Stefan Berger

The Internationalism of Social Movements—an Introduction

Social movements have been at the heart of some of the major turning points of twentieth-century international history, such as the Russian revolution of 1917, the revolutionary turmoil between 1905 and the mid-1920s, the student revolts of 1968, the Prague spring of the same year, the "velvet revolutions" in Central and Eastern Europe during the years 1989/90, and the Arab spring of 2011. Social movements have also informed some of the most powerful international campaigns of a "contentious politics."[1] These include, amongst others, campaigns for environmental protection, equal rights for women and protests to prevent war. In this special issue we have selected some of the "old" social movements, such as the socialist and communist movement, rooted in the nineteenth century, who arguably had a major impact on the shape of the twentieth-century world, and some of the "new" social movements, emerging in the 1970s, such as the women's movement, the environmental movement and the peace movement, who also set important agendas. The articles that follow focus in particular on the role that their internationalism played for their positioning in key social conflicts of the twentieth century.

It is to this very day not common to extend the concept of social movement to the labour movement and thereby include both socialism and communism into the fold of social movements. Much of social movement research has so far focused on the new social movements. Dieter Rucht has, with good reason, argued that the concept of social movement should be restricted to those movements that are not characterised by formal organisation and can be described as loose networks of groups.[2] However, as Dieter Rucht would be the first to admit and as much social movement research has pointed out—the object of this research is, in Doug Imig's and Sid Tarrow's words, a "moving target"[3]. The borders between social movements and more formal organisations are fuzzy and porous.

One thing that characterises all social movements is that they attempt to bring about social change through the mobilisation of the public or the citizens. Even if they are not necessarily oppositional, and can work in support of governments/ruling parties and even

---

1 Charles Tilly/Sidney Tarrow: Contentious Politics, rev. and updated 2nd edn, Oxford 2015.
2 Dieter Rucht: Studying Social Movements: some Conceptual Challenges, in: Stefan Berger/ Holger Nehring (eds.): Towards a Global History of Social Movements, Basingstoke 2017 (forthcoming).
3 Doug Imig/Sidney Tarrow (eds.): Contentious Europeans: Protests and Politics in an Emerging Polity, Lanham/Maryland 2001, part 1: Studying a Moving Target.

dictatorships,[4] their main characteristic is that such mobilisation can often not do without forms of organisation. The typical organisational format for social movements tends to be somewhere on a sliding scale between fixed institutional structures and complete fluidity and individualism. Friedhelm Neidhardt's definition of a social movement as a "mobilizng network of networks" is one attempt to catch that ambiguous in-between status of social movements.[5] It is precisely such ambiguity that should warn us against drawing the boundaries of any definitions of social movements too tightly. Traditional labour movements should, in my view, be included in examinations of social movements, even if political parties or trade unions or co-operatives each do possess quite formal organisational structures. Yet as a whole the labour movement amounts to an assemblage of different organisations and institutions, in other words, a "network of networks", with a distinct self-understanding as a broad educational, cultural and social movement. Therefore it should not be ignored by social movement researchers.

Especially during phases of international historical structural change, social movements were often vital in deciding conflicts surrounding access to important political, social, economic and cultural resources. As central ingredient of wider civil societies, social movements enabled political action in a variety of different spheres, but they also helped to regulate societal conflicts. The articles in this issue will discuss in which way a diverse set of social movements were able to use an internationalist credo in order to set transnational political agendas, which empowered groups within often nationally-constituted societies to gain access to diverse sets of resources. The latter included access to governmental power or influence on governmental politics or financial resources or access to the media and to published opinion.

But how is internationalism defined in what follows? Talbot Imlay suggests to see internationalism as "clusters of activity, some inter-connected and others not, occurring in multiple spaces, at various speeds and intensities, and with different durations." This highly flexible definition has the advantage of getting a great variety of internationalist practices and initiatives into view and avoiding an overdetermination of internationalist action. In relation to Communist internationalism, Andreas Wirsching suggests to see internationalism as an "enduring process of communication" drawing attention both to the sites of communication, their respective potential and their limits. There can indeed be no internationalism without communication. Whatever happens in one place

---

4   Thus fascist movements have been fruitfully analysed as social movements. See, for example, Wolfgang Schieder (ed.): Faschismus als soziale Bewegung: Deutschland und Italien im Vergleich, Frankfurt/Main 1976; Sven Reichardt: Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA, 2nd edn, Cologne 2009.
5   Friedhelm Neidhardt: Einige Ideen zu einer allgemeinen Theorie sozialer Bewegungen, in: Stefan Hradil (ed.): Sozialstruktur im Umbruch: Karl Martin Bolte zum 60. Geburtstag, Opladen 1985, pp. 193-204, here p. 195.

at one time needs to be communicated, translated, transmitted, and in the process of communication adopted, adapted or rejected by the recipient of such communication. Communication is also always at least a two-way (and indeed, more often, a multi-way) process, in which the communicator also acts as recipient and vice versa. Such multi-polarity of communicative processes makes internationalism such a complex process of interactions and interdependencies.

Social movement research has been booming in many different parts of the world for at least two decades now.[6] Much of it is, however, focused on the new social movements and rooted in social science departments. It tends to avoid a deeper historical engagement with earlier social movements. Craig Calhoun's book on early nineteenth-century social movements is one of the few attempts to make the concept productive for forms of nineteenth-century social protest.[7] And Marcel van der Linden has somewhat provocatively written about a thousand years of social protest in Europe between 1000 and 2000.[8] This journal is dedicated to exploring the deeper historical roots of social movements and make a contribution to the greater awareness that social movement studies should develop a more historical attitude to its subject matter. Hence it seems appropriate that the subsequent articles all ask for longer-term continuities of social movements, thereby questioning the "newness" of the "new" social movements and the rationale behind much social movement research never to look beyond the *annus mirabilis* of social movement research—1968.

In the few instances, in which historians have actually studied social movements, they have often done so in national contexts—a powerful sign of the continuing hold of the national paradigm over much contemporary historiography—despite a recent surge of global, transnational and international history.[9] The aim of this special issue is to contribute to moving beyond such national perspectives and ask about the role of internationalism in the formation and development of diverse social movements.[10] If

6   For a good overview see Donatella della Porta/Mario Diani (eds.): The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements, Oxford 2015.
7   Craig Calhoun: The Roots of Radicalism: Tradition, the Public Sphere, and Early Nineteenth-Century Social Movements, Chicago 2012.
8   Marcel van der Linden: European Social Protest 1000–2000, in: Stefan Berger/Holger Nehring (eds.): Towards a Global History of Social Movements.
9   The power of national and even nationalist paradigms over history-writing has been analysed in detail for the European context by Stefan Berger, with Cristoph Conrad: The Power of the Past: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe, Basingstoke 2015. On global history and its remarkable rise for more than a decade now see Sebastian Conrad: What is Global History?, Princeton 2016.
10   The trend to internationalise research on social movements is visible in a range of recent publications, including Donatella della Porta/Sidney Tarrow (eds.): Transnational Protest and Global Activism, Lanham/Maryland 2005; Jackie Smith/Hank Johnston (eds.): Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements, Lanham/Maryland 2002;

the short twentieth century, in Eric Hobsbawm's memorable phrase,[11] was the age of the nation state, social movements necessarily had to organise and mobilise national citizens and publics, in order to mobilise resources for their causes. However, it is a marked characteristic of many of those social movements that they espoused internationalist credos and agendas, organised international conferences, communicated well beyond national borders and saw their agendas as agendas which were of universal and global relevance. This tension between a strong internationalist orientation and a firm nation-state orientation, which, in many cases was also shot through with regionalist/localist concerns, is a tension that is central to many of the following articles.

A strong internationalist commitment is a continuing and ongoing characteristic of many social movements, including the ones that are being examined here. It is therefore productive to ask about programmatic continuities and connections between "old" and "new" social movements. As the contributions to this special issue underline, the issues of peace and of women's rights were issues championed, amongst others, by the labour movement from the nineteenth century onwards. Peace and women's rights movements also existed in their own rights and there was considerable tension at times between these and the labour movements. Yet, at other times, they could also be allies and work together in the pursuit of common aims and objectives over specific themes and issues. In contrast to issues such as peace and women's rights, environmentalism had, for a long time, been neglected by the labour movement. The latter were too much enamoured by notions of progress and modernity to recognise the destructive potential of those forces—especially vis-à-vis the natural environment. But from the 1960s onwards, more or less in parallel with the rising and independent environmental protection movement, labour movements in the West at least "discovered" the theme and sought to harmonise their traditional belief in "progress" and "growth" with "sustainability." As these examples indicate, there is merit in studying the new and old social movements together, as they interacted and overlapped in their concerns over particular issues, such as peace, women's rights and environmental protection.

Talbot Imlay, in his contribution, makes the case for the importance of an internationalist perspective on the history of twentieth-century socialism. Internationalism was not only an important part of the credo of socialist parties, it also resulted in the formation of international association, from the First International, set up by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in London in 1864 to the Second International, set up in Paris in 1889 to the Labour and Socialist International, founded in Hamburg in 1923 to the Socialist International that came into existence in Frankfurt/Main in 1951 and finally to

---

Sidney Tarrow: The New Transnational Activism, Cambridge 2006; Donatella della Porta/Manuela Caiani: Social Movements and Europeanisation, Oxford 2011; Stefan Berger/Sean Scalmer (eds.): Transnational Activism in the Anglo-World, Basingstoke 2017 (forthcoming).

11   Eric Hobsbawm: Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914–1991, London 2000.

the Progressive Alliance, most recently established in Leipzig in 2013. This interrupted history of socialist internationalism had much to do with inner-socialist conflict. The First International broke apart over ideological conflicts between Marxists and Anarchists. The Second International and the Labour and Socialist International failed in the face of the hyper-nationalisms that led to the First and Second World Wars. The Socialist International again foundered on ideological disagreements over democratic socialism (with the emphasis on "democratic") as a precondition for membership in the socialist international.

Socialist internationalism can therefore be described as a story of high ambition and spectacular failure. In his article Talbot Imlay points to one important reason for failure: the nationalisation of socialist parties and the nationalisation of specific issues discussed internationally. Talbot Imlay points out that internationalism was not just a faith but also a practice—a practice of coming together and discussing issues that were of mutual concern for socialists. In the process of discussing these issues, socialists would confirm their common brotherhood and faith.[12] The ongoing attempt to re-establish international organisations that can further this practice shows the strong commitment to socialist internationalism which was far more than mere lip service in otherwise highly nationalised parties. Yet, the nationalisation of labour movements needs to be taken seriously, for it forms one of their most important characteristics. It was within the framework of the nation state that labour movements could hope to achieve concrete reforms and advances, and hence it is not surprising that they paid strongest attention to the nation-state frame in which they operated. Yet, pointing to considerable research in the realm of identity studies, Talbot Imlay emphasises the compatibility of national and international sentiments. They were not necessarily mutually exclusive and one could go alongside the other sometimes without too much conflict, but their relationship could also be characterised by tensions.[13]

Talbot Imlay analyses the reconstitution of the socialist internationals following the two world wars. In both periods, the speed and intensity with which socialists sought to rebuild internationalism demonstrates how important the issue was to their self-understanding. Even if they were voluntarist organisations with members retaining much autonomy and the International not having binding decision-making powers on individual members, the practice and process of Internationalism was important to member organisations. Talbot Imlay uses the example of the socialist debates on disarmament in the interwar period to exemplify the tensions between nationalisation and internationalism inherent in socialist internationalism. Pursuing the common socialist goal of disarmament, different members of the International faced diverse domestic pressures. It became clear that a number of

12   On socialist internationalism as practice see also Kevin J. Callaghan: Demonstration Culture: European Socialism and the Second International 1889–1914, London 2010.

13   Compare Stefan Berger/Angel Smith (eds.): Nationalism, Labour and Ethnicity, 1870–1939, Manchester 1999.

nationally specific angles to the debate would import tensions into the attempt, on the level of the International, to find a common internationalist position on disarmament. This, in turn, weakened the member parties' commitment to internationalism itself and spelt failure for the highly principled internationalist ambition of interwar socialists. Instead of the attempted internationalisation of the national arenas , the International became sectionalised into national camps.

From socialist internationalism we move to its bitter rival—communist internationalism. One important difference between the two was that the former was voluntarist, the latter was not—the Communist International, the Comintern, did have the power to tell its members what to do and what not to do. This has often been interpreted as the Comintern being the foreign policy instrument of the Soviet Union instructing fellow Communist Parties elsewhere according to the foreign policy needs of the motherland of the revolution.[14] The Comintern's universalist language often hid its particularist Soviet interests. Andreas Wirsching's article starts from the theoretical assumption that Soviet universalism was in denial of national particularisms (other than those of the Soviet Union). He goes on to argue that Communist internationalism suffered from very similar tensions between national practices in national contexts and internationalist practices in internationalist contexts that Talbot Imlay identified with relation to Socialist internationalism. The Soviet Union might be able to instruct Comintern officials to act according to a policy line determined in Moscow, but on the ground, outside of the Soviet Union, this policy line frequently clashed with local considerations, interests and conditions. Soviet universalism could not resolve the idiosyncracies of different national contexts. Instead, like a boomerang, they continually came back to haunt the attempt to find a universal language of international Communism. Andreas Wirsching refers to the disappointments of many syndicalist and left revolutionary forces in France and elsewhere in Europe who had initially hoped that they could combine their insistence on federal autonomy with support of Bolshevism only to learn that Soviet universalism had little time for federal autonomies of any sort.

And yet Andreas Wirsching, like Talbot Imlay, pleads to take seriously the Comintern as a communicative space, as a reflection of life experiences and as a social practice in which different actors came together to negotiate their spatial and non-spatial understandings of internationalism. The Comintern turned internationalism into a life-style of a distinct set of officials who lived and breathed internationalism, who represented internationalism and who gave a transnational feel to the internationalist communist movement. These officials were often multi-lingual and were sent on missions to different and often distant parts of the world—to foster revolutionary sentiment, sometimes in secret. Their missions could be dangerous and were often adventurous. Their whole existence had a somewhat romantic

---

14   Sobhanlal Datta Gupta: Marxism in Dark Times: Select Essays for the New Century, London, 2012, ch. 5: "Comintern: Exploring the New Historiography."

rebellious image attached to it. Much of their success depended on their communicative skills—and the apparatus needed for communication, the media, the translators and translations to communicate the action repertoires of communist internationalism.[15] As Andreas Wirsching points out, the political language of Communism was international. Its discourses were meant to be as little nation-specific as possible. As a political ideology that self-consciously span the world, international Communism sponsored a discursive set of texts that were supposed to be global in reach and explanatory power. Of course, this ambition time and time again clashed with the many local vernacularisms that Communism was confronted with in nationally specific contexts. Not the least because of these tensions between a political language that was universal and national/regional contexts that were highly specific, Communist internationalism and its proponents failed in manifold specific circumstances.

Andreas Wirsching also discusses the memory of Communist internationalism. The heroic and the bleak often lie side by side in the Communist internationalist realms of memory. The Hitler-Stalin pact, the Hotel Lux, the Stalinist purges are as much part of that memory landscape as are the revolutionary struggles, the emancipatory ambitions and the antifascist commitment of international Communism. Internationalism itself is an important vector of both Communist and Socialist, and indeed, many social movement memories. And the memory politics of social movements makes use of internationalism to provide various movements with a particular set of identities that re-inforce the cohesion and strength of the social movements themselves. It is therefore not surprising that within social movement research, collective memory research methodology has become a popular and powerful tool to examine the impact of memory on a wide variety of social movements.[16]

The continuities of internationalism from the old to the new social movements are very visible when we move from our discussions of socialist and communist internationalism to our discussions of the role of internationalism in three of the most prominent new social movements: the women's, the environmental and the peace movements. None of them were exactly "new", and the authors of the respective articles all point out the long-term origins—all ranging back to the early nineteenth century—of the "new" movements as they came to prominence in the 1970s and 1980s. Krista Cowman points out that an international women's movement as a transnational network of activists can be traced back to the early 1800s. Not unlike the labour movement internationalists discussed by Talbot Imlay and Andreas Wirsching, many women activists denied national or regional

---

15   On repertoires of contention see Mark Traugott (ed.): Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action, Durham 1995.
16   Lorenzo Bosi/Herbert Reiter: Historical Methodologies: Archival Research and Oral History in Social Movement Research, in: Donatella della Porta (ed.): Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research, Oxford 2014, pp. 117–143, p. 131.

particularities and spoke a universal language of women's rights and women's liberation that was self-consciously internationalist. Like with Communism it produced the same tensions between a universal political language and the needs of specific vernaculars. Communication again proved to be vital, as the language of women's rights was transported through a dense web of newspapers and journals that were often strongly internationalist in orientation. In the 21st century the new digital media provided a new set of opportunities for networking and linking women's initiatives globally, but the media had already played a vital role before. Translators of particular forms of activism and resistance or of specific sets of demands or programs had been of crucial important to women's social activism since the nineteenth century. The foundation of organisations and associations often institutionalised those communicative links between networks of activists and gave additional stability and longevity to the networks. The sharing of specific action repertoires and programmatic statements was an important aspect of their internationalism. Women's groups could also use other forums than their own to promote their particular cause. Thus, Krista Cowman points out that world fairs and national exhibitions were often prominent events on which the voices of women's rights' activists could be heard loud and clear.

The women's movement never existed in the singular. It was a set of movements, members of which did not necessarily see eye to eye over the meaning of women's rights and women's liberation. The political language of the women's movement was also by no means unified. The divisions between a bourgeois and a socialist women's movement was particular marked, although, even here, we have instances of overlap, communication and common action.[17] Cooperation could be particularly marked over specific issues. Krista Cowman uses the example of the women's peace movement to show that both socialist and bourgeois campaigners could come together over the issue of securing peace in Europe before 1914. This also points to the interconnectedness of issue-based social movements, in this case the women's movement and the peace movement. The socialist women's movement found in the Second International a ready-made forum for their transnational activism, thus also institutionally linking one of the old social movements to one of the new. Comintern women activists had often been active in the socialist women's movement before the First World War and ensured that the Comintern would also develop a strong Communist women's internationalism.

Yet, as Krista Cowman points out, the link of women's movements to political movements was often problematic, as it circumscribed women's activism according to the political ideology that the movement as a whole espoused. Hence women within political movements found it difficult to get their voices heard, as they were competing both with men and with other issues. More successful, therefore, were women's groups

---

17   Helmut Gruber/Pamela M. Graves (eds.): Women and Socialism: Socialism and Women: Europe Between the Two World Wars, Oxford 1998.

fighting as independent women's movement for particular causes, such a suffrage or women's education or the abolition of a wide variety of social discriminatory practices against women. Women's movements, as Krista Cowman underlines, were successful as lobbyists at a variety of international non-governmental institutions and organisations, such as the League of Nations or later the United Nations. Women's International Non-Governmental Organisations were themselves vital in achieving remarkable successes in certain areas, such as prostitution, trafficking of women and preserving or extending the legal rights of women. The support of international bodies, such as the United Nations and of national governments was often vital in that, so that, here, as elsewhere in this special issue, we again witness to close interrelationship between the national and the international.

Moving from women's internationalism to the internationalism of environmental movements, Franz-Josef Brüggemeier continues with some of the themes prominent in Krista Cowman's article. Thus he also emphasises that the environmental protection movement of the 1970s was not as new as its proponents often claimed. Environmental protection as an issue producing social protest can be traced back to the early nineteenth century, when protests against industrialisation and industrial modernity were connected to demands to preserve the traditional environment against the encroachments of industry, urbanisation and the transport revolution. Political Romanticism often gave a voice to those concerns, and it remained characteristic of environmental protection movements that they could be located both on the political right and the political left.[18]

Another claim of the new ecology movement of the 1970s that is viewed somewhat sceptically by Franz-Josef Brüggemeier is the claim that it was a movement from below that pushed through its demands with the help of citizens' mobilisations—often against the official political forces. In fact, as he demonstrates in his article, official politics were often crucial in helping the movements from below to realise their ambitions and fulfill their demands for better environmental protection.

The internationalisation of the discourse of environmental protection happened early and was influenced by the perception of the interconnectedness of environmental concerns in different parts of the world. The notion of "one world" in which issues of ecology were interrelated across the globe spurned international action but also produced resistances, especially from those sections of the world which felt themselves hindered in their economic development by demands of environmental protection. Nevertheless international cooperation was seen as vital, if the "one world" was going to survive into the future, whether it is over the protection of the oceans or the protection of migrating birds. From early on, issues of ecology and environmental protection did not know regional or national borders.

---

18   Franz-Josef Brüggemeier/Marc Cioc/Thomas Zeller: How Green were the Nazis? Nature, Environment and Nation in the Third Reich, Athens/Ohio 2005.

Like in the women's movement, non-governmental organisations played a crucial role in promoting internationalism in environmental protection. Franz-Josef Brüggemeier stresses the role of landmark publications and their echoes in multiple civil societies through translations and reporting in the media. Here, like with the other social movements discussed in this special issue, the media, including the social movement-specific media, are important preconditions of internationalism as well as a vital forum for internationalism.[19]

In relation to the massive debates on the allegedly dying German forests in the 1980s, Franz-Josef Brüggemeier also points out that specific national contexts have been important for understanding the particular strength of environmental concerns in concrete places. The universal language of environmental protection, so visible in the "one world" rhetoric, had to contend with a variety of local particularisms and negotiate these if it wanted to be successful. Once again, therefore, we encounter the tensions in the relationship of social movement internationalism with a wide variety of local, regional and national concerns. Franz-Josef Brüggemeier emphasises the complexity of these tensions in the realm of environmental protection. It is difficult to analyse one level without taking into account the other levels as well. Localism, nationalism and internationalism were interrelated in often contradictory but always intriguing ways.

Franz-Josef Brüggemeier also questions the idea that environmental protection movements were always organised in a democratic bottom-up way. The example of the highly centralised and undemocratic structure of one of the most successful international environmental protection groups, Greenpeace, serves as an example that here as elsewhere, the realities of the histories of social movements are often more complex than the myths peddled about those movements by their activists and their activist historians and social scientists.[20]

The final contribution to this special issue deals with the peace movement. Holger Nehring recognises that international peace movements, like women's movements, came in many shapes, sizes and forms, and he restricts his own article to a discussion of groups that can be described as pacifist. Like with the women's movement and the environmental protection movement, pacifist peace movements can be traced back to the early nineteenth century—when the first peace societies emerged in response to the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. Transnational communication played an important role almost from the beginning, especially as the early activists placed a lot of emphasis on the education

---

19   For the digital age, this has frequently been emphasised. See, for example, Paolo Gerbaudo: Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism, London 2012; Manuel Castells: Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age, Cambridge 2012.

20   On the relationship between activism and scholarship compare William Hoynes/Charlotte Ryan (eds.): Rhyming Hope and History: Activism, Academics, and Social Movement Scholarship, Minneapolis 2005.

of the public. As Holger Nehring emphasises, international law, reason and the norms of a European/Western civilisation played a crucial role in the peace activists' vision for a peaceful world order.

Peace societies were founded nationally in the nineteenth century and then combined to act transnationally. That also conforms to a pattern that we have seen with other social movements. It shows at the same time the importance and the inadequacy of the national framework for social movement internationalism. Ideas of peace were universal, but had to be negotiated in national contexts. This often produced tensions—another red thread running through all the contributions of this special issue.

According to Holger Nehring, the First World War marked a major watershed for international pacificist organisations. The hyper-nationalism of war created within peace activism a greater mistrust of nation state as the basis for peace work. Instead, it promoted an even stronger orientation towards internationalism, as Holger Nehring demonstrates with the example of the War Resisters' International. Communication both through a developed travel culture and through the media provided the bedrock of this newly re-enforced internationalism.

After 1945 pacifist internationalism, as Holger Nehring points out, was discredited by the appeasement policies of the 1930s. Yet peace became an urgent issue, as the world was faced for the first time by the danger of global destruction through nuclear weapons. Although the threat to peace was never more global, the fight for peace was fought predominantly through national organisations. The trend towards greater organisational internationalism of the interwar period was not continued. And even when organisations were programmatically transnational, they were mostly restricted in their spatial reach. The Campaign for European Nuclear Disarmament, for example, was predominantly a British organisations with links both to North America and continental Europe.[21] But it was certainly not global. It is ironic that one of the most prominent slogans of the post-war peace movement—"one world or none"—was used near-universally in many vernacular languages in distinct national peace movements. The Cold War divide of the world, of course, made a global peace movement near impossible. Official Communist peace movements were instruments of their respective governments who in turn, repressed independent peace movements. In the West, peace movements were routinely denounced as "fifth column" of Communism and a pronounced internationalism or their willingness to talk also to the official peace movements in the Communist world only heightened the suspicions of Cold Warriors in the West.

---

21 Patrick D. M. Burke: European Nuclear Disarmament: A Study of Transnational Social Movement Strategy, unpublished University of Westminster D.Phil. 2004; also: Patrick D. M. Burke: We Envisage a European-Wide Campaign in which Every Kind of Exchange Takes Place: European Nuclear Disarmament in the West European Peace Movements of the 1980s, in: Eckart Conze/Martin Klimke/Jeremy Varon (eds.): Accidental Armageddons: Nuclear Threats, Nuclear Fears and the Cold War of the 1980s, Cambridge 2016 (forthcoming)

Overall, the contributions to this special issue all highlight the fruitfulness of studying the internationalism of both "old" and "new" social movements together. Not only has internationalism been an important part of modern social movements, as they emerged from the eighteenth century onwards, but their internationalism also shared a number of important characteristics. It was based on communication and hence the media through which social movements interacted became vitally important for their internationalism as did specific travel cultures and cultures of translation that introduced location-specific movements and their programs and action repertoires to other locations, where similar movements had formed around related issues. A focus on internationalism in social movements further questions the distinction between old and new social movements, as internationalism was a continuum of social movements and a practice that was studied and adapted across a wide variety of strongly interrelated social movements over time. If internationalism was a vital ingredient of a wide variety of social movements, it was rarely decisive in pushing through particular objectives or in realising specific aims of social movements. Its high ambition stood in contrast to a long history of failure. But, as all articles in this issue argue in their different ways, the issue of internationalism was intricately connected to national campaigns over social movement concerns and as such the interplay of international and national action ultimately might have re-enforced and strengthened social movements and thereby also contributed to their many successes. Hence, future research needs to examine much more closely the interplay between national and international actions and commitments of intersecting social movements. The articles assembled here certainly encourage future scholars to take that step.