



Resistances in the Field of Frontiers and Identities: a New Connecting Theme or an Interdisciplinary Tool for Comparative Research?

Aladin Larguèche, Andrew Sargent, Eva Kalivodová, Jaroslav Ira

► To cite this version:

Aladin Larguèche, Andrew Sargent, Eva Kalivodová, Jaroslav Ira. Resistances in the Field of Frontiers and Identities: a New Connecting Theme or an Interdisciplinary Tool for Comparative Research?. Luďa Klusáková and Martin Moll with Jaroslav Ira, Aladin Larguèche, Eva Kalivodová, Andrew Sargent. Crossing Frontiers, Resisting Identities, Plus-Pisa University Press, pp. 103-121, 2011, Frontiers and identities, 978-88-8492-737-8. <hal-00724582>

HAL Id: hal-00724582

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00724582>

Submitted on 21 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

Published by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

info.plus@adm.unipi.it

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

Part II: An Experiment



Conwy Bridge, North Wales.

During the fourth year of the project the group debated about how to formulate proposals for a new agenda in frontiers and identities research. We pondered what we would do if we had the opportunity to work more in the field. Discussions were frank, since everyone was interested in the problem, and hoped for some form of continuation. The future framework will not be CLIOHRES, but perhaps there will be another format in which research in the field may be developed further.

The formation of identities, as has been written by many authors, very often takes place in a context of the self-protection of an individual or of a group, and, as a consequence, some authors insist, frontiers are involved. This protection or defence takes different forms. During our discussions we identified as axiomatic the importance of considering identities in the plural, and as connected to exchanges and *métissages* in various ways. Markéta Křížová, Harieta Mareci Sabol and Alexandre Massé presented this issue in their chapter in the first part of the book. The second concept we took as axiomatic was “resistance”, as a many-faceted response to the pressures of identity building or the imposition of identities. “Resistance” is displayed in the construction of various forms of barriers, and proved to be a concept that connects the research themes of

many members of the group, particularly our doctoral students. The common perspective with regard to concepts studied is transdisciplinarity, which should not mean only collaboration with anthropology, psychology and sociology (as performed by Martina Krocová, Miloš Řezník, and indeed Jiří Janáč), but also a much greater involvement with humanist geography, as has been argued in previous chapters by Matej Blažek and Pavel Šuška.

In the second part of the book we look towards the future in a series of chapters that map our discussions and support our arguments through case studies. The focus will be on the theme or concept of resistance, as formulated by anthropologists and sociologists, but the perspective of historiographical research.



The *dragonnades*, the persecution of French Protestants under Louis XIV. Engraving, Musée internationale de la Réforme protestante, Geneva.

Resistances in the Field of Frontiers and Identities: a New Connecting Theme or an Interdisciplinary Tool for Comparative Research?

ALADIN LARGUÈCHE

University of Toulouse II-Le-Mirail

ANDREW SARGENT

National University of Ireland, Galway

EVA KALIVODOVÁ

JAROSLAV IRA

Charles University in Prague

ABSTRACT

The following chapter introduces a body of case studies which intend to explore various conceptions of resistance in the field of frontiers and identities. It does not mean to present an exhaustive discussion of the concept's roots, but it still presents some major theories, firstly as they have been discussed in other disciplinary fields (psychology, anthropology, political studies and sociology), secondly by focussing on the relevance of this concept both as a connecting theme and as an analytical tool for innovative historical studies about frontiers and identities. Finally, the authors present an overview of the case studies developed in this chapter.

La présente contribution introduit un ensemble d'études de cas qui explorent différentes dimensions du concept de résistance, ainsi que l'utilité de cette notion dans les études des frontières et des identités en Europe. Ce texte ne propose pas un compte rendu exhaustif des débats académiques qui entourent l'idée de résistance: en premier lieu, il vise à présenter certaines théories majeures issues de la psychologie, de l'anthropologie, des sciences politiques et de la sociologie, afin de tester leur pertinence en histoire; en second lieu, il évoque un ensemble de théories plus spécifiquement utilisées par les historiens, montrant comment le concept de résistance, soit comme thème de recherche, soit comme outil analytique et interdisciplinaire, peut favoriser de nouvelles études historiques comparatives et innovantes

sur les frontières et les identités. Enfin, les auteurs proposent un aperçu des contributions présentées dans ce chapitre.

Tato kapitola je úvodem k souboru případových studií, které si kladou za cíl prozkoumat různé formy a pojetí rezistencí v rámci studia hranic a identit. Stat' nemůže sloužit jako vyčerpávající souhrn akademických debat o pojmu rezistence; autoři zde nicméně podávají pohled na nejzásadnější teorie týkající se tohoto jevu v dějinách. Zároveň je stručně načrtnuto, jak zkoumají rezistenci jiné vědní disciplíny (psychologie, sociologie, politologie, kulturní antropologie). Kapitola čtenáři předkládá rovněž přehled vybraných důležitých debat, jež poukazují na možná využití pojmu rezistence jakožto analytického nástroje pro inovativní historická studia hranic a identit. V závěru kapitola uvádí jednotlivé případové studie.

Since its inception the CLIOHRES network has attempted to look at innovative ways to study history. Thematic work group 5 has specifically explored the historical entities that could be included within a study of frontiers and identities. This has been undertaken with a view to include interdisciplinary studies and themed research with a wider remit than simple, narrative history. As the group was looking for prospective fields for further research, some members suggested that we could discuss the concept of resistance. This term has recently grown popular in the social sciences and in critical discourses of post-modern society, after having been for long associated with a particular moment in contemporary history – a classic model of European resistance made up of shadowy groups of people who, often heroically, resisted the totalitarian principles of Communism or Fascism. Many people throughout the world have also heard of such figures as Gandhi, who resisted the British Empire peacefully in order to highlight the plight of his people or Martin Luther King, who resisted the inherently racist laws and norms of then American society. Perhaps the most persistent and famous recent image of resistance is the ‘tank man’ who stood in front of a tank during the protest at Tiananmen Square. This is really just the tip of an enormous iceberg; history seems to be full of examples and types of resistance. Quite surprisingly, the initial suggestion came from historians of Late Antiquity (Esther Sánchez-Medina) and early modern times (Eva Kalivodová).

Indeed, resistance actually means many things to different people. For instance, simple acts such as changing a hairstyle have been seen to constitute resistance¹. However, all of these are relatively modern types and definitions of resistance. More recently, thematic work group 2 (power and culture) has focused on resistance in its fourth volume. This book explores the concept as “the refusal to accept established authority, be it political, economic, religious, cultural or generational”². Here, the usefulness of resistance is mainly advocated from an empirical point of view and exemplified through a body of case studies which range from the Middle Ages to contemporary times. Nevertheless, major methodological questions remain unanswered, which can be summed up as such:

can resistance provide a pertinent theoretical and practical framework within which to place our historical studies on frontiers and identities? Beyond academic fashions and classical patterns of resistance, is it possible to define this notion as an intersection between frontiers and identities?

As we have seen in the first TWG5 volume, the word frontier has a long history since the Middle Ages, when it primarily referred to a space of conflicts the shape of which followed the tides of power changes in a given territory³. In spite of the semantic extension of its meaning to non-territorial phenomena, the spatial dimension of frontier has always been prominent in its common usage in European languages. In contexts where territorial identities have been built up and sanctioned politically, frontiers are likely to be disputed. Both internally and externally, identity-building desires have to cope with various actors, powers or alternative identities which may contest their legitimacy and offer resistance to the threat of political, social and cultural change. "Belonging to any group is based on a definition of otherness"⁴. Consequently, frontiers appear to be the most obvious materialization of a human group's cohesion, as well as an impassable stage for negotiations between human communities which reciprocally proclaim their differences. By extension, if frontiers are codified spaces for various kinds of accommodations with otherness, they can also be seen as the result of processes which can be labelled as resistances to external changes, leading to a positive affirmation of the self. Resistance can therefore be interpreted as a set of actions employed by (in our case) people or groups of people, intending to protect themselves. From this perspective, the creation of borders is a natural defensive reaction when changes can be perceived as traumas for individuals as well as communities. For these reasons, it seems highly relevant to the field that we examine borders/frontiers/peripheries and their identities by using resistance as a theme for research⁵.

Nonetheless, the apparent simplicity of this statement does not diminish the challenging and ambitious aspects of the topic. As we wrote, there are a large range of social, political, cultural or individual strategies which can be depicted as 'resistances', and many scholars disagree about the pertinence of labelling some actions as such⁶. These disagreements actually centre around one problem: if resistance should be used as an analytical tool, should it not be theoretically defined in a restrictive, clear way?

After a fruitful discussion, the authors of this section have decided to elude this issue and to resume their experimental approach: the connecting theme of resistance should offer the opportunity of focussing on various processes, dynamic elements of identity-buildings and frontiers settings, thereby breaking the vicious circle of concepts (identity, borders etc.) which sometimes tend to be approached as physical essences or static phenomena. In other words, resistance would not be necessarily defined through these studies, but it would rather be employed as a lens to look through at our particular area of study. Bearing this in mind, studies could be linked by common themes and concepts: although discussing different eras, places or events, each study could examine the

extent to which the theme of resistance constitutes “a communicating vessel”⁷ between frontiers and identities. Another pertinent approach would be to see how applying, especially modern sociological, theories of resistance to our work as historians may add to the richness of an already vibrant area of study. The method would consist of: firstly, examining earlier views of resistance; secondly, describing types of resistance that occurred in a particular event, using more modern frames of reference; thirdly integrating each study of resistance into a relevant theoretical framework. This would, perhaps, be an innovative approach as advocated by the CLIOHRES network.

As it has happened, the writing of this section was no less experimental than its task⁸. The outcome has been a multitude of interesting ideas regarding possible understandings of resistance, definitions, classifications, and ways of studying the phenomenon through a body of short case studies and more general reflections. By putting forward these ideas, the authors of this section also intend to escape the pitfall of strict categorization, which can blur our understanding of the past by excluding several historical factors, instead of making them visible (which is, after all, the work of historians). But firstly, an overview of semantic, academic and theoretical aspects would allow us to grasp several dimensions of the concept of resistance. How does the understanding of resistance in other academic fields improve our comprehension of the topic frontiers and identities? Is it also possible to implement an effective typology for this research area? At last, and before proceeding any further, the authors would also like to thank Esther Sánchez-Medina, Ute Hofmann and Jiří Janáč for their precious collaboration.

RESISTANCE IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

In common language, resistance refers to a force or an action opposing a moral or physical pressure. Originally, the concept was mainly employed in the natural sciences: in this context, it is a mechanist concept used to describe an opposing force to movement. It is also employed by biological studies, where, in a rather Darwinist manner, resistance is defined as the ability by which living organisms deal with unusual solicitations or manage to stand against an agent which is a threat to their balance.

JUNGIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS

Analytical psychology has something to add to the contemporary debate about conscious/unconscious resistance, and the problem of applying this concept to unintended action against social change. Indeed, in clinical psychoanalysis, resistance normally refers to a mental barrier preventing the recollection of unconscious thoughts which might be able to heal a patient. But this Freudian statement has been more deeply examined by analytical psychology. Carl G. Jung (1875-1961) elaborated a theory of resistance based on the concept of ‘misonism’: “an unreasoning fear and hatred of new ideas”; the attitude by which one rejects innovations⁹. Jung did not restrict his theory to the

individual psyche but applied it to a collective unconscious, “a part of the psyche that retains and transmits the common psychological inheritance of mankind”¹⁰. Indeed, the use of Jungian psychology may be able to provide a relevant theory for questioning articulations and relationships between individual and collective identities, a field which remains underdeveloped in academic discourses about frontiers and identities¹¹. Eternal symbols, symbolic images and myths that often re-emerge in our dreams, exist because “the unconscious mind of modern man preserves the symbol-making capacity that once found expression in the beliefs and rituals of the primitive. And that capacity still plays a role of vital psychic importance”¹². Contrary to Freud’s, Jung’s idea of resistance is a common human experience which does not necessarily imply neurosis. In Jung’s theory the quest for symbols is an imperative need for the construction and balance of identities, which are sustained by different forms of representations¹³. Every collective representation has its roots in a collective unconscious, constituted of primordial images, or so-called archetypes (the father, the mother, the hero, the resurrection etc.) which themselves produce myths, religions and beliefs¹⁴.

Jung and his followers enhanced the theory that the barrier between the conscious and the unconscious is not at all impervious. Indeed, in the course of historical change, some previously unconscious acts may pass the blurred threshold between the unconscious and the conscious, thereby gaining intentionality, and therefore have to be considered in a dynamic perspective. This could be contradictory to the statement which insists on the necessary intentionality of resisting: thus, unconscious motives of resistance, which are a part of a general process of self-individuation, should not be neglected.

RESISTANCE AND POWER: ANTHROPOLOGY AND POLITICAL STUDIES

Both anthropology and the political sciences have been prolific on the topic of resistance. Inspired by Michel Foucault (1926-1984), the anthropologist James C. Scott has studied various forms of resistance against dominance among subaltern people¹⁵: “the poor sang one tune when they were in the presence of the rich and another tune when they were among the poor. The rich too spoke one way to the poor and another among themselves”¹⁶. According to his approach, one will generally refer to everyday forms of resistance to analyze the relation between the powerful and the poor. James C. Scott has listed other collective actions of resistance such as “theft, pilfering, feigned ignorance, shirking or careless labour, foot-dragging, secret trade and production for sale, sabotage of crops, livestock and machinery, arson, flight and so on”¹⁷. These “hidden transcripts” vary according to the nature and the degree of the domination’s violence and allow the creation of a “social space in which offstage dissent to the official transcript may be voiced”¹⁸. Subtlety, silence and secrecy may often become psychological features of an unquestioned collective behaviour, explaining that “relations of domination are, at the same time, relations of resistance”¹⁹. Thus, resistance is characterized by different

degrees of conflictuality. Some other, more empirical, terms are sometimes preferred: *débrouillardise*, cunning²⁰ and others describe situations of active resistance, as well as accommodations, negotiations or the “arts of political disguise”²¹. Scott’s arguments present at least one major analytical perspective and seem to be a genuine interdisciplinary tool, as shown by the thematic work group 2 in its fourth volume: the case studies explore various forms of resistance, from civil disobedience to violent uprising, and the use of the concept proved useful in order to enhance the cultural, almost anthropological dimension of contests for power²².

Resistance is thus a conceptual bridge between psychology, the political sciences and history. Discourse variations and power relations are indeed closely linked phenomena, and do not necessarily refer to fully conscious acts. From this point of view, the use of the concept is not only derived from psychology: it seems unavoidable in the understanding of elite theory. Scott’s approach is indeed symmetrical to the one developed in the field of political studies by Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), as the aim is to enlighten some processes of domination and to understand the “fugitive political conduct of subordinate groups”²³. However, Scott’s ‘hidden transcripts’ theory partly contradicts Gramsci’s argument, inspired by Marx, which held that the ruling class does not rule by force alone, but does so by persuading the subordinate class(es) to see society from the rulers’ perspective through such controls as education or religion²⁴. According to Gramsci, a group can only be dominant if it succeeds in assigning its symbolic discourse and values as dominant: for this purpose the dominant ideology has to rely on the idea of common sense, so as to win the support of subordinated groups²⁵. In other words, the acceptance of a social order is dependent on the ability of the elite to make its discourse coincide with general beliefs, which are social constructions, but which are perceived as ‘natural beliefs’ by the subordinated groups. Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) labelled this process ‘symbolic violence’²⁶.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES OF RESISTANCE

Resistance has also been a fashionable subject for sociological studies, but has aroused a lesser degree of theoretical debate. Sociologists generally employ the term negotiation to describe the silent process of give and take between elites and subordinate groups²⁷. Beyond the study of power relations, the concept of *habitus* provides an interesting conceptual framework for social studies. Although *habitus* can be shortly defined as collective schemes of perception, thought, behaviour and action, it has a dual nature. On the one hand, it serves as a generator of actions; in doing so it does not necessarily determine these actions, but it defines a certain scope of possible strategies. The structure of society arises out of these actions. On the other hand, *habitus* is strongly influenced by social structures (particularly by structures existing during the time of the genesis of the *habitus*) as well as by the position of social actors within the class struc-

ture. Bourdieu speaks of the ‘incorporation’ of structures by the individual subject. Because of the interdependency between actions and structures, and as a consequence of early socialization’s domination, the *habitus* stays rather stable in times of social change. In other words the behaviour, actions, perceptions and valuations of the social actors and groups are affected by former structures. This inertia of *habitus* is called ‘hysteresis’, and is considered as a factor in explaining why people’s resistance to social change can emerge: the scope of possible actions which their *habitus* enables them to execute does not allow them to accommodate to certain aspects of social change²⁸.

Drawn from this statement, a common typology could classify these actions, by recognizing four elements: two elements (action and opposition) are at the core of this typology and do not provoke discussion, while two alternative elements (intent and recognition) incite disagreements²⁹. Crossing these criteria, one obtains a typology distinguishing between overt resistance (full recognition and full intent), covert resistance (no recognition and full intent) and non-intentional forms of resistance, which are not always labelled as resistances because of their unconscious or ambiguous character. In this case, some scholars advocate the use of ‘transgression’; a somehow less ambivalent term, in that it does not generally imply intentionality³⁰.

RESISTANCES, FRONTIERS AND IDENTITIES IN SOME HISTORICAL DISCOURSES

As we have seen, resistance has been used mainly as a fundamental category in numerous examinations or interpretations of political, anthropological, sociological or psychoanalytical analysis. The typology presented here is not exhaustive, but it enlightens central methodological questions in approaching resistance as an essential factor for historical change, especially by highlighting issues of language, ideologies, social mobility or power. All these issues are major concerns for historians as well. Without pretending to encompass every kind of historical definition of resistance, we would like to propose now a typological overview linked to our case studies.

ROMANTICIZED RESISTANCES

We have already stated that resistances in historical studies have been traditionally approached in rather different manners: the dominance of romanticized descriptions, ‘fights for freedom’ narratives, crusades or exalted quests for uniqueness. Considerations about the problems of ethnic origins remain one of the most powerful legacies of the 19th century, when Nationalism created differentiated models of Barbarian peoples in which to base the emergence of their national spirit, taking the theoretical-literary archetypes that Rome had constructed³¹. The influence of these archetypes, intending to define ‘the ancestral spirit’ of the European nations, is still perceptible in such expressions as *nos ancêtres les Gaulois*. Yet, these archetypes have not ceased to exist in our present time. On the contrary, they have been generously employed by pop cul-

ture, contributing to create, retell and sustain national memories and identities³². As an example (amongst many others) the movie *300* (Zack Snyder, 2006) is typical of cinema's contemporary exploitation of ancient historical narratives. Depicting an epic fight for liberty along the symbolic and territorial frontier between the deprived, demonic, feminine and tyrannical East and the honourable, virile and free West the plot is a strongly Manichean drama of resistance. This movie is an interesting example of an identity-oriented stylization of an ancient historical event and gives a contemporary political message even if it was not meant to do so³³.

This use of resistance is not exclusively limited to popular historical fictions. Many academic works have described resistances as hagiographic, nationalist, Marxist or anti-colonialist narratives with positive subtexts. This is particularly obvious in European countries where history writing has been conceived as an intellectual contribution to memory and identity-building³⁴. Highly influential in social sciences, the Marxist rhetoric of class struggle has sometimes worked according to the same pattern, and has occasionally been combined in nationalist and anti-colonialist narratives. The weight of this romanticized tradition has therefore turned the *topoi* into a part of nature and some resistances may actually have been left unquestioned. Then, resistance is nothing more than a theoretical trap because of the implicit moral judgement which is hidden behind its mythology. Nevertheless, intellectual reconstructions of the past may provide fruitful ground for reflection when they are thoroughly deconstructed, in order to study the ideological mechanisms of resistance-labelling, and ultimately, to disclose the hidden patterns and strategies of the groups (or individuals) which decided to qualify specific actions in specific contexts as resistances³⁵.

Besides, focussing on resistance may prove useful, if one keeps in mind that "the achievement of an ever developing identity, even solidarity" may occur "through social tensions and conflicts"³⁶. In many cases, resistance in relation to frontiers and identities exists as one of a complex set of factors where it is not always easy to distinguish cause from consequence. Romanticized resistances can occasionally unveil an interesting contradiction about identities. In the course of human history, these are undoubtedly dynamic realities which have to integrate or accommodate social changes. However, they often pretend to embody a harmonic self-representation, and thereby give ground to various conflicts.

But resistance also nourishes legends, and may be the first stage on which a loose feeling of identity can produce a strong and conscious affirmation of distinctiveness. The emergence of critical situations can lead to feelings of a collective responsibility and push threatened populations into resistance. This collective responsibility can manifest itself through a collective identity which, in various contexts, can take different shapes (social, cultural, confessional, national or communitarian) but can be transformed by resistance into a supplementary and temporary 'rebel identity'. Many reports and accounts describing the rage, the furies of the revolted mass, their almost psycho-somati-

cal ferociousness on display, allow us to realize that rebel identity goes beyond basic identity. Indeed, it represents rather a psychological identity, the one ready to push the rebels or insurgents ahead³⁷. More generally, the concept of resistance does not limit itself to a critical interrogation of political structures and social order. Taken with its relational, psychosocial and infra-political dimensions, it permits us to discover *le noyau dur* (the hard core) and to understand which forces, conscious or unconscious, drove the actors of this contesting drama to identify themselves with a certain common image: thus becoming a group and gaining access to rudimentary, but clear forms of social consciousness³⁸.

THE CENTRE-PERIPHERY PROBLEM: TERRITORIALITY AND SOCIAL DISCIPLINE

Other theoretical perspectives on forms of hegemony, political domination and resistance found their way into some historical analyses. One of the most influential is undoubtedly the centre-periphery model, elaborated by the social scientist Stein Rokkan (1921-1979). Firstly intending to provide an analytical framework for understanding the differences between political systems in Europe, this model has transcended all disciplinary borders and has become a key concept in comparative studies and in the theory of social change. Concerned with the problems of nationalism, boundary-building and democracy, Rokkan adopted a large historical perspective for studying processes of nation and state-building in Western Europe³⁹. Beyond the wide range of global factors he took into account (economic, religious and cultural infrastructures etc.), Rokkan focused mainly on the territorial aspects of peripheral distinctiveness, especially by proposing a conceptual map of Europe: successful centres, multilingual structures, victorious peripheries, autonomous peripheries, marginal peripheries and interface regions⁴⁰. As identity-building and frontier implementation are both central features in this framework, Rokkan's notion of 'cleavage' between centres and peripheries refers to "fundamental oppositions within a territorial population which stand out from the multiplicity of conflicts rooted in the social structure"⁴¹. Cleavage does not precisely refer to resistance but it may imply it; it is defined as a specific category of frozen conflicts, with structural consequences for the institutional organization of a given territory⁴².

Historians have managed to criticize and enrich this frame substantially, sometimes by questioning the pertinence of a model built partly on a nation-state oriented methodology⁴³. We can discern significant connections with this model and some historical studies of resistance. The centre-periphery frame seems particularly appropriate for the late modern and contemporary periods, as it provides a ground for the study of peripheral resistances and the consequent emergence of political parties⁴⁴. This frame has also proven its utility for other historical periods. Historians of Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages have not been less than prolific users of such concepts, for instance when

studying the emergence of regional systems in some Hellenistic states and their peripheries⁴⁵. Resistance and centre-periphery concepts have also been employed by those studying the genesis of territorial dependency, economic, technological and cultural transfers, as well as the phenomenon of Roman imperial expansion and its unequal impact on the genesis of frontiers in the Germanic hinterlands⁴⁶. Yet, resistance has also been employed as a critical concept for the centre-periphery model in Marcel Bénabou's innovative study about Romanization in North Africa. Here, resistance works as a unifying concept for all kinds of reaction to the Roman presence in Africa, from open rebellion to partial accommodations with a foreign culture. Thereby, it has provided a renewed perspective on the Roman African population, placing the focus back on the centre of its own historical identity⁴⁷.

Historians of the Early Modern period have largely discussed the problem of state-modernization and construction in Europe⁴⁸. Since the beginnings of the feudal system, the unequal social position between the dominant ruling class and the dominated common people provoked several popular revolts, rebellions, riots and other uprisings. This resistance was directed against the autocratic power of landlords, as well as against burdens imposed by the system (feudal fees, *corvées*, restrictions on sale, and claims for lands, etc.). This kind of resistance fits well into the category of classical social contests with an economic basis.

Yet, this traditional dichotomical scheme⁴⁹ could be widened through the perspective of social discipline. Gerhard Oestreich described *Sozialdisziplinierung* as a process by which the early modern state strove to control the behaviour of its subjects in all areas of life, thus turning them into obedient, pious, and diligent subjects⁵⁰. The social discipline theory helps to describe the relationship established between bonded villagers, or serfs, and their feudal lords. These antagonisms, forced relations and ties were strengthened by the consolidation of the absolutist state. The disciplining of subjects on the etatistic level started with the efforts of different Churches during the Reformation and Counter Reformation⁵¹. This discipline was perpetuated by different state authorities throughout the *Ancien Régime* until the emergence of modern civil society and its public sphere – *Öffentlichkeit* (a public space outside of state control). In every case, any resistance against established orders (lords/rules, laws and moral codes) was logically perceived by the governing authorities as disturbing, negative, or even revolutionary⁵².

Therefore, the outburst of these, sometimes quite violent, resistances and uprisings especially in peripheral areas obliged the rulers and the state's apparatus to intervene in these regions in an attempt to tie them more firmly to the core. Revolts and rebellions in provinces gave weight to important arguments for the reinforcement of centralization in the sphere of public politics. The resistance movements represented an important impulse which strengthened the need for social discipline and therefore, accelerated the modernization of society⁵³.

TECHNOLOGY, IDENTITY AND RESISTANCE

Resistance has also been studied by historians of technologies. In this field the connotations are quite different from the myths of resistance which have prevailed in many historical discourses. Indeed, usually the 'progressive' and ultra-modernist viewpoints of engineers and technocrats have meant that resistance is seen as a negative event, an undesirable hindrance to rational progress and a factor generated by uneducated, 'reactionary' masses, creating uncertainty in the process of designing new technology⁵⁴. However, any technological solution is always partially socially constructed and thus spatially and temporarily specific: different assumptions suggest different solutions and legitimate resistance to a single best design⁵⁵. Thus, the connection of identities, frontiers and resistance to technology can provide an interesting framework for analysis⁵⁶.

Among major variables that explain uneven technological progress (demographical and geographical characteristics, science, institutions, property rights, psychological patterns like openness to information and willingness to take risks, etc.) the economic historian Joel Mokyr has underlined the importance of social resistance. In a Darwinist manner he has stated that inertia, limiting creativity through resistance, is inherent within many social structures. According to Mokyr, technological change invariably involves losers; thus resistance often serves the narrow interest of a selfish group of potential losers. Here, the issue of borders comes to the fore: due to the existence of sovereign nation states technological change, stalled in one area, might flourish in another, more favourable institutional and ideological setting⁵⁷. When technology is seen as a path to the over-rationalization and consequent de-humanization of society, a more extreme case of resistance is 'technophobia': a fear of technological progress. This can even go as far as machine breaking (the narratives of which may sometimes be romanticized like 'classical' descriptions of social protests)⁵⁸.

Reacting to this determinist approach, another methodology in technological studies has been inspired by social constructivism, using the Social Construction of Technology Theory (SCOT). Here, the notion of resistance refers to the reactions of the socio-technical system's various components which block the introduction of new technology, especially when technology is used as a mean for groups to retain or rearrange social relations⁵⁹. For instance, considering resistance to the automobile in the USA, Trevor Pinch and Ronald Kline introduced in their narrative the social group of the farmers' anti-car movement, which took shape as organized anti-automobile groups and occasionally engaged in sabotage of roads and attacks on motorists or machines. But what was not mentioned explicitly is that the anti-car movement was, to a great extent, an articulation of the 'farm men' identity. The car, as it was around 1905, was of no use for transport on muddy country roads and antagonism was strengthened by the types of car drivers (urban upper class) the farmers encountered. Furthermore, a source of criticism against automobiles anticipated damage to the fabric

of rural life. Thus, together with the wide geographical spread of the movement, resistance seemed to stem from the shared identity of rural people, and some sources pointed at the existence of an imagined community. Identities (national, professional etc.) enter the story in the form of grounds through which relevant social groups are formed. In many cases, although not without exception, ‘interpretative flexibility’ is a conflict between contradictory interpretations of artefacts arising from the cultural background of adverse collective identities⁶⁰.

Another interesting approach of resistance to technology in studying frontiers and identities has been developed by the sociologist Alain Touraine. In his account of a current crisis of progress, rooted in the modern dilemma of universal rationality and particular identities⁶¹, he has argued that technology is sometimes resisted because it signifies the hegemony of a foreign power: “the ideology of progress has been not only abandoned but rejected as destructive of national or cultural identity”⁶². Here, resistance to a new technology is aligned with national (or a broader cultural) identity⁶³. Historiography is full of such examples, though the resistance itself is not usually conceptualized in specific terms, such as the state organized resistance of European broadcasting to Americanization characterized by the setting of national/transnational quotas⁶⁴ or the resistance of Škoda’s engineers to Soviet technological standards in the 1950s⁶⁵.

RESISTANCES IN HISTORICAL CONTEXTS

Bearing some of these theoretical elements in mind, there now follow several case studies exploring themes of resistance from various time periods and areas. To conclude this section a close examination of common themes of resistance within these narratives will be described in order to ascertain whether links between time periods exist. This will eventually demonstrate whether or not using modern themes or concepts such as resistance can be a useful tool, or lens, to look at history.

Esther Sánchez-Medina examines the problem of resistance by discussing the relations between Romans/Byzantines and outsiders (living both inside and outside the Empire) defined as Barbarians (*barbari*) in Late Antiquity. The attitude of the Barbarians’ majority towards the Empire was a positive one, as many wanted to take part in the Roman community. However, the Empire’s attitude to this attempt was one of opposition, expressed in different ways: Rome decided that the Barbarians were resisters, opposing Roman culture (*Romanitas*) and fighting against their own insignificance in the face of the Empire’s greatness. Thus Roman literature created an essentialist archetype of the Barbarian, originating from beyond the *limes*, the one who supposedly resisted the dominant conception of the so-called Roman lifestyle. Taking the example of Visigothic Spain and the Byzantine province of *Spania*, the author refers to evidence showing that Barbarians lived in a way quite different from the one depicted by the Romans and the Byzantines, but they also throw light upon the creation of a Barbarian enemy. This

was the result of a serious identity crisis for the Roman Empire; from the 4th century on, the appearance of Christianity and the migrations of new people on the threshold of the *limes* complicated the self-conception of the Romans, who needed to maintain their uniqueness or difference.

Andrew Sargent and Kieran Hoare submit a study of two concomitant resistances at the borderlands of the English Kingdom in 1603. The problem of resistance is also seen as centre-periphery cleavage, but in a different manner: in a period of weakness for the English monarchy, the main issue here is the construction of the English state and the religious and social resistance against a centralizing process. However, the authors use untypical examples of early modern rebellions, where resistance was a form of negotiation between the ruled and the rulers. Inspired by the resistance theory of Gramsci and Bourdieu, these examples also refer to typologies of resistance that reveal extremely nuanced political awareness in their actors. One group wanted religious toleration, so demonstrated a willingness to cause trouble if necessary, another group wanted to avoid the financial exactions that came with stronger Crown authority, so the group members gave reasons why they could not afford to pay. Both took advantage of Crown weakness. Both were the ruling classes of their respective regions.

When in 1603, James VI of Scotland became James I of England he expressed the wish to standardize administration, Crown authority and religion within the monarchy and to put into practice the reciprocal economic, military and legal obligations which were expected from subjects of this new state. In Ireland, the main resistance of the Recusancy Revolt arose from an overt demonstration of the cohesion of the conservative Catholic religion amongst the urban elites of Irish society. The movement demonstrated their willingness to defend their religious principles from any innovations from above. Various processions and symbolic demonstrations took place in numerous Irish towns. Eventually, the protest achieved the aim of showing the strength of the old religion in Ireland and warned the Crown to leave religion alone. Likewise, the gentry of the northern borders, the actual ruling class of the area, took up a very nuanced and modern form of resistance. They wished to uphold their time honoured exemption from Crown taxation. Therefore, they highlighted the continuing poorness and lawlessness of their *locale*. In other words, they colluded to paint a picture of border society that they knew would fit in well with governmental perceptions.

This was rather unfortunate for the 'Border Surnames' – a clan based society produced by the conditions at and living at the Anglo-Scottish border since warfare between England and Scotland had begun. Indeed, their identity was unsuitable for the new 'civilised' identity of James' middle shires, and their very existence was presumed to be resistance against the political wishes of the regime, although it was not actual resistance. Powerless, without any political weapons, these clans were harshly eradicated within a few years by the centralizing king.

Eva Kalivodová presents a study about the religious and spiritual resistance of hidden non-Catholics in eastern Bohemia in the beginning of the 18th century. This case focuses on the passage from covert resistance of the persecuted believers to overt resistance. When Catholicism was made the state religion in 1627 by the Habsburgs, Protestants from this region became a religious minority and resorted to covert resistance by practicing a hidden domestic cult. Although seldom, some secret gatherings incorporating the ceremony of the Eucharist took place in some isolated places. Sometimes these were beyond the close-by Bohemian-Silesian border, where relative religious tolerance allowed Protestants to attend the Lutheran masses in churches of grace. By maintaining their confessional otherness and resisting the imposed Catholic rites, the Protestant 'misbelievers' reinforced their spiritual identity. In the atmosphere of strengthened re-Catholicization and growing pietistic faith in some still sensitive Protestant regions of Bohemia and Moravia, the weakened confessional identity of non-Catholics received a new impetus. Combined with the echo of the persecution and final expulsion of Salzburgian Lutherans, Protestant subjects of the Opočno domain soon contested their clandestineness. In a feudal estate at the peripheral, semi-frontier zone of the Habsburg Monarchy, the location of the Opočno Rebellion (1732) played a, not negligible, role in the decisive passage from covert to overt revolt. Illustrating the theory of social discipline, the Opočno Revolt was an example of resistance against the systematical indoctrination, asserted by all early modern states as an integral part of the process of the consolidation of the absolutist state. In this aspect, Eva Kalivodová's argumentation is close to the study of Andrew Sargent and Kieran Hoare.

Although Opočno's rebels had never directly disputed the centralist wishes of the regime, or the authority of the emperor to whom they were in principle loyal, their overt claim for religious freedom was considered as disobedience to Crown authority. Eventually, the modern state could not only repress, but also had to prevent similar upheavals by adopting new legislation and by creating new bureaucratic sub-delegated offices in peripheral regions. This process enhanced the centralization of the Habsburg Monarchy as will be described in this section.

Alexandre Massé raises the issue of the changing perception of the legitimacy of resistance in his study about the Greek insurrection of 1821. The Congress of Vienna (1814-1815) did not admit the legitimacy of the peoples' national aspirations and established the principle that the only political legitimacy was that of the sovereigns to whom the people owed obedience. Supporting the absolutist restoration of post-Napoleonic Europe, the Holy Alliance was a pact of mutual assistance to combat national and liberal insurrections, as had been demonstrated by France's intervention in Spain in 1824. But when the Greeks rose against the Ottoman Empire in 1821, the Great Powers declared their neutrality before deciding to help the Hellenic insurrection while, theoretically, they could have acted against it. By studying consular correspondence, the author shows the importance of consuls' representations and images of Greek identity, and how these

images influenced their judgement upon the legitimacy of insurrection. This eventually became a resistance through a textual reconstruction of the events.

Aladin Larguèche considers the construction of Scandinavian identity during the mid-19th century within the academic *milieux* of Christiania (Oslo), Copenhagen, Lund and Uppsala, in a context where national romanticist ideas spread throughout Europe. Cultural Scandinavism, as an identity-building desire, meant firstly the promotion of a 'Nordic spirit' in the academic field, in order to break from foreign secular influences. However, it eventually fostered an organized, although small, movement of political resistance among students and intellectuals, focusing on the necessity of defending Scandinavia's southern frontier against the threat of German nationalism. Scandinavian academics did so mainly by recourse to the rhetoric of the natural frontiers of Scandinavia. The author underlines the articulations between psychological patterns of resistance, language rhetoric and collective strategy in a context where a transnational identity could be seen as an effective response to an unstable geopolitical order.

Ute Hofmann focuses on the resistance of Bohemian aristocratic politicians against the execution of national policy and national commitments in the second part of the 19th century. Their resistance appeared as an early constitutional movement, within a generally modernizing society. Their refusal to implement new policies can be interpreted as a desire for the conservation of a traditional hierarchical structure of society and a traditional social identity. The frontiers that are involved are basically social ones, i.e. the frontiers are the divides between the (former) estates. As the aristocrats' resistance against nationalization was not an organized movement, but a certain attitude towards a social process, it is hard to identify their specific means. Perhaps their main means was language, e.g. they announced their point of view in public speeches as well as in private documents in order to explain actions which could be (and were) interpreted as a national commitment by contemporaries.

Dušan Labuda proposes to show how the profound frontier changes in Central Europe impacted on the formation and eventual success of dissenting identity-based political parties. In the aftermath of World War I, the defeated states suffered massive losses of territory. Hungary was the most seriously affected state, losing two thirds of its former territory. Defining the frontiers of newly created Czechoslovakia according to certain strategic expectations the state had included large territories with numerous non-Czech and non-Slovak inhabitants. Having been aware of the numbers of minorities' members (parts of the formerly ruling nations, the Germans and the Magyars), the Czechoslovak government struggled to form a unitary state and thus to limit the influence of minorities. In Slovakia the Magyar element was especially obvious. However the official ruling power faced an organized resistance movement as soon as the first parliamentary elections took place. In the case of the Magyars in Slovakia, their resistance was controlled and directed by minority political parties formed as essential platforms for political dialogue and activity to become an equal partner to the state. Primarily through the ac-

tivities of the parties, the attitudes of former Hungarian (now Magyar) aristocracy and intelligence towards the Czechoslovak state were expressed, not hiding obvious links to Hungarian foreign affairs and not denying their aims to destabilize the state and to revise the Treaty of Trianon (1920).

Closing our examination of resistances in Europe, Jiří Janáč evokes the case of Czechoslovak engineers from the Society for the Danube-Oder-Elbe Canal and their reluctance to accept Soviet technological standards during the 1950s, based on the belief that these standards were unsuitable for the Central European system of waterways.

NOTES

- ¹ R. Weitz, *Women and their Hair Seeking Power through Resistance and Accommodation*, in "Gender and Society", 2001, 15, p. 667; see also B. Czetz, *Rebels and Rule-Abiders. Hungarian Youth in the 1950s and the Early 1960s*, in H. Jensen (ed.), *Rebellion and Resistance*, Pisa 2009, pp. 167-183, at p. 177.
- ² H. Jensen, *Introduction*, in Id., *Rebellion* cit., p. xiii.
- ³ S.G. Ellis, L. Klusáková, *Terms and Concepts: 'Frontier' and 'Identity' in Academic and Popular Usage*, in Id. (eds.), *Frontiers and Identities. Exploring the Research Area*, Pisa 2006, pp. 1-15, at p. 3.
- ⁴ L. Klusáková, "A European on the Road": in Pursuit of "Connecting Themes" for Frontiers, Borders and Cultural Identities, in S.G. Ellis, L. Klusáková (eds.), *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities*, Pisa 2007, pp. 1-19, at p. 3.
- ⁵ This is particularly important in a field where frontiers and identities have been considered as distinct phenomena for a long time. See the opening chapter in this volume by M. Krocová and M. Řezník.
- ⁶ J.A. Hollander, R.L. Einwohner, *Conceptualizing Resistance*, in "Sociological forum", 2004, 19, pp. 533-554, at p. 534.
- ⁷ Klusáková, *European on the Road* cit., p. 3.
- ⁸ The final collective of authors emerged from a group of doctoral students established in the autumn 2008 meeting of TWG5 in Cluj-Napoca. During the year, a few real and electronic discussions and brainstormings took place within the authorial collective and the TWG.
- ⁹ C.G. Jung, *Man and his symbols*, London 1964, p. 33; for resistance as a fear of new ideas in this section, see U. Hofmann, *Resistance against Nationalization. The Case of Bohemian Nobles in the 19th Century*.
- ¹⁰ Jung, *Man* cit., p. 107.
- ¹¹ In this volume see the opening chapter by M. Krocová, M. Řezník.
- ¹² Jung, *Man* cit., p. 107.
- ¹³ In this section, see A. Larguèche, *Resistance as the Creation of a 'Natural Frontier': the Language of 19th-Century Scandinavism*.
- ¹⁴ C.G. Jung, *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*, London 1975, pp. 3-72.
- ¹⁵ Scotts' ideas were first developed in a study about peasant communities in Malaysia, J.C. Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Subsistence and Rebellion in Southeast Asia*, New Haven CT 1976. They were then deepened and enlarged in Id., *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*, New Haven CT 1985. See also Id., *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*, New Haven CT 1990.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. ix.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xi.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- ²⁰ D. Reed-Danahay, *Talking about resistance: ethnography and theory in rural France*, in "Anthropological Quarterly", 1993, 66, pp. 223-224.
- ²¹ Scott, *Domination* cit., p. 136.
- ²² See S. Bießecker, *How to Rebel via Jokes and Laughter. Two Examples of Rebellious Emotions in the Early Middle Ages*, in Jensen, *Rebellion* cit., pp. 1-14.
- ²³ Scott, *Domination* cit., p. 17.
- ²⁴ J. Femia, *Gramsci's Political Thought*, Oxford 1981; T. Lears, *The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities*, in "American Historical Review", 1985, 90, pp. 567-593.
- ²⁵ T. Cresswell, *In place, out of place: geography, ideology and transgression*, Minneapolis MN 1996, pp. 18-19.
- ²⁶ P. Bourdieu, *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Paris 1972.
- ²⁷ A. Strauss, *Negotiations*, San Francisco 1978, pp. 224-233; F. Parkin, *Class Inequality and Political Order*, London 1971.
- ²⁸ For *habitus* see P. Bourdieu, *Le sens pratique*, Paris 1980, p. 88; pp. 104-105. In this section, see Hofmann, *Resistance* cit.; see also A. Sargent, K. Hoare, *Resistance to the Union of the Crowns: the North of England and the Recusancy Revolt of 1603*, pp. 135-156.
- ²⁹ Hollander, Einwohner, *Conceptualizing Resistance* cit.
- ³⁰ Cresswell, *In place* cit., p. 22.
- ³¹ In this section, see E. Sánchez-Medina, *A Created Enemy: 'Barbarians' in spite of Religious Conversion. Visigoths and Byzantines in 6th-Century Iberia*, pp. 122-134.
- ³² D. Martin-Jones, *Deleuze, cinema and national identity*, Edinburgh 2006, pp. 32-34. About resistance and cinema, see also K. Ahonen, *Treason in the Family. Leo McCarey's Film My Son John (1952) as an Anticommunist Melodrama*, in Jensen, *Rebellion* cit., pp. 121-136.
- ³³ Adapted from the graphic novel of Frank Miller (1998), this movie retells the Battle of Thermopylae (480 BC), a famous episode of the Greco-Persian Wars, first mentioned in Herodotus' *Enquiries*. In spite of the assertions of the director, who defended a fictional work loosely based on history, the film raised a wide controversy about its ideological nature and about the use of common identity-stereotypes which were also distilled in Herodotus' original text.
- ³⁴ A.D. Smith, *Myths and memories of the nation*, Oxford 1999, p. 29.
- ³⁵ 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*, pp. 173-180.
- ³⁶ Smith, *Myths* cit., p. 83.
- ³⁷ For example, see A. Corbin, *The Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France 1870*, Harvard 1993.
- ³⁸ J. Revel, *L'histoire au ras du sol*, in G. Lévi (ed.), *Le pouvoir au village*, Paris 1989, pp. i-xxxi.
- ³⁹ S. Rokkan, D.W. Urwin (eds.), *The politics of territorial identity: studies in European regionalism*, New York 1982.
- ⁴⁰ P. Flora (ed.), *State-formation, nation-building and mass-politics in Europe: the theory of Stein Rokkan*, Oxford 1999, p. 135.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

- ⁴³ R. Eßer, S.G. Ellis, *Conclusion: towards an Agenda for a New Regional History*, in Id. (eds.), *Frontiers, Regions and Identities in Europe*, Pisa 2009, pp. 287-290, at p. 290.
- ⁴⁴ In this section, see D. Labuda, *Through Resistance towards Restoration: Political Parties of the Hungarian Minority in Czechoslovakia during the Interwar Period*, pp. 207-208.
- ⁴⁵ P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle, K. Randsborg (eds.), *Centre and periphery in the Hellenistic world*, Århus 1994.
- ⁴⁶ M. Rowlands, M. Larsen, K. Kristiansen (eds.), *Centre and periphery in the Ancient world*, Cambridge 1987, p. 159.
- ⁴⁷ M. Bénabou, *La résistance africaine à la romanisation*, Paris 1976.
- ⁴⁸ In this section, see Hoare, Sargent, *Resistance* cit.; E. Kalivodová, *The Opočno Religious Rebellion and its Consequences in the Context of the Carolinian Counter-Reformation*, pp. 157-172.
- ⁴⁹ The elementary oppositions are mainly: rich/poor, proprietor/non proprietor, privileged/non privileged, old settled community/newcomers, exclusion/integration, modernity/tradition. See J. Nicolas, *La rébellion française: mouvements populaires et conscience sociale: 1661-1789*, Paris 2002, pp. 10-16.
- ⁵⁰ Social and church disciplines are historiographical concepts which have been developed to describe a general trend exhibited by all states and confessional churches during the early modern period of establishing control mechanisms over their subjects. Originally, the concept of social discipline (or disciplining) was developed as an alternative to the etatistic term 'absolutism'. See G. Oestreich, *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Berlin 1969; see also S. Breuer, *Sozialdisziplinierung. Probleme und Problemverlagerungen eines Konzepts bei Max Weber, Gerhard Oestreich und Michel Foucault*, in C. Sachße, F. Tennstedt (eds.), *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, Frankfurt am Main 1986, pp. 45-69.
- ⁵¹ For example, see E.W. Monter, *Enforcing Morality in Early Modern Europe*, London 1987. This book is an investigation of the ideal of moral purity and the desire for social controls which impacted so powerfully on European society during the 16th and 17th centuries.
- ⁵² It is obvious that resistant individuals or groups perceive themselves in an absolutely different manner. Within their ideas and actions, they often feel as guarantors of ancient traditions, necessary to be preserved; they are conservatives. At other times, they are on the contrary those who act as a progressive force and aspire to different changes and transformations of liberties.
- ⁵³ In this section, see Sargent, Hoare, *Resistance* cit.; Kalivodová, *Opočno* cit.
- ⁵⁴ A. Randall, *Before the Luddites: Custom, Community and Machinery in the English Woolen Industry 1776-1809*, Cambridge - New York 1991, p. 3.
- ⁵⁵ M.W. Bauer, *Resistance to new technology: Nuclear power, Information technology and Biotechnology*, Cambridge - New York 1995.
- ⁵⁶ In this volume, see J. Janáč, *History of Technology on the Issues of Frontiers and Identities*, pp. 219-223.
- ⁵⁷ For example, increased resistance to technological change in Britain after 1850, provoked by groups protecting their vested interests in old technology (not only upper classes, but also skilled workers etc.) led to the loss of technological leadership. J. Mokyr, *Technological inertia in economic history*, in "Journal of Economic History", 1992, 52, pp. 325-338.
- ⁵⁸ See the example of the Luddites in Britain. Named after their mythical leader, Ned Ludd, the Luddites were a group of social agitators in 19th-century Britain who tried to prevent the mechanization of cloth factories; they blamed the new type of loom for increased unemployment and poverty. Though famous for their violent protests, the Luddites also engaged in literary resistance in the form of poems etc. Cf. K. Bonfield, *Writings of the Luddites*, Baltimore MD 2004. The reception of their perceived technophobia is called neo-Luddism, see S.E. Jones, *Against technology: from the Luddites to neo-Luddism*, New York 2006.

- ⁵⁹ For details on SCOT see the two programmatic publications by N. Oudshoorn, T.J. Pinch (eds.), *How users matter: the co-construction of users and technologies (Inside technology)*, Cambridge 2003. See also W.E. Bijker, T.P. Hughes, T.J. Pinch (eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology*, Cambridge 1987.
- ⁶⁰ For instance, see N. Oudshoorn's monograph about the history of hormonal contraceptives for men, which reveals a negotiation of gender identities (masculinities) in the last decades of the 20th century, against a background of the development of safe and effective technologies; N. Oudshoorn, *The male pill: a biography of a technology in the making*, Durham 2003.
- ⁶¹ A. Touraine, *The crisis of progress*, in Bauer, *Resistance* cit., pp. 45-55.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 52.
- ⁶³ In this section, see J. Janáč, *Resistance to Sovietization in Technology*.
- ⁶⁴ W. Kaufman, H.S. McPherson (eds.), *Britain and the Americas: Culture, politics and history. A multidisciplinary encyclopedia*, Santa Barbara CA 2005, p. 954.
- ⁶⁵ V. Fava, *Between American Fordism and 'Soviet Fordism': Czechoslovak way towards mass production*, in B. Apor, P. Apor, E.A. Rees (eds.), *The Sovietization of Eastern Europe: new perspectives on the postwar period*, Washington 2008, pp. 47-64.



Tetrarchs, Venice.