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Collective Memory Work (CMW) and Political Activist Ethnography (PAE) are two modes of social enquiry that developed out of the second-wave feminist movement. Based in a Marxist-feminist perspective on social movements, they discuss the relationship between the everyday life experiences of activists, and the social circumstances which form those experiences. While both take everyday experience to be their point of departure, PAE reaches out ethnographically to explore the textually mediated relations of ruling that organize those experiences. CMW uses textual accounts of activists' memories to investigate how they participate in their own oppression. This study explores whether the two modes enquiry are compatible and can be used alongside each other. Completed memory work and political activist ethnography research in social movement contexts will be analysed and synthesized to understand the compatibilities, and contradictions between the two modes of enquiry, as well as the limits and potential benefits of their combination.
Acknowledgements

I want to thank all people who, in some way or the other, accompanied and supported me on my Master thesis journey. First of all, I owe my thanks to my supervisor Dr. Peter Sawchuk and my second reader Dr. Shahrzad Mojtaba for their support. This is also the place to remember my faculty advisor, Roxana Ng, who passed away in January 2013. Though we didn't have many opportunities to work together since I commenced my studies at OISE in fall 2012, I learned a lot from my interaction with her writing.

Thanks to OISE, I could rely on a scholarship for the first year of my Master studies at this institution which covered international tuition fees for the period. I also had the privilege to work as a graduate assistant for Dr. Bonnie Burstow and Dr. Shahrzad Mojtaba, a position which, additionally to covering a significant part of my daily expenses, allowed me to gain important experiences in exciting research and publication projects. Without the continuous support of my parents, Brigitte and Guenter Taucher, it would not have been possible to pursue and complete my post-secondary education, thank you so much. I also want to thank my aunt, Irene Horejs, for her important advice and assistance.

Thanks, to my friend and colleague Shirin Haghdou and my friends and flat mates Francesc Rodriguez, Rakhat Zholdoshalieva and Christina Galego who have been a great support in all aspects of study, work and life in Toronto. Nathan Prier's great editing support was essential for delivering my thesis in adequate and correct English – Thank you.

In 2005 I had the opportunity to participate in a workshop with Frigga Haug at the Green Academy in Vienna. At that time I was active in a self-organized social movement academy and we were searching for innovative approaches to learning and researching in social movements. At this event Frigga Haug made me aware of Collective Memory Work. One year later I could offer the first
Collective Memory Work seminar in our social movement academy. Our reading soon got us into contact with other research and learning approaches which emerged from the feminist movement, among them Dorothy Smith's Institutional Ethnography. In 2009 I had the pleasure to work together with Frigga Haug in a book project on workplace realities, for which we conducted Collective Memory Work. The same year I started my fieldwork for my Master thesis in Sociology, an Institutional Ethnography about the relation between immigrant youth and the labour office in Vienna, Austria. In a workshop on texts in Institutional Ethnography at the Centre for Women Studies in Education at OISE in 2012 Susan Turner and Dorothy Smith made me aware of George Smith's work on Political Activist Ethnography. In Susan Turner's research course on Institutional Ethnography in early 2013 I could focus my interest in this approach and expand my knowledge and research experience accordingly. Thank you all for these important impulses.

During the course on Institutional Ethnography I already pursued an interest in conducting an Institutional Ethnography about the institutional relations immigrants with precarious status in Canada have to cope with in their every-day life. The role of labour unions was of particular interest for me. In February 2013 the city council of Toronto passed a motion to provide “Access Without Fear” to services provided by the city to all residents, regardless of their immigration status. After this city council decision a network of community organizations which have been involved in struggling for such a policy in specific service sectors for the last five years, the Solidarity City Network, recruited activists for a community campaign to force the city to implement the newly adopted policy. I recognized this as an opportunity to engage in community activism related to my research interest, as well as a possibility to combine these research interests with my activism in order to produce research which can directly feed into the organizing process. In the following year I participated in diverse efforts by the Solidarity City Network and simultaneously developed my Master. thesis research along these lines. For several reasons which I cannot explain here I abandoned the research I have conducted
till the end of 2013 and decided to separate my Master thesis from my activism. Therefore this study does not represent an application of the Collective Memory Work or Political Activist Ethnography, but an investigation about these methodologies themselves. Nevertheless I owe my thanks to my fellow activists in the Solidarity City Network as well as my friends in the Canadian Union for Public Employees. It was and is a pleasure to struggle together. On June 10th 2014 we could harvest some of the fruits of our work, as the Toronto city council passed another motion which includes concrete measures to implement the city's “Access Without Fear” policy. A research report on the accessibility of city services for undocumented residents which the Solidarity City Network published independently provided an important contribution for the success in city council. I hope that in future the research presented in this study will feed into successful activism too.
# Table of Contents

Abstract...................................................................................................................................................... ii
Acknowledgements................................................................................................................................... iii
Table of Contents......................................................................................................................................... vi
List of Tables............................................................................................................................................... vii
List of Appendices....................................................................................................................................... vii
Chapter One.............................................................................................................................................. 1
  Research site........................................................................................................................................... 2
  Intention and purpose............................................................................................................................. 3
  Research question.................................................................................................................................. 3
  Research approach................................................................................................................................. 4
  Defining social movements....................................................................................................................... 7
  Structure of the thesis............................................................................................................................... 12
Chapter Two: Collective Memory Work and Political Activist Ethnography in Context.................... 13
  Knowing from the women's standpoint.................................................................................................. 16
  Consciousness-raising groups and the women's liberation movement.................................................... 20
  From consciousness-raising to feminist methodology.......................................................................... 23
  Feminist methodologies........................................................................................................................... 28
    From women’s liberation to passive revolution.................................................................................... 29
  Learning from Marx............................................................................................................................... 32
    Memory work and the Theses on Feuerbach......................................................................................... 34
    Institutional Ethnography and the German Ideology......................................................................... 37
    Texts, ruling relations and the ontology of the social......................................................................... 40
  Political Activist Ethnography and Institutional Ethnography............................................................. 47
    The problematic................................................................................................................................... 48
  Frigga Haug's Collective Memory Work............................................................................................... 54
  The memory work process...................................................................................................................... 61
  Concluding summary............................................................................................................................... 65
Chapter Three: Methodology................................................................................................................... 68
  Unit of analysis and sampling................................................................................................................ 72
  Analytical framework............................................................................................................................... 74
Chapter Four: Analysis and Literature Review....................................................................................... 76
Existing references............................................................................................................................76
Overview of the texts in the sample..................................................................................................80
Excursus: Academia, Research, Activism and Social Change..........................................................83
Activism and research.......................................................................................................................87
Social change and activism.................................................................................................................90
CMW: Germany and beyond.............................................................................................................96
Conceptual analysis............................................................................................................................105
Ontology and epistemology...............................................................................................................106
Situated knowledge, conflict, and contradiction.............................................................................109
Role of abstraction and theory..........................................................................................................112
Social relations....................................................................................................................................119
Experience........................................................................................................................................120
Summary.........................................................................................................................................123
Chapter Five: Conclusion.................................................................................................................126
Synergy...............................................................................................................................................128
Combination......................................................................................................................................137
Prospects...........................................................................................................................................138
References.......................................................................................................................................140
Appendices.....................................................................................................................................149
Appendix One: List of articles in the research sample......................................................................149
Appendix Two: List of references of the research sample.................................................................150

List of Tables
Sample of Texts for the Analysis ......................................................................................................60
Dimensions of the analytical framework..........................................................................................61

List of Appendices
Appendix One: List of articles in the research sample......................................................................149
Appendix Two: List of references of the research sample................................................................150
Chapter One

Collective Memory Work (CMW) and Political Activist Ethnography (PAE) are two modes of social enquiry that developed out of the second-wave feminist movement. Based in a Marxist-feminist perspective on social movements, they discuss the relationship between the everyday life experiences and consciousness of activists, and the social circumstances which form those experiences. While both take everyday experience to be their point of departure, PAE reaches out ethnographically to explore the textually mediated institutional relations of ruling that organize those experiences. CMW uses textual accounts of activists' personal memories to investigate how they construct themselves and thereby participate in their own oppression by reproducing specific social relations. This study explores the extent to which the two modes of enquiry are compatible and can be used alongside each other. Completed memory work and political activist ethnography research in social movement contexts will be analysed and synthesized to understand the compatibilities, contradictions, and (dis)junctures between the two modes of enquiry, as well as the limits and potential benefits of their combination.

In introducing this project, I will first demarcate my research site, before addressing the intentions and purposes of my research. Later, I will present my general research question and its specific sub-questions. I refer to the development of my thesis to pose practical questions on the research strategies emerging from social movements. A short overview on the research methodology applied in this project will be followed by a
discussion of my specific use of social movement concepts. Finally, I will briefly guide the reader through the structure of my remaining chapters.

**Research site**

The discussion of CMW and PAE in this thesis can be located in both academic and social movement contexts. First, both modes of enquiry identify with Marxist-feminist traditions of scholarship. Second, both emerged out of concrete social movement practices and were developed by activist scholars in the second-wave feminist movement, as well as the gay rights movement. Second-wave feminism in particular treated the question of knowledge production in social movements as central - many related practices emerged out of movement activities and were later introduced into academic settings. Feminist consciousness-raising groups, for example, have played an important role in the formulation of feminist standpoint theory and in developing and establishing collective and participative research approaches in academia. In a similar vein, both CMW and PAE explicitly refer to methodological tendencies in Marxism. These tendencies involve direction on how to perceive and investigate social reality from Marx's earlier writings, particularly 'The German Ideology' (Marx & Engels, 1970) and the 'Theses on Feuerbach' (Marx, 1969). Though both research approaches are considered to be feminist methodologies, identify as Marxist-feminist, and emerged from second-wave feminism (more specifically, the women's liberation movement), they have not yet been synthesized in research projects. Methodological reflections and analysis exist for CMW as well as PAE, but have always been discussed and applied separately. I intend to start filling that gap with this thesis. I assume that a joint discussion of both modes of enquiry
will deliver insights for the development of each approach while producing benefits for the social movement contexts in which they are, or could be, applied.

**Intention and purpose**

One intention of this research is to synthesize two research approaches developed from similar practices of knowledge production in social movements. If this synthesized approach comes to fruition, the combination of CMW and PAE can provide new and more comprehensive research perspectives in understanding the relationship between consciousness and institutional relations in activism.

Any proposed combinations of modes of enquiry should be adapted to the conditions of knowledge production in social movements. This involves, among other things, research procedures which can adapt to the time rhythms of social movements, the production of action-relevant results, and pronounced elements of participation and informal mutual learning. The study of PAE and CMW and their applications in diverse social movement settings should expand the horizon of possible applications and combinations of these modes of enquiry. This research also functions as preparatory work to apply the methodologies in question in future social movement research projects.

**Research question**

The general research question for this thesis project can be summed up as such: *Are CMW and PAE compatible as two modes of enquiry in social movement contexts?*

Both modes of enquiry aim to go beyond the exchange of experiences and critically investigate the social relations at work in those exchanges. To achieve this goal the two approaches have found different solutions. CMW tries to shed light on how social
relations are articulated in the memories of people, while PAE explores how these relations are mediated by translocal textual forms of knowing. How can we synthesize the two approaches and benefit from that synthesis, given their common foundations, but different foci and diverse developments, as research practices within social movements and the academy? This study will explore how the two approaches have developed in the context of social movements, and which capacities (and incapacities) for synthesis these developments created.

Another set of questions aims at different qualities of relating the research approaches to each other. This involves differences and similarities, contradictions and coherence, possible connections and disjunctures, as well as strengths and weaknesses of and between CMW and PAE. The analysis of specific methodological dimensions and theoretical concepts will be structured along these relational lines. Important dimensions of analysis and synthesis include ontological and epistemological assumptions, methodical strategies and procedures, questions of concrete application in a social movement context, and aspects of the relation between social movement activity and research.

Finally, if the two modes of enquiry are considered to be compatible, the subsequent question is whether and how they can be combined in a social movement context, and which benefits can be expected to enhance further research as well as activism.

**Research approach**

The research conducted for this project can be described as a meta-study of completed
and published scientific studies. Publications considered for analysis should either apply CMW or PAE, or discuss at least one of the two modes of enquiry. Moreover, any studies which apply one of the approaches have to be related to a social movement context. That is, either they were written in a social movement environment or by an activist researcher, or are written about a social movement.

As a meta-study the project contains elements of meta-method and meta-theory, though it does not include any secondary meta-data analysis (Zhao, 1991). Neither primary data nor the research results of primary studies will be an object of analysis. In this analysis I am focusing on methodological, methodical, and theoretical aspects of the sample of research studies. I will use very broad definitions of the modes of enquiry in question. Therefore, all studies which are explicitly informed by the epistemological, ontological, and methodological concepts of Frigga Haug’s formulation of CMW (Haug, 1987), Dorothy Smith’s Institutional Ethnography (IE) (D. Smith, 2005), or George Smith’s concept of PAE (G. W. Smith, 1990) are recognized as within the spectrum of those modes of enquiry. This research aims at reflecting and exploring the variety of developments within this spectrum. In the creation of this sample of studies, no single selection criteria was employed (the definition of the unit and area of analysis is described in my methodological chapter).

In CMW a group of co-researchers critically analyses their own memories of past incidences related to a specific topic. This analysis aims to unravel how people construct their personalities through inscription into dominant moral and cultural form, thereby participating in their own subjection to oppressive social relations. Going beyond this
analysis, memory work groups reformulate their memories to excavate their abilities to act and participate in the transformation of dominant cultural forms. IE aims to explore the social relations organizing peoples’ lives, starting from the everyday life experiences. Social relations are investigated as trans-local, textually mediated forms of ruling. PAE follows a similar trajectory - the researcher develops her/his study from the experiences of activists confronting specific institutional practices located in political-administrative regimes. The resulting research outcomes should contribute to the activists' struggle as a guiding map of ruling relations.

Following Hussey (2012), I understand PAE as a sub-form of IE because it historically developed out of an application of IE in a social movement context, and operates with the same epistemological and ontological framework while employing similar empirical strategies. In many cases I refer to IE and PAE simultaneously - where significant differences exist with regards to a specific question, I will indicate this.

Dorothy Smith refers to IE as a mode of enquiry (D. Smith, 2005) while Frigga Haug identifies CMW as a method (Haug, 1987), or sometimes as a methodology (Haug, 1999d). Both emphasize that their research approach cannot be formulated as a “how to” guide. Their innovative strength lies in their specific epistemological and ontological considerations. These considerations, aside from conceptual questions, will form a central part of my analysis. I will use both terms (methodology and mode of enquiry) and understand both as approaches in investigating social reality based on specific assumptions on how the social is constituted (ontology) and how we can create knowledge or appropriate this social reality consciously (epistemology). I do not
understand them as a device in a toolbox of empirical social research.

All of these approaches use everyday life standpoints to investigate social relations. They all rely on a materialist conception of the social, which understands the social world as constantly (re)produced by concrete human practices. Nevertheless, their research object differs – PAE and IE use everyday life experiences as a starting point to investigate trans-local, textually mediated ruling relations. In contrast, CMW analyses experiential knowledge itself, in the form of memories, to explore social relations. Both modes of enquiry reject a more conventional deductive form of reasoning in social science research, in which existing theory and concepts are used as a point of departure to deduce more theory or to test theoretical assumptions. These procedures are criticized as ideological, because they produce new knowledge by imposing preformed concepts on reality rather than deriving ideas from the organization of human practices in real life. IE and CMW emerged from the women's liberation movement of the 1970s in North America and Europe, and aim to build on women’s experiences as a useful source of knowledge when empirically investigating the conditions of their lives. As mentioned above, the extent to which these two modes of enquiry are compatible will be subject of this enquiry.

**Defining social movements**
Defining terms and concepts in advance of a study of two methodologies which fundamentally question the deductive logic of reasoning in mainstream social science creates some difficulties. Furthermore, to strictly define and operationalize what a social movement is and is not, so that I can later apply the definition to an empirical case, would
contradict the epistemological positions of PAE and CMW. Also, the studies analysed in this project emerged at different times and places in the world. If I use the same trans-historic and trans-local definition of social movements as a point of departure for my investigation, I may well end up with objective, exact, and reliable results, but their validity (the criteria which indicates whether the concepts represent what they purport to represent) may be questionable. So if we should not apply the same theoretical concept to investigate different cases, how can we generalize, compare, or even analyse?

To avoid the ideological practices in the social sciences Dorothy Smith has criticized (see e.g., D. Smith, 1990a) does not imply that we should lose ourselves in unrelated particularities. To assume that our research and the application of theories brings order in an otherwise chaotic world is misguided. Coordination processes are at the core of what we understand as the social and these coordinations emerge from specific social relations that they help constitute. Generalization is a feature of specific social relations, not simply a product of thought. In his history of social movements, Charles Tilly explores repertoires of social movements going back to the end of the 18th century and finds that the practices, tactics, and strategies of social movements hardly changed over time (Tilly, 2005). He relates this finding to the social context in which modern social movements emerged (nation-state systems, bourgeois revolution, urbanization, capitalism) and argues that the activity of social movements changes with the relations they are acting in. For example, the current transnationalization of the state relates to the transnationalization of social movements (Tilly, 2005, p. 14). To talk about striking as a tactic in the labour movement makes sense only in the historically specific
context of capitalism. Though labour movements and strikes, to say nothing of capitalism itself, are very diverse and have developed differently over time and space, they share a specific labour relation as a constitutive element. This labour relation makes striking a potentially effective tool of struggle. The spread of capitalist relations around the globe makes generalization, comparison, and global analysis of related phenomena possible and useful. One could frame it as a dialectical relationship between the particular appearances of a phenomena and a generalized/abstract essence. And as we already operate in dialectical terminology we can identify the term (germ. “Begriff”) as the connector between the phenomenon as it appears to us in life ( “Erscheinung”) and its abstract essence (“Wesen”). Appearance and essence are ontological categories, unlike the role of a concept in mainstream deductive reasoning. The term assumes a methodological role, as a connecting tool, not as a representation of a thing. As such, the term “social movement” can be used as a tool to investigate social reality, rather than as a representation of this reality. I will not expand on this at this point, as related epistemological and ontological aspects will be extensively discussed in later chapters. With these observations I simply intend to build a bridge between the critique of ideological conceptual practices (from both Dorothy Smith and Frigga Haug) and the use and discussion of concepts in this project.

The discussion on defining elements of social movements in the following paragraphs does not intend to fix a pre-shaped concept of social movements, but should provide some guidance in understanding sampling in my analysis of completed PAE and CMW studies. Such a discussion tries to sensitize perceptions when looking at concrete
situations and phenomena, and explores them from an activist standpoint as social
movement phenomena, using the term “social movements” as a methodological device at
a given time and from a specific position.

For this purpose, I refer to a relatively open definition by Mario Diani, who
describes social movements as “networks of informal interactions between a plurality of
individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in political or cultural conflicts, on the
basis of shared collective identities.” (Diani, 1992, p. 1) In this definition several
elements of social movements are highlighted. First, social movements are constituted by
diverse networks and interactions between different actors. A single formal organization
may not represent a social movement, but it can be part of one. Diani and Della Porta
expand on this in their introduction to social movement studies:

Dense information networks differentiate social movement processes from
innumerable instances in which collective action takes place and is
coordinated, mostly within the boundaries of specific organizations. A social
movement process is in place to the extent that both individual and organized
actors, while keeping their autonomy and independence, engage in sustained
exchanges of resources in pursuit of common goals. The coordination of
specific initiatives, the regulation of individual actors' conduct, and the
definition of strategies all depend on permanent negotiations between the
individuals and the organizations involved in collective action. No single
organized actor, no matter how powerful, can claim to represent a movement
as a whole. (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 20)
According to Diani and Della Porta, a second important element of a social movement is that the movement's actors are engaged in a conflict in which they confront and negotiate opposed interests (so that one party cannot realize their interests entirely without damaging the interests of the other parties). Third, a movement develops collective practices and identities which are not contained to singular events. Diani and Della Porta also stress the importance of organizations in social movements:

> Whatever their specificity, organizations secure continuity to collective action even when the potential for spontaneous, unmediated participation somehow subsides. They also provide resources and opportunities for action to escalate when opportunities are more favourable; as well as sources for the creation and reproduction of loyalties and collective identities. While recognizing the importance of organizations operating within movements, we should not make the mistake of identifying the latter with the former. (Della Porta, 2006, p. 5)

The emergence of CMW and IE from informal practices of knowledge production in the women's liberation movement of the 1970s indicates that a focus on social movement organization would occlude important spaces and practices within social movements. Informal consciousness-raising groups, often organized in the homes of activists, formed an important organizational foundation for the women's liberation movement in general and for the development of feminist research methodologies in particular. This practice didn't have to rely on sophisticated, formalized organizational structures, though (as in the case of CMW) this could also happen in the environment of a larger organization.
Consciousness-raising groups are also good examples that demonstrate that direct confrontation with an (personalized) opponent in the social movement context doesn't have to be at the centre of every social movement activity. In those groups, and particularly in CMW, self-reflection on the “enemy inside” one’s own consciousness played an important role. In contrast, PAE integrated the confrontation with an institutional opponent as a methodological element of the research process itself. A point of conflict and confrontation between specific elements of ruling relations and activists provides the basis to formulate the study’s problematic, while the directions these confrontations take chart the course of further investigation.

**Structure of the thesis**

This thesis is organized around two longer chapters paired around a shorter methodological chapter, while the introduction and concluding chapters form the structural bracket. Chapter two provides the historical and theoretical context of CMW and PAE/IE and lays out the core elements of the two approaches. In Chapter three, the methodology of this meta-study and its methodical application will be discussed briefly. Chapter four integrates a review of the literature into the sample of the study and develops an analysis therein. In the concluding chapter, the findings of the analytical chapter will be synthesized and possibilities to combine CMW and PAE are discussed.
Chapter Two:

Collective Memory Work and Political Activist Ethnography in Context

The intention of this chapter is to discuss the foundations and the development of the methodologies/ modes of inquiry of Collective Memory Work (CMW) and Political Activist Ethnography (PAE)/Institutional Ethnography (IE)\(^1\) as well as sketching some basic ideas and practices associated with them. In both research approaches knowledge production is framed as concrete social practices, which are activities that explore social relations and thereby produce certain social relations of knowing. As these two methodologies emerged from the second-wave feminist movement, I intend to describe their development as social movement practices in the context of second-wave feminism - more specifically, the women's liberation movement in North America and Western Europe. The theoretical genesis of these methodologies and their later categorization in the social sciences will be considered in relation to these social movement practices, but are not the structuring element or point of departure of this account. This focus tries to take the same perspective in the presentation of knowledge about Marxist-feminist

---

\(^1\) I discuss PAE together with IE because the former developed as a special form of the latter since the late 1980s. Dorothy Smith first used the term Institutional Ethnography in a collection of writings at the end of the 1980s (D. Smith, 1987) It took until 2005 to have her provide a comprehensive elaboration of IE as “Sociology for People” (D. Smith, 2005) George Smith described his project in 1990 in “The Political Activist as Ethnographer” (G. W. Smith, 1990) where he did not use the term “Political Activist Ethnography.” I first encountered the term in the collection of writings in George Smith's honour “Sociology for Changing the World” (Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006). Both George and Dorothy Smith worked on and developed their approaches together in the 1980s and early 1990s at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Dorothy Smith’s earlier writings were foundational for both projects and her epistemological, ontological, and methodological considerations can also be found in George Smith's formulation of PAE. Furthermore, possibly also due to George Smith's untimely death, in later research by other authors the application of PAE remained limited. As such, it is hard to consider PAE to be a mode of enquiry independent from IE. Hussey (2012) classifies PAE as a subform of IE in his review of Activist Ethnographies.
methodologies, as Marxist-feminist research applies in the study of other social realities. The final purpose of this study lies in the development, and later joint application of, CMW and PAE/IE as social movement practices. Also, from this perspective, it is more beneficial to structure the account around research as a social (movement) practice.

Social reality is permanently coordinated through the actions of people. As such, it is not the task of a researcher or author to bring order into a chaotic world, but to explore social relations as they exist (D. Smith, 2005). But an account of (a part of) this social reality can never capture complexity in its entirety. On the contrary, when people remember (and remembering is an important mode of appropriating social reality, as a condition to engage it consciously), they construct coherent, closed stories, avoiding contradictions, open scenarios, or dead ends (Haug, 1987). The historical aspects of the account you are currently reading mostly rely on written memories of researchers and activists who participated in and experienced the historical processes they were remembering and reporting. I didn't experience most of this history firsthand. My first practical engagement with the methodologies I am discussing here emerged from a social movement context, in 2005. At that time I initiated a Memory Work group in a self-organized social movement university in Vienna, Austria – a major part of this chapter merges and combines memories which were written by others. By recombining these memories, hidden contradictions and covered voids may surface, while the writing involves a new selection and levelling procedure, so that a historical process can be presented in a linear way. This linearised story should introduce readers to the methodologies under discussion in this study. One of the tasks of the coming chapters
will be to disrupt this linearity and expose the voids, crossings, hidden potentials, and open spaces to find useful junctures for the further development of CMW and PAE.

My account starts with a contextualization of the feminist epistemological approach of women's standpoint. Both IE/PAE and CMW use situated, embodied, everyday forms of knowing as a point of departure for their research process. Women's standpoint theory and both modes of enquiry are tightly related to a crucial movement practice in the women's liberation movement – consciousness raising groups. Most feminist methodologies developed out of consciousness-raising practices within the feminist movement. A short summation of the transformation of second-wave feminism and its partial integration into dominant hegemonic projects will be followed by an exploration of the Marxist development of CMW and IE/PAE. Marx's “Theses on Feuerbach” will be discussed as an important point of reference for the epistemology and ontology of CMW. Dorothy Smith builds her project on Marx's notion of ideology, which he (with Engels) most famously elaborated in “The German Ideology” (Marx & Engels, 1970). Through her analysis of ideological forms of knowing, Smith develops a concept of ruling relations and the role texts play in mediating these relations. Following a description of the historical development of ruling relations the concept will be theoretically elaborated through her ontology of the social. Within this body of literature, there are important similarities (broadly speaking) with PAE and IE. Their differences in theory, research practice, and historical development will then be briefly compared. In the last section of this chapter some key theoretical assumptions and related research processes in CMW will be described.
Knowing from the women's standpoint

The scientific project of Dorothy Smith and Frigga Haug was founded on experiences many female scholars in the second-wave feminist movement were seen to have shared. When they entered the post-war academy, they were one of few women in an overwhelmingly male-dominated sphere. Often they had to balance their family work at home together with their professional life in the academy. For Dorothy Smith, tensions emerged from a split between two worlds of knowing. In the intellectual work of academia, bodily labour and all the work which is necessary so that some people can specialize on academic work seemed to disappear. One was left with the impression that the university was built on thoughts, rather than bricks - that professors and students were fed, dressed, and reproduced by reading and writing books and that the dust in the corridors disappeared through a rigorous deconstruction of discourses on hygiene and not by cleaning staff hoovering at night. For Smith to be successful in academia, her knowledge and experience of the embodied work at home as a single mother was not helpful; the work at home constituted a barrier for her career. Her knowledge from working at home did not seem to be of any value in the academic world, and academic knowledge didn't have anything valuable to say about her lived experience at home either (Campbell, 2003). This personally-experienced disjuncture of knowing in the “head-world” and embodied knowing at home encouraged her to develop a radical standpoint theory of knowledge, which was broadly discussed through her article, “Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology” (D. E. Smith, 1974).

She first presented the article at a conference in 1972 in the USA, published it in 1974, and in 1987 Sandra Harding included it in her intensively discussed collection on
feminist methodology (Harding, 1987). In her text, Smith analyses the split between modes of knowing in academia and the embodied knowing of women in their everyday life to formulate a theory of knowing from the women's standpoint. She emphasizes that the caring work of women at home is knowledgeable. Through their daily practices, women have insight into how life is concretely (re)produced day by day and can take a critical stance towards objectified forms of institutional knowledge (like academic bodies of knowledge). This figure of the oppressed as the privileged subject of knowledge relates to Hegel's master-slave allegory, in which the slave has the advantage of knowing how things are put together in reality (e.g. by preparing the food for the master) while the master just sees his dinner as a final product. Smith borrows the dialectical view of this relationship from Hegel's image. Her understanding of the women's standpoint doesn't essentialize women or gender, but understands these terms relationally and locates a point of departure in knowing within the everyday processes of (re)producing life.

“It [the women's standpoint] does not identify a position or a category of position, gender, class, or race within the society, but it does establish as a subject position for [...] enquiry, a site for the knower that is open to anyone.”

(D. Smith, 2005, p. 10)

In later writings Smith opened up the concept of the women's standpoint, so that more than women could be addressed. The key idea of her standpoint theory is epistemological and methodological - a disjuncture exists between embodied local and particular forms of

---

Smith stresses that knowing from embodied experience in everyday life and objectifying knowing in academia or other institutional settings are not two distinctive types of knowledge. They are different practices or methods of knowing. She later identifies the objectifying mode of knowing which assembles institutional relations as ideological practices.
knowing in everyday life and objectified trans-local modes of knowing. Exploring objectified modes of knowing from the perspective of everyday life experience produces the possibility of better understanding how they are active in regulating our lives. In an article about the creation of statistics on mental illness of women in North America, Smith develops her analysis from the standpoint of women who tried to resist overwork and alienation in their daily housework (D. Smith, 1990b). Physicians regularly diagnosed the women's anger as a mental condition, which ought to be cured with psychiatric medication, while totally concealing the working conditions generating the anger itself. The suppression of women's experiences by psychiatric diagnostic procedures was mirrored in a high rate of female mental illness in official health statistics. Without starting the investigation from the embodied experiences of women at home, the ideological practices of knowing in psychiatric diagnostics and the bias in its respective statistical accounts wouldn't have surfaced. Smith relates ideological practices of knowing and experiential forms of knowing as inter-penetrating opposites. The former play a crucial role in organizing experiences in everyday life, but do not determine everyday life experience. A position of knowing from outside the ideological modes of knowing is possible. This direction of exploration leads the researcher downside up and outside in, though the social relations which are under investigation are understood as internally related. In the study on mental illness statistics the experience of anger towards housework was made invisible and translated into a concept of mental illness by concrete standardized diagnostic procedures. These procedures then facilitated the construction of an individual problem which could be 'cured' with medication. The disjuncture between
the embodied experience of overwork, alienation and anger, and the diagnosis of a mental illness may be concealed, but still exists from a woman's perspective. Therefore assuming the standpoint of the woman is necessary to make relevant processes visible and to be able to problematize the disjuncture. An objective perspective based on the official statistics on mental illness would not be able to reveal and explore this disjuncture. In contrast, this approach would actually build on the ideological practices of diagnosis as a constituent element of these statistics.\(^3\)

Frigga Haug's epistemological approach to CMW also integrates the women's standpoint. This standpoint is also located in the everyday experiences of women as a position in the production of knowledge. But Haug doesn't operate with oppositional modes of knowing. She is interested in how women participate in their oppression when they construct their memories of earlier events in their life (F. Haug, 1987). By analysing their own memories of specific incidents, the participants of memory work groups are collectively exploring the social relations of women's oppression and how they construct themselves into those relations. Haug also has a concept of ideological modes of knowing, but in CMW she is tracking the ideological within experiential accounts through memories. These memories are not just a starting point to investigate relations which then have to be explored somewhere else – they are a startin- and endpoint, and they are transformed during the memory work process. In CMW the epistemological move is inside in (investigating social relations within textual accounts of personal memories). Embodied forms of knowing are not primarily perceived as being co-ordered

\(^3\) At this point it is important to emphasize that Smith's investigation from the women's standpoint is not solely subjectivist. In her approach a standpoint in the (subjective) embodied everyday life experiences is necessary to fully explore the objective/ objectifying social relations as they are (re)produced day by day.
ideologically from above, but in terms of being themselves actively engaged in the (re)production of ideology. Haug (following Gramsci) perceives everyday knowledge as contradictory and inconsistent, containing fragments of diverse and competing world views, ideological modes of knowing, and more immediate experiential elements. Considering this inconsistency and these contradictory elements, everyday knowledge cannot be entirely ideologically determined. On the one hand, the possibility of the critique of ideology and emancipatory action lies in these very contradictions. On the other hand, the inconsistency of knowledge is a challenge for the ability to act (Haug, 1999d) Therefore, the practice of research and learning should be oriented towards establishing one’s consciousness and practices more coherently on an individual and collective level within and beyond memory work groups. Haug understands these processes of knowing the world and oneself, and producing/transforming the world and oneself, as interdependent collective processes.

The women's standpoint, for Haug, is also an epistemological standpoint, a perspective from which to know. For Haug this perspective from which to know is explicitly collective and addresses women as a knowledgeable political collective (concretely in the women's liberation movement).

**Consciousness-raising groups and the women's liberation movement**

At this point one option would be to explore the positions presented above relative to their theoretical genesis and to unfold how they effectively influenced concrete research practices. To be consistent with the epistemological approach Haug and Smith share, I start by investigating the concrete practices of the second-wave feminist
movement, from which Haug's and Smith's research developed, and then relate relevant theoretical influences to these practices.

Many would agree that a method, consciousness raising, was at the heart of this women’s movement. In various settings, small groups of women began to talk together, analyse, and act. The method of consciousness raising was fundamentally empirical; it provided a systematic mode of inquiry that challenged received knowledge and allowed women to learn from one another. (DeVault, 1996, p. 30)

In her reflection on feminist methodologies, DeVault stresses that in the second-wave feminist movement, consciousness-raising groups were an essential movement practice. These groups responded to what Dorothy Smith formulated as disjuncture between the male 'head-world' and embodied experiences of women at home, and the suppression, alienation, and isolation that came with those embodied experiences. In consciousness-raising groups, women challenged the Cartesian distinction between mind and body, or culture and nature, in which women where often associated with the natural, embodied world. By exchanging and analysing their own experiences in small groups, women claimed their knowledge as a legitimate form of such and challenged the objectivity of other forms of knowledge. In the dominant bourgeois view of reason as 'ratio', feelings were often depreciated. The body, nature in the form of a living being, wasn't understood as source of knowledge but as an object to be dominated. In opposition to this view, women in the feminist movement used embodied feelings as the starting point of their collective practices. At that time in particular this was a highly political
choice. In struggles over abortion rights, a woman’s body was itself a site of conflict. Claiming ownership over one's own body and the knowledge production associated with it was thus also a strategic move to gain control over an important terrain of conflict.

In consciousness-raising groups, women shared their lived experience. The collective setting provided the possibility to go beyond those experiences in their analysis. Essentialist interpretations of this practice associated feelings and embodiment with a distinctive female nature or femininity, while more constructivist feminist positions identified the women's accounts as suppressed forms of knowing which were inscribed in the contradictions of women's oppression. From this standpoint women could gain a more complete understanding of oppressive relationships (DeVault, 1999). The goal was to collectively investigate the participants’ own experiences in order to raise consciousness about how women's oppression works (and how women participate in this process).

In some cases the consciousness-raising groups remained at the stage of sharing stories, expressing their frustrations, providing mutual self-help, and creating a communal and safe space for women. In other cases, like the American “bitch sessions” (Sarachild, 2000), consciousness-raising went beyond the shared analysis of participant experiences and involved theory building and expansive movement organizing efforts. Participating women simultaneously performed as object and subject of a form of knowledge production which could enable themselves to be protagonists in their liberation (Arnold, 2000). Within the women's liberation movement, methodological reflections and detailed methodical guides for consciousness-raising groups circulated
(see Crow, 2000). Consciousness-raising groups and their practices spread in the dynamic period of the women's liberation movement in the early 1970s in Western Europe and North America. Collective expansive learning became a driving force in those groups organizing the movement.

One should not conclude that the women's liberation movement included or represented all feminist struggles of that time. Black feminists and women of colour more broadly in North America criticised these groups for their white, middle-class bias (see Hill Collins, 1991). Many other (larger) feminist struggles were fought at the same time, in the Global North, South, East, and West involving diverse forms of collective consciousness-raising. I refer to the North American and European women's liberation movement and their practices of consciousness-raising groups because they provide the historical soil on which CMW and IE/PAE could grow.

**From consciousness-raising to feminist methodology.**

In the early 1970s Dorothy Smith participated in women's community groups in British Columbia, whose members practised consciousness-raising in their local area. Smith's experience in these groups became crucial for her thinking about knowledge as a practical matter in everyday life, and for developing a specifically feminist scholarship (Campbell, 2003). She built on this experience in a presentation entitled, “Feminism and Marxism”, that she gave (and published) in 1977 to fellow feminist activists (D. Smith, 1977). In this article she explains how a distinctive feminist position could be informed by Marxism. She argued that ideas of the feminist movement, like sisterhood, should not be perceived as sentimental concepts, but as a method of working and struggling together.
It involves a specific location of the knowing subject central to women's lives when trying to understand and change the social relations that regulate these lives.

For Frigga Haug consciousness-raising in the women's liberation movement has not just been an important experience and inspiration for the development of her feminist scholarship. In fact, CMW relies to a great extent on methodical and methodological considerations which were drawn from feminist consciousness-raising groups. Since the late 1960s Haug has been active in the German feminist movement, specifically in the Socialist Women's Association in West Berlin and Hamburg. In West Berlin she co-organized the “Action Council for the Liberation of Women.” At the beginning of the 1970s this Action Council transformed into several autonomous learning groups. The membership in the groups was diverse. Middle-class and working-class women, academics, students, housewives, clerks, and workers participated. Some of those groups read classical socialist literature to investigate its relevance to the feminist struggle. The participants intended to assemble relevant texts and teach other women about them. While collecting and writing summaries, they realized that a feminist learning process couldn't work in the way that they had approached their project (Haug, 1999d). Their accounts didn't relate to their everyday life experience in a common struggle. These accounts were structured by the same ideologies these women originally intended to criticise. Therefore, participating women concluded that it was necessary to investigate their own knowledge and how it was related to the different ideologies and worldviews competing for terrain in their consciousness.

They started to write down their learning experiences in diverse life settings. After
sharing these texts they collectively analysed them to explore the relations structuring their experiences as women in society. Based on these reflections on learning experiences the group compiled a collection of work called Frauenformen (German for ‘women forms’), which later became a series about different CMW Projects, edited by Frigga Haug and published by the Argument Publishing House in Hamburg (Haug, 1980a). The term “Frauenformen” or women forms attempts to reflect the framework of social relations and norms in which women are socialized and actively (and creatively) participate in, through moulding their personalities to these forms. In these first investigations the group did not yet have a developed CMW methodology – they expanded their project to study their own memories about how they learned to become women. In the ensuing investigation about how women socialize into their body, the distinctive collective research method of memory work had already taken shape.

The group members agreed on a general topic which was associated with significant experiences in the socialization as women for all of the participants. Every participant wrote down memories of specific related incidents in their life. They then shared those accounts and analysed them as texts. By objectifying their memories as texts, they gained an analytical distance and avoided performing personalized group therapy. After analysis the participants rewrote their memories to identify possibilities for transformative action.

In this memory work research, which was later published in the second Frauenformen volume (Haug, 1980b) and which was translated into English with the title female sexualization (Haug, 1987), the research group agreed on specific body parts as
general topics. One of the projects was organized around the topic of “hair”. In this study the participants wrote about incidents they remembered associated with hair on all parts of the body. At a glance, this topic seemed insignificant, at least in relation to other social phenomena the feminist movement was concerned about. But women’s stories in the group indicated that remembering even seemingly mundane matters was important – for example, the treatment of a hair on the chin allowed the dissection of the sexualized socialization in relation to the female body. Even when women resisted dominant body norms they confirmed the “sexualization” of the body by actively relating to the norm. Decrypting the embodied ideologies in action in the memories allowed for a better understanding of the social character of the embodied experiences of women. Rigorous analysis of the written memories as text and the collective rewriting of the stories uncovered barriers and potentials for women to critically engage with these social conditions.

The methodical process of the study was designed as a work-in-progress so that the resulting publication included a chapter introducing an initial framework for CMW as a learning and research method (Haug, 1987). Initially, the activists involved planned to work together in the original constellation and develop a distinctive learning approach over a one year period. Following this year, the group intended have split and have each individual find another CMW group in their community, so (according to the snowball principle) a whole avalanche of feminist learning groups would develop. Part of the idea was that the methodology shouldn't be simply passed on like a recipe, but, rather, developed and transformed according to the particular needs of new groups.
This was the plan, though initial group stayed together for more than four years. They worked on several topics around the general theme of female socialization or “female sexualization” and developed their new methodology. They did in fact split and found new groups, but in the 1980s the women’s liberation movement had already lost most of its original dynamic - the intended avalanche proved to be smaller than expected.

A newly founded autonomous feminist editorial board for the journal *Das Argument*, grouped around Frigga Haug, formed the centre of gravity for CMW in Western Germany. This feminist board was responsible for two of six issues of the journal per year. This provided a opportunity to share CMW research with a broader intellectual public in German-speaking countries. The second volume of the *Frauenformen* book series was later translated into English (Haug, 1987). It was widely discussed in the English-speaking feminist academy and women’s movement, so much so that by the late 1980s CMW groups formed in the USA, Canada, Australia, and Scandinavia. The women on the feminist editorial board of *Das Argument* maintained a goal of open development for Collective Memory Work as a method and methodology, restraining from publishing a “how-to” instructional for the research method until the end of the 1990s, when Haug gave a series of lectures at Duke University (Haug, 1999). In the book version of her lectures, Haug included a detailed rendering of a CMW process so that groups unfamiliar with its tenets could rely on their guidance.

---

4 The social sciences and philosophical journal *Das Argument* was founded by German student activists working in the German peace movement of the 1950s. It gained popularity and became one of the central organs of the German student movement of the late 1960s and 1970s and assembled the European protagonists of Marxism, Feminism and Critical Theory among their contributors and editors. Haug and her husband Wolfgang Fritz Haug were editing the journal and also founded the “Argument” publishing house in Hamburg, in which Haug and the feminist group around her published their CMW studies.
Feminist methodologies

It was in the 1980s when methodological developments emerging from the feminist movement began to surface in the academy. Academics like Haug and Smith, together with students who were politically socialized in the women's liberation movement, opened the gate from which feminist content and methodology could enter the academic field. In 1987 Haug as well as Smith published the books which laid the basis for the broad discussion of their distinctive feminist research approach in English-speaking feminist academia. Haug published the studies of the early CMW groups in *Female Sexualization* (Haug, 1987) and Smith provided a collection of her texts in *The Everyday World as Problematic* (D. Smith, 1987) in which she first formulates her project as a “Sociology for Women”. One field of action formed to critique mainstream social science and its methodologies. Another was aimed at reflection on practices of knowledge production in the feminist movement. Based on these reflections, feminist scholars further developed those practices and tried to establish them in academia. An academic community of practice emerged around feminist methodology and research, a fact which DeVault (1996) identified as decisive for the identification of distinctive feminist methodologies. Within this community, feminist academics tackled the question of what makes feminist research distinctive. In her prominent collection of contributions on feminist methodologies Sandra Harding (1987) argues that it is not a specific set of research tools and methods that make feminist research distinctive, but its methodological foundations (the role of everyday life experience, questions of epistemological standpoints etc.). So feminist methodologies cannot be reduced to the methodologies and methods feminist academics use in their work, nor are they a rigid framework of
procedures, but rather a community of practices and field of discussion. Devault (1996) identifies three commonalities feminist methodologies share: first, researchers intend to excavate women - to make women visible and investigate how they are interwoven into social relations; second, feminist methodologies avoid any research practices which can harm women and are oriented towards action which improves the situation of women; third, they centre women as knowing subjects in the research process.

**From women’s liberation to passive revolution**

The growing debate on feminist methodologies and the establishment of women’s studies in the academy in the 1980s corresponded with a decrease in second-wave feminist movements around the globe. This increasing feminist activity in academia laid the ground for a third wave of feminism. Haug identified three major developments in explaining the decreasing activity within second-wave feminism in the 1980s, summarized as “passive revolution” (Haug, 2009). Haug explains the integration of feminism into a new post-Fordist, high-tech capitalist regime (corresponding to the rise of a neoliberal hegemonic project) along the lines of a partial incorporation of feminist organizations in the state system, a transformed presence of feminism in public media, and feminism's role in the transformation from a Fordist mode of production to a post-Fordist high-tech capitalism. For the German case, she explains how in the 1980s liberal feminism received public attention in the media much more intensively than the whole feminist movement in the 1970s. Liberal feminists had successfully established their own media projects, and some issues they were raising were also being discussed in

---

5 “Passive revolution” is a concept Antonio Gramsci introduced in his prison notebooks to explain the partial integration of the labour movement into 19th century Italian national unification movement (Risorgimento) and 20th century Fascism.
the mainstream media (abortion, domestic violence, quotas, labour market participation). While this appeared as if feminism had gone mainstream, Haug argued that a simplified, selective, and polarized image of feminism gained access to public debate – for example, the image of feminists as “man-haters” had become widespread in German mainstream media during the 1980s. Having achieved partial successes in their struggle, liberal feminists clearly distanced themselves from socialist and radical feminist politics and demands. This made it easier to integrate liberal feminist demands into a new liberal hegemonic project and marginalize other feminist agendas. Still, socialist and radical/autonomous feminist movements were also successful in receiving funding from public sources for certain institutions, such as women's shelters, or in gaining access to positions in public institutions, such as tenureships for feminist scholars. Partial funding and limited institutional integration for scarce resources and positions triggered competition between feminist activists, groups, organizations, and institutions. This competition subverted alliances within the feminist movement and limited their ability to act in solidarity on a larger scale particularly on issues that threatened relationships with funding institutions. The partial state integration of feminist demands and organizational structures reflected a success in outcomes while diminishing the dynamic of movement activity itself (Haug, 2009).

Within the second-wave feminist movement, scepticism towards the Fordist patriarchal state and large bureaucratic institutions was a common phenomenon. Feminists had developed the theoretical and methodological tools to investigate and explain their exclusion from power positions, public life, and the labour market, among
other things, from a subaltern position. Practices of consciousness-raising groups relied on self-organization and self-investigation and usually took a critical stance towards state institutions (Haug, 2009). Feminist modes of inquiry like IE served to critically investigate social and institutional relations, and often state institutions, from an outsider position grounded in everyday life experience. The integration of feminist demands into a new hegemonic project required a new critical understanding. Scepticism towards the state, the call for autonomy and liberation, and self-organization and self-reliance were central positions of the feminist movement which resonated with slogans now coming from the “commanding heights” of society. Those demands that proved compatible with a rising neoliberal agenda could be integrated in a hegemonic project, partially raising feminism out of its subaltern position, though in an extremely limited sense. Haug stresses that the intensive period of the second-wave feminist movement at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s coincided with the crisis of the Fordist mode of production in the Global North and the transition to a post-Fordist, high-tech capitalism (Haug, 2009). Feminist resistance against the patriarchal Fordist mode of production (including its corresponding institutional family forms) didn't necessarily translate into an empowering integration into post-Fordist capitalism. In the nuclear family of the Global North and West, women were dominated into their role as housewife, taking care of children and the household, while the husband worked outside the home and provided the single monetary income for the family. This was possible because the wage of a labourer paid enough to sustain a family and a welfare state provided compensation if the family couldn't cope with its economic challenges. The patronizing and oppressive arrangements
of the nuclear family in this state also provided a certain social and economic security for women. The transition to a post-Fordist regime involved significant defeats of the organized labour movement (which was also attacked by feminists). Under these new circumstances, women found more opportunities to participate in the labour market, but due to the slow growth of real wages it was also economically necessary that they contribute to the family income. These successes in the liberation of women remained ambiguous as the movement actually lost momentum and became passively integrated – a passive revolution (Haug, 2009).

Learning from Marx

Up to this point, I have mainly discussed IE and CMW as feminist methodologies in the context of the second-wave feminist movement. Smith and Haug position their scientific projects in a feminist as well as a Marxist tradition, or a Marxist-feminist tradition. Marxist-feminism has often occupied a marginal position in both feminist and Marxist debates, which may be due to its critical stance toward more dominant forms of feminism and the orthodox Marxism of the labour movement. Though socialist feminism emerged from the post-Second World War labour and student movements, and relies on a Marxist historical materialist analysis, it has constantly been in conflict with the labour movement and its dominant interpretations of Marx. Marxist feminists particularly criticized Marx and the Marxism of the labour movement for concentrating on the process of wage labour when analysing the sources of accumulation, while ignoring or underestimating the unpaid work of women in the household (Dalla Costa & James, 1975; Werlhof, 1978). Politically, this debate resonated in movement demands for wages for housewives. In
Italy during the 1970s and 1980s, Marxist-feminism played a strong role in feminist movements. The immediate, personal environment became a focal space when translating social transformation in the so-called “immanence debate” (see Pasquinelli, 1982). Rossana Rosandra relates this focus on the personal to Marx's concept of alienation when formulating a concept of liberation for men and women (Rossanda, 1986). In theorizing subsistence economies in the countries of the Global South, Marxist-feminists attempted to expand the relevance of their argument beyond the experience of women in Western welfare states (Mies, 1981). In her “Cyborg Manifesto”, Donna Haraway delivered a Marxist-feminist critique of biologism and essentialism in feminism by critiquing the biotechnological industry (Haraway, 1985).

Haug later integrated the Marxist-feminist political economic debates and debates around how to frame gender/sex in a theory of gender as integral to the relations of production. In this theory she identifies gender as a constituent relation in all processes of production, the reproduction of life, and the means to live (Haug, 2001). Her theory of gender relations doesn't introduce a new sphere of production that had been ignored before, or a gender dimension to traditional terrains of Marxist analysis, but tries to establish gender relations as foundational instruments in Marxism and feminism that allows us to synthesize thinking on capitalism and patriarchy. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and state-socialist regimes of Eastern Europe, together with the rise of post-feminism, post-Marxism, and post-modernism in academia and in new social movements ground Marxist-feminist debates to a halt for nearly a decade.

Smith as well as Haug directly refer to the writings of Marx as foundational to
their scientific project. They pay particular attention to the early philosophical writings of Marx, gleaning from Marx's methodological approach tools to conduct critical investigations of today's society rather than deducing truths from Marxist theory. When Smith criticises "The Ideological Practice of Sociology" (Smith, 1990a) she adapts Marx's critique of the materialists and idealists of his time, which he formulated in "The German Ideology" (Marx & Engels, 1970), to confront the ideological practice of deductive reasoning in modern social science. She developed this critique into an ontological pillar for IE - to understand society's ruling relations as ideological practices. Haug has also dissected Marx's "Theses on Feuerbach" and their relevance for the feminist movement (Haug, 1999).

Memory work and the Theses on Feuerbach.

In this section of the chapter I will focus on Haug's discussion of three of the eleven "Theses on Feuerbach:"

The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism - that of Feuerbach included - is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the *object* or of *contemplation*, but not as *sensuous human activity*, *practice*, not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the active side was developed abstractly by idealism - which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such. (Marx, 1969, p. 6) [italics in original P.T.]

Haug relates this fragment of the first thesis to the feminist critique of mainstream practices in social science. Science detaches from the real, everyday practices of women
while simultaneously deducing human activity from abstract categories and forgetting about real sensuous human activity. This has been critiqued by feminists since the beginning of the feminist movement. Furthermore, Haug argues, this first thesis implies that the analysis of oppressive relations cannot simply proceed in the abstract, but must be understood in its practical, subjective, everyday dimension. Therefore, women have to engage in the process of knowledge creation themselves, rather than proceeding towards an object of investigation. Interestingly, neither the early feminist movement nor the labour movement directly referred to the “Theses on Feuerbach” (Haug, 1999, p. 178).

The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that it is essential to educate the educator himself. This doctrine must, therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society. The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice. (Marx & Engels, 1970, p. 6) [italics in original P.T.]

The third thesis discloses that changing oneself coincides with the changing of circumstances as a revolutionary practice. Consequently, a liberatory feminist knowledge must investigate social relations together with the subjective construction of women themselves to explore how individuals participate in the reproduction of oppression, and what shifts in action must occur so that the oppressive relationship can be overthrown. In this sense the personal can be understood as political, and its investigation as necessary for revolutionary change. Furthermore, Haug interprets the third thesis through the
feminist demand that women can only liberate themselves and cannot rely on a male-dominated labour movement to liberate them. The idea that self-transformation is a revolutionary practice and that women are an autonomous political subject generated tensions between the male-dominated labour movement and socialist feminist organizations. Feminists resisted the view that “women's issues” were degraded to “side contradictions.” (Haug, 1999d, p. 179) Due to their interest in “personal issues,” feminists were often perceived as bourgeois within the labour movement. In many European countries this conflictive relationship forced to feminists step out of traditional labour organizations and form autonomous socialist feminist organizational structures. In Italy feminists subsumed this tactic under the term “double militancy” (Haug, 1999d, p. 180).

Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations. Feuerbach, who does not enter upon a criticism of this real essence, is consequently compelled: To abstract from the historical process and to fix the religious sentiment as something by itself and to presuppose an abstract - isolated - human individual. Essence, therefore, can be comprehended only as "genus", as an internal, dumb generality which naturally unites the many individuals. (Marx & Engels, 1970, p. 7)

Haug translates the sixth thesis on Feuerbach as a warning not to perceive women as an abstract, ahistoric category with an unchangeable essence, or to talk about humanity
in general while forgetting about women in particular. Haug emphasizes the historic processes and social relations in which women became and become women day by day. This implies a necessary understanding of the connection between the personal histories of women and how they are interwoven in “big history.” An understanding of this connection would open the possibility of investigating how women participate in oppressive social relations. This knowledge of social relations and how individuals inscribe themselves into those relations allows for alternative modes of being, or transforming personally and transforming social relations. It is at this conjuncture that CMW as a methodology becomes useful. In CMW the investigative process happens in a collective in which women are both the object and subject of investigation.

In Germany the combined influence of Marxism and feminism and the contribution of CMW to this often conflictive dialogue was institutionally concentrated around the Argument publishing house and its journal, *Das Argument*. Haug was one of the publishers, and women from different memory work groups organized a feminist board of editors which was responsible for two of the six issues of the journal. This provided an organizational basis in which feminist thinking, and research from memory work groups in particular, could engage in dialogue with other Marxist approaches. This mutual influence materialized, in one instance, in the “Project Ideology Theory” (Projekt Ideologie-Theorie, 1979 and following) and the “Project Automation and Qualification” (Projekt Automation und Qualifikation, 1975 and following).

**Institutional Ethnography and the German Ideology**

Smith builds her concept of ideology on Marx and Engels’ critique of early 19th
century German materialism and idealism, most comprehensively formulated in *The German Ideology* (Marx & Engels, 1970). Ideology here is not primarily a system of thoughts and ideas or the embodiment of false consciousness, nor is it simply a misguided perception of reality. Ideology, in the idealist framework, is a specific practice of knowing, a perception of reality deduced from abstract concepts, as if real practices were simply expressions of ideas. As an answer to these ideological practices of knowing, Marx and Engels insist on operating with concepts derived from real human practices. Smith goes beyond this, and does not distinguish between consciousness, ideas, or concepts on the one hand, and human practices and social relations on the other, as if they were operating in two different realities (or spheres of reality). She understands ideology as concrete practices in the real world which (re)produce social relations, which she calls “ruling relations.” (D. Smith, 2005)

In “The Ideological Practice of Sociology” (D. Smith, 1990a), Smith explains how in sociological concepts are used in a way Marx would have identified as ideological. She directly refers to a passage in *The German Ideology* when she caricatures the dominant use of sociological terms as ideological circles:

1. Separate what people say they think from the actual circumstances in which it is said, from the actual empirical conditions of their lives, and from the actual individuals who said it.

2. Having detached the ideas, arrange them to demonstrate an order among them that accounts for what is observed [...].

The “Theses on Feuerbach,” which Haug discussed as a methodological pillar for CMW, already presents the main arguments later expanded in “The German Ideology.” Marx produced the “Theses on Feuerbach as a note in his research records (W. F. Haug, 1999). He elaborated his critique of Feuerbach’s Materialism in “The German Ideology.”
Trick 3. Then change the ideas into a 'person'; that is, set them up as distinct entities (for example, a value pattern, norm, belief system, and so forth) to which agency (or possibly causal efficacy) may be attributed. And redistribute them to 'reality' by attributing them to actors who can now be treated as representing the ideas. […]

Through these 'tricks' a fact can be represented as an expression of a principle originating the same fact. The procedure discards the presence of the subject and reconceptualizes actual activity as an abstract noun capable of functioning as an agent. The original relation between the fact and the reflection, wherein the principle arises as an abstraction from the fact, is then reversed. The fact becomes an abstraction of the principle. An ideological circle is created. (D. Smith, 1990a, pp. 43–44)

The selective treatment of actualities allows that concepts can be developed without regards to time and space, in the abstract, and that they can later be used as a form to selectively perceive the reality as if it was an expression of concepts. This detachment of concepts from their material foundation allows that ideas can be understood as the driving force of history. The sensuous activities of people, if at all, appear as effects of ideas. By disconnecting from the actual social relations constituting these concepts, they create a separate world of ideas, detached from lived experience. As such, in the end concepts demarcate what can be perceived and understood rather than being instruments and starting points to explore reality. If these ideological procedures were simply an intellectual problem of misrepresentation, the irritation could be fixed by
using other, better concepts. Still, conceptual problems appear as belonging to a “head world,” when in fact they work as real practices which coordinate concrete human actions. The ability to coordinate human action and the appearance of concepts as just existing in the “head world” relies on a specific material condition. This material condition must allow concepts to exist and to be activated in various locations at the same time and maintain their appearance over time.

In modern societies texts fulfil this function of detaching words and images from their particular contexts of immediate interaction. Their material existence on paper, hard disk, compact disk, or video tape and their form of distribution as books, newspapers, broadcasting, web-sites, or e-mails allows them to be activated (read or written) in different locations at the same time. Thereby these texts coordinate actions which relate to their reading or writing. The actions the follow the reading of a text may differ in their particular environment, but the text in its material existence remains the same. This material existence of the text allows scientific discourse to appear as if it remains in the textual world. The objectification of this discourse in texts is a precondition for its appearance as objective knowledge. Smith does not limit her analysis of textually mediated ideological practices to scientific discourse. For her, texts form a constituent part of the modes of ruling in modern societies.

**Texts, ruling relations and the ontology of the social**

Smith developed a new ontology of the social, which is the innovative core of IE. At the centre of this ontology is the text as trans-local coordinator of actions and social relations. In her recent monograph on IE as a mode of enquiry, Smith explains the emergence of
this ontology of the social and her understanding of “ruling relations” historically as well as logically (D. Smith, 2005).

For Smith, the development of printing with movable letters in the 16th century created a material condition which allowed the spread of knowledge in the form of texts, independent from its immediate local context of creation. New forms of ruling became possible and necessary. Phenomena like the intensification of long-distance trade required new forms of ruling which stretched beyond personal relations of domination. These new forms of ruling relied on the ability of texts to be read and written at different locations simultaneously. With these new technologies to reproduce and distribute texts, codified law and central government orders could reach the most remote areas of a state. The development of accounting systems accompanied the expansion of trade, monetary relationships, and the creation of markets and their respective commodities. The location of production started to shift to the first manufactures in cities. In these cities, the bourgeois class gained influence. Newspapers and literature developed as cultural media beyond vocal transmission and immediate state or church control - through them, the bourgeois public sphere emerged. This public sphere and its new mode of production (early capitalism) had also developed a new gender regime. While the bourgeois man left home to work, trade, or engage in politics and cultural activities, a woman’s sphere remained restricted to the household. Male and female spheres of activity and consciousness split within the growing bourgeoisie. The new (male) bourgeois subject could be constituted ideologically as a universal, rational, disembodied, civilized being in contrast to its particular, embodied, natural (female) opposite (D. Smith, 2005, p. 14).  

7 In her very brief historical analysis Smith specifically focuses on Northern
For Smith this split also materialized as a separation of the social functions of coordination and ruling from immediate everyday lived experiences. A complex of textually mediated ruling relations grew and differentiated over time. Texts provide the link between the ruling relations and the lived actualities of people. (D. Smith, 1998, p. 191).

When Smith uses the concept of relations to characterize these new modes of ruling she is referring to Marx. With the rise of capitalist relationships, Marx identified a shift of the social functions of knowing, judgement, and will from the immediate producers of goods, to capital and its complex, reified forms of organization. Accordingly, Smith describes ruling relations as extracting the moment of coordination and rule from everyday interactions, and specializing those functions in objectified social relations, which work independently of particular individuals. Individuals can participate in these relations according to the concepts, positions, and subjectivities provided to them (D. Smith, 1998, p. 190). They are active in the sense that they are activating ruling relations in their practices, particularly when dealing with texts. Similar to Haug's approach to social relations, individuals play an active part in the (re)production of those social relations. Smith's ruling relations realize their ideological function when individuals inscribe their actions in the forms and subjectivities provided by ruling relations. While Smith emphasizes the ruling function, and therefore locates the crucial position for transforming ruling relations outside of them, for Haug there is no outside to the gendered relations of production. She emphasizes the creative act of inscribing bourgeois gender relations. These considerations do not necessarily reflect other gendered realities of other races and classes in the corresponding historical periods.
oneself into oppressive relations and the possibility or rewriting or unlearning them.

With regards to feminist struggles, Smith identifies two approaches towards ruling relations. One is to emphasize women's positions as excluded and outside of ruling relations. In this analysis, women fought against the increasingly extra-local regulation of their lives or male rule in their local circumstances. A different approach in feminist struggles was to demand more participation and better representation of women within existing ruling relations (D. Smith, 2005, p. 19). This included increasing the share of women in governing or managing positions, and expanding women's participation to economic activities beyond the household.

To understand how ruling relations coordinate everyday actions and how texts become active in this process, Smith developed her ontology of the social:

The ontology I'm writing here is modest. I want a theory of how the social exists of such a kind that it will help us see what we might be observing, listening for, recording, and analysing. […] It does make the claim, as an ontology, to provide a conceptual framework for selective attention to actualities such that the project of inquiry can proceed as discovery of and learning from actualities. Returning to the metaphor of a map, it proposes cartographic principles for what might be incorporated into the mapping of social in its institutional form (D. Smith, 2005, p. 52).

The central question for Smith when conceptualizing the social is how people's actual practices are coordinated. Coordination itself consists of concrete embodied activities, when mediated by texts and located in objectified institutional forms. These
coordinating activities are not separate forms of action which are reified into something like “social structures.” The challenge for Smith is how to understand and investigate practices (ethnographically) which are not accessible via immediate experience. When researching concrete practices, the institutional coordination process, not the individual itself, is in focus (D. Smith, 2005, p. 59). As ruling relations are textually mediated, Smith suggests we investigate their coordinative function as textual practices. Texts have to be understood through their activation by people and how they are used in sequences of actions to coordinate multiple peoples’ activities. Therefore language in its coordinative function comes into focus and must be theorized. Smith makes reference to Herbert Meads’ concept of the significant symbol (Mead, 1967). Mead understands language as a social phenomenon, which can’t exist for itself, but through its interaction between people. The significant symbol (or language) coordinates consciousness in interaction when participants respond to an action or situation by giving the action the same meaning. The continuity or discontinuity of an interaction from the past to the future is organized by the significant symbol - it keeps the wheels moving and gathers people into the same train. A street sign coordinating the traffic on a street would be an example of a significant symbol.

Moving to the more inclusive conception of coordination, the social might be conceived as an ongoing historical process in which the people's doings are caught up and responsive to what others are doing; what they are doing is responsive to and given by what has been going on; every next act, as it is concerted with those of others, picks up and projects forward into the future.
Coordination is not an activity which can be associated with a single individual; it is always inter-individual, occurring in in-between space. To understand this, Smith adapts Vološinov’s notion of the inter-individual territory (Vološinov, 1986). The inter-individual territory is constituted by the word as a two-sided act. A word is not simply created by a speaker, but also through the response of the listener. In this act the speaker and listener negotiate a common understanding of an object or situation. Smith follows Alexander Luria when she argues that the material of the object, e.g. a table, exists independently of any communication about it, but as a point of reference for the word, the object is a language performance.

Word and objects are in this account not independent of one another. The object perceived is already organized as such, that is, as an object, by the word that refers to it. Of course there's a real thing there, but how it becomes an object for us is, according to Luria, already organized perceptually by the referring word. The perceptual standardization organized by a word means also that people differently positioned in relation to a named object see it as the same. Hence diverging perspectives that are the necessary outcome of being in bodies [...] can be concerted in words that organize perceptual generalization. (D. Smith, 2005, pp. 84–85)

Inter-individual territories are the sites where language organizes our different experiences in a “reciprocal relation between speaker and hearer” so that they can
“intersect in a world known and named in common” (D. Smith, 2005, p. 78).

Smith expands the notion of inter-individual territories as sites where consciousness is coordinated to texts and identifies inter-textual territories. This expansion refers to Bakhtin’s concept of speech genres (Bakhtin, 1986). According to Bakhtin, language can be organized in different genres. In one genre, action is based on direct speech in an inter-individual territory and a shared world of experiences. In a different genre, action is mediated by texts. For Smith these inter-textual territories are the sites where ruling relations materialize as coordinative practices.

Based on this dialogic understanding of language and social coordination, Smith develops the notion of “text-reader conversations.” On the one hand, the text is the material condition which allows concepts to appear as if they existed in a separate world; on the other, Smith's understanding of text as a coordinative activity provides the material link between ruling relations and everyday experience. People always activate texts (by reading or writing) in a particular local setting at a particular time. In this text-reader conversation, the reader responds to the text in a way which is relevant for their own work and thereby participates in the coordination and organizing of specific sequences of action (D. Smith, 2005, p. 120). This is also the way in which experiences come into existence and are shaped (e.g., by textually mediated ruling relations). For Smith, experiences are not an automatic by-product of every action, nor are they instantaneously formed in the memory where one can simply recall them. They are created in a dialogic relation while they are communicated to others. Not just the speaker, but also the listener is co-producing the experience by the way he/she is responding. The creation of
experiences is an ongoing conversation. This is particularly important for the research process, as the experiences of the respondents are created in the dialogue with the researcher, and are constantly developed in a dialogic movement.

**Political Activist Ethnography and Institutional Ethnography.**

So far Smith's epistemological and ontological reflections hold true for IE as well as PAE. In this section, I will emphasize the differences and particularities of the two approaches. I begin with a short account of their development in order to contextualize the conceptual comparison which follows.

During the 1980s Dorothy Smith and George Smith were collaborating at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto. Dorothy Smith held a tenured position and George Smith was working on her team. In 1987, Dorothy Smith published a collection of her writings entitled “The everyday world as problematic” in which she sketches her project of Institutional Ethnography (D. Smith, 1987). This volume was widely lauded and discussed, within and beyond feminist circles. At this time IE began to establish itself as a distinctive mode of enquiry, first in the scientific community around Dorothy Smith and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and later within a broader feminist context. At the same time, George Smith was engaged in Toronto's gay rights movement as an activist and researcher. In his work he tried to apply IE as an activist within a social movement in a way that activists could simultaneously act as researchers and create important knowledge for their political struggle. He reflected his experience as activist and researcher in “Political Activist as Ethnographer” (G. W.
Smith, 1990). Based on two of his research projects, he discussed how IE could be used in activist contexts and further adapted the approach to the specific conditions of a social movement. Later he called this form of IE “Political Activist Ethnography.” George Smith died in 1994, but scholars continued with the sort of research he proposed. In 2002 Canadian researchers organized a conference on activism and ethnography in Sudbury, Canada, where activist scholars presented and discussed research based on George Smith’s “Political Activist Ethnography”. An edited volume of those contributions was published in 2006 (Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006). This publication of activist research is still the most comprehensive collection of work on PAE. Some activist ethnographers have raised the criticism that the collection includes few actual applications of this mode of enquiry (Hussey, 2012). As such, a collection of recent ethnographies which apply PAE as a mode of enquiry is currently in preparation. The number of research projects which have adopted PAE as their methodology/mode of enquiry is limited. Due to this fact and the conceptual similarities between IE and PAE, the latter may be understood as a subform of the former, rather than as an autonomous mode of enquiry.

The problematic.

The starting point for every IE and PAE project is formulating a problematic for the research. A problematic is not a theoretical hypothesis or a research question. Originally, Dorothy Smith adopted the term from Luis Althusser's analysis of ideological state apparatuses (Althusser, 1971). The researcher first has to explore the lived reality and access the everyday knowledge which provides the standpoint for the investigation. This
Knowledge is then critically analysed in order to identify how it is hooked up in certain trans-local institutional relations. The researcher identifies a disjuncture between certain lived experiences and the way they are integrated into institutional relations and discourse. This disjuncture provides the starting point to formulate a problematic for research. Let us return to the example of mental health statistics given at the beginning of the chapter. In this example, the disjuncture appeared between the lived anger of women towards their working reality at home and the physician's diagnosis, which qualified the anger as mental illness. For the problematic, the researcher identifies which textually mediated institutional relations of diagnosis and statistics are creating this disjuncture. The researcher problematizes ruling relations from a standpoint of lived experience and knowledge in everyday life. This is the point of entry for research in IE. From this point, the institutional ethnographer traces how certain texts work when coordinating trans-local ruling relations. The aim is to investigate ruling relations and how they coordinate human actions - therefore, the focus is on institutional structures and not on individuals and their actions, beliefs, or characteristics. The lived experiences of informants are simply the entry point for the enquiry; IE must go beyond the everyday, particular experience to investigate generalized institutional relations. For Dorothy Smith the problematic in IE is not a political standpoint but an entry point for investigation.

Though a study's problematic may originate in the researcher's political concerns, those concerns must be translated into an investigatory focus that is not simply critical. [...] The political concerns must be transcended or set aside in formulating the research problematic. Institutional Ethnography is
essentially a work of inquiry and discovery; (D. Smith, 2005, p. 207)

By contrast, in PAE political concerns constitute the driving force of an investigation. Though the research problematic is not a political positioning, political conflicts are the basis for the formulation of the problematic. The research process in PAE is tightly linked to activist work. Still, the goal of research is to deliver reliable, adequate information about the social relations activists are confronted with so that activists can act effectively. This does not mean that the research process must be detached from the activism. In contrast, the direction of investigation follows the priorities of activism and research informs activism in order to enable educated decisions. In George Smith's words, PAE is a “method of using grassroots political organizing as a means of describing how people's lives are determined from beyond the scope of their everyday world. In doing so, it provides a way of exploring, from their standpoint, how the world works and how it is put together, with a view to helping them change it” (G. Smith, 2006, p. 44). It is not only the position from below or outside specific political-administrative regimes that provides a privileged position to create knowledge about ruling relations. The very act of challenging these relations allows better insight into how they function. As George Smith reflects in “Political Activist as Ethnographer”, his approach was based on two political campaigns and corresponding research projects within Toronto's gay rights movement in the 1980s. In one project Smith analysed the police documentation of a police raid at a local bathhouse in Toronto. The bathhouse was a popular meeting point for the gay community, and the police raid was therefore seen as a homophobic attack by members of the community. Smith conducted this research as a
member of a “Right to Privacy Committee” which was organized after the raids. In his research, Smith criticises the “speculative” and ideological approach which saw the policemen as acting out their personal homophobia. He analyses how the police actions are coordinated by several governing texts including the criminal law. Based on this analysis he emphasizes the need to change specific governing texts instead of concentrating on a moralistic awareness-raising intended to change the attitudes of policemen. In the second project, Smith participated in a campaign called “AIDS Action Now!” In the late 1980s, life-expanding treatment and experimental treatment for HIV- or AIDS-patients was not available in Canada. The campaign fought for access to existing, state-of-the-art treatment. Therefore, Smith analysed how AIDS was classified as a fatal epidemic in public health regulations, which in consequence limited the range of treatments permitted. Based on the research, the campaign concentrated on changing these regulations (G. W. Smith, 1990).

In all these cases the starting points of investigation are activists confronting a political-administrative complex, with the development of the confrontation also leading the research. According to Smith, data collection is not separate from activist activity, but is part of it. The activist ethnographer does not organize separate interviews or questionnaires, but uses the work as an activist and the knowledge he/she may acquire in confrontation with political administrative complexes as data source for ongoing analysis of the political-administrative regime in question. For Smith the activist ethnographer’s positioning in everyday life is strictly outside of and oppositional to what he calls political-administrative regimes. He distinguishes between reflexive knowledge, or
knowledge practices based on experience, and objective forms of knowing, or institutionalized knowledge. Accordingly, Smith understands objectivity not as an epistemological category but as a social form of organization, which he associates with the term political-administrative regimes. He uses the notion of regime to identify a whole complex of social relations which mingle in coordinating certain aspects of social life and which also materialize in ruling apparatuses or institutions. He calls these regimes “political-administrative” to emphasize that institutional ruling involves a combination of political and administrative apparatuses. Nevertheless, for him these terms only follow an analytical and methodological purpose to direct the research and do not represent a social reality. They are to be understood as a form to investigate social reality. The concept of political-administrative regime can be understood as a particular instance of Dorothy Smith’s notion of ruling relations. Both terms do describe how the actual ruling works, and give direction on how to investigate ruling practices. A relational view of institutions, for example, avoids an analysis of institutions as separate organizational entities. The work of ruling transcends organizational boundaries. Diagnostic or policing practices are linked with administrative and legal texts which are organized and activated on different levels and in different organizational environments.

Each stage or step orients to the work with which it coordinates sequentially; each next stage or step articulates to the foregoing and defines it as well as orients to what follows. Assembling the stages helps to locate a sequence of

---

8 Considering concepts as methodological devices does not necessarily prevent their ideological use. The awareness that the terms in use do not represent reality but should build a bridge to understand them, may prevent an ideological use of language. Nevertheless these terms themselves always require a certain form of abstraction, which should be kept in mind when George Smith, like Dorothy Smith, criticises the role of theory in a social research process.
action or a set of sequences [...]. (D. Smith, 2005, p. 162)

In the concrete research process the researcher follows how texts are used in a specific setting and how these texts are organized into hierarchies. In the case of the bathhouse raids, the documentation of police actions was coordinated by a specific institutional discourse which corresponds with more general procedural regulations for police interventions. These regulations are themselves coordinated by, what Dorothy Smith would call “boss texts.” On a certain, increasingly generalized, level in this textual hierarchy, George Smith identified formulations in the Criminal Code as crucial to the fact that activities in the bathhouse where considered criminally relevant, thereby triggering the police raids. The texts in these sequences do not stand for themselves and are not interpreted as autonomous texts. But they are perceived as coordinating a sequence and hierarchy of actions - they are active texts. The task of the activist researcher is to explore these sequences and trace the institutional procedures, directing the attention of activists to those procedures which are found to be crucial for any desired change.

George Smith directs his research to investigate the concrete human practices which create the social relations that activists try to confront. He is sceptical about taking theoretical considerations as a point of departure for research. PAE intends to create social maps which can be used by activists to navigate their actions in an informed way. Interpreting Marx's first thesis on Feuerbach, Smith argues for an empirically-centred approach with aim of critiquing a theory orientation in social research and activist knowledge production. Smith doesn't opt for subjectivism, but for a reflexivity, which
considers the objectified relations as constituted by real human practices. His scepticism towards abstraction and his emphasis on empirical exploration risks becoming lost in empty empiricism. In many cases, political activist ethnographies and institutional ethnographies share this scepticism and its corresponding risk. The risk in this case is that the research cannot push beyond descriptions of particularities (as well as the description of specific trans-local institutional relations) and does not capture social relations, which are difficult to excavate on a very concrete level by observing human practices (in text or everyday life).

**Frigga Haug's Collective Memory Work.**

In the final section of this chapter I will discuss CMW and how it is used as a research practice more closely. With CMW, Frigga Haug, together with the women of her memory work groups, developed an empirical critique of ideological forms of knowing and acting comparable to Dorothy, and specifically George, Smith's project. In contrast to PAE, the activist experience in CMW is not simply a starting point for investigation outside of the sphere to be explored that embodies the ideological. In CMW, participants collectively analyse their own memories as containing and reproducing ideologies.

Thus experience may be seen as lived practice in the memory of the self-constructed identity. It is structured by expectations, norms, and values, in short by the dominant culture: and yet it still contains an element of resistance, a germ of oppositional cultural activity. It is this intertwining of processes of self-fulfilment with the fulfilment of cultural expectations that is responsible for example for the fixity with which notions of morality become
Where George Smith locates a privileged reflexive knowledge in everyday life as a contrast to an objective mode of knowing ruling relations (whereby the former functions as a starting point to investigate the latter), Haug focuses on contradictory lived experience and tries to investigate social relations the way they appear in ideological form within memories. For Haug, the ideological does not simply enter experience through trans-local impersonal ruling relations, textual mediations, and apparatuses. When experiencing and remembering, individuals play a much more active role in inscribing themselves into dominant cultural forms. Still, these experiences and memories are contradictory. They contain elements resistant to hegemonic culture, and as such are not totally determined by hegemonic culture. While contradiction might hint at a possibility of resistance, a consciousness which contains too much contradictions prevents people from acting. Therefore, an effort is needed to work on this consciousness in a more coherent manner. More so, this effort must be collective so that it can be translated into effective transformative action. Haug's aim with CMW is to investigate how people inscribe themselves into dominant culture. In so doing, the contradictions of self-construction and its relation to certain oppressive structures can be uncovered. Working with and on these contradictions should facilitate a more coherent world-view and enhance capacity to act in a transformative way. While George Smith's goal is to explore ruling relations in order to create useful maps for activism, which should help to transform these relations, Haug directly connects the capacity to transform social relations to the ability to transform oneself as an activist. Therefore, for Haug,
transforming social relations as an activist also requires critically working on how we perceive and construct ourselves in relation to the world. This perception and construction is reflected in our personal memories. Given this, memory work is necessary. Haug's concept of memory builds on a long tradition of critical thinking about the relation between knowledge, experience, and memory (Haug, 1999d, p. 23 ff).

In ancient Greece (in the works of Plato and Aristotle) memory was seen as a preliminary form of experience, as remembering what has been seen in the past. Bourgeois philosophy links memory to a conscious subject - memory is necessary for knowledge creation. For Kant, memory together with ratio builds our cognitive faculty. Hegel understands memory as an act which transforms personality, works against alienation, and is opposed to outwardness. All these thinkers relate memory to experience, consciousness, and knowledge. In later critical theory, memory is located within the historical process and discussed in relation to a liberating intention. For Ernst Bloch, hope and possibility take a central position in his philosophy. While, according to Bloch, memory is a chastening force against hope, it functions as a connector between individual experience and collective history. (Haug, 1999d, p. 23 ff) Haug uses this vein of thought to relate personal memories to the development of social relations or “great history.” Walter Benjamin identifies remembering as the conscious work of strategic relevance for liberation, an idea Haug further developed in her notion of memory work. According to Benjamin, this memory work creates meaning for life when it connects the past with the future (memory as a backward repetition and repetition as a forward memory). Marcuse sees the liberating potential of memory in counteracting the tendency to abjection and
abstinence in the process of forgetting. But memories cannot unfold this potential if not
freed from their ideological dyes. Haug later establishes this ambiguous constitution of
memory as a basis for the analytical process in her version of memory work. The German
novelist Christa Wolf agrees with the necessity to struggle and work with the ideological
dimension of memories. For her, remembering subjects are interwoven into society in
such a way that they cannot simply activate their dreams and fantasies and project them
into the future while remembering. Subjects actively take part in their own oppression
and the ideological coining of their memories. From Leontiev and his cultural historical
approach to psychology, Haug learns that memory is a feature of personality, that
personality remembers, and that this is a process of permanent social construction. The
past is not simply etched in memory and summoned when needed. Personality plays a
mediating and selective role in the personal appropriation of the past - the construction of
this personality becomes a key interest for memory work. Haug refers to Gramsci and his
concept of cultural hegemony when she explores how people try to inscribe their personal
history into currently dominant cultural forms and construct themselves as coherent
personalities within their time. One of the goals of memory work is to investigate the
personality's infusion by hegemonic culture. Following Gramsci, the site where
personality and its relation to hegemonic culture must be investigated is the incoherent
everyday knowledge of people. These incoherent fragments of knowledge are
co-constituted with others as collective forms of knowledge. Therefore, the goal of
developing a critical and coherent world-view must involve collective efforts. These
efforts are also critiques of existing philosophies because everyday knowledge
appropriates elements of diverse philosophies and world-views. Passed on via everyday knowledge, they are part of the historical backpack that our consciousness uncritically carries. By excavating these philosophical fragments from the lens of personal experience and trying to transform them into a coherent world-view, participants in memory work become philosophers too. This can only happen, however, if they are engaged in a common social project aiming to change the world as the inconsistency in consciousness is a result of a disrupting, isolating, and alienating lived reality characteristic of a subordinated group). Here it is crucial to understand that for Gramsci the production of (scientific) knowledge is not limited to the discovery and communication of specific insights. Raising the intellectual level of a whole segment of society is a constituent part of knowledge production. What Gramsci calls “organic intellectuals,” a term Haug adopts for CMW, play a guiding role in this process of raising the intellectual level (one can call it collective learning/teaching). Those “organic intellectuals” are the organizers of the memory work process and they have a much more profound knowledge of theories (which appear as fragments in everyday knowledge). They are not coming from, and not being organized in, a distinct social strata of intellectuals, but are organically connected to the lifeworld (a community, a movement etc.) of the participants. Their competence in theories and philosophies as well as their capacity to lead the group process make them a crucial element of every CMW group. In contrast to PAE, working with theory is central to CMW. The creation of critical theory based on an analysis of everyday knowledge and a critique of existing theories is a goal of the process.

As with PAE, CMW means working with language. Memories are articulated in
language. The construction and articulation of memories requires the person remembering to use a language which is shaped by power relations. In order to be understood and accepted by others, people write their memories through the codes of the dominant culture, so that the writing makes “sense” and others can emotionally connect. Remembering becomes a craft in adapting to dominant cultural codes. Simultaneously, those memories contain liberating elements which contradict the dominant culture and must be excavated. The process of working through those memories and appropriating language critically means claiming a position in the creation of culture. In fact, the idea of memories as contradictory is not a quality of memory or experience in general. For Haug the (gendered, racialized, or otherwise oppressive) social relations of production in contemporary capitalist society consequently create disruptions. In feminist theories about everyday life these disruptions appear in different forms. Dorothy Smith identifies disjunctures between everyday knowledge and ruling relations. Caroll Giligan analyses the dissociation of female experiences. For Haug, these disruptions are articulated as contradictions within everyday knowledge. (Haug, 1999d) For all of them, a gendered division of labour (in knowledge production, in/outside the household, etc.) is essential for theorizing these disruptions in women's experiences. The division of labour is the source of domination as well as the basis for liberatory potential. It doesn't simply create suppressed forms of knowledge because it requires an active engagement with the world, even (or particularly) from the perspective of the dominated or exploited. Haug cites Gramsci again in invoking the notion of common sense (ital. senso commune, a term Gramsci analytically differentiates from everyday knowledge) as a potentially conscious
basis for liberation. Common sense emerges from the active, personal, and collective appropriation of nature and society. This active relation to the world and its respective common sense is not necessarily in and of itself liberatory, but contains the elements required for its use in liberation. When Haug is seeking collective capacity to act through CMW, she tries to activate the elements of common sense in a critique of everyday knowledge. This notion of common sense has parallels to George Smith's concept of reflexive knowledge (which he derives from Garfinkel). Reflexive forms of knowing are constituted by immediate interpersonal interaction and dialogue. In contrast to Smith, who distinguish reflexive from objective forms of knowing ontologically, Haug’s and Gramsci’s differentiation of common sense and everyday experience is primarily analytical.

The ability to act is of central interest for CMW, and language used in the articulation of memories is an important point of analysis for how a person constructs her/his ability to act. In everyday life, this ability is created by adapting to dominant cultural discourses by covering contradictions and voids in everyday knowledge. Still, this ability is restricted by the boundaries of the subordinated position the person is assigned to in society. CMW tries to create a critical ability to act by discovering boundaries and uncovering contradictions in our memories collectively. To allow for this work, memories have to be externalized - for example, in texts - so that they can be analysed as cultural artefacts from a distanced position. For both PAE and CMW

9 Haug's analysis of the partial integration of second-wave feminism into the neoliberal hegemonic project shows that the simple demand for more autonomy and ability to act can be transformed into new strategies of domination. Therefore, it is crucial for CMW to be embedded in a critical and collective movement for social transformation. Memory work supports the movement’s critical approach, and collective action within the movement provides the social basis for CMW as a transformative project.
language and texts are core spheres of analysis.

For Frigga Haug CMW is not simply a research methodology, but a cultural praxis. It was originally designed as a social movement learning practice, when in fact CMW can be perceived as an unlearning project, because it intends to question and overcome internalized cultural norms and beliefs. In addition to this unlearning effect, it can have positive effects on the organizing process of a community.

The memory work process
In contrast to PAE or IE, CMW provides a specific methodical procedure. This does not, however, imply that there is a standard process to follow when conducting CMW. Since the first memory work groups in Germany in the 1970s, the development of the concrete method has been practised as an open process, and every new memory group adapted this method to their project. Nevertheless, at the end of the 1990s Frigga Haug published a short methodical guide for memory work projects (Haug, 1999d, p. 199ff). The intention of this text was to provide guidance for groups in which none of the members had ever participated in memory work. Based on this guideline, I will give a short overview over the methodical steps of a CMW process.

Typically, there are two approaches to initiating a CMW process in social movement contexts: either the group already exists and has to identify a topic they wish to work on; or a facilitator is publishing a topic and recruiting participants. Forming a collective (more than two people, not more than twelve) is critical to this method - one
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10 Due to the fact that PAE and IE are ethnographies, the actual research project (strategies and techniques of data collection and analysis) has to be adjusted to the field and dynamic of the fieldwork. Epistemological, ontological, and methodological assumptions provide the framework and orientation - discussions of fieldwork strategies in PAE/IE exist and will be subject of the following chapters. (see D. Smith, 2006)
cannot pursue the process individually. The process also depends on available time, which can vary from a weekend seminar (not less then two days) to regular meetings over months and years. In the first session the participants share their interests and motivations and identify a topic that all can relate to and are personally curious about. The research topic should be formulated in casual, everyday language, which should trigger the process of remembering. “Once I was really afraid...” should be given preference to formulations such as “the social construction of anxiety in social movement contexts...” Before the next session, every participant has to write a short (one to maximum two typed pages) but detailed text about one concrete situation or scene she/he remembers that relates to the topic. The text must describe the situation in as much detail as possible. It should be written in the first person to encourage the personal memory process, and after finishing the text will be transferred into the third person, in order to create distance from any specific person. The participants bring anonymized copies of their texts to the next session. While the goal for the whole research process is to keep all steps as collective as possible, there should be someone in every session in charge of facilitation. Usually these are people who are familiar with the research methodology, can provide knowledge on theories related to the chosen topic, and can facilitate group work. Referring to Gramsci, Haug calls this role “the organic intellectual” (Haug, 1999d, p. 205). In the second session the memory texts will be shared and all participants must read all the texts the others have written. Based on these readings, the group (and if this is not possible, the facilitator) decides which text they want to analyse first. In general, all participants should show some interest in the text, they should understand the text, and it should be
rich in detailed descriptions of the scene. Before analysing the text collectively, the (or one of the) organic intellectual(s) should introduce the participants to the philosophical background of the method. If time and group interest allows, the lecture can be combined with readings. In the following analysis of the participant's texts, at least two continuous hours of group-work has to be reserved (per text). The object of analysis is the text, not the author. The aim is to elaborate the social constructions in the text, not to provide therapy or criticize the author. In the initial analytical step, the participants have to come to an agreement about “what the author wants to say” with the text (Haug, 1999d, p. 210). In this step, the everyday knowledge of participants should be explained so that it can be contrasted with the result of the deconstruction later. This is the only analytic stage in which the participants should try to assemble what the author means in her/his writing. The group's answer will be formulated in a short sentence or, if possible, as a “popular saying”. Then the group identifies everyday life theories which inform the author’s message and visibly note them. As a second step, the group completes a chart with language particles from the memory text.

Verbs are crucial to identify the construction of (non)activity in the text. First, verbs will be collected according to their different usages. One column collects verbs which relate to the narrating subject, while an extensive use of supporting verbs will be noted separately. The use of impersonal subjects should be noted in another column. These grammatical forms have the effect of making the author disappear into the text, or it appears as if the author is driven by invisible external powers. Things, not people

---

11 Popular Sayings reflect a cultural repertoire from which everyday knowledge is nurtured from. Being able to formulate one's individual perceptions into a popular saying allows to connect the individual understanding of experiential knowledge with shared cultural forms.
become the subjects of action. In an additional column the group assembles negative verb constructions. These constructions, together with supporting verbs, tend to marginalize the narrating subject in the text. The following column contains all cases where feelings were noted in the text. In many cases, even when the text is about a feeling like “anxiety,” feelings are scarcely named. Intentions, desires, and interests which are mentioned in the text in relation to the narrating subject should be noted in another column. Often, actions in memory texts are not explained by their motivation and thereby become incomprehensible for the reader, who does not know the contexts of the action. The final column is reserved for notes on contradictions and voids in the text. Here, the group mentions where more information is needed to understand the story, where it appears as if the author has left something out to narrate the story more smoothly, or where contradictions appear. In contrast to the other columns, the final column names things which cannot be found directly in the text. Similar tables and collections will then be made for every other person which appears in the text. Usually, much less information is available about these other people, which allows this component to be finished faster.

For the next step in the analysis, the group works only with the newly produced table, and leaves the original text as well as the first thesis aside. Rather than the content and meaning of the text, its construction is to be analysed. Based on the items in the analytic table, the group shares observations on the text. The quantity and diversity of active verbs informs how actively the protagonist is constructed, while passive constructions, impersonal verbs, and supporting verbs indicate the opposite and stress the importance of other forces. Sometimes verbs indicate that activities are just happening in
the author’s head. The group then discusses the effects of the different language particles and their combination in the construction of the person in the story. After reflecting on the construction of the protagonist, the relation to other people in the text will be analysed. In many cases, other people appear only as part of the stage, or as servants to the protagonist, which limits her/his ability to act. The group discusses these different constitutive elements and tries to build a bigger picture together in the next step. Based on this interpretation, the group formulates a new thesis about what the author is actually communicating based on how she/he constructs her/his memory account. Later, the group may compare their initial thesis on what the author wanted to say with the text to the second thesis on the message of her/his memory's construction. None of those theses are to be considered as a true representations of what has happened in the past - they are different messages from those the author attempted to convey. The discrepancy between the messages can be used for further discussion, including a critical review of theories which occupy the scientific and political discourse on the topic. If there is time available, the author of the original memory text can be offered a chance to rewrite her/his story based on the new knowledge gleaned from the analysis, and offer it to the group for analysis at a later point. Depending on the intention of the memory work group, the time available, and the dynamic within the group, the process can be adapted or extended. The basic design I presented here includes some core elements of the CMW method, which usually form part of the process.

**Concluding summary**

In this chapter I introduced CMW and PAE/IE through the context of their development
in a social movement background. Frigga Haug's, as well as Dorothy Smith's, work is decisively influenced by second-wave feminism, or more specifically, by the women's liberation movement in Europe and North America. The praxis of consciousness-raising groups in this movement provided an important basis for the development of these two modes of enquiry and feminist methodology in general. Dorothy Smith formulated her distinctive women's standpoint theory in this context, and one can recognize the principles of feminist consciousness-raising in Frigga Haug's CMW. PAE is based in George Smith's activism and ethnographic research within the gay rights movement in Toronto in the 1980s, and shares basic (ontological, epistemological, and methodological) assumptions with IE, so I identified it as a subform of IE. These modes of enquiry, as well as CMW, use situated, embodied, everyday forms of knowing as a point of departure in their research process. George and Dorothy Smith start with everyday experiences in order to explore trans-local ruling relations. Frigga Haug investigates experiential accounts themselves to excavate the forms how women inscribe themselves into dominant cultural forms, and to find transformative potential in those accounts. Both approaches do not identify only as feminist, but strongly build (though in different ways) on Marxist philosophical considerations in their theory. PAE and IE specifically concentrate on Marx's critique of deductive reasoning in his critique of German materialism and idealism, and develops it into a materialist theory of ruling relations. Among other works by Marx, Frigga Haug discusses the “Thesis on Feuerbach” as a fundamental guidepost for her formulation of CMW. CMW and PAE/IE both focus on the analysis of language to investigate social relations. In the final sections of this chapter, I
described how they theorize language in relation to the social and how they implement their theoretical insights in their research approach. In the fourth chapter of this thesis, research based on Dorothy and George Smith's and Frigga Haug's work will be analysed. Before, the methodological approach of this meta-study will be presented in the following chapter.
Chapter Three:
Methodology

In this chapter, I will present the methodological framework of this study. My methodological core consists of a meta-study approach, focusing on meta-theoretic and meta-methodical aspects. Published studies based on Political Activist Ethnography (PAE) or Collective Memory Work (CMW) form the object area for the analysis. In this chapter I will clarify the meta-study approach used in this thesis. In addition, I will identify the research object and describe the sampling process, as well as give basic information about the sample. The content of articles which were selected for the analysis will be discussed in more detail in the fourth chapter. Finally, I will specify the analytical framework, including different dimensions of analytical categories.

In this research project, I will analyse completed and published empirical and methodological studies, which were written about and/or created in social movements, and which are based on the modes of enquiry of PAE (as a sub-form of Institutional Ethnography, or IE) or Collective Memory Work. Studies which discuss PAE or CMW methodologically, or studies which combine one of those approaches with other methodologies, will also be considered for analysis.

This research can be understood as meta-research - more specifically as a meta-study, with one limitation being the lack of a meta-data analysis (Zhao, 1991). Neither primary data nor research results of primary studies will be analysed. The focus lies, instead, on the analysis of methodological and methodical dimensions of, as well as
theoretical approaches in, the studies in the research sample. Accordingly, a combination of meta-theoretical and meta-methodical elements of meta-study will be employed in this research.

Though a synthesis of PAE and CMW is one of my main goals, I will not conduct a classical meta-synthesis. Meta-synthesis is understood as "representing a family of methodological approaches to developing new knowledge based on rigorous analysis of existing qualitative research findings" (Thorne, 2004, p. 1343). Like every other form of qualitative research integration, meta-synthesis is mainly concerned with the findings of previous research (Paterson et al., 2009, p. 3). In contrast, this study deals with the methodological, methodical, and conceptual elements of studies which shaped the production of research findings.

The prefix “meta” indicates that the research happens “after” something. In our case it is conducted after primary studies were completed. Meta-study is a second-order study analysing the processes of previous studies, to draw conclusions which go beyond those of the primary studies.

Meta-study differs from other forms of second-order studies (e.g., historical, logical, and aesthetic analyses of first-order studies) in that it seeks not only to synthesize […] but also to reflect upon the processes involved in previous studies in terms of 'where we are and where we are going' (Fuhrman and Snizek 1990:27). (Zhao, 1991, p. 378)

---

12 The Greek prefix “meta” is equivalent to the Latin “post”, which originally indicated something coming “after” something else. Today it is also used to indicate a higher level of abstraction or a discussion “about” a certain phenomenon.
The fact that meta-study is a second-order study does not automatically mean that it operates in a more abstract sphere than the primary studies it analyses. What differentiates primary studies from second-order studies is the sequence of analysis:

According to Paterson et. al. (2009, p. 76) “metastudy involves three analytic phases (meta–data analysis, metamethod, and metatheory), in which the findings, research designs, and theoretical frames of primary research (i.e., the research reports that are synthesized) are compared and contrasted. In the synthesis phase, the findings of the analytic phases are considered in light of the historical, sociocultural, and disciplinary context in which the primary research was conducted. This phase can be described as digging deep to generate new knowledge about the phenomenon under study.

In this research project I concentrate on meta-method and meta-theory. Meta-theory generally examines theories of the social world. According to Zhao (1991), three sub-branches of meta-theorizing can be distinguished: the first performs meta-theorizing to better understand social theory; another intends to develop new theory based on the systematic analysis of existing research and theoretical findings; and the third tries to elaborate theoretical findings on a higher level of abstraction than the studies under analysis.

Zhao (1991) distinguishes several dimensions of meta-theory studies which intend to create a better understanding of existing theory. On an internal-intellectual dimension, the research tries to understand the theory and its cognitive characteristics (structure, consistency, assumptions, levels of analysis, etc.). The external-intellectual dimension
sheds light on the process of “doing theory”, or the practices of researchers employ when creating theory. External intellectual influences (e.g. from other fields of research/disciplines) are reflected on an external-intellectual dimension. An external-social dimension should contextualize the creation of theory within the socio-historical setting in which it developed. (Zhao, 1991, p. 383)

This study will primarily follow the sub-branch of meta-theory which aims at an improved understanding of existing theory. All four dimensions presented above will be relevant for the proposed synthesis. Some of these aspects are already covered within the second chapter of this study. Meta-method is concerned with the study of research methods and methodologies. Zhao (1991, p. 383) distinguishes three types of meta-method analysis according to their purpose: "(1) The examination of the methodological presuppositions necessary for carrying out sociological research; (2) the evaluation of extant sociological research methods in terms of their weaknesses and strengths; and (3) the codification of new procedural rules for sociological research." All of these three aspects are central elements of analysis in my proposed study, while some of the first type of meta-method analysis is already covered in the second chapter of this study. Recently, meta-method studies gained popularity as a preparatory step for the combination of different methods, particularly the triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods. Beside the (re-)combination of research methods and the critical examination of research methodologies, their epistemological and ontological foundation has always remained an important reason to pursue meta-method research. Accordingly, meta-method research doesn’t always result in suggesting procedures for combining
methods, but may also deliver reasons as to why certain methods cannot be combined. Meta-study research may result in finding that specific research approaches are incompatible. This doesn’t imply that uniformity should prevail when creating a sample of research studies. A certain irreducible plurality is a precondition for any meta-study.

**Unit of analysis and sampling**

To create a sample which complies with the requirements of a meta-study, a unit of analysis and respective selection criteria must be defined. The unit of analysis for this research project is scientific publications in the form of research reports, articles in scientific journals, or chapters in edited volumes. To be included into the sample for this research project these publications have to match the following criteria:

1. Publications must directly refer to either CMW (and a related text by Frigga Haug, specifically (Haug, 1987)) or PAE (and related texts by George Smith, specifically (Smith, 1990)). Studies in the sample may apply one of the research approaches, combine CMW or PAE with other methodologies, or provide a critique/evaluation of one of the approaches.

2. The text must have been written from the position of an activist within a social movement, have been developed in a social movement setting, or have been written about a specific social movement phenomena. Methodological discussions, or critiques and combination of methodologies, do not necessarily have to fulfil this condition.

---

13 These specific texts were chosen because they were the most influential texts in the English language for the establishment of CMW and PAE in academia. It is more difficult to identify such a text for CMW studies in German. Therefore, the criteria for studies in the German language was formulated more openly. Selected studies could either refer to (Haug, 1980), (Haug, 1990) or (Haug, 1999).
This sampling is based on literature searches in databases for scientific journals (especially articles referencing the above-mentioned foundational articles by Haug and Smith), in collections and edited volumes, and through review articles. As the study will be published in English in an English-speaking country, special attention will be drawn to literature in English, while publications in German or Spanish may also be considered (if no English translation is available).

As the sole author of this thesis, I was the final arbiter on whether a publication had to be included into the sample, based on the established selection criteria and the level of saturation of the analysis/synthesis (theoretical sampling). The sample should reflect the variety of developments and applications of CMW and PAE. No random sample has been drawn for the purposes of this study.

In the appendix to this thesis, I have included a list of the texts that were included into the sample. According to the criteria described above, 48 texts have been included into this sample. 17 of these texts are articles published in scientific journals, 24 are contributions or chapters in edited volumes, five are these, and two are monographs. 39 of these texts were published in English (six translated from German) – only nine were available in German. 13 texts included in the sample can be considered as applications of CMW, and 15 provide discussions of the methodology. Four applications of PAE are included in the sample, with 15 discussions of the methodology and one glossary passage considered for analysis. The texts in the sample will be presented and compared more closely in the literature review that follows this chapter.
Analytical framework

The texts in this sample will be analysed qualitatively - no quantitative analysis of the content of the texts in the sample will be conducted. In the following table I have laid out the dimensions which will structure the analysis of the sample. First, each study in the sample will be analysed along the categories in Dimension 3, and will then be related to each other based on the categories in Dimension 2 (within and between the categories of Dimension One).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Memory Work</th>
<th>PAE/IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980ies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990ies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000ies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010ies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book (chapters)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Sample of texts for the analysis*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 1: Mode of enquiry</th>
<th>Dimension 2: Relations</th>
<th>Dimension 3: Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Collective Memory Work</td>
<td>- Comparison: similarities, differences</td>
<td>- Epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Political Activist/Institutional Ethnography</td>
<td>- Opposition: contradictions and complementarity</td>
<td>- Ontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluation: strengths/ weaknesses</td>
<td>- Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Links: junctures and disjunctures</td>
<td>- Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prospect: potentials/ barriers for combination</td>
<td>- Social context of research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Dimensions of the analytical framework*

The results from the analysis of the sample of texts based on the framework presented above will serve to formulate a synthesis of CMW and PAE.
Chapter Four:  
Analysis and Literature Review

This chapter merges a review of the literature in the study's sample with an analysis of that literature. First, I will present the very few writings in which CMW and IE are discussed together, or where Dorothy Smith or Frigga Haug refer to one another. Next, I sketch the material through an overview of the literature as a sample for analysis, which is combined with an excursus on the relationship between activism, research, academia, and social change, as well as the different conceptualizations of ideology in CMW and PAE. Following this, I analyse the same literature through the analytical framework presented in the previous chapter. This analysis proceeds by topic in a series of steps. The positions of CMW and PAE are presented, followed by the strengths and weaknesses, potentials and pitfalls, and possible links and contradictions between the two modes of enquiry. Epistemological, ontological, and methodological considerations are discussed first. Specific conceptual themes are integrated into the methodological discussion or dealt with at a later moment. As the foundational texts by George and Dorothy Smith, as well as Frigga Haug, have already been presented, the analysis here tries to include contributions by other authors wherever possible. At the end of the chapter, the most important outcomes of the analysis are summarized.

Existing references
An attempt to analyse and synthesize CMW and IE must begin with the already existing literature. The texts in the sample used in this analytical chapter include discussions and
applications (in a social movement context) of either CMW or PAE/IE. The sample does not contain texts in which the two modes of enquiry are discussed or applied together in a systematic way - such a text does not yet exist. In fact, in one section of a chapter in her *Lectures as Introduction to Memory Work* (1999d, p. 43ff), Frigga Haug provides starting points for such a discussion. In her chapter on everyday life as an important location for feminist research, Haug presents Smith's IE, Carol Gilligan’s work on dissociation, and her own CMW approach. She then begins to discuss them together in a short conclusion.

As far as I could ascertain, Dorothy Smith refers to Frigga Haug's work once in her writings. In *Text, Facts, Femininity* (D. Smith, 2002, p. 43), she quotes a passage from Haug's *Female Sexualization*” (Haug, 1987). In this reference she is not making a methodological argument and does not refer to CMW as a methodology, but rather refers to Haug's argument about the social construction of the female body. Haug never discussed PAE; she edited a collection of Dorothy Smith's earlier texts, translated into German (D. Smith, 1998). This collection of Smith's writings is still the only one available in German.

Whenever I found entries about IE and CMW in handbooks and scientific dictionaries on feminist/gender studies or qualitative research, the two modes of enquiry were mostly discussed as empirical research methods, never related to each other. I could not find any such entries about PAE.

I will briefly concentrate on Haug's brief discussion of CMW and IE. In the first section of the chapter mentioned above (Haug, 1999d, p. 43ff), Haug analyses Marxist and ethnomethodological contributions to the investigation of everyday life in relation to
“greater society.” She argues that these two theoretical paradigms treat people's real actions in everyday life as an important sphere for social analysis and intervention. In both cases the danger was to declare everyday life a separate social sphere and its analysis a distinct discipline. Only few Marxists, such as Antonio Gramsci or Henri Lefebvre, attempted to overcome the separation of the analysis of everyday life and social relations, as well as theory and practice (of changing social relations and oneself simultaneously). Often everyday life was not perceived as in itself a social battlefield. It was constructed as a site disrupted or determined by social relations “from above.” In the second section of the chapter, Haug discusses feminist methodologies (including CMW and IE). With the then-upcoming second wave of feminism, feminist scholars and activists criticized the invisibility of women in the existent theoretical concepts of everyday life. With their claim that the personal is political, the everyday life of women didn't just become a site of political struggle; women's everyday life experiences also gained legitimacy as a source of knowledge. Rooted in this soil, distinctive feminist methodologies – much more than applications of standard scientific methods on “women's issues” - emerged. Haug discusses three of those feminist methodologies: CMW, Carol Gilligan's work on dissociation, and Dorothy Smith's IE. These research approaches share the view that a paradigm shift on all levels of scientific production is needed. They developed out of, or are associated with, concrete social struggles. They take contradictions and disruptions in women's lived experience as a point of departure for the investigation of society. In all three approaches the role of the researcher vis-a-vis the “research object” and the community where she/he is intervening is conceptualized
differently than in mainstream social science. The critique of ideology and language are of central concern to these feminist methodologies. Borders of disciplines are constantly crossed, methodical designs are flexible and diverse, and the methods and methodologies themselves are permanently in development (Haug, 1999d, p. 70). For Haug, two similarities are particularly important. One is the central role of language. In today's conjuncture of postmodern and poststructuralist theorizing, it should not be surprising that methodologies in qualitative social research are centred on the analysis of language, specifically text. Though for these “post-”-traditions it is unusual to conduct research about language in the form of a critique of ideology. CMW and IE discuss language as a means of domination as well as liberation, and concepts as social powers. Nevertheless, Haug and Smith have different positions on the rewriting of concepts, language, and methods to better understand female socialization and patriarchal social relations, and on using theorization as a tool of liberation.

Another aspect IE and CMW share, according to Haug, is that contradictions, disruptions, conflict, and separation in the experience of women play an important role in the development of the research problematic and act as a guide for the research itself. They agree on the assumption that under relations of domination and power, women's experiences are damaged, which in turn disables them, to some extent, in transforming the conditions of their life (Haug, 1999d, p. 69).

Haug emphasizes that IE's intention with respect to theory production differs from what she aspires to with CMW. One purpose of CMW is to produce better theory from a woman's perspective - Dorothy Smith is more sceptical about theory production in her
ethnographic research. IE focusses on investigating the trans-local, conceptual forms of power that (dis)organize the experiences of women. CMW, in contrast, focusses on the investigation of the experiences themselves. It critically analyses experiences and related theories. One of CMW's goals is to develop a better theoretical understanding of those experiences, based on earlier critique (Haug, 1999d, p. 64).

Overview of the texts in the sample

As a feminist sociologist, I have found two approaches to have changed the sociological landscape fundamentally. One is the approach of Dorothy Smith and her critique of sociological traditions for their practice of 'writing the social' (Smith 1987; 1989; 1990a; 1990b; 1999; 2005) and the other is the method of memory-work developed by Frigga Haug (1987). Taken together, they are the tinder that could set sociology ablaze. But since they both present and propose “methods of inquiry” (to use Dorothy Smith's expression) rather than grand theory or doxic conceptual systems, their approaches are more demanding than other more traditional means of writing the social. It is when it is put to use that its productive nature is illuminated - or, in other words, it is the results that prove the value of the approach as such. (Widerberg, 2008, p. 113)

Karin Widerberg's promising announcement of having brought Smith's and Haug's work together—made at the beginning of her contribution to a collection of international discussions and applications of CMW (Hyle, 2008)—is unfortunately unrealized. Though her references to Dorothy Smith from this quote account for half the list of references in
her text, Smith's work is not mentioned more than once. Therefore the fire remains unlit, but this spent match still exists. One of the tasks of this chapter is to recover this match and make it flammable again. In accordance with the quote above, the methodological issues will be discussed by referring to concrete applications and their results. The final product will most probably not set sociology on fire, but perhaps can be used to support critical social movement dynamics in future. Interestingly, those dynamics are absent in large parts of this international collection of CMW writings. Therefore I only included Widberg's discussion of CMW in research and teaching contexts in the sample for this analysis. The fields of applications in this volume range from education to marketing, but mostly remain in the academic environment. This is absolutely legitimate and sometimes proves very productive, but it makes the publication less interesting for the purposes of my thesis. Widberg's discussion of CMW in the Norwegian academic research and teaching context concentrates on questions of method and practical application. This is probably one of the reasons why she can propose an individual version of CMW (which evidently lacks the decisive methodological, epistemological, and political element of Haug's approach – the researching collective) and legitimises this with considerations on research efficiency and practicability (Widerberg, 2008, p. 114f). Nevertheless this proposal can prove very fruitful when discussing the role of collectivity in CMW. Widerberg shares this focus on CMW as a method (rather than discussing more theoretical and methodological questions) with most of the other contributions in this collection and even in the sample for this thesis. Although Frigga Haug contributed a translation of her detailed rendering of methodic steps in CMW to this collection, some
articles maintain a rather loose relation to Haug's approach (more in the tradition of biography methods and discourse analysis) while others can be considered to further develop on Haug's CMW approach. Geographically, the contributions come mainly from the United States and Australia.

What immediately strikes the reader when looking at the list of CMW texts from Germany in the sample for this thesis is that they are almost entirely authored solely by Frigga Haug. Though the corresponding research has been conducted in various changing feminist collectives, Haug was responsible for publishing it. One of the reasons for Haug's dominant visibility and for my choices for the sample is that most of the CMW in German publications that were later translated into English have been authored by Frigga Haug (and I gave preference to texts which are also available in English). Another reason is Frigga Haug's active role or dominant position in the scientific field and in the Argument publishing house, which publishes most of the Memory Work texts in Germany. But even outside this publishing house it is very difficult to find German CMW publications which were not at least co-authored by Frigga Haug. Given the fact that CMW relies on a collective of research participants and that this collectivity is a core element of the methodology, doubts remain as to which extent this publishing practice contradicts the emphasis on collectivity and its embeddedment in social movement contexts. Making non-academic participants partners in the research process would

---

14 E.g. Kornelia Hauser, student and later collaborator of Frigga Haug and feminist activist has participated in Memory Work groups from the beginning and has appeared as co-author of Frigga Haug in German publications (see Frigga Haug & Hauser, 1986, 1988a; Frigga. Haug & Hauser, 1988b; Frigga Haug & Hauser, 1991). Many elements of these co-authored research publications are used or referred to in the (translated) contributions by Haug, which are part of the study's sample. Other influential co-researchers for the first CMW publications were: Andresen, Bünz-Efferding, Lang, Laudan, Lüdenabbbm Neur, Nemitz, Neihoft, Prinz, Räthzel, Scheu and Thomas.
provide an opportunity to share ownership of the process and its results beyond the borders of academia. Therefore Onyx and Small’s question is legitimate: “To what extent is it possible for a group of non-academic women to meaningfully share ownership in the process?” (Onyx & Small, 2001, p. 780) Memory Work groups in other German speaking feminist contexts have found more collective and less academic approaches to articulate and publish their research and learning outcomes. The autonomous feminist collective “Action of Independent Women” (Aktion Unabhängiger Frauen) in Vienna used their self-published feminist magazine “AUF” as a platform to debate results from their CMW Group. This raises important questions about the ownership of collective research in a social movement context and the effects of academics as participants who use the group's work as material for their personal academic projects.

**Excursus: Academia, Research, Activism and Social Change.**

Having access to academia can be an important resource for social movement activities. Besides material resources, academic reputation can be used in public to gain legitimacy in public discourse. Mutual knowledge transfer can improve the social movement's ability to act and may deliver important insights for academic research. But if this relationship develops in a one-sided manner, social movement and academic activities can also have a negative impact on each other. Where movements simply serve as a data source for academic research (which sometimes doesn't even intend to create benefits for the movement, or which – consciously or unconsciously - attempts to control or fight

---

15 The selection criteria for the sample in this thesis just allowed published scientific publications. This discriminates other forms of presentation of CMW projects and creates a bias towards more academic applications of the methodology. Particularly within the context of social movements forms of publications are diverse. But alternative sources are also difficult to access, especially from abroad. Furthermore, analysis and comparison becomes more difficult the more the sources differ in form.
movement activities) their relationship can easily adopt an exploitative or oppressive form. On the other hand, if research ends up simply reproducing a specific ideology cultivated within the movement, and this setting doesn't leave space for productive criticism, research becomes degraded to a propaganda technique.

Sometimes the introduction of academic institutional logics may contradict the collective ownership of a research or learning process in social movements. Much-appreciated single authorship in academia may alter collective dynamics in movements. Academic restrictions imposed by funding or ethics regulations can contradict social movement practices, and, if funding is available, its distribution between research(ers) and activists is a frequent source of conflict. Many of these concerns have been discussed in the context of Memory Work groups. In the case of the first Memory Work groups around Frigga Haug, financial imbalances were not a central concern because all participants were working as activists on a voluntary basis. Academic restrictions on the work were limited because the memory work groups were just indirectly attached to academic institutions. The women’s groups also had significant control over the publication process itself because Frigga Haug, while simultaneously being a group participant, played a leading role in the publishing house where the studies were published. In her various roles, Frigga Haug maintained a central position in the development of CMW in German-speaking countries, and she was also the main agent to spread the methodology to other areas of the world. Gramsci’s term “organic intellectual,” which Haug uses to describe the theoretically and organisationally leading function of a facilitator and organizer in CMW, probably aptly describes her own role. This also
involves the contradictory functions of leading, facilitating, and representing a group or movement while being an equal participant when it comes to the sharing of memories in the research process. The close relationship to _Argument_ and the professional association with academia of some participants definitely influenced the choice of the groups’ practices (writing, analysing texts, and publishing in scientific and political publications), and how they articulated their research results. The groups had more control over institutional conditions than most authors have who aim to publish in an academic context. And many participants were well organized in the academic field as well as in the women's and socialist movement context, so that they could eliminate some of the potential incongruity between movement and academic logics through collective effort.

In PAE, the institutional conditions of research are more intensively debated than in CMW. Campbell (2006) and Church (Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006) made the institutional conditions of activist research a part of their empirical investigations. Church in particular emphasizes the conflict between academic requirements and activism or activist research. She mentions that George Smith himself never used his university credentials in his fieldwork. He insisted on researching as an activist, though he also emphasized to separate research activity and the engagement in activist campaigns. His activism in the gay rights movement in Toronto and his related research became a hindrance for his academic career. (Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006, p. 74ff.) Church herself experienced similar incongruities in her ethnographic research:

In terms of psychiatric survivor community, my university affiliations and professional credentials were more hindrance than help anyway. I needed
something closer to street credentials, which I definitely did not have. I entered the survivor community on legitimacy that I borrowed from one recognized survivor leader, who introduced me to others, who tested me in various ways and from whom I began to take instructions about how to be in the community. (Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006, p. 76)

These challenges to fieldwork in academic research are definitely not unique to PAE. Frampton, Kinsman, and Thompson point to another tension which Political Activist Ethnographies shares with other ethnographic academic research or other non-standardized, qualitative research approaches. Regulations like the “Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Research Conduct” provide the framework in which Canadian universities formulate and realize their procedures with regard to research ethics. These regulations favour standardized research designs so that the ethical approval process of ethnographic work often becomes a serious obstacle in the research process. Connecting the research design to activism usually does not mitigate the problem, however. While ethical considerations about people involved in the research process are very important for activist research, the usual objections the university ethical boards articulated were not so much related to concerns about “risks” for research participants, as about liability issues for the university (Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006a, p. 265). Therefore many studies which had been planned as PAEs had to be redesigned or were rejected due to ethical concerns. Frampton, Kinsman, and Thompson describe funding regulations as another important and often restrictive institutional condition for PAE. They argue that these regulations reflect the neoliberal corporatization of
universities, which makes it more difficult to create and sustain infrastructure for activist research at universities (Framton et al., 2006a, p. 262f). Kinsman expands this critique of the restrictive function of funding regulations in his research about the co-optation of AIDS-related community organisations and movements into public AIDS management strategies (Kinsman, 1997). The basic argument is that although the community organizations and researchers succeed in receiving public funds in intensive struggles, their dependence on public or corporate funding and related regulations significantly limits their repertoire of action, community orientation, political positioning, and their autonomy in general.

Activism and research

In PAE, the relation between activism and research is discussed more intensively than in CMW, though its realization in concrete studies does not always correspond to the positions taken in more conceptual discussions. In most studies, the activist researcher plays a supporting role for activism, maintains ownership of the research process individually, and provides the results of her/his research to the movement. According to George Smith, the activist ethnographer develops the “scientific basis for the political strategy of grass-roots organizing” (G. W. Smith, 1990, p. 629). Smith maintains a functional division of labour between an activist researcher and a movement activist. The same person may fulfil both functions at different times. While most studies in IE and PAE exercise this functional division of labour (e.g. Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006) and others emphasize work “on behalf of” movements (e.g. Campell, 2006; Bisaillon, 2012), some criticize this differentiation and aim to eliminate the distinction between activism
and research (Frampton et al., 2006a; Kinsman, 2006). As Mykhalovskiy & Church explain:

As he [George Smith] put it, the work of the activist researcher was to do a careful, detailed and reliable ethnography of how ruling regimes work. Directly using this knowledge was not his or her responsibility but a matter of concern for movement activists. In some ways this split between research production resonates with the metaphor of science that George draws upon to discuss the relationship of scholarship to activism. […] There is something to be said for pursuing PAE relatively unfettered by the ideological commitments of a given social movement, of not having one's inquiry driven by movement theorizing or engaging too closely in its political work of using research. (2006, p. 80)

In fact, the only studies where researchers could maintain a consistent position in the relation between activism and academia are those where the activist research was conducted separately from the movement activity and “in support” or “on behalf of” activists. These studies tend to apply a more conventional IE approach within social movements. George Smith himself conducted some of his research in movements where he was activist at the same time and where his activism was very strongly interwoven with the research activity (G. W. Smith, 1990). But he also conducted activist ethnographic studies in which research and activism were separate processes (see Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006). He wanted to use “political confrontation as an ethnographic resource” (G. W. Smith, 1990, p. 629) to explore the ruling relations which
activists encounter in their struggle and which they try to transform. Frampton et. al (2006a) formulate the merging of the activist function and the research function as a future goal and perspective for PAE. While they are interested in dissolving the distinction between activism and research, they maintain this differentiation throughout their argument. Despite the diverging positions on how the relation between research and activism has to work, in empirical studies the actual negotiation of this relation happens in the specific context of the field. The relation can change its form within the same project due to changing needs and circumstances in activism and research. As long as this negotiation between activism and research happens and those given needs are somehow addressed, the relation can take various forms in PAE.

In CMW this question is framed differently. Those participating in the Memory Work group are considered to be co-researchers. The CMW process can be combined with other social movement activities, but is essentially a distinctive process which can also be realized apart from these activities. A core element in CMW is to integrate a transformative act (collective consciousness raising) into the research process itself. Therefore, the desired change does not happen separately from the research, as in some interpretations of PAE, but, to some extent, is part of the research itself. So, investigating the relation between activism and research leads to the question of whether or not CMW is considered to be an activist practice itself. The answer depends on whether collective consciousness raising (and the related challenging of dominant morals or cultural practices) is perceived as social change or relevant transformation. It might be fruitful to discuss this in each specific context in the light of Marx's third thesis on Feuerbach and
his claim that the changing of oneself and the changing of the circumstances fall together.

In all the studies in our sample which used CMW, research was a separate activity, happening within or related to a social movement, but it was not directly interwoven with more activist interventions or confrontations (direct actions, negotiations, etc.). The relation between activism and research has not been discussed directly in any of the studies in the sample.

Social change and activism.

Examining how ontological and epistemological assumptions in PAE are realized in studies and how activism and social change are understood allows for a better grasp on why the relation between activism and research is perceived as more problematic (and is therefore more broadly discussed) than in CMW. In most PAEs we find a distinction between ruling relations or political-administrative regimes on the one hand, and the everyday interactions of activists on the other. Activists are usually perceived as intervening into institutional relations from a position outside of them. In some studies, like in George Smith's and Gary Kinsman's research in the gay rights movement, activists are affected in their everyday life by the specific ruling relations they are challenging. In other projects they fulfill more kind of an advocacy role (see Bisaillon, 2012). The object of research as well as the target for activism (or object of intended change) are specific institutional practices (or aspects of ruling relations or political-administrative regimes). Kinsman's mapping of relations of struggle in the queer movement and the specific role of non-government organizations in AIDS campaigns and policies are an important exception (Kinsman, 1997, 2006). In the original conception of Dorothy and George
Smith, textually-mediated ruling relations, and everyday, experiential, embodied, reflexive knowledges are two distinctive, even opposed, forms of knowing. In many later PAEs they appear almost as distinctive realities. Consequently the relational quality of political-administrative regimes disappears and the activist (and the activist researcher) can be perceived as coming from 'outside'. The desired change occurs in a specific section of the political-administrative regime (often specific institutional practices or processes in organizations), and the researcher and activist appear from outside to investigate the regime and induce this change. The changing of circumstances (ruling relations) doesn't necessarily involve the changing of the activist /her/himself. Consequently, the relation between research, activism, and social change becomes a tension in need of explanation. This explanation or discussion becomes difficult when the Political Activist Ethnographer uses these conceptual terms, but rejects theoretical abstractions. To avoid the problems of idealism and speculation they associate with abstraction or theorizing, George and Dorothy Smith refer to the ethnomethodological concept of “indexicality” (D. Smith, 2005). An indexical term points at a specific empirical reality (and vice versa) and its meaning can only be established in a particular context. So, depending on the empirical study, activism and social change can mean something very different. Mutual discussions must be satisfied with a collection of different activist practices found in empirical studies. If these practices somehow fit together, one can start “mapping” their relation. If they do not fit together, discussants using the same word are simply talking about different things. So, activism in PAE may include activities in relation to occupying a house and organizing a homeless community.
(Clarke, 2006), participating in union flying squads, and occupying a workplace or government offices (Kuhling & Levant, 2006), organizing a global justice demonstration against a meeting of the World Trade Organization (Campell, 2006), or supporting and engaging in fair trade initiatives (Hussey, 2012).

The next question is how these different activist phenomena relate to desired changes in ruling relations. Most PAEs do not get to the point where they may have to ask this question – the stop at the “mapping” or empirical exploration of certain institutional relations. An investigation of the processes of change themselves would require a concept of change, of the development of social relations in time and space. Dorothy Smith’s historical trajectory of the development of ruling relations may give hints (see D. Smith, 2005, p. 13ff). But on these few pages Smith tentatively describes the emergence of ruling relations as a historical differentiation of the social organization of knowing, while only marginally mentioning social struggles related to this process. For PAE this does not provide a suitable framework for understanding change. One would assume that activism and social struggles would have to play a more prominent role in such a framework. Smith addressed her understanding of “change from below” in a short article in Socialist Studies (D. Smith, 2008), where she developed on how the dilemma of IE’s understanding of social change had become apparent. Smith repeats her historical account of the differentiation of textually mediated ruling relations over the last 150 years without much reference to social struggles until she discusses the rise of neoliberalism and the current “managerial” forms of ruling. She identifies the establishment of neoliberal forms of regulation as an ideological class struggle from above. Granting that
this struggle was mainly launched by actors in national and multinational state organizations, she then concludes that in today's age of globalization, national states are no longer particularly important fields when it comes to questions of social change. As such, it does not make sense for movements to try to conquer state power. Unfortunately, she did not discuss the role of social movements in the struggles leading to “neoliberalism” and “globalization.” She subsequently provides a comprehensive overview of different institutional ethnographic and political activist ethnographic studies which analyse the new “managerial” form of ruling and struggles against it. Despite the fact that Smith diagnosed the declining role of the nation state for social change, many of those studies deal with institutions (such as hospitals) for which the nation-state still plays a dominant role. The shift from a “bureaucratic” to “managerial” form of ruling (the use of this conceptual differentiation apparently was unproblematic for Smith) doesn't necessarily imply a weakening of the nation-state. Smith assembles studies which describe managerial modes of ruling, and the struggles against them, in a detailed and colourful way. She refers to the important role of mobilizing the lived experience of affected communities, as well as the ambiguous position of NGOs. Organizing is discussed in the context of the tension between co-optation to the ruling regime and the creation of alternatives. This is a much more relational/dialectical perception of ruling and organizing than we can find in many IE and PAEs. Nevertheless, until the end of her argument it remains obscure how activism and social change (i.e. the transformation of ruling relations) relate to each other. Smith emphasizes that well-conducted ethnographies about ruling relations can inform and support successful activism and
social change. From my position, it is still unclear how social movement activism and the changing of ruling relations can be understood in this framework.\footnote{Given this vagueness, discussions about whether the system should be changed from 'inside' or 'outside', which was debated at the activist ethnography conference in Sudbury, Canada, in 2002, do not promise fruitful results (see Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006b). Moreover, the clear-cut distinction between 'inside' and 'outside' of 'the system' reproduces the original problem of how to relate activism and social change and prevents a more dialectical perception of this relation.}

As I already mentioned, Kinsman (1997, 2006) (and to some extent also Choudry (2008)) chose a different approach in their PAE work, which breaks with many of the characteristics of other PAEs. He identifies himself as researcher and activist simultaneously and advocates for working towards merging these two roles. His approach of mapping the relations of struggle uses a more relational understanding of ruling relations than other PAEs. In his studies about the queer movement and the management of AIDS, he didn't limit his investigation to the specific institutional practices activists confront. He related these institutional practices to how the gay communities organized themselves and the role of NGOs in this process.\footnote{Hussey and Choudry also discussed the ambiguous role of NGOs in social movement conflicts. While a certain degree of institutionalization is necessary or even intended by social movements in order to induce sustainable alternatives and changes in ruling relations, an “NGOisation” of movements can counteract their progressive dynamics and provide an organizational entry point for co-optation into dominant ruling relations. Hussey analyses these organizational processes within the Canadian Fair Trade movement in relation to certification procedures (Hussey, 2012). Choudry analyses the role of NGOs and other forms of social movement organizing in the anti-globalization movement, more specifically in transnational alliances against the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum in the 1990s. He particularly focusses on learning processes within diverse organizational contexts in social movements (A. Choudry, 2009, 2012; 2008).} He thereby avoided an inside/outside dichotomy and located the activist researcher within ruling relations (which he called relations of struggle). And he operated with a clear theoretical framework to conceptualize the relation between activism and social change which he adopted from autonomous Marxism (see Cleaver in the US; in Europe it is known as “workerism” in the Italian tradition, following Tronti). Workerism or autonomous Marxism definitely
emphasizes the significance of activists’/workers’ struggles for transformations in society/capitalism. Kinsman even integrated a notion of learning as consciousness-raising when he introduced political breaching experiments (informed by ethnomethodology) as a form of “disrupting research, disruption as research” (Kinsman, 2006, p. 152). Other Political Activist Ethnographers or Institutional Ethnographers may criticize the fact that Kinsman used a conceptual/theoretical framework, but they have to admit that his choice comes closer to a dialectical understanding of social relations than most of the existing studies based on these two modes of enquiry. For the major part of PAE/IE studies, it is true that they adopt a materialist understanding of the social (ie. composed of concrete and coordinated human practices) from Marx and Garfinkel. Nonetheless, conceptions of inside/outside, an appreciation of the socially concrete and a simultaneous scepticism towards abstraction (similar to Garfinkel), and the consequently absent conceptions of activism and social change, indicate that these studies lack a dialectical understanding of social relations (if they claimed to strive for such a thing).

As I already explained, many of the issues discussed above are less problematic for CMW. The relation between activism, research, and social change becomes more relevant when investigating what CMW can contribute to transformations beyond collective consciousness raising, theoretical work, group organizing, and research which might inform other movement activities. This question is not addressed in the Memory Work studies in this sample, because CMW doesn't claim to address it. Memory Work is certainly less sceptical of the use of theory, which enables the critical investigation and potentially fruitful adoption of different theoretical frameworks of social change. In the
German context, CMW groups often worked with notions of social change derived from Holtzkamp's critical psychology and Gramsci's philosophy of praxis. The basic assumptions of Memory Work certainly favour more voluntaristic theories, as opposed to structuralist (and particularly economistic) conceptions of social change. In contrast to PAE, Memory Work has the capacities to empirically capture aspects of social change. Memories function as a connector between past experiences and present consciousness and therefore incorporate an element of time and (in a dialectical understanding) consequently a moment of change. The critical analysis of memories enables one to capture how the past is appropriated in our present, and in some studies has even been used to point towards possible future developments (Haug, 1992b).

**CMW: Germany and beyond**

In the English CMW literature, the most referred-to text is Haug's *Female Sexualization* (Haug, 1987). It provided the first comprehensive description and application of the CMW approach in the English language. As I have already pointed out, the text is a translation of the second volume of a series of CMW publications about female socialization. This research was based on the feminist groups surrounding Haug, which were working together on this topic in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The basic argument is that the socialization of women is tightly related to their body and that the female body is constantly sexualized in this process. As such, women are participating in their own ideological subjection. The close relation of the female body and ideological constructions about/of women reappears in many CMW research efforts. Participants in the first Memory Work groups organized their projects around specific body parts (such
as “the body project,” “the hair project” or “the legs project”). The presentation of this group research was followed by discussion of Foucault's then recent theories on sexuality and power as well as a critique of Marxist concepts of sexuality. Many of the later German CMW emerged out of these projects, which may be a reason for its thematic consistency. In the second-most cited collection of CMW in English, *Beyond Female Masochism* (Haug, 1992a), Haug assembles CMW projects, feminist political interventions (particularly talks she gave at the Berlin People's University), articles about her earlier research about work and automation, and more conceptual essays. Here I concentrate on the text based on CMW. In “The Höchst Chemical Company and Boredom with the Economy” (Haug, 1992e, p. 13ff), Haug introduces the methodology of Memory Work as critique of the public discussion of social and, more often, economic issues, where these relations appear completely detached from everyday life. This text is followed by the most pronounced example of Memory Work in which Haug dissects the tight relation of female moral socialization and the ideological practices acting on women's bodies. “Morals also have two genders” (Haug, 1992c, p. 31ff) analyses how women disappear in general accounts on morality. Simultaneously morality appears for women in everyday practices (like dressing, or sitting postures at a table) and is organized around the female body. In contrast, male morality is more closely related to categories such as business, money, and property. “Their [the women's P.T.] corporeality is the foundation of their identity as well as their subordination to men and their isolation” (Haug, 1992c, p. 51). Haug identifies collective strategies to overcome women's isolation and feelings of guilt. For her, dissolving the gendered social formation of morality is a
necessary condition to fight male domination and to develop more equitable, pleasurable, and productive relationships.

One point of commonality in these studies is the central role the body plays in gendered ideological constructions. This is not surprising, considered the fact that both modes of enquiry emerged from the women's liberation movement in which political struggles around the female body were at the centre of the conflict. According to Haug, the ideological constructions of the female in gender relations are organized around the body. For Dorothy and George Smith, embodied forms of knowledge and everyday-life experience also play a crucial role as a starting point for their research. In contrast to Haug's analysis, Dorothy Smith associates ideological practices with trans-local, conceptual, and textual forms of knowing as opposed to embodied, experiential, and reflexive forms. This does not mean that Smith considers experience or embodied forms of knowing to be true or particularly authentic. But for George and Dorothy Smith, experience can capture the actualities of social coordination. Experience allows the researcher to investigate how the social world is coordinated. Ideological practices enter experiential forms of knowing via the coordinating function of ruling relations. The ideological is characteristic for textually mediated ruling relations. It is imposed on, more so than actively produced in, everyday life experience. Dialogically and reflexively constituted experiences play a rather passive role. Therefore PAE and IE experiences are analysed only insofar as they provide an entry point to the study of the trans-local (ideological) ruling relations.\[^{18}\] On the contrary, in Haug's analysis of women's memories, in PAE/IE the ideological is a quality of textually mediated ruling relations and liberatory potential is associated with distinct experiential forms of knowing. This separation becomes problematic when one wants to analyse liberatory potential in institutionalized forms (e.g. certain social movement organizations) or the contribution of experience in the (re)production of ideology.
experiencing and remembering these experiences is a central activity in the creation of ideological (and very real) constructions of femininity. This process is not separate from gendered relations of production. It actually is part of these relations. For Haug the social function of ruling is not so much detached from the everyday life experiences as it is in Smith's concept of ruling relations. Therefore, in CMW, embodied experiences play a much more ambiguous role in the active (re)production of ideology and as liberating potential. Collective work is required to unleash this liberating potential – CMW.¹⁹

In “Daydreams” (Haug, 1992b, p. 53ff) the Memory Work Group was not working with lived experiences, but with memories from the participants’ daydreams. According to Ernst Bloch, daydreams contain an emancipatory potential because in these dreams people imagine utopian elements of a better world and acts of resistance against current injustice. The group members worked with resistance daydreams to investigate how they relate to real resistance and in which ways women's dreams of resistance, especially when imagined as individual and isolated struggle, can also have a domesticating function.

Tying women to the domestic sphere is another common motive in Haug's works on women's fears (Haug, 1999c, p. 71ff), on their sense of responsibility (Haug, 1992d, p. 75ff), and notions of performance (Haug, 1999b, p. 101ff). In these pieces of CMW, Haug connects very intimate experiences and feelings with gendered relations of production and politics. The analysis of the memories suggests that women are associated

¹⁹ Haug as well as George and Dorothy Smith derive their theoretical understanding of experience or experiential forms of knowing from different theoretical paradigms. This, to a certain extent, explains their different framing of the issue. George and Dorothy Smith operate with a distinction between reflexive forms of knowing, which are associated with direct social interaction in everyday life, and objective forms, which is mediated institutionally. Haug, when talking about every-day life experience, primarily refers to Antonio Gramsci's concept of common sense.
with the domestic as sphere of production. Simultaneously, the construction of the household as an intimate, private space conceals the work women are performing. Fears are associated with women leaving this domestic sphere and appearing in the public, while female responsibilities are idealized as sacrificial domestic work. Such (self) constructions perpetuate existing divisions of labour. In Haug's analysis of experiences of sexual politics, abuse, and harassment she identifies a shift from a Fordist to a post-Fordist, neoliberal mode of production and a correspondingly gendered relations of production (Haug, 1999a, p. 127ff, 2001). Automated production came along with a virtual commodification of sexual abuse. The more sexual aggression became subject to trade relations, the more it was de-politicized and pathologized on an individual level of sexual drives. CMW studies intended to counteract this detachment of social relations of production from personal experiences in order to find viable paths to liberation on an individual and larger social scale.

Based on the two collections of Haug's writings, CMW spread in the English-speaking academic world during the 1990s. Onyx and Small, both actively practising CMW in Australia, delivered an overview of the reception of CMW in Australia and New Zealand and provided an influential description of the method (Onyx & Small, 2001). In Australia and New Zealand, CMW was mainly adopted in academia in diverse disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields like nursing, education, sociology, psychology, tourism studies, marketing, management, and leisure studies. The researchers treated CMW as a research method at a time when Haug had not provided a 'step by step' description of her methodical approach yet. Therefore diverse methodical interpretations
and adaptations of the method emerged in CMW studies in Australia and New Zealand. Due to the academic fields it was being applied in and the development of the feminist movement of the time, CMW did not become very established as a social movement practice (Onyx & Small, 2001, p. 778). The Australian researchers continued the focus CMW projects on feelings and experiences related to the body. Crawford, Kippax, Onyx, Gault, and Benton (1990, 1992) produced a series of studies on the gendered construction of emotions in the late 1980s and early 1990s. One central emotion investigated in this research group was anger, particularly with relation to fear, injuries, and injustice, while exploring how gendered power relations structure these relationships. The study is reminiscent of Smith’s early IE of psychiatric diagnosis of female homemakers’ anger about exploitative and invisible domestic work, which I mentioned at the beginning of Chapter Two (D. Smith, 1990b). Frigga Haug herself was in close contact with the Australian scholars and shaped their further development of CMW. She adopted many of their innovations into her formulation of the methodology (Haug, 2008).

North America and Scandinavia were other regions where CMW found followers not only in academia but also in movement contexts. Again, the construction of the body and embodied practices were of central concern. Sometimes they remained within the established theoretical framework of Haug's formulation of CMW, like in Gillies et al’s research, *Cartesian dualism in memories of sweating and pain* (2004). In other the cases, like Berg's work on “Whiteness and Racialization” (Berg, 2008), researchers applied the method to new phenomena and fields, and integrated new theoretical frameworks. Berg's study is particularly significant insofar as processes of racialization had played a marginal
role in CMW before. This may be surprising, given the paramount importance the method attributes to the social construction of bodies. One reason may be the white bias in the women's liberation movement in Europe and North America, which has been frequently criticized by feminists of colour. Another important factor can be the very different discussion and meaning of race in Germany and in English-speaking countries, due to their different (colonial) histories and the differently racialized or ethnically stratified composition of the population. In her analysis of female memories of fear, Haug included memories of white women fearing racialized men, in which she dissected the interplay of racism and gender relations (Haug, 1999c). Berg's study of “Whiteness and Racialization” was based on the CMW of a group of white feminists in Norway, who first attempted to analyse the construction of ethnic minorities in Norway before they decided to shift their focus and develop a critique of their own “invisible” or normalized practices of whiteness. Mulinari and Räthzel (2007) conducted CMW from a Global North-South perspective when they investigated memories of politicization in Argentina and Germany. In so doing, they analysed the importance of political socialization in the historical development of global justice movements, and more specifically the construction of gendered and racialized subjectivities. According to their analysis, the movements of 1968 provided alternative subjectivities and forms of participation, particularly for those who would have had access to “normal,” though gendered, middle class lives but who did not identify with dominant identities. This didn't mean that movement culture and political socialization within the movements didn't develop a gendered expression. A male bias often forced and facilitated women to found separate organizations for and
collective identifications among female activists. Many of the more recent CMW projects in English-speaking contexts concentrate on the (de)construction of identities and subjectivities. These are central aspects of the method and they correspond to similar foci in feminist theorizing in the same period. Still, this reveals the risk in CMW of concentrating on discursive phenomena and paying less attention to connected social relations (of production).

Together with this more subjectively-oriented work, several studies emerged where researchers reflected their experiences with CMW in social movements and academia (Frost et al., 2012; Travis, 2003) or developed a methodical analysis using examples from their own research (Jansson, Wendt, & Åse, 2008; Stephenson, 2005). Diverse forms of methodical and methodological reflections of one’s own research are also popular among Political Activist Ethnographers. Stephenson's analysis of CMW on HIV and negotiations of guilt related to the infection, uses example from AIDS-related activism - a popular topic in methodological reflections on PAE. Many of George Smith's former collaborators and students also focused their interest on the gay movement and its struggles around political, administrative, and medical processes related to AIDS and HIV treatment (Kinsman, 1997, 2006; Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006; Walsh, 2009). Campbell reflected the political activist research process based on her engagement with and studies on the disability movement and its struggles around the organization of home support services. Besides this, she also reflected on activist ethnographies of the resistance against the World Trade Organization (Campell, 2006). The organization of struggles against institutions implementing a global free trade agenda is also the subject
of Choudry's doctoral dissertation (Choudry, 2008). There he analyses the ambiguous role of international NGOs in relation to the social movements and multinational organizations which try to implement free-trade policies. A critical view of tendencies of "NGOisation" of social movement activity can also be detected in Hussey's work about fair trade movements and product certification processes (Hussey, 2012) and Kinsman's studies within the gay rights movement (Kinsman, 1997, 2006). Beside his own research, Hussey methodologically analyses Campbell's and Kinsman's reflections of their own PAEs. Accordingly, as you read this reference to Hussey, reflection has already reached the third meta-level. These various levels of reflection combined with fragments from primary research projects complicate the meta-study intended for this thesis, as the primary research is often only accessible in fragments, presented as examples in methodological discussion.

Unions are another political field of action in which PAE has been applied. Frampton analyses the textual coordination of bargaining processes of university teaching support staff, and how teaching assistants were unable to negotiate tuition waivers (Frampton, 2007). Kuhling and Levant (2006) investigate political de-skilling processes through the bureaucratisation of unions and union representation. They relate it to the counter-effort of unions’ flying squads to politically re-skill workers and activate them as members in direct political actions which go beyond the classical field of union politics around questions of wage and employment conditions.

Bisaillion (2012) provides a comprehensive glossary of 52 important terms and concepts in the practice of IE and PAE. She intended it as a one-stop shop for those who
want to engage in empirical research using these modes of enquiry. While this glossary provides an interesting orientation and entry point for those interested in IE or PAE, it might not be sufficient to use it as a one-stop shop for researchers who are considering using these modes of enquiry in their research.

**Conceptual analysis**

In the first section of this chapter I presented and positioned the articles in the research sample in the context of their emergence in academia and social movements. Excurses have been used to discuss practical and theoretical problems related to the social embedding of PAE and CMW. The second part of this chapter is structured as an analysis of concepts which are central to both modes of enquiry based on the literature in the sample presented before. In order to avoid an overly schematic account and to draw connections, not just between the two modes of enquiry, but also between different concepts, the presentation of the arguments does not strictly follow the analytical grid outlined in Chapter Three. This second part of the chapter will start with arguments on a more abstract level (ontology and epistemology) and lead to more concrete considerations towards the end of the chapter. Special emphasis will be placed on relating PAE and CMW to each other, rather than presenting their positions separately. This should avoid a simple repetition of arguments from Chapter Two. If there are significant differences between the presentation of CMW and PAE in the studies of the research sample and the way concepts were introduced in the Chapter Two, this will be indicated. Given the limited space and time of a Masters thesis, this analysis provides preliminary insights which may be deepened and focused in future (empirical) projects. The aim of
the analysis is to present insights which facilitate an attempt to synthesize CMW and PAE in the concluding chapter of the thesis.

**Ontology and epistemology**

Beginning from the most abstract level of theorizing is certainly not how Political Activist Ethnographers or Collective Memory Workers would proceed in their research. Furthermore, mixing epistemological and ontological discussions under the same subheading is not common in other meta-study research. I chose to begin this discussion with ontological and epistemological issues because it is on this abstract level that important assumptions are made, which decisively influence whether the two modes of enquiry or methodologies can be synthesized or even combined. Many of the less abstract characteristics, like methodical decisions, rely on those assumptions. Thus, starting on this foundational level should clarify the use of other concepts and methodological/methodical decisions. Frigga Haug, and George and Dorothy Smith, emphasize the distinctiveness of their ontological and epistemological approach. Dorothy Smith stresses that IE is neither a methodology nor a method, but rather a mode of enquiry. Accordingly, epistemological and ontological considerations become more important as directions for research than particular methodical steps in fieldwork. This is also true for most Political Activist Ethnographies. The use of methods in the ethnographic fieldwork follows the requirements of the field context. This doesn't mean that those methods applied must be unconventional; they simply must be used reflexively in relation to the field. In CMW the claim of methodical flexibility led to a variety of methodical reflections and step by step models (e.g. Onyx & Small, 2001; Frost et al.,
2012; Frigga Haug, 1992e, 2008; Stephenson, 2005; Widerberg, 2008) which contradict the original emphasis on a philosophical and methodological framework.

Why merge epistemology and ontology into one subheading? One can often distinguish between the answer to questions of what, for example, the social is, and how we can know it. Furthermore, in CMW and PAE such a distinction is possible to a certain extent. But what if we ask “How does knowing work?” within those methodological frameworks? For CMW as well as PAE this question is a central epistemological and ontological question. Both approaches offer tools to investigate practices of knowing as an important subject area. For both, the social consists of the real practices of actual human beings, and both consider different forms of knowing (experience, memory, ideology, etc.) as material practices and part of the same reality. Not all knowable human practices are forms of knowing, so we should not argue that epistemological considerations and ontological assumptions are identical, but rather that they overlap or are internally related.20

George Smith's and PAE's materialist approach to knowledge in particular are informed by Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, which investigates the methods of how people appropriate or know the world reflexively in their everyday interactions. Frigga Haug's position in CMW derives from Holtzkamp's subject science, which relies on Marxist subject-object dialectics when investigating how people appropriate, produce, and transform social relations and themselves.21 PAEs emphasise the objective side

20 E.g. the work of changing a diaper and remembering the last time a diaper was changed are both real (socially coordinated) human practices and they cannot simply be dissolved into forms of knowing or an isolated cognitive system (like in radical constructivism).

21 Another important influence for Haug's ontological and epistemological position is Gramsci's philosophy of praxis.
(researching the institutional relations of political-administrative regimes and how they coordinate activists' experience - seen from the positions of the activists, which is considered to be outside the regime (see G. W. Smith, 1990; outside positioning is criticized and adapted in Kinsman, 2006; Hussey, 2012; Frampton, 2007), while more recent CMW studies (see Berg, 2008; Mulinari & Räthzel, 2007) in particular tend to gravitate to a more subjectivist approach (collectively investigating the social and subjective construction of memories). These different foci, on a similar ontological and epistemological basis, indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the two approaches and build the foundation for a synthesis or a compatibility which may open opportunities for methodical combination.

CMW enables the empirical study of the construction of memories. It does not provide an empirical method(ology) to investigate social relations which reach beyond the experienced or the remembered. In Haug's conception, the collective analysis of memories and the critical discussion and imposition of theory should create the basis for generalizations and abstraction (eg. from the shared experience and analysis of a specific group of women to capitalist racialized gender relations) which allow one to connect subjective constructions with relations and practices beyond the personally experienced. This requires a firm dialectical understanding by the co-researchers in the group - otherwise, the risk of limiting the analysis to subjective and mainly discursive phenomena (identity, subjectivities) is high.

PAE also begins its investigation within concrete experiences in everyday life or in specific conflictive situations. These lived experiences are the entry point to
empirically explore ruling relations or political-administrative regimes. The strength of the approach is that it opens an empirical avenue to ethnographically investigate textually mediated trans-local ruling relations by looking at texts (and the way they are activated) as concrete practices. Still, actual political activist ethnographic studies often pose the risk that analysis is captured within the political-administrative regime (Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006b). The activist and her/his initial experiences are constructed as “outside” the regime, and the institutional analysis does not relate back to the initial experience. As such, the subjective side (and therefore also reflexivity) in this ruling relation is lost. This limits the possibility of understanding the activist's ability to act within ruling relations.22 Furthermore, as experiential accounts mainly serve as methodological entry points to the investigation, they are perceived as actualities and not further critically analysed for their own active ideological formation. As we can see, the areas where CMW provides strong methodological solutions correspond to the limits of PAE, and vice versa. In fact, this does not mean that synthesizing or combining both approaches is possible, efficient, and beneficial, but indicates that they can learn from each other.

**Situated knowledge, conflict, and contradiction.**

PAE as well as CMW are based on an understanding of knowledge as situated. Both modes of enquiry use situated knowledge as their research object and as a resource for research, and perceive the research itself as creating situated knowledge. One of their

---

22 To adopt the allegory of Kinsman's formulation “mapping social relations of struggle” (Kinsman, 2006): In order to lead a successful fight it is helpful to possess an accurate map of the institutional regime you are struggling with, but this does not necessarily improve your subjective ability to fight. If one e.g. fears accessing/confronting official institutions, the best map alone will not be of great value.
aims is to uncover the situatedness of supposedly objective knowledge. As “situated knowledges imply articulation of the location one is speaking from” (Berg, 2008, p. 223), both PAE and CMW perceive the researchers’ experience as an important resource and object of investigation, and its explicit subjective presence in the research process as a crucial epistemological foundation. The situatedness of the subject within the social relations (including the research process) is part of the research object.

Accordingly, both formulate an epistemological standpoint theory, which uses lived experience as a starting point to investigate social relations. In CMW, the role of the researcher’s personal memories and those of the researched fall together, as all participants fill both roles in the process. This is true for all studies in the sample. In some PAEs, the role and function of the researcher and the activist merge (Kinsman, 2006). In some, the same person occupies both roles but separates the two functions (e.g. Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006; G. W. Smith, 1990), and in others, the researcher conducts a study but separates the two functions (for example, in all these cases the situated knowledge of activists and the researcher is an important resource). Most often, the researcher's experience (as an activist) is the starting point within the research process. Kinsman's “mapping social relations of struggle” (Kinsman, 2006) aims at investigating the relation between activism and a specific ruling regime, and perceives research in social movements as activism, so that activism and the research itself remain objects of research throughout the process. To some extent this is also true for those studies which analyse social movement organizations and their relation to or their role within ruling regimes and where the researcher/activist is active in those organizations.
(A. Choudry, 2008; Frampton, 2007; Hussey, 2012). In other PAEs, activist experiences serve as an entry point to investigate a specific element of a political-administrative regime in which the activist is in conflict. In these studies, the activism itself is not an object of research. The activist is constructed as “being located outside of and yet constantly in interaction and struggle with ruling regimes.” Thereby, “activists can explore the social organization of power as it is revealed through the moments of confrontation.” (Frampton et al., 2006b, p. 35). She/he uses “political confrontation as an ethnographic resource” (G. W. Smith, 1990, p. 629). “Research can be seen as disruption and disruption seen as research” (Frampton, Kinsman, & Thompson, 2006c, p. 97).

PAE and CMW share this moment of disruption, conflict, disjuncture, or contradiction as orientation for the direction of the research process. For PAE, conflict/disjuncture serves to formulate the problematic for the research and to guide further steps in the enquiry. In CMW, the excavation of contradictions in memory accounts points to collisions of contradictory social relations within coherently constructed experiences. In both cases, conflict and contradiction are a starting point of the research process and the place where the relation (and friction) between the subjective appropriation of reality in everyday life experience and social relations becomes apparent and accessible for investigation. Though the direction of the following exploration is different, CMW aims at excavating generalizable social relations in memories. PAE goes beyond such experiential accounts and aims to explore trans-local (textually mediated) relations of ruling. These research strategies lead in different directions, but their different foci may complement each other.
Nevertheless, a synergy between CMW and PAE would have to cope with several hindrances on an epistemological and ontological level. In fact these hindrances may be accommodated if we refer to how the modes of enquiry are actually applied in empirical study rather than articulated as absolute positions in methodological reflections.

**Role of abstraction and theory.**

In his foundational text *Political Activist as Ethnographer* (G. W. Smith, 1990), George Smith denounces the use of theory in activist research as “speculative” and pleads for reflexive ethnographies which produce indexical accounts of the social relations and practices activists are confronted with and are acting within. Furthermore, he constructs the position of the activist as outside of the ruling regime. He associates ruling regimes with apparently objective forms of knowing and puts them into contrast to reflexive forms of knowing which he associates with the everyday life experience of activists. These are two problems which may be incompatible with CMW if interpreted very strictly. In fact, in many empirical PAEs, those positions are relativised.23

Smith derives his scepticism towards theorizing and related vocabulary from ethnomethodology, a sociological paradigm or methodology which manages to function without an extensive theoretical framework. According to this line of thinking,

23 In this chapter I omit the discussion about interpretation and exploration in Political Activist and IE and how this relates to interpretation in CMW. In IE some authors reject interpretation as an analytical strategy (Campbell & Gregor, 2004) and favour the concept of "exploration" of practices and relations of ruling, while others argue that PAE and IE performed an "ontological shift" (Mykhalovskiy & Church, 2006; G. W. Smith, 1990) through which these methodologies can go beyond interpretation (Bisaillon, 2012). In actual empirical studies one can find explorative descriptions as well as interpretative abstractions. I do not consider this to be the most decisive and distinctive aspect of these modes of enquiry. Because CMW intends to excavate the forms through which people construct themselves into social relations, it explicitly relies on interpretative modes of analysis. Neither in methodological pieces about CMW nor in empirical studies is the distinction between interpretative and exploration approaches discussed or proven to be particularly relevant. Therefore I will limit this discussion to this footnote.
knowledge is always produced reflexively, and is dependent on a specific context. The imposition of theory, which is representing and abstracting from social practices in their context, would contradict their reflexivity. Instead, indexical accounts of these practices have to be produced. The words and terms in these accounts point at specific practices in their context and cannot be generalized. These words do not represent or categorize practices either. Such short references cannot reflect the framework of Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, but should contextualize George Smith's concern. Dorothy Smith also adopts these terms from Garfinkel and develops a critical position towards theory-driven deductive reasoning and the role of theory in social research (D. Smith, 2005). Though the main source for this scepticism is her interpretation of Marx's critique of German idealist and materialist thought in the 19th century (D. Smith, 1990a), she does not refuse the use of theory in general, but rather its ideological use as a conceptual practice of power. Smith calls this ideology, when reality is treated as an expression of ideas and ideas are seen as a primary organizing actor in reality. Instead, theoretical terms should reflect real social practices and may be used as methodological devices to understand the social world and its coordination. She also refers to the concept of indexicality when she uses the allegory of mapping social relations to explain that terms and concepts in IE are like signs on a map which indexically point at real places. Given the substantial amount of theoretical concepts Smith has developed around IE, it would be wrong to read her as rejecting any form of theory or abstraction (also, indexical accounts are a form of abstraction). Due to these considerations, I would prefer to interpret George Smith's critique of theory as speculation, not as a general rejection of abstraction but as critique
of an ideological use of theory (in Marx's and Dorothy Smith's sense). This would greatly simplify my analysis, because most of the empirical studies in which PAE has to date been used would not comply with these methodological standards. In his ethnographies on AIDS organizing in the Toronto gay's rights movement and the global justice movement, Kinsman (Kinsman, 1997, 2006) explicitly expands his insights from his ethnographic work and adopts or adapts theories about struggle and class composition in capitalism from the Italian tradition of autonomous Marxism and Marxist feminism. Choudry (2008) critically appropriates a variety of theoretical approaches in his activist ethnography on the anti-globalization work of transnational social movement organizations and their fight against free-market integration projects, particularly the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). He uses his ethnographic work to criticize dominant social movement theories, and develops a theoretical approach in which he connects elements of Marxist political economy, critical adult education theories, critical historiography, and non-Western approaches to epistemology. In other PAEs like Campell's (2006), she is not explicitly trying to theorize the explorations of home care practices she conducted in the context of the disability movement. Still, when she develops her notion of “scheduling,” she is definitively abstracting, though on a firm empirical basis. This is similar to Frampton's (2007) PAE of university unions' bargaining conflicts around tuition fees. When she relates her ethnographic analysis to concepts of business unions, union renewal, and labour organizing, she performs important theorizing steps without explaining them.

If one does not conduct a more conventional ethnomethodological study, the
application of PAE somehow involves processes of abstraction and theorizing, or risks remaining on the level of a simple empiricist description of particular interactions, preferably around a camp-fire. If one abstracts and theorizes, then it is definitely better to do this consciously and to make it explicit. In PAE the problem of theory and abstraction should be framed as “how to abstract and theorize adequately” rather than “theorizing or no theorizing.” The point is not to fall into the dominant deductive reasoning of mainstream social science, and to be aware of ideological conceptual practices, so that ethnographic research does not become relegated to an illustration of theoretical concepts. Still, in an attempt to avoid this, we should not fall back to empiricist descriptions. PAEs have shown that they can be beneficial to the critique and development of theory, while delivering accurate ethnographic accounts of relations of ruling and struggle. Why should we not harness this potential?

At this point, a popular argument from PAE and IE is that their task is to create accurate maps which activists can use to make their interventions more effective, rather than theorizing (Campbell & Gregor, 2004; Kinsman, 2006; Turner, 2006). Kinsman, following George Smith, pleads that the task is to create accurate maps for activism” (Kinsman, 2006, p. 136) to counteract “reification and deductive reasoning” (Kinsman, 2006, p. 135) in social movements. He argues that mapping is crucial for Political Activist Ethnographies not just because of its uses in orientation, but also as a social and political process in and of itself. He emphasizes that mapping in PAE should not not simply include specific ruling relations but also movement capacities in a conflict. One should also be aware of the colonial history of mapping and define a clear standpoint in
the process. I do not doubt that such maps are helpful for social movements, and Political Activist and Institutional Ethnographers are definitely not the first to choose this technique. The problem I have with this proposition relates more to the idea that indexical maps should replace systematic abstraction and theorizing. In order to use a map effectively in a conflict, activists need, for example, a firm understanding of social change. And if researchers simply produce one map after the other, which may even fit together (for some time), this will still remain a scattered aggregation of particular accounts, lacking the necessary connectors on different levels of abstraction. Therefore, systematic theory work based on solid empirical grounding is absolutely needed. Mapping can be a useful tool to facilitate the appreciation that a movement’s actions relate reflexively to the specific context they are acting within, and to avoid accusations that they exclusively rely on an aggregation of particularities. Activism or social change must look at how the state and institutions work. Theorizing and mapping practices should not substitute for, but should rather complement and build on each other wherever it is useful.

CMW, like PAE, does not begin its enquiry from a theoretical concept or hypothesis, but with experiential accounts in the form of written memories. This methodology incorporates work with theories in two ways: as an empirically grounded critique of existing or dominant theories; and as collectively created new theory from women's perspective. Frigga Haug finds that there is a possibility and need for collective abstraction from personal experience in the lived realities as social beings:

“Since it is as individuals that we interpret and suffer our lives, our
experiences appear unique and thus of no value for scientific analysis. The mass character of social processes is obliterated within the concept of individuality. Yet we believe that the notion of the uniqueness of experience and of the various ways in which it is consciously assessed is a fiction. The number of possibilities for action open to us is radically limited. We live according to a whole series of imperatives: social pressures, natural limitations, the imperative of economic survival, the given conditions of history and culture. Human beings produce their lives collectively. It is within the domain of collective production that individual experience becomes possible. If therefore a given experience is possible, it is also subject to universalization. What we perceive as ‘personal’ ways of adapting to the social are also potentially generalizable modes of appropriation.”

(Haug, 1987, p. 43)

Frigga Haug derives her claim for generalizable experiences allows for a collectively coordinated embedding within the relations of production, of the means to live and the reproduction of life itself. The argument is not essentially different from Smith's notion that ruling relations owe their universal appearance to their generalizing function of coordinating the lives and experiences of many through their textually mediated forms of ruling. Still, the dialectics between personal modes of experience and the generalizable modes of the appropriation of the social are more pronounced in Haug's approach - and in this dialectic also lies a considerable challenge for researchers using CMW.
Which abstractions are possible based on the collective analysis of concrete memories? What are some potential pitfalls? Most of the CMW groups were formed by white middle-class women and claimed to produce knowledge and insights about women in general or women in capitalism. If group members are aware about, for example, the white bias in the group’s experiences, abstraction might be possible. Berg (2008) stresses this bias and the need for a respective awareness of whiteness, and criticizes the blindness towards racialization in other CMW studies. If a group does not include participants’ experiences other than those of white middle-class women and/or that do not consciously reflect their bias, they may claim to abstract their insights on the level of women in general while they actually speak on a much lower level of generalization, e.g. that of white middle-class women. This would produce the same problematic knowledge practices feminists have criticized in “male science,” in which (male) scientists are speaking of human beings while ignoring the realities of women.

Another crucial question asks to which extent the level of generality of abstractions based on CMW corresponds to the action strategies developed in the same process. How much can we learn from knowledge about women in general, for e.g. feminist fights against gentrification in a racialized immigrant neighbourhood in Toronto? This does not mean that analysis has to be restricted to rather concrete levels, but that considering and connecting several levels of abstraction may be more useful in a practical social movement context than concentrating on high levels of abstractions when theorizing.
Social relations

Another possible hindrance for synthesising CMW and PAE is their conceptualization of social relations and the function of ruling. George Smith (G. W. Smith, 1990) distinguishes between reflexive forms of knowing in everyday life and seemingly objective (which are in fact also reflexive) forms which constitute the basis for the ruling relations of political-administrative regimes. The function of ruling is associated with those regimes and the activist (researcher) is constructed as being located outside these regimes in the domain of reflexive everyday life experiences. CMW assumes that people in everyday life participate in their social ruling by constructing themselves into dominant social forms. These are two incompatible positions. As I have already mentioned several times, some studies (Choudry, 2008; Frampton, 2007; Kinsman, 2006) did not adopt the notion of the activist being located outside of the relations and regimes under study, and investigated the participation of activists and social movement organization in practices of ruling. One can observe that the more certain studies adopted the concept of a regime (originally a relationally conceptualized term borrowed from the French regulationist school), and the less they operated within the terminology of “relations,” the less relational the analysis itself became. It is hard to find the benefit in constructing activists as somewhere “outside,” when in fact they are part of the relation which ought to be analysed. One can argue that the position “outside” refers to specific forms of knowing and the institutional forms of a particular section of ruling regimes. In empirical studies this is then translated in a way so that activists and their experiences are located outside certain organizations (like the police or the provincial government) or institutional processes (like the production and execution of laws). By adopting this
position, one sacrifices a relational view of ruling relations and actually reifies those relationships as organizational and institutional entities (a practice Dorothy Smith explicitly wants to avoid in her formulation of IE). If we sacrifice the notion of activists being located somewhere “outside” and instead bring them back into the ruling relations and political-administrative regimes, we can take full advantage of these relational concepts and develop PAE even further (as the studies mentioned above have already done). Thereby, as a side effect, the concepts of ruling and social relations in CMW and PAE become more compatible.

More recent studies using CMW tend to be inclined towards a more discursive perception of social relations (e.g. Berg, 2008; Chidgey, 2013; Mulinari & Räthzel, 2007). As the method of CMW consists of the analysis of written memories, as the goal is to investigate self-constructions of personality, and as more discourse-oriented studies gained importance in feminist science in general, this tendency toward the discursive investigation of identities and subjectivities is not surprising. Nevertheless, Haug’s notion of gender relations as relations of production (of the means to live and the reproduction of life itself) (Haug, 2002) may serve as a guide to rethink the relation between discursive phenomena and those material relations which go beyond the discursive.

Experience

“Although experience is a central feature of memory work, we would initially like to underline that the method does not entail any simple idea of experiences as given or objective, as in themselves bearing with them specific knowledge. In memory work, experiences do not exist “out there,” ready to
be picked up and inserted into an analytical or interpretative process. […]

Articulating experiences always entails a discursive dimension, writes Karin Widerberg, which inevitably leads to a tension between the lived experiences and the way in which they are (and can be) articulated.” (Jansson et al., 2008, p. 229)

Lived, embodied, everyday life experiences are an elementary resource for CMW. Both approaches investigate their formation within specific social relations. Both approaches share the understanding that experiences are co-produced in interaction, and that these experiences are saved in the brain, waiting to be downloaded. The fact that experiences are constructed when remembering and reporting about certain events in specific social settings, rather than by capturing the totality of incidents as we live them, doesn’t devalue these experiences as a resource for research. This social co-production of experiences allows researchers conducting CMW or PAE to analyse social relations as they are subjectively appropriated and expand the research of social relations from a standpoint in everyday life. Experiences are formed within the social relations in which they are articulated, and therefore critically analysing experiences can provide access to exploring and understanding these social conditions and how they relate to our subjective perception. In PAE, researchers distinguish between how experiences are formed reflexively in direct interaction and how they are formed by textually mediated ideological forms of knowing within ruling regimes. The lived experiences are understood as located outside the ideological practices’ ruling regime. Their quality as embodied, lived knowledge makes them more reflexive as opposed to generalizing
ideological forms of knowing. Despite the fact that they are coordinated and formed by
the ruling regimes these embodied, a disjuncture exists between lived experiences and the
ruling regime. The experiences are not totally ideologically determined and therefore they
provide a possible location for resistance or autonomy. It's the knowledge which derives
from the embodied activities of everyday life which facilitates this disjuncture and
resistance against ideological over-determination.

In CMW this element of resistance in experiences or memories also derives from
the immediate involvement of people in the daily production of means to live and
reproduction of life itself. This production happens in interaction with other people and in
this interaction develops what Haug calls a “common sense.” This common sense is the
(collective!) resisting element in the ideologically formed everyday life knowledge. In
contrast to PAE, CMWers assume that people are actively writing themselves into
dominant cultural forms. Conscious collective activity is necessary to analyse those forms
and excavate the elements of common sense in everyday life knowledge. This work is
necessary to acquire the collective ability to act, which CMWers understand as the ability
to transform the conditions of our life, rather than just actively inscribing ourselves in
dominant cultural forms. The work has to be done collectively because all these elements
of everyday life experience are socially produced and can be better accessed as such and
transformed collectively. CMW intends to provide a methodology for this work.

Other than in PAE, the body plays a more ambiguous role in CMW. On the one
hand, the socially mediated embodied production of life and means for living are the
basis for an element of common sense, which is potentially oppositional to dominant
cultural forms. On the other hand, particularly for women, these dominant cultural forms are organized around the body. Therefore, embodied knowledge is not automatically liberating. Critical work is necessary to activate its liberatory potential.

In their interpretation of PAE, Frampton et al understand embodied knowledge as “an alternative to […] external authority” (2006b, p. 30). Dorothy Smith refers to “those interchanges of awareness, recognition, feeling, noticing, and learning going on between body and the world that are prior to and provide sources for experience as it is evoked in dialogue” (D. Smith, 2006, p. 224) when she is talking about lived experience. To some extent Smith's idea of lived experience corresponds to Haug's notion of common sense. Haug might object (based on her projects dealing with the process of women's sexualization (Haug, 1987), the female body, and feelings) that this lived experience is not directly accessible. Feelings like fear are always already ideologically formed. Their critical potential needs to be excavated before they can provide a standpoint in lived experience. Furthermore these lived experiences are actually just accessible in the form of memories, as they always happened in the past and therefore have to be remembered. These memories are socially constructed each time they are reported. Therefore, I think, when the research problematic for a PAE should be formulated from a standpoint in lived experience, memory work is needed. At the least, this is helpful in developing a more critical approach towards using everyday life knowledge as a resource for research.

**Summary**

In this chapter I have analysed and reviewed the applications and discussions of CMW and PAE represented in the research sample. First, I reviewed Haug's short comparative
discussion of similarities and differences in CMW and IE, followed by an overview of publications where Haug and Dorothy and George Smith have referred to each other's work. In a longer excursus I discussed the relation between activist research and academia, activism and research, and activism and social change before introducing CMW studies which were conducted in social movements in Argentina, Germany, Norway, Australia, and New Zealand. In another short excursus I differentiated the understanding of the relation between ideology, experience, and social relations in CMW and PAE. A significantly smaller number of PAEs were the subject of the final section of my literature review.

In the second part of this thesis I compared different dimensions and concepts in CMW and PAE. First, I identified common ontological and epistemological features in both modes of enquiry, while exploring different but compatible foci in the research subject. Both modes of enquiry rely on a materialist understanding of social practices and assume an epistemological standpoint as a starting point for research, and both share an understanding of knowledge as situated. I then discussed two potential barriers for synthesizing CMW and PAE. One is different positioning with regards to the use of abstraction and theory in the research process. CMW aims to criticize existing theory based on empirical investigation and to create theory from a women's perspective. PAE is more sceptical towards the use of theory. If this scepticism is articulated as a rejection of any theorizing, it is incompatible with CMW. But if the criticism is directed at ideological forms of theorizing, this position can enrich a synthesis. After solving inconsistencies in the different approaches to social relations, I concluded my analysis with a discussion of
the concept of experience in both CMW and PAE. Based on this analysis, I will attempt a short synthesis of both modes of enquiry in the following conclusion.
Chapter Five:
Conclusion

Are CMW and PAE compatible as two modes of enquiry? Can we even combine them as methodologies for a beneficial application in the context of social movements? These are guiding questions for this thesis, and this concluding chapter will attempt to find answers, however preliminary. I will try to follow the important dimensions along which I have analysed CMW and PAE in the previous chapters. In these dimensions, we find aspects of historical development of the methodology, ontological and epistemological assumptions, research strategies, methodical questions in empirical research, and conceptual considerations on experience, memory, and social relations. The relation between activism, social change, and research in social movement contexts will also be the subject of this chapter. Based on this synthesis, I try to answer the question of whether CMW and PAE can be combined in ways which are beneficial to social movements. Finally, I articulate some questions and problematics which developed out of my research for this thesis which require more research.

First, I want to begin by explaining the reasons for my interest in synthesizing CMW and PAE in the first place. As I already mentioned in the acknowledgements at the beginning of this thesis, the original idea was to study the implementation of the “Access Without Fear” policy in the City of Toronto, particularly the relation between migrant justice movements, the city, and public employee unions. “Access Without Fear” refers to the practice that all residents of Toronto, regardless of their immigration status, should be
able to access public services provided by the city without fear of revealing their immigration status. Due to continuous community organizing and advocacy work by actors like the Solidarity City Network, a network of community groups and organizations who work with immigrants with precarious status, the City of Toronto passed a motion in February 2013 which should guarantee “Access Without Fear” to city services in Toronto. The Solidarity City Network then concentrated on creating community pressure so that the city implements the city motion. Changing one (important) text within a sequence of political-administrative processes doesn't automatically equate to changing those processes. Access to many city services was still denied to many residents with precarious immigration status, even after the very public City Council debate which voted the policy in. On the one hand, this relates to questions on the time, money, and political will it takes to implement a specific policy within an enormous administrative apparatus. On the other hand, very subjective factors are also relevant to facilitate “Access Without Fear.” Though this specific fear has its root in actual institutional practices (of immigration law, enforcement practices, exchange of sensitive information between different government agencies), fears of undocumented residents (e.g. of bringing their children to public childcare) cannot be fully understood by exploring textually mediated institutional processes. This is also true of the fear and uncertainty a frontline worker feels when, for example, an undocumented woman experiencing domestic violence wants to use a women's shelter and the frontline worker must guarantee that the woman is safe (e.g. from immigration enforcement). Making residents and frontline workers more capable of acting based on “Access Without Fear”
policies depends on many objective institutional circumstances, but also on subjective aspects. Also, the role of “allies” in a social movement and the self-constructions of such a vulnerable group of residents and activists each depend on both objective and subjective dimensions. The basic idea for combining methodologies was that neither CMW nor PAE, if applied separately, can provide solutions to investigate and change the interwoven dimensions of fear (institutional, administrative practices, or the subjective appropriation of those circumstances). If combined, CMW and PAE may be able to provide the possibility of better addressing several dimensions in the same research process. Such a combination could provide important information on how to effectively intervene in and transform institutional and administrative practices like staff training, identification policies, budgeting, relations to provincial services, to the police, etc., and would relate this to work with activists, residents, and frontline workers to unlearn their subjective fears and uncertainties.

Synergy

Historically, CMW and PAE originated out of situated practices of knowledge production based on the everyday life experiences of activists in the women's liberation movement in the 1970s and the gay rights movement of the 1980s. Both have later been applied and further developed in other movement contexts as well as in academia. More recent studies modified the method according to the specific research context. Though, particularly in the case of CMW, many different step-by-step methodical guides exist, the original idea of both modes of enquiry to keep their development rather reflexive and open to innovations is still valid. Accordingly, attempting to find synergies in the
combination of CMW and PAE fits into the ethos of their respective traditions.

Besides adopting a feminist conception of situated knowledge and an epistemological standpoint theory, both modes of enquiry share references to Marx. For both, the early philosophical writings of Marx, particularly the “Thesis on Feuerbach” (Marx, 1969), inform their ontological and epistemological position, though Frigga Haug’s and Dorothy and George Smith's references to other Marx writings and concepts differ significantly. Though it is possible to qualify Haug's and Dorothy Smith's work as within the tradition of Marxist-Feminism, PAE and CMW, particularly their more recent developments and applications, may not necessarily fall into this trajectory anymore.

Nevertheless, in accordance with Marx, CMW's and PAE's ontological position assumes that the social is constituted by coordinated and real human practices in their objective and subjective dimension. Both stress the role of language in this coordination processes, though they do not reduce the social (or social relations) to discursive phenomena. Therefore the examination of language practices takes a central role in the generation of knowledge about social relations. Both methodologies are characterized by the assumption that all forms of knowledge are situated, and understand this as an important resource and starting point for any investigation rather than as a defect. From a particular standpoint in interactively generated everyday life experience, CMW and PAE attempt to explore social relations and how they relate to those experiences. Memory work studies collects experience in the form of memories in order to understand how people construct themselves into social relations and thereby participate in their own domination. PAE uses experiential knowledge as an entry point to explore social relations
in the form of textually mediated trans-local ruling relations. CMW emphasizes an interpretive approach to understanding social constructions, while PAE claims to go beyond interpretation to explore practices of ruling as they occur. Their different focus, with a shared ontological and epistemological basis, complement each other, such that a critical analysis of the social construction of experiences can be enriched by an exploration of trans-local practices of ruling. The collective analysis of experiences and the exploration of ruling relations are empirical investigations of real practices. The focus of interest and the unit of analysis in both approaches are not individuals, or their particular experiences or opinions, but the social relations and institutional processes which coordinate the experiences of individuals. Generalizations in CMW are facilitated through the collectivity of the analysis, which provides possibilities of going beyond the particular and unique appearance of an individual's experiences to excavate the co-production of collective experiences within certain social relations. In PAE the material basis (texts) of coordination in ruling relations/regimes facilitates their generalizing function and abstract qualities. In both cases the generalizing element of social relations is creating the possibility of abstraction beyond the experienced. Social relations are not immediately accessible; therefore strategies are required to excavate them. In CMW and PAE, conflicts, disjunctures, and contradictions indicate the connecting points from which to formulate the research problematic and relate the standpoint in lived experience to generalized ruling relations. In PAE, this connection is assumed as the immediate experience of a conflict within a ruling regime (or specific institutional practices). This conflict is the anchor point required to develop a research
problematic for further exploration into the ruling regime. CMW instead assumes that contradictions are not immediately accessible in experiential accounts because people level contradictions to construct coherent and linear memories. Therefore an effort at deconstruction is needed to excavate the contradictions which indicate social relations as limits to our ability to act individually. Accordingly, the analytic methods from CMW used to deconstruct experiential accounts can be useful if the conflict and disjuncture on which the research problematic for a PAE should be formulated is not obvious. Simultaneously, in some contexts CMW can be enriched if one expands the analysis of contradictions in peoples’ self-constructions to include an ethnographic analysis of the institutional practices which facilitate the creation of these subjectivities.

A main difference between the two modes of enquiry constitutes the epistemologically founded and methodologically necessary collectivity of CMW, in which the researcher and the researched fall together, on the one hand, and the usually individual research process in PAE, on the other hand. Still, PAE, if this is considered to be beneficial, can also be organized as a collective process. Activist ethnographers may also start their investigation from their own experience, but the focus of enquiry should be institutional practices, not the experience.

In CMW collective analysis is a condition for abstraction and the generation of generalizable theoretical insights based on empirical work with memories. Furthermore, existing theory on the topic of the Memory Work Group should be discussed critically based on a group's own empirical research. A critical analysis of existing theory is also central to PAE. Though, while in CMW, the critique relates mostly to the content of the
theories, PAE also aims at criticizing deductive reasoning and ideological practices of knowing, which make reality appear as an expression of ideas on which the logic of ruling relations is based. George Smith (1990) is critical of the imposition of theory in general as a “speculative” research practice in PAE. Other authors plead for a non-ideological use of theorizing within the same framework. If one follows the stricter position of George Smith, then this poses a significant barrier to a synergy with CMW, because the latter not only aims to critique existing theory, but sees the creation of theory from below as an explicit goal. Instead of rejecting theorizing in general, I would rather follow the interpretation of PAE which rejects ideological forms of theorizing but allows for abstractions based on solid ethnographic fieldwork. Such a differentiated approach towards theorizing, consisting of a critical discussion of existing theory, a systematic critique of ideological forms of knowing as conceptual practices of power, and an attempt to create abstractions and develop theory from below (based on empirical research), would allow for a fruitful synergy of both modes of enquiry. Furthermore, one should remember George Smith's call for reflexivity and his caution towards “speculative” reasoning when creating knowledge for social movement purposes.

For Smith, reflexively constituted, lived, embodied, experiences in everyday life provide the counterpart to ideological forms of knowing, which he associates with trans-local ruling regimes. He also locates activism in this sphere of reflexive everyday life experience. In research this experience can provide a strong basis to begin exploring ruling regimes. For the activist it is a resource in conflict. In contrast, Haug identifies the body and everyday experience not just as ideologically overdetermined, but also as a site
where ideology is actively produced. According to Haug's studies on female socialization (Haug, 1987), particularly for women, dominant cultural forms, norms, morals, and other ideological expressions preferably organize around the body. Therefore embodied knowledge, everyday experience, and memories require rigorous analysis and critique - these experiences and memories are full of contradictions. They are interactively and socially constituted, not simply saved and downloaded by the subject. As such, they reflect the contradictions of today's society. As contradictory phenomena, they also contain liberating elements, and one should excavate them so that people can develop their collective ability to act and change the circumstances regulating their lives. While Smith distinguishes two forms of knowing - associating one with ideology and perceiving the other as liberating - Haug sees these opposites unite in memories of everyday experience. Both see experiences and memories as socially coordinated and constituted in the act of sharing them. Haug sees memories as a socially constructed feature of personality. Therefore they are the proper material to investigate our subjective self-constructions. For a synergy of CMW and PAE, we can learn from CMW that everyday life experiences provide an important resource for research, but it is necessary to critically analyse them as sites of ideological production in order to excavate their liberatory potential. Maybe with the exception of observational data, all articulations and accounts of experience can be understood and analysed as memories. Memories are constructed in interviews or discussions, in writing about personal experiences, and in the written accounts of others. Accordingly, this data can and should be analysed as memories. The author's intended message does not have to correspond to the ways she/he
constructs his/her account. Work is required to bring contradictions and voids to light which would otherwise appear as coherent stories. Also, in PAE, one analyses experiences in search of “the institutional” in one’s accounts or to contrast experiences with institutional discourse. It might be beneficial to use more effort and time operating from this starting point of research to benefit from the richness of experiences and to uncover their ideological constitution. Experiences and memories are not a solid fundament of the research process, but a rich mine in need of exploration.

For a conceptual synthesis of social relations in PAE and CMW, the central question is whether they are understood as internally related or constructed in an inside-outside scheme. In CMW it is clear that the relations of production of our lives (and the means for living) are internally related to how we remember events. Therefore, the investigation of memories tries to excavate the social relations within memories, and both the researcher and the activist are constituent parts of those relations. In some interpretations of PAE, the activist researcher is constructed as outside ruling relations or political-administrative regimes (Smith, 1990). In this conception, ruling relations are based on an ideological form of knowing, as opposed to reflexive forms in the everyday knowledge sites where the activist researcher is located. Other studies also include social movement organizations (in which the activist researcher is engaged) in the analysis (Choudry, 2008; Frampton, 2007; Kinsman, 2006). Accordingly, the activist and his/her organizations are perceived as part of the ruling relations. If he/she is a constitutive part of ruling relations, she/he is able to change those relations, and the process of transformation will inherently change him/herself. If the activist is constructed as outside,
it remains unclear how the activist relates to ruling relations, or how activism relates to social and personal change, among other things. As such, reading social relations as internally related allows for an integrative analysis of ruling, activism, and social change, and has the benefit of corresponding to a similar understanding of relations of production in CMW.

Both modes of enquiry use texts as an important resource for investigating ruling relations. Many studies, therefore, focus on discursive phenomena. Accordingly, for PAE as well as CMW, the danger exists to limit the understanding of social relations to their discursive appearance. A rigorous reflection, based on the materialist ontological foundations of both methodologies and the integration of methods which go beyond the textual (e.g. observations) may help to avoid this bias.

Studies which used CMW and PAE as their methodological framework used a variety of strategies and empirical methods to gather and analyse their material. As PAE is an ethnographic approach, the dynamics of the fieldwork determine which methods are most adequate to obtain useful data and analyse it. Interviews, participant observations, personal memories and document analysis are the most common approaches. An important guide in the data collection and analysis is the orientation towards the institutional, how it (re)produces certain institutional practices in their actions, and how they activate the ruling function of texts by reading and responding to them etc.. CMW groups usually follow a specified methodical process, though this process can be adapted. Therefore a lot of different methodic strategies exist, and every Memory Work Group chooses different methodic solutions, but a certain sequence of steps is common in most
of the group's work. The research is centred around the collective analysis of memory texts written by the participants themselves.

CMW is always a separate group activity. It can happen within a social movement context, but seldomly in combination with other actions because participants have to meet and work in a concentrated way over several sessions. Though e.g. a squatting can provide the space and time conditions to engage in direct action and conduct the collective research at the same time. In PAE, many times the research is happening in activism. Knowledge acquired in activism is used for the analysis, and the research direction follows the conflict lines of activism. Sometimes activist research is organized separately from actual movement actions. The design of the research is usually adapted to the specific movement circumstances. If the research collectives are not in place yet, the CMW process needs more efforts and resources, in organizational terms. Sometimes existing political collectives conduct CMW on a weekend retreat or combine it with regular organizational meetings. These are resource-sensitive ways to link research and activism in a movement setting. For some collectives, larger long-term CMW projects are the central social movement activity itself. In these cases collective consciousness raising and learning in the group is perceived as activism, often combined with journalistic and scientific publication of results and reflections. In PAE, activism and research, though occurring simultaneously, are mostly understood as separate activities. The research provides adequate “maps” or descriptions of ruling relations to allow for a better understanding of certain institutional practices, and therein facilitates more effective activism. Whether CMW and PAE can be synthesized or combined at this organizational
and methodical level is the subject of the remaining section.

**Combination**

Though some possible barriers to synthesizing CMW and PAE were discussed in the previous chapter, this analysis shows that, despite strong methodological claims in methodological writings, in empirical research many of those claims become relativized. I would conclude that there is no hindrance which should prohibit a combination. Therefore, combining CMW and PAE becomes more a question of practical effectiveness, efficiency, and benefit analysis in a specific social movement setting. Usually combinations of methods and methodologies are much more complicated and resource-intensive than the application of one approach to a problem. Particularly in social movements with limited resources, the expected benefits of a combination must justify the additional efforts. Accordingly, creating a new method or methodology by merging PAE and CMW would not prove very efficient. Therefore, a different option is to use elements of one approach within the framework of another. This is probably easier to realize in a CMW than in a PAE framework. If we return back to the example of the “Access Without Fear” policy, a CMW group could be organized between residents and frontline service providers. In the group work, the participants can write short passages about incidents where they felt anxiety (when dealing with residents with precarious immigration status or where they even rejected a potential client) and analyse them collectively according to one of the analytical frameworks provided in the literature. The...
group might find that it is necessary to know more about the concrete institutional processes which create the challenges for the frontline workers and their clients. Then, the memory texts can be reconsidered when looking for how specific texts, institutional discourse, or other institutional practices appear within the memories, or how certain administrative procedures produce a conflict in interactions with residents (or whatever has been found in the Memory Work before). Based on this analysis, a problematic can be formulated for a PAE which will then lead into an exploration of constricting service provision procedures and policies in the city government or into policing practices. The results of the ethnographic work can then be related back to the original memories. Possibilities for intervention may be discussed and the memory stories can be rewritten to find possible means to make residents and frontline workers more able to act in concrete encounters, which may provide perspectives for collective action and intervention into the institutional circumstances of their work. The PAE can produce an analysis of relevant institutional procedures and the CMW provides an analysis of the subjective appropriation of the resulting problems and may deliver concrete ways to act in a transformative way. This is just one possible approach to apply a combination of CMW. The project may also be organized as a PAE of an activist researcher who develops the problematic of her/his research based on a (time-) limited Memory Group Work session with other activists or with frontline workers, and then proceeds with her/his individual investigation.

**Prospects**

Based on the analysis in this study, one obvious prospect for the future would be to apply
a combination of CMW and PAE in an empirical project. This would also be an
opportunity to critically test and expand analysis in this thesis. Thorny methodical and
organizational questions of such a combination must be discussed on the basis of an
empirical example in a social movement context. Topics for which I collected material in
the analysis, but which I ultimately did not include into the thesis, were the concepts of
work, consciousness, and learning in PAE and CMW. I may use this material for future
projects. The analysis of both modes of enquiry as learning methodologies promises
particularly useful insights for learning processes in social movements.

Within the next year, a collection of recently conducted Political Activist Ethnographies
will be published (edited by Bisaillon and Hussey). These studies will probably bring
more insights to the research approach and new developments will be presented. For this
thesis, I relied on a very limited number of actual empirical applications of PAEs. This
limitation will probably be overcome with the forthcoming collection of studies.

Finally, I'm looking forward to using my insights from this thesis in my activist
work in different social movements, and I hope that you as a reader can find some benefit
in your endeavours.
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Appendix One: List of articles in the research sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Berg, A.</td>
<td>Silence and Ar</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, d</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaillon, L.</td>
<td>An Analytic Glimpse</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>glossary</td>
<td>b, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, M.</td>
<td>Research for A</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidley, R.</td>
<td>Reassess Your Ways</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, f</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudry, A.</td>
<td>Learning in So</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, g</td>
<td>thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudry, A.</td>
<td>Learning in So</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, e, h</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudry, A.</td>
<td>On knowledge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, e, h</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudry, A.</td>
<td>NGOs, social i</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, g</td>
<td>thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, J.</td>
<td>Ocap, Housing</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, i</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, J.</td>
<td>Women Theorizing</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, J.</td>
<td>Emotion and g</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, f</td>
<td>book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, C.</td>
<td>Tuition rebates</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, C., Afterword: New</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, C., Beyond Ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, C., Preface: Socia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton, C. Research as D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, N. A., E.</td>
<td>Pleasure, Pain</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillies, V.</td>
<td>Women's collective constructions of embodied practices through memory work</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e, f</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Female Sexua</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, e, f, j</td>
<td>book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Eine Hausfrau</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, f, k</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Frauenbeteur</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e, f</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Sozialisation</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, e, f, j</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Zur Politik von</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, e, f</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Daydreams</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>e, f</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>e, f, h</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>The Hoechst C</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e, f</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Dialektik Sexus</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, e, f, j</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Hat Leistung e</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>f, g, k</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Uber die Ges</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>e, f, l</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Sexual Dereg</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>f, g, j</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Leistung und i</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e, f, h</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, F.</td>
<td>Memory Work</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e, f</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey, J.</td>
<td>&quot;Political Activism&quot;</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e, g</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansson, M., E.</td>
<td>Memory Work</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsman, G.</td>
<td>Managing AIDS</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsman, G.</td>
<td>Mapping Societies</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhling, C., &amp; Political De-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, h, k</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muliniari, D., &amp; Politicizing Bic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykhaylovs'kyi, T-Shirt Gi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, h</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyx, J., &amp; S'rMemory-work:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, D.</td>
<td>Foreword: Geo</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, e</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, D.</td>
<td>Making change</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, G.W.</td>
<td>Political Activism</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>a, b, c, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, N.</td>
<td>Living history</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e</td>
<td>journal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, M. A.</td>
<td>Detach to pow</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, e</td>
<td>thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, S.</td>
<td>Ethnography-in</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>PAE/IE</td>
<td>application</td>
<td>a, c, g</td>
<td>thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widerberg, K.</td>
<td>For the sake of</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>memory work</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>b, h</td>
<td>book chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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