

Interface tenth issue

Interface editorial spokescouncil (contributions from Lesley Wood, Peter Waterman, Sara Motta, Alice Mattoni, Mandisi Majavu, Elizabeth Humphrys, Cristina Flesher Fominaya and Laurence Cox)

As we celebrate our fifth year anniversary, we make a departure from our existing practice to publish our first ever non-themed journal. Interestingly, despite every CFP stating that we always are open to non-themed contributions, we frequently receive questions about this so we thought a general issue might help highlight the issue once and for all: *we are always open to contributions on any social movement related subject even if we issue themed calls for papers.*

Normally, our editorials are jointly written by the editors who have taken the lead on designing the theme of the issue and writing the original call for papers. They are somewhat unusual for journal editorials in that they attempt to be a sort of state of the art on the theme under discussion in the issue, from the perspectives of the editors coordinating the issue. They often involve intense debate, dialogues and compromises between a diverse range of positions before finally coalescing in what we hope are more or less coherent position papers. They take a lot of work and we hope they are in themselves important contributions (the fact that they do get cited and reprinted gives us some basis for this hope).

This issue, however, we are doing something completely different in that we are simply individually reflecting on our experience with the journal since its inception, and offering those reflections in a very loosely edited fashion for any of our readers who might be interested in knowing more about how the Interface project began and where we would like it to go from here. For those of you who simply want to get on to what is in store for you in this issue, you can skip the trip down memory lane, and jump straight to the section titled "In this issue".

And now for something completely different:

How did *Interface* start, and what did we think we were up to?

Cristina¹: The *Interface* project was born out of a proposal launched during an annual conference in Manchester that brings together academics and activists.

¹This is adapted from a chapter co-authored with Laurence Cox and published as Cristina Flesher Fominaya y Laurence Cox "El Proyecto Interface: una reflexión sobre los movimientos sociales y el conocimiento". Alberto Arribas Lozano, Nayra García-González, Aurora Álvarez Veinguer y Antonio Ortega Santos (eds.) *Tentativas, Contagios, Desbordes. Territorios del Pensamiento*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2012, Pp. 171-185.

The Alternative Futures and Popular Protest conference has been organized for many years by Colin Barker and Mike Tyldesley and creates an environment where academic texts are subject to criticism by activists and where activist presentations are also subject to theoretical and analytical criticism by academics. Within this exchange of ideas and perspectives, the resulting production of knowledge seems to somehow to go beyond the boundaries of the different groups that make up the participants and become greater than the sum of its parts.

The proposal for the journal, therefore, was born out of the positive experience that many of the founders of the journal had had in this particular conference. At that time (2007) we had the sense that many social movement journals didn't really offer a lot of information that was of value for the social movements that were being analyzed. In some cases it seemed the journals were controlled by a nucleus of academic gatekeepers with a particular theoretical line who were perhaps not that open to new ideas coming from younger researchers who were also activists within the movements that they were studying.

On the other hand, we recognized that oftentimes movements produce a lot of knowledge but that it can be self-referential and not in dialogue with either other movements and groups, or with academic and theoretical work. In the context of a global movement of movements in which many activists had one foot in the academy and vice versa, the *Interface* project can be understood as a small part of a much wider process of the development of participant-action research by academic activists at that time.

Essentially we wanted to create a journal that would be open to a diverse range of perspectives, that wouldn't have a predetermined editorial line, that would be relevant for social movements, and that could offer a diverse and high-quality content. Above all we wanted to establish a bridge and a dialogue both between social movements in the academy and between different groups within social movements and the academy.

So we needed to work out an organizational model that would reflect our goals. After a lengthy period of debate and reflection we decided to organize ourselves in a decentralized and regional manner in which each editorial group would be quite autonomous in its own internal functioning but would have as a reference point the virtual editorial collective, and would have the obligation of following certain norms collectively developed in the editorial collective and to respect the decisions that were made there. Because of the great diversity of relationships between social movements and intellectual production in different regions of the world, we wanted a model that would allow sufficient flexibility for editors in particular regions to decide what worked best at their particular context.

Because we wanted to be truly accessible to people anywhere in the world we took for granted from the beginning that we would follow a true open access model of publishing in which no money of any kind would be exchanged on either end of the production process. The fact that we have been able to produce five years of issues of up to 500 pages each issue following this open access

model proves that it can be done. Of course, what this means is that a tremendous amount of work has gone into the journal, unpaid volunteer labor from the editors and the many collaborators who have helped us produce the journal over the past five years.

We follow a Creative Commons licensing model where contributors are free to republish their work, although we do ask that they credit the original publication in *Interface*. We feel that open access is a crucial way of realizing the vision of a truly global journal. If we have not yet managed to be truly global in terms of production, at least we can feel sure that in terms of who is able to read us, anyone with access to the internet can. We realize that an online only journal excludes people who do not have access to the internet, but the open access model means that any collective or person who can and wants to make hard copies of the journal available to individuals or groups is free to do so.

One of the key innovations of the journal was our modification of the process of peer review, in which all the peer-reviewed contributions would be reviewed by an activist and by an academic. This was crucial to us to avoid *Interface* simply becoming another social movement journal and also to maintain our focus on meeting needs of movements and maintaining to some degree a practical and useful orientation. In practice, so many of our reviewers are both activists and academics that we often end up asking them to evaluate a particular contribution from the perspective of one orientation or the other.

We felt peer review was important to maintain a high quality standard of articles, and to enable contributors to reach their full potential by benefiting from input from a number of sources, but on the other hand we realized that not everyone is interested in reading or producing an "academic" text and therefore it was important to us to also include a range of formats for contributions such as interviews, strategy texts, event analyses, etc. We try to be reflexive about the incorporation of different forms of contribution from movements around the world, and we are trying to imagine and integrate new forms of collaboration.

As an online open access journal that tries to reach whoever wants to read us we do run into some limitations of a technical nature. For some of us, it has long been a hope to incorporate more visual and artistic forms of contribution, but we are limited by the size of the PDF files that we can create – beyond a certain limit people around the world would not be able to download the issues without a very high-speed broadband connection. As technology advances this may be more possible in the future, or perhaps we will come up with a solution that will enable us to have articles with embedded video and so on.

Taking our vision and converting it into an actual working collective and journal was a long and arduous process. We worked for over a year and a half without producing anything at all, simply developing an organizational model that would work for the founders of the journal. It was a very lengthy process of dialogue and debate before we settled on a model that we all felt comfortable with and felt would work in practice. We never expected the journal to have the kind of response that we got. The diversity of contributions, the number of

readers around the world, and the many wonderful people who have wanted to collaborate with us has exceeded our wildest expectations.

The organizational challenges that we face are really the classic ones related to any kind of collective horizontal project: too few people actively participating, the challenges of trying to work in a participatory way, the difficulties of incorporating new people to an established working culture, the problems with some regional collectives that were unable to really get off the ground, and balancing the pressures of our own individual work and activism and finding time for the journal.

The other classic challenge is that when we incorporate new editors, sometimes people want to re-open debates and decisions that we have already discussed at great length and closed and we really don't want to start the whole debate up again! Going over the same ground again and again can be a cause for burnout. But of course this is the classic problem for horizontal groups when they enter into a period of growth and we need to strike a balance between being true to our original vision and in the decisions we've already taken, and incorporating new perspectives, new ideas, new proposals and new ways of working which is not always easy. We have, however, on the whole been incredibly lucky in finding people to work with who have enriched and developed the project.

Liz: I have been involved in *Interface* since its inception, hearing about it at a conference in Manchester that I attended. At that point I was studying a graduate certificate and was presenting a paper on a social movement I had been involved in. I considered myself an activist. I definitely did not think of myself as an academic. I was reading a lot of academic critiques on the 'gap' or disconnect between activist and academic knowledge, and the *Interface* project seemed to me an attempt to tackle this in a small way. I didn't know anybody else involved, but was impressed by people's openness and desire to see the project realized. Within three days I went from being isolated in Australia with a few thoughts on the problems of social movement scholarship, to someone engaged in a project to attempt to address some of those concerns. While others had been thinking about the possibility of *Interface* for a while, for me it was a whirlwind introduction.

Laurence: I think *Interface* mostly came out of the experience of a group of activists who felt they needed a wider canvas to think about the movements they were in (and so had taken on extra roles as researchers) and were disappointed both by the quality of much academic movements research and the barriers of form preventing people writing genuinely engaged research on movements within the academy. There were animated discussions around this at the Manchester Alternative Futures and Popular Protest (AFPP) conference in the mid-2000s. As I recall it the background experience of working together with people from different movements and political backgrounds in the alterglobalist movement of movements was a really important "learning moment" that made

it possible for us to work together - as of course AFPP's cross-discipline, non-sectarian and activist / academic atmosphere.

I think we thought we were pursuing the same theoretical explorations that had brought us there - needing to reach beyond our own movements, national contexts and political traditions and beyond given disciplinary constraints and the depoliticisation of scholarship, without for those reasons either giving up on serious intellectual work or on our own struggles. We had the phrase "learning from each other's struggles" which didn't make it into the journal's title but could have done. I also want to say that we were right in this - the global political shift of the late 2000s drew on much of the "movement of movements" learning while also showing that we had not reached an endpoint in terms of thinking about what we were up to (a point which some of the more celebratory writing of earlier years rather missed). And what a difference a recession and three movement waves (anti-austerity, Arab world, Occupy) make in terms of scholarship - now disciplines which drew in their skirts from discussions of movements in the mid-2000s are falling over themselves to capture the lucrative high ground of commentary on Real Politics (by which they mean the actions of states and economic elites)...

Alice: I began to be involved in *Interface* as a translator from English to Italian, immediately after the first issue of the journal was published. The *Interface* project fascinated me from the very beginning since it was open to many activist and scholarly traditions. Also, I really like its attempt to be a multilingual publication, to be engaged towards a truly open access policy, and of course to aim at fostering a dialogue between social movement scholars and social movement activists. It is now many years since I have translated into Italian the first call for action for *Interface* and I found myself doing many things for the journal: from developing the new website to acting as a guest co-editor for a couple of issues, apart from taking care of the usual editorial process in the context of the Western European editorial collective. Being engaged in so many activities allowed me to appreciate the many faces of an open access editorial enterprise such as *Interface*. How difficult it is at times to work with so many diverse people across the world, but how rewarding, also, when constructive dialogue between different editors develops and, of course, when a new issue is published online.

Sara: I remember a group of activist-scholars, some familiar faces and some new faces, sitting round a wooden table in a pub in Manchester discussing the possibilities of beginning a new type of journal. Our journal hoped to bridge borders of knowledge, place and practices to facilitate processes of systematisation, reflection and strategic development of social movement struggles (including those within the university space).

It was also a way to develop our disruptive practices in, against and beyond the marketised university and its suffocation of the possibilities of alternative

emancipatory horizons and imaginaries. It has thus also been a journey of self/other discovery and of learning to produce myself differently to that of the logics, rationalities and ways of being a scholar of commodified regimes of knowledge.

This journey has often been one of taking chances and leaps of faith without knowing whether the hunches, relationships or practices would actually work. Yet I think that what marks out our collective practice is the courage to commit again and again to such a politics of hope, invention and creativity and the tenderness and care through which we hold each other through the difficult moments in our lives as scholars, carers, activists, workers.

What has happened since with the journal?

Liz: I'm not sure I ever worried that *Interface* would not happen, or would not release issues, but I was concerned that the process of doing this would be quite fraught given the enormity of working across the globe and through different networks and language groups. Part of what made the project exciting, the different people and the attempt to organize through decentralized processes, also worried me in terms of simply *getting it done*. I was pleased a few years in at how relatively easy it had been to locate good work and get it out, as well as to work across boundaries and differences of various kinds. *Interface* is not without its weak spots and challenges by any estimation, like any project of its ilk, but I feel the journal is at a point where these can be tackled in an effort to build from our solid base.

Lesley: The engagement of the Canada/US region has grown from year to year as we build our networks and attract an increasing volume of submissions. In 2010, there was a discussion of David Harvey's work, that included the first focused attention on movement dynamics in the US and Canada in the journal. From there, the journal has touched on the movement for medical marijuana, police repression, anti-Olympics organizing, working class organizing, bike culture, US feminism and populism, participatory budgeting in NYC, childcare services in Quebec, Occupy Wall Street, animal rights, anti-colonial, and environmental movements. The current issue expands our engagement with US based movements in particular, looking at Occupy Wall Street, counter-recruitment organizing, movements of the blind, and anti-fascist movements. Not including the book reviews.

Overall, I'm delighted with the way that the themes touch on key questions within organizing. My sense is also that they are gradually accumulating into a theoretical approach, one that brings Marxist, New Social Movement and Political Process/Social Movement theory together into the same space. I'm curious whether others have seen similar convergences playing out. That said, there may be less theoretically driven pieces than there were in the first two years.

Peter: The process has seemed to me - in connection with 'my' themed issue - to have been a little bit magical. This because of my anxiety that we wouldn't get to the church on time and then the relief, and the amazement, that the improvisation worked. Further, related to the above, the surprisingly relaxed and friendly relationships between a group with quite radically different ages, political orientations, nationalities, genders (I don't know about sexualities or preferred wines). I can only assume that this has to do with the spirit of the times. It is certainly different from the spirit of my various previous times and publication efforts!

Alice: The journal broadened its audiences as the years passed by and, also, it became more popular amongst scholars in social movement studies. I saw the journal growing issue after issue, both in terms of readership and authorship, expanding also its global reach. Although there is still much work to do and it is of course difficult to broaden the editorial collective, including new editors and passing by the knowledge about the editorial processes and how things work within *Interface*. It is a slow process, sometimes in contrast with the need to have things done rather quickly when it comes to respect the deadlines for publication etc. So *Interface* is also a good place from which to learn the challenges that being a horizontal organization implies, along with the challenges of transferring knowledge within horizontal organizations.

Laurence: We have certainly found that we were asking the right questions in many areas. So we have seen contributors coming from activism and academia, from a very wide range of movements indeed, from many different corners of the globe, and using very different political and disciplinary languages. I think we made the right choice in terms of theming issues so that a reader of any given issue (other than this one of course) encounters a series of pieces tackling a particular theme within movements, or a particular kind of movement - and these change from issue to issue, showing that we are interested in a wide range of movements and themes.

At the same time I think we have also seen how difficult real dialogue is (which of course underlines its necessity). Many researchers submit pieces which seem aimed only at others in the academy, while many activists return the favour by not writing for *Interface* - a balance which we have to keep on working hard at, commissioning pieces from voices we feel need to be heard. Formats are often determinedly conventional despite all the possibilities offered by online publication. Very few writers seem really able to speak to peers who stand outside of their theoretical / disciplinary / political / intellectual language, or whose main point of reference is to a different kind of movement or a different part of the world. Even non-native speakers often prefer to write in English, and our readership is considerably more Northern-heavy than we had hoped.

This might sound like the voice of disappointment, but in my view it reflects the scale of the real problems (both external ones which movements seek to

overcome in society and their own internal ones) and we do our best to tackle them, with our very limited resources, I think we are managing to construct a diverse space for *readers* - who will find writing spanning all these divides and more, and can certainly hear a very diverse range of voices in *Interface*. Our challenge is now more to find a way of constructing real conversations between those different voices directly, not only in the minds of the readers.

When we started, in the final years of the boom, we could draw on the long experience of the alterglobalist movement of movements in enabling and encouraging diversity along many different axes. As for other movement institutions, this has been really helpful in working with the new movement upsurge around the world since 2008. Bringing in new voices with very different agendas, this experience underlines how important it is to keep on developing conversations, building alliances and "learning from each other's struggles".

In the narrower world of academia, social movements have of course become the focus of many people's attention. There is much cynical appropriation - for annual disciplinary conferences, edited collections or special issues of mainstream journals etc. - which involves little real engagement with movements but rather their use to boost a particular group's cultural capital. Much the same, of course, is true for many journalists and other writers who have no particular relationship to movements but find movement issues, or esthetics, offer a way to attract readers. It was ever thus!

More interestingly, the existing field of social movements research has become much more open to dialogue with movements in many ways, while engaged researchers who previously dedicated themselves to the relentless chronicling of structural injustice are now at times exploring the question of what collective agency can put things right. It is now far easier than it was when we started - at least in some countries and some disciplines - to carry out "movement-relevant research", engage practically with movements, and have a day job in academia. To the extent that other academics feel the same way (and thus help to hold researchers accountable in this sense), this is no bad thing.

Sara: The collective has in many ways come into its own, which is reflected in the depth and breadth of thematics and contributions. Individually, I feel that our voices have developed as editors, scholar-activists and facilitators of collectivity. Importantly this has also enabled the flourishing of our abilities to facilitate the voices of others through thematic choice, experimentation in format and form and editorial maturity. We have cultivated a generosity of spirit and practice of recognition of each other. This means that there is acceptance of our changing and differing cycles of engagement and commitment and attempts to navigate these differences.

For me personally the freedom to be able to go with my intuition about which thematics are important, relevant and meaningful for the development, generalisability and sustainability of movements has been fundamental in my own process of self-liberation and healing from the wounds of colonial

patriarchal capitalism . For many years I felt silenced and invisible; so to enter into a space (and virtual at that!) with friends and people whom I have never met in person and to be accepted and valued has been transformative.

There are thus many mirrors in the multiple stories and *travesías* of our collective practices of producing knowledge for and about movements. These practices also enable us to produce ourselves and our relationships differently to that of capitalist logics and rationalities.

Cristina: The journal has grown beyond our wildest dreams and it is a real kick to look at the clustr map

(<http://www3.clustrmaps.com/counter/maps.php?url=http://www.interfacejournal.net>) and see that we have readers in places I have trouble locating on a map (geography is not my strong suit) and think that a bunch of us sitting around a table in Manchester made that happen. I think that is what keeps me going through the times I have wanted to throw in the towel. For me the journal has opened many doors, from people wanting to talk to me about it at conferences and encounters, to being invited to talk about the journal at a wonderful conference/exchange in Granada in 2010, to putting me in touch with the many interesting contributors to the journal with whom it has been my real pleasure to work. I have also developed some excellent relationships with co-editors on the journal that have transcended issues related to the journal.

Where to next with the project?

Mandisi: I joined *Interface* in 2011. As Book Reviews Editor, I would like to see the journal publishing more reviews of books authored by grassroots activists than we are currently doing. Similarly, I would like to see more reviews of books on women's movements and movements from the South in general. That said, the diversity of contributions that the journal has published in the past is impressive.

Alice: Something that I think would be valuable for *Interface* and its editorial collectives would be to organize an *Interface* conference that would render possible the meeting between activists and academics, but also between *Interface* and other open publishing projects on social movements, that are flourishing in recent years. We already had a couple of meetings before/after the Council for European Studies Conference - Boston 2012 and Amsterdam 2013 - but I was thinking about a more structured and ad-hoc conference event with the active participation of many *Interface* members. I think that such an event would be a nice next step for *Interface*. Although one big challenge would be to find out the funding in order to have travel/accommodation grants for those who would be self-funded.

Liz: Diversity is a key concern of *Interface* – diversity in terms of people, voices, experiences, movements, languages and geographies. For me, this is something we need to work on further. We need to find ways of working with people and regions under-represented in the *Interface* project, as well as areas of social movement activity and analysis we have not covered well. We need more involvement from people and networks in South East Asia, as well as from the United States. We know from our active editors and group in Western Europe that activity begets activity (and excellent journal articles!), and so I'm hopeful that small steps we have taken in places will blossom with further focus by the journal's Editorial Spokescouncil members.

Lesley: My hopes for my next steps in terms of the journal is first and foremost to build the capacity of the journal to handle the increasing volume of work. I worry that our/my turnaround isn't good enough. Another ongoing challenge is the question of how to plug people into the project that allows them to be fully engaged in the process. We have a list of wonderful people willing to help, but reviewing articles isn't really enough to keep them engaged and interested. I'd also like us to build our relationships to people in other regions. I'd also like to continue to build our collective process as a journal. It's quite lovely that it works so well informally – but it can result in too much work in a few hands.

Laurence: I think our main goal for the next five years (if that isn't too grandiose a scale to be thinking on) should actually be to consolidate what we are doing or trying to do already. Our ideas are good, we know how to turn them into reality, but it takes time and energy, and we are all very much engaged in our movements and / or as researchers (which is as it should be). This shows up in how much internal learning we have done when we have to try and articulate it for new participants - as well as in how much of a challenge it is to actually include new people, simply because we are all so stretched. At the same time, those of us who are involved are usually under great pressure simply to hold our end of things up. I think if we can manage, slowly and sustainably, to include new people to help us do better what we are already trying to do, and hold open the space for "learning from each other's struggles" which we aim to be, then we are doing something very useful!

Sara: Our collective practice has emerged and consolidated. The next steps are ensuring our longer term sustainability. Here continual collective reflection on our practices, processes and possibilities seems important. In particular, it is crucial to facilitate the continual participation of current members of the Editorial Board collective and enable the inclusion of other voices, experiences and perspectives.

Multiplicity and its fostering in practice, thought and theory also strikes me as a key thematic both in terms of multiple contents, analyses, perspectives and

experiences of movement struggles and practices but also in terms of the form through which we produce knowledge for and about movements.

I would thus like to help foster more multiplicity in form, or as Gloria Anzaldúa describes, speak in multiple tongues, including image, art, poetry, audio, visuals. I also think that finding ways and methodologies to support author experimentation with collective processes of writing and producing movement-relevant knowledges is an exciting prospect.

I hope that in this way we can continue to contribute to making our dreams of transformation and liberation in our lives, communities and world possible.

Cristina: One thing we have never had is money. On the whole, I think this is a good thing, because a) it shows that it is possible to produce a high quality journal outside of the logic of any sort of monetary exchange, and b) it would have introduced yet another element that would need to be negotiated and thought through and frankly we never really felt the effort would be worth it. Getting each issue out is enough work as it is! Having said that, there are a few things we would like to be able to do better and which would be greatly facilitated by some sort of face to face encounter between editors, along the lines of Alice's suggestion above. Many people can't believe that in fact many of us have never laid eyes on each other, but it is true. Translation is another dream we never managed to realize, simply because good translations are hard work and deserve to be remunerated, and we never have any money. So, if we ever get around to putting up a contribution button on the webpage, and your great Aunt Fanny leaves you a large inheritance, feel free to contribute to fund a face to face *Interface* editorial encounter or earmark it for the translation of your favourite *Interface* article into the language of your choice!

On a separate note, it is clear that the nature of academic publishing is changing with the inexorable move to online and "open-access" publications. *Interface* has been one of a tradition of truly open access journals that are committed to high quality publication of sympathetically edited work from a range of contributors. I hope that in a modest way we have shown that this model of journal is sustainable, at least for a while, and hope others will be inspired to provide other outlets for high quality work beyond the confines of the current academic/editorial marketplace.

In this issue:

Although this issue of *Interface* has no specific theme, the topics authors have chosen to write on certainly reflect the struggles going on across the world today as well as key questions researchers and activists face.

Thus understanding the new movements is a key concern. Anna Szolucha's article explores the messy complexity of Occupy in the SF Bay area and Ireland. She argues that the practice of real democracy is not the incarnation of an ideal but is rather best understood as a changing and incomplete construction, and

that it is from the complexities of these temporalities that the potential for real change comes. José Antonio Cerrillo Vidal takes up the question of what led to the strength of the November 14th 2012 general strike in Spain. He argues that innovative alliances between the 15-M movement and labour struggles and the true grassroots and inclusive nature of the support for the strike, as well as its unique trans-European dimension, are its most distinctive features. Panagiotis Sotiris investigates the December 2008 revolt of the Greek youth from the perspective of Greek intellectuals and social theorists, arguing that these actors refused to acknowledge the revolt's potential as a highly original form of collective action, opting to treat it as a case of social deviance, anomie, and evidence of a deficient political culture.

Another set of concerns relates to movement alliance-building and networking processes. Giuseppe Caruso's article explores the unique approach of the World Social Forum in terms of its identity, its vision and its methodology: we are inviting responses to this article for next issue. In similarly dialogical vein, activists and researchers from across Europe who took part in the Transnational Institute symposium "Social movements and the European crisis" reflect on the state of the struggle, on solidarity and on how movements can win. Yavuz Yildirim's piece discusses the current situation of the European Social Forum and in particular the 2010 Istanbul ESF, where tensions between "horizontals" and "verticals" played a major role. Despite the ESF's current crisis, the author argues that contemporary movements show the continuing need and potential for movements of this kind.

A number of articles discuss the political implications of different organising strategies. Amy Lane's research on early disability rights organizing in the US shows how in 1959, the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) adapted race based civil rights strategies and to attempt to enact civil rights legislation for the blind, challenging the institutional authority of professional services for the blind. Patricia Aljama and Joan Pujol explore the dynamics of institutionalization of LGBT politics in Catalonia, to examine the legal and institutional achievements but also the political costs of institutionalization, including cooptation, the de-radicalization of a politics of transformation based on sexuality, and a lack of recognition of the diversity and complexity of the LGBT collective. Eric Turner provides an overview of the 5 Star Movement in Italy comparing it to similar cases of comedians-turned-politicians, media figures as social movement leaders and populism in Italy. The article also analyzes the reasons for the recent 5 Star Movement success in the last Italian political elections.

Cost and risk are important parts of many movements' experience. Franz Seifert explores how the tactic of destroying fields of GM crops was diffused from France to Spain and Germany, noting the importance of national factors in explaining the failure of diffusion to Spain and the moderate results in Germany. The article argues that high-cost tactics in particular face particular challenges in diffusion from one country to the next. Connor T. Jerzak examines the roles of the Ultras (organised football fans), in Egyptian politics and argues

that they have become a significant popular force against authoritarianism. Based on years of participant observation of militant anti-fascist movements in the United States, Stanislav Vysotsky shows how the perception of threat within a counter-cultural space justifies the tactical choices of anti-fascist activists.

By contrast, a series of articles explore where social movements are situated in terms of wider political discourses. Raphael Schlembach's article on the German "autonomous nationalists" explores the paradox of far-right mobilisation using DIY attitudes, horizontal organisation and counter-cultural style more typical of the alterglobalisation movement and raise questions as to how far we can assume that such orientations are always and automatically progressive. In similar vein, Mi Park explores far-right discourses in the global North which use themes of cultural diversity, environmental protection and local autonomy to ground anti-immigration positions. She argues for the need for progressive critiques of globalisation to go beyond a privileged eco-localism.

Christian Fuchs draws on an analysis of public video announcements posted by Anonymous activists on the Internet to explore the ideological underpinnings or "political worldviews" of the Anonymous movement and specifically the role that socialism and liberalism play in it, arguing that the two coexist in a sometimes contradictory fashion. Using Gramsci, Emily Brisette explores the relationship between neoliberalism and the contemporary movement against military recruitment in the US, finding that the counter-recruitment movement is constrained by, reproduces, and in some instances challenges the reigning neoliberal common sense.

Two articles explore the particular challenges movements face organising in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). Grzegorz Piotrowski's article on the alterglobalisation movement in Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary discusses how the region's previous history has led to a smaller movement and one less comfortable with leftist arguments. The movement's subcultural and anarchist tone has in turn had a significant effect on subsequent movements, while the peripheral situation of CEE led to complex interactions with western movement representatives. Yulia Lukashina's article uses social media sources to explore how the Russian "snow revolution" protests of 2011-13 tried to develop collective action frames, noting both the difficulties in articulating positive frames and the power of the spectre of a return to the USSR.

The articles section closes with three pieces on movement outcomes and legacies. Through her examination of the US civil rights movement in Clarksdale, Mississippi, Françoise Hamlin critically interrogates movement legacies and histories, raising questions about the nature and extent of change, and the implications for contemporary black freedom struggles in the USA. Thinking through their work with activists in Nova Scotia, Max Haiven and Alex Khasnabish reflect on how we measure and imagine "success" and "failure" in social movement research, especially research that strives to work in solidarity with the social movements in question. Lastly, John L. Hammond reflects on what can be learned about space and power from the experience of Occupy Wall Street.

Book reviews

This issue sees book reviews of the new edition of Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal and Hilary Wainwright's *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* (Laurence Cox); Setsu Shigematsu's *Scream from the Shadows: the Women's Liberation Movement in Japan* (Julia Schuster); Chris Crass' *Towards Collective Liberation: Anti-racist Organizing, Feminist Praxis and Movement Building Strategy* (Lesley Wood); Lesley Wood's *Direct action, Deliberation and Diffusion: Collective Action after the WTO Protests in Seattle* (Neil Sutherland); Alice Mattoni's *Media Practices and Protest Politics: How Precarious Workers Mobilise* (Mark Bergfeld); Paulo Gerbaudo's *Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism* (Maite Tapia); Symon Hill's *Digital Revolutions: Activism in the Internet Age* (Deborah Eade); and RD Smith's *Higher Hopes: a Black Man's Guide to College* (Mandisi Majavu).

New editors

This issue we welcome four (!) new editors. In Central and Eastern Europe Jiří Navrátil, Asia Rutkowska and Anna Szolucha have kindly agreed to join us and in Southeast Asia Sarah Raymundo. We look forward to working with them and to deepening our connections with movements and researchers in those regions.

Upcoming issues

Our next issue (vol 6 no 1, May 2014) will be on the pedagogical practices of social movements (extended deadline for contributions 1 December 2013). The subsequent issue (vol 6 no 2, November 2014) will be on movement internationalism(s); a call for papers is in this issue (deadline for contributions 1 May 2014). As always, contributions on relevant topics outside the special theme for that issue are welcome.

About the authors

The authors are all editors of *Interface* and can be contacted via <http://www.interfacejournal.net/submissions/editorial-contact/>.