



## Outcomes and Outlooks: Resistance after the Case Studies

Jaroslav Ira, Eva Kalivodová, Andrew Sargent, Aladin Larguèche

### ► To cite this version:

Jaroslav Ira, Eva Kalivodová, Andrew Sargent, Aladin Larguèche. Outcomes and Outlooks: Resistance after the Case Studies. Lud'a Klusáková, Martin Moll ; with Jaroslav Ira, Aladin Laruèche, Eva Kalivodová, Andrew Sargent. Contesting frontiers, resisting identities, Edizioni Plus - Pisa University Press, pp. 223-244., 2010, Frontiers and identities, 978-88-8492-737-8. <hal-00724588>

**HAL Id: hal-00724588**

**<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00724588>**

Submitted on 23 Aug 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Crossing Frontiers, Resisting Identities / edited by Lud'a Klusáková, Martin Moll ; with Jaroslav Ira ... [et al.]. - Pisa : Plus-Pisa University Press, 2010  
(Thematic work group. 5. Frontiers and Identities ; 5)



302.5 (21.)

1. Individuo e società I. Klusáková, Lud'a II. Moll, Martin III. Ira, Jaroslav

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-006164.

The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

*Cover: Piet Mondrian (1872-1944), View from the Dunes with Beach and Piers, Domburg, 1909, painting, Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York*

© 1992 PhotoScala, Florence

© 2010 by CLIOHRES.net

The materials published as part of the CLIOHRES Project are the property of the CLIOHRES.net Consortium.

They are available for study and use, provided that the source is clearly acknowledged.

CLIOHRES@CLIOHRES.net - [www.CLIOHRES.net](http://www.CLIOHRES.net)

Published by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

[info.plus@adm.unipi.it](mailto:info.plus@adm.unipi.it)

[www.edizioniplus.it](http://www.edizioniplus.it) - Section "Biblioteca"

Member of



Association of American  
University Presses

ISBN: 978-88-8492-737-8

Editorial assistance

Viktoriya Kolp

Informatic editing

Răzvan Adrian Marinescu

# Outcomes and Outlooks: Resistance after the Case Studies

JAROSLAV IRA

EVA KALIVODOVÁ

Charles University in Prague

ANDREW SARGENT

National University of Ireland, Galway

ALADIN LARGUÈCHE

University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail

## ABSTRACT

In this chapter, we return to the general and theoretical level, nevertheless drawing heavily on our experience with the particular resistances that were explored in the case studies. In the first part, a scrupulous conceptual analysis of the case studies aims at focusing on the possible interactions between frontiers, identities, and resistances, whilst keeping an eye on factors of historical change. The chapter proceeds with various classifications of resistances and the formulation of a general typology of resistances, as informed by historical knowledge and appropriate for historical research. In the final part general conclusions are drawn and avenues for future research are suggested.

*Cette contribution propose un bilan théorique et général des résistances telles qu'explorées dans les études de cas précédentes. La première partie consiste en une analyse scrupuleuse de ces études, et vise à examiner les possibles interactions entre frontières, identités et résistances, sans perdre de vue l'importance du changement historique comme facteur explicatif. Les auteurs procèdent ainsi à diverses classifications et proposent, entre autres, une typologie générale des résistances en Europe, susceptible de fournir les bases d'une plateforme méthodologique pour stimuler les recherches interdisciplinaires et comparatives.*

*V této závěrečné kapitole se autoři vrací k obecnější, teoretické rovině rozboru, přičemž ovšem plně čerpají ze závěrů jednotlivých případových studií. První část statě nabízí důslednou analýzu jednotlivých studií z konceptuálního úhlu pohledu, a to ve snaze poukázat na možné interakce mezi pojmy hranice, identity a rezistence. Zároveň je sledována vazba těchto pojmů na dlouhodobé faktory historické změny. Kapitola následně nabízí pře-*

*hled různých klasifikací odporů, přičemž se pokouší formulovat obecnou typologii rezistencí vhodnou pro historický výzkum, typologii, jež se zakládá na historickém poznání. Konec stati nabízí obecné závěry s výhledy na budoucí badatelské využití.*

## CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDIES

The case studies presented above testify to the great variety of interplay among the concepts across the cases. As stated in the opening chapter of this section, the authors were not required to conceptualize the interrelation of frontiers, identities, and resistance in any specific or uniform way<sup>1</sup>. However, in order to illustrate how frontiers and identities, as fields interconnected through resistance, can open several strands for a comparative and interdisciplinary research agenda<sup>2</sup>, it should be revealing to look explicitly at these combinations. Beyond their multiplicity, are resistances useful for providing an innovative platform for research, not only as a thematic problem but also as a methodological tool for exploring frontiers and identities? At this stage, the way forward seems to be to propose an analysis which will take into account the diverse meanings of each term. These meanings are summarized in table 1. Brief summaries of the case studies will be followed by more general conclusions<sup>3</sup>.

### Summaries of case studies through frontiers and identities

In the issue studied by Esther Sánchez-Medina<sup>4</sup>, we encounter ‘constructed’ resistance, which was attributed by Byzantines to ‘Barbarians’ – in this case, Visigoths living either within or close to the borders of the Roman Empire in the Iberian Peninsula. Resistance is here depicted as an imagined resistance to Roman norms and ways of life: in other words, a propaganda rhetoric intended to reinforce the frontiers of *Romanitas* as boundaries of an uncertain territorial and religious identity.

In the cases shown by Andrew Sargent and Kieran Hoare<sup>5</sup>, three resistances appear: the preventive demonstrative behaviour of Irish townsmen, directed against any possible interference by the state in their religion; systematically negative depictions of the former Anglo-Scottish border region by the local gentry to deter taxation; constructed resistance against civilizing missions, ascribed to the so-called Border Surnames. Frontiers played a role in a two-fold sense. The peripheral position of Ireland and Northern England conditioned resistance as a negotiation between the centre and the peripheral elites. The disappearance of the Anglo-Scottish border promoted resistances insofar as the distinct cultures and societies, peculiar to borderland conditions, became endangered. Religious identity motivated the resistance in the Irish towns and cities, whereas in the case of the border gentry, it was rather a shared interest based on regional specificity of the cancelled borderland. Resistance of the Border Surnames was closely related to their identity as a way of life that was destroyed by the eradication of borders.

In the example of Eva Kalivodová<sup>6</sup>, resistance covers actions of religious non-conformists to preserve their collective religious tradition in spite of the adversary efforts of the official church and the state. Normally a routine of hidden religious practices, the resistance turns into an open revolt. Religious identity is the crucial source of resistance. Frontiers enter into play insofar as the peripheral location and closeness to the border with a Protestant country facilitated the resistance. On a more subtle level non-conformists in fact resisted the social expansion of the modern state (and its social disciplining politics), even if they did so unconsciously.

In Alexandre Massé's case<sup>7</sup>, physical resistance is embodied in the uprising of Greeks against the Ottoman Empire. The uprising was undoubtedly motivated by (national) identity and as a struggle for independence. Logically it aimed at border changes. However, Massé's study concentrates on a different aspect: the representation of the event by foreign observers, in this case French consuls, through which the uprising actually became legitimate and suitable resistance. The Greeks were trying to achieve an appearance of legitimacy in order to garner sympathy for their actions although how much their own representations influenced the consuls cannot really be gauged. In the context of conservative European politics, representations of ancient Greek identity became accepted amongst the consuls. The Greeks were also Christians rising against a Muslim power. These two factors of Greek identity were highlighted by the consuls' representations eventually legitimizing both the uprising and the intervention of foreign powers.

In Aladin Larguèche's example<sup>8</sup>, the performance of resistance is equivalent to the propagation of a large-scale regional and cultural identity: Scandinavism. Initially effective as a rejection of foreign cultural influence in the context of Romanticism, the Scandinavianist identity-project suddenly became a form of political resistance for some elite social groups.

In the case study by Ute Hofmann<sup>9</sup>, resistance refers to the refusal of the Bohemian nobility to identify with any national collective and also to being identified as national or nationally-minded. We encounter a situation, where the collective identity of a particular sort is resisted on the basis of a specific social identity (belonging to the aristocracy) and in the name of other collective and territorial identities (the supranational Bohemian, Austrian, and cosmopolitan ones). Frontiers are implied in two ways: resistance reflects the safeguarding of social barriers toward the lower strata and at the same time disrespects ethnic boundaries, which the middle class elites strove to make ultimately significant.

In the example offered by Dušan Labuda<sup>10</sup>, resistance refers to formation and actions of political parties representing a national minority that targeted the legitimacy of their new state (Czechoslovakia). The frontiers at stake are the state border that created a minority of Magyar people within the new state and the identity concerned is the national one. In the name of national identity the artificially created border, which disrespected ethnic boundaries, is principally resisted; but also resisted are the policies of the state that threatened the very identity of the Magyar community.

A moment of transgression surfaces in Jiří Janáč's case<sup>11</sup>. The resistance of Czechoslovak engineers to Soviet models of technology inevitably crossed the dangerous lines of official ideology, even if the experts themselves were more concerned with preserving the firm boundary between any ideology and what they considered as the sphere of pure technical rationality. It was precisely professional identity that primarily encouraged the resistance to Sovietization. The most visible frontier in this case is, however, the barrier between two technological – and implicitly cultural – systems, the relocation of which from the eastern to the western borders of Central Europe was contested.

### Identities and resistance

The analysis revealed a variety of roles that identities played in resistance situations. Most typically, an identity was a source of resistance or a basis of its legitimization. This is the case for the religious identity of Irish burghers and Bohemian nonconformists, and the regional identity of Anglo-Scottish gentry and Border Surnames for the early modern periods. For modern times, the distinctive social and supranational identity of the Bohemian nobility, the ethnic-national identity of Magyars in Czechoslovakia, and the 'western' and professional identity of Czechoslovak engineers are further examples. People thus resisted pro-identity. However, we could see the opposite situation as well: an identity imposed from outside could provoke resistance. That is the case of the different religious identity (Catholic) demanded from the Bohemian Protestants, the Czech and German national identities imposed on Bohemian nobles, or identification with the Czechoslovak state. People resisted contra-identity. Hofmann's case of the Bohemian nobility is the perfect example of both processes happening simultaneously. Larguèche introduced the category of resistance through identity, i.e. the formation of (Scandinavian) identity, which operates as resistance. Finally, either term can point to the sphere of the imaginary. Thus the construction of someone's identity can assist resistance, as shown by the example of the French consuls' perception of Greeks, or the construction of resisters as the 'others' helps to maintain 'our' identity, as in case of Roman identity and 'Barbarians'. Theoretically, other variants could be searched for: for instance, a situation where resistance creates an identity of its own; this was not really developed in our chapters, even though Kalivodová coined a 'rebel identity' and we can be reminded, at least, of various revolutionaries or veterans. The ever-present category – though in our critical distance, rather than in the case studies – is of course the memory and romanticization of resistance deployed for the construction of identities<sup>12</sup>.

### Frontiers and resistance

This plurality of roles appears in the case of the concept of frontiers as well, making a sound typology even harder to define. We can again cluster some resistances as posi-

tively oriented toward the frontiers. In some cases, resistance is intentionally oriented toward the making and preservation of frontiers: the southern border of Denmark as the 'natural', and wishfully 'shared', frontier of Scandinavia is the best example. In other cases resistance may *de facto* create or maintain frontiers. But perhaps most typically, the making of frontiers by resistance is more or less intentional, but not explicit, as is the case with the boundaries of Roman collective identity, the social boundaries of the Bohemian aristocracy, or the techno-cultural frontier between Central Europe and the Soviet Union. The opposite cluster covers resistances negatively oriented to frontiers. Surprisingly little addressed was the refusal of the very existence of particular frontiers: the issue echoes in the case of the 'Barbarians', who in fact resisted the boundaries of the Roman Empire, in spite of Rome's efforts to maintain the boundary that would keep them beyond. The actual disrespect of the Bohemian nobles for ethnic boundaries that emerged in the Bohemian population is a transitional case moving towards a refusal of a particular delineation of frontiers. This is the case for the Czechoslovak-Hungarian state border, which was resisted not as such, but rather for its not respecting the ethnic border. Negotiation of frontiers and attempts to redraw them thus belong here. This category comprises situations in which frontiers become factors influencing resistance. Frontiers can be one of the agents creating resistance, i.e. their presence or absence may have an impact on resistance in some way: the clearest example is the cancelled border (zone) between England and Scotland, the disappearance of which promoted resistance of the local gentry. But herein fits also the peripheral or border location as facilitator of resistance (e.g. of the religious nonconformists in Bohemia), the 'mental frontier' of Bohemian aristocrats that conditioned resistance to national identity, or the technological frontier dividing two incomparable systems, which determined the resistance of Czechoslovak engineers.

### Historical change and resistance

The very term resistance already implies dynamics and processuality. Yet to address the question of resistance as a relevant factor for historical change properly, we have to introduce change as another variable. As demonstrated in table 2, all the resistances presented in our case studies were inextricably set against a backdrop of large historical changes, which conditioned the resistance at a most general level. These were namely the erosion of cultural homogeneity in the late Roman Empire; the formation of modern centralized, homogenous and disciplining states during the early modern period; the rise and the ultimate dominance of the national principle in modern European societies; the rise of social ideologies and the corrosion of the Euro-centric, uni-linear modernization model in recent historiography.

Yet the cases documented a difference with regard to immediate changes. Some of them were reactions to, or triggered by, a concrete change or event: dissolution of borders and consequent measures of the monarch in the Anglo-Scottish Union; the Schleswig

Wars that gave momentum to the political phase of Scandinavism; the establishment of the new state and borders of Czechoslovakia; the imposition of Soviet norms on waterway projects in Central Europe. Other resistances were not so rapidly reactive: the construction of resistant Barbarians was a long-term process that mirrored the slow erosion of Roman identity, and so were the religious practices of nonconformists, cultural Scandinavism, or the resistance of the Bohemian aristocracy to national identity. There the action-reaction logic was generally more protracted and blurred. Particular changes and occasions could nevertheless activate more apparent and time-compressed manifestations of these resistances, such as the Opočno Rebellion.

To close this part of the chapter, we raise the challenging question of an eventual creation of theoretical-historical models that would promote further stages of research. The models would be based on the above discussed categories: resistance, frontiers, identities, and change. If carefully developed, they could become a bridge to a more sophisticated research in the future, providing us with clear heuristic guideposts, sharpened hypotheses, and sound criteria for comparison.

#### TOWARD A HISTORICAL TYPOLOGY OF RESISTANCE

The question of typology has been a persistent problem from the very beginning of our collaboration. Should we elaborate a typology of resistances before embarking on the case studies? Or should we eventually end up with some? We finally decided for the latter, with a latent ambition to arrive at more than just an out-of-hand classification. Another problem concerned the countless criteria that could be used for classifying the resistances we described. Partly from the literature, partly from the collective brainstorming with frontiers and identities on our minds, we figured out several forms of classification: actors, targets, and objects of resistance; intensity and mode; intentionality and recognition of resistance; the relation to identity and frontiers; the character of resistance-stimulating change<sup>13</sup>.

Regarding the question of who resisted, we can see, for instance, that resistance was by no means a weapon utilized by only weak and oppressed people; resistances were often conducted by those, who seized or held significant power (the Bohemian aristocracy, to a lesser degree the Anglo-Scottish border gentry and Irish burghers). Observations like these can help us to de-romanticize resistance and make it thus a more neutral and analytical term, applicable to the study and explanation of historical change.

Other criteria occurred only after we collected the case studies. Such is the example of ontology: in three cases, we encounter resistance as a constructed phenomenon – by the contemporaneous agents – rather than a real behaviour. Whereas both the Romans and the Anglo-Scottish border gentry unilaterally attributed resistance to the ‘others’ (Barbarians, Border Surnames) for their own benefit, in the case of the French consuls’ repre-



TABLE 1. CONCEPTS 'FRONTIERS' AND 'IDENTITIES' IN THE CASE STUDIES		
Authors	Frontiers	Identities
Sánchez-Medina	Frontiers of empire, collective and civilization <i>Limes</i> of the Roman Empire; boundaries of Romanity and Roman civility	Cultural and collective identity Identity assigned to 'Barbarians'. The need to maintain a separate Roman identity
Sargent, Hoare	State borders; borderland; periphery (Cancelled) borders between England-Scotland and the locale; fringes of England	Religious identity Catholic confession of Irish townsmen Regional identity The specific regional identity of borderers (Gentry; Border Surnames)
Kalivodová	Limits of state; state borders; borderland Semi-border location of non-conformist peasants; shifting limits of state control over the population	Religious identity Non-catholic confessional and symbolic spiritual identity. Maintenance of traditional identity
Massé	Frontiers of thought, cultural borders Boundaries of European civility, boundaries of Greece and the Greek nation	Identity as image Constructed identity of modern Greeks linked to ancient Greeks and against Turks imagined as Barbarians
Larguèche	Cultural and geographic frontiers; state borders; ethnic boundary Frontiers of Scandinavia – borders of Denmark. German-Danish ethnic boundary at Eider river	Linked cultural identity Transnational Scandinavism
Hofmann	Social boundaries and ethnic boundaries Boundaries of the aristocratic class and between Czechs and Germans	National identity, social identity, territorial identity Czech-German national identities, noble identity, Bohemian patriotism
Labuda	Ethnic and geographic frontiers; state borders Borders of Czechoslovakia Slovak-Magyar ethnic boundary at Danube river	Ethnic-national identity Identity of Hungarians as a national minority in Czechoslovakia
Janáč	Technological frontier, limits of system Frontier between two incompatible technological systems; limits of official ideology; boundaries between ideological and technical spheres	Cultural and professional identity Identification with technological rationality; 'Western' identity

sentations of the Greek uprising the construction was made by both the consuls and the Greeks. In all the other examples, resistance denotes various forms of actual conduct.

TABLE 2. CLASSIFICATION OF RESISTANCES		
Authors	Object of resistance Actors of resistance	Large historical change Urgent change
Sánchez-Medina	'Roman norms' 'Barbarians', constructed by Roman elites	Cultural differentiation within Empire
Sargent, Hoare	Taxation of gentry Border gentry Religious innovations Irish town Burghers	Formation of modern state Abolition of internal borders and consequent measures
	'Civility' Border Surnames, constructed by border gentry	Formation of modern state Abolition of internal borders and consequent measures
Kalivodová	Eradication of religious traditions; formation of disciplined state subjects Religious nonconformists	Formation of modern state; counter-reformation and its confrontation with new spiritual currents (Pietism)
Massé	'Ottoman oppression' 'Greek population', constructed by Greek elites and French consuls	Rise of national principle
Larguèche	Cultural homogeneity; German expansion Scandinavian intellectuals	Rise of national principle Schleswig Wars and German policies
Hofmann	Nationalization and being identified as national Bohemian aristocracy	Rise of national principle Rapid nationalization of public discourse in Bohemia
Labuda	New state, minority position, and assimilation Magyar elites in Czechoslovakia	Rise of national principle Creation of new state and new border
Janáč	Sovietization of technological modernization Czechoslovak engineers	Rise of social ideologies Imposition of Soviet norms on waterway projects

After the various cases presented in this section, the problem of implementing an effective typology of resistance in historical research about frontiers and identities seems to remain. Risking being repetitive, we would say that historical resistances are characterized by great diversity, and that any efforts towards conceptualization could result in unwelcome simplifications. However, as one of the purposes of this section was to test the possibility of applying interdisciplinary concepts to historical studies, we can, for instance, question the pertinence of sociological theories to the cases studied. In Table 3 an

attempt is made to classify our examples using the typology employed in the discourse of the social sciences and developed by Hollander and Einwohner.

TABLE 3. SOCIAL-SCIENCE TYPOLOGY OF RESISTANCES APPLIED TO CASE STUDIES  
According to J.A. Hollander, R.L. Einwohner, *Conceptualizing Resistance*, in "Sociological Forum", 2004, 19, p. 544.

Type of resistance	Is the act intended as resistance by actor?	Is act recognized as resistance by		Case studies
		Target?	Observer?	
Overt resistance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Kalivodová, Larguèche, Hofmann, Labuda, Sargent and Hoare
Covert resistance	Yes	No	Yes	Kalivodová, Janáč, Hofmann, Larguèche
Unwitting resistance	No	Yes	Yes	Kalivodová, Sargent and Hoare
Target-defined resistance	No	Yes	No	Sánchez-Medina, Sargent and Hoare (Border Surnames)
Externally-defined resistance	No	No	Yes	Massé
Missed resistance	Yes	Yes	No	-----
Attempted resistance	Yes	No	No	Larguèche
No resistance	No	No	No	-----

As seen previously, this table can prove useful for defining common stages or degrees of resistance. With the exception of constructed resistances, which belong to a specific category because they mainly have to do with representations of alterity rather than with concrete actions or social change, most of the case studies seem to describe several sociological types of resistance. Sometimes the borders between different types of resistance are blurred and it would seem that an endless amount of arguments, debates and different perspectives would have to be taken into account before resistance can be easily and neatly classified. However, from a historical point of view, this sociological typology is only partly relevant: its main weakness is that it seems impossible to classify and study identity or frontier-based resistances by using a pattern which does not take into account time as a variable.

We have already discussed the external time of contextual historical change. But there is also the internal time of the resistance itself. Resistances' intensity varies during the course of the historical process and as we could see in our examples, many resistances

transform from unwitting, covert actions to overt manifestations of the self. Bearing this in mind, a way out could be to use resistance as a concept for deconstructing different stages of identity-making: from unintentional motives to overt resistance, resulting in the implementation and recognition of physical or symbolic, but in any case socially 'visible' frontiers. Then, the theories developed by psychology, anthropology and political studies have their utility in all these stages. But the problem remains; there is a lack of a specific historical typology of resistance that could integrate the time variable. This of course implies that the different stages of identity-making and boundaries-building be taken into consideration. Table 4 suggests the road toward such a typology, as it associates several sociological types of resistance with different stages of the identity and frontier building, including 'constructed resistance' as a specific but – in the discipline of history – apparently common type.

In addition the last column of table 4 affiliates typical sources with particular types of resistance. Originally, the idea of typical sources emerged out of discussions about another problem related with the time dimension: can we talk about certain types of resistance that would be characteristic for particular periods in history? Though our answer is largely sceptical, as shown in the paragraphs that follow, we nevertheless realized two interesting sub-questions. The first has to do precisely with the sources: could we claim that certain types of resistance would be dominant in historical sources for particular periods? This of course raises the problem of what sources and more theoretically to what extent sources alone contain any meaning<sup>14</sup>. A sophisticated version of this question would nevertheless explore, whether certain types of resistance were more likely to be accentuated in given periods by the contemporaries, and hence captured in the language of resistance and left as such in the sources. Needless to say, this leads us back to the issue, what are those languages of resistance<sup>15</sup>. The second sub-question concerns rather the producers of historical memory and knowledge. We can ask then, whether certain types of resistance – rather than others – have been typically focused, highlighted and described in the resistance terminology employed by historians of particular periods? Or said differently, whether particular kinds of resistance tend to be 'romanticized' for particular periods, or stressed by historians as memory-makers and hence identity co-creators? Clearly, for the historian modern notions of identity and of strengthening state or ethnic identities have left an indelible dominant narrative of resistance. Especially in nation based identities and accounts of history one set of resistances can become more highlighted or discussed than other types of resistance.

Indeed, one way to look at resistance, time and the study of history would be to determine, if seen from a perspective of historical narratives, would there be some type of prevalent resistance appearing in each time period? If this were the case then resistance of the modern period would follow the historical narrative of the period: certain types of resistance would be present mirroring major historical events of the time. Thus before the fall of the Berlin Wall or around the time the USSR was formed ideological

TABLE 4. HISTORICAL TYPOLOGY OF RESISTANCES			
Types of resistances	General impact on frontiers and identities	Concrete events and strategies	Typical sources
Overt resistance or violent uprisings and conflicts	Defence, creation or implementation of empowered or 'rebel' identities/frontiers	Self assertive resistances, which need to describe themselves in terms of resistance in order to be legitimized and recognized by their targets: wars, revolutions, uprisings, repression, mass contestation, peaceful demonstrations, political changes, and intellectual or social commitments	Source-productive resistances: political programs, apologies, polemics, etc. These resistances are likely to be romanticized (often immediately), which further stimulates source production (commemorative texts, histories, or monuments)
Covert resistance peaceful negotiations	Defence/ implementation of politically or culturally weakened or underpowered identities and frontiers	Silence, ambiguity, dissimulation, clandestineness, 'Everyday forms of resistance'	Private sources, sources of popular culture (e.g. letters, diaries, popular songs and illustrations)
Transgression (unwitting resistance)	Defence of self-unaware identities/frontiers?	Psychology of identities in a process of self-individuation with unconscious motives	Indirect sources created by observers: Judicial documents, police reports, administrative descriptions, journalist critiques, etc.
Constructed (fictive or used to implement an internal strategy) resistance	Resistance as a rhetorical device for implementing internal or external identity-frontiers based strategies	Strategies of inclusion, exclusion or legitimating identities <i>a posteriori</i>	Mainly literature and art works, but also all kinds of documents referring to stereotyped discourses about alterity (e.g. letters)
No resistance	Assimilation or disappearance of frontiers/identities	Integration of peripheral territories, groups and 'unsuccessful' identities into a centre or a dominant identity-based group	No specific sources

resistance may be detected in analysis of the period. In the studies presented this sometimes appears to be the case. In Janáč's study on engineers, ideological factors certainly are at play in defining resistance. However, all that this really demonstrates is what a particular student of history has decided to concentrate on, rather than any clear, overarching reality.

For studies of the 18th and 19th centuries a resistance based on nationality or ethnicity might be expected to be encountered. From the viewpoint of the historian this may, again, appear to be the case. In the studies presented here the cases by Labuda and Massé exhibit this trait: perhaps they provide examples of typical, certain types of resistance. However, this view shows more about historical research than about anything else. After all, Hofmann and Languèche provide counter-examples, which demonstrate both the long-lasting prevalence of national agenda for the history of the 19th century and the decisive shift beyond this heritage. Although in some ways Scandinavism had nationalism at its roots, as a threat against the borders of Denmark fostered a pan-Scandinavian reaction. Really a question about dominant historical narratives and resistance against these narratives would be more pertinent. However, this is something that would need to be answered by more than just historical research; social science, philosophy and many other disciplines would also have to research the question of just what type of event becomes historically significant. And, of course, what is significant for one school of thought or discipline may not seem as relevant for another.

In the early modern period, within the studies presented here, a certain type of resistance seems present: that of religious or confessional difference. This, however, only scratches the surface of the motives behind acts of resistance: much more may have been at stake for the actors involved. More nuanced types of resistance are actually presented and discussed in the case studies by Kalivodová, Sargent and Hoare. Initially the typology of resistance may seem typical and obvious, however, resistance to preserve traditions or resistance to financial demands are not particularly obvious types of resistance. Certainly a fact that can be garnered from this study is that resistance is a diverse field and resists being easily classified or categorized simply because of its diversity. Resistance can mean many things to many people, as stated in our introduction and alluded to when typologies of resistance were attempted<sup>16</sup>.

Thus there are unusual, untypical models of resistance also depicted and researched by scholars exploring their niche in history. In Languèche's example on Scandinavism an academic, intellectual resistance becomes a resistance through shared theoretical beliefs but also through real historical events. This type of resistance becomes hard to quantify physically but exists through historical research and intellectual thought. In a sense the study of Scandinavism keeps this intellectual resistance and shared identity alive at least in memory: the historical narrative will be left for others to pick up and study. However, the sources referring to Scandinavian meetings attest to the very, very Romantic atmosphere surrounding these meetings, which is very similar to German, Italian, and Czech

Romanticism. On the contrary, historians had a tendency to neglect Scandinavism as a field of research afterwards, because of the apparent small impact of the movement in the political field and also because the movement was completely overshadowed by the rise of “classical nationalism” in each Scandinavian country. On the other hand, the Scandinavian movement never ceased to exist completely, but it took a radical different direction after 1864: a pragmatic, non-romantic movement, enhancing collaboration in various fields – commercial, monetary, cultural – but not as a political union.

This brings the focus onto the sources that are left behind for history to peruse. This is apparent in the article by Medina- Sánchez on Visigothic Iberia, when the historical narratives are those left by the dominant civilization – in this case by the Romans. So a question is left unanswered: how can resistance, examined indifferently and separately from historical discourse or from dominant historical narratives, be correctly studied? One thing that can be said is that this is a wider research question highlighting just one difficulty in examining resistance.

Even the same acts of resistance can be interpreted differently by different schools of thought or disciplines. In fact no certain type of resistance exists. But like identities certain types of resistance, or narratives of resistance, can become fashionable, desirable or merely suitable. This chapter has demonstrated a great diversity of resistances but was always probably doomed to failure in defining every aspect of the concept. In fact resistance, on the whole, may be conceptualized and typologized in general terms but may elude a full definition. This, however, may never have been possible without analyzing every viewpoint on resistance and, if this prospect is considered, the whole of history would have to be examined. Certainly no single book or section would ever fully achieve this; there is no certain, correct type of history and no certain, correct type of resistance.

## CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

From the remarks above the theories and concepts surrounding resistance have been clearly marked out and highlighted as they have been used in each case study. However, what about the general concepts of resistance and identity: do they go hand in hand, do they inform each other? What has been the usefulness of this rather experimental approach to the concept of resistance? Has the discipline of studying history been enriched by this study of resistance and does resistance in fact provide interesting avenues for further research? To follow are some reflections on these questions.

From the studies provided it is clear that the concept of resistance is a central dynamic in many cases and periods for examining frontiers and identities. Of relevance for each case, and thus one of the factors determining resistance, are the conceived importance of factors that eventually construct identity and the perceived threats that are challenging those factors of identity. In these cases, therefore communities’ identities may appear threatened especially when another, opposing identity is constructed. More accu-

rately, what have been examined are a number of cases of political action, in which if a group loses, it has resisted and if it wins, it achieves hegemony. To this extent, what also appears is that references to frontiers and identities are often invoked as rhetorical devices intending to foster or implement various forms of resistance from different human communities, therefore ensuring power or resolving conflicts of interest. Therefore, as shown by the chapter about Visigothic Spain, being a part of the Roman civilization was obviously an important part of everyday citizens' identities. Many of the so-called 'Barbarians' also wished to be a part of this civilization although others were obviously not so impressed by Roman culture (as can be seen by their efforts to resist its expansion into their territory)<sup>17</sup>. The Byzantine too, were proud of their Roman identity. They were also afraid of the outside influences exerted upon the Empire's population by barbarian tribes – there was a general belief that becoming more 'barbarian' would mean the end of the Roman Empire. The Roman elite did not want the Roman identity of its people diluted by, what they saw as, a less civilized people. This is aptly demonstrated by the number of edicts issued to the population of the Empire, during its latter days, which attempted to restrict barbarian influence on the populace of the Empire; amongst other measures these laws forbade the wearing of trousers (a barbarian trait) amongst the Roman populace<sup>18</sup>. Opposing or contesting identities lie at the heart of all of our studies of resistance in one form or another.

Our studies have also highlighted another central element of resistance in that there is always a kind of push-pull force of resistance. Like Isaac Newton's Law, where every force is opposed by an equal and opposite force, resistance in all the cases described, is always a two-way, dual resistance<sup>19</sup>. Taking again the example of Visigothic Spain: whilst some of the people outside of the Roman Empire wished to be admitted into the *civitas* and resisted attempts at stopping them, others, already inside, resisted their incorporation<sup>20</sup>. Even where the study of resistance does not explicitly deal with the two sides of resistance, the other side of resistance, the force opposed to the resistance being offered, is always present. If, for example, Massé's depiction of diplomats constituting an element of resistance in favour of Greek independence and Greek nationalism is examined, it can certainly be implied that from the Turkish-Ottoman perspective, the opposing perspective, there were forces in operation resisting the activities of the diplomats involved. Ottoman diplomatic envoys made representations to the Great Powers showing that they had true sovereignty over the Greeks in an attempt to resist the behind the scenes machinations that were moving towards favouring Greek independence<sup>21</sup>. There are always two actors in resistance; they are not necessarily totally opposed to each other, nor do they necessarily act with equal force, or gain equal success, against each other. Unlike Newton's Law the physical force of resistance is hard to quantify, usually resistance is best measured by its success. Thus if national or ethnic resistance is successful, the actors can be seen as freedom fighters gaining liberty for their people or country. Conversely if unsuccessful, the same freedom fighters can be described as



terrorists trying to subvert the state or natural order. This, of course, depends on who controls the historical narrative; usually it is the victors who do so. There are often two or more simultaneous historical narratives of the same events and resistances, proposing radically different interpretations of history. This can mean that resistance becomes part of an ethnic or national tradition and becomes acceptable when successful or (as is also often the case) romantically heroic in defeat depending on the perspective the resistance is viewed from.

The chapters have also highlighted the importance of national identity to the individual at certain times in history<sup>22</sup>. Certainly, national identity and the inherent need for a nation state or homeland must have formed a central element of identity for people involved in various revolutions. So many were willing to die for their homeland or for their independence from supra-national states; they would not do so were it not considered an important factor making up their own individual or group identity. For others it was not so clear cut, however, and in at least one of our studies we find that where national based resistance may be expected the discourse of resistance was employed for the betterment of a people rather than a nation<sup>23</sup>. Since the time of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution, national resistance has dominated the historical discourse. There are still many examples of this type of resistance today: Chechnya, the Tamils in Sri-Lanka, ETA – the list goes on. This national element of resistance highlights the fact that often the dominant forces of historical discourses also seem to dominate the theories of resistance. If we examine the early modern period and show the importance of religion as a factor of change and in forming identity during this era, we see that religious factors formed a central element of resistance during this early modern period. Thus religion is a major factor in the Recusancy Revolt and is the crucial factor in motivating the rebellion of the Protestants in Kalivodov's case study<sup>24</sup>. These were the periods of Reformation and Counter-Reformation, and periods where personal religious identities became intertwined with state power and a group's identity<sup>25</sup>. The acts of resistance described in the case of Ireland and its borderland show how religion became a central part of national or ethnic identity or character. Therefore, when someone (state power, regime or individual) innovated in religious practise, or tried to change someone's personal beliefs, resistance to change was likely to occur. It is clear from this that resistance, as already stated, often comes hand in hand as a concept with the concepts of the formation of identities<sup>26</sup>. When a human community faces the, sometimes traumatic, forces of change on its environment, it may choose diverse strategies of resistance according to the nature of the perceived threat. This 'environment' can be defined as a space combining political, social, geographical, cultural, economical and even technological dimensions. This space is understood, integrated and represented as an inherent support for both collective and individual identities within a given group. Thus, frontiers and identities are not only the results of affective or emotional concerns: people also have an interest in supporting or combating certain systems. Elites, as well

as other groups, try to take the best course of action available to them. Taking the example of Hofmann, the cosmopolitan German and Czech speaking nobility were not necessarily doing anything other than trying to protect an imperial system in which they had a stake, as long as this was an option. Although it was a powerful motif in arts, literature, and in the ‘mythology of the fallen empires’, the nostalgia of the old Habsburg dominion could not be seen as the main reason for the political commitment of the nobility. In other words, beyond the romance of resistance, historians should be able to take into account the materiality of these dynamics. This is rather reminiscent of the biologists’ view of resistance<sup>27</sup> which has perhaps proved more relevant to historical discourse on resistance than was initially obvious. The periodization of history should be questioned and criticized. It is clearly one of the main devices used to construct national narratives or to create a perception of the ‘other’

Another, perhaps more unusual approach than might have seemed obvious, was the suggestion that resistance could be periodized<sup>28</sup>, or put into categories showing trends in particular periods in history. That is, instances of resistance could be periodized to fit in with dominant historical discourses covering the time period involved. For Classical Antiquity this would mean that resistance and identities would be largely based on the (sometimes narrow) cultural perceptions of the classical civilizations – the Romans or the Greeks. Thus anyone not conforming to their beliefs of identity would be an outsider, or Barbarian. This would appear to have been the case in Visigothic Spain<sup>29</sup>. However, the reason for this is more likely surviving source material than reality. For the later 18th and 19th centuries, up to the 20th century, resistance would be largely national or ethnic in basis as this became the more common discourse of the period. When looking at our more modern case studies, from the Greek uprising in the 1820s<sup>30</sup> up to the case of Hungarian parties in inter-war Czechoslovakia<sup>31</sup>, all cases of resistance include nationalism or ethnicity as a major factor making up the opposing identities<sup>32</sup>. As already stated, the cases concerning the early modern period involve religious or confessional identities, as this was a period of reformation and counter-reformation this fits into this general pattern. However, to periodize resistance may not be that helpful; the debate is still out as to whether periodizing history is a useful tool or not. For example how would we categorize the resistance of the gentry to taxes in the north of England? This would not be part of any major historical discourse: there would always be exceptions to the rule. Another question that would have to be asked (and answered) would be: where do the limits – the frontiers – of our periods fit in; what and when are the Middle Ages or the early modern period? Especially when considering such a broad area of disciplines, territories, people, actors and identities, no single overarching theory can inform us of every relevant factor in resistance.

What has been an interesting discovery of this section on resistance have been depictions of the nuanced forms of resistance that were sometimes employed by historical actors. In the case study describing Greek resistance against Ottoman domination, in-

fluence over foreign public opinion was obviously sought after by some participants<sup>33</sup>. In the case of Hungarian nationalists who were incorporated into a foreign state, they made the most of the opportunity afforded by Lord Rothermere's news articles; in fact so much so that it has been indelibly incorporated into Hungarian historical memory as Rothermere's Action<sup>34</sup>. In the case of 17th century's England and Ireland, there must have been a remarkable co-ordination of the resistance by the protagonists: how exactly did the Irish towns manage to co-ordinate their religious protests against the Crown<sup>35</sup>? In the case about 19th century's Scandinavism, there was an intense academic debate about the interpretation of national symbolism and what exactly formed the basis for an understanding of shared identity<sup>36</sup>. In other words peoples' debate about what formed identity was not recognized as resistance against anything at the time but it can be interpreted as such now. What is demonstrated by these examples is the understanding of forms of resistance that have only recently been researched by social scientists or political scientists or, indeed, historians; i.e. these historical actors used tactics of resistance that have only recently been noticed, researched and theorized, even though many actors in the actual resistance may not even have realized they were actively resisting anything.

This leads to another aspect of this chapter: how can modern theories of resistance be applied to historical actions? What has become apparent from our studies is that modern theories surrounding resistance and identities can be applied to the actions of the past relatively effectively. All of the examples of resistance studied can be typologized using accepted modern terms of reference, albeit with some difficulty. For example, each type of resistance was either covert or overt resistance; each type of resistance went either recognized or unrecognized<sup>37</sup>. Resistance, even of the distant past, can be quite usefully examined using modern sociological or political theories of resistance. However, some historical acts of resistance may well escape such neat categorization. A more nuanced interrogation of resistance may be offered by studies that do not incorporate these classifications. All the types of resistance examined by the case studies presented here have elements of Scott's theories of social domination in some form or another – even when not specifically described. The people of the past had far more of an understanding of collusion, political negotiation, covert resistance and foot-dragging etc., than they have sometimes been credited with<sup>38</sup>.

Modern actors in resistance have learnt from acts of resistance in the past. Forces, especially state authorities, opposing resistance have also learnt tactics to deal effectively with resistance. Anti-globalization protestors today try to have the largest impact possible on public opinion by purposely carrying on their resistance in the full glare of the world's media. This tactic is learnt from resistance in the past, resistance is more effective when public opinion is influenced by the acts of resistance<sup>39</sup>. Those attempting to put an end to anti-globalization protests do not always want to do so out in the open, thus revealing their identity, for fear of repercussions<sup>40</sup>. In England, police removed their identification numbers at recent protests so that they could not be held to account

for their actions. Those confronting protestors in Ireland have employed similar tactics. There may be a concern that if there is a perceived use of heavy-handed tactics against protestors the resistance may be further legitimated. If that were to occur those under orders to put down protest may become accountable, if not to the law, then to an element of public opinion or trial by media<sup>40</sup>. Regimes do not publicise the suppression of resistance to science or technology – in recent years, knowledge about the use of intelligence services to infiltrate protest movements against nuclear power or animal experiments has come into the public domain – shocking some. Governments realise that if they openly declare organisations as illegal they could reinforce the aims of resisters by being perceived as attacking certain freedoms. Of course, many people realise that for the public well-being a certain amount of surveillance of society is required. In today's political climate, created by the “war on terror”, there is often public goodwill towards the monitoring of groups which are viewed as potentially subversive by those in power<sup>41</sup>. Obviously there is still much to learn from resistance, as shown in Janáč's case study. Resistance is a current theme as well as a historical one<sup>42</sup>.

This study has also been useful in the regard of showing that resistance can actually provide common bonds between people and common themes for historians to explore. All groups of people whether divided ethnically, nationally, or simply collectively have some form of narrative of resistance informing their identities. Every British school child learns of the victory over Nazism, every French student learns about the French Revolution, every Polish pupil learns of his or her country's fight for freedom from invading powers. These narratives of resistance, sometimes seen as heroic, sometimes desperate and futile, have ultimately informed every type of identity within Europe and beyond; many US school children learn of the colonists' struggle for independence as part of the school history syllabus<sup>43</sup>. This highlights the fact that resistance is common to all societies, often it forms a major part of their self identity, and it is ultimately useful to study links between forms of resistance in all societies. At CLIOHRES our aim has always been to study innovative links between the studies of history of our states. As it seems that all types of nations, all types of ethnicities and all types of cultures may have some memory of resistance, the theme of resistance can provide a common link with the past for all societies and may fulfil this aim.

When this, rather experimental and collaborative approach, was embarked on some considerable time ago, and the specifics of each of our studies were thought about, this finding or realization is something which we probably all ignored. It has been an unusual journey of discovery to find that resistance – something that usually divides people – can, in fact, link all of our studies. Like Europe, which is constantly being brought together through the integration process (and, of course, faces various forms of resistance to this along the way) our studies of history can be linked by the common theme of resistance. This must, at least, be one fruitful outcome of our experimental approach to the theme of resistance in history.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> In this section see A. Larguèche, A. Sargent, E. Kalivodová, J. Ira, *Resistances in the Field of Frontiers and Identities: a New Connecting Theme or an Interdisciplinary Tool for Comparative Research?*
- <sup>2</sup> In this volume see the opening chapter by M. Krocová, M. Řezník, *Boundaries and Identities in Academic Discourse*.
- <sup>3</sup> This is a highly abstract and reductive reading, which concentrates exclusively on the crucial terms and their relations, and thus abstracts from the contexts. The exercise in a way corresponds with the analysis pursued in the “CLIOHRES about Frontiers and Identities” chapters in this volume.
- <sup>4</sup> In this section see E. Sánchez-Medina, *A Created Enemy: ‘Barbarians’ in spite of Religious Conversion. Visigoths and Byzantines in 6th-Century Iberia*.
- <sup>5</sup> In this section see K. Hoare, A. Sargent, *Resistance to the Union of the Crowns: the North of England and the Recusancy Revolt of 1603*.
- <sup>6</sup> In this section see E. Kalivodová, *The Opočno Religious Rebellion and its Consequences in the Context of the Carolinian Counter-Reformation*.
- <sup>7</sup> In this section see A. Massé, *French Consuls and the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1827: The Consequences of Consular Representations of Greek and Ottoman Identities*.
- <sup>8</sup> In this section see A. Larguèche, *Resistance as the Creation of a Natural Frontier: the Language of 19th-Century Scandinavism (1839-1867)*.
- <sup>9</sup> In this section see U. Hofmann, *Resistance against Nationalization: The Case of Bohemian Nobles in the 19th Century*.
- <sup>10</sup> In this section see D. Labuda, *Through Resistance towards Restoration: Political Parties of the Hungarian Minority in Czechoslovakia during the Interwar Period*.
- <sup>11</sup> J. Janáč, *Resistance to Sovietization in Technology*.
- <sup>12</sup> In this section see Larguèche, Sargent, Kalivodová, Ira, *Resistances* cit.
- <sup>13</sup> Some of these criteria were explicitly adopted from or inspired by authors that were discussed in Larguèche, Sargent, Kalivodová, Ira, *Resistances* cit.
- <sup>14</sup> Recent theories of historiography and literature stress rather the receptive role of historians, or readers, and even more of their intellectual backgrounds and social contexts in creating meanings out of sources and texts.
- <sup>15</sup> The whole field of conceptual history and historical semantics opens here. In this section the issue was partly addressed in Hoare, Sargent, *Resistance to the Union* cit.; Larguèche, *Resistance as the Creation* cit.
- <sup>16</sup> See tables 3 and 4 above.
- <sup>17</sup> Sánchez-Medina, *A Created Enemy* cit.; see also P.A. Brunt, *Laus Imperii*, in P.D. Garnsey, C.R. Whitaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World: The Cambridge University Research Seminar*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 159-192.
- <sup>18</sup> R. Collins, *Early Medieval Europe 300-1000*, Hampshire 1999, pp. 100-101.
- <sup>19</sup> S. Holzner, *Physics for Dummies*, Indianapolis IN 2005, pp. 144-145.
- <sup>20</sup> Sánchez-Medina, *A created Enemy* cit.
- <sup>21</sup> Massé, *French Consuls* cit.
- <sup>22</sup> Hofmann, *Resistance against Nationalization* cit.; Labuda, *Through Resistance* cit.
- <sup>23</sup> Hofmann, *Resistance against Nationalization* cit.
- <sup>24</sup> Hoare, Sargent, *Resistance to the Union* cit.; see also Kalivodová, *The Opočno Religious Rebellion* cit.
- <sup>25</sup> D. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided, 1490-1700*, Oxford 2003, pp. xxii-xxiii; M. Kaelberer, *The Euro and European Identity: Symbols, Power and the Politics of European Monetary Union*, in “Review of International Studies”, 30 April 2004, pp. 161-178.

- <sup>26</sup> In this volume see Krocová, Řezník, *Boundaries and Identities* cit.
- <sup>27</sup> Larguèche, Sargent, Kalivodová, Ira, *Resistances* cit.; see also R. Dulbecco, *Encyclopedia of human biology*, vol. 1, San Diego CA 2008, pp. 37-38, 295.
- <sup>28</sup> U. Lotz-Heumann, *Confessionalisation in Ireland: periodisation and character, 1534-1649*, in A. Ford, J. McCafferty (eds.), *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 24-53; W. Reinhard, *The Idea of Early Modern History*, in M. Bentley (ed.), *Companion to Historiography*, London 1997, pp. 281-292.
- <sup>29</sup> Sánchez-Medina, *A Created Enemy* cit.
- <sup>30</sup> Massé, *French Consuls* cit.
- <sup>31</sup> Labuda, *Through Resistance* cit.
- <sup>32</sup> Larguèche, *Resistance as the Creation* cit. See also Hofmann, *Resistance against Nationalization* cit.
- <sup>33</sup> Massé, *French Consuls* cit.
- <sup>34</sup> Labuda, *Through Resistance* cit.; see also G. Juhász, *Hungarian foreign policy, 1919-1945*, Budapest 1979, p. 85.
- <sup>35</sup> Sargent, Hoare, *Resistance to the Union* cit.
- <sup>36</sup> Larguèche, *Resistance as the Creation* cit.
- <sup>37</sup> J.A. Hollander, R.L. Einwohner, *Conceptualizing Resistance*, in "Sociological Forum", 19, 4, 2004, pp. 533-554, at pp. 544-545.
- <sup>38</sup> Larguèche, Sargent, Kalivodová, Ira, *Resistances* cit.
- <sup>39</sup> Labuda, *Through Resistance* cit.
- <sup>40</sup> B. Frommer, *National cleansing: retribution against Nazi collaborators in postwar Czechoslovakia*, Cambridge 2005; N. Tec, *Defiance: The Bielski Partisans*, Oxford 1993, pp. 76-79; W. Laqueur, *The Rebirth of Europe*, Austin TX 1970, pp. 18-23; D. Baker, *Public Order Policing*, in T. Prenzler, J. Ransley (eds.), *Police reform: building integrity*, New South Wales 2002, pp. 39-52; M. Hickley, "Daily Mail Online", 22 April 2009, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1172252/Watchdogs-G20-anger-Police-tactics-violence-unacceptable.html>, accessed on 3 December 2009.
- <sup>41</sup> P. Todd, J. Bloch, *Global Intelligence: the World's Secret Services Today*, Dhaka 2003, pp. 116-117.
- <sup>42</sup> Janáč, *Resistance to Sovietization* cit.
- <sup>43</sup> L.P. McKenzie, *The Pledge of Allegiance: One Nation Under God?*, in "The Arizona Law Review", 2004, 46, pp. 379-414.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adnan S., *Departures from everyday resistance and flexible strategies of domination: the making and unmaking of a poor peasant mobilization in Bangladesh*, in "Journal of Agrarian change", 2007, 7, pp. 183-224.
- Bauer M.W., *Resistance to new technology: Nuclear power, Information technology and Biotechnology*, Cambridge - New York 1995.
- Bénabou M., *La résistance africaine à la romanisation*, Paris 1976.
- Bijker W.E., Hughes T.P., Pinch T.J. (eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology*, Cambridge 1987.
- Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J., Randsborg K. (eds.), *Centre and periphery in the Hellenistic world*, Aarhus 1994.
- Bonfield K., *Writings of the Luddites*, Baltimore 2004.

- Bourdieu P., *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Paris 1972.
- Bourdieu P., *Le sens pratique*, Paris 1980.
- Breuer S., *Sozialdisziplinierung. Probleme und Problemverlagerungen eines Konzepts bei Max Weber, Gerhard Oestreich und Michel Foucault*, in Sachße C., Tennstedt F. (eds.), *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, Frankfurt am Main 1986, pp. 45-69.
- Brunel G., Brunet S., *Les luttes anti-seigneuriales dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne: Haro sur le seigneur!*, Toulouse 2009.
- Burke P., *History and social theory*, Cambridge 2005.
- Chollet M., Rimbert P., *Les révoltés du travail*, Paris 2008.
- Clark L., *Identity and insurgency in the late Middle Ages*, Woodbridge 2006.
- Constant J-M., *Révoltes et révolutions en Amérique et en Europe (1773-1802)*, Paris 2005.
- Cresswell T., *In place, out of place: geography, ideology and transgression*, Minneapolis 1996.
- Cucó Ginger Al., *Els Confins d'Europa: nacionalisme, geopolítica i drets humans a la Mediterrània oriental*, Valencia 1997.
- De Castéra B., *La révolte est-elle juste?*, Paris 2009.
- Dewitte J., *Le pouvoir de la langue et la liberté de l'esprit: essai sur la résistance au langage totalitaire*, Paris 2007.
- Diener G., *L'autre communisme en Roumanie : résistance populaire et maquis: 1945-1965*, Paris 2001.
- Ellis S.G., Klusáková L. (eds.), *Frontiers and identities: exploring the research area*, Pisa 2006.
- Id. (eds.), *Imagining frontiers, contesting identities*, Pisa 2007.
- Ellis S.G., Eßer R. (eds.), *Frontiers, regions and identities in Europe*, Pisa 2009.
- Emery D.B., *Self, creativity, political resistance*, in "Political Psychology", 1993, 14, pp. 347-362.
- Fava V., *Between American Fordism and 'Soviet Fordism': Czechoslovak way towards mass production*, in Apor B., Apor P., Rees E.A. (eds.), *The Sovietization of Eastern Europe: new perspectives on the postwar period*, Washington DC 2008, pp. 47-64.
- Fletcher A., MacCulloch D., *Tudor Rebellions*, Harlow 2004.
- Flora P. (ed.), *State-formation, nation-building and mass-politics in Europe: the theory of Stein Rokkan*, Oxford 1999.
- Hemstad R., *Historie og nasjonal identitet: kampen om fortiden i det danske-tyske grenseland 1815-1840*, Oslo 1996.
- Hobsbawm E.J., *Primitive rebels: studies in archaic forms of social movement in the 19th and 20th centuries*, Manchester 1959.
- Hollander J.A., Einwohner R.L., *Conceptualizing Resistance*, in "Sociological forum", 2004, 19, pp. 533-554.
- Jensen H. (ed.), *Rebellion and resistance*, Pisa 2009.
- Jones S.E., *Against technology: from the Luddites to neo-Luddism*, New York 2006.
- Jung C.G., *Man and his symbols*, London 1964.
- Id., *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*, London 1975.
- Lassen A. (ed.), *Det norrøne og det nationale: studier i brugen af Islands gamle litteratur i nationale sammenhænge i Norge, Sverige, Island, Storbritannien, Tyskland og Danmark*, Reykjavik 2008.
- Lears T., *The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities*, in "American Historical Review", 1985, 90, pp. 567-593.
- Lignereux A., *La France rébellionnaire: les résistances à la gendarmerie: 1800-1859*, Rennes 2008.
- Martin-Jones D., *Deleuze, cinema and national identity*, Edinburgh 2006.
- Mokyr J., *Technological inertia in economic history*, in "Journal of Economic History", 1992, 52, pp. 325-338.

- Monter E.W., *Enforcing Morality in Early Modern Europe*, London 1987.
- Mousnier R., *Fireurs paysannes: les paysans dans les révoltes du XVIIe siècle: France, Russie, Chine*, Paris 1967.
- Nicolas J., *La rébellion française: mouvements populaires et conscience sociale: 1661-1789*, Paris 2002.
- Oestreich G., *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Berlin 1969.
- Oudshoorn N., Pinch T.J. (eds.), *How users matter: the co-construction of users and technologies (Inside technology)*, Cambridge 2003.
- Parkin F., *Class Inequality and Political Order*, London 1971.
- Randall A., *Before the Luddites: Custom, Community and Machinery in the English Woolen Industry 1776-1809*, Cambridge - New York 1991.
- Reed-Danahay D., *Talking about resistance: ethnography and theory in rural France*, in "Anthropological Quarterly", 1993, 66, pp. 221-229.
- Reichelberg R., Kauffmann J., *Littérature et résistance*, Reims 2000.
- Revel J., *L'histoire au ras du sol*, in Lévi G. (ed.), *Le pouvoir au village*, Paris 1989, pp. i-xxxii.
- Rokkan S., Urwin D.W. (eds.), *The politics of territorial identity: studies in European regionalism*, New York 1982.
- Rowlands M., Larsen M., Kristiansen K. (eds.), *Centre and periphery in the Ancient world*, Cambridge 1987.
- Sato Y., *Pouvoir et résistance: Foucault, Deleuze, Derrida, Althusser*, Paris 2007.
- Scott J.C., *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Subsistence and Rebellion in Southeast Asia*, New Haven 1976.
- Id., *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*, New Haven CN 1985.
- Id., *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*, New Haven CN 1990.
- Sémelin J., Andrieu C., Gensburger S., *La résistance aux génocides: de la pluralité des actes de sauvetage*, Paris 2008.
- Sivaramakrishnan K., *Some intellectual genealogies for the concept of everyday resistance*, in "American Anthropologist", 2005, 107, pp. 346-355.
- Slack P. (ed.), *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England*, Cambridge 2008.
- Smith A.D., *Myths and memories of the nation*, Oxford 1999.
- Strauss A., *Negotiations*, San Francisco 1978.
- Urbainczyk T., *Slave revolts in antiquity*, Berkeley CA 2008.
- Weitz R., *Women and their Hair Seeking Power through Resistance and Accommodation*, in "Gender and Society", 2001, 15, pp. 667-686.
- Windler C., *La diplomatie comme expérience de l'autre: consuls français au Maghreb, 1700-1840*, Geneva 2002.