Beyond "Individual" or "Collective" Resistance: Assessment towards an Agenda for Future Research on Dissent

Mona Lilja, *University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg*
Stellan Vinthagen, *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*
Kristin Wiksell, *University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg*

Abstract

We argue that studies of resistance have suffered from a bifurcation of fields, whereby some focus on organized forms (social movements, civil society or revolutions), while others are concerned with individual types (everyday, local and dispersed) of resistance. This de facto academic division has unwittingly obscured the links, dynamics, hybridity and entanglements between different forms of resistance. In order to stimulate a more complex and nuanced understanding of resistance, we propose a new research agenda for transdisciplinary studies of resistance and present some connections between individual and more collective/organized forms of resistance that need to be systematically explored in future research. Overall, this article argues for the need to recognize both the variation in forms of resistance, and the (often hybrid) linkages between them. The recognition that individual acts of resistance are fundamentally entangled with collective or organized dissent is necessary for shifting our understanding of resistance.

Introduction

There is a tendency for scholars with a focus on resistance to address either more visible and organized forms of collective resistance (civil society, social movements, revolutions, and so forth), or to embrace small-scale, informal and individualized forms of resistance practices (everyday, local and dispersed resistance). Since its inception in the 1980s, the scholarly field of 'everyday resistance' (Scott, 1990) has flourished, yet it has remained focused on individuals, informal small-scale groupings and dispersed forms

of resistance (such as 'infrapolitics', which is James Scott's alternative concept for everyday resistance). Meanwhile, the popular field of 'social movement' studies has sustained its interest in collective mobilizations, often by limiting studies to 'movement organizations', public 'episodes' and 'campaigns' of different kinds. It is noteworthy that so far, as Asara (2017) notes, 'there has been a surprisingly little effort towards conceptualizing and problematizing resistance within social movement studies' and especially theorizing how it intersects with more individual forms of resistance (p. 1). For example, the field of 'contentious politics' (McAdam, McCarthy & Mayer, 2001) excludes acts by small groups of individuals from what they count as 'events' and limits its scope to forms of contention that display 'public, collective interaction' (p. 4). 'Contentious politics,' when elaborating on how individuals relate to collective struggles, mainly addressed them when organized as, for example, leaders, organizers or participants. The same pattern can be distinguished within the studies of (everyday) resistance, which is a field that has shown very little interest in theorizing movements (for some exceptions, see Chabot, 2004; Creasap, 2012; Johansson and Vinthagen, 2019; Selbin, 2009; Sörbom & Wennerhag, 2013; Törnberg, 2017). The knowledge production within the two fields must not be problematic. All scholarly fields focus on certain issues, themes, or research problems. However, as pointed out by Roland Bleiker (2000, p. 276), opening up one certain perspective tends to 'hide' everything that is invisible from that vantage point: 'every process of revealing is at the same time a process of concealing.' From our perspective, a too strict focus on organized or everyday resistance gets problematic when the relationship between different forms of resistance become hidden in the research process.

We find it remarkable that, so far, relatively few scholars have elaborated on the inter-linkage of shifting forms of resistance in general, or how practices of everyday or dispersed resistance entangle with more organized and sometimes mass-based resistance activities, in particular. In our view, neither contemporary studies of everyday resistance nor social movement studies are equipped or sufficient to grasp, analyse and explore the often-complex entanglements between different forms of resistance. In order to better understand resistance, such entanglements need to be carefully analyzed by taking into consideration various connections between many diverse practices of resistance.

This article, by doing so, enriches the debates and scholarship of social movement research and individual resistance by putting up a new research

agenda for the study of resistance. The overall aim is to rethink the collective in relation to individual forms of dissent. Exploring the entanglements between different forms of resistance means dissolving the line that is often drawn between everyday resistance, on the one hand, and collective/organized forms of resistance, on the other.

Overall, we wish to add to the growing critical literature that deals with resistance, social movements, civil society, revolutions and so forth, by arguing that, among other things, there are three main connections between individual and organized/collective resistance that need to be systematically explored in future research. This study aims to contribute to the literature in three ways. We suggest that: 1) organized and individual resistance do not usually exist autonomously but exist in relation to different forms of resistance; 2) organized resistance sometimes evokes, or transforms into, individual resistance and the other way around; and 3) individual resistance can, to some extent, also be understood as a more or less collective form of dissent (although not organized, as such). These nexuses are further explored below.

Resistance

Resistance is a broad concept that is used by researchers to unveil practices that emerge from and against relations of domination. The specific type of resistance that is studied depends in part on the type of power that the researcher is interested in. If interested in state power, the resistance studied often involves visible protests and organized campaigns, while hegemonic 'truth' interventions are mapped as discursive strategies. Researchers' analysis of resistance is also formed by the theory or perspective that is adopted. The major theoretical orientations that guide researchers within resistance studies mainly merit attention to, as stated above, social movements or everyday resistance.

Social movement studies, which has been increasingly important since the late 1970s, has developed theories and concepts for understanding social movements' political activities (Yates, 2015). Social movement studies is a broad field including, among other things, studies on the alter-globalization movement (Maeckelbergh, 2011; Thörn, 2006; Wennerhag, 2009), the notion of 'prefigurative politics' (Yates, 2015), 'political opportunities' or 'process theory', 'resource mobilization', 'collective framing' (McAdam et al., 1996), 'contentious politics' (McAdam et al., 2001), and the so called 'new

social movements' with their collective identities (Melucci, 1996; Polletta, 1999).

Studies of social movements are clearly sophisticated and highly developed, and give many theoretical concepts and models of how to understand the collective mobilization of resistance. One of the more important and still ongoing paradigmatic debates in social movement studies concerns the role of strategy and culture (Yates, 2015). However, as stated above, the social movement research tends to focus on the *collective* (identity, framing, resource mobilization or strategy), while omitting individual forms of resistance. There are, of course, occasional exceptions that are articulated in discussions about emerging, submerged or dispersed networks of movements, although individual forms of resistance seem to only matter therein as indicators, beginnings or evolving processes of *collective* action (see e.g., Castells, 1996; Melucci, 1996).

Everyday resistance, on the other hand, tends to be oriented towards an individual level approach and it unveils micro-events. Researchers have often been inspired by James Scott's studies in which he suggests how this individual and non-organized resistance can have a great impact on social change through its cumulative effects, despite its mundane features. 'Everyday resistance' exhibits an alternative form of resistance; one that is not as dramatic and visible as rebellions, riots, demonstrations, revolutions, civil war and other organized, collective and/or confrontational articulations of resistance (e.g., Scott, 1990). 'Everyday resistance' is that which Scott interchangeably calls 'infra-politics', since it is described as a silent and underground ('hidden' or 'disguised') type of resistance and includes tactics of, for example, escape, sarcasm, passivity, laziness, misunderstandings, disloyalty, slander, avoidance or theft (Scott, 1990, p. 198). Important here is that to Scott, such resistance is 'without protest and without organization', which is clearly not 'movements' (Scott, 1987), and is even sometimes described as 'non-movements' (Bayat, 2013).

Everyday resistance is regularly suggested as a concept that complements research on organized resistance, which makes sense. However, we would like to argue that the many scattered, dispersed and small-scale resistance practices that we see today are more complex and richer than those being covered by the concept of hidden and subtle 'everyday resistance'. From our perspective, everyday resistance is one of many types of small-scale or individual resistance practices. For example, individual resistance is not always

hidden but is sometimes loud and public (cf. Butler, 1997; Burkitt, 2002; Koefoed, 2017; Odysseos, Death & Malmvig, 2016; Thompson, 2003; Lilja et al. 2017; Lilja and Vinthagen, 2018). In a similar way, larger movements of dissent that fly under the radar and avoid all attention—such as those that are hidden on the internet, and therefore do not fit neatly into what is conventionally seen as 'social movements'—must also be acknowledged. Thus, with this article, we open up the opportunity for a (re)engagement in the categories that resistance scholars depart from.

Both the literature on the everyday and the research on more collective or organized forms of resistance mainly focus on what Steven Lukes has labelled the one-dimensional or two-dimensional forms of power (Lukes, 1974). In this text, we will discuss resistance and power in a broader sense. First of all, we are not focusing on only organized resistance or individual dissent, but rather the span between the individual and/or collective/organized. Foremost, we would like to show how small-scale forms of resistance entangle in more collective forms. For example, individual resistance acts, when repeated in different venues, are aggregating, and thereby also come to form collective resistance. This 'fused', or 'hybrid' resistance is not to be seen as organized, but still collective as well as simultaneously individual. It composes an example of the many 'blended' forms of resistance, which mingle collective, organized and individual expressions. Below, we will also display how individual and organized resistance evoke each other and form a complex web.

The entanglements of resistance

As stated above, there are still major lacunae in the field of resistance studies, which leave us with many queries concerning the dynamics between collective and individual resistance. The analysis below is a conceptual and critical contribution to the debate. We further elaborate on the three crossroads, which we suggest need further explanation. The analysis is conceptual in that it advances some connections between the individual and the collective that have bearing on the research on political mobilizations. Moreover, our research is synthetic in nature and draws on different perspectives in order to advance its findings.

Connections between resistance acts

Historically, studies of resistance have gone through similar stages as the studies of power. Although power was initially studied in its most explicit forms, during the 1970s more subtle, symbolic and dispersed forms of power were increasingly acknowledged. Likewise, the earlier focus on the more obvious and dramatic forms of resistance have been broadened through a recognition of more subtle and diffuse articulations of resistance (Scott, 1989; 1990). In contemporary research on resistance, we see that political struggles are clearly not always a matter of 'claims-making' on elites or regimes through public protests that are organized by social movements; sometimes they involve subtle and dispersed struggles about meaning-making, or they might be driven by a desire for escape from a relation of domination or by the need for plain survival, without being framed as 'political' at all. Resistance might also be about establishing new truths or other ways of living, be practiced as different forms of avoidance, or be hidden or disguised. It takes many forms and is called by many different names. Still, as Foucault pinpoints, different forms of resistance, while understood through their specificities, do not exist autonomously:

> The specificity of these struggles, of these resistances of conduct, does not mean that they remained separate or isolated from each other, with their own partners, forms, dramaturgy, and distinct aim. In actual fact they are always, or almost always, linked to other conflicts and problems [...] So, these revolts of conduct may well be specific in their form and objective, but whatever the identifiable character of their specificity, they are never autonomous, they never remain autonomous. (Foucault, 2009, pp. 196–197)

Different forms of resistance, then, despite their specificities, are not isolated from each other, but are linked to each other, and are evoked by the same conflict or power-relation. They occur in webs of different forms of resistance and power, which means that specific forms of resistance are understandable in and through these connections. This implies that individual resistance may be connected to more collective expressions, and vice versa, and that these may be simultaneously practiced and linked to each other when evoked by the same conflict, violence or power relation. This can be illuminated by the struggle of the Swedish HBTQ movement in the 1970s. Inspired by the *Stonewall Riots* in New York City in 1969, a younger generation of gay

activists in Sweden began to demand that the classification of homosexuality as a 'disease' should be abolished. Not only did they collectively organize demonstrations and a Gay Liberation Week, but also an 'occupation' of the staircase at the National Board of Health and Welfare (NBHW). In addition, gay activists individually 'called in sick' to the Social Insurance Agency (SIA) and claimed that they were unable to work because they were homosexuals (read as mentally disordered). All in all, the struggles over the classification of 'homosexuality' in the 1970s involved complexity and display how resistance often transcends the often too simplistic vernacular of resistance studies when focusing on resistance as individual *or* collective. The case illuminates how different forms of resistance struggles, despite their specificities, were not isolated from each other, but occurred in the same web, which means that the resistance should be understandable in the light of these connections. The resistance of the activists contributed to the removal of the classification of homosexuality as a mental disorder on 19 October 1979 (Quistbergh, 2001; Baaz and Lilja, 2022).

In a similar vein, feminist resistance sometimes appears as a complex network of various forms of resistance that emerge from the same relations of power. Lately, it has revolved around sexual abuse (the individual but serial resistance of the #MeToo campaign) as well as taking the form of collective mobilization in relation to, among other things, the 'pussy hats'. This has been complemented with more everyday forms of feminism in intimate relations as well as policy-oriented state feminism. Altogether, feminist resistance is sometimes small-scale and sometimes organized and grand in its character, but it is still related to addressing (different aspects of) the same gender relations of power (Lilja and Johansson, 2018).

By drawing on the above, we suggest a need for more research on the relationship between different forms of resistance (and the identities, acts and emotions involved in the dissent) and power. This rhymes very well with other trends in social science, which have a renewed interest in relationships. For example, Fox and Alldred (2020) suggest that the so-called new materialism involves a shift from essentialism to relationality (Fox and Alldred, 2020, p. 122; Bennett, 2010; see also e.g., Braidotti, 2019, p. 45; Frost, 2011). This is to be understood as a far-reaching critique of the cultural categories from which we approach the world. Instead of embracing certain categories as the basic scaffolding from which we interpret different practices, the new materialism suggests that there exist no non-relational or fixed entities, but rather a myriad of related entities (Fox and Alldred, 2020, pp. 122–123).

The point is that relations form the qualities of entities, which make them malleable and potentially without essence. By taking this as inspiration, we want to encourage new research on the relationship between assorted forms of resistance, which appear autonomous, but are intertwined in a complex web. Thus, more individual and organized forms of resistance often co-exist in processes of social change. When attempting to understand one form of resistance, it should be interrogated in the light of other related expressions of dissent and how the relationship between different practices of dissent affecting these practices, and thereby the very form of the resistance.

To the above we must also add that, over and above the relationship between resistances, also the repetition of resistance over times matters. Repetitions are part of how norms and values are communicated and forwarded, and they are important for how resistance is both formulated and understood (Bleiker, 2021). Thus, not only must resistance practices be analysed in their connections to other practices of dissent, but we must also acknowledge how they are repeated; repetitions encourage repetitions, thus being an engine and means in resistance movements. Repetitions lead to new reiterations, which establish orders and cemented norms (Lilja, 2021).

The collectiveness of serial resistance

Above, we have suggested that different forms of resistance should not be viewed as separate, but as related, given that they address the same power-relation. In the below, we propose that individual practices of resistance, when practiced by a multitude of individuals, have the ability to become a *serial phenomenon* with major impacts. For example, resistance that attempts to transform institutionalized and taken-for-granted discourses is sometimes carried out individually but in a serialized manner (Lilja and Vinthagen, 2018). An example of this is the combatting of stereotyped notions of men and women in Sweden through the repetition of the new Swedish word *hen*, which complements the 'he' and 'she' binary. The 'hen' word denotes a non-binary identity position while dissolving the divide between the sexes and enabling other subjectivities (Lilja and Johansson, 2018). 'Hen' has been increasingly recurring over recent years, and in 2015 it was included as a new Swedish word in the *Swedish Academy Dictionary*. The success of the resistance against the he–she binary through the establishing of 'hen' is due to individual persons who have embraced and repeated the word over time. Thus, serial actions of resistance can have real and far-reaching effects.

The same pattern prevails in Foucault's (1990) *The history of sexuality*, wherein resistance is outlined as emerging from, or working through, discourses. Discourses are seen as a starting point for, a target and an instrument of resisting practices. Domains of discursive interaction are characterized by different discursive battles, and discursive resistance is pictured as a 'multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies' (Foucault, 1990, p. 100). Foucault states:

> We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. (Foucault, 1990, p. 101)

Discourses could be seen as an instrument as well as an effect of power, but also as harboring resistance and providing a starting point for subversive strategies. In every direction within the social realm there are multiple and heterogeneous 'points' of resistance that are transmitted and produced. Foucault also points to resistance as appearing in an irregular fashion with varying densities that are spread over time and space. Political struggles and subversive acts thus occur as micro-complexities—with words, practices and sentences—that spread themselves about as a network. Or as formulated by Medina (2011): 'Foucault makes clear that there are irreducibly multiple and heterogeneous forms of power flowing in every direction within the social fabric, and offering multiple points of resistance' (p. 10).

The multiple points of resistance that Foucault mentioned have the ability to set off major changes. A single act of resistance, which is, to a great extent, interwoven with power discourses, might be hidden and negligible, but when accumulated might lead to social transformations. In fact, according to Foucault, the net-like organization of small instances and intensities of resistance, which are repetitively but irregularly repeated, can, when methodized, systemized and collected, give rise to a 'revolution'. Or: 'it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible' (Foucault, 1990, p. 96; Lilja, 2018; Medina, 2011). Resistance is individually practiced, yet performed by a multitude and it can be organized, systematized and arranged, thereby making real changes (Bayat, 2013). Everyday stories of individuals, particularly in the space of

social media, are now added to each other in serial ways and even inspire each other, and as such they are repeated, copied and spread in new ways; as, for example, the narratives of individuals relating to the 'fat acceptance' discourse that is posted within the digital space of the 'fat-o-sphere' (Johansson and Vinthagen, 2019, Ch. 5). In this way individuals can, in a serial manner, add to the narratives of each other and, by relating to stories of others, over time become many individual voices amassed. Through this, they can be part of an ongoing social construction and negotiation of new collective online identities or together, without knowing each other offline, construct new counter-discourses, as is the case with individuals who make up the 'fat-o-sphere'. Another example can be found in the anti-compulsory hijab protests in Iran directed against state power, where women, in one of several forms of resistance, take off their veil in everyday life. As Masih Alinejad, founder of the online movement My Stealthy Freedom (MSF) that inspires women to post footage of their headscarf-free hair, puts it: 'if you make every individual person to act like an organization, to be a movement, then the dictators cannot go and arrest every individual person' (Gilbert, 2020, p. 165). Individual acts of everyday resistance can gain momentum through repetition.

Something similar to the 'serial dynamic', suggested above, has been claimed by authors within studies of everyday resistance. As stated above, Scott has contributed extensively to the development of everyday resistance as an analytical category within the emerging academic field of resistance studies. Everyday resistance authors have illuminated how aggregated or cumulative political effects arise from many individuals who carry out small-scale acts of resistance (Bayat, 2013, p. 22; Scott, 1989), although often without explicitly relating such claims to social movement theory. Everyday resistance, when carried out by many, can become a powerful form of resistance (Scott; 1972; 1989; 1990). Among the examples provided by Scott is the case of the thousands of soldiers who silently and individually deserted the Confederate Army and, as such, according to Scott, significantly contributed to the defeat of the southern states in the US Civil War. Thus, dispersed practices of resistance can lead to major transformations of society, when prevailing as serial, non-organized yet still collective events. Or as expressed by Scott himself:

> Quiet unremitting guerrilla warfare [...] day-in and day-out [that] rarely make headlines. But just as millions of anthozoan polyps create,

> willy-nilly, a coral reef, thousands upon thousands of petty acts of insubordination and evasion create a political and economic barrier reef of their own. And whenever [...] the ship of state runs aground on such a reef, attention is typically directed to the shipwreck itself and not the vast aggregation of actions which make it possible. (Scott, 1989, p. 49)

Overall, we want to argue that what looks like 'individual' resistance might become a collective phenomenon when carried out in patterns (e.g., as a serial phenomenon). In addition, such individual resistance should be understood as always being, more or less, embedded in the collective, that is, non-organized communities of belonging. Although resistance is carried out individually, it is by individuals who are often 'connected' by the sharing of the same knowledge or discourses, perceived common interests or grievances, or the same identity positions. Scott does indeed interpret the meaning of individual resistance through its embeddedness within (subaltern) communities and their culture or social norms (see especially Scott, 2010; 2013). It is through such norms, customs, legends, stories and other 'hidden transcripts' that individuals find legitimacy, motivation and tactics for their everyday resistance. For example, the widespread poaching on aristocratic property by poor peasants in England was, according to Scott, despite threats of severe punishment, made possible through a collective solidarity where villagers looked the other way. Thus, it is possible to argue that even within the Scottian framework, 'individual' resistance is not really, clearly, or at least not meaningfully understood as 'individual', rather as somehow community-based—as Scott (2019) has subsequently clarified.

Resistance that alternates between small-scale and organized forms

Above, we have discussed the collectiveness of serial resistance. In this section, we suggest that resistance movements sometimes alternate between different expressions. Among other things, we argue that the environment and experience of collectively organized resistance, at least sometimes, also stimulates and creates dispersed forms of resistance, where individuals carry out their own glaring or hidden forms of resistance. One example of this is civil society organizations' men's groups that are run by male trainers and/or trained (male) villagers in Cambodia. During interviews that were conducted with representatives from some of these local organizations, it was revealed how they practice resistance against violent gender norms, not only within

the groups but also in their day-to-day lives. Overall, these men's groups seemingly set off different individual negotiations of gendered discourses and images of identity. For example, one of the Cambodian trainers stated that his work within the men's groups had made him combat his everyday subscription to a Cambodian masculinity (see further Lilja et al, 2017; Lilja, 2018; Lilja and Baaz, 2016). Among other things, he encouraged his wife to take the initiative with sex (a practice he located outside of Cambodian culture).

Another pattern is pointed out by Scott, who argues that the practice of everyday resistance might precede riots, social movements and political parties, which are the other forms of acknowledged resistance. Thus, more invisible and individual forms of resistance might develop into more visible, organized and large-scale forms. Without relying on Foucault, Scott connects dispersed forms of individual resistance to revolutionary processes (Scott, 1979). Here it is not a matter of discursive processes, which become the seedbed of major social change or more collective or organized resistance expressions; instead, Scott refers to acts of resistance, which are evoked by similar contexts of power (which could involve material hardship). Nevertheless, this movement between dispersed and organized resistance is never fully developed, and even less studied in a systematic way, which leaves us with an unclear picture of how, when and why individual resistance can aggravate, escalate and lead to organized resistance and revolutions. Thus, more studies are required that disentangle how the individual and collective fall into a new form of 'fused' resistance, when collective and dispersed resistance fuel each other.

Concluding from the above, it is not only individual resistance that can move into more collective outbursts of resistance (through serial repetition), but organized resistance has sometimes created dispersed resistance (through provocation, meaning-making, being inspired, and so forth), while thereafter changing yet again (Lilja et al. 2017). Asef Bayat, among others, displays how people can perform scattered everyday politics in one moment, but in the next moment the struggle becomes public and collective when the state or other power elites crack down on the advancements of the informal people (Bayat, 2002). This is not necessarily leading towards a sustained mobilization but rather to be seen as a proactive resistance by disenfranchised groups—the street vendors, the squatters, unemployed or underemployed—in their attempts to improve their life chances (in terms of capital, social goods, opportunity, autonomy and thus power) (Bayat, 1997a, pp. 2–6, 12;

1997b; 2000; 2010; Lilja, 2016). By illuminating a kind of resistance that is not necessarily 'hidden' or organized, Bayat offers a theory of resistance that moves beyond Scott's theoretical framework. Drawing on Bayat we would like to suggest that more research is warranted on the different stages of resistance. To make social movement theory more complex, we encourage a broader take, in which different stages—before, between and after an outburst of collective actions—are also embraced in the research agenda. In conclusion, a new framework for the study of political struggles should include not only how individual practices of resistance aggregate, but should be constructed to include how organized resistance leads to dispersed resistance and how it alternates between the two.

Concluding discussion: Time for a new research agenda of resistance studies

The overarching aim of the article has been to advance a new research agenda on the entanglements between organized/collective movements and individual resistance. Social movement theory has elaborated processes, preconditions for political actions, political ends, the circulation of political perspectives, the production of new norms, conducts and diffusion (Yates, 2015). Still, while more subtle and individual forms of resistance have emerged as a 'new' form of understanding and framing how political actions are done, these more modest forms of resistance, and how they intersect with communities of belonging, collective expressions of resistance or social movements, have rarely been addressed by social science scholars.

The connections between the organized, collective and individual elements of resistance have not been explicitly embraced by social movement scholars or everyday resistance studies scholars. Instead, it has been as if they divided up organized and individual articulations of resistance between each other, thereby ignoring the links and dynamics that exist between them. Thus, the main aim of this article has been to advance a new research agenda by identifying some paths to a more complex and nuanced approach to resistance.

We started with a (re)engagement in the categories that we depart from. We must abandon some of the core debates within the everyday resistance literature and social movement research in order to embrace categories beyond organized/public and hidden/everyday resistance. The many scattered, dispersed and small-scale resistance practices that are identified—

which are not mass-organized—are more complex and richer than those being covered by the concept of (hidden and subtle) 'everyday resistance'. We must, for example, embrace different kinds of individual, dispersed or small-scale resistance, which might be loud and extraordinary. In addition, resistance movements sometimes go undercover in order to move under the radar (as 'infrapolitics').

After concluding this, we, by drawing on decades of interesting research within these fields, unpacked different assemblages of resistance, in which the collective and the individual fall. After all, movements come from somewhere, and the roles and motivations of the individuals that participate in mobilizations have always been of interest to movement scholars. At the same time, when we look closer at Scott's everyday resistance, we have found that it is always embedded in a (subaltern) community context, with social norms that sustain and inspire individuals towards conducting their 'infrapolitics'. Thus, individuals matter for social movements, and collectives matter for individual forms of dispersed resistance. Accordingly, we suggest that we also leave the familiar lines of distinction between individual and organized resistance behind. Instead, we have suggested a further mapping of complex forms of resistance wherein the individual, collective and organized sometimes overlap or evoke and/or support each other.

Overall, we suggest that studies of social movements, civil society, revolutions and resistance need to *embrace the individual/collective nexus, while analyzing resistance*. We have added three distinct narratives, pathways or links to encourage new research that embraces these connections. We conclude that there is a need to encourage case studies of social mobilizations that take the following into consideration: 1) organized and individual resistance do not usually exist autonomously, but exist in relation to other forms of resistance and should be understood in these relations; 2) individual resistance can, to some extent, also be understood as a more collective (serial) form of dissent (although not organized, as such) and; 3) organized resistance sometimes evokes, or transforms into, individual resistance and the other way around. To summarize, these linkages must guide the forthcoming research within different strands of resistance and social movement studies.

References

Asara, V. (2017). "Social movements and resistance". In C. Spash (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of ecological economics: Nature and Society* (pp. 173–182). Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Baaz, Mikael, and Mona Lilja (2022). "I felt a little homosexual today, so I called in sick: The formation of 'reverse discourse' by Swedish gay activists in the 1970s". *Global Society.*

Bayat, A. (1997a). "Cairo's poor: dilemmas of survival and solidarity". *Middle East Report*, Winter, 2–12.

Bayat, A. (1997b). *Street politics: poor people's movements in Iran*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

Bayat, A. (2000). "From 'dangerous classes' to 'quiet rebels': Politics of the urban subaltern in the Global South". *International Sociology*, *15*, 533–557.

Bayat, A. (2010). *Life as politics: How ordinary people change the Middle East*. Redwood City, California: Stanford University Press.

Bayat, A. (2013). *Life as politics: How ordinary people change the Middle East* (2nd ed.). Redwood City, California: Stanford University Press.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge*. New York: Polity.

Bleiker, R. (2021). "Foreword", In Lilja, M. *Constructive Resistance: repetitions, emotions and time.* London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Bleiker, R. (2000). *Popular Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burkitt, I. (2002). "Technologies of the self: habitus and capacities". *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *32*(2), 219–237.

Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Redwood City, California: Stanford University Press.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society, Volume I*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Blackwell Publishers.

Chabot, S. (2004). "Framing, transnational diffusion, and African–American intellectuals in the land of Gandhi". *International Review of Social History*, *49*, Supplement, pp. 19–40.

Creasap, K. (2012). "Social movement scenes: Place-based politics and everyday resistance". *Sociology Compass*, *6*(2), 182–191.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York City: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978* [Lectures at the College de France]. London: Picador Pan Macmillan.

Fox, N. J., and Alldred, P. (2020). "Sustainability, feminist posthumanism and the unusual capacities of (post)humans". *Environmental Sociology*, *6*(2), 121–131.

Frost, S. (2011). "The Implications of the new materialisms for feminist epistemology". In H. Grasswick (Ed.), *Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science* (pp. 69–83). New York City: Springer.

Gilbert, L. (2020). "Deploying social media to empower iranian women: An interview with Masih Alinejad". *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology, 25*, 149–166, 168.

Johansson, A. and Vinthagen, S. (2019). *Conceptualizing 'everyday resistance', a transdisciplinary approach*. New York, NY and Abingdon: Routledge.

Koefoed, M. (2017). "Constructive resistance in Northern Kurdistan: Exploring the peace, development and resistance nexus". *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, *12*(3), 39–53.

Lilja, M. (2022). "The definition of resistance". *Journal of Political Power*, *15*(2), 202-220.

Lilja, M. (2018). "The politics of time and temporality in Foucault's theorisation of resistance: Ruptures, time-lags and decelerations". *Journal of Political Power*, *11*(3), 419-432.

Lilja, M. (2016). *Resisting Gendered Norms: Civil Society, the Juridical and Political Space in Cambodia*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lilja, M., and E. Johansson (2018). "Feminism as Power and Resistance: An Inquiry into Different Forms of Swedish Feminist Resistance and Anti-Genderist Reactions". *Social Inclusion*, *6*(4), 82-94.

Lilja, M., and M. Baaz (2016). "Theorising 'Peace-Building' Resistance: Constructions of Time and Different Temporalities at Play in the Preah Vihear Temple-Conflict". *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, *3*(4), 426–446.

Lilja, M., M. Baaz, M.Schulz, and S. Vinthagen (2017). "How Resistance Encourages Resistance: Theorising the nexus between Power, Everyday Resistance and Organized Resistance". *Journal of Political Power, 10*(1), 40–54.

Lilja, M., and S. Vinthagen (2018). "Dispersed resistance: Unpacking the spectrum and properties of glaring and everyday resistance". *Journal of Political Power*, *11*(2), 211-229.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view*. London: Macmillan.

Maeckelbergh, M. (2011). "Doing is believing: Prefiguration as strategic practice in the alterglobalization movement". *Social Movement Studies, 10*(1), 1–20.

McAdam, D., McCarthy J. D., and Mayer, N. Z. (Eds.) (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., and Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of contention*. Cambridge, England: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Medina, J. (2011). "Toward a Foucaultian epistemology of resistance: Counter-memory, epistemic friction, and guerrilla pluralism". *Foucault Studies, 12*, 9–35.

Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging codes: Collective action in the information age*. Cambridge, England: Press Syndicate, University of Cambridge.

Odysseos, L., Death, C., and Malmvig, H. (2016). "Interrogating Michel Foucault's counter-conduct: Theorising the subjects and practices of resistance in global politics". *Global Society, 30*(2), 151–156.

Polletta, F. (1999). "'Free spaces' in collective action". *Theory and Society, 28*(1), 1–38.

Quistbergh, F. (2001). Jag känner mig lite homosexuell idag. In *Motstånd*, Dielemans J. and Quistbergh, F. Stockholm: Bokförlaget DN. http://www.quistbergh.se/view/514/.

Scott, J. C. (1972). "Patron-client politics and political change in Southeast Asia". *The American Political Science Review*, *66*(1), 91–113.

Scott, J. C. (1979). "Revolution in the revolution: Peasants and commissars". *Theory and Society*, *7*(1/2), 97–134.

Scott, J. C. (1987). "Resistance without protest and without organization: Peasant opposition to the Islamic Zakat and the Christian Tithe". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *29*(3), 417–452.

Scott, J. C. (1989). "Everyday forms of resistance". *Copenhagen Papers*, *4*, 33–62.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Yale, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. C. (2010). *The art of not being governed – An anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*. Yale, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. C. (2013). *Decoding subaltern politics: Ideology, disguise, and resistance in agrarian politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Scott, J. C. (2019). "Foreword", in Johansson, A., and Vinthagen, S. *Conceptualizing 'everyday resistance', a transdisciplinary approach*. New York, NY and Abingdon: Routledge, pp. ix-xi.

Selbin, E. (2009). "What was revolutionary about the Iranian Revolution? The power of possibility". *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, *29*(1), 33–46.

Sörbom, A., and Wennerhag, M. (2013). "Individualization, life politics, and the reformulation of social critique: An analysis of the global justice movement". *Critical Sociology*, *39*(3), 453–478.

Thompson, K. (2003). "Forms of resistance: Foucault on tactical reversal and self-formation". *Continental Philosophy Review*, *36*, 113–138.

Thörn, H. (2006). *Anti-apartheid and the emergence of a global civil society*. London: Palgrave.

Törnberg, A. (2017). *The wicked nature of social systems – A complexity approach to sociology* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg].

Wennerhag, M. (2009). *Den globala rättviserörelsen*. Stockholm: Atlas.

Yates, L. (2015). "Rethinking prefiguration: alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements". *Social Movement Studies, 14*(1), 1–21.