of knowledge of the consequences of these activities, makes them reluctant to choose more challenging forms.

7.5 Summing up the discussion

Thus, it seems that the two stages of the French organisation’s organisational trajectory described in the introduction, where the organisation paid increasing attention to the destinies of fellow sufferers, or politicised the issue of unemployment and rejected social activities, describe two ideal cases of an organisation of the unemployed. Depending on the presence or absence of the conditions discussed above, organisations either resort to disruptive activities or moderate their action repertoire: To compensate for their lack of access to resources and decision-making institutions, for example, organisations use disruptive strategies. On the contrary,

organisations with access to institutions, for example, moderate their tactical choices and are more favourable towards the provision of services. Further, the embeddedness of an organisation in a local counter-cultural network and the presence of experienced movement activists in the organisation is assumed to encourage organisations to use disruptive strategies, and discourage the provision of social services, considered apolitical strategies.

Leaving aside the question of how differences between the two political systems account for variances between the local organisations in Berlin and Paris, - or more precisely, considering it simply as one condition between others in that “political contexts influence the development of systems of alliances and ... collective action” (Royall 2004:51) - in the following empirical discussion I ask what role these four conditions play in structuring the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. Looking at these organisations, I assume that good access to resources and close contacts with institutional actors in particular moderate action repertoires. Furthermore, I assume that a counter-cultural context and members with a lot of movement experience encourage disruptive strategies, while discouraging the use of service provision.

The absence or presence of these conditions is thus assumed to make the difference between two kinds of organisations: firstly, professional non-profit organisations preferring moderate activities and giving importance to the provision of services; and secondly, grassroots organisations that rely on direct action forms to grab the attention of the public or institutions, which prefer disruptive and political activities. The first type of organisation is assumed to have good access to resources, to be included by political and discursive centres of power, to be less secluded in the field of actors, and to consist of professional staff but not movement activists. This type of actor is reluctant to enter into conflict with established actors and institutions. This type of actor is represented by the upper-left box in *table 7.1*.

Table 7.1 – Presumed impact of the four conditions (resources, institutionalised field, counterculture, experiences) on preferred strategies

	disruptive strategies/ absence of caring activities	
conditions (no resources, no access, countercultural network, experiences)	moderate	disruptive
absent (-)	X	
present (+)		X

The second type of actor is forced to make up for a lack of resources and access to institutionalised actors by the use of disruptive activities. Furthermore, these actors are embedded in counter-cultural networks, and dispose of many experienced movement activists. This type of actor is represented by the lower-right box of *table 7.1*.

The model suggests that two fields, the upper-left and lower-right boxes, are the most populated. I thus presume that these two ideal types of actors dominate the field of organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin.

Chapter 8

Empirical description of the four conditions

In the following empirical discussion I address the question raised in the discussion of the four conditions. The empirical discussion asks whether the two ideal types of movement organisations indeed dominate the field of actors in Paris and Berlin. However, assuming that organisations of the unemployed will only rarely combine all four conditions, that is they will only rarely resemble the two ideal cases described above, I will first discuss the role of each condition separately in the form of four tables, giving preference to a variable-oriented approach. In the subsequent chapter, I move in the direction of a case study analysis using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). This type of analysis allows to compare the cases as configurations of conditions, taking into account interaction between the four conditions and the different roles they might play in the use of disruptive strategies. The following empirical discussion is thus structured in two chapters: *chapter 8* discusses the relationship between disruptive activities and service provision under each of the four conditions. The subsequent chapter 9 concentrates exclusively on disruptive strategies, taking into account the four conditions as configurations.

8.1 Organisations of the unemployed accessing resources

The first question to be addressed by the empirical analysis is whether good access to resources moderate organisations' tactical choices, or, vice versa, whether the absence of access encourages organisations to use disruptive and exclusively political strategies. The analysis asks whether access to resources prevents organisations of the unemployed from using disruptive activities.

What access to resources do organisations of the unemployed have? Unlike most studies that simply list resources in advance and then check for empirical evidence, I am interested in what organisations of the unemployed consider as resources, and how they ensure access to them.¹⁵⁴ The perception of resources by unemployment activists

¹⁵⁴ In the empirical analysis I thus follow the study of Cress and Snow (1996) who follow a similar research strategy.

appears to be particularly crucial in assessing the role of resources for organisations of the unemployed. For example, resources that are usually considered important in acting collectively - such as financial resources in the form of an annual budget - did not play a crucial role for organisations of the unemployed. These resources were available only for a very few organisations, while most did not receive funds directly, receiving instead other forms of support.¹⁵⁵

Further, in looking at how organisations of the unemployed access resources, a dynamic perspective became apparent, in that some resources were constructed in the during actions, rather than having been available from the start. In addition, a qualitative dimension was added to assess the quality of access to resources, taking into account the roles different resources play for different organisations.

Accessing resources

All in all, a surprising variety of different resources are accessed and created by organisations of the unemployed. About twenty different resources are mobilised by the organisations studied here, all accessed in different ways and playing different roles for different organisations.¹⁵⁶ Instead of listing all these different resources, in the following I focus on two of the most crucial - access to working space and access to expert knowledge - to exemplify the symbolic and practical role of resources for these organisations' activities.

One of the 'context dependent resources' (Edwards and McCarthy 2004:129f) organisations of the unemployed have relatively easy access to, is the use of another organisation's office space. That is, while money is always welcome it does not seem to be as important as having a space to meet: premises, even in another organisation's offices, are considered important by most organisations of the unemployed. Interestingly, this also seems to be an important resource for other poor people's movements, such as homeless social movement organisations (Cress 1997).¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ See also Cress and Snow (1996) who report the same phenomena for homeless groups.

¹⁵⁶ Cress and Snow obtain similar findings when studying homeless organisations. Groups of homeless organisations mobilize fourteen resources and no less than nine of these are necessary for engaging in collective action campaigns. While some resources are always mobilized by homeless organisations, other resources are combined in different ways to enable these actors to regularly meet and organize campaigns on behalf of homeless people.

¹⁵⁷ Cress and Snow cite a fragment of an interview which recalls many similar comments heard during my own interviews. *"Well, I think that giving people a space makes life possible. You know, I mean what's the difference between a person who is homeless and a person who isn't homeless? The person who isn't homeless has a home. Well the Homeless Union when it was homeless had a different*

However, organisations of the homeless and unemployed frame the importance of an organisational home differently: While homeless activists stress finding a “home” for the “homeless”, unemployment activists stress that unemployed people need “*a place to go when everybody else goes to work*” (Interview 14:6).

Furthermore, organisations that are hosted by other organisations stress the obligation on wealthier actors to care for poor actors. In these offices, organisations are approachable for unemployed people, and can organise meetings and activities. Instead of renting offices and using financial resources most organisations of the unemployed rely on the support of other more established organisations. Using another organisation’s logistical resources is not necessarily seen as a setback, and the responsibility of other organisations to show solidarity is integrated into the framing of what the problem unemployment is about. Thus, resources such as a place to meet are also important for framing strategies to define the problem unemployment, and can have a high symbolic value alongside it’s the practical advantage of having a place to meet.

organisations also develop alternative ways to ensure access to those goods that money would allow them to buy. For example, while one organisation is able to invite professionals to offer training courses on unemployment policy issues for their organisation members, another self-organises training courses for their members on the basis of information collected on the internet or from other sources, such as the periodicals of other organisations. Some organisations also access information on new measures and political practices by maintaining close contacts with unemployment experts in the city or other parts of the country.

Indeed, a crucial resource for most organisations of the unemployed is access to reliable information. Even if organisations do not consider providing services for individual unemployed people, they use political or legal background information in order to be recognised as legitimate speakers in the contentious field. By accessing information, organisations of the unemployed become experts in two senses. Firstly they become experts by emphasizing that they as unemployed people are concerned by policy decisions and are thus those best qualified to evaluate the worth of political

character than when it had some place to be. There is a kind of franticness when you don’t really have a place where you can invite anybody into. But when you do, people can find you. Strategies can be developed. You can get a sense of your own identity.” (cited in Cress and Snow 1996:1098).

decisions. Further, unemployment activists also ensure their status as experts on the topic by keeping themselves informed about political decisions and collecting information about the effects of new measures. For example, the German organisation No Service organised regular visits to places where so-called 1-Euro-Jobbers were employed, gathering information on the effects of the activation measure on individuals as well as on the public employment sector in Berlin in general. Temporarily, the organisation was the best source of information on the effects of the activation measure in Berlin. The organisation published the information they gathered in their visits to 1-Euro employers – such as public institutions and welfare organisations – on the internet, and made it accessible for other organisations of the unemployed. Information and its exchange seems to be of particular importance for movements mobilising a specific constituency, and thus one crucial resource for organisations of the unemployed.

These are just two of many different resources that are mobilised by organisations of the unemployed. By identifying the many different resources organisations mobilised or gained access to in a first step, it was then possible to assess the actual quality of access for organisations of the unemployed more effectively. Reducing resources to just one indicator such as the annual budget not only ignores the variety and creativity with which organisations of the unemployed mobilise different resources, but also the many ways in which resources are perceived and sometimes self-created, and the different roles resources play for different organisations. To take the various aspects of resources into account is particularly important to assess the role of resources for ‘poor’ actors.

Linking resources and action strategies

On the basis of this range of resources used by organisations of the unemployed Paris and Berlin, quality of access to resources was defined.¹⁵⁸ *Tables 1* and *2* link the quality of access to resources to two of the activities considered as indicative of a organisation’s disruptiveness. Good access to resources is assumed to be a crucial moderating factor for organisations’ action repertoires. In addition, the availability of

¹⁵⁸ Organisations are places where some resources necessary for collective action are already gathered. I thus start from the assumption that all groups have some minimal resources, without which no organisation would have emerged and survived for a certain period of time. If an organisation is defined as disposing of no resources, it means that the group holds only these minimum resources without which no organisation would exist.

good access to resources is also considered to favour the inclination to provide services rather than challenge institutions via political activities.

Table 8.1 illustrates the relationship between organisations' access to resources and their use of disruptive collective activities. Nine of the nineteen organisations studied in Paris and Berlin use disruptive activities as part of their collective action strategies. Ten organisations do not even consider disruptive activities as an action alternative and exclusively use moderate protest forms or other political and social activities. Seven organisations have no or bad access to resources, while twelve organisations have good access to resources.

Table 8.1 — Access to resources and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of disruptive activities	
<u>no</u> access to resources	-	+
-	Selbsthilfe Aktionsbündnis unemployed verdi unemployed GEW <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> N = 6	Elvis unemployed Metall Anders arbeiten <i>Apeis</i> <i>unemployed CGT</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 6
+	Erwin Ermutigungskreis Anti-Hartz unemployed NGG N = 4	Kampagne No service unemployed Bau N = 3

Two types of actors were assumed to dominate the field of actors. Firstly, I assume good access to resources to have a moderating effect on a organisation's activities. This type is illustrated by the later stage of the French organisation of the unemployed presented at the beginning of *chapter 7*. This type is represented in the upper-left box of *table 8.1*. Secondly, I assume that marginalised actors will be more likely to use

disruptive tactics, as the only tool available to exert or gain power and influence. This type of actor is represented by the lower-right box of *table 8.1*.

As shown in *table 8.1* there are indeed three organisations with few resources that use disruptive activities in their action repertoires (lower right box), and six organisations with many material resources that prefer moderate activities (lower left box). However, there is no clear moderating effect of the quality of access to resources. In contrast to the assumptions spelled out above, all four possible combinations exist empirically, with no clear tendency of one type dominating the field. That is, there are also organisations with few resources and rather moderate action repertoires, as well as well-off organisations that consider disruptive activities as an important tool. All together, ten organisations are not represented by the ideal types.

Thus, there are organisations that combine the opposing characteristics of the ideal types discussed above. One example is a German organisation that prefers to engage in moderate activities, situated at the poorer end of the resources scale. The organisation meets in private houses or in pubs, and can only rarely rely on financial or other forms of support. From its very beginnings the organisation was a broad alliance of different actors. Attempts by some actors and representatives of organisations to make the claims of the organisation more challenging by asking for a basic income or refusing the reform package of the red-green government were unsuccessful. Rather, these more disruptive parts of the alliance dropped out. The organisation shrank dramatically in size and today – some years after its foundation, when several dozen organisation representatives participated - only a handful people remain. Even though the organisation retained its moderate profile, it was not able to access material or other support from other organisations. This is especially interesting since the organisation initially involved a lot of activists from well-established organisations, such as critical members of the social-democratic party or critical trade union activists, who should have been able to provide access to resource-rich organisations.

Furthermore, there are organisations that have comparably good access to resources, but continue to use disruptive activities. Six local organisations of the unemployed did not give up disruption as a tool, despite their access to resources.

Thus, organisations do not necessarily desist from disruptive political activities simply because they can afford to use other activities.

Table 8.2 — Access to resources and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	caring activities	
<u>no access to resources</u>	+	-
-	Elvis Selbsthilfe unemployed Verdi unemployed Metall <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> <i>Apeis</i> N = 7	Aktionsbündnis unemployed Gew Anders arbeiten <i>unemployed CGT</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 5
+	Ermutigungskreis unemployed Bau N = 2	Kampagne No service Anti-Hartz Erwin unemployed Ngg N = 4

A second interest is what impact the control over many or few resources has on the services provided by local organisations of the unemployed. Do organisations take up the tasks of welfare organisations and thus draw away from political activities once they gain access to more resources? In *table 8.2* the amount of resources social movement organisations of the unemployed control, and the importance these organisations give service provision, is shown. Similar to the use of disruptive activities, service provision is also considered important by about half of the organisations (N = 9), while ten do not engage in service activities.

Table 8.2 shows a slight tendency of organisations with a good access to resources to provide services, while organisations without tend not to offer services to unemployed people. Altogether, twelve of the nineteen organisations belong to these two types of actors. organisations that do not provide services give two reasons for

not doing so. First, some organisations of the unemployed explain their failure to provide services by the simple fact that they cannot afford to. While this is the most frequent explanation, some refuse to engage in these social activities because, for example, “... *helping the unemployed is not a solution*” (Interview 5:6). These actors instead stress the importance of political activities to change the position of unemployed people. Despite having comparably good access to resources, these actors do not consider the provision of services as important compared to political activities. Two organisations with comparatively high levels of organisational resources that reject these activities because of their apolitical character are deeply embedded in the social movement culture of the city of Berlin.

Furthermore, it is not necessarily the case that poorer organisations do not provide services, as the examples of a few other organisations show. There are some cases where poor actors provide services to unemployed people. These organisations are particularly motivated to make up their lack of legitimacy by providing services to an unemployed constituency.

8.2 Access to institutionalised actors

A second interest of this chapter is to assess the role of the organisational environment in organisations’ tactical choices. The question I posed above was whether regular and close contact with established organisations providing access to resources an organisation lacked moderates the action repertoires of these organisations of the unemployed as a result. Organisations of the unemployed that have contacts with institutional actors that provide some form of support are assumed to assume a moderate action repertoire and to integrate social activities into their daily routines.

For the analysis all contacts with other actors that consisted of a one-directional relationship were taken into account. That is, contacts with other organisations and organisations that function as relationships of mutual support or common activities are excluded from the analysis (see the discussion in the next). Instead, all those contacts that organisations forge in order to get access to something they lack, such as resources, legitimacy, decision-making bodies and a voice in the public debate, are taken into account. As in the previous section, access to the institutional field is conceptualised as a dichotomous variable: organisations’ main contact(s) are either

with institutional or non-institutional actors. Where organisations have contacts with both types of actors, the frequency and importance of contacts was also taken into account in order to assign the contacts to one type of access.

A first question is whether organisations of the unemployed actors actually have the opportunity to contact resource-rich and powerful organisations, as suggested by the previous section. Therefore, before linking this characteristic of organisations of the unemployed to the two action forms, in the following light I will investigate the various support relationships organisations actually forge.

Accessing the field of institutional actors

Organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris have contacts with various institutional actors. Organisations most frequently contact trade unions and left-wing political parties. These actors were important allies during some waves of protest in Germany and France. Yet, these institutional actors do not only provide support during phases of mass mobilisation, but also provide support to unemployment activists organising routine and occasional protest activities.

Support relationships with trade unions exist because organisations of the unemployed are often founded within trade unions and thus - formally or informally - belong to their mother organisation. Six of the nineteen organisations of the unemployed studied in Paris and Berlin were founded by union members within their union, initiated both from above and from below. These organisations of the unemployed usually enjoy direct access to their host organisation's infrastructure. Organisations get financial and material support or access to decision-making bodies. Even where an organisation of the unemployed is not officially recognised by their mother organisation, organisation members obtain, for example, support from their former colleagues, the use of mailing lists, and other informative material from the union.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ Nevertheless, there are huge differences as to what extent the groups are officially recognised and supported by their mother organisations. While, for example, pensioners or women are recognised bodies within the unions, some unions refuse their unemployed members an official status. They are not included in the statutes of the union and thus have no delegates at meetings. Other union unemployed groups receive only marginal or no material support from their mother organisation. One unemployment activist speaks of the organisational isolation of unemployed union members and explains that the founding of an unemployed people's group within the union was foremost an attempt to fight the feeling of being excluded within their own organisation: *"We met to fight our isolation. All the colleagues felt terribly isolated in their place or their regional group. Having the sensation to not*

Other organisations of the unemployed do not usually receive support from official trade unions outside occasional support for public events, such as conferences in which union and non-union organisations of the unemployed participate. This, for example, was the case in Berlin in 2004. There is one exception to this rule where a non-union organisation participated regularly at the meetings of Berlin trade union organisations of the unemployed. Because of the decades-long union membership of the founder of this particular organisation, the organisation became a regular member of the coordination of Berlin trade union organisations of the unemployed within the regional branch of the DGB. This organisation of the unemployed thus has access to a political body within the regional branch of the German peak union.¹⁶⁰

‘Non-organised unemployment activists’ – an expression used by trade union unemployment activists to define non-union organisations of the unemployed – also establish relationships with institutional actors. Local branches of left wing political parties – particularly the PDS and the newly founded WASG in Berlin and the communist PCF in Paris – grant unemployed people access to their resources during more latent periods. organisations meet for example in the offices of the German socialist party, the PDS. Unemployment activists also have personal ties with communist or socialist parties. Individual members of local parliaments grant organisations access to political bodies by voicing their concerns during political debates.

One organisation of the unemployed studied receives support from a local party office for example. The organisation’s unemployed breakfast is paid for by the socialist party, and most of the donations come from local party members. The organisation also uses the rooms and logistics of the local branch, such as the photocopier machine and internet connection – crucial for communication between unemployment experts. For a long time a delegate on the city council participated in the organisation’s activities and voiced unemployed people’s claims in council

belong to any organisation, you know. To keep each other a bit warm, we tried to see each other once a month, in the beginning, to see how we could help each other. It was more like an aspect of solidarity, within an organisation” (Interview 17:3). While being part of the same union helped the unemployed union members to get in contact with each other, it did not mean being recognised as an organisation within an organisation. Thus, the access union unemployed groups gain from being founded within an institutionalised actor is not automatic and differs between the single groups.

¹⁶⁰ In France, the situation is slightly different in that the relatively young SUD union provided an important source of support for unemployed people’s groups, yet because the union is not an official partner of the French government it is considered a non-institutionalised actor and therefore discussed below.

meetings. The organisation's main route of access to material resources, but also to decision-making institutions, is provided by the local party. At the same time, the story of this organisation of the unemployed is closely intertwined with internal developments in the local party. Most importantly, the organisation was initiated by active party members. This also often meant that tensions within the party also tended to limit support for the activities of the organisation. For example, founding members unsatisfied with the politics of the party also dropped out of the organisation of the unemployed.¹⁶¹

Some, but not all organisations were, similarly to the trade union organisations, founded by active party members. Others approach left-wing parties without having any active party members in their organisation. The latter unemployment activists consider radical left parties as important allies: *"It is somewhat logical that a party that engages on social topics supports people that work extra-parliamentary in the same direction. [...] and information material is here too"* (Interview 5:8). However, while the organisation expects left-wing parties to take up the issue of unemployment and support unemployed people's claims, the organisations insist on their non-party identity and organisational independency. *"We can use the copy machine to copy our leaflets. But we decide the content of the leaflets. Nobody of the [party] comes and says 'you cannot do this'. This is our consensus what we write on that"* (Interview 5:4). Like trade union organisations, activists stress the fact that decisions are taken by the organisation without influence from or consideration of the hosting organisation's preferences.

Although organisations of the unemployed get in contact with parties or single party members, no organisation mentioned any relationship with conservative or right-wing parties. Indeed, when asked about organisations or organisations they do *not* consider to belong to the same contentious field, all organisations of the unemployed mentioned their reluctance to work with right-wing organisations. Some

¹⁶¹ Further, unemployed people are sometimes 'open' party members, that is, they act within the group under their double identity as 'unemployment activists' and 'party members', providing a link between organisations. Sometimes it is not clear what exactly the main interest of people with a double organisational identity is within the group: *"I do not know whether the socialist party sent an unemployed person by decision to participate in our group or whether she came of her own interest"* (Interview 19:13). While there may be different reasons for people to join an unemployed people's organisation, the double organisational identity in any case provides a link – and thus access to the political party – between the two groups. Yet, it is not important for my purposes to speculate about individual motivations: the contact a person provides with an institutionalised actor – here a left-wing party – is of interest.

told stories of the misuse of their claims by right-wing organisations, or attempts to co-opt the movement. *“The extreme right tried to build on the movement of unemployed people, but fortunately this did not work”* (Interview 1:13). While right-wing organisations are generally excluded as potential allies, some organisations note a hypothetical collaboration with conservative parties if they were to support their cause. However, no such collaboration had actually taken place at the time of the empirical investigation.

Besides trade unions and left-wing political parties, organisations of the unemployed also receive support from state institutions, and occasionally from mainstream media and welfare organisations. Although organisations of the unemployed are often critical of government policies, some organisations seek to make contact with the *“social caring institutions of the state”* (Interview 2: 5). Some unemployment activists are also involved in local social policy. For example, the elected spokesperson of one French organisation is a member of the social advisory body of a district in Paris. Furthermore, unemployment activists have contacts with newspaper journalists such as the *taz*¹⁶² and *Berliner Zeitung* in Berlin.

Other organisations of the unemployed do not contact unions, parties, and state institutions, or refuse support from these institutional actors. Indeed, some organisations are critical of political parties and the role they play in the democratic process: *“Concerning the political parties we are very suspicious. We are generally very suspicious. This does not prevent some members to be organised within parties and others to say that we would need a new one, but regarding political parties as they exist today we are very suspicious”* (Interview 18:20). Political parties are considered as unable to translate unemployed people’s claims into a political language, as they have other interests to take into account. Combining this with the ideal of self-representation, these activists refuse to make contact with institutionalised actors they consider do not serve the aim of the unemployed: *“There was this hearing the Parliament. from the left party .. we were invited but we did not go. [You were not interested in it?] We are interested in the content, what is decided, but ...this is this classical level where some prominent representatives in some so-called professional competences are invited and sit at the podium and are listen to, and you sit downstairs and are allowed to clap you hands”* (Interview 6:15).

¹⁶² In my study I consider the Tageszeitung *taz* as part of the mainsteram media.

However, only in exceptional cases do organisations of the unemployed people get no support from other organisations. Usually, where an organisation has no access to institutional actors or refuses to form relationships with such, support is obtained from non-institutional actors, such as movement organisations belonging to other contentious fields, civil society organisations, or individuals. One of the organisations engaged on unemployment issues in Berlin, for example, receives support from a movement foundation, that is, a political foundation that promotes political initiatives. Other organisations of the unemployed in Paris as well as Berlin use the offices of foundations promoting civil engagement.

Other important sources of access to the alternative public sphere are unemployed people's newspapers, and, even more so, internet sites such as the radical left-wing newspaper Arranca, the left-wing unionists' site Labournet, and Indymedia.

Additionally, individuals sometimes support movement activities via donations. In Berlin one individual gave a large amount of money to several organisations of the unemployed. But unemployment activists also often get support for their daily activities from people they know. For example, a graphic designer offered to design protest-postcards, experts offer their knowledge on legal or other technical issues, or a lawyer worked voluntarily for some time for one organisation of the unemployed.

Thus, unemployment activists come into contact with a variety of organisations and individuals offering some form of access and support. These actors can be split into two types: institutionalised actors such as trade unions and left-wing political parties, state institutions and occasionally mainstream media, and non-institutionalised actors such as (political) foundations, social movement organisations, individual experts, and alternative print or internet media. Hardly any organisation receives no support from another actor, and most depend on support from other actors to some extent.

Linking supporting relationships to institutionalised actors

Table 8.3 below shows that most organisations - that is thirteen of the nineteen organisations - have their main support relationship with institutional actors. Considering that institutional actors usually have more to offer to these organisations it is not surprising that most seek contacts with this type of actor. However, the frequency of these support contacts points to the fact that *"the crude picture of a fight*

between two clear-cut antagonistic actors, a social movement and its opponent, is utterly inadequate” (Rucht 2004). While all actors - official trade unions, governing parties, state agencies, and the mainstream media – are described by unemployment activists as advocates of political decisions the movement opposes, most organisations seem to depend on support from these actors. Only one third of all the organisations of the unemployed studied in Berlin and Paris receive support from actors outside established channels of decisional and discursive power.

Table 8.3 — Access to the field of institutionalised actors and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of disruptive activities	
<u>no</u> access to institutionalised field	-	+
-	Selbsthilfe Erwin Aktionsbündnis unemployed verdi unemployed Gew unemployed Ngg CPP Assol N = 8	Elvis unemployed Metall Apeis unemployed CGT AC! N = 5
+	Ermutigungskreis Anti-Hartz N = 2	Kampagne No service unemployed Bau Anders Arbeiten N = 4

Table 8.3 links the type of contact to the strategic choices of organisations of the unemployed. The table shows that most organisations with contacts with institutional actors indeed use moderate activities (eight out of thirteen), while most organisations with contacts with non-institutional actors use disruptive strategies (four out of six). That is, twelve out of nineteen organisations belong to the two types of actors presumed to dominate the field. Yet, on the basis of the discussion above, we would expect the upper-left and lower-right boxes to be the most populated. This is not however the case: five organisations using disruptive activities count institutional

actors as their most important support contacts. There is no clear pattern to suggest that the type of supporting contact moderates the political activities of organisations of the unemployed. Thus, while organisations seem to depend on the support of institutional actors, this dependency only marginally – if at all – influences organisations' strategic choices on disruptive activities.

Other organisations of the unemployed mainly supported by institutional actors yet still using disruptive tactics as their main strategy also refer to the common assumption about the influence of powerful actors over organisation activities. The activist refers to presumed dependency to emphasise their independent status.

The theoretical discussion above suggested that organisations with resources would divert attention from political activities in order to focus on service provision. *Table 8.4* describes the relationship between the importance organisations place on service provision and access to institutional actors.

Table 8.4 — Access to the field of institutionalised actors and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of caring activities	
<u>no</u> access to institutionalised field	+	-
-	unemployed Verdi Elvis Selbsthilfe unemployed metall <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> <i>Apeis</i> N = 7	Erwin unemployed Ngg unemployed Gew Aktionsbündnis <i>unemployed CGT</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 6
+	Ermutigungskreis unemployed Bau N = 2	Kampagne No service Anti-Hartz Anders arbeiten N = 4

Seven out of nineteen organisations have a support relationship with institutional actors and also provide services to unemployed people, while four organisations do not provide services and are excluded from the field of institutional actors. As in *table 8.2* above we would expect the upper-left and the lower-right boxes to be the most populated. However, only eleven organisations fall into these two categories of actors. Six organisations with contacts with institutional actors do not provide services. Another two organisations offer services to unemployed people, but their most important support contacts are with non-institutional actors. *Table 8.4* thus suggests that organisations of the unemployed do not choose to carry out social activities such as service provision as a result of the type of support relationship they have.

8.3 Peer group pressure and making a collective actor

Because unemployed people are assumed to have little capacity to mobilise and act on their own, common actions with other actors would seem to be crucial. Often, joint activities with other actors are planned with organisations actors feel some sense of belonging to. This network of groups is held together by a shared sense of belonging to the same action space and reinforced by common actions. The question I raised in the discussion above related to whether embeddedness in different movement networks can explain the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. More precisely, I presumed that affinity with a counter-cultural network would encourage organisations to use disruptive strategies and reject social activities such as service provision. On the other hand, I also spelled out the assumption that organisations belonging to a network of cooperative movement actors will favour moderate tactics and goals.

In the following I discuss whether collective actions are affected by organisations' embeddedness in different types of pre-existing networks. Following Koopmans (1995), a counter-cultural network is defined as consisting of those movement actors that prefer identity logics of action as opposed to more instrumental logics. The construction of a collective identity is an end in itself for these movements, and results from conflicts and interactions with other organisations. Most importantly, counter-cultural networks consider state institutions as adversaries.

On the basis of the empirical material collected, organisations' belonging to these counter-cultural networks was analysed and described. The analysis – similar to those

of previous chapters - uses a qualitative approach to grasp the embeddedness of organisations of the unemployed in counter-cultural networks. To clarify the process of data analysis some conceptual tools from standard network analysis are however used. These concepts concern types of links, that is whether a link is direct or indirect, and, the properties of relations, that is whether the relationship is unidirectional or mutual, and whether it is a strong or a weak tie. These concepts from network analysis should help to grasp those ties that tell us whether a organisation is embedded in a counter-cultural network or not. Most importantly, these concepts grasp the differences between relationships defined as support relationships in the previous part, and relationships that define counter-cultural collective actors, which form the central theme of this part.

In the language of a formal network approach, only direct ties were considered. That is, although indirect ties, such as the multiple memberships of individual organisation members, or participation in the same protest, may play a role for the activities of organisations, I presume that these ties are less telling about the construction of a collective actor than direct ties. In contrast to the previous chapter, ties must be mutual for flows of resources or information. That is, where a relationship with another actor was described in terms of unidirectional flows of information or support, the relationship was not taken into account even where it seemed of particular importance to the organisation of the unemployed.

The qualitative dimension of the analysis lies in the fact that the meaning of ties was taken into account. For example, where a organisation rarely organises joint activities with another actor belonging to a counter-cultural network, but this other organisation is mentioned several times as an important reference point, a strong tie was assumed to exist. That is, affiliations to other actors are not only based on organisation-to- organisation interactions,, and therefore other expressions of a sense of belonging to a network were also taken into account. This also means that multiple forms of ties were taken into account. That is, not only one type of tie constructed by the organisations, such as telling a story about a jointly organised event, but also mutual support, the exchange of information, or simply the description of a feeling of belonging together were taken into account. However, in contrast to the support relationships of the previous chapter, which concern weak relations with different types of organisations, the following analysis only considers thick ties. That is,

relationships with counter-cultural networks were only taken into account where these relationships were given important meaning by the organisations. Links were taken into consideration both where actors regarded each other as belonging to the same contentious field and where actors regarded each other as outsiders of their relevant social spaces (della Porta and Diani 1999:125).

Thus, unlike the previous chapter, here those ties that describe a strong feeling of belong together and forming a collective actor are of interest. These relationships differ from relationships with allies that occasionally support organisations of the unemployed where no feeling of belonging together develops. That there is a difference between these two types of relationships is also expressed by unemployment activists. One organisations of the unemployed contacted voluntary associations from their district in order to exchange information. However, these organisations are distinguished from a collective unemployed people's actor: *"This activity helped to get to know this and that association, But these association are not at the side of the unemployed when it is to do activities, they would not come to a demonstration march"* (Interview 15:8) These organisations are not considered as belonging to the same social action space. Another organisations of the unemployed distinguishes occasional invitations to single party members from parties as a whole as possible allies for collective activities *"we invited a person for a speech an economist who also is a member of the PDS, this happens, that is a form of connection, but a concrete joint activities with parties, no"* (Interview 9:16).

Thus, while in the previous section the emphasis was on relationships characterised as unidirectional and weak, here I look at those links that make up a collective identity within the same contentious field. That is, I will look at relationships that can be characterised as strong and mutual.

Most unemployment activists describe themselves first and foremost as belonging to a movement of the unemployed. Other organisations of the unemployed in the same city are an important reference point for single organisations, even where the reference may not be benevolent, or contact with these other actors without conflict.¹⁶³ Most organisations of the unemployed meet during protest mobilisations,

¹⁶³ This may be due to the perceived scarcity of the resources the actors compete for. These conflicts are very distinct in the Berlin field of actors, which is probably also because of the engagement of new

such as the protest events organised once a month in Berlin or the annual demonstration march of Parisian organisations. There are also many occasions where organisations of the unemployed coordinate activities and smaller events. Even where organisations do not have any direct contact, most know of each other. However, organisations of the unemployed also refer to the activities of older organisations, or organisations in other cities, or even movements on the other side of the globe, such as the Argentinian Piqueteros. To refer to other organisations of the unemployed is crucial for the unemployed to confer legitimacy on their own activities and compare their perceptions of their own mobilisation's potential and impact. Thus, first and foremost organisations of the unemployed belong to a movement of the unemployed.¹⁶⁴

However, interesting though the differences between single organisations' affiliations to other unemployment activists are, they give no general insights in terms of explaining the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. There may be a particular action repertoire for poor actors as compared to other movements. A particular repertoire of activities and frames does not however explain why certain organisations of the unemployed choose activities from a whole range of possible strategies, while some choose strategies from the more confrontational end of the scale, and yet others stick to the moderate end. Simply belonging to a collective actor of the unemployed does not explain the differences that exist between single organisations.

Thus, in order to identify the differences between the organisations, I sought to describe a collective actor that cut across the field of a collective actor of the unemployed. That is, I was interested in discovering those networks that explain the tactical choices of organisations, as argued in the theoretical discussion above.

social movement activists who knew each other from past activities, but diverging interests also exist among the Parisian groups.

¹⁶⁴ Differently from the women's movement or the gay movement, the unemployed have more difficulty in 'coming out of the closet' in that their social stigmatisation is strong and unemployment is one of the core political issues. Further, unemployed people often have difficulty in constructing a collective identity of the unemployed, because not all unemployment activists aim for the recognition of the rights of the unemployed, but at full employment: *"We do not call ourselves a federation for a political reason. If we would call ourselves a federation that would mean that we think unemployment will always exist. While our main priority is that unemployment does not exist any more, that people return to work to earn their living, [...] Or to say it otherwise, we are certainly the only union organisation in the world who wants to self-destroy itself as quickly as possible"* (Interview 21 :2).

While some agree that a collective actor of unemployed people does exist – even though not all activists would call it a social movement – there are different alliances and conflicts within that contentious field. That is, some organisations – even though they protest together in mass demonstrations – prefer not to cooperate too closely, while others regularly plan activities together. Indeed, alongside relations with other organisations of the unemployed, I identified different movement networks to which the organisations describe themselves as belonging to.

Indeed, as della Porta (2005) points out for the individual level, activists often feel they belong to different collectives.¹⁶⁵ In a similar way, organisations – already small collectives themselves – also have multiple identities: organisations of the unemployed describe affiliations to other unemployment actors as well as to other collectives. This is done by distinguishing various strands within the movement sector, within the unemployed people's movement, or within local movement infrastructure.

Unemployment activists often describe the field of (unemployment) movement actors as consisting of different strands, as, for example, the following activist does: *“There are different arrays [of actors] in Berlin. There is this PDS environment, next to them critical left unionists that partly stem from the ‘K-Gruppen’ that partly stem from the 1970s and 1980s. [...] and then a third array of the so-called independent, previously ‘Autonome’ to which I would allocate [organisation X] and us”* (Interview 9:4). Other distinctions are also made, most importantly between those organisations that are either considered too radical or too much a part of the establishment.

With which types of organisations and organisations one should plan joint activities is a highly contested issue. One organisation of the unemployed, for example, tells of other organisations hostility towards them because they had planned common activities with welfare organisations and had cooperated with the local police. The question of what types of actors organisations should carry out joint

¹⁶⁵ Unemployed activists - before becoming unemployed or, less often, before becoming activists – already belonged to collectivities. Sometimes simultaneous identities are perceived to be in conflict with each other by an unemployment activist. One unemployment activist who was an active union member, for example, felt the official position of her union to be in conflict with her identity as an unemployment activist. After decades of membership she and her partner decided to leave the union. To leave “their” union was however a difficult step, it was not simply a matter of returning a membership card, but of renouncing a collective identity that gave their voluntary engagement a political frame.

activities with can also re-structure a organisation's character. Sometimes, there are internal conflicts over which actors are considered viable partners. One such conflict took place in an organisation of the unemployed seeking to cooperate with welfare organisations. The conflict resulted in the several organisation members dropping out. The new composition of the organisation thus re-defined the organisation's primary goals and activities. Not only welfare organisations, but also unions are rejected as potential allies by some organisations of the unemployed: *"definitely [we don't work] ... with unions. Since we don't take stock of unions as they are organised today, and we say these are not a valuable alliance partner for the unemployed. And we do not expect that this will change in the near future"* (Interview 9:13). Thus, the planning joint activities with various types of movement actors and other organisations is a highly contested issue.

Sometimes even local trade union organisations refuse to cooperate with their mother organisations, preferring instead to organise a demonstration with other more radical unemployment actors and organisations. On unions, unemployment activists also tell of new alliances created by organisations of the unemployed. For example one trade union unemployment activist told of new emerging alliances in the German case, where unions are organised into different sectors and a visible separation between the different unions dominated public collective actions. That is, union unemployment organisations prefer to march with their fellow unemployed colleagues from other unions rather than with their union during demonstration marches. Also, trade union organisations of the unemployed have planned counter-marches with other movement organisations during major protest marches called by the peak union organisation the DGB.

Yet, sometimes the existence of a trade union organisation of the unemployed opens up possibilities for movement actors to cooperate with unions more. The organisations of the unemployed provide handles for other social movement organisations to get in contact with unions with which they would not usually cooperate. One of the French organisations of the unemployed that is usually reluctant to work with traditional unions - *"we are not of the same field"* (Interview 18:12) – cooperated with the relatively new SUD trade union. However, since the CGT has its own organisation of the unemployed, they occasionally plan activities even with this union – *"it is complicated from time to time, but still possible ... with CGT chômeur"*

obviously” (Interview 18:12). Thus, organisations of the unemployed that would never usually have considered collaborating with the official unions occasionally cooperate with them. The union organisations of the unemployed work in these cases as connecting links between ‘non-organised’ movement organisations and the official unions.

Other organisations refuse to collaborate with local organisations belonging to local counter-cultural networks. One union organisation of the unemployed, for example, tells the story of a conference: *“There was a lot of row. And this was because a lot of non-organised were invited”* (Interview 3:1). According to the union activist the conference was not successful because non-organised organisations are too confrontational and uncooperative during these events. On another occasion, a union activist explained how a union organisation dropped out of preparatory meetings for a major protest event. Since the non-union organisations refused to invite a popular union member as a speaker, the union organisation concluded that it was impossible to cooperate with these organisations. *“These quarrels with the left organisations about what strategy to adopt. They prefer to discuss the content instead of [mobilising broadly]. ... Then we prefer to do it on our own. Then you say, my god, keep the truth for you”* (Interview 3:16).

Cooperation and affiliations with other organisations and organisations is a highly contested and dynamic process. However, there is a tendency among the organisations of this study to describe affiliations with either cooperative or counter-cultural actors. In general, organisations of the unemployed describe themselves as belonging to two types of networks. Firstly, a collective actor of the unemployed. Thus, organisations of the unemployed belong to a network based on a common issue. Secondly, organisations of the unemployed are tied to other informal organisations, more formal organisations, or associations in the territory of their district or city. organisations often plan common activities with other grassroots organisations, more formal organisations, or public institutions. Some organisations of the unemployed prefer to work with radical left-wing organisations or coordinate activities with squatters. Others prefer a joint press conference with a welfare organisation, and still others prefer to take part only in trade union actions, distancing themselves from the so-called ‘non-organised organisations’. These collaborations bring organisations into closer contact with each other, sharing expertise and planning further activities

together. However, these local movement networks consist of organisations that prefer certain logics of action: those that prefer cooperative strategies with institutionalised actors, and those that belong to a counter-cultural movement network. Although belonging to a counter-cultural network is not eternal, most organisations of the unemployed can be described as affiliated to such a network or not.

Linking counter-cultural networks to the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed, *table 8.5* below shows the numbers of organisations with affiliations to counter-cultural collective actors. While ten organisations have strong ties to collaborative organisations, nine organisations belong to a network of counter-cultural actors. Further, *table 8.5* shows that the use of disruptive strategies and the type of collective actor organisations of the unemployed describe themselves as belonging to are linked. All but two organisations belong to the two types of actors that were assumed to dominate the field. Those organisations that belong to a collaborative collective actor use moderate strategies. And those organisations that belong to a network of counter-cultural actors use disruptive strategies. Only two organisations fall outside this pattern: one organisation uses disruptive strategies even though it has close contacts with collaborative actors, and one organisation seeks contacts mainly with counter-cultural actors, but refrains from using disruptive strategies. Both organisations are German, while all French organisations conform to one of the two types of organisations assumed to dominate the field of actors.

Table 8.5 — Embeddedness in countercultural network and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of disruptive activities	
countercultural network	-	+
-	Selbsthilfe Aktionsbündnis unemployed Verdi unemployed Gew unemployed Ngg Erwin Anti-Hartz <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> N = 9	unemployed Bau N = 1
+	Ermutigungskreis N = 1	Elvis Kampagne No service unemployed Metall Anders arbeiten <i>Apeis</i> <i>unemployed CGT</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 8

Thus, there is a clear pattern to suggest the type of collective actor an organisation of the unemployed belongs to is of importance for their tactical choices. While activities are not determined, the type of network in which a organisation is embedded seems to play a crucial role. There are only two organisations that fall outside of this grid representing the relationship between these two characteristics.

Table 8.6 — Embeddedness in countercultural network and use of caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of caring activities	
countercultural network	+	-
-	Selbsthilfe unemployed Verdi unemployed Bau <i>CPP</i> <i>Assol</i> N = 5	Erwin Aktionsbündnis Anti-Hartz unemployed Ngg unemployed Gew N = 5
+	Elvis Ermutigungskreis unemployed Metall <i>Apeis</i> N = 4	Kampagne No service Anders arbeiten <i>unemployed Cgt</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 5

Table 8.6 links the type of network the organisations describe themselves as belonging to, to service provision. As shown in the table, ten out of nineteen organisations belong to the two types of actors that were assumed to dominated the field, while nine organisations are not represented by these two ideal types. Unlike disruptive strategies, service provision is not explained by the network an organisation of the unemployed belongs to.

8.4 Movement activists becoming unemployed and experience in movement action

In the previous three parts assumptions about unemployment actors were compared with empirical insights on organisations of the unemployed. These assumptions concerned a presumed lack of resources, relative marginalisation within the field of actors, and the organisational isolation of unemployment actors. It was shown that single organisations of the unemployed have different levels of access to resources and the field of institutional actors, and that organisations are embedded in different types of movement networks.

In the following part I shift the focus to individual members of organisations of the unemployed. As suggested in the discussion above, the question is whether organisations' tactical choices differ as a result of the proportion of experienced activists in the organisations. I assumed that organisations with unemployed members with no experience in movement activities will tend to shy away from using disruptive activities that are not considered as legitimate means of political expression. Instead, organisations with a large share of people with movement experience will orient their attention to service disruption as a familiar form of engagement.

Before turning my attention to the relationship between the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed and the share of members with or without movement experience, I shall first present some general information on individual unemployment activists. That is, some general information about the perceptions of movement activists on their experience of movement activities, and some general data on this issue will be presented.

Experience in movement activities

What experience do unemployed people have of movement activities? The field of movement actors in both cities is first of all composed of movement experts with broad experiences in various political activities. Most public protest events are organised by small local networks of unemployment activists: *"It is always a very small circle of people ... who trigger that [the unemployed actions] off. In different accentuations and different institutional interlockings ... it is a small circle of people that initiates something, also the Monday demonstrations of Berlin have been initiated by 15 to 20 people"* (Interview 25:12). Or, as another activist mentions: *"You meet the same suspects everywhere"* (Interview 28:18). In both cities a few unemployment activists, often engaged in various different organisations and organisations, initiate most protest activities, and form the core of the local unemployed people's movement.

Most core activists were politically or socially engaged before becoming unemployed. Indeed, during an interview, one unemployment activist mentions that the conflict over unemployment is also the conflict of a certain generation of activists: *"There was a demand to express, to construct something together, I was surprised*

about the number of people who had a political history on the one hand, and who were unemployed on the other, at the same time. And basically this helped“ (Interview 18:6). Often, core unemployment activists have experienced non-traditional work histories, unemployment and precarious jobs. Indeed, as one unemployment activist mentioned when asked about her previous employment status: *“You know, in the left those that are active it is anyway the case that often you are employed precariously or you are unemployed at the moment, then you do something again”* (Interview 9:9). While unemployment activist were politically active before becoming unemployed, many had also long been interested in the issues of working societies and unemployment: *“I studied and then I got unemployed. I got forced to do a state financed job, this was in a self-help meeting point There I got on well with the women there and we founded a working organisation within the local agenda, well, I already wrote my master thesis on the working society”* (Interview 9:5). Most founders or core unemployment activists were either interested in the topic of work, society or unemployment, or were engaged in trade unions, or studied these issues at university. Becoming unemployed thus gave their activities a new dimension, or a new topic.

Some more general insights on the individual characteristics of members of organisations of the unemployed available from the individual survey (see *chapter 2* and the *appendix*). More than half of the unemployment activists here are between 50 and 65 years old. Furthermore, similar to the findings of Rucht and Yang (Rucht and Yang 2004), people with higher levels of education are overrepresented in the organisation of unemployment activists: 39 of 48 people have a high school degree, and 29 have studied, although some without obtaining a formal degree.

Often, core unemployment activists make a distinction between full-time activists and ‘other’ unemployed or organisation members that occasionally come to the meetings: *“There are always three different parts. One third are the masterminds, who do the job and feel responsible. ... Then there is a second part ... that are also engaged people that become active if there is something to do concretely, as for example writing a minute, formulating a flyer, making an information stand, not necessarily organising an event, that not any more They help but do not carry the responsibility ... and the third part are people that are more afraid, that do not feel so competent, that take a backseat. And this part consist of people that make anything*

than coming to the meetings and people who sometimes distribute leaflets. That's all"

(Interview 1:7) Thus, there are activists that take on roles of responsibility, and other unemployed people who only occasionally come to organisation meetings. Often, these unemployed people are perceived as concerned only with their own individualistic needs.

Some organisations, although generally admitting the need to mobilise the unemployed constituency, mention the problem of integrating inexperienced unemployed people into their organisations. While most organisations are generally interested in mobilising people, their mobilising strategies usually target those who are already familiar with movement activities. One activist, for example, tells of tiring discussions with people unfamiliar with decision-making processes in their organisation: *"You notice people who have experience in [that] work, they really put a jerk on it. You do not have to start with Adam and Eve"* (Interview 3:19). On another occasion I visited a organisation discussion where it was decided to give up efforts to recruit new organisation members. The organisation found it too tiring to introduce new members to the preferred strategies of the organisation, and of little use to explain over and over again the logic behind their preference for small spectacular public actions over participation in mass demonstrations. They found it a waste of time and effort to introduce unemployed people to movement activities instead of planning public actions. Thus, the process of recruiting new but inexperienced members is described by some organisations as not worth the effort. Some organisations of the unemployed are loath to discuss their general logics of action.

Nevertheless, it is the professed aim of most organisations to politicise unemployed people and get them involved in movement activities. And organisations of the unemployed seem to contaminate other unemployed people with an interest in engaging collectively on the topic unemployment. Half of the respondents to the survey state that engagement in a movement organisation is a new experience for them (24 of 48), while 21 respond that such activity is a familiar experience for them. Thus, the share of people for whom engagement in a movement organisation is a new experience is large.

Organisation founders and a few core activists in particular dispose of movement action expertise. Often, these actors were engaged in other movements previously, but

at the same time many of them have long had a particular interest in work and employment issues. However, organisations are also composed of unemployed people for whom engagement in a movement organisation is their first experience of a committed movement activity. These people may have participated in normalised protest behaviour such as demonstrations but are unfamiliar with the organisation of other more spectacular protest events. organisations thus dispose of different levels of movement experience, depending on how many member have previously been involved in the organisation of protest events.

Linking movement experience and the tactical choices of the organisations

In the following tables movement capital is linked to the two strategies, that is disruptive and social strategies of organisations of the unemployed. *Table 8.7* shows that eight organisations dispose of little movement capital, while eleven organisations are composed of members that have extensive experiences in social movement activity. Linking levels of movement capital to disruptive strategies, I assumed the upper-left and lower-right boxes would be most populated. All together eleven organisations belong to these two types of actors: five organisations have little movement capital and use exclusively moderate strategies, while six organisations have a lot of movement capital and use disruptive strategies. There are, however, eight organisations that do not fit the presumed relationship between movement capital and disruptive strategies. Thus, no clear pattern is suggested for the relationship between movement capital and disruptive activities.

Table 8.7 — Movement experience and use of disruptive strategies among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of disruptive activities	
movement experience	-	+
-	Erwin Selbsthilfe unemployed Ngg Ermutigungskreis <i>Assol</i> N = 5	unemployed Bau unemployed Metall <i>Apeis</i> N = 3
+	Aktionsbündnis Anti-Hartz unemployed Verdi unemployed Gew <i>CPP</i> N = 5	Elvis Kampagne No service Anders arbeiten <i>unemployed CGT</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 6

Table 8.8 below shows the relationship between levels of movement capital and the use of service provision by organisations of the unemployed. Fourteen organisations belong the two types of actors that were assumed to dominate the field. Yet three organisations combine the conditions of providing services despite having organisation members with a lot of movement experience, while two organisations provide no services yet enjoy little movement capital. Thus, regarding service provision, levels of movement capital provide only a weak pattern for the two ideal types dominating the field of actors, unlike the case of disruptive strategies.

Table 8.8 — Movement experience and caring activities among organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin

	use of caring activities	
movement experience	+	-
-	Selbsthilfe Ermutigungskreis unemployed Metall unemployed Bau <i>Apeis</i> <i>Assol</i> N = 6	Erwin unemployed Ngg N = 2
+	Elvis unemployed verdi <i>CPP</i> N = 3	Kampagne No service Aktionsbündnis Anti-Hartz unemployed Gew Anders arbeiten <i>unemployed Cgt</i> <i>AC!</i> N = 8

Discussion

Regarding **access to resources** the empirical discussion points first of all to the ability of organisations of the unemployed to successfully mobilise a broad variety of resources. Organisations of the unemployed successfully mobilise access to different resources from their institutional and organisational environment, albeit with different degrees of success. Thus, the empirical discussion suggests that we should question the assumption that the unemployed represent a resource-poor actor. About half of all the organisations studied have relatively few resources such as office space, money, or ideational support, while the other half have comparatively rich resources. Contrary to the ascription and self-description of unemployment activists as “*a bunch of starvelings*” (Interview 19:21), some organisations of the unemployed have rather good access to resources for their collective activities. Certainly, compared to national social movement organisations the amount of resources the organisations have access

to is limited, but organisations of the unemployed are probably not be in any worse a situation than other local social movement organisations. Generally, one can thus assume that local organisations of the unemployed act as an important channel and location for resources for movement activities of the unemployed.¹⁶⁶

At the same time, McCarthy et al. (1991) suggestion that organisations are unable to resist resource benefits - and thus voluntarily enter the non-profit sector - was not verified for the local organisations of the unemployed studied in Berlin and Paris. Although one would expect poor actors to be particularly attracted by and in need of access to resources from their environment, half of the organisations of the unemployed were not able or willing to do so and thus lack – whether voluntarily or not – resource benefits. That is, in contrast to the study by McCarthy et al. (1991) which reports that a vast majority of social movement organisations within poor people's movements adopt non-profit forms and access resources reserved for this category of organisations, many organisations of the unemployed either cannot overcome the structurally biased access to resources or do not wish to access more resources.

Indeed, as Cress (1997) shows for homeless social movement organisations, non-profit adaptation and the presumed resource benefits leading from this is only one possible path of development for poor organisations. Similarly to my own analysis, half of the homeless organisations studied by Cress did not become non-profit actors or engage in activities typical for these kinds of organisations¹⁶⁷ either because they did not even consider doing so, or, like the German organisation No service, they reject access to resources benefits because “... *the perceived limitations on political activity were viewed as not worth the potential benefits*” (Cress, 1997:347). That is, some organisations are either not aware of the possibility to access, for example, material resources by adopting a specific activity or organisational form, or they refuse to access such resources because they this will limit their political activism.

This leads to our main interest and the assumption spelled out above on the effects of a large amount of resources on the action repertoires of organisations of the

¹⁶⁶ Whether the increase in protest events and successful mobilisations of past years are based on the successful efforts of local groups to mobilise resources or whether the groups became wealthy as a result of these events goes beyond the scope of this study.

¹⁶⁷ Indeed, not every group offering services for an unemployed constituency necessarily adopts a particular statutory organisational form.

unemployed. We expected that access to resources would impact on organisations' action strategies. The empirical discussion suggests that service provision and access to resources do in fact seem to be slightly linked. As shown in *table 8.2*, organisations that have more resources at their disposal are more likely to include the social service provision in their action repertoires. Slightly more organisations with access to resources tend to take the distress of the unemployed constituency into account; poor actors tend not to take part in social activities.

However, as shown in *table 8.1*, resources do not seem to restrict organisations' willingness to engage in more disruptive forms of collective action. In contrast to my expectations, access to resources does not limit organisations' ability to challenge welfare institutions via disruptive tactics. Access to resources does not explain the disruptiveness of an organisation's action repertoire.¹⁶⁸

Thus, the fact that organisations are aware of the possible effects of accessing resources does not mean - as Cress (1997) suggests - that they necessarily refuse resource benefits from the state. It seems that organisations are conscious of the possible impacts of resource acquisition. Where disruptive activities are crucial strategic tools for organisations of the unemployed, accessing these resources will be avoided, since it is presumed that indirect or direct social control is at work. Other organisations do not however renounce access to these resources whilst retaining their use of disruptive actions. I will come back to this aspect in the discussion below.

Looking at the **contact between organisations of the unemployed and institutional actors** the empirical analysis reveals first of all that organisations get in contact with a variety of institutional and non-institutional actors. However, although unemployment activists describe institutional actors - such as official trade unions, political parties, state agencies, and the mainstream media - as advocates of political decisions they oppose, most organisations seem to depend on support from these actors in order to organise their local protest activities and daily routines. *Tables 8.4*

¹⁶⁸ Often, organisations of the unemployed mention the dilemma of deciding where to invest their energy and resources. Even though the provision of services does not exclude the use of disruptive tactics, the engagement of groups in welfare activities certainly draws some attention away from protest activities. For example, people have to invest time and money in order to stay informed about the newest policy developments and implementations of political decisions that affect unemployed peoples' daily lives. In that sense, it could still be the case that, at least to some extent, access to resources and the orientation to provide services draws some attention away from political activities in general.

and 8.5 indicate the importance of institutional in terms of providing some form of access to organisations of the unemployed. Only six organisations fail to seek contacts with institutional and other powerful actors.

However, organisations also find alternatives to contacts with institutional actors in order to gain access to something they lack. This means that access to resources is not necessarily linked to a dependent relationship with an institutional actor, as resources can also be accessed via civil society organisations or movement organisations that are not perceived as constraints on the activities of organisations of the unemployed.

The description of the supporting contacts organisations of the unemployed forge qualifies the importance of state resources for these actors, as described by Jenkins and McCarthy (1986). Organisations of the unemployed compensate for a lack of access by approaching – or organising within - other actors. Local branches of left-wing political parties and trade unions are the most important supporting organisations for organisations of the unemployed, as well as political foundations, social movement organisations, and individual support from experts for those organisations that avoid contact with institutional actors.

In the discussion in *chapter 7* I assumed that exclusion from the field of institutional actors would make organisations more political and disruptive. However, *tables 8.3* and *8.4* suggest that while contact with institutional actors seems to be an important handle for gaining access to something lacking for an organisation, contact with supporting actors does not necessarily influence strategic choices. The need to form alliances with actors providing some form of access does not prevent organisations of the unemployed from using more disruptive activities, although there is a slight tendency for organisations lacking access to use disruptive actions and for organisations with access to institutional actors to avoid these strategies. While some actors aim to become legitimate actors in the field of welfare politics by choosing moderate and social activities (N = 8), others do not give up their disruptive strategies despite their important contacts with the field of institutional actors (N = 5). Further, there seems to be no influence on organisations' choices to carry out social activities.

Indeed, in their research on homeless organisations Cress and Snow (1996) find that support from a single facilitative organisation produces stable resource flows that

allow organisations to devote more time to collective action. This in turn guarantees the continuous mobilisation of the homeless population in the city studied, which would otherwise be likely to decline leading to membership attrition. Regarding the propensity to militant action where a homeless organisation has a support relationship with another organisation, the authors found no significant relationship. The authors thus summarise that while a benefactor relationship enhances viability, that is the likelihood of survival and the general ability to organise collective actions such as campaigns, there does not seem to be any effect on organisations' tactical choices.

Indeed, some organisations develop discursive strategies to prevent donor institutions from influencing their tactical choices. One organisation of the unemployed, for example, developed a strategy of ridiculing the attempts of a donor institution to limit their tactical choices. Referring to a successful application for resources from a state institution, the activists said: *“And I can tell you a story, since it makes me laugh even now, one elected person who was present at that meeting (with the public institution, A.Z.) told us that he hopes that the money, our subventions, would not serve political aims - And this while we are a political organisation. That is to say, we do not do politics in the proper sense of the term, but our actions are political. To fight against inequality and to inform the unemployed and the precarious that is political. So we made a bit fun of that. [...] ‘I hope that this money won’t be used for political activities.’ This makes me laugh (laughs)”* (Interview 14:8). In telling this story the activist first refers to the assumption - a common concern among movement actors - that state institutions limit political organisations' tactical choices. We may therefore assume that the supposed impact becomes reality for actors because it is defined in this way. However, telling this story repeatedly during organisation meetings makes this presumed influence tangible for activists, and thus a possible reason for refusal. Presuming influence will be attempted is thus a discursive strategy for organisations to justify their disruptive strategies. Telling stories of attempts at influence by more powerful actors gives the organisation control over their tactical choices.

Thus, some organisations simply oppose these ‘indirect social control mechanisms’ (McCarthy et al. 1991) by ridiculing the attempt by state employees to channel the organisation's activities and not becoming subject to regulating (state) mechanisms.

Other organisations that are excluded from the field of institutional actors but refuse to use disruptive strategies nevertheless perceive the political context as open. The political system is, for example, described as a horizontal system where the organisation can find hooks here and there in order to put political authorities under pressure. This perception encourages organisations to approach political power-holders instead of using disruptive activities, even though contact is difficult to establish.

In sum, while some organisations stress their resource dependency or the fact that they are excluded from the institutional field of policy making, other organisations state the exact opposite. It seems that self-portrayal as an agent able to oppose (state) control, and the perception of political opportunities, are important tools for justifying those tactical choices considered most appropriate.

The **type of collective actor** a organisation belongs, on the other hand, seems to explain the use of disruptive strategies, but not service provision. Although I assumed that social activities would be criticised by counter-cultural actors as ‘not political’, several organisations of the unemployed provide services despite belonging to a network of counter-cultural actors. Further, not all organisations affiliated to the collaborative part of a social movement infrastructure carry out service activities. The provision of services must be explained by taking into account conditions other than the type of network a organisation belongs to. *table 8.5* presented above does however suggest that the type of network a organisation belongs to makes a strong impact on their propensity to use disruptive strategies. All together seventeen of the nineteen organisations belong to the two types of actors that were assumed to dominate the field.

One of the two organisations that did not fall within this grid is a organisation embedded in a collaborative network that prefers disruptive actions. The organisation distances itself from other organisations that seek allies in the local movement infrastructure. *“In our organisation the basic idea was in the first line to help the colleagues in their individual situation, to care for them individually, as far as we could. ... While [this other organisation] from the beginning understood its work rather as political, as a political work. And needless to say, they were looking for alliance partners everywhere, since they are not so strong. And they always thought*

that they have to play along with the social movements. And this does not find a lot of approval in our organisation” (Interview 8:10f). This is not to say that the organisation does not belong to a network of movement organisations: the activist is referring here to the confrontational strand of the city’s movement infrastructure, and only criticising the purely political orientation of this movement strand. The organisation prefers to work with collaborative organisations and organisations.

Yet, although the organisation is embedded in a collaborative movement network, they prefer to use disruptive actions in their strategies. The organisation clearly describes its particular role within the network: *“We are the bad boys. That is just how it is. But ... as soon as it is about public activities we are happily seen* (Interview 8:5). The organisation thus assumes a particular role within the network. The activist mentions that the organisation is more independent in their activities than most other actors, because they do not have to consider strategies for building alliances with other organisations. Instead, as a small organisation of the unemployed, they stress that they are not considered a serious threat. This allows them to choose more confrontational action strategies and frames.

However, as the activist points out, the organisation is a welcome participant at public actions. The organisation’s most important ally – an official trade union – welcomes the organisation’s participation in public protest events. Other organisations of the unemployed also mention the ‘need’ for more power - and resourceful organisations mention their need for participation from organisations of the unemployed. Some organisations, both trade union as well as non-trade union organisations, clearly define their powerful role: at the public protest events of major organisations such as trade unions and welfare organisations, organisations of the unemployed are crucial participants. While organisations of the unemployed often complain of not being taken seriously as political bodies or allies, other organisations actually need their participation during major mobilisations and symbolic battles.

One trade union unemployment activist told, for example, of a planned march to a strike by colleagues against the closure of a company. The organisation of the unemployed chose a classical action form of unemployed people’s protests: they planned to march with three people to the company in order to show their solidarity with their (still) employed colleagues. The strike had been featured in the media for

several days and the closure of the company was considered a major symbolic battle for the local economy. The mother union organisation proposed making a big event of the participation of the unemployed people, and provided the organisation with logistical and material support to carry out their action.

The story is one example of many told during the interviews where unemployment activists mention that their participation at public protest events was very welcome. Indeed, it is not always the case that resources flow from established organisations to the unemployed: the unemployed also provide unions, left-wing parties, and welfare organisations with the valuable resource of legitimacy. Where unemployed people participate in a public event, these actors can claim to speak for a broad constituency, and in particular to speak for the poor and excluded. This is an interesting aspect, since trade unions have often been described as having a particularly difficult relation with unemployed people (Faniel 2009). Where unemployed people refuse to participate and mobilise on their own account, they deprive other actors of the chance to speak legitimately for the excluded and the poor.

The empirical insights on the availability of **experienced activists** for organisations of the unemployed suggest that there are great differences in the levels of experience available to the organisations.

The core of the unemployed constituency is composed by activists who became unemployed rather than unemployed people who then became activists. Indeed, studies on the personal and political biographies of people who have engaged in political activism show that they tend to remain active in contemporary movements or other forms of political activism (Giugni 2004). Studies on former activists have also shown that, on a personal level, former activists were more likely than their age peers to have experienced an extended episode of unemployment or a non-traditional work history (Goldstone and McAdam 2001). Thus, two aspects conjoin in the personalities of core unemployment activists. Firstly, unemployed actions involve people that have been engaged politically- and in rare cases also socially – before. Secondly, these people face precarious employment situations or various episodes of long-term unemployment.

Yet there are also many unemployed organisation members for whom participation in more committed forms of activism is a new experience. While this suggests that the

success of unemployed people's activism inspires people to political activism, it also points to a heterogeneous movement population that may face particular challenges compared to other social movements.

Linking the share of experienced organisation members to tactical choices, the empirical data suggest that there is no tendency for more experienced organisations to prefer disruptive strategies. Yet the provision of services does seem to be influenced by the share of members with experience: six organisations with few experienced members provide services to an unemployed constituency, while eight organisations with many experienced activists avoid this kind of social activity.

One example of the type of actor that combines moderate strategies and service provision with high movement capital is the following organisation. As mentioned above, with the exception of one organisation all (co)-founders or spokespersons of the organisations studied had already been involved in social movements or other political activities previously. Indeed, the founder of this particular organisation of the unemployed has been engaged in various political activities since the 1960s: *"The typical development, the 1968 movement, [...] well, that is a long story, I think I drop that part "* (Interview 2:3). In recent years the activist had already tried to set up an organisation of the unemployed in another district of the city. She is also connected to other activists engaged on the topic unemployment in the city. She regularly participates at events, such as discussion rounds, organised by various movement activists and organisations from the city. Yet most members of the organisation she founded have no prior experience of social movement activity. While the organisation's members are interested in contributing their general professional experience for cultural and social activities, they have no experience of more committed types of movement activities. Indeed, the interviewee mentions that member have many different professional backgrounds, but are not politicised people. Members' professional backgrounds are *"incredibly manifold and simple. The amazing thing of the organisation is that they are [...] normal people. Normal in the sense that these people had an employment career and than they abruptly dropped out of work"* (Interview 2:5). The organisation members are unfamiliar with different forms of political resistance.

As assumed previously, the low level of movement experience in the organisation seems to explain its preference for moderate activities and the provision of services. Members are interested in setting up a self-help service point and providing different forms of assistance to the unemployed people of their district. While the organisation's members are full of ideas to find pragmatic innovative solutions to their daily problems as unemployed people, disruptive strategies are not considered. This is not to say that the organisation is apolitical: over the course of the time, the organisation has become increasingly politicised and adopted more and more social and political strategies. Yet the organisation limits itself to 'normalised protest behaviour' and does not engage in disruptive forms of activities. Like many other organisations, they lump disruptive strategies together with radical and violent activities. The activist clearly states that the organisation would not collaborate with destructive organisations, such as *"people who make an assault just for the hell of it, this strange appropriation movement"* (Interview 2:14). Yet although the interviewee formulates a strong critique of these radical action forms disruptive strategies are not even considered as an option during organisation meetings, either because of a lack of knowledge of these action forms or their express rejection.

Disruptive activities are perceived as particularly risky by organisation members with little movement experience. The interviewee speaks, for example, of a fare-dodging action to protest for an unemployed people's transport ticket (see *chapter 6* above). In her opinion, most of the activists participating in these cross-border activities are not really unemployed people, but other activists engaging on behalf of the unemployed. Unemployed people would not be able to risk paying a fine from their social benefits. Instead, it is considered a form of a *"bourgeois disobedience"* (Interview 8:24). Disruptive activities are thus used as strategic tools, and are not an expression of desperation.

Thus, while disruptive activities are often described as necessary to defend basic rights, *"There is not ten ways to prevent a person to be expelled from her house"* (Interview 14:7), disruption is often used as a strategic tool to transmit a message. That is, the 'radical' nature of these activities often works as a 'frame': social distress justifies the means. It seems, however, that a lack of movement experience is not enough to explain why some organisations abandon disruptive activities and turn towards service provision, nor is the availability of movement capital enough to

explain the use of disruptive strategies. There are eight organisations that are not represented by the ideal types.

Chapter 9

There's more than one way to skin a cat. Stuyding organisations of the unemployed as configurations with QCA

In the previous chapter organisation characteristics were analysed separately in order to assess their respective roles for the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. The lack of resources, access to the field of institutional actors, collective identity within the movement, and the experience of movement activists were analysed separately to see whether they could explain the use of disruptive strategies by organisations of the unemployed. The following chapter takes up the insights from the theoretical discussions of each of these conditions. However, instead of looking at the various organisation characteristics separately, the following combines them using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (Ragin 2000). That is, the following analysis asks about the interactions between these conditions and their different roles for the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed when considered together.

As described in *chapter 2*, in the following the four previously introduced conditions will be analysed not individually but as configurations. The question is, which configurations of organisation properties imply the outcome of interest here. More precisely, the following analysis asks firstly which organisation properties are *necessary* to enable or encourage organisations to use radical strategies, and secondly, which configurations are *sufficient* to enable organisations to use disruptive strategies. As described earlier, necessary conditions imply that organisation characteristics are always present where the outcome – that is, the use of disruptive strategies – is present. Sufficient conditions are various combinations of organisation characteristics that are enough to enable organisations to choose disruptive activities. These conditions describe configurations of organisation characteristics that always lead to the use of disruptive strategies. Translating the search for sufficient and necessary conditions into theoretical language, one could also ask which combinations of organisation characteristics enable and which constrain disruptive activities.

Before presenting the analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions, the following will present some additional information on the analysis and type of data.¹⁶⁹ Considering the relatively rare use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis in social sciences, I present the most important steps of the data analysis in the text in order to make the analytical procedure more transparent to the reader¹⁷⁰. Firstly, some peculiarities of the fuzzy-set coding process are explained, and a summary table of the results of this calibration process provided. Secondly, the concept of ideal configuration is introduced and applied to the organisations of the unemployed studied. After presenting this information in the form of two tables, I focus on the analysis of sufficient and necessary conditions for disruptive strategies, and discuss the results.

9.1 Preparing the analysis: configurations of set memberships and ideal configurations

Unlike the previous four parts in which organisation characteristics were presented as dichotomous variables, the following analysis takes different degrees of, for example, ‘access’ into account. Instead of coding organisations as simply having access or no access to policy makers, different degrees of access are specified and coded. Indeed, the empirical material allows - even lends itself - to taking these differences into account. Organisations of the unemployed - as described in the previous part on access to institutional actors - have different possibilities for contacting supporting organisations. A contact with established organisations can be very close, implying regular contact on a daily basis, be merely a loose connection, or even exist because of unique support for the organisation. These qualitative differences, present for all four conditions as well as for the outcome, have been taken into account in the following analysis.

For each organisation characteristic (resources, access, collective identity, and movement capital) as well as the outcome (disruptive strategies), two qualitative endpoints of full membership and full non-membership are specified.¹⁷¹ A full membership is awarded the value 1, and a full non-membership the value 0. A fuzzy

¹⁶⁹ For any further information, for example the specific calibration procedures, I refer the reader to the information in the *appendix*.

¹⁷⁰ In the following analysis I follow the steps suggested by Schneider and Wagemann, (2007 :2210ff), see also Schneider and Wagemann (forthcoming 2010).

¹⁷¹ For more information on the definition of the two ideal end points and calibration rules see the *appendix*.

set permits memberships in the interval between these two qualitative endpoints, constructing a fuzzy scale that assigns membership values between 0 and 1. For each organisation characteristic and the outcome I decided on four additional degrees of membership, expressed by the values 0.8, 0.6, 0.4, and 0.2. Using the example of membership scores in the set of organisations using disruptive strategies, these membership scores were defined as follows:

- ‘almost fully in the set of organisations using disruptive strategies as an important strategic tool’ is expressed by the value 0.8
- ‘in the set of organisations using disruptive strategies as an important strategic tool’ is expressed by the value 0.6
- ‘rather outside the set of organisations using disruptive strategies as an important strategic tool’ is expressed by the value 0.4
- ‘almost fully out of the set of organisations using disruptive strategies as an important strategic tool’ is expressed by the value 0.2

The degrees of membership in the other four sets of organisations were defined in a similar manner.

Table 9.1 below shows the different levels of membership of the single organisations in the set of organisations using disruptive strategies. This is described by fuzzy-membership values in the last column: *Erwin*, for example, almost never resorts to forms of collective action that can be described as crossing the borders of institutionalised forms of protest. The organisation is not completely outside the set of organisations who use disruptive strategies, but has a very low membership score. On the contrary, *Elvis* uses disruptive activities and frames as an important strategic tool. This organisation of the unemployed is thus assigned the highest membership score, describing the ideal of organisations using disruptive strategies as an important strategic tool.

Table 9.1 also shows the four causal conditions assumed to account for different levels of membership as introduced earlier. In the table, the fuzzy-membership scores for the four sets are reported in the respective columns ‘Resources’, ‘Access’, ‘Collective Identity’, and ‘Movement Capital’.

Table 9.1 – Fuzzy-set membership values of four properties and disruptive strategies of organisations of the unemployed

Organisations	Conditions				Disruptive Strategies
	Resources	Access	Counter culture	Experience	
Erwin	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2
Elvis	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.8	1
Selbsthilfe	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.4
Kampagne	0.6	1	0.8	1	0.8
No Service	1	1	1	1	1
Aktionsbündnis	0.4	0.4	0.4	1	0.4
Ermutigungskreis	1	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.2
Anti-Hartz	0.8	0.8	0.4	1	0.2
Unemployed verdi	0	0	0.2	1	0.2
Unemployed Bau	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.6
Unemployed Metall	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.6
Unemployed NGG	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.4	0
Unemployed GEW	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.8	0.2
Anders arbeiten	0.2	1	1	1	1
CPP	0	0.2	0.4	0.8	0.2
Apeis	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.4	1
Assol	0	0.2	0.2	0.4	0
unemployed CGT	0	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.8
AC!	0.4	0.4	1	1	1

Resources: 1 = no access to resources; Access: 1 = no access to power-holders; Collective Identity: 1 = contentious identity; Movement Capital: 1 = high movement capital

Each case displays a different configuration of these causal conditions. The organisation *No service*, for example, has the highest membership scores in each set, while *Assol* has low membership scores for most sets. Other organisations show different configurations of high and low membership scores in the various sets. Thus, the table summarises the membership scores for each of the nineteen organisations of the unemployed for five different sets - the four causal conditions and the outcome – and the specific configuration of causal conditions for each.

For the fuzzy-set QCA analysis, the information shown in *table 9.1* was then translated into a truth table. A truth table provides the basic information for carrying out a Qualitative Comparative Analysis. Although at first sight it resembles a classical data matrix, it actually contains different information. Indeed, in *table 9.2* below, single rows do not represent individual cases but ideal configurations. That is, rows

do not describe empirical cases but combinations of the two ideal endpoints. For example, the first row describes the ideal case of a organisation that has no access to resources and policy makers, a contentious collective identity, and a lot of movement capital. This row describes a configuration where all causal conditions are assigned the value 1. The following rows then describe different combinations of the two values 0 and 1.

Thus, a truth table lists all possible configurations of conditions that are either fully present or fully absent. That is, it lists all possible ideal configurations, namely 2^k possible constellations where k is the number of conditions. In my study – which takes four conditions into account - there are $2^4 = 16$ possible configurations.

Table 9.2 below lists these 16 possible logical configurations: each row in the truth table represents one ideal type. In the first column the serial numbers of the configurations are shown as along with the ideal type specified. Capital letters denote a configuration where the organisation characteristic is present, while small letters denote that the organisation characteristic is absent. Line seven, for example, describes the ideal case of a organisation where the characteristic of ‘poor resources’ and ‘poor access’ are absent. This means that this ideal case describes a organisation with many resources and good access to, for example, policy makers. At the same time the ideal case describes a organisation with a contentious collective identity and high levels of movement capital.

Truth Table 9.2 - Ideal types of configurations of organisation characteristics and number of organisations best described by that ideal configuration

ideal types	Conditions				Number of cases
	Resources	Access	Counter culture	Experience	
1 (R*A*C*I)	1	1	1	1	2
2 (R*A*C*i)	1	1	1	0	1
3 (R*A*c*i)	1	1	0	0	1
4 (R*a*c*i)	1	0	0	0	2
5 (r*a*c*i)	0	0	0	0	2
6 (r*a*c*I)	0	0	0	1	4
7 (r*a*C*I)	0	0	1	1	3
8 (r*A*C*I)	0	1	1	1	1
9 (R*a*c*I)	1	0	0	1	0
10 (r*A*C*i)	0	1	1	0	0
11 (R*a*C*i)	1	0	1	0	0
12 (r*A*c*I)	0	1	0	1	0
13 (R*A*c*I)	1	1	0	1	1
14 (R*a*C*I)	1	0	1	1	0
15 (r*a*C*i)	0	0	1	0	2
16 (r*A*c*i)	0	1	0	0	0

The cases are distributed following the ideal cases represented in the 16 rows of the table.

Fuzzy-membership score in the set of organisations using disruptive strategies in brackets

Row 1 (R*A*C*I): No service (1); Kampagne (0.8)

Row 2 (R*A*C*i): Ermutigungskreis (0.2)

Row 3 (R*A*c*i): Unemployed Bau (0.6)

Row 4 (R*a*c*i): Erwin (0.2); Unemployed Ngg (0)

Row 5: (r*a*c*i): Selbsthilfe (0.4); Assol (0.2)

Row 6 (r*a*c*I): Unemployed Verdi (0.2); Aktionsbündnis (0.4); CPP (0.2); Unemployed Gew (0.2)

Row 7 (r*a*C*I): Elvis (0.2); Unemployed Cgt (0.8); AC! (1)

Row 8 (r*A*C*I): Anders arbeiten (1)

Row 13 (R*A*c*I): Anti-Hartz (0.2)

Row 15 (r*a*C*i): Apeis (1); Unemployed Metall (0.6)

The single organisations were then assigned to the ideal case best representing their configurations of membership scores in the different sets.¹⁷² Indeed, each case is best represented by just one ideal configuration (Schneider and Wagemann,

¹⁷² For details on how cases with fuzzy- membership scores are assigned to ideal cases see Schneider and Wagemann (2007).

2007:188). In the last column of *table 9.2* the number of cases best represented by that ideal type are reported. Ideal case number six – a configuration summarised by the expression ‘r*a*c*I’ - represents four organisations. Ideal case number two (R*A*C*i) represents just one.

All together there are ten different ideal configurations that are the best representations of at least one empirical case, while six ideal configurations do not represent any empirical cases. That is, even though the N of 19 organisations means we are working with more cases than possible configurations, not all possible logical combinations necessarily represent an empirical case. These empty lines are logically possible configurations for which no empirical evidence is available, since no outcome values can be assigned. In my study there is, for example, no organisation that is best represented by the ideal case of an adapted collective identity and no movement capital, while having good access to resources but no access to policy makers (ideal configuration r*A*c*i). Even though this case could exist logically, it does not exist as an empirical case in my study. These logical leftovers are for the moment deleted from the table, although they still exist for the computer programme, and thus for the analysis carried out below.¹⁷³

The remaining ideal configurations for which empirical information on the outcome is available are then tested to see whether they form sufficient conditions for the outcome.¹⁷⁴ On the basis of the actual membership scores of the organisations, the truth table algorithm checks whether a row describes a sufficient configuration leading to the outcome for each case. I stipulated that $N \geq 1$ and set the consistency value at ≥ 0.85 ¹⁷⁵ (compare to Schneider and Wagemann 2007:231ff and 222). That is, the configurations are tested to see whether they are consistent enough to adhere to the statement that these conditions are sufficient for the outcome.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ Ragin (2000) deals with this aspect as the problem of limited diversity. QCA analyses may offer very different solutions depending on what assumptions one makes about missing cases.. In fuzzy-set QCA limited diversity is defined as all combinations of aspects for which no case with a membership score higher than 0.5 exists (see Schneider and Wagemann forthcoming 2010).

¹⁷⁴ On the discussion of why fs-truth-table values cannot simply be translated into dichotomous values - assigning all values above 0.5 a 1 and all values below 0.5 a 0 – and why the truth-table algorithm has to be used see Schneider and Wagemann (2007:225ff).

¹⁷⁵ Yet, where the consistency value is defined at the level 0.9, only two ideal configurations describe sufficient conditions for the outcome, while a consistency value defined at level 0.8 gives the same result.

¹⁷⁶ For each row that satisfies these conditions, the value 1 was inserted in the box ‘Outcome D’. On the contrary, for each configuration that does not satisfy these conditions the value 0 was inserted in the

Truth Table 9.3 - Ideal configurations, number of cases best described by an ideal configuration, consistency values, and sufficient conditions for the outcome disruptive activities

ideal types	Conditions				Number of cases	Consistency value	Outcome D**
	R	A	C	I			
1 (R*A*C*I)	1	1	1	1	2	0.92	1
2 (R*A*C*i)	1	1	1	0	1	0.73	0
3 (R*A*c*i)	1	1	0	0	1	0.73	0
4 (R*a*c*i)	1	0	0	0	2	0.67	0
5 (r*a*c*i)	0	0	0	0	2	0.65	0
6 (r*a*c*I)	0	0	0	1	4	0.56	0
7 (r*a*C*I)	0	0	1	1	3	0.85	1
8 (r*A*C*I)	0	1	1	1	1	0.92	1
13 (R*A*c*I)	1	1	0	1	1	0.75	0
15 (r*a*C*i)	0	0	1	0	2	0.88	1

** Sufficient configuration for Outcome D: 0 = no; 1 = yes

R = Resources

A = Access

C = Collective Identity

I = Movement Capital

9.2 Analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions

The analysis of sufficient and necessary conditions was carried out on the basis of truth *table 9.3*. Firstly, the necessary conditions were tested.¹⁷⁷ A condition is defined as necessary where the condition is present wherever the outcome is present (see discussion above). In QCA this is represented by the following formula: $X \leftarrow Y$ where X is the condition and Y the outcome¹⁷⁸. An analysis of the necessary conditions for R, A, C, and I, and their complementary conditions r, a, c, and i was carried out.

appropriate box. The truth table 9.3 above shows the result of the process: for each row in which $N \geq 1$ and the consistency value $C \geq 0.85$ the configuration is defined as sufficient to lead to the outcome as expressed by the value 1. All together four rows describe configurations that can be defined as sufficient.

¹⁷⁷ Schneider and Wagemann (2007) suggest that the necessary conditions always be tested first.

¹⁷⁸ As Schneider and Wagemann (2007) point out, this direction of the arrow describes a logical relationship and not a causal relationship.

Table 9.4 – Consistency and coverage values for necessary conditions for outcome D

Factor	Consistency	Coverage
R	0.55	0.66
r	0.65	0.59
A	0.71	0.76
a	0.57	0.57
C	0.92	0.85
c	0.41	0.48
I	0.84	0.65
i	0.35	0.53

The analysis of the truth table for all rows with a positive outcome, that is, all organisations using disruptive strategies, shows the highest consistency value for C at 0.92 and a coverage value of 0.85. With the threshold for the consistency value set at 0.9, only condition C is necessary for the outcome (Schneider and Wagemann, 2007:213).¹⁷⁹ This logical relationship between the outcome disruptive strategy and the organisation's property is expressed in the following formula:

$$C \leftarrow D$$

The data was also analysed for sufficient conditions. To test which conditions are sufficient, not only single conditions but configurations of conditions must be considered.¹⁸⁰ It may be that a lack of access to resources is not sufficient for organisations to use radical strategies. However, combining two conditions such as no access to resources and a lot of movement capital may be sufficient for organisations to resort to radical strategies. Thus, the context of organisations of the unemployed that lack access to resources can make a difference, and can be analysed with using QCA.

The following analysis describes those configurations that are sufficient for organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris to use disruptive activities and frames. Four lines – that is four configurations in *table 9.4* – lead to the outcome 'disruptive strategies'.

$$R*A*C*I + r*a*C*I + r*A*C*I + r*a*C*i \rightarrow D$$

¹⁷⁹ Further, condition I has a consistency value only slightly below (0.84) but this condition covers only 65% of all cases.

¹⁸⁰ Having specified four different conditions, possibly $3^{\text{number of conditions}} - 1$ that is in my study $3^4 - 1 = 80$ configurations to be tested.

These ‘primitive expressions’ describe all rows from the truth table that lead to the outcome.

These expressions can be condensed into shorter expressions using two different strategies. As previously stated, the expressions resulting from QCA analysis differ according to the assumptions one makes about the logical rudiments excluded from *table 8.10*. Six lines of the truth table cannot be assigned any outcome value: for six configurations we do not know whether – were they to exist in my study – they would qualify as sufficient conditions for the use of disruptive activities or not.

As Schneider and Wagemann (2007:101ff) point out, there are two different possibilities for dealing with this problem of limited diversity: either one makes a statement purely on the basis of existing empirical cases (a blanket assumption), or one assigns outcome values to the empty lines. The first – the blanket assumption – is the more conservative approach to dealing with the problem of limited diversity. For the second possibility, the computer programme simulates the outcome values and offers the most parsimonious solution.¹⁸¹ The two analyses differ in their treatment of logical rudiments, that is, those lines for which no outcome value could be assigned, and therefore usually yield different results.

Using the Quine-McClusky algorithm for carrying out a conservative analysis, the primitive expressions are reduced to two alternative paths:

$$\begin{aligned} r*a*C &\rightarrow D \\ A*C*I &\rightarrow D \end{aligned}$$

As seen above, C has already been identified as a necessary condition, and indeed it is also part of the solution describing sufficient conditions. The analysis of these expressions yields the following results for the raw and unique coverage and consistency values.

¹⁸¹ That is, in the first case the programme assumes the outcome to be true and all other values for the outcome to be ‘false’, in the most ‘parsimonious solution’ the computer defines outcome 1 as ‘true’ but the logical rudiments as ‘don’t care’. The problem with the second method is that the more logical rudiments exist, the more the solution is based on assumptions the computer makes to reduce the complexity of the solution rather than a solution based on empirical insights.

Table 9.5 – Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), conservative solution

Sufficient Expression	Consistency	Raw coverage	Unique coverage
$r*a*C$	0.86	0.51	0.16
$A*C*I$	0.91	0.65	0.31

solution coverage 0.82

solution consistency 0.89

Both sufficient conditions have a consistency value above the previously defined value of ≥ 0.85 (compare *table 9.2*). For example, the statement that the configuration of factors $A*C*I$ is sufficient for organisations to use disruptive activities is nearly, but not fully consistent. Furthermore, both paths have a raw coverage of 51% and 65% respectively. Raw coverage describes the percentage of cases covered by an expression. Both paths have similar raw coverage values and thus no expression has empirically greater weight for the explanation in terms of raw coverage. However, unique coverage is 16% for path $r*a*C$ but 31% for $A*C*I$. Since explanations often overlap, this value describes the percentage of cases explained only by that expression, subtracting those empirical cases that are covered by both paths. Regarding unique coverage, path $A*C*I$ seems to have more explanatory power: alone it explains 31% of cases. The common solution of both paths covers 82% of all cases and has a consistency value of 0.89.

In the second type of analysis the computer simulates outcome values for the logical rudiments. Reducing the information contained in the prime implicant, the programme offers two solutions of equal value as the most parsimonious solution.

In the first most parsimonious solution the computer programme comes up with the two paths $C*I$ and $a*C$ as two sufficient expressions for the outcome:

$$\begin{aligned} C*I &\rightarrow D \\ a*C &\rightarrow D \end{aligned}$$

Table 9.6 below shows the values for the consistency of each expression, as well as raw and unique coverage values.

Table 9.6 – Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), parsimonious solution 1

Sufficient Expression	Consistency	Raw coverage	Unique coverage
C*I	0.89	0.82	0.33
a*C	0.85	0.57	0.08

solution coverage 0.90

solution consistency 0.88

A second alternative solution chooses the short expression $r*C$ instead of $a*C$:

$$C*I \rightarrow D$$

$$r*C \rightarrow D$$

This solution scores the following values for consistency, raw coverage, and unique coverage.

Table 9.7 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome D), parsimonious solution 2

Sufficient Expression	Consistency	Raw coverage	Unique coverage
C*I	0.89	0.82	0.24
r*C	0.89	0.63	0.06

solution coverage 0.88

solution consistency 0.90

Both solutions score consistency values of 0.85 and higher. In the first solution, the unique coverage of the expression $C*I$ is a little higher. The unique coverage of both the remaining expressions ($a*C$ and $r*C$) is very low, meaning that taken alone they explain very few outcomes.

The analysis for necessary conditions for the use of disruptive strategies yields a clear result. The analysis suggests that a confrontational collective identity is a necessary condition is organisations of the unemployed are to choose disruptive strategies. Indeed, as shown in *part 8.3*, all organisations except one belonging to a contentious network use disruptive strategies. This result bolsters the idea of the importance of mutual and close social networks for the strategic choices of movement organisations.

The analysis of sufficient conditions is more complex and provides two different types of solutions. The first, more complex solution, which is based exclusively on the empirical cases, consists of the expressions $r*a*C$ and $A*C*I$. This solution suggests that organisations of the unemployed combining two different conditions

sufficient for the use of disruptive strategies. Firstly, having good access to resources, good access to the field of institutional actors *and* a confrontational collective identity is sufficient for the use disruptive strategies. Secondly, organisations with a confrontational collective identity and *no* access to the field of institutional actors, but with a lot of movement capital, also use disruptive strategies.

This solution points to two specific aspects of Comparative Analysis. First, the solution offers two configurations of conditions as sufficient for organisations of the unemployed to use disruptive strategies. The first analysis thus offers an equifinal solution: two alternative paths lead to the outcome. Second, the solution points to the importance of the context of single conditions. While in the previous chapter on the role of access to institutional actors I concluded that access does not contribute to an explanation for the use of disruptive strategies, in the solutions presented here access to these actors is part of the sufficient expression. Depending on the context, that is, depending on whether organisations have no access to resources, or a lot of movement capital, access to institutional actors has to be present in one situation and absent in the other in order to be sufficient for the outcome.

The second type of solution based on computer calculations for the empty lines for which no outcome values could be assigned - the most parsimonious solution - offers two alternatives. In both solutions the configuration C*I is defined as sufficient. That is, unlike the previous analysis, access to the institutional field is excluded from the expression. Here only the necessary condition of a contentious collective identity alongside high levels of movement capital are defined as sufficient for the use of disruptive strategies. The two second paths are combinations of the necessary condition with either no access to resources or no access to institutional actors.

To simplify the theoretical discussion in the last section of the chapter (see below) I choose the more conservative solution made on the basis of existing empirical cases.

9.3 Analysing the negation of the outcome: organisations of the unemployed that do not use disruptive strategies

To complement the above analysis, the negative outcome, that is, the absence of disruptive activities, was tested for sufficient and necessary conditions (see Schneider and Wagemann forthcoming 2010). Similar to the procedure described above, a truth

table was created with the definition of a sufficient condition for the outcome set at $N \geq 1$ and consistency ≥ 0.85 .

Truth Table 9.8 - Ideal configurations, number of organisations best described by that ideal configuration, consistency values, and sufficient conditions for the outcome non-disruptive activities

ideal types	Conditions				Number of cases	Consistency value	Outcome d**
	R	A	C	I			
1 (R*A*C*I)	1	1	1	1	2	0.48	0
2 (R*A*C*i)	1	1	1	0	1	0.80	0
3 (R*A*c*I)	1	1	0	0	1	0.80	0
4 (R*a*c*i)	1	0	0	0	2	0.87	1
5 (r*a*c*i)	0	0	0	0	2	0.88	1
6 (r*a*c*I)	0	0	0	1	4	0.89	1
7 (r*a*C*I)	0	0	1	1	3	0.62	0
8 (r*A*C*I)	0	1	1	1	1	0.56	0
13 (R*A*c*I)	1	1	0	1	1	0.88	1
15 (r*a*C*i)	0	0	1	0	2	0.69	0

** Sufficient configuration for Outcome b: 0 = no; 1 = yes

R = Resources

A = Access

C = Countercultural Identity

I = Movement Experience

Necessary and sufficient conditions were tested on the basis of the truth-table. First, the analysis for necessary conditions, that is for conditions R, A, C, I, and their complementary conditions, r, a, c, i were carried out.

The analysis shows that no single condition has a consistency value of ≥ 0.90 , and no condition is therefore defined as necessary for organisations of the unemployed to use non-disruptive strategies.

Table 9.9 – Consistency and coverage values for necessary conditions for outcome d

Factor	Consistency	Coverage
R	0.52	0.59
r	0.70	0.59
A	0.54	0.54
a	0.76	0.71
C	0.52	0.45
c	0.83	0.90
I	0.67	0.49
i	0.52	0.75

The analysis of sufficient conditions yielded the following primitive expressions describing sufficient configurations for the use non-disruptive strategies:

$$\mathbf{R*a*c*i + r*a*c*i + r*a*c*I + R*A*c*I \rightarrow d}$$

Reducing the expression using the Quine-McClusky algorithm, the following complex solution, based only on the existing empirical cases, is offered:

Table 9.10 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome d), conservative solution

Sufficient Expression	Consistency	Raw coverage	Unique coverage
a*c*i	0.91	0.43	0.09
r*a*c	0.90	0.61	0.22
R*A*c*I	0.88	0.30	0.07

solution coverage 0.78

solution consistency 0.92

The table shows that three different paths qualify as sufficient conditions for the use of non-disruptive strategies. First, organisations of the unemployed with the access properties combined with an adapted collective identity and no movement capital fulfil the description of sufficient conditions that encourage organisations to avoid using disruptive strategies. However, the unique coverage of this path is very low: taken alone the expression describes only a marginal portion of the cases. Furthermore, many resources and access and an adapted identity describe organisation properties that are sufficient for organisations to use moderate strategies. This expression has the highest values for raw and unique coverage. Finally, organisations with no resources or access, but a lot of movement capital and an adapted identity are organisations that tend to desist from the use of disruptive strategies, but here again unique coverage is very low.

Calculating the most parsimonious solution by defining the logical rudiments as ‘don’t care’ we get the following picture:

Table 9.11 - Sufficient expressions and their consistency, raw and unique coverage (outcome d), parsimonious solution

Sufficient Expression	Consistency	Raw coverage	Unique coverage
ac	0.92	0.72	0.17
cI	0.90	0.61	0.07

solution coverage 0.78

solution consistency 0.92

The first path defines the absence of access and the absence of a contentious identity as sufficient conditions for the use of non-disruptive strategies. The second path of the solution defines the absence of a contentious collective identity and high levels of movement capital as sufficient conditions for the use of non-disruptive strategies.

Summing up the tables analysing the negation of the outcome

The first insight of the analysis of non-disruptive strategies is that sufficient and necessary conditions for the outcome cannot simply be inferred (see also (Schneider and Wagemann forthcoming 2010). Knowing the conditions that lead to the outcome does not necessarily imply that we know the conditions that lead to the opposite. Although a contentious collective identity is necessary for the use of disruptive activities, the absence of a contentious identity does not necessarily lead to the use of non-disruptive strategies.¹⁸² Sufficient conditions for an outcome cannot just be turned upside down. As presented previously, the conservative analysis yields the sufficient conditions $r*a*C$ and $A*C*I$. The analysis of sufficient conditions for the negation of the outcome yielded the following three paths: $a*c*i$, $r*a*c$, and $R*A*c*I$, while the analysis for the outcome provided only two paths. Thus, the analysis of the negation of the outcome has a value on its own and generates different insights.

¹⁸² More precisely, applying the DeMorgan Law the opposite of a necessary condition would be a sufficient condition. Schneider and Wagemann give the following example: “*While the condition ‘clear sight’ ... is a necessary condition to see the alps from Munich ..., the fact that there is no clear sight is already a sufficient conditions to not see the Alps from Munich.*” (Schneider and Wagemann 2007:125; own translation). However, results can be inferred using DeMorgan’s law only where a study has no problems of limited diversity.

No condition can be defined as necessary for non-disruptive strategies. In the analysis for sufficient conditions QCA provided an equifinal solution: there are three different paths that are sufficient for organisations of the unemployed to use non-disruptive strategies. Access to the field of institutional actors and the absence of a contentious collective identity, combined with either access to resources or the absence of movement capital are sufficient conditions for the use of non-disruptive strategies. Further, the absence of a contentious identity, a lack of resources and no access to the institutional field combined with the presence of movement capital also leads to the use of non-disruptive strategies. Other conditions that are not included in this study may explain the use of non-disruptive strategies, but local organisations of the unemployed in Berlin and Paris with the characteristics described here usually use non-disruptive strategies. The most parsimonious solution provides two paths: the absence of a contentious collective identity combined with either high levels of movement capital or access to the field of institutional actors.

Discussion

While in the previous chapter single variables were analysed separately in order to assess their roles in moderating the strategies of organisations of the unemployed, in the final part I move towards studying cases rather than variables by **conceptualising cases as configurations**. In this part we obtained a comprehensive insight into the different roles of the four conditions for the tactical choices of movement organisations.

Similar to previous analyses in the form of fourfold tables, the Qualitative Comparative Analysis found evidence of a crucial role of counter-cultural collective identity. However, the Qualitative Comparative Analysis specified this condition as necessary condition. Indeed, the previous analyses which approached the factors separately indicated their importance but were not able to assign a particular role.

To belong to a counter-cultural collective actor is therefore crucial for movement organisations that want to disrupt the everyday business of welfare and unemployment policies through their activities or discursive strategies. Almost¹⁸³ all of the organisations that use disruptive strategies belong to networks of counter-cultural actors that draw their collective identity within a larger movement. Specifying

¹⁸³ I use the term almost since the statement is not 100% consistent, as the consistency value indicates.

the condition as necessary also means that the absence of a confrontational collective identity hampers the use of disruptive strategies: the analysis suggests that there no single condition could work as a functional equivalent. Thus, contacts with other counter-cultural actors where close and mutual relationships exist is a necessary pre-condition for organisations that aim to adopt more challenging collective action forms.

Interestingly, the absence of links with a counter-cultural network is not enough to guarantee the use of non-disruptive strategies. Indeed, the analysis of the negation of the outcome, that is the use of non-disruptive strategies, does not identify any of the conditions as necessary for the use of moderate strategies. The absence of the condition is however part of all three of the sufficient expressions identified.

At the same time, however, the analysis suggests that it is not sufficient merely to belong to a counter-cultural network. Indeed, the fourfold tables already hinted at the limits of using just one condition to explain disruptive strategies: one organisation belonging to a counter-cultural network preferred moderate strategies. The Qualitative Comparative Analysis offers a more comprehensive perspective by putting this single condition into context.

The diverse roles of single conditions when organisations of the unemployed choose disruptive actions is pointed out in the analysis of sufficient conditions. For example, while in the previous analysis in the form of four-fold tables the role of access to institutional actors did not seem particularly telling for the tactical choices of movement organisations, studying cases as configurations gave a different result. As explained above, whether or not organisations have access to the field of institutional actors makes a difference depending on the context, that is, whether resources are accessed or movement experience is available. organisations belonging to a counter-cultural network and with access to resources also need access to the field of institutional actors if they are to use disruptive strategies. However, organisations that have no access to the institutional field but with a lot of available movement experience may also use disruptive strategies. For these actors it is not arbitrary that they are excluded from the institutional field of actors, exclusion forms part of the configuration of sufficient conditions. That is, organisations with members with experiences in new social movement activities only use disruptive activities where

they are excluded from the field of institutional actors. In the first case access, and in the latter case the absence of access, is crucial to describing a sufficient configuration. Thus, the role of access to the institutional field for the use of disruptive strategies differs according to context. Let me discuss these two types of actors in more detail.

The first type of organisation – with access to resources and the field of institutional actors – confounds the assumption spelled out previously which states that organisations of the unemployed tend to use disruptive strategies. One would assume that those organisations that occupy an excluded position – that is organisations that have not overcome resource inequalities and are marginalised in the contentious field of welfare and unemployment policies - will use disruptive strategies to arouse attention. Indeed, as discussed above, neither exclusion from resources nor exclusion from the field of institutional actors explains the use of disruptive strategies. These two conditions are nevertheless crucial to explaining the use of disruptive strategies: it is those actors that overcome resource inequalities and establish relationships with institutional actors in order to gain access to centres of political and discursive power that use disruptive strategies. The absence of these two conditions¹⁸⁴ is crucial to understanding the configurations that explain the use of disruptive activities.

Further, the picture provided by QCA yields more insights than simply that access to resources and the field of institutional actors are crucial conditions in understanding organisations' tactical choices. Five organisations that have managed to build bridges to centres of discursive and political power also hold counter-cultural identities.¹⁸⁵ That is, it is not only marginalised actors that hold alternative counter-cultural identities that in turn provide them with disruptive repertoires. On the contrary, only three organisations excluded in these two respects belong to counter-cultural networks. Yet this configuration is not sufficient for the use of disruptive strategies. Looking for an alternative identity when excluded is therefore not a valid way of accessing more challenging repertoires.

¹⁸⁴ The language here may be confusing: the absence of the condition means the absence of no-access. It therefore signifies 'access to' resources and the institutionalised field.

¹⁸⁵ Five groups belong to this type of actor with a confrontational collective identity overcoming an excluded position in these two respects. There are three groups that are excluded in these two respects, who belong at the same time to a confrontational network, yet this configuration is not sufficient for using disruptive strategies.

This expression of sufficiency suggests that disruptive activities and frames are less exposed to control and co-optation where actors are supported by certain networks. Access to resources and to the field of institutional actors not only constrains disruptive strategies, but is a part of one of the two expressions of sufficiency. The analysis suggests that access to resources and the field of institutional actors encourages those organisations that share a certain collective identity to use disruptive activities in a strategic way in order to attract the attention of the public and allies. Enjoying the support of actors with whom they share much, resources and access to centres of power can be used strategically to disrupt the everyday business of institutional politics.

The first solution thus suggests to us that it is not exclusion but the possibility to be heard rather than lost in the media jungle that gives marginalised actors the courage to suggest new policies. However, without the support of a network of counter-cultural challengers, these organisations would not find themselves in the context necessary for managing this.

The second type of organisation – those belonging to a confrontational collective actor – have no access to the institutional field. At first this seems surprising, since the members of these organisations have a lot of experience in movement activity. In other words, I suppose this to mean that individual movement activists have been in contact with political institutions before, have good knowledge of resource acquisition, and have certainly been in contact with donor organisations during their past movement activities such as conferences the organisation of larger demonstrations. As pointed out previously, established organisations such as trade unions and political parties are part of social movements during the peaks of protest waves. Yet movement activists from these local organisations of the unemployed do not use their knowledge or network resources from past activities to built contacts with the more institutionalised end of the field.

Three of the nine organisations using disruptive strategies conform to this type. However, this type of actor only exists in Berlin, not in the French organisations studied. All three organisations are part of the network of local new social movement organisations. These organisations belong to a counter-cultural network of movement

activists engaged in the local production of an alternative public space (Gegenöffentlichkeit) and alternative expertise.

Usually, these organisations refuse contact with the field of institutional actors. As one unemployment activist, involved in movement activities since the aftermath of the student revolt at the end of the 1960s explains, collaboration with state institutions is seen by some parts of the movement as a betrayal. As an organisation of the unemployed it could seem more justifiable to seek support from ‘caring state institutions’, but as the activist describes, this is critically observed by other activists. Not only collaboration with state actors is refused by these movement activists. A discussion within one organisation about collaborating with welfare organisations resulted in several organisation members who refused cooperation with this type of organisation dropping out. The idea was to critically discuss the role of welfare organisations in implementing 1-Euro jobs, and to develop joint strategies in order to avoid requests from these actors for cheap labour. organisations of this type are instead critical of support from beneficial organisations, as described in the above discussion on access. It is these ‘classical’ new social movement actors that refuse to work with certain types of actors, considered as adversaries.

Thus, the three conditions adding up to a sufficient expression for the use of disruptive strategies are linked by a certain understanding of movement policy. The analysis suggests that it is not exclusion that pushes actors towards alternative identities and disruptive strategies. Instead, these actors decide not to build bridges with centres of political and discursive power. These organisations are considered the adversaries or targets of their claims. These actors can afford to refuse the support of institutional organisations because they can rely on alternative support networks to overcome their lack of resources. Further, these organisations of the unemployed belong to counter-cultural local movement cultures where the use of disruptive activities forms a part of their self-understanding.

To conclude, let me illustrate the role of sufficient conditions for the latter type of organisation by placing it in contrast with an organisation of the unemployed that uses moderate strategies despite belonging to a confrontational network. As stated above, simply belonging to a confrontational network is not enough, or, more precisely, it is not sufficient for a organisation to use disruptive strategies. Depending on the context,

some organisations with a confrontational collective identity will use disruptive strategies while others will not, as one of the organisations in Berlin illustrates.

Shortly after its foundation this organisation of the unemployed began to get in contact with other movement actors and organisations of the unemployed. The founder of the organisation did not however belong to a local network of new social movement activists. Instead, the activist sought the support of more challenging actors after being involved in the more institutionalised part of the field. After many years of volunteering in caring institutions, the activist became very critical of these institutions. Unemployed herself, she criticises the paternalistic and alienated approach of those caring for unemployed people while having safe jobs themselves. She underlines that these people often do not understand the perspectives and problems of unemployed people. Interested in “*working for unemployed as an unemployed person*” (Interview 4:13), the activist decided to found a self-help organisation that would also engage in political actions.

The organisation has two connections to the field of counter-cultural actors. Firstly, the activist is convinced that returning to employment is not a realistic alternative for the long-term unemployed members of the organisation. She is very critical of political initiatives that promote full employment, and therefore seeks contacts with organisations advancing alternative scenarios to these mainstream initiatives. Secondly, the unemployed activist is disappointed in the dominant ‘caring’ approach of welfare actors. Although the activist uses the language of these institutions, speaking, for example, of “*difficult cases*” (Interview 12:3) in need of help, the activist is mainly interested in activating people to take part in political activities and take matters into their own hands.

The definition of alternative political scenarios and the role of the self-representation of the unemployed are two crucial topics for counter-cultural movement actors. Firstly, these organisations often consider governing institutions as adversaries and promote radical solutions. Further, the self-representation of the socially and politically excluded is an important topic for many unemployment activists previously engaged in the new social movements. Self-representation is often framed as promoting direct democracy and as a criticism of corporate decision-

making and representative democracy, and is thus linked to topics crucial to this movement family (della Porta and Rucht 1995).

The organisation of the unemployed is therefore able to frame its own objectives as in line with those of these types of actors. However, in contrast to other organisations sharing the same collective identity, the organisation does not use disruptive strategies. The activist considers these political activities as risky, and maintains a clear distance. Interestingly, the unemployed activist speaks of two alternatives of either moderate or violent activities, similarly to the French organisation mentioned in the introduction to *part three*.

What distinguishes the organisation from other organisations of the unemployed and what might explain differences in terms of choosing disruptive strategies or not? In contrast to other organisations, this organisation of the unemployed does not share certain characteristics identified as crucial components of the sufficient expression. In contrast to other organisations of the unemployed, this organisation lacks movement capital. That is, both types of organisation share a confrontational identity and both lack access to the field of institutional actors, or, more precisely, refuse to establish contacts with centres of discursive and political power. However, the organisations differ in terms of the availability of movement capital, identified as a part of the sufficient expression.

It is the familiarity of these activists with different protest forms that dulls the illegitimate veneer of more confrontational action forms. It is interesting to note that organisations refusing disruptive actions forms seem to distinguish between only two alternative forms of protest: moderate and violent. Disruptive, that is, non-violent protest forms that cross the borders of accepted (legal but also socially accepted) behaviour are not considered. It seems that these action forms are considered as one and the same, and no distinction is made between violent and disruptive action forms. However, these protest forms clearly have very different characters and play different roles during cycles of protest (della Porta and Tarrow 1987; Koopmans 1995). Familiarity with disruptive action forms and their usefulness in rousing public attention particularly at the outset of protest waves is common knowledge to more experienced movement activists. Attempting to trigger major protest waves, these actors use these action forms as strategic tools, since they know how useful (or indeed

necessary) they are to trigger protest waves. Knowledge of the differences between these action forms and violent protest provides them with a more skilled and targeted use of different action forms in different circumstances. Relatively new unemployment activists, coming from different backgrounds of social and political engagement, lack these skills.

Thus, in linking the conditions considered necessary for movement activities to the two action forms, the empirical discussion suggests that different impacts are made on the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. The four conditions identified have different impacts on the two tactical choices when considered separately. The final part specifies the roles of the single conditions while pointing out the importance of putting them in context. That is, sometimes the presence or absence of another condition makes a difference in explaining disruptive strategies.

Taking the insights of the Qualitative Comparative Analysis together with the reasoning provided for the limited explanatory power of some conditions, the importance of cognitive devices comes to the fore. For example, when discussing the role of access to the field of institutional actors, I look at the discursive strategies through which dependent relationships are identified and subverted by unemployment activists. organisations who perceive a risk of becoming dependent either avoid these types of contacts or develop strategies to promote their tactical autonomy. I gave the example of a organisation that ridicules the expectations of their donor institutions that they will withdraw from political activism. Further, I look at one organisation that falls outside the ideal types, which specify that organisations either belong to a counter-cultural network and use disruptive strategies or belong to a collaborative network and use moderate strategies. This organisation uses disruptive strategies despite its affiliation with a collaborative network by assigning itself a certain role: that of a ‘bad boy’ that is nevertheless needed by the more powerful actors within the network. It seems that these alternatives are provided either by the counter-cultural network or the movement experience of activists. Thus, where a toolkit of various forms of political action is at the disposal of activists, being present either in the collective memory of a network or in the memory of movement activists, organisations are able to choose from the whole range of repertoires of resistance.

Thus, in general the insights of my study point to the importance of the cognitive abilities of organisations. Organisations are not helpless rabbits in headlights, exposed to structures but unable to react. Depending on their ability to carve out their own roles in the contentious field and perceive opportunities instead of constraints, organisations enjoy the possibility of using disruptive strategies even in unfavourable contexts.

Conclusion of the third part

The illustration of the organisations of the unemployed detailed in the introduction suggests that organisations develop from disruptive actors into moderate service providers that occasionally participate in moderate mass demonstrations. Yet, in my study of organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin, differences in degrees of disruptiveness is not linked to the age of the organisations. While some organisations have developed from grassroots disruptive actors into formal organisations providing services, others have not given up their disruptive strategies even years after the beginning of mobilisation waves. There does not seem to be any clear trend where organisations become less disruptive and develop into professional service providers.

To contribute to our understanding of when and why ‘poor’ actors choose to use disruptive political actions, I proposed looking at four different conditions that have been argued to explain degrees of disruptiveness among movement actors. Part three of the thesis therefore discussed the role of resources, access to the field of institutional actors, embeddedness in counter-cultural networks and the share of members with extensive movement experience for the tactical choices of local organisations of the unemployed. My assumption was that good access to resources, and close contact to the field of institutional actors who provide access to resources organisations lack, would moderate the activities of organisations of the unemployed. Further, I presumed that belonging to a counter-cultural network and having many members with previous experience in movement activities would in turn lead organisations to use more disruptive actions. To test these assumptions I linked the four conditions to two activities of organisations of the unemployed: disruptive activities and service provision. Disruptive strategies and the provision of services were chosen as two particularly telling action orientations indicative of the moderation of organisations’ political engagement in Berlin and Paris.

The present study offers new and innovative insights on the study of poor people’s movements in various ways. In general, there are few studies that look at local organisations of poor people’s actors. One exception is the study by Cress and Snow (1996) on homeless organisations in the United States. Considering the importance these local organisations are ascribed firstly for the organisation of national protest

waves (Lahusen and Baumgarten 2006; Cress and Snow 2000) and secondly as carriers at the outset of protest waves and the more disruptive and innovative phases of protest waves (della Porta and Tarrow 1987; Koopmans 1993), the study not only provides insights on the tactical choices of single organisations but adds to our general knowledge of the dynamics of major protest waves.

The present analysis also adds to our understanding of the tactical choices of movement organisations in various respects. First, previous studies have mostly focused on one single factor or bunch of factors derived from one particular theoretical framework in order to explain the tactical choices of whole movements or movement organisations. For example, the political opportunity approach offers several variables to explain the degree of disruptiveness of whole movements. From a different theoretical perspective, Cress and Snow (1996) have discussed the role of various resources for the degree of disruptiveness of homeless organisations. The present study integrates various theoretical frameworks to explain the tactical choices of poor people's organisations. It is thus able to compare and combine the explanatory powers of frameworks such as the resource mobilisation approach, the political opportunity approach, and the network approach.

Finally, the present study is to my knowledge the only study to apply the latest developments in Qualitative Comparative Analysis¹⁸⁶ to poor people's organisations.¹⁸⁷ Thus, the study is the only one to provide a middle-sized N allowing us to combine in-depth knowledge on single cases with the aim of generalising results to a broader category of social organisations. The present study therefore contributes to our understanding of the conditions that moderate the tactical choices of poor people's actors.

¹⁸⁶ See Wagemann and Schneider (forthcoming 2010) for the criteria for carrying out a high quality QC Analysis.

¹⁸⁷ Cress and Snow (1996) carry out a QC Analysis on homeless organisations, but the analysis does not satisfy today's criteria for high quality QCA as outlined by Wagemann and Schneider (forthcoming 2010).

Conclusion

Over the past decade, unemployed actors have entered the field of contentious politics on unemployment in a number of European countries. In an attempt to understand this new phenomenon in post-war Europe, a number of studies investigated how and why organisations of the unemployed occasionally mobilised for protest despite numerous potential obstacles. While most studies focus on explaining the major mobilisation waves, the present thesis focused instead on the local roots of these events, providing a comprehensive picture of the activities and characteristics of local organisations of the unemployed, understanding their everyday contentious politics and explaining their tactical choices.

Contentious agency of the unemployed in France and Germany

Looking at local organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin – the capitals of the two countries that have experienced the strongest mobilisations of the unemployed over the past decade - shows some differences in organisational features and contentious agency in the two cities. These differences can be explained by the general (Kriesi et al. 1995) and concrete political opportunities (Giugni 2009) of the two countries, in particular with regard to the institutions of contention, that is, the movements, protest actions and political cleavages that characterise the two countries.

(1) Firstly, concerning organisational features, in France, the centralised political system is reflected in the absence of independent local organisations: all local organisations belong to a national umbrella organisation or a national network that coordinates the activities of local organisations at the national level. This may also account for the stronger identification with a national movement of the unemployed found among the local organisations in Paris, and the different perceptions concerning the existence of a movement of the unemployed in the two countries. In Berlin, although many more local organisations of the unemployed exist, unemployment

activists are sceptical about the existence of an unemployed people's movement. Yet, although in Paris actors speak of an unemployed people's movement, while activists in Berlin find it difficult to do so, in reality unemployed people in both cities have successfully created a collective actor of the unemployed – albeit in different ways.

Secondly, some types of local organisations simply do not exist in Paris. For example, in Paris only one organisation addresses the social citizenship of the unemployed, aiming to empower unemployed people to defend their social rights. Most French organisations address the political agency of the unemployed, aiming to mobilise the unemployed constituency for protest action. Further, organisations combining goals of the political and social empowerment were not found in Paris. Organisations of the unemployed in Paris only use instrumental strategies, while activities that address individual behaviour in a long-term perspective, that is, cultural strategies, do not form part of the French action repertoire. Mobilisation strategies are often those typical of trade unions, that is, mass mobilisation strategies involving broad sections of the population.

Finally, regarding the types of actors that use disruptive strategies, my analysis shows that all organisations of the unemployed in Paris belong to one type. That is, all organisations of the unemployed that use disruptive strategies have access to resources and to the field of institutional actors, and belong to a counter-cultural network (see discussion below). This is also due to the fact that all organisations in Paris have access to resources and the field of institutional actors as compared to the organisations in Berlin, where some have access but others do not. The fact that certain types of organisations are not found in Paris may partly be due to the simple fact that fewer organisations exist in Paris when compared to Berlin. However, it is specific types that do not exist, while others are equally represented in both Berlin and Paris.

(2) The unemployed people's movements in France and Germany exist in addition, to or sometimes even in contention with, established movements that consider themselves to constitute the 'left'. However, over the past few decades, both France and Germany have been characterised by opposing trends regarding the features and the strength of old and new social movements. In France most protest activities were corporatist protests by workers, and protest identities evolved around class position

(Fillieule 1998). In contrast, in Germany protest was not dominated by traditional organisations but by new social movements that conquered the public sphere. These different institutions of contention have different impacts on the contentious agency of the unemployed regarding their claims and alliance building activities.

In Paris, activists mainly link the claims of the unemployed to the *question sociale*. Thus, in France it is much easier for the unemployed to link their claims to those of other poor actors: in Berlin only one organisation has tried to construct a collective actor of the poor, and became rather marginalised in that attempt. As I have argued, this is also due to the different roles of trade unions within the social benefits system in the two countries (Pailier 2006). That is, in France the public discourse is dominated by issues on the topic of unemployment that make it easier for the unemployed to attach their frames to those of other poor actors. In Berlin, actors have nevertheless constructed a collective actor of the unemployed by referring more to local struggles and linking their claims more often to the issues new social movements have typically been involved in.

Further, unemployed people's movements in France and Germany differ in how they relate to established organisations of the labour movement. Interestingly, in both countries organisations of the unemployed have developed ambivalent relationships with trade unions - albeit from different angles. In both countries organisations of the unemployed participate in protest events organised by unions, yet relations with traditional unions are difficult in both. In France the movement of the unemployed evolved from a critique of union policy, but *within* the union landscape. Many critical union activists joined interest organisations of the unemployed, while at the same time building networks to renew union activism. Furthermore, the fragmented union landscape in France led to a situation where small and newer unions (such as the Groupe de Dix) sought allies outside the union landscape, that is, with organisations of the unemployed interested in developing a political profile by placing the issue of social exclusion on the agenda. In Germany, where new social movements have dominated the public sphere since the 1980s, there is instead a conflict over who has the right to speak for the unemployed: the conflict of unemployment is either framed as a labour conflict, or as a new(er) social movement concern. This shows that, depending on the institutions of contention, the unemployed may ally themselves not only with different *actors*, but also with different *claims*. Not that unemployed

people's claims are made invisible by these relationships to the old or new left, nor that unemployed people's claims are integrated and fully represented in a wider movement context. However, it might hint at the fact that the issue of unemployment is only rendered contentious when it is connected to cleavages already available in the local context.

Thus, differences in the organisational structures, and some characteristics of how a collective actor of the unemployed is constructed (national scope and perception of a collective actor of the unemployed), seem to depend strongly on the type of political system. Claims and alliance building processes, as well as some types of engagement, are instead shaped by the specific contentious traditions of the two countries, and particularly the role unions play in the social benefit institutions. That is, the role of unions in the French social benefit system seems to be crucial for a public debate that forms fertile ground for 'concerned' actors to intervene in the debate. This means that the French unemployed form alliances with other poor people. In Germany the new social movement actors that have dominated the contentious space for the past decade are instead important allies for some organisations of the unemployed in Berlin. The contentious traditions in both countries, the presence of the labour conflict in France (Fillieule 1998) and the dominance of the new social movements in Germany (Koopmans 1995) are reflected here, pointing to the crucial role of neo-corporatist arrangements in shaping the space for challengers engaged on social topics (and for the quality of democracy in general, see Crouch 2006).¹⁸⁸ However, as my analysis suggests, unemployment provides a useful topic to build new alliances, and challenges the positions of the respective dominant actors in both France and Germany. That is, while on the one hand it suggests the continued importance of neo-corporatist traditions, on the other it points to their transformation. The contentious activities taking place around the issue of unemployment link two spheres of political activism that have usually formed two separate spheres of collective action: union activism and new(er) social movements.

Despite this structural impact of the political system on the organisations of the unemployed in terms of organisational structure and the existence of some types of

¹⁸⁸ In a way, neo-corporatist arrangements and contentious traditions form a bridge between general and more concrete opportunities. It would be worth taking these aspects into account in further developing the concept of concrete opportunities for unemployed actors.

organisations, there are many similarities between the two fields of unemployed contention. For example, although the political systems and contentious traditions of both countries, that is the dominance of the class conflict in France and the dominance of new social movements in Germany, explain some of the actors' orientations, unemployment contention in both cities is characterised by the link it provides between different movement families: old and new social movements (and the newest global justice movement). Indeed, as I have shown, on an individual level these two movement family identities are not perceived to be in conflict with each other.

In terms of two important aspects of unemployed action in particular there seem to be no major differences between the two cities. Firstly, in Paris as well as Berlin protest actions by the unemployed have been institutionalised in recent years. Secondly, both fields are characterised by organisations that continue to use disruptive activities that can be explained by certain properties of the organisations. That is, while the political opportunity structure explains some aspects of unemployed action, there are other conditions that it is crucial to take into account if one wants to explain the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed. Let me summarise these two important insights of the thesis in more detail.

Institutionalising contentious agency of the unemployed. Oxymoron or promise?

One major goal of the thesis was to specify the role of organisations of the unemployed and social movements, that is, to add to knowledge of social movements in an organisational perspective. As the description of the protest cycles in France and Germany suggest, contentious periods are difficult to stabilise over time. Protest by the unemployed, as for other challenging actors, happens when favourable conditions and various pre-conditions are present. In fact, it is often argued that it is not even desirable to stabilise protest waves over time. Protest as a tool for disturbing the everyday business of politics is more powerful as an occasional tool. Protest that is institutionalised on a daily, weekly or monthly basis will soon lose the interest of the media and thus an important mode of access to the public sphere. However, protest activities are not necessarily linked to major protest cycles. A primary interest was to define the relationship between major protest cycles, organisations, and protest activities (Clemens and Minkoff 2004).

Students of social movements have long been interested in what happens to the organisational field and how organisational agency changes once a protest wave fades. Often, it is assumed that protest organisations either dissolve or become different types of organisations. In the former perspective, organisations are assumed to exist as particular protest organisations. Once the contentious atmosphere disappears, these organisations lose their *raison d'être* and dissolve. In another perspective, organisations are assumed to survive periods of protest, but moderate their action repertoires to such an extent that they lose their original identity of movement organisations. Attempting to become legitimate players in conventional collective action, these organisations adapt, becoming, for example, non-profit actors. These organisations are not considered to be political actors because they take up matters of, for example, the welfare state without engaging in politics (Passy 2001; Crouch 2004). Finally, in a less radical perspective than those already mentioned, social movement organisations are assumed to change their action repertoires during more latent phases. Organisations give up public protest actions and focus instead on running an alternative infrastructure. That is, organisations may still feel that they belong to a social movement family (della Porta and Rucht 1995) or a specific movement, but engage in less contentious forms of action, such as organising conferences, publishing books, and creating alternative media landscapes.

The empirical description presented in the thesis shows that local organisations of the unemployed have survived the major protest cycles, and that Berlin and Paris are characterised by heterogeneous fields of lively organisations. The empirical description of the organisations of the unemployed in Paris and Berlin demonstrates the stability of the organisational structures, although stability means different things in the two cities. In Paris most organisations of the unemployed have existed for a comparatively long time, and most preceded as well as survived the protest wave of winter 1997. Berlin is characterised by a younger and more dynamic organisational field, but more organisations exist. Stability in Berlin means that a network of organisations and individuals exists which can respond to periods of increased tension by founding organisations. The empirical discussion therefore points to the relative stability of the organisational field of organisations of the unemployed.

Considering that the thesis focuses on those organisations of the unemployed that engage at least occasionally in protest action, one may argue that the contentious

agency of the unemployed can be (and is) stabilised over time by local organisations of the unemployed. That is, local organisations of the unemployed not only survive major protest cycles, but continue to engage in protest activities during more latent phases at the local level. While the general importance of local groups for mobilisation processes and the organisation of protest waves has been pointed out for other movements, it seems to be particularly important in order for the unemployed to sustain a contentious character. The strong emphasis of organisations of the unemployed on carrying out protest activities during more latent phases is exceptional compared to other organisations from the alternative sector, as studied by Rucht et al. (1997).

Organisations of the unemployed engage with the topic of unemployment in a number of ways. Discussing the main activities in which the organisations are involved reveals that caring activities and protest activities – particularly disruptive strategies (see below) - are important characteristics of unemployed action. Further, empowering strategies are important for organisations of the unemployed in both cities, although social empowerment strategies play a more important role for organisations in Berlin.

An interesting insight is that while most organisations keep their political and social activities in separate action spheres, some blur the distinction between social and political action. Organisations of the unemployed aim to get unemployed people involved in their actions via different forms of caring activities. While service provision by collective actors is not new – trade unions, for example, have long included caring activities in their action repertoires - the emphasis and goal of these activities for organisations of the unemployed are different. These organisations often bridge – or better blur - the differences between political and social activities in that their caring activities carry the explicit aim of getting people politically involved. The analysis suggests that political and caring activities are not necessarily opposed forms of collective engagement.

Political and caring activities (disruptive action and caring activities) indeed seem to follow different logics in that caring activities appear to be linked to the availability of individual resources, while disruptive strategies seem to be linked to the presence of a counter-cultural network. That is, the presence or absence of the same variable

does not explain the orientation of an organisation of the unemployed towards either political or social activities. What does seem to be important is whether organisations consider caring strategies as apolitical or not. The idea of what political and caring activities are and what role they play is important. Some organisations that are well-embedded in the movement culture of their city reject this type of caring activity as apolitical despite having enough resources to carry them out. Other groups have few resources and try to make up for their lack of legitimacy by providing services, considering caring activities as a moral resource. Still others invent new forms of engagement and invest caring activities with new meaning. Thus, much depends on how these activities are perceived: as civil engagement, as a second-order activity that takes human aspects into account, as apolitical since other organisations carry out welfare tasks, or as a form of empowering the poor.

In general, in terms of types of actors and activities the analysis suggests that protest is a crucial activity for local organisations of the unemployed even some years after major protest waves end, to the extent that I would speak of institutions of unemployment protest at the local level. Although local organisations of the unemployed are engaged in different types of activities, protest action is a crucial activity for them. However, organisations engage in various types of protest, as spaces for movement traditions targeting new challenges and creative places for inventing new forms of collective engagement.

What makes for disruptive action?

A second major concern of the thesis is to explain the use of disruptive strategies by organisations of the unemployed. Organisations of the unemployed can, like other movements, draw on a wide repertoire of protest forms to express their discontent. Following the interests of Piven and Cloward (1977), one of the major themes of the thesis was disruptive strategies. As Piven and Cloward argue, actors from the lower-stratum need to significantly disrupt public order in order to gain even the smallest concessions. These disruptive strategies are the main or only power-tool for poor people's movements (Piven and Cloward 1977, 1992). Various theoretical perspectives on social movement research have however argued that certain conditions deprive social movements of the power to carry out disruptive action. Most prominently, Piven and Cloward (1977) have argued that mass membership

organisations deprive poor people's actors of their capacity for spontaneous and disruptive action. Mass membership organisations channel the activities of the poor into the moderate activities that are typical of these.

Yet, as I have argued, a more nuanced understanding of the roles of different types of organisations, and in particular the focus on local and informal organisations, allows us to escape the rigid opposing concepts of organisation and disruption (see also Clemens and Minkoff, 2004). Indeed, as the findings in the second part of the thesis suggest, local organisations of the unemployed are important carriers of disruptive strategies. All together, nine of nineteen organisations consider disruptive strategies as crucial power tools to advance the claims of the unemployed. Thus, local organisations of the unemployed are places where disruptive strategies are developed and maintained. The continued presence of these organisations of the unemployed some years after the end of major protest waves suggests that there is no general tendency among social movements of the poor to adapt to conventional politics and lose their main power tools. Organisations of the unemployed not only continue to mount protests during more latent phases, they are also engaged in the more demanding and challenging forms of protest action usually typical to the beginnings of protest waves. It is not the foregone destiny of social movement organisations of the poor to become less disruptive.

However, while this is true for some organisations, not all organisations use disruptive strategies. To understand what lies behind the difference between disruptive and moderate organisations, I focused on the properties of organisations. Indeed, from the perspective of various strands of social movement studies it has been argued that certain characteristics of social movement organisations favour more moderate strategies, while others favour more disruptive ones. Drawing on a number of theoretical frameworks of social movement theory, I argued that four conditions in particular may explain the moderation of movement action. Firstly, access to resources is considered to channel movement action into activities typical of non-profit organisations. Secondly, access to the field of institutional actors is argued to moderate the tactical choices of movements. Here I combine arguments from the resource derivation debate with those of the political opportunity approach. Thirdly, I used insights from network analysis and studies on collective identity to argue for the moderation of organisations' tactical choices. Finally, I again used arguments from

the resource mobilisation approach that look at the individual resources of group members, that is, their previous experience of movement action. Discussing the relevant literature behind the main arguments, I suggested four ideal types that link these conditions to the degree of disruptiveness of a group. The moderation of groups' tactical choices is first indicated by the absence of protest activities and framing activities that can be characterised as disruptive, and second by the presence of caring activities.

In a first step I analysed the impact of each of these conditions on the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed separately. The findings pointed to different aspects. First of all, the empirical findings suggested that none of the conditions - except one - provided a strong explanation for organisations' tactical choices: only the type of network an organisation described themselves as belonging to seemed to be linked to its tactical choices. That is, where organisations of the unemployed describe themselves as belonging to a counter-cultural network, they show a strong tendency to use disruptive activities and frames. This finding points to the importance of counter-cultural movement infrastructures in empowering poor actors. While other social movement organisations and alternative groups do not necessarily provide direct support to the unemployed, counter-cultural networks provide fertile ground for empowering poor actors. Further, there seems to be a weak relationship between the experience of movement activists and the caring activities of an organisation: the less familiar members are with activism in social movement organisations, the more likely they are to provide services to the unemployed. Here again the availability of a movement infrastructure in which unemployed actors may gather their experience of movement activity seems crucial for stressing political over caring activities. The absence of resources and the exclusion from the field of actors does not explain tactical choices: these findings also confirm Cress's (1997) findings about homeless organisations, that is that support from facilitative organisations allows organisations to devote more time to collective action, while it has no effect on organisations' tactical choices.

The discussion of the single conditions therefore challenges the assumptions of the resource derivation (i.e. Haines, 1984) and political opportunity approaches (Kriesi et al. 1995), stressing instead the importance of pre-existing movement action and identities for empowering the poor to take political action. The discussion of the

single conditions suggests that the available movement infrastructures, and particularly the availability of movements that define their identity as opposed to mainstream politics and public institutions, are crucial.

A slightly different and more nuanced picture is provided by the Qualitative Comparative Analysis, which looks not at single conditions but configurations of conditions – one could also say different types of organisations. While the QCA also pointed to a crucial role for counter-cultural networks, the role of this condition is specified in that it is defined as a necessary condition. Belonging to a counter-cultural network is important: organisations without a counter-cultural identity will find it almost impossible to use disruptive strategies. Yet it merely belonging to such networks is not enough.

The QC analysis points to two different types of organisations that use disruptive strategies: firstly, organisations that belong to a counter-cultural network and have access to resources and the field of institutional actors, and secondly organisations that have no access to the field of institutional actors and are composed of experienced movement activists. Here again, the assumption that exclusion motivates actors to use disruptive strategies is challenged by the first type of organisation. In fact, it is those organisations with access to resources and the field of institutional actors that use disruptive strategies, while belonging to a counter-cultural network at the same time. This type of actor also challenges the assumption that counter-cultural networks are excluded from access to resources and centres of political and discursive power. These findings suggest that counter-cultural actors are able to distinguish between strategic interaction with supporting organisations and mainstream political and social actors on the one hand, and the construction of a counter-cultural identity in strong contrast to these organisations on the other. What I found to be of particular importance were discursive strategies responding to ideas of what dependency and influence mean: organisations that access state resources, for example, develop discursive strategies ridiculing the attempts of donor institutions to limit their tactical choices.

The second type of actor has no access to institutional actors. However, as the detailed discussion of these organisations suggests, this seems to be the result of a conscious choice to not seek support from institutional actors by experienced

movement actors. Here again, it is not exclusion that explains the use of disruptive strategies, but the strategic considerations of experts in this field of collective actors.

Disruptive unemployment action is therefore enabled either by experienced movement activists becoming unemployed or by their giving their irregular employment history a new contentious dimension where a counter-cultural movement infrastructure is available. That is, micro-level explanations combine with meso-level explanations. Or, disruptive unemployment action is enabled by the combination of a number of factors on the meso-level: the existence of a counter-cultural network, the possibility of establishing contacts with supporting actors and institutions, and the possibility of accessing resources. The findings therefore suggest that a network perspective is the most promising to understand and explain unemployed action, combined, however, with insights on the individual dispositions of the unemployed people involved. A qualitative perspective seems most fruitful in that patterns of unemployment action can be explained by the perceptions of these relationships among unemployment activists. Particularly interesting, in my opinion, is the study of memories of action repertoires contained in counter-cultural networks or the heads of experienced activists. It seems that a focus on the link between tactical choices and perceptions would be useful for understanding the collective (protest) actions of the unemployed.

In general, the findings of the present study point to the agency of unemployment actors where they use the right language. The transformation from a social group exposed to unalterable structures to a contentious collective actor is mirrored in the confident activities of local organisations of the unemployed. This is not to say that opportunities for different social groups are unequal: marginalised social groups, such as the unemployed, will always have more obstacles to overcome than others before they can make their claims heard. We may however decide to choose our scientific language more carefully by not exaggerating structural determinism: the more we recognise and emphasise these actors' tentative attempts at agency, the more we challenge self-fulfilling prophecies of the inability of some groups to stand up and become active citizens with a lot to say.

Methodological considerations and outlook

As an aside, one of the major findings of the thesis from a methodological point of view lies in the different results one may obtain by using a single theoretical approach focusing on one specific variable, or by looking at cases as composed of different aspects (see also della Porta 2008). While the discussion of the single conditions provides insights into the different explanatory powers of single variables – in the present study the strong link between belonging to a counter-cultural network and the use of disruptive activities as compared to the weaker link between movement experience and caring activities – it also overlooks the importance of other conditions. By using QCA, that is by moving in the direction of a case study approach, the specific role of some conditions becomes apparent. That is, some conditions explain the tactical choices of organisations of the unemployed only when combined with other conditions. The explanatory power here lies in the configuration of conditions, that is in the collage of conditions that must be either present or absent, rather than in one single condition. In this perspective the role of access to the field of institutional actors is crucial. Depending on context, in one case access is important to explain the use of disruptive activities by organisations of the unemployed, while in another the absence of access is crucial to explain the use of disruptive activities. My findings therefore strongly suggest the utility of integrating various theoretical frameworks when seeking to explain protest and movement action.

On a final note, unemployment as a contentious topic seems to provide fertile ground for new forms of active citizenship (Crouch 2004) combining identity politics (Eder 1993) with questions of social justice. On the one hand it is a form of political activism that moves away from (left-wing) political parties as the guarantors of the cause of ordinary people, in this case the unemployed. Political parties and trade unions – the other powerful institution that formerly represented a large section of the population – are considered as having betrayed the unemployed and left-wing ideas. On the other hand, unemployment is one of the few examples where a marginalised social group defending weak interests has intervened in the public sphere and become political. As I have shown in the empirical discussion, organisations of the unemployed have even managed to pull those unfamiliar with the ‘most committed’ forms of political activism into more demanding forms of political activism. Thus, the contentious actions of the unemployed mean more than the simple defence of a cause,

they are the broad and fruitful ground for challenging post-democratic tendencies. A focus on the empowering strategies of organisations through which ordinary people are pulled into political activism, as well as the conditions on the meso- and macro-levels that provide a favourable context for the organisations to do so, form an interesting perspective for future research.

Appendix A

List of Organisations of the Unemployed

A.1 Definition of the population

A full sample of local organisations in Paris and Berlin. Organisations of the unemployed are defined as all formal and informal organisations using protest activities to make claims on the issue of ‘unemployment’ or the ‘unemployed’ as one of the central topics of concern to the organisation. Further, at least half of the organisation’s members must be unemployed people.

Where one type of organisation exists that works on the level of the city and another at the level of the district, only the organisation working at the city level was considered (as was the case for AC! in Paris and unemployed verdi in Berlin, for example).

A.2 List of organisations of the unemployed

AC! (Agir ensemble contre le chômage et la précarité, Paris)

The organisation was founded in 1994 by unemployed people, critical unionists, employed people, pensioners, and students, as well as activists from other organisations. The national AC! network issued its first calls for action as early as 1992. The most active AC! members were found in Paris until 1999, meeting regularly in the ‘Maison des ensembles’ where a lot of associations and organisations had their offices and cooperated in organising collective activities. During the period of empirical investigation the organisation split into two parts, one more moderate and one more radical (in fact there were then three organisations AC! 19-20; AC! nord-ouest; and AC! collectif).

Aktionsbündnis (Soziales Aktionsbündnis Berlin)

The organisation – which considers itself more as a network of social actors in Berlin - was founded in 2004 but has a number of predecessors with similar names, with the same people often having been involved in these previous networks. Previous organisations were called social alliance 1 and 2, dealing with issues of education and unemployment, as well as other social issues. The organisation meets in the Haus der Demokratie und Menschenrechte, a space promoting civil engagement in Berlin. The organisation is composed of about 11 people, most of whom are also engaged in other organisations, trade unions or political parties.

Anders arbeiten (Anders arbeiten – oder gar nicht)

The organisation was founded after the congress of the same name in 1999. The organisation distinguishes itself from other organisations of the unemployed, but is composed mostly of unemployed people and works, amongst others, on the topic of unemployment. The organisation is also well connected to other organisations of the

unemployed, but members of the organisations or network are also engaged in other projects and social movements. While from 1999 to 2002 the organisation was mainly devoted to the organisation of two annual conferences, after the Hartz concept was introduced the organisation engaged in protest actions on the topic unemployment and participated at the Berlin Round Table of the unemployed and in the Anti-Hartz alliance. From then on more unemployed people joined the activities of the organisation. The organisation was composed of about seven people.

Anti-Hartz (Anti-Hartz Bündis)

The Anti-Hartz Bündis was founded after the Hartz concept was publicly presented in 2002 and a protest event in Berlin was organised to express discontent with the ideas it formulated. Originally the alliance gathered people from more than 70 different organisations, including the SPD, unions, as well as various social movement organisations and other parties. During the period of empirical investigation the organisation was composed of about six people.

Apeis (Association pour l'emploi, l'information et la solidarité des chômeurs et des précaires, Paris)

The organisation Apeis Paris belongs to the national Apeis organisation. While the national organisation was founded in 1987, the Paris organisation was founded in 1994. The organisation counts more than 300 members in Paris, but only five activists run the premises and mobilise for collective action. Compared with the other local Apeis organisations, this office has difficulties gaining access to financial and other support, although it is supported by the local communist party, which pays the rent for the premises, as well as the electricity and telephone bills.

Assol (Association d'aide aux chômeurs et précaires)

Assol was founded in 1986 by union activists and pensioners and has changed a lot over the years. The organisation was initially run by activists but today is run by professional staff, although voluntary activists are also engaged in the organisation. During the period of the empirical investigation the supervisory board was composed of 15 people.

CPP (Chômeurs et Précaires de Paris)

The organisation Chômeurs et Précaires de Paris was formally founded in 1996, but the organisation really dates from 1995 and the national public sector strikes initiated by members of the Green party. The organisation was composed of about 12 people during the period of my empirical investigation. The organisation works on the district level, and has its own premises. The organisation belongs to the national umbrella organisation MNCP.

Elvis (Erwerbsloseninitiative Schöneberg)

The organisation was founded by an unemployed active party member of the PDS in a district of Berlin in 2002. The organisation acts however independently from the local party and is one of the few independent counselling services points for the unemployed in Berlin. The organisation meets at the local premises of the party and can use its infrastructure. About five people were actively engaged in the organisation during the period of empirical research, but unemployed people also attend the regular unemployed breakfast meeting and feel they belong to the organisation, despite not being actively involved in its work.

Ermutigungskreis (Ermutigungskreis für Arbeitssuchende)

This organisation was founded on the initiative of a single unemployed person in 2003. The organisation is very small and usually no more than three people go to its meetings.

Erwin (Erwerbsloseninitiative Neukölln)

The Erwin organisation was founded in 1998 during the national mobilisation of the unemployed, on the initiative of a retired union activist. The organisation works in the local district of Neukölln and is composed of about 9 people. The organisation was the only non-union organisation of the unemployed to occasionally participate in the meetings of the Koordinierungstreffen der gewerkschaftlichen Erwerbsloseninitiativen (KOK) of the Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund (DGB) Berlin. The local organisations meets at the premises of the local PDS and can use its infrastructure.

Kampagne (Kampagne gegen Hartz IV)

The organisation was founded by movement activists in spring 2004 in order to organise protest activities against the fourth package of the Hartz reform and its implementation in January 2005. Most activists were previously active on social issues, particularly on education and the social and labour market politics of Berlin. The organisation is composed of about 17 people, while occasionally more people coming to the meetings of the organisation.

No service

This organisation was founded in summer 2003 by three activists who were organising public events on a regular basis. Most members knew each other before becoming more intensively engaged in the organisation. Three and a half years after its foundation the organisation was composed of about 10 people who regularly attended its weekly plenary sessions, while 10 to 20 more people are involved in the public protest activities of the organisation. The organisation became famous for organising the so-called '1Euro walks'. This protest form consisted of paying unexpected visits to the places where people were employed in 1-Euro jobs in order to initiate discussions with the employers and particularly with the people employed under these measures.

Selbsthilfegruppe (Selbsthilfegruppe der Geringverdienenden und Erwerbslosen in Pankow-Spitze)

The organisation was founded on the initiative of a single unemployed person who distributed leaflets in the East Berlin district of Pankow calling for the foundation of an organisation to defend the interests of people with little income. The organisation was then founded in June 2004 and meets once a month. While the organisation was initially composed of about six people, after the introduction of the Hartz reform in January 2005 many more people joined the organisation and it was composed of about 25 people who regularly came to meetings and were engaged in the activities of the organisation.

Unemployed Bau (Arbeitskreis Erwerbslose in der Ig Bau Berlin – union unemployed Ig Bau)

This union organisation of the unemployed was founded after a conference on public employment in 2003. The union had invited some unemployed people to participate in the event and these colleagues founded a working group. The organisation began its work at the beginning of 2004 with a number of presentations on the social statute. While at the first meeting more than 50 people participated, today the union organisation is composed of about 12 active members.

Unemployed Cgt (CGT Chômeurs Paris)

In Paris the union organisation has no official status but is organised as a coordination, that is, in a more informal way. The unemployed people of the union began to meet on a regular in 1997 when unemployed people all over France occupied the offices of the Assedics. Between 10 and 15 people regularly participate in meetings.

Unemployed Gew (Erwerbslosengruppe in der GEW Berlin – union unemployed GEW Berlin)

The union organisation of the unemployed has occasionally been very active and has long existed. It was however not possible to obtain information on its first activities, and it seems that a coordination meeting in 2005 considerably revived the membership structure and activities. However the organisation has been active since 1994, which is why I take this year as the founding year. About 9 people come regularly to meetings.

Unemployed Metall (Arbeitskreis Arbeitslose der IG Metall Berlin - union unemployed IG Metall)

The union unemployed organisation of IG Metall Berlin was founded at the beginning of the 1990s on the initiative of some union activists who founded a self-help organisation of the unemployed within the union. The organisation has only been formally recognised for a few years (ca. 2002), when the organisation was anchored within the statute of the union organisation. About 65 people belong to the organisation, but only about 30 people are active and come to meetings.

Unemployed Ngg (Arbeitslosenkreis in der NGG Berlin – union unemployed NGG)

In the mid-1990s a first initiative was started by the executive secretary inviting the unemployed to found a union unemployed organisation. The organisation came into being some years later, when in 1998 the organisation got involved in a number of local battles, most importantly the battle for a transport ticket for the unemployed. About 12 people meet every three months to organise collective activities.

Unemployed Verdi (Erwerbslosenausschuss Verdi Berlin - union unemployed Verdi Berlin)

The union verdi was founded in 2001 through the merger of five different unions. The previously existing union organisation of the unemployed of one of these unions (Gewerkschaft Öffentliche Dienste, Transport und Verkehr, ÖTV) continued to exist within the newly founded union Verdi, and is a formally recognised organisation within the union. The formal foundation of the union organisation is therefore dated to its foundation in 1994, with a long history of voluntary engagement on the topic since the late 1980s. The organisation is composed of about 35 people, of which about 15

are elected members of a committee. The Berlin organisation is further composed of three union organisations working at the district level.

Appendix B

List of semi-structured interviews with founders or long-term members of local organisations of the unemployed

Interview 1, Berlin, April 2004
Interview 2, Berlin, March 2004
Interview 3, Berlin, April 2004
Interview 4, Berlin, April 2004
Interview 5, Berlin, March 2005
Interview 6, Berlin, April 2004
Interview 7, Berlin, March 2005
Interview 8, Berlin, May 2005
Interview 9, Berlin, April 2005
Interview 10, Berlin, April 2005
Interview 11, Berlin, June 2005 (telephone interview)
Interview 12, Berlin, April 2005
Interview 13, Berlin, May 2005
Interview 14, Paris, July 2006
Interview 15, Paris, October 2006
Interview 16, Paris, November 2006
Interview 17, Paris, January 2007 (telephone interview)
Interview 18, Paris, December 2006
Interview 19, Berlin, May 2005

List of expert interviews

Interview 20, Berlin, May 2005
Interview 21, Paris, November 2006
Interview 22, Paris, November 2006
Interview 23, Paris, May 2006
Interview 24, Paris, October 2006
Interview 25, Berlin, May 2006 (telephone interview)
Interview 26, Paris, January 2007
Interview 27, Berlin, May 2005
Interview 28, Berlin, April, 2005
Interview 29, Berlin, February 2005
Interview 30, Berlin, April 2005
Interview 31, Berlin, May 2005
Interview 32, Berlin, March 2004
Interview 33, Berlin, May 2005 (telephone interview)

Appendix C

Semi-structured interview guide

First of all I would like to thank you for your time and for allowing me to interview you today. The interview should last about an hour.

I have different questions to ask you about the members of your group, your group's activities and also on cooperation with other groups, institutions and organisations.

Some of the questions are very precise and brief, while other are more open-ended and will allow you more scope for expressing your thoughts. In any case, feel free to intervene at any point and say whatever you'd like.

I am interested in information about your organisation I would therefore ask you to respond as a representative of that organisation rather than as an individual. If you should have an opinion very different to that of your organisation, I would be grateful if you could make that clear. Only the first three questions concern yourself and your relationship with this unemployed persons' organisation.

Question 1

How long have you been a member of this organisation (and how long has this organisation existed)?

Question 2

Do you also have other activities or commitments?

Question 3

What did you do before you became a member of this organisation?

We shall now move on to questions that concern your organisation more specifically.

Question 4

How many members (active members or sympathisers) does your group have? More precisely, how many people form the hard core of the group, and how many participate only occasionally?

Question 5

How long have these people been members of the groups? What were their motivations for doing so?

Question 6

Can you give me a detailed history of your group? For example, please state the reasons for which the group was founded.

Question 7

How, in your opinion, can the problem of unemployment be solved? What actions does your groups recommend? How could it participate in implementing them?

Question 8

To whom are your actions addressed: public opinion, other unemployed people, politicians, the unemployed people in your group? Who is your priority target?

Question 9

What are the most important forms of action for your group ? What types of action does your group consider most important and why? What forms of action have you used in the past year? Can you describe them?

Question 10

Do you have your own funds (financial resources)?

Question 11

Do you receive external aid? For example, public funding, donations or individual help from experts (lawyers, barristers), etc.

Question 12

Are these different sorts of aid different from those you have received in the past ? If so, what effects has this had on your actions?

Question 13

Do you know if members of your group are also members of other organisations or groups (not necessarily other organisations for the unemployed)?

Question 14

Do you know how many of your members have already participated in collective action such as strikes or sit-ins?

Question 15

Some groups are independent, while others are part of another organisation or network of social actors. Is your group a part of another organisation or network of actors ? (Does your group fit into this second category?)

Question 16

Do you coordinate actions with other groups? Do you have regular contact with an institution or another organisation? If so, please name them.

Question 17

Here is a list of different types of organisation. Can you tell me which types of organisation your group has already had contact with, and did it work?

- Trade Unions
- Churches
- Charities
- Public institutions
- Political Parties
- Groups or organisations from other social movements

Question 18

Apart from other organisations for the unemployed, what groups do you consider as part of a network engaged in the struggle against unemployment? Do you consider them as allies?

Question 19

Do the members of your group have direct contacts with other organisations or political parties or media organisations that help your organisation?

Question 20

What groups does your own refuse to collaborate with or consider as not part of a movement against unemployment?

Question 21

Where do you find the information useful to carrying out your activities, for example providing information on their rights to unemployed people that have just contacted your organisation?

Question 22

In your opinion, what are the most important or pivotal political decisions to have been taken in France in the past?

Question 23

Does your group have the possibility or the opportunity to influence politicians ? Have you noticed any changes in recent years? Can you name the politicians to whom you have posed your claims? Is it, on the contrary, impossible for you to have your grievances heard?

Question 24

Are there political parties more concerned with unemployed people, who are more sensitive to their needs? Is so, which ones?

Question 25

Which political or institutional actors try to limit (or expand) unemployed peoples' rights? For example, which actors supported the policy of limiting the financial resources of unemployed people?

Question 26

What in your opinion are the strengths and/or weaknesses of opposition actors who act against unemployment? (or the strengths and / or weaknesses of unemployed peoples' movements against unemployment?

Question 27

What institutional channels are there to defend the interests of unemployed people? (Examples, are given, in the French case: For example, is it possible to influence the decisions of UNEDIC?)

Question 28

Which procedures or measures concerning unemployed people have changed radically in recent years? Have there been changes that have satisfied or angered your group?

Question 29

Let us consider the national debate on unemployment and unemployed peoples in general. How do you find this subject is treated by the media? What is the central theme for the media?

Question 30

Who are the most important actors in this debate? In other words, who are the most influential actors in this debate?

Question 31

In your opinion, are there few or many actors participating in this debate?

Question 32

Are there perhaps more marginalised actors who nevertheless participate in the public debate on unemployment?

Question 33

In your opinion, what are the positions of the different participants in this debate? Are they generally in line with one another or do they hold very different opinions?

Question 34

Have the causes of the conflict changed in recent years? Are there new actors or new interpretations in the debate?

Question 35

How do the participants in this debate speak about 'unemployed people'? How do they introduce this figure into the debate on unemployment?

Question 36

In your opinion, do journalists have a strong position in the public debate?

Question 37

In the debate on unemployment different groups and organisations hold different opinions on the question of how to resolve the problem of unemployment. How would your group respond to this question? How do you approach and understand this question within your group? In what ways are you different to other organisations of the unemployed or other groups in general?

Question 38

What interpretations of the problem of unemployment is your group opposed to, or reject?

Question 39

Does your group produce any publications? A website?

Question 40

Would you like to add anything to this interview (something we haven't spoken about that you consider important when speaking about unemployment and unemployed peoples' activities)?

Thank you very much for the conversation and your time !

Appendix D

Individual Survey

D.1 German Survey

Vielen herzlichen Dank für Ihre Bereitschaft sich an diesem Forschungsvorhaben zu beteiligen. Die Informationen, die Sie mir mit Ihren Antworten zur Verfügung stellen, sind für dieses Vorhaben sehr wertvoll. Der Fragebogen ist selbstverständlich anonym und die Informationen werden ausschliesslich von mir gesichtet und bearbeitet.

Bitte nehmen Sie sich Zeit, die Fragen genau zu lesen und zu beantworten. Falls Sie eine Frage nicht beantworten möchten oder nicht wissen, was Sie ankreuzen sollen, kreuzen Sie bitte das Kästchen „☐keine Antwort“ an.

1. In welchem Monat und Jahr waren Sie zum ersten Mal bei einem Gruppentreffen dieser Gruppe?

- ☐ Monat ____ Jahr ____
- ☐ Heute zum ersten Mal
- ☐ Ich kann mich nicht mehr erinnern.
- ☐ keine Antwort

2. Wie viel Zeit widmen Sie ungefähr den Aktivitäten Ihrer Gruppe? Bitte geben Sie die durchschnittliche Zeit in Stunden pro Woche an.

- ☐ _____ Stunden pro Woche
- ☐ keine Antwort

3. Engagieren Sie sich auch außerhalb der Gruppe für das Thema “Erwerbslosigkeit”? Oder sind Sie nur im Rahmen dieser Gruppe aktiv? Bitte geben Sie die Zeit in Stunden pro Woche an.

- ☐ Ich bin nur im Rahmen dieser Gruppe aktiv.
- ☐ _____ Stunden pro Woche
- ☐ keine Antwort

4. Kommen Sie (fast) immer zu den Gruppentreffen, eher oft, manchmal, eher selten oder selten?

- ☐ fast immer/ immer
- ☐ eher oft
- ☐ manchmal
- ☐ eher selten
- ☐ selten

5. Wie kam es dazu, dass Sie zu diesen Gruppentreffen kommen? Bitte kreuzen Sie alle zutreffenden Felder an.

- ☐ Ich trug zu der Gründung der Gruppe bei
- ☐ Bekanntschaft mit Gruppenmitgliedern
- ☐ Ich wurde durch eine Veranstaltung der Gruppe auf die Gruppe aufmerksam
- ☐ Ich wurde durch Medien oder Flugblätter auf die Gruppe aufmerksam
- ☐ Anderes, bitte beschreiben _____

6. Als Sie anfangs zu der Gruppe stießen: Waren Sie gleich von Beginn an vertraut mit den Aktivitäten der Gruppe oder waren die Aktivitäten anfangs für Sie eine neue Erfahrung?

- ☐ Die Aktivitäten waren mir vertraut.
- ☐ Es war eine neue Erfahrung fuer mich
- ☐ Keine Antwort
- ☐ Kommentar _____

7. Das Engagement von Personen in einer Gruppe ist unterschiedlich. In welcher Art beteiligen Sie sich an den Aktivitäten Ihrer Gruppe? Bitte kreuzen Sie alle zutreffenden Felder an.

- ☐ Aktive Beteiligung an den Gruppendiskussionen
- ☐ Auftreten als Gruppensprecher/ in
- ☐ Formulierung von Briefen, Flugblättern oder offiziellen Dokumenten
- ☐ Beteiligung an der Formulierung von Briefen, Flugblättern oder offiziellen Dokumenten
- ☐ Organisation von Veranstaltungen
- ☐ Beteiligung an der Organisation von Veranstaltungen
- ☐ Weitergabe von Informationen an andere Gruppenmitglieder
- ☐ Anderes, und zwar _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

8. Was ist zur Zeit Ihr offizieller Status?

- ☐ regulär erwerbstätig (im Ersten Arbeitsmarkt)
- ☐ vorübergehend erwerbstätig (im Ersten Arbeitsmarkt)
- ☐ selbstständig
- ☐ erwerbslos, zur Zeit nicht beschäftigt in einem staatlichen Programm (wie ABM, 1-Euro Job oder anderes)
 - ☐ in einem staatlichen Programm beschäftigt (wie ABM, 1-Euro Jobs oder anderes)
- ☐ in Ausbildung
- ☐ Hausfrau/ Hausmann
- ☐ Rentner/ Renterin, Pensionär, Pensionärin
- ☐ Anderes, bitte angeben _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

9. Falls für Sie zutreffend: Bekommen Sie Sozialhilfe oder Arbeitslosenhilfe? Wenn ja, seit wann?

- ☐ Trifft nicht zu
- ☐ Ja, seit _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

10. Wenn Sie zu Zeit erwerbslos sind oder in einem staatlichen Beschäftigungsprogramm beschäftigt sind: Bis zu welchem Jahr sind sie einer regulären (sozialversicherungspflichtigen) Erwerbstätigkeit im Ersten Arbeitsmarkt nachgegangen.?

- ☐ Bis zum Jahr _____
- ☐ Ich war noch nie regulär beschäftigt

11. Was war Ihre letzte Erwerbstätigkeit, wenn Sie zur Zeit erwerbslos sind?

- _____
- ☐ Ich war noch nie beschäftigt

12. Was ist zur Zeit Ihre Erwerbstätigkeit, wenn Sie zur Zeit erwerbstätig sind?

13. Wenn Sie in der Vergangenheit erwerbstätig waren oder wenn Sie zur Zeit erwerbstätig sind:

13a: Welche Aussagen beschreiben am besten ihre Arbeitsbeziehung?

- ☐ Ich führte Arbeit aus, die mir zugewiesen wurde, ein Vorgesetzter kontrollierte meine Arbeit.
- ☐ Obwohl mir Aufgaben zugewiesen wurden, musste/ konnte ich mir meine Arbeit selbst einteilen.
- ☐ Ich war vollständig unabhängig in meiner Arbeit.

13b: Wieviele Personen haben Ihnen Weisungen bei Ihrer Arbeit erteilt?

13c Falls zutreffend: Wievielen Personen haben Sie Weisungen erteilt?

13d: Wie groß war das Unternehmen/ Betrieb, bei dem Sie erwerbstätig waren/ sind?

- ☐ bis zu 10 Beschäftigte
- ☐ bis zu 50 Beschäftigte
- ☐ bis zu 100 Beschäftigte
- ☐ mehr als 100 Beschäftigte

14. Welche Ausbildung haben Sie?

- ☐ Kein Schulabschluss
- ☐ Haupt- oder Realschulabschluss
- ☐ Abitur
- ☐ Ausbildung als _____
- ☐ Meister/ Meisterin _____
- ☐ Studiert, ohne Abschluss
- ☐ Zur Zeit Studium
- ☐ Studienabschluss, Fach _____
- ☐ Anderes, bitte angeben _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

15. Bevor Sie in dieser Gruppe aktiv wurden: An welchen der folgenden politischen und sozialen Aktivitäten hatten Sie bereits in der Vergangenheit teilgenommen? Bitte kreuzen Sie alle zutreffenden Felder an.

- ☐ Wählen
- ☐ Ehrenamtliche Mitarbeit bei einer Organisation oder bei der Kirche
- ☐ Arbeitsstreiks
 - ☐ Teilnahme an öffentlichen Protestaktivitäten, wie Demonstrationen oder öffentlichen Versammlungen
- ☐ Verteilung von Flugblättern
- ☐ öffentliche Ansprache bei einer Demonstration
- ☐ Gründung einer Gruppe im folgenden Themenbereich _____
- ☐ Teilnahme an einer Protestaktivität, wie Besetzungen oder radikalen symbolischen Aktionen
- ☐ militante Aktionen
- ☐ Anderes, bitte angeben _____

16. Wenn Sie bereits in der Vergangenheit- das heißt bevor Sie zu dieser Gruppe stießen- an politischen oder sozialen Aktivitäten teilgenommen haben: Welchen Themengebieten lassen sich diese Aktivitäten zuordnen? Bitte kreuzen Sie alle zutreffenden Felder an.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ich habe an keiner der folgenden Aktivitäten teilgenommen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ökologie und Umwelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Globalisierung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soziale Gerechtigkeit | <input type="checkbox"/> Frauenbewegung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nukleare Energie | <input type="checkbox"/> Frieden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Einwanderung, Menschenrechte | <input type="checkbox"/> Rassismus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arbeitsbedingungen | <input type="checkbox"/> Arbeiterbewegung |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studentenbewegung | <input type="checkbox"/> Schwule/ Lesben |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bildung | <input type="checkbox"/> Erwerbslosigkeit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Obdachlosigkeit | <input type="checkbox"/> Bürgerrechte |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gesundheit | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Faschismus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gegen allgemeine Politik | <input type="checkbox"/> Wohnungspolitik |
| <input type="checkbox"/> spezifische politische Entscheidung, und zwar _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anderes, bitte angeben _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Keine Antwort | |

17. Falls Sie bereits in der Vergangenheit politisch aktiv waren: Welche Rolle hatten Sie bei diesen Aktivitäten? Bitte kreuzen Sie alle zutreffenden Antworten an.

- ☐ Ich habe selbst eine Gruppe gegründet
- ☐ Ich habe lediglich an Aktivitäten teilgenommen
- ☐ Ich habe Veranstaltungen mit organisiert
- ☐ Ich war in einer/ mehreren Gruppen engagiert

18. Sind Sie Mitglied einer anderen Gruppe, die zu dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ arbeitet, oder besuchen Sie zur Zeit eine andere Erwerbslosengruppe?

- ☐ Nein, ich komme nur zu den Treffen dieser Gruppe
- ☐ Ja, ich gehe zu den Treffen der folgenden Gruppe: _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

19. Falls Sie noch anderen Gruppen angehören, die zu dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ arbeiten: Versuchen Sie diese Gruppen miteinander in Kontakt zu bringen? Wenn ja, wie?

- ☐ Ich gehöre keiner anderen Gruppe an.
- ☐ Ich gehöre zwar mehreren Gruppen an, diese haben aber nichts miteinander zu tun.
- ☐ Die Gruppen stehen bereits in Kontakt miteinander.
- ☐ Ich versuche die Gruppen miteinander in Kontakt zu bringen, und zwar folgendermassen:

20. Bevor Sie in dieser Gruppe aktiv wurden: Waren Sie früher bereits in kleineren Gruppen engagiert, die zu anderen Themen arbeiteten als zu dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“? Falls ja, können Sie bitte den Gruppennamen und das Thema der Gruppe auflisten?

- ☐ Nein, ich war nie in einer anderen Gruppe engagiert, bevor ich zu dieser Gruppe stiess
- ☐ Ja, ich war in folgender/ folgenden Gruppen
- | | |
|--------------|-------------|
| Gruppe _____ | Thema _____ |
| Gruppe _____ | Thema _____ |
- ☐ Keine Antwort

21. Waren oder sind Sie Mitglied in einer der folgenden Organisationen? Wenn ja, in welcher? Für welchen Zeitraum waren Sie Mitglied oder seit wann sind sie Mitglied?

- ☐ Partei, und zwar in der _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Gewerkschaft, und zwar in der _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Kirche, und zwar _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Verein, und zwar in dem _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Kulturelle Institution, und zwar _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Anderes, und zwar _____ von/ seit _____ bis _____
- ☐ Keine Antwort

22. Waren Sie aktives Gewerkschaftsmitglied in der Vergangenheit oder sind Sie zur Zeit aktives Gewerkschaftsmitglied? Wenn ja, seit wann?

- ☐ Ja, seit _____ bis _____
☐ Nein

23. Bevor Sie zum ersten Mal zu den Treffen dieser Gruppe kamen: Haben Sie manchmal an den Demonstrationen zum 1. Mai teilgenommen?

- ☐ Nein
☐ Ja, an der Demonstration die von den Gewerkschaften organisiert wurden
☐ Ja, an anderen Demonstrationen, die von kritischen Gruppen organisiert wurden
☐ Ja, an den Erster-Mai-Festen
☐ Ja, an den radikalen Aktivitäten
☐ Keine Antwort

24. Welche Gruppen und Organisationen kennen Sie, die zu dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ arbeiten? Bitte listen Sie die Gruppen auf.

25. Nehmen Sie manchmal an Veranstaltungen oder Aktivitäten zu dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ teil, die von anderen Gruppen organisiert werden? Wenn ja: Welche Gruppen sind das? Bitte listen Sie diese Gruppen auf.

- ☐ Ja, ich nehme gelegentlich an den Veranstaltungen folgender Gruppen teil:
☐ Nein, ich nehme nur an Veranstaltungen dieser Gruppe teil
☐ Keine Antwort

26. Haben Sie Freunde, Bekannte oder Kollegen in anderen Gruppen, die sich für das Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ engagieren ?

- ☐ Nein, ich kenne niemanden ausserhalb der Gruppe, der sich für das Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ engagiert
☐ Ich habe Freunde/ Freundinnen, die sich in der folgenden Gruppe engagieren
☐ Ich habe Bekannte, die sich in der folgenden Gruppe engagieren
☐ Ich habe Kollegen/ Kolleginnen, die sich in der folgenden Gruppe engagieren

27. Haben Sie Kontakte zu Personen oder Institutionen (wie z.B. Politiker/PolitikerInnen, Presse usw.) die hilfreich für diese Gruppe sind?

- ☐ Ja, und zwar _____
 - ☐ Nein
 - ☐ Keine Antwort
 - ☐ Kommentar
-

28. Informieren Sie manchmal andere Personen, wie zum Beispiel andere Erwerbslose, Mitglieder anderer Gruppen, Personen in Institutionen oder Journalisten über die Aktivitäten dieser Gruppe? Wenn ja, könnten Sie bitte angeben, welcher Gruppe, Institution oder Presse diese Personen gegebenenfalls angehören?

- ☐ Nein, ich informiere niemanden über die Aktivitäten der Gruppe
 - ☐ Ja, ich informiere Erwerbslose aus meinem Bekanntenkreis
 - ☐ Ja, ich informiere Personen aus folgenden Gruppen oder Institutionen über Aktivitäten dieser Gruppe:
-
-

29. Fühlten oder fühlen sie sich der Arbeiterbewegung zugehörig?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | <input type="checkbox"/> keine Antwort |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | <input type="checkbox"/> Ich weiß nicht |

30. Fühlen sie sich der neuen sozialen Bewegung zugehörig?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ja | <input type="checkbox"/> keine Antwort |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nein | <input type="checkbox"/> Ich weiß nicht |

31. Alter

- ☐ Jünger als 30
- ☐ Zwischen 30 und 39
- ☐ Zwischen 40 und 49
- ☐ Zwischen 50 und 59
- ☐ Zwischen 60 und 65
- ☐ Über 65
- ☐ Keine Antwort

32. Geschlecht

- ☐ Männlich
- ☐ Weiblich

33. Postleitzahl Ihres Wohnsitzes

34. Ihre Meinung: Stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu, oder lehnen Sie die folgenden Aussagen ab? Bitte kreisen Sie die zutreffende Zahl zwischen 10 (ich stimme voll zu) und 1 (ich lehne voll ab) ein.

Die SPD ist die Partei, welche die Interessen der Arbeiter vertreten sollte.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Die SPD ist die Partei, welche die Interessen der Erwerbslosen vertreten sollte

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Die Arbeiterbewegung ist eine wichtige Errungenschaft der deutschen Geschichte.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Die sogenannten „Neuen Sozialen Bewegungen“ wie die Umweltbewegung, die Frauenbewegung und die Anti-Atomkraftbewegung sind wichtige Errungenschaften der deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Gewerkschaften sind der richtige Ort, um die Interessen der Erwerbslosen durchzusetzen.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Die Rolle der Gewerkschaften sollte ausgebaut werden, damit die Interessen der Erwerbslosen besser vertreten werden können.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu									lehne voll ab

Die folgenden Organisationen sind am besten geeignet, die Interessen der Erwerbslosen zu vertreten:

Gewerkschaften

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Kritische Gewerkschaften

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Erwerbslosengruppen

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Linke Parteien

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Rechte Parteien

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Kirche

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll ab	

Wohlfahrtsorganisationen

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
stimme voll zu								lehne voll	
ab									

Soziale Bewegungen

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
stimme voll zu lehne voll ab

Linksradikale Gruppen

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
stimme voll zu lehne voll
ab

Welcher der folgenden Aussagen stimmen Sie am ehesten zu? Bitte alle zutreffenden Felder ankreuzen.

- ☐ *Arbeitslosenhilfe sollte eigentlich unabhängig davon gezahlt werden, ob jemand gearbeitet hat oder arbeiten will. (Arbeit hier verstanden als alle Aktivitäten, auch Nicht-Erwerbstätigkeit)*
- ☐ *Arbeitslosenhilfe sollte eigentlich nur denen gezahlt werden, die sich auch für die Gesellschaft engagieren.*
- ☐ *Arbeitslosenhilfe sollte Bedürftigen unabhängig von ihren Leistungen gezahlt werden.*
- ☐ *Die Höhe der Arbeitslosenhilfe sollte sich nach den vorherigen Leistungen (Dauer und Höhe des Beitrags) richten.*
- ☐ *Die Höhe der Arbeitslosenhilfe sollte sich nicht nach der Dauer und Höhe der Beitragszahlungen richten.*

35. Dem Thema „Erwerbslosigkeit“ wird meiner Meinung nach am besten folgendermaßen begegnet:

Vielen Dank für Ihre wertvolle Hilfe und Ihre Kooperation. Wenn Sie Fragen zu meinem Forschungsvorhaben haben, kontaktieren Sie mich bitte unter folgender Adresse. Ich stehe Ihnen gern für alle Auskünfte und Fragen zur Verfügung.

D. 2 French Survey

Merci beaucoup pour votre disponibilité à participer à ce projet de recherche !

Il vous faudra entre 10 et 15 minutes pour remplir ce questionnaire. Prenez le temps de bien lire les questions. Si vous avez des questions, vous pouvez bien entendu me contacter (voir mon adresse ci-dessus). Dans le cas où vous ne voudriez pas répondre à une question, cochez la case « ☐Aucune réponse ».

Les informations que vous donnerez me sont très précieuses. Elles sont naturellement anonymes et je serai la seule personne à les examiner.

1. Quand avez-vous fréquenté ce groupe pour la première fois ?

- ☐ C'était en _____ (mois) _____ (année)
- ☐ Aujourd'hui pour la première fois
- ☐ Je ne me rappelle pas
- ☐ Aucune réponse

2. Combien de temps - en moyenne – dédiez-vous aux activités de votre groupe ? Veuillez indiquer le temps moyen en nombre d'heure par semaine.

- ☐ Je dédis en moyenne _____ heure(s) par semaine.
- ☐ Aucune réponse

3. Avez-vous pris des engagements dans une autre organisation qui lutte contre le chômage (auquel cas veuillez préciser le temps moyen consacré) ou concentrez-vous votre activité dans ce groupe uniquement ?

- ☐ Je suis engagé uniquement dans ce groupe de lutte contre le chômage.
- ☐ Je suis aussi engagé dans un autre groupe à raison de _____ heure(s) par semaine.
- ☐ Aucune réponse

4. Êtes-vous présent(e) aux réunions organisées par votre groupe : presque toujours, plutôt souvent, quelque fois, plutôt rarement ou rarement ?

- ☐ Presque à chaque fois
- ☐ Plutôt souvent
- ☐ Quelque fois
- ☐ Plutôt rarement
- ☐ Rarement
- ☐ Aucune réponse

5. Pour quelle raison avez-vous commencé à fréquenter ce groupe ?

- ☐ J'ai contribué à la fondation du groupe.
- ☐ Je connaissais déjà des membres du groupe.
- ☐ J'ai connu le groupe grâce à une manifestation qu'il a organisée.
- ☐ J'ai vu le groupe dans les médias *ou* j'ai lu des tracts.
- ☐ Autres : _____

6. Souvenez-vous de votre première rencontre avec le groupe : était-ce pour vous une expérience familière ou au contraire une expérience nouvelle?

- ☐ C'était une expérience familière.
- ☐ C'était une expérience nouvelle.
- ☐ Aucune réponse
- ☐ Commentaire : _____

7. L'engagement dans un groupe est toujours très différent selon les personnes. De quelle manière participez-vous aux actions organisées par votre groupe ?

- ☐ Participation active aux discussions du groupe
- ☐ Porte-parole du groupe
- ☐ Rédaction des lettres, des tracts ou des documents officiels
- ☐ Participation à la rédaction des lettres, des tracts ou des documents officiels
- ☐ Organisation de manifestations
- ☐ Participation à l'organisation de manifestations
- ☐ Transmission d'informations aux autres membres du groupe
- ☐ Autres : _____
- ☐ Aucune réponse

8. Quel est votre statut officiel ?

- ☐ Membre actif régulier
- ☐ Membre actif passager
- ☐ Membre indépendant
- ☐ Chômeur, chômeuse
- ☐ Membre actif dans un programme public (par exemple un 'contrat initiative emploi' ou autre)
- ☐ En formation, en stage
- ☐ menagere/ menager
- ☐ Retraité
- ☐ Autres : _____
- ☐ Aucune réponse

9. Percevez-vous l'Allocation Spécifique de Solidarité (ASS) ou le Revenu Minimum d'Insertion (RMI) ou une autre allocation de fin de droits ?

- ☐ Non
- ☐ Oui, depuis _____, je perçois _____.
- ☐ Aucune réponse

10. Si vous êtes au chômage ou si vous êtes actif(ve) dans un programme public : Jusqu'à quel âge avez-vous travaillé de façon régulière sur le marché du travail ?

- ☐ Jusqu'à ____ ans
- ☐ Je n'ai jamais travaillé régulièrement.

11. Quel était votre dernière occupation ou votre dernier emploi ?

12. Quelle est votre occupation actuelle / emploi actuel ?

13. Dans le cas où vous avez exercé une activité dans le passé ou que vous l'exercez actuellement :

13.a Veuillez décrire votre poste :

- ☐ Des tâches me sont (m'étaient) assignées et un supérieur contrôle (contrôlait) mon travail.
- ☐ Des tâches me sont (m'étaient) assignées mais je suis (j'étais) relativement indépendant(e) dans mon travail.
- ☐ Je suis (ou j'étais) complètement indépendant(e) dans mon travail.
- ☐ Aucune réponse

13.b Combien des personnes vous dictent (ou dictaient) vos tâches, vous dirigeant (dirigeaient) ?

13.c Au contraire, combien de personnes dirigez-vous (ou dirigiez-vous) vous-même ?

13.d Combien de personnes compte (ou comptait) l'entreprise ?

14. Quelle est votre formation ?

- ☐ Certificat d'études
 - ☐ Brevet des Collèges
 - ☐ BEP/ CAP
 - ☐ Niveau Bac : Baccalauréat ou BT
 - ☐ Niveau Bac + 2 : DEUG, DUT, BTS
 - ☐ Niveau Bac + 3 : Licence
 - ☐ Niveau Bac + 4 : Maîtrise
 - ☐ Niveau Bac + 5 : DESS, DEA, Master
 - ☐ Niveau Bac + 7 : Doctorat
 - ☐ Pour les études universitaires, précisez la faculté : _____
-
- ☐ Études poursuivies sans obtention de diplôme : _____
 - ☐ Études poursuivies actuellement : _____
 - ☐ Autres : _____

15. Avant d'être membre de ce groupe, quelles activités exerciez-vous déjà ou à quelle action aviez-vous déjà participé ?

- ☐ Voter
- ☐ Engagement bénévole dans une organisation laïque ou religieuse
- ☐ Participation à une grève
- ☐ Participation à des protestations publiques, comme des manifestations ou des réunions publiques
- ☐ Distribution de tracts
- ☐ Discours public lors d'une manifestation
- ☐ Fondation d'un groupe à la thématique suivante : _____
- ☐ Participation à des actions radicales, comme des occupations ou d'autres actions symboliques
- ☐ Actions très radicales
- ☐ Autres : _____

16. Dans le cas où vous étiez déjà actif politiquement ou socialement avant de connaître le groupe, dans quel domaine ou pour défendre quelle idée avez-vous exercé ces activités ?

- ☐ Dans le passé, je n'ai jamais participé à des actions politiques ou sociales
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Écologie et environnement | <input type="checkbox"/> Globalisation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Justice sociale | <input type="checkbox"/> Mouvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> féministe | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Énergie nucléaire | <input type="checkbox"/> Paix |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Immigration et droits de l'homme | <input type="checkbox"/> Racisme |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions de travail | <input type="checkbox"/> Mouvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ouvrier | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Université, conditions des étudiants | <input type="checkbox"/> Homosexualité |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Éducation / formation | <input type="checkbox"/> Chômage |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Problèmes de logement | <input type="checkbox"/> Droit du |
| <input type="checkbox"/> citoyen | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Santé | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti- |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fascisme | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contre la politique en général | <input type="checkbox"/> Politique de |
| <input type="checkbox"/> logement | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pour ou contre une décision politique spécifique, à savoir : | |
| <hr/> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Autres : <hr/> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aucune réponse | |

17. Dans le cas où vous avez déjà participé à des actions dans le passé, quel rôle avez-vous joué ?

- ☐ J'ai fondé un groupe.
- ☐ J'ai « seulement » participé à des activités.
- ☐ J'ai organisé des manifestations, des événements importants.
- ☐ Je me suis engagé dans des groupes différents.
- ☐ Aucune réponse.

18. Participez-vous à d'autres rencontres que celles organisées par votre groupe ?

- ☐ Non, je viens seulement aux rencontres de mon groupe.
- ☐ Oui, je vais aussi à des rencontres organisées par d'autres groupes, à savoir :

- ☐ Aucune réponse.

19. Dans le cas où vous fréquentez d'autres groupes qui s'engagent dans la lutte contre le chômage, tentez-vous de les mettre en contact les uns les autres ?

- ☐ Je ne fréquente pas d'autres groupes.
- ☐ Je fréquente d'autres groupes mais ils n'ont rien en commun.
- ☐ Les groupes sont déjà en contact.
- ☐ Je tente de mettre les groupes en contact de la manière suivante :

20. Avant de devenir un membre actif de ce groupe, avez-vous déjà été engagé(e) dans d'autres groupes qui luttent dans d'autres domaines ? Si oui, pourriez-vous en faire la liste ?

- ☐ Non, je ne me suis jamais engagé(e) dans un autre groupe.
- ☐ Oui, j'ai été engagé(e) dans le(s) groupe(s) suivant(s) :

Nom du groupe : _____ - Thématique

Nom du groupe : _____ - Thématique

Nom du groupe : _____ - Thématique

- ☐ Aucune réponse

21. Êtes-vous (ou avez-vous été) membre d'une des organisations suivantes ?

- ☐ Parti politique, à savoir _____, de _____ à _____ (années)
- ☐ Association ou institution religieuse, à savoir _____, de _____ à _____ (années)
- ☐ Association, à savoir _____, de _____ à _____ (années)
- ☐ Institution culturelle, à savoir _____, de _____ à _____ (années)
- ☐ Autres : _____
- ☐ Aucune réponse

22. Êtes-vous (ou avez-vous été) membre d'un syndicat ?

- ☐ Oui, membre passif, dans le syndicat suivant : _____
- ☐ Oui, membre actif, dans le syndicat suivant : _____
- ☐ Non

23. Avant votre adhésion à votre groupe, aviez-vous participé à des manifestations le jour du 1^{er} mai ?

- ☐ Non.
- ☐ Oui, à la (aux) manifestation(s) organisée(s) par le(s) syndicat(s) 'traditionnels'
- ☐ Oui, à la manifestation organisée par les syndicats 'nouveaux'
- ☐ Oui, aux festivités du 1^{er} mai.
- ☐ Oui, à des actions radicales.
- ☐ Aucune réponse.

**24. Quels groupes engagés dans la lutte contre le chômage connaissez-vous ?
Pouvez-vous en faire la liste ci-dessous ?**

25. Participez-vous quelquefois à des manifestations organisées par d'autres groupes et qui ont pour thématique le « chômage » ?

- ☐ Oui, quelquefois je participe aux manifestations du(des) groupe(s) suivant(s) :

- ☐ Non, je vais seulement aux manifestations organisées par mon groupe.
- ☐ Aucune réponse.

26. Avez-vous des amis, des connaissances ou des collègues qui sont actifs dans d'autres groupes qui luttent contre le chômage ?

- ☐ Non, je ne connais personne qui se soit engagé dans ce domaine, à part les membres de notre groupe.
- ☐ J'ai des amis qui se sont engagés dans le(s) groupe(s) suivant(s) :

- ☐ J'ai des connaissances qui se sont engagées dans le(s) groupe(s) suivant(s) :

- ☐ J'ai des collègues qui se sont engagés dans le(s) groupe(s) suivant(s) :

27. Avez-vous des contacts avec des personnes ou institutions qui aident votre groupe, comme par exemple des politiciens, des médias ou d'autres contacts ?

☐ Oui, à savoir

☐ Non

☐ Aucune réponse

☐ Commentaire :

28. Informez-vous quelquefois d'autres personnes sur les activités de votre groupe, comme par exemple d'autres chômeurs, des membres d'autres organisations, des personnes de certaines institutions ou des journalistes ?

☐ Non, je n'informe personne sur les activités du groupe.

☐ Oui, j'informe d'autres chômeurs que je connais.

☐ Oui, j'informe d'autres personnes sur les activités de mon groupe. Ces personnes font partie des organisations / médias / institutions suivant(e)s :

29. Considérez-vous faire partie d'un mouvement social d'ouvriers ?

☐ Oui

☐ Je ne sais pas.

☐ Non

☐ Aucune réponse

30. Considérez-vous faire partie des nouveaux mouvements sociaux ?

☐ Oui

☐ Je ne sais pas.

☐ Non

☐ Aucune réponse

31. Âge : Dans quelle tranche vous situez-vous ?

☐ moins de 30 ans

☐ de 30 à 39 ans

☐ de 40 à 49 ans

☐ de 50 à 59 ans

☐ de 60 à 65 ans

☐ plus de 65 ans

☐ Aucune réponse

32. Sexe

- ☐ Masculin
☐ Féminin

33. Code postal de votre domicile

— — — — —

34. Êtes-vous en accord ou en désaccord avec les déclarations suivantes ?
Entourez un nombre entre 10 (plein accord) et 1 (complet désaccord) de
façon à exprimer au plus près votre opinion.

« *Le parti socialiste est le parti qui doit défendre les intérêts des ouvriers.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

« *Le parti socialiste est le parti qui doit défendre les intérêts des chômeurs.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

« *Les mouvements sociaux des ouvriers ont été déterminants dans l'histoire française.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

« *Les nouveaux mouvements sociaux comme les mouvements écologiques, les mouvements féministes ou les mouvements anti-nucléaire, ont été déterminants dans l'histoire française.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

« *Les syndicats constituent le juste lieu pour représenter les intérêts des chômeurs.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

« *Le rôle des syndicats doit être de s'agrandir / se développer pour représenter les intérêts des chômeurs.* »
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

35. Quelles sont, parmi les organisations suivantes, celles qui, selon vous, défendent le mieux les intérêts des chômeurs ?

			Syndicats traditionnels							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Nouveaux syndicats							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Organisations de chômeurs							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Partis politiques de gauche							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Partis politiques de droite							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Institutions religieuses							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Organisations de bénévolat							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

			Mouvements sociaux							
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
complètement d'accord										pas du tout d'accord

Groupes radicaux de gauche

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

complètement d'accord pas du tout d'accord

**36. Quelles sont les déclarations suivantes avec lesquelles vous êtes d'accord ?
Veuillez cocher les cases correspondantes :**

- ☐ *L'Allocation Spécifique de Solidarité (ASS) et le Revenu Minimum d'Insertion (RMI) devraient être alloués indépendamment du fait que la personne a déjà travaillé ou veut travailler dans le futur (par travail, on entend ici également le travail bénévole).*
- ☐ *L'Allocation Spécifique de Solidarité (ASS) et le Revenu Minimum d'Insertion (RMI) devraient être alloués à tous ceux qui s'engagent pour la société, en tant que travailleurs ou bénévoles.*
- ☐ *Le Revenu Minimum d'Insertion (RMI) devrait être alloué seulement à ceux qui sont dans le besoin.*
- ☐ *Le montant de l'Allocation Spécifique de Solidarité (ASS) devrait dépendre de la contribution ou des charges payées par les personnes durant leur activité, avant qu'elles soient sans emploi.*
- ☐ *Le montant de l'Allocation Spécifique de Solidarité (ASS) ne devrait pas dépendre de la contribution ou des charges payées par les personnes durant leur activité, avant qu'elles se retrouvent sans emploi.*

37. Le chômage pourrait être résolu de la manière suivante

*Merci beaucoup pour votre précieuse collaboration !!!
Si vous avez des questions sur mon projet de recherche, vous pouvez me contacter à
l'adresse ci-dessus (1ère page du questionnaire).*

Appendix E

Comparing Berlin and Paris. Some general economic features of Paris and Berlin.

Paris and Berlin are considered similar economic regions. Data compiled by the European Commission (Eurostat's regional statistics [Regio])¹⁸⁹ allow a comparison of the two cities' economic performances. Analysing and combining the values of different economic variables, five types of regional economic performers are distinguished. Paris (Île-de-France) and Berlin are both part of the first type of region with a high average income, high shares of value-added produced by the service sector, and higher than average skills.

Berlin is the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany and one of the country's 16 federal states (a city-state). Since the 1990s - after German reunification - Berlin's economy has undergone structural changes. Once dominated by industrial production, Berlin's economy is now characterised by investment in the technology sector and its largest employer is the service sector. However, the effects of the structural change were not felt uniformly and some districts in particular that were previously industrial districts have suffered an economic decline since 1990, and have high unemployment rates. Generally Berlin's unemployment rate is above the national average (see *table F.1*).

Paris is the capital of France, and lies at the heart of the Île-de-France region. The Parisian economy produces about 28% of the national GDP. As in Berlin the service sector dominates as an employer. Paris is France's leading industrial region, although the past 15 years have brought a pronounced decline in industrial jobs. The growth of tertiary activities has failed to fully offset these losses and this is reflected in the labour market.

¹⁸⁹ The regions are the so-called NUTS (Nomenclature of territorial Units for Statistics) which describe a sub-division of Member States into a number of regions, firstly at the NUTS level, and then into further smaller units. Usually these units are administrative units. More information on NUTS can be found on the Eurostat website: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nuts/splash_regions.html.

Table E.1 – Employment, social and civic characteristics of the regions Paris (Île-de-France) and Berlin, 2005 (%), NUTS level 2

Employment characteristics	Economic activity rate (%)	Unemployment rate* (%)	Long-term unemployment rate** (%)	Poor households (%)	Local voting (%)
EU (27)	56.8	9.0	46.1	n.a.	n.a.
Paris (Île-de-France)	60.3	9.5	44.5	~ 10	~ 61
Berlin	59.8	19.4	58.5	~ 20	~ 68

Source: Eurostat/ REGIO-Data, date of extraction 13 March 2007, and Urban Audit City profiles, date of extraction 13 March 2007

*NUTS level 3

**on total unemployment (12 months and longer)

*** Percentage of households receiving less than half of the national average household income, city profiles from 2001

**** Percentage of registered electorate voting in city elections, city profiles from 2001

The unemployment rate has been relatively stable in Paris, fluctuating between 9.5% and 7.4% in the time period from 2000 until 2005, whereas in Berlin the unemployment rate increased from 14% to 19.4% over the same period. For all people over 25 years the EU wide unemployment rate is 7.7%, in Berlin 18.8% and in Paris 8.3%. Youth unemployment (15 to 24 years) in Paris is 20.4%, while in Berlin it is 23.8%. Regarding youth unemployment then both cities face more similar problems than for the general unemployment rate. The activity rates of the male population over 15 years are similar, 66.9% in Paris and 65.5% in Berlin. Female activity rates are 54.4%, exactly the same in Paris and Berlin, and above the European average (49.0%).

Although Paris and Berlin differ greatly in one aspect in particular, that is the unemployment rate, recent empirical investigations have repeatedly stressed the poor explanatory power of unemployment rates for the emergence and strength of contentious politics over unemployment.

Appendix F

Calibration rules for fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis

The analysis in *chapter 8* part is based on ‘Qualitative Comparative Analysis’ (QCA), developed by Ragin (1987) at the end of the 1980s (see also *Chapter 2*). While the early method only allowed the use of variables with dichotomous values, the ‘fuzzy-set’ version presented by Ragin in 2000 (2000) allows researchers to take into account qualitative and quantitative differences between cases. In the following the four conditions are presented along with rules for assigning membership scores in the fuzzy-sets outlined. I constructed the fuzzy-set as a six-value fuzzy-set, with the following values: 1.00, 0.8, 0.6, 0.4, 0.2, 0.

Access to resources

Resources are considered to be all material, financial, and ideal resources that organisations may use and perceive to be of value for their activities. Where these resources come from is not of interest, only what resources the groups have in their immediate control. 1.0 (ideal endpoint – no resources) was assigned where an organisation disposed of no resources apart from those any organisation has access to such as the time of their members. 0.8 (rather few resources) was assigned where the organisation has, apart from on rare occasions, no access to resources aside from those any organisation disposes of, such as the time of their members. 0.6 (rather few than more resources) was the score assigned where the organisation occasionally received support or access to some kind of resources, but did not have stable access to resources, for example not having their own meeting place but using another organisation’s offices for meetings. Access to resources is also considered rather difficult or not wished for. 0.4 (rather more than few resources) this membership score was assigned where an organisation was fairly satisfied with its access to resources, with relatively stable access to either material or ideal resources. The organisation disposes, for example, of a meeting place. 0.2 (rather a lot of resources) this membership-score was assigned where the organisation perceived some difficulties in obtaining those resources necessary for the type of activities the organisation wants to carry out and lacks either material resources or ideal support. 0 (ideal end point – many resources) This means the group enjoys a stable material situation through access to an annual budget, its own office, computer and telephone equipment and paid staff that work exclusively for the purpose of the group, along with ideal support from other organisations.

Access to the field of institutionalised actors

Access to the field of institutionalised actors is indicated a relationship with an established actor (e.g. unions, governing actor, mainstream media) providing some kind of support (material or ideal) – such as, for example, office space or space in the newspaper of the local party to publish the organisation’s activities - or by access to

political institutions (e.g. the right to attend meetings, the right to speak, being invited to parliamentary discussions). In contrast to links that indicate belonging to a network (see below), the relationship must be unidirectional (between an established actor and an organisation of the unemployed). Fuzzy-membership scores were assigned as follows: 1 (ideal end-point, no access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where an organisation had no access to the field of institutionalised actors; 0.8 (bad access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where only very occasionally organisations sought some support or gained access to political bodies. 0.6 (rather bad access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where organisations occasionally gained access to the field, but this was the exception rather than the rule. 0.4 (rather good than bad access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where organisations had regular or institutionalised relationships of support with some institutionalised actor or political body, although this link was not crucial for the day-to-day activities of the organisation. 0.2 (good access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where an organisation had more or less regular contact with the institutionalised field and perceived the field as fairly accessible. 0 (ideal endpoint – very good access to the field of institutionalised actors) was assigned where organisations perceived the field as open and had frequent and regular contacts with established actors or political bodies.

Belonging to the field of counter-cultural actors

Organisations either perceive themselves as belonging to a counter-cultural network or have mutual relationships with other organisations belonging to a counter-cultural network. Belonging to a counter-cultural network is indicated, for example, by a strong conception of ‘we’ and ‘they’ (established actors), and a strong distinction between established politics and movement activities, as well as cooperation with organisations outside institutionalised channels of policy-making. A strong definition of ‘belonging to a counter-cultural network’ was opted for: other organisations and initiatives are considered part of the collective identity if it is stated explicitly in the interview that common activities were organised, or the organisation emphasises in some other way a strong belonging to such a network. 1 (ideal endpoint – belonging to a counter-cultural network) was assigned where an organisation clearly identified with a counter-cultural actor and planned its activities as joint activities with this type of actor. 0.8 (rather strong feeling of belonging) was assigned where an organisation mentioned common activities with counter-cultural networks, but also showed signs of being open to other collective identities and types of policy making. 0.6 (rather belonging to a counter-cultural network) was assigned where an organisation occasionally planned common activities with this type of actor and was sympathetic to this type of actor. 0.4 (rather not belonging to a counter-cultural network) was assigned where an organisation was rather critical of these actors, but did not completely refuse activities and mentioned activities where such actors were present, although activities were not planned together. 0.2 (rather strong feeling of not belonging) was assigned where an organisation opposed the activities of these actors or did not know of or take into consideration these types of actors as possible allies. 0 (ideal end-point) was assigned for a strong refusal of the network or no consideration of such actors because the organisation did not know of any such actors.

Movement experience

Movement experience assesses the share of members in an organisation familiar with movement activities. It was indicated by the way in which collective actions were

discussed as well as insights from interviewees on the familiarity of group members with this type of collective action. 1 (ideal endpoint - a lot of movement experience) was assigned where the organisation was composed of members very familiar with movement experiences, and during discussions protests or other collective actions were discussed in a professional way using technical vocabulary. 0.8 (rather a lot of movement experience) was assigned where an organisation included many members familiar with movement activities, although with a few members to whom such activities were relatively new. 0.6 (rather many than few) was assigned where most members of an organisation were familiar with movement activities, but where a share of members were new to these activities. 0.4 (rather few than many) was assigned where some members were familiar with movement activities, such as organising protest events, or writing leaflets, but most had not had these experiences (despite participating in demonstration marches, for example). 0.2. (rather few) was assigned where most members had not engaged in a social movement organisation or been familiar with organising protest activities, despite being the leader or founder of the organisation. 0 (ideal endpoint no experience) was assigned where an organisation, with the exception of the founder, was not familiar with this type of political activism, despite having participated in demonstration marches in the past.

Disruptive strategies

Disruptive strategies are indicated by either protest actions that challenge widely accepted social rules of social interaction – such as, for example, organising a ticket strike and pointing out the plain-clothes controllers to the other public transport users - or by disruptive frames – that is, interpretations of a problem that challenge widely accepted interpretations. An example of a disruptive frame is ‘basic income’. Organisations with the clearest records of using disruptive strategies as a crucial strategy were assigned the full membership score of 1 (ideal case: disruptive strategies form a crucial strategy of the organisation). Organisations received the lowest membership scores in the set of groups using disruptive activities 0 (ideal endpoint) where they strongly refused disruptive strategies or showed no inclination to use these strategies.

Bibliography

- Adema, Willem, Donald Gray, and Sigrun Kahl. 2003. *Labour Market and Social Policy. Occasional Papers, OECD, Paris* 58.
- Alber, Jens. 1982. *Vom Armenhaus zum Wohlfahrtsstaat. Analysen zur Entwicklung der Sozialversicherung in Westeuropa*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Andretta, Massimiliano, Donatella della Porta, Lorenzo Mosca, and Herbert Reiter. 2003. *No Global - New Global. Identität und Strategien der Antiglobalisierungsbewegung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Ansell, Christopher. 2003. Community Embeddedness and Collaborative Governance in the San Francisco Bay Area Environmental Movement. In *Social Movements and Networks. Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, edited by M. Diani and D. McAdam. Oxford: Oxford University Press:123-44.
- Bagguley, Paul. 1991. *From Protest to Acquiescence? Political Movements of the Unemployed*. London: Macmillan.
- Baglioni, Simone. 2003. Bridging the Local and the Global. Experiences of Transnational Social Alert from the Organizations of the Unemployed Movement in Italy. Paper at conference *Transnational Processes and Social Movements*. Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, July 22-26.
- Baglioni, Simone, Britta Baumgarten, Didier Chabanet, and Christian Lahusen. 2008. Transcending Marginalization. The Mobilization of the Unemployed in France, Germany, and Italy in a Comparative Perspective. *Mobilization* 13 (3):323-35.
- Baum, Annerose, Britta Baumgarten, and Christian Lahusen. 2005. Chapter 7. Final Report Germany. In *The Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Political Claim-Making, Policy Deliberation and Exclusion from the Labor Market. Final Report*, edited by M. Giugni and P. Statham.
- Baumgarten, Britta. 2008. *Der Diskurs über Arbeitslosigkeit in Deutschland. Eine Analyse der Kommunikationsstrategien der Interessenvertretung von Arbeitslosen*. Dissertation, Universität Duisburg/ Essen.
- Baumgarten, Britta. 2004. Strong Protest by the Weak? Comparing Two Phases of High Mobilisation of the Unemployed in Germany. In *Public Employment Action and Unemployed Movements*. Lyon.
- Baumgarten, Britta, and Christian Lahusen. forthcoming 2010. The Mobilization of the Unemployed in Germany. In *The Mobilization of the Unemployed in Europe*, edited by D. Chabanet and J. Faniel. London: Palgrave.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611-39.
- Berkel, Rik van, Harry Coenen, and Ruud Vlek, eds. 1998. *Beyond Marginality? Social Movements of Social Security Claimants in the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Blee, Kathleen M., and Verta Taylor. 2002. Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B.

- Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press:92-117.
- Bode, Ingo. 2000. Die Starken und die Schwachen - ein kompliziertes Verhältnis. Erfahrungen aus Interessenvermittlungsprozessen in Frankreich. In *Politische Repräsentation schwacher Interessen*, edited by U. Willems and T. v. Winter. Opladen: Leske und Budrich:285-313.
- Chabanet, Didier. 2001. The European Marches against Unemployment, Insecurity, and Exclusion. Paper at conference *European Studies Association Conference*. Madison, Wisconsin, May 31-June 2.
- . 2008. When the Unemployed Challenge the European Union. The European Marches as Externalization of Protest. *Mobilization* 13 (3):311-22.
- Chabanet, Didier, and Jean Faniel. forthcoming 2010. From Acquiescence to Protest? The Mobilization of the Unemployed in Europe. In *The mobilisation of the unemployed in Europe*, edited by D. Chabanet and J. Faniel. London: Palgrave.
- . forthcoming 2010. La Longue Histoire d'une Nouvelle Cause. La Mobilisation des Chômeurs en France. In *From Acquiescence to Protest? The Mobilization of the Unemployed in Europe*, edited by D. Chabanet and J. Faniel. London: Palgrave.
- Chabanet, Didier, and Christophe Fay. 2005. Chapter 5. Final Report France. In *The Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Political Claim-making, Policy Deliberation and Exclusion from the Labor Market. Finale Report*, edited by M. Giugni and P. Statham.
- Clasen, Jochen, and Daniel Clegg. 2003. Unemployment Protection and Labour Market Reform in France and Britain in the 1990s. Solidarity versus Activation? *Journal of Social Policy* 32 (2):361-81.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1993. Organizational repertoires and Institutional Change. Women's Groups and The Transformation of the U.S. Politics, 1890-1920. *American Journal of Sociology* 98:755-98.
- . 1996. Organizational Form as Frame: Collective Identity and Political Strategy in the American Labor Movement. In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy and M. N. Zald. Cambridge [England], New York: Cambridge University Press:205-26.
- . 1997. *The People's Lobby. Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S., and Debra C. Minkoff. 2004. Beyond the Iron Law. Rethinking the Place of Organizations in Social Movement Research. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi. Malden, Mass., Oxford: Blackwell Publishing:155-70.
- Cloward, Richard A., and Frances Fox Piven. 1984. Disruption and Organization. A Rejoinder. *Theory and Society* 13:587-99.
- Cohen, Valérie. 2008. Transformation et devenir des mobilisation collectives de chômeurs. *Les mondes du travail* 6.
- Cress, Daniel M. 1997. Nonprofit Incorporation among Movements of the Poor. Pathways and Consequences for Homeless Social Movement Organizations. *The Sociological Quarterly* 38 (2):343-360.

- Cress, Daniel M., and David A. Snow. 1996. Mobilization at the Margins. Resources, Benefactors, and the Viability of Homeless Social Movement Organizations. *American Sociological Review* 61 (6):1089-1109.
- . 2000. The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization. The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation, and Framing. *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (4):1063-1104.
- Crouch, Colin. 2004. *Post-democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Crouch, Colin. 2006. Neo-corporatism and democracy. In *The Diversity of Democracy. Corporatism, Social Order and Political Conflict*, edited by C. Crouch and W. Streeck. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing: 46-70.
- Curcio, Anna. 2005. Conflitti e rappresentanza, in Brancaccio F., et al, Precariopoli, manifestolibri, Roma. . In *Precariopoli. Parole e pratiche delle nuove lotte sul lavoro*, edited by f. Brancaccio, s. Cominu, a. Curcio, e. d. Corte, f. Pozzi, Gigi, Roggero and c. Tajani. Roma: Manifestolibri.
- Davis, Gerald F., Doug McAdam, Richard W. Scott, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. 2005. *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press.
- della Porta, Donatella. 1987. Organizzazioni politiche clandestine. Il terrorismo di sinistra in Italia durante gli anni Settanta, European University Institute, Florence.
- . 2002. Comparative Politics and Social Movements. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press:286-313.
- . 2004. Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities, and the Construction of 'Another Politics'. Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Fora. In *Transnational Protest and Global Activism. People, Passions, and Power*, edited by D. della Porta and S. Tarrow. New York: Rowman and Littlefield:175-202.
- . 2006. From Corporatist Unions to Protest Unions? On the (Difficult) Relations Between Organized Labour and New Social Movements. In *The Diversity of Democracy. Corporatism, Social Order and Political Conflict*, edited by C. Crouch and W. Streeck. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing:71-96.
- . 2008. Comparative analysis. Case-oriented versus Variable-oriented Research. In *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective*, edited by D. della Porta and M. Keating. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:198-222.
- . 2008. Protest on Unemployment. Forms and Opportunities. *Mobilization* 13 (1):277-295.
- della Porta, Donatella, and Manuela Caiani. 2009. *Social Movements and Europeanization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- della Porta, Donatella, and Mario Diani. 1999. *Social Movements. An introduction*. Oxford, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- . 2006. *Social Movements. An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- della Porta, Donatella, and Lorenzo Mosca. 2006. Organizational Structures and Practices of Democracy. An Introduction. In *WP4 Integrated Report. Organizational Networks. Organizational Structures and Practices of Democracy in the Global Justice Movement*, edited by D. della Porta and L. Mosca. Florence: European University Institute:5-47.

- della Porta, Donatella, and Dieter Rucht. 1995. Left-libertarian Movements in Context. Comparing Italy and West Germany, 1965-1990. In *The Politics of Social Protest. Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*,, edited by C. J. Jenkins and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press:229-72.
- della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney Tarrow. 1987. Unwanted Children. Political Violence and the Cycle of Protest in Italy, 1966-1973. *European Journal of Political Research* 14:607-32.
- Demazière, Didier. 2002. Le fonctionnement local des comités de liaison de l'ANPE. Un dispositif aux significations problématiques. *Travail et Emploi* 89:95-111.
- Demazière, Didier, and Maria-Teresa Pignoni. 1998. *Chômeurs. Du silence à révolte. Sociologie d'une action collective*. Paris: Hachette Littératures.
- Diani, Mario. 1992. The Concept of Social Movement. *Sociological Review* 40:1-25.
- . 2003. Networks and Social Movements: A Research Program. In *Social Movements and Networks*, edited by M. Diani and D. McAdam. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press:299-318.
- Duyvendak, Jan-Willem. 1995. *The Power of Politics. New Social Movements in an Old Polity. France 1965-1989*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Eder, Klaus. 1993. *The New Politics of Class. Social Movements and Cultural Dynamics in Advanced Societies*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, Bob, and John D. McCarthy. 2004. Resources and Social Movement Mobilization. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA et al.: Blackwell:116-52.
- Elman, Amy R. 2003. Refuge in Reconfigured States. Shelter Movements in the United States, Britain, and Sweden. In *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*, edited by L. A. Banaszak, K. Beckwith and D. Rucht. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:94-113.
- European Commission. 2005. Eurobarometer 63. Public Opinion in the European Union: European Commission.
- Faniel, Jean. 2009. Belgian Trade Unions, the Unemployed and the Growth of Unemployment. In *The Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Policy Responses and Collective Action*, edited by M. Giugni. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing:101-15.
- Fernandez, Roberto M., and Doug McAdam. 1988. Social Networks and Social Movements. Multiorganizational Fields and Recruitment to Mississippi Freedom Summer. *Sociological Forum* 3 (3):357-82.
- Fetzer, Dorothee. 2006. Verfolgungsbetreuung, Schikanen und Verletzungen der Privat und Intimsphäre. In *Schwarzbuch Hartz IV*, edited by Agenturschluss. Berlin: Assoziation A:31-45.
- Fillieule, Olivier. 1997. *Stratégies de la rue. Les manifestations en France*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- . 1998. 'Plus ça change, moins ça change.' Demonstrations in France During the Nineteen-Eighties. In *Acts of Dissent. New Development of the Study of Protest*, edited by D. Rucht, R. Koopmans and F. Neidhardt. Berlin: Sigma Press:199-226.
- . 2003. France. In *Environmental Protest in Western Europe*, edited by C. Rootes. Oxford: Oxford University Press:59-79.

- Gallas, Andreas. 1994. *Politische Interessenvertretung von Arbeitslosen. Eine theoretische und empirische Analyse*. Vol. 57, *Schriftenreihe der Otto Brenner Stiftung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Bund-Verlag.
- Gamson, Josh. 1989. Silence, death, and the Invisible Enemy. Aids Activism and Social Movement 'Newness'. *Social Problems* 36 (4):351-67.
- Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Dorsey series in sociology. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- . 1992. The Social Psychology of Collective Action. In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press:53-76.
- Gamson, William A., Steven Rytina, and Bruce Fireman. 1982. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, William A., and Emilie Schmeidler. 1984. Review Essay. Organizing the Poor. An Argument with Francis Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward. Poor People's movements. Why They Succeed, How They Fail. *Theory, Culture and Society* 2 (2):567-85.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1992. Die positiven Funktionen der unwürdigen Armen. Zur Bedeutung des 'underclass' in den USA. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Sonderheft*. 32 (Armut im modernen Wohlfahrtsstaat):48-62.
- Giugni, Marco. 2004. Personal and Biographical Consequences. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing:489-507.
- . 2008. Welfare States, Political Opportunities, and the Mobilization of the Unemployed. A Cross-National Analysis. *Mobilization* 13 (3):297-310.
- . 2009. State and Civil Society Responses to Unemployment: Welfare, Conditionality and Collective Action. In *The Politics of Unemployment in Europe*, edited by M. Giugni. Farnham Surrey: Ashgate:1-16.
- Giugni, Marco, Berclaz Michel, and Katharina Fueglistner. 2009. Welfare States, Labour Markets, and the Political Opportunities for Collective Action in the Field of Unemployment. A Theoretical Framework. In *The Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Policy Responses and Collective Action*, edited by M. Giugni. Farnham Surrey: Ashgate:133-49.
- Giugni, Marco, and Paul Statham. 2002. The Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Political Claim-Making, Policy Deliberation and Exclusion from the Labor Market. Leeds: European Political Communication Working Paper Series, Issue 2/02, Centre for European Political Communication.
- . 2005. Introduction. In *The Contentious Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Political Claim-making, Policy Deliberation and Exclusion from the Labor Market*, edited by M. Giugni and P. Statham.
- Goldstone, Jack A., and Doug McAdam. 2001. Contention in demographic and Life-Course Context. In *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, edited by R. Aminzade, J. A. Goldstone, D. McAdam, E. Perry, W. H. J. Sewell, S. Tarrow and C. Tilly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:195-221.
- Gottschall, Karin, and Irene Dingeldey. 2000. Arbeitsmarkt im konservativ-korporatistischen Wohlfahrtsstaat. Auf dem Weg zu reflexiver Deregulierung? In *Der deutsche*

- Sozialstaat. Bilanzen - Reformen - Perspektiven*, edited by S. Leibfried and U. Wagschal. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag:306-39.
- Gurr, Ted. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haines, Herbert H. 1984. Black Radicalization and the Funding of Civil Rights. 1957-1970. *Social Problems* 32:331-72.
- Hellmann, Kai-Uwe, and Ruud Koopmans. 1998. *Paradigmen der Bewegungsforschung. Entstehung und Entwicklung von Neuen Sozialen Bewegungen und Rechtsextremismus*: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Höfer, Thomas, Hildegard Przyrembel, and Silvia Verleger. 2004. New evidence for the Theory of the Stork. *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology* 18 (1):88-92.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jäger, Michael, Andrea Koschwitz, and Gerburg Treusch-Dieter, eds. 2001. *Recht auf Faulheit. Zukunft der Nichtarbeit. Beiträge eines Themenwochenendes der Volksbühne am Rosa-Luxemburg-Platz vom 18.Mai bis 20. Mai 2001*: Edition Freitag.
- Jahoda, Marie. 1982. *Employment and Unemployment. A Social-Psychological Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahoda, Marie, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Hans Zeisel. 1975 [1933]. *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal. Ein soziographischer Versuch über die Wirkung von langandauernder Arbeitslosigkeit*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest. Culture, Creativity and Biography in Social Movements*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Jenkins, Craig J. . 1985. *The Politics of Insurgency. The Farm Worker Movement in the 1960s*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jenkins, Craig J., and Craig M. Eckert. 1986. Channeling Black Insurgency. Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement. *American Sociological Review* 51:812-29.
- Jordan, Bill. 1998. Collective Action and Everyday Resistance. In *Beyond Marginality. Social Movements of Social Security Claimants in the European Union*, edited by R. v. Berkel, H. Coenen and R. Vlek. Aldershot: Ashgate:203-19.
- Juris, Jeffrey S. 2008. Performing Politics. Image, embodiment, and affective solidarity during anti-corporate globalization protests. *Ethnography* 9 (1):61-97.
- Kemmerling, Achim, and Oliver Bruttel. 2005. New politics in German labour market policy? The implications of the recent Hartz reforms for the German welfare state. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Kim, Hyojoung, and Peter S. Bearman. 1997. The Structure and Dynamics of Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review* 62 (1):70-93.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1986. Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest. Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies. *British Journal of Political Science* 16 (1):57-85.
- . 2003. Landscapes of Political Interest Intermediation. Social Movements, Interest groups, and Parties in the early Twenty-First Century. In *Social Movements and Democracy*, edited by P. Ibarra. New York: Palgrave Macmillan:81-104.

- Klandermans, Bert, and Jackie Smith. 2002. Survey Research. A Case for Comparative Designs. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press:3-31.
- Kluge, Susanne. 1999. *Empirisch begründete Typenbildung. Zur Konstruktion von Typen und Typologien in der qualitativen Sozialforschung*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 1993. The Dynamic of Protest Waves. West Germany, 1965 to 1989. *American Sociological Review* 58 (5):637-658.
- . 1995. *Democracy from Below. New Social Movements and the Political System in West Germany*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- . 1995. The Dynamics of Protest Waves. In *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis* edited by H. Kriesi, R. Koopmans, J. W. Duyvendak and M. Giugni. London: UCL Press:111-42.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 1995. Conclusion. In *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*, edited by H. Kriesi, R. Koopmans, J. W. Duyvendak and M. Giugni. London: UCL Press:238-51.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Hanspeter Kriesi. 1995. Institutional Structures and Prevailing Strategies. In *New Social Movements in Western Europe*, edited by H. Kriesi, R. Koopmans, J. W. Duyvendak and M. Giugni. London, UCL Press:26-52.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Paul Statham. 1999. Political Claims Analysis. Integrating Protest Event and Public Discourse Approaches. *Mobilization. Special Issue: Protest Event Analysis* 4 (2), edited by Dieter Rucht and Ruud Koopmans:203-22.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 1988. Local Mobilization For the People's Social Petition of the Dutch Peace Movement. *International Social Movement Research* 1:41-81.
- . 1995. Alliance Structures. In *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*, edited by H. Kriesi, R. Koopmans, J. W. Dyvendak and M. Giugni. London: UCL Press:53-81.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Marco Giugni. 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*. London: UCL Press.
- Kronauer, Martin. 1997. Soziale Ausgrenzung" und "Underclass": Über neue Formen der gesellschaftlichen Spaltung. *Leviathan* 1:28-49.
- Lahusen, Christian, and Britta Baumgarten. 2006. Die Fragilität kollektiven Handelns. Arbeitslosenproteste in Deutschland un Frankreich. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 35 (2):102-19.
- Lewis, Jane, and Ilona Ostner. 1994. Gender and the Evolution of European Social Policy. *Arbeitspapier 4/94 des Zentrums fuer Sozialpolitik der Universität Bremen*.
- Lichterman, Paul. 2002. Seeing Structure Happen: Theory-Driven Participant Observation. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press:118-45.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1968. Protest as a Political Resource. *The American Political Science Review* 62 (4):1144-58.
- . 1970. *Protest in City Politics. Rent Strikes, Housing and the Power of the Poor*. Chicago: Rand MacNally.
- Mau, Steffen. 2001. Die üblichen Verdächtigen. Mythen über die 'Drückeberger' der Arbeitsgesellschaft. *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 21.4.2001:7.

- Maurer, Sophie. 2001. *Les Chômeurs en Action (Décembre 1997 – Mars 1998). Mobilisation collective et ressources compensatoires*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Maurer, Sophie, and Emmanuel Pierru. 2001. Le Mouvement des Chômeurs de l'Hiver 1997-1998. Retour sur un 'Miracle Social'. *Revue Française de Science Politique* 512:317-407.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1983. Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency. *American Sociological Review* 48:735-54.
- McAdam, Doug, and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. Specifying the Relationship Between Social Ties and Activism. *American Journal of Sociology* 99 (3):640-67.
- McAdam, Doug, and Richard W. Scott. 2005. Organizations and Movements. In *Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, R. W. Scott and M. N. Zald. Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press:4-40.
- McCarthy, John D., David W. Britt, and Mark Wolfson. 1991. The Institutional Channeling of Social Movements by the State in the United States. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 13:45-76.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. Resource Mobilization and Social Movements. A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (6):1212-41.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present. Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. London: Hutchinson Radius.
- . 1995. The Process of Collective Identity. In *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by H. Johnston and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press:41-63.
- Michels, Robert. 1987 [1908]. Die oligarchischen Tendenzen der Gesellschaft. In *Masse, Führer, Intellektuelle. Politisch-soziologische Aufsätze 1906-1933*, edited by R. Michels. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. The Sequencing of Social Movements. *American Sociological Review* 62 (5):779-99.
- . 2002. Macro-Organizational Analysis. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press:260-85.
- Morgenroth, Christine. 2003. Arbeitsidentität und Arbeitslosigkeit. Ein depressiver Zirkel. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 6-7:17-24.
- Mouchard, Daniel. 2001. *Les 'exclus' dans l'espace public. Mobilisations et logiques de représentation dans la France contemporaine*. Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris, Paris.
- Narr, Wolf-Dieter, and Claus Offe, eds. 1975. *Wohlfahrtsstaat und Massenloyalität*. Köln: Kiepenheuer und Witsch.
- Neidhardt, Friedhelm, and Dieter Rucht. 1993. Auf dem Weg in die 'Bewegungsgesellschaft'? Über die Stabilität sozialer Bewegungen. *Soziale Welt* 44:305-26.
- Noakes, John A., and Hank Johnston. 2005. Frames of Protest. A Road Map to a Perspective. In *Frames of Protest. Social Movement and the Framing Perspective*, edited by H.

- Johnston and J. A. Noakes. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers:1-29.
- Offe, Claus. 1972. Politische Klassenherrschaft und Klassenstrukturen. Zur Analyse spätkapitalistischer Gesellschaftssysteme. In *Politikwissenschaft. Eine Einführung in ihre Probleme*, edited by G. Kress and D. Senghaas. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag: 135-64
- Offe, Claus, and Helmut Wiesensthal. 1980. Two Logics Of Collective Action. Theoretical Notes on Social Class and Organisational Form. In *Political Power and Social Theory*, edited by M. Zeitlin. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.
- Oliver, Pamela. 1989. Bringing the Crowd Back In. The Nonorganizational Elements of Social Movements In *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, edited by L. Kriesberg. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press:1-30.
- Opielka, Michael. 2004. *Sozialpolitik. Grundlagen und vergleichende Perspektiven*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Oschmiansky, Frank. 2003. Faule Arbeitslose? Zur Debatte ueber Arbeitsunwilligkeit und Leistungsmissbrauch. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 6-7:10-16.
- Ostner, Ilona. 1995. Arm ohne Ehemann? Sozialpolitische Regulierung von Lebenschancen für Frauen im internationalen Vergleich. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (36-37):3-12.
- Palier, Bruno. 2006. The Long Good Bye to Bismarck? Changes in the French Welfare State. In *Changing France. The Politics that Markets Make*, edited by P. D. Culpepper, P. A. Hall and B. Palier. New York: Palgrave McMillan:107-28.
- Passy, Florence. 2001. Political Altruism and the Solidarity Movement. An Introduction. In *Political Altruism? Solidarity Movements in International Perspective*, edited by M. Giugni and F. Passy. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers:3-25.
- Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements. Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1992. Normalizing Collective Protest. In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press:301-25.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2006. *It was Like a Fever. Storytelling in Protest and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2000. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rein, Harald. 1997. Wir kämpfen um das, was wir brauchen. Stand und Perspektiven des Erwerbslosenprotests. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen* 10 (2):70-75.
- Rein, Harald, and Wolfgang Scherer. 1993. *Erwerbslosigkeit und politischer Protest. Zur Neubewertung von Erwerbslosigkeit und der Einwirkung sozialer Arbeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Richards, Andrew. 2002. Mobilizing the Powerless. Collective Protest Action of the Unemployed in the Interwar Period. Madrid: Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones, Working Paper 2002/175.

- Robnett, Belinda. 1996. African-American Women in the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1965. Gender, Leadership, and Micromobilization. *American Journal of Sociology* 101:1661-93.
- Roth, Roland. 1994. Lokale Bewegungsnetzwerke und die Institutionalisierung von neuen sozialen Bewegungen. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie. Sonderheft. Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung, soziale Bewegungen* 34:413-36.
- . 1997. Die Rückkehr des Sozialen. Neue soziale Bewegungen, poor people's movements und der Kampf um soziale Bürgerrechte. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen* 10 (2):38-50.
- Royall, Frédéric. 1998. Le Mouvement des Chomeurs en France de l'Hiver 1997-1998. *Modern and Contemporary France* 6:351-65.
- . 2004. Politics and Unemployment Organisations in France. *Modern and Contemporary France* 12 (1):49-62.
- . 2009. Political Challengers, Service Providers or Service Recipients? Participants in Irish Pro-Unemployed Organizations. In *The Politics of Unemployment in Europe. Policy Responses and Collective Action*, edited by M. Giugni. Farnham Surrey: Ashgate:117-32.
- Rucht, Dieter. 1999. Linking Organization and Mobilization. Michel's Iron Law of Oligarchy reconsidered. *Mobilization* 4 (2):151-169.
- . 2003. Interactions Between Social Movements and States in a Comparative Perspective. In *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State.*, edited by L. A. Banaszak, K. Beckwith and D. Rucht. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:242-74.
- . 2004. Movement Allies, Adversaries, and Third Parties. In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing:197-216.
- Rucht, Dieter, Barbara Blattert, and Dieter Rink. 1997. *Soziale Bewegungen auf dem Weg zur Institutionalisierung. Zum Strukturwandel 'alternativer' Gruppen in beiden Teilen Deutschlands*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Rucht, Dieter, Ruud Koopmans, and Friedhelm Neidhardt, eds. 1998. *Acts of Dissent. New Developments in the Study of Protest*. Berlin: Edition Sigma, WZB.
- Rucht, Dieter, and Mundo Yang. 2004. Wer demonstrierte gegen Hartz IV? *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen* 17 (4):21-27.
- Scharpf, Fritz W. 2001. Employment and the welfare Stat. A continental dilemma. In *Comparing Welfare Capitalism. Social Policy and Political Economy in Europe, Japan and the USA* edited by B. Ebbinghaus and P. Manow. London: Routledge:270-83.
- Schneider, Carsten Q., and Claudius Wagemann. 2007. *Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) und Fuzzy Sets. Ein Lehrbuch fuer Anwender und jene, die es werden wollen*. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- . forthcoming 2010. Standards of Good Practice in Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Fuzzy-Sets. *Comparative Sociology* 9.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Snow, David A., and Leon Anderson. 1993. *Down on Their Luck. A Study of Homeless Street People*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. In *From Structure to Action*, edited by B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi and S. Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press:197-218.
- Snow, David A., and Danny Trom. 2002. The Case Study and the Study of Social Movements. In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press:146-72.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. The Consequences of Professionalisation and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement. *American Sociological Review* 53:585-606.
- . 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steinert, Heinz, and Arno Pilgram, eds. 2003. *Welfare Policy from Below. Struggles against Social Exclusion in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Streeck, Wolfgang, and Anke Hassel. 2003. Trade Unions as Political Actors. In *International Handbook of Trade Unions*, edited by J. T. Addison and C. Schnabel. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar:335-65.
- Tilly, Charles. 1977. Getting it Together in Burgundy, 1675-1975. *Theory and Society* 4:479-504.
- . 1986. *The Contentious French*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Touraine, Alain. 1981. *The Voice and the Eye. An Analysis of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1983. *Anti-Nuclear Protest. The Opposition to Nuclear Energy in France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Truninger, Luzia. 1990. *Arbeitslos? Ich nicht*. Freiburg Schweiz: Universitaetsverlag.
- Wagemann, Claudius. 2007. QCA e 'Fuzzy Set Analysis'. Che cosa é e che cosa non é. *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica* Anno XXXVII (3):385-409.
- Wagner, David, and Marcia B. Cohen. 1991. The Power of the People. Homeless Protesters in the Aftermath of Social Movement Participation. *Social Problems* 38 (4):543-61.
- Willems, Ulrich, and Thomas von Winter, eds. 2000. *Politische Repräsentation schwacher Interessen*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Wolf, Hans-Georg. 1991. Arbeitslosenprojekte und die Logik kollektiven Handelns. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen* 4 (3):46-58.
- Wolski-Prenger, Friedhelm. 1997. Marginalität und Widerstand. Mobilisierungsprobleme der Arbeitslosenbewegung. *Forschungsjournal Neue Soziale Bewegungen* 10 (2):63-69.
- Zald, Mayer N., and Roberta Ash. 1966. Social Movement Organizations. Growth, Decay and Change. *Social Forces* 44:327-40.
- Zorn, Annika. 2004. Entering the Unemployment Debate. From Unemployed Observers to Unemployed Participants. Paper at conference *Public Employment Action and Unemployed Movements*. Lyon, November 19-20.
- . 2007. Bringing Solidarity Back in. Solidarity Actions in the Contentious Field of Unemployment. In *European Solidarities. Tensions and Contentions of a Concept*, edited by L. Magnusson and B. Stråth. Brussels: Peter Lang:235-66.

