Introduction

D. R. Sahu

I Theoretical Perspectives

Contemporary society has been witnessing collective mobilisations of people's action groups; protest movements; resistance concerned with land rights, environmentalism, women's rights, peace initiatives, response to consumerism, lifestyle choices and many other issues. Against this backdrop, there have been many studies on social movements during the last five decades by social scientists in general and sociologists in particular.

Why and how do social movements emerge? How are they analysed? What are the sociological approaches to the study of social movements? These questions have been addressed in scholarly articles published for over 50 years in the *Sociological Bulletin*. This volume, *Sociology of Social Movement* is an outcome of 11 published articles from this repository.

Sociology principally aims at studying the structure of social systems and its institutions, the perennial processes of change triggered by a combination of endogenous factors and external conditions, and the resulting outcomes, intended or unintended. One of the major focuses has been on the study of social movement. Historically, social movements as a field of study within Sociology and the social sciences are a late entrant. The socialist working-class movement occupied the social movement space until the arrival of 'new social movements' in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Heberle (1968) was one of the earliest to forcefully argue that social movement studies needed to be expanded beyond the working-class movements to include others.

Conceptualising the term 'social movement' has been a difficult task. Protests, collective actions, agitations, resistances and rebellions, collective mobilisations of all varieties have generally been described as social movements.

Heberle (1951) regards the belief system that underlies social mobilisations as an expression of collective will of the participants. It is the conscious

volition of individuals acting collectively that brings about the embodiment of ideologies in social movements.

Wilkinson (1971) provides a working concept, which could be adequately deployed and related to empirical phenomena by the combined, and often collaborative, efforts of historians, political scientists, sociologists, social anthropologists and psychologists. Social movement

> ... is a deliberate collective endeavor to promote change by any means, not excluding violence, illegality and revolution or withdrawal into 'utopian' community … and it must evince a minimal degree of organization though this may range from a loose, informal or partial level of organization to the highly institutionalized and bureaucratic movement and the corporate group. (Wilkinson 1971: 27)

Wilkinson's definition of movement spells out a collective action through legal means very much within the boundary of institutions as well as violent extra-institutional collective action.

There is no single definition of social movement nor a single method for studying them nor any consensus on particular types of questions that need to be addressed. Sydney Tarrow (1998) argues how the connections between Political Science, Economics and Sociology can help to develop an inter-disciplinary approach to the study of social movements He combines some of the insights of Economics with the macro-structural focus of Political Science to propose a theory that accounts for the cyclical nature of social protest activity. There is a variety of different methodological, theoretical and substantive approaches to the study of social movements due to the broad and inclusive nature of Sociology. As a social science, Sociology is noteworthy because it has influence of various disciplines in order to understand the relationship between the individual and society.

There are a variety of ways in which social movements have been classified. Herbert Bulmmer (1969) classifies movements into three major categories, namely general social movements, specific social movements and expressive social movements. First category gives general direction towards which they move in a slow, yet a persisting fashion, unorganised, neither established leadership nor recognised movement. Second category has clear-cut and well-defined objectives, which seeks to reach the goal. It also develops a recognised and accepted leadership and definite goals characterised by collective consciousness, for example, various reform and revolutionary movements. Expressive movements do not seek to alter the institutions or its social order or its objective character. Various religious and fashion movements come under this category.

Ralph H. Turner and Lewis M. Killian (1957) have also classified movements into three types—value oriented, power oriented and participation oriented. Value-oriented movements gain support primarily from the conviction for social change; power-oriented movements are directed towards contestation of power and status and their accumulation; while participation-orientation seeks membership and gratification mainly through self-expression.

David Aberle (1966) in his study of America's Navaho Indians categorises movements as transformative, reformative, redemptive and alternative movements. Neil J. Smelser (1962) attempts to integrate his typology of social movements with the general theory of collective action from a Parsonian perspective. The primacy of value orientation is followed by the normative, the goal attainment and adaptive functions of collective behaviour. Correspondingly, he puts emphasis on the growth and spread of generalised belief, the structural strains produced within the social system and the adaptive mechanisms by which these are met and resolved or not resolved.

Movements and collective actions are characterised by some continuity and minimum degree of organisation (Heberle 1951; Turner and Killian 1957; Wilkinson 1971; Wilson 1973). With the sustained action and some level of organisational structure, the collectivities involved in social movements usually adopt non-institutionalised means to achieve the goal (Smelser 1962; Wilson 1973).

Consistent with researches on social movements, studies on contemporary social movements have focused on the organisational aspect, collective action and consequent changes in the social structure.

T. K. Oommen (2010) describes three approaches to the study of social movements: historical, psychological and sociological. The historical approach focuses on the career of movements and characteristics of participants and their motivation, while the psychological approach perceives movements as expressions of needs and discontents of participants. Sociological analysis of social movements presupposes a theory of society within which collective actions take place. He points out the limitations of the structural–functional paradigm in the analysis of social movements as it stresses on order and integration rather than on conflict and change.

Oommen has traced the historical evolution of theories of social movements from classical thinkers: Durkheim, Weber and Marx. Though, they did not propound specifically any theory of social movements, their sociology is premised on collective actions in the analysis of society. Durkheim in his *The Division of Labour in Society* (1893) and later in *Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912) postulated a theory of collective action and the kind of

solidarity that produced and approved forms of collective action. Weber had conceptualised the theory of social change with the notion of 'reutilizations of charisma' where two opposing forces of disruption are the authority of rationality and the power of charisma. Oommen describes Marxian notion of social change as more systematic. Marx took into account the collective actions of antagonistic classes (Oommen 2010: 2–6).

A collective mobilisation is called a social movement when it develops an organisational structure, rules, established leadership and a division of labour. The criteria employed by various authors to define a movement are goals, means, scope and content. Sociologists and anthropologists who have studied movements in their own or other societies have labelled them as 'political/social', 'messianic', 'nativist' and 'revitalisation'. The second defining criteria of social movements refers to the 'means' employed to attain their goals. This is followed by the criteria of spatial and societal scope of the movement. Finally, there is the substantive aspect of content (whether religious or secular, etc.).

Oommen has used two criteria for the classification of social movements: types of collectivities (biological, primordial and civil) and nature of goals (symbolic and instrumental) to sketch out the phase-wise development of social movements in twentieth-century India (Oommen 2010: 16–17). These are the colonial phase (1900–47), the nation-building phase (1947–89) and the present phase (1990 to the present) of a globalising India. He distinguishes between three ideal-typical movements: ideological, organisational and charismatic. Irrespective of which type of movement component emerges first, the elements of other two will have to emerge subsequently, if it has to become a social movement (Ibid: 34–38).

Partha N. Mukherji deals with a number of fundamental issues. Are all collective/social mobilisations to be regarded as social movements? If that is so, there remains no analytical value in the concept. To qualify as a social movement of one kind or another, structurally, the three essentials are: social conflict, social/collective mobilisation and social change *in their interrelation*. Singly, none of these constitute social movement. Collective mobilisation against AIDS, or for Pulse Polio, or engaging in disaster management or community development are laudable social activities, but they are not social movements. They may be better designated as campaigns for public good. Conflict, structure and change constitute the core of the theoretical orientation for the study of social movements. The presence of an ideology, the need for an organisational base and leadership are necessary conditions that accompany the core conditionalities (Mukherji 2010: 126–27).

Mukherji argues that since social movements are change seeking (or resisting), it would only be appropriate that they are classified by the *kind* of change they *intend* to bring about. It follows that classification of social movements is premised on the classification of social change. Elaborating, he argues that change has to be identified with reference to some social system that is supposed to undergo change during the process of the social movement. Such a social system can be perceived in terms of *interrelated* (rather than *interdependent*) structure/s (or parts). When such interrelationship becomes asymmetrical, it is likely to develop contradictions. Contradictions may move from a permissive level of non-antagonistic to a precipitative level of antagonistic relationships that may create objective conditions for conflict and social mobilisation, seeking change.

Change has been classified by him in terms of incremental, evolutionary changes that occur *within* the system without any threat to it (accumulative); and structural changes *of* the system that either alter the social system (alterative change) or transform the system (transformative or revolutionary changes). Correspondingly, social mobilisations seeking changes within the system are quasi-social movements; those that seek to alter the system (by eliminating an existing structure or adding a new one) are alterative social movements; and those that reject existing structure(s) and replace them with alternative one(s) could be transformative or revolutionary movements. Quasi-social movements include those that bargain for better resources and facilities, and redressal of grievances. An agrarian movement leading to the elimination of bonded labour is an instance of an alterative social movement. The replacement of state ownership of property by private ownership would be an instance of transformatory/revolutionary change depending upon the scale of the transformation.

To bring a dynamic element into the classificatory scheme, Mukherji introduces the praxiological aspect of the use of institutional, non-institutional or a combination of both means for the achievement of movement goals. This, he asserts, enables the tracing of the trajectory of any social movement, making it possible not to lose sight of the historicity of the movement (Mukherji 2010: 128–31).

Finally, Mukherji rounds off his theoretical orientation by a *domainal* categorisation of the social system at the macro-societal level. He conceives of a social system comprising of five analytically distinct domains of asymmetrical social relationships, namely, discrimination, exploitation, oppression, gender discrimination and eco-environmental asymmetry. These asymmetries are ubiquitous in society. Contradictions are embedded in these asymmetries. In any societal system these asymmetries are *interrelated* and *interfaced*,

characterised by a constellation of primary and subsidiary contradictions (Mukherji 2010: 132–33). While logically, at the societal level, any number of domains can be conceptualised depending upon the scientists' conceptual needs, he suggests these set of five asymmetries find favour in the social science literature. He illustrates the use of this theoretical framework by analysing the Maoist movement (Mukherji 2010: 134–40).

Other than Mukherji, there are other sociologists who have also attempted to define social movements in terms of their structural features, typology and appropriate methodology for analysis.

M. S. A Rao (1978) was the first sociologist who has attempted to put together the studies of social movements by various scholars in his two edited volumes. Rao argues that sociologists and social anthropologists have been preoccupied with the concept of social structure at various levels of abstraction. Generally, social movements deal with a range of social phenomena that include all that can be observed while studying the process. If we consider a social movement to be an organised effort on the part of a collectivity, involving social mobilisation based on an ideology for bringing about changes (either partial or total) in the social system, then we have to view social process as consisting of interrelated activities, interactions and events guided by an ideology directed towards social and cultural changes. The character of social movements as an instrument of social change is quite different from an imitative or emulative process of mobility and change. While the latter centres on agreement, the former is focused on protest of one kind or the other. Following from this, the latter emphasises on contradiction and conflict.

The conceptual issues deal with social movement's definition (typification) and implications for social order. Rao (1979) identifies the conceptual issues as classification, genesis, ideology and identity, organisation and leadership, internal dynamics, routinisation and social consequences. Collective mobilisation, ideology and orientation to change are important. According to Rao, explanation relating to social movements lies in the theory of relative deprivation and reference group behaviour. He questions the validity of strain theory or revitalisation theory as providing adequate explanation of social movements. The organisation comprises aspects of recruitment, commitment and leadership. As for Rao, a movement may bring about social change either in the form of reform, transformation or revolution. Corresponding to these three outcomes one can classify social movements as reformative, transformative or revolutionary.

D. N. Dhanagare (2007) is of the view that historical method has a com-paratively greater appeal among sociologists. Reviewing contributions

of various sociologists on social movements, many movement studies including those of A. R. Desai, I. P. Desai, M. S. A Rao, Partha Nath Mukherji, T. K. Oommen, Rajendra Singh, Hira Singh, Ram Chandra Guha, Puspendra Surana and himself have employed this approach. All of them have used history rigorously to arrive at broader levels of explanation, generalisation and theoretical abstraction. However, conventional movements attracted more attention of the scholars than some of new social movements (Dhanagare and John 1988).

Yogendra Singh (1986) argues that most studies on social movements have not only made substantive contributions by providing information on specific movements, their structure and process, but have also tried to clarify conceptual problems relating to classification and raised questions on causality and validity. Social movement studies not only question the functional presuppositions of social system but the constituent processes of movements link them organically with the historical forces in a particular society. The two key concepts, which were introduced in sociological analysis of movement studies, are those of 'historicity' and the 'dialectic of social processes'. Historicity lies in the process of development and its contradictions. A typology of social move-ments could be evolved by making a methodological distinction between 'the problems related to the scale of the movement and the issues related to the units and levels of observation. Further, he views social movement as institutionalised collective action that is guided by ideology and supported by an organisational structure.

Literature on social movements has been concerned with histories, theories of movement and its consequences. Such models have attempted to stimulate changes in the structure and organisation of movement ranging from states of precipitating factors, initial social unrest and excitement and emergence of charismatic leadership to a revolutionary nature of capturing the power. Wilkinson (1971: 27) argues that 'social movements have a commitment towards bringing about change and the raison d'être of its organisation have been founded upon the conscious volition, normative commitment to the movement aims or beliefs and active participation of followers or members…' . These above characterisation of movements have been endorsed and subscribed by many scholars in the field of movement studies.

Rajendra Singh (2001) broadly divides the theoretical tradition of movement studies into *(a)* classical, *(b)* neo-classical and *(c)* 'new' social movements. The classical tradition includes studies mostly related to collective behaviour of crowds, riots and rebel groups especially studied by Western social psychologists and historians. The neo-classical tradition refers to the tradition of 'old' social movement studies mainly after 1950s dominated

primarily by Marxists and functionalists. European and American scholars propounded the 'new' social movement theory, popularly known as NSM.

Singh summarises some of the characteristics of the NSMs:

1. They raise the issue of the 'self-defence' of the community against the state and the consciousness of civil society, which are new phenomena of contemporary postmodern world.
2. NSMs do not subscribe to the Marxist paradigm of explaining conflicts and contradictions in terms of 'class' and class conflict.
3. NSMs generally evolve through grass-roots politics. Grass-roots actions often initiate micro-movements of small groups, targeting localised issues with a limited institutional base. They write their own scripts like a street theatre. They focus much more on social domain of civil society rather than the economy or state. Further, the goal of NSMs is to reorganise state, society and economy and to create a public space in which democratic discourse on autonomy and freedom of the individual and collectivities, their identities and orientations could be analysed.
4. NSMs are essentially plural in structure and generally global and trans-human in character, which include protest against nuclear war, advocacy for environment, peace, civil liberty, identity, freedom and personal dignity (Singh 2001).

Oommen (2010) has commented on the validity of Rajendra Singh's claims towards contributing to the general theory of social movements. He criticises Singh for proposing 'reflexive empiricism' as a methodological device for the study of both nature and society, and for using the phrase 'Indian Society' to delineate a region, when Indian civilisation transcends the territory of the Indian state incorporating the whole of South Asia. He disapproves Singh's position on post-ism and questions the relevance of pre–post phase of movement in Indian context. Singh claims that the everyday resistance has been ignored by conventional movement studies in India. But Oommen argues that everyday protest and collective action exist in different contexts and levels. Similarly, Oommen adds to Singh's argument that the movement is engaged in reproducing society not only through conflict but also through the process of cooperation. Movements are not expression of change, as suggested by Singh, rather social movements accelerate, decelerate and prevent change (Oommen 2010: 15).

Debal K. SinghaRoy (2010) examines the emerging patterns of social movements taking shape all over the world, locally and also cutting across

the geographical boundaries of the state and the nation globally. He not only critically analyses the conceptual underpinnings of the functional, symbolic interactional, Marxian, neo-Marxian, political process–resource mobilisation, new social movement identity, subaltern, Gandhian perspectives, among others, but also delineates alternative viewpoints of social movement analysis. Various studies focus on the nature and forms of local resistance against global domination by predefined but rearticulated social categories like caste, race, tribe and ethnic groups, and the emerging nature of the protest of women, farmers, students and migrants in a changing scenario illustrating social movements taking place in North and South America, Eastern and Western Europe, Africa, Asia and Australia.

In order to have better understanding of Western perspective particularly on new social movement (NSMs), analysis of two broad theoretical perspectives known as Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT) and Identity-Oriented Theory (IOT) of American and European traditions, respectively, are essential. IOT has its emphasis on the cultural dimensions of contemporary social movements and the structural conditions, which explain their emergence. RMT has its focus on organisations and the notion of rational action. There are limitations of these theories specifically on the difficulties they encounter when dealing with the people's movements.

IOT defines contemporary social movements as new, but there is considerable debate about whether and in what ways they are significantly different from other social movements. It poses the question: What is 'new' about new social movements? Most of the answers relate to the difference between new social movements and the social movements of capitalist industrial societies. Thus new social movements are not based on traditional forms of class conflict. Their values are distinct from those of traditional movement and they embody a fundamental critique of modernity and rationality. They belong to a 'different systemic location' from old social movements (Melucci 1985).

New social movements are generally associated with systemic change, whether this be conceptualised as a transition to post-industrial or programmed society, (Touraine 1981) or a transition to disorganised capitalism or the emergence of post-modernity (Melucci 1980). The structural locations are primarily cultural rather than political, bringing about social change through the transformation of cultural codes and collective identities. They are concerned with 'cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization' and seek to defend the life world from encroachment by the system. The new 'politics' is all about 'quality of life, equality, individual self-realization, participation and human rights', whereas the 'old politics' is based on economic, social, domestic and military security (Habermas 1981).

New social movements arise not from relations of production and distribution but from within the sphere of reproduction of the life world, hence the issues of resource distribution are said to be irrelevant to them. Their action primarily concerns civil society rather than the state. Similarly, Alain Touraine (1977) articulates that in post-industrial societies social movements form around personal or collective identity not in relation to the system of ownership. The struggle between capital and labour in an industrial society has been superseded by the struggle between social forces for the control of historicity and the overall system of meaning which sets dominant rules in a given society. Touraine's (1985) notion of historicity is analogous to Gramsci's hegemony, both being concerned with culture and definitions of social reality, and the way social conflict has the potential to transform dominant definitions of social realities that are reproduced through cultural forms. These social forces are social movements, and their struggles are about culture and meaning. NSM theorists distinguish social movements from political movements. Political movements are concerned with the state and state power, whilst new social movements are concerned with the cultural codes, specifically, the production of symbolic goods of information and images, of culture itself. Thus, 'social movements, in a strict sense, represent conflicting efforts to control cultural patterns in a given societal type'. New social movements, therefore, are located in the civil society and are involved in bringing about cultural change.

The structural location of new social movements is reflected in their social base which is no longer the working class but the 'new class' or the new middle class inclusive of the old rural classes (Melucci 1980). The new middle class is drawn from the service professions and the public sector and their activism is explained by their relatively high levels of education and their access to information (Offe 1985: 817–68). They question the way society is functioning and are motivated to participate in collective action. These movements operate primarily on the symbolic level. The movement is the message; the form it takes constitutes itself is a challenge to dominant cultural codes and embodies different ways of understanding and relating to the social world. Social movements 'perceive' and 'name' the given society in new ways that make visible previously invisible power relations. He observes that although these movements do not directly address the state or demand political power, one of their effects is to 'render' visible the power that lies behind the rationality of administrative or organisational procedure. Following Foucault, Melucci argues that power is dispersed in complex societies and is invisible 'playing a crucial role in shaping all social relationships' (Melucci 1985: 789–816).

Eyerman and Jamison (1991) argue that new social movements present a fundamental challenge to the

> established routine of 'doing politics' ... redefining situations, opening up new conceptual spaces and framing new issues in political terms—this is politics in its primary form and is the core around which cognitive praxis of social movements resolves …. all social movements originate as attempts to redefine the accepted boundaries of the politics.

Same position is also adopted by Claus Offe, who says that the new social movements represent a new paradigm of politics, which has the potential of transforming the political order. 'Old' social movements were also involved in social transformations. They were the torchbearers of modernity and helped in mediating the transition from tradition to modern society by creating new individual and collective identities and new form of politics. Now, however, they have become institutionalised and new social movements have taken their place. These new social movements occur at a distinct stage in societal development, involve new actors equipped with different orientations and identities and aim at achieving quite different ends than the old movements. In addition, they take these older movements as the part of the other, a responsible party in the formation of the values and the institutions they react against.

The preceding discussions on new social movements derive from social transformations at the macro level. New social movement theory attempts to relate changes occurring at the micro level of society. Melucci's identity-oriented paradigm conceptualises social movements as action systems that are both enabled and constrained by the system in which they exist. It is the process of negotiations and renegotiations by the collective identities of social actors that links individuals with the social structure and system.

Collective identity is the shared definition of the field of opportunities and constraints offered to collective action that is subject to a continuous process of construction and reconstruction. Contemporary social movements do not fight merely for material goals, or to increase their participation in the system. They fight for symbolic and cultural stakes and for a different meaning and orientation of social action. They try to change people's lives as they believe that you can change your life today, while fighting for more general changes in society. Although new social movements are primarily cultural in orientation, they may also bring about policy and institutional change through the formation of new elites and cultural innovation. He thus acknowledges that contemporary social movements can have political effects that restructure socio-political order of a given society (Melucci 1985).

Melluci argues that new social movements are functional for contemporary societies insofar as they draw attention to fundamental problems such as threat to environment or danger of nuclear catastrophe, which are products of the system and remain invisible until social movements raise questions. In this way, movements function to facilitate 'the adoption of complex system to transformation of the environment and to accelerated pace of internal change they are exposed to and assisting the system to adapt and change' (Melucci 1985).

Claus Offe regards new social movements to be a part of the project of modernity rather than facilitating transition to a postmodern society. Subscribing to the position taken by Habermas, he is of the view that with the state seeking control of more and more aspects of daily life, people's resistance to this grows: they seek to defend civil society and the spaces of everyday existence from the encroachment of state. This has given rise not only to new social movements but also to the new rights, both of which are involved in restoring and reconstituting civil society in different ways (Offe 1985: 817–68).

The new social movements often question the very idea of progress, economic growth and development packages on which old social movements were based. Offe argues that there is nothing postmodern about these values; on the contrary, they have been evident in social movements of both the bourgeoisie and the working class throughout the modern period. He prefers to call the criticism raised by new social movements a modern critique of modernity.

RMT focuses at the meso level and is concerned basically with mobilisation of social actors into social movements. The two variants of this theory are: the 'organisational entrepreneurial' and the 'political-interactive' models. McCarthy and Zald (1977), writing from the perspective of movement activists, are into problems of strategy and tactics about how to identify the conditions under which peoples' groups get mobilised. Their emphasis is on the social environment that is conducive or constraining for the mobilisation of social movements. The central problem is tactical.

They define social movements as a 'set of opinions and beliefs in a population representing preferences for changing some elements of social structure or reward distribution, or both, of a society'. The mobilisation process is facilitated by their organisation into institutions and communities, social groups and networks of various kinds. The assumption is that movement participants act on basis of instrumental rationality, weighing up the costs and benefits of any particular course of action before deciding to pursue it. Incentives are needed to persuade them to participate in social movement

organisations. There are two types of social movement organisation: professional and classical; both of these need resources in order to achieve their goals. Resource takes the form of labour, money, premises, transport and legitimacy. Professional social movement organisations appeal for resources from supporters and sympathisers who may not themselves benefit directly from the success of movements. They are known as *conscience* adherents. Classical social movement organisations rely for resources on *beneficiary adherents*, who support the movement's goals in the expectation that they will benefit from its success.

Affluence and better economic position of a society encourage the formation of movement organisations, which like any other organisation, sustain on an assessment of cost–benefit analysis. 'Solidarity incentives' increase their commitment to collective action. The success of social movements lies in their professional and organisational approach. Contrary to new social movement theorists that focus on non-institutional character of social movements, RM theorists centre on institutionalised organisational social movements.

The political-interactive model comes closer to NSM perspective. Tarrow (1994) defines social movements as 'collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities'. Collective action is not triggered by an increase in the availability of resources but changes in the political opportunity structure, that is, '[c]onsistent but not necessarily formal, permanent or national dimensions of political environment, which either encourage or discourage people from using collective action'. People are encouraged to use collective action when their prospects of success increase.

In this perspective, social structure is seen as important in creating mobilisation potential of a movement. Tarrow argues that the mobilisation potential needs to be activated through organisation, but, going beyond them, collective action also requires the mobilisation of consensus and a favourable political opportunity structure (Tarrow 1994). Consensus mobilisation, therefore, could also be conceptualised as the construction of a counter-hegemonic movement, particularly if the transformation is accomplished (Snow et al. 1986). Tarrow (1994) locates himself within the European structuralist tradition of analysis as well as the American RMT framework. He suggests that the emergence of collective action is a response to changes in the political opportunity structure and that those changes, in addition to macro-structural changes, explain when and why social movements emerge. Like McCarthy and Zald, he urges that it is the social organisation of actors into networks, groups and institutions that provides the basis for 'activating' and 'sustaining' collective action. Mobilisation also requires trust cooperation

and shared understanding between movement participants and the negotiation of a collective identity. For Tarrow, social movements occur in cycles and have effects in political sphere. The formation of collective identity is part of the mobilisation (Klandermans 1986). Resource mobilisation theory recognises the issues of meaning, culture and identity, which are crucial to understanding the processes of mobilisation and the link between social structure and social action.

However, new social movement theories have been criticised on several counts. First, that there is nothing new about new social movements. Empirically, new social movements differ considerably from each other and display far more continuity than the movements of the past. Second, they are criticised for their Western ethnocentricity. Non-Western countries like India, where majority of the population live in conditions of material scarcity, the applicability of NSM theories seems questionable.

II Major Empirical Contributions

There have been many studies in social movements in India by social scientists in general and sociologists in particular during the last six decades. A. R. Desai (1954) was the first sociologist who contributed to the study of social movements from the Marxian perspective. Stephen Fuchs has studied messianic tribal movements during 1960s. During the 1970s, empirical studies of agrarian, tribal, revolutionary and religious movements were initiated by Indian sociologists, especially Partha Nath Mukherjee, T. K. Oommen, D. N. Dhanagare, M. S. A. Rao and Rajendra Singh. These studies facilitated movement studies as an emerging area of research in Indian Sociology.

Partha Nath Mukherji's (1987) comparative study of famous Naxalbari peasant movement and Sarvodaya Movement of Bihar reveals collective mobilisation as an important attribute of social movement. He also attempts to understand Naxalism as a pervasive structural–transformative–revolutionary movement. He argues that Naxalism or the Mao-inspired social movements for structural–transformative–revolutionary changes that have taken place almost exclusively in remote, backward, mostly tribal, less-communicable areas of the country are the very regions where the responsible role of the democratic state has least penetrated, leaving feudal enclaves to persist and prosper outside the ambit of governance of the state. The demolition of these feudal vestiges may be transformatory with respect to the backward region, but not so for the environment external to it, where feudal structures are

getting dismantled through market and other social forces such as farmers movements. He argues that a structurally evolved, socially and politically differentiated democratic societal context is more likely to generate and accommodate quasi-structural movements associated with intra-systemic conflicts. The capacity of adaptive changes is higher in such societies with institutionally legitimated groups, representing competing and conflicting interests, than ones in which structural elaboration is less developed. In the latter context, the intensity of conflict even for intra-systemic changes can run very high and the scope for structural–alterative–transformative–revolutionary changes is relatively greater (Mukherji 2010).

T. K. Oommen in 1970s studied *Bhoodan-gramdan* (land gift) movement in Rajasthan, which was based on the Gandhian Philosophy of *Sarvodaya* (upliftment of all), led by the charismatic leader Vinoba Bhave. Oommen examines Weber's theory of social change which invokes charisma as the force that triggered the change. His argument is that the attributes of charisma are not given forever; they are contextually determined. Charisma can be both a system-changing and a system-stabilising force depending upon the context. While charismatic movements can and do initiate change through collective actions, in translating movement goals into reality an organisational build-up becomes inevitable. In this process, there occurs the considerable erosion of charisma and the movement may become a mechanism for pattern maintenance and tension management experiencing erosion in its potentiality to bring about change (Oommen 2010). He outlines the role of ideology, leadership and its class and caste linkages in determining the process and outcome of such movements. Both Fuchs and Oommen introduced the role of values and ideologies as pre-eminent elements in the triggering process of social movements.

T. K. Oommen has studied the nature and dynamics of the agrarian movement in Kerala during the twentieth century. His study focuses on understanding peasant struggles in Malabar as well as in Travancore–Cochin princely states that together formed the state of Kerala. He attempts to reconstruct the process of mobilisation during anti-imperialist movement led by the Congress. According to him, anti-imperialist ethos of the early peasant movements gave way to new issues and more institutionalised forms of protests under the leftist parties and their leadership (Oommen 1985: 35–53).

M. S. A. Rao (1978) has studied two backward-class movements such as Sree Narayana Dharma Paripalana (SNDP) movement in Kerala and Yadava movement in north India in a comparative perspective. He spelled out their ideologies, organisations, leadership and their internal dynamics.

In his study, he has shown how a micro-level caste identity became a pan-India macro-level ethnic identity, which helped the Yadava movement to make its presence felt in different parts of the India.

Dhanagare's contribution to the theoretical discourse on peasant movement in Indian Sociology is worth mentioning. He has highlighted ideology, leadership, nature of protest and grass-roots participation in the various peasant movements in India. Based on the study of Tebhaga, Telengana, Moplah, Bardoli, Oudh Kishan Mahasabha and left-wing peasant movements, Dhanagare offers a comparative analysis of Indian peasantry and its class character. His typology of agrarian social movements is nativistic/restorative movements; religious/millenarian movements; and social banditry, mass insurrections, terrorism and liberal reformist agitations (Dhanagare 1983). Subsequently, Katheleen Gough (1979), in her study of peasant movements in south India, classifies peasant movements similar to those of Dhanagare. They are restorative, religious, terrorist, mass insurrectionist movements and social banditry.

Rajendra Singh (1988) examines the relationship between power structures, cultural and symbolic systems and peasant revolts in Basti, a district in eastern Uttar Pradesh, from a historical perspective and which is known as 'land-grab movement' (*Nejeibol*). His focus is both on contribution and changes in the structure of domination as well as on the emergent counter-ideologies in the process.

M. S. Gore (1989) discussed the ideology, leadership and nature of protest during two phases of non-Brahmin movement in Maharashtra. His main focus was on the interface between social structure and process of social movement. Gore, in this study of non-Brahmins movement in Maharashtra, analyses the issues of social movement from Merton's functionalist perspective.

K. L. Sharma (1985) in his study of peasant movements of Rajasthan has used structural-historical perspective. Sharma argues that peasant movements were carried out largely by various organisations like Marwar Hitkari Sabha and Lok Parishad, different 'Praja Manadals', Rajputana Madhya Bharat Sabha, Sewa Sanghs that were engaged in welfare activities simultaneously with the task of political awakening of the peasant masses. Dhanagare (2007) points out that although Sharma claims to have used structural-historical perspective, his essay is based on secondary sources and less on the use of primary archival material as such.

Dipankar Gupta (1982) studied a regional political-cultural movement, the *Shiv Sena* in Mumbai with the help of a structuralist–Marxist approach. He stresses the role of the mode of production, class structure and class

contradiction in explaining social movements. As said earlier, Desai with the help of a Marxist approach came out with a set of postulates for the study of agrarian movement. Singh (1986) observes that the distinctive feature of Desai's formulation focuses on the nature the state, its class character and its social and economic policies which in a macroscopic sense impinge upon specific historical manifestations of social movements and revolt in society.

Following a Marxist approach, Gail Omvedt (1976) postulates a strategy of class struggle in India through the roots of caste mobilisations. The subaltern approach in history explains social movement with the help of structuralism and (semiology), which is known as dialectical–historical perspective. They tend to conceive of the process of change as a transition from one system-state to another, mainly through the rise of a new class, a political elite or a national bourgeois endeavour (Singh 1986).

Further, they began to study the 'history from below' and argue that the traditional Marxist scholars have undermined cultural factors and viewed a linear development of class consciousness. On the other hand, these subaltern groups are criticised by Marxists scholars for ignoring structural factors and viewing 'consciousness' as independent of structural contradictions. Similarly, non-Marxist scholars accuse the Marxist studies of being 'reductionist', 'mechanical' and 'over-determining' economic factors. Non-Marxists have employed the historical structural method in understanding social movements in India. Religious conversions as social protest have been studied by many social scientists. Religious movements seeking fundamentalist revivalism particularly in Islam and Hinduism have been analysed.

Yogendra Singh (1986) argues that most of the studies focus on the impact of changes in the economic, political, social structure and on the segment of castes and communities and social categories which engender a consciousness of identity that is projected into various channels of mobilisation and using new symbols, values, profiles and processes of rationalisation. There have been many studies on tribal movements which focus on transformation, ideology, reform and development.

However, some scholars (Akerkar 1995; Baviskar 1995; Dwivedi 2006; Guha and Gadgil 1989; Kothari 1984; Omvedt 1984; Sahu 2004; Seth 1983; Sethi 1993), including those working on feminist, environmental and Dalit movement studies, have attempted to study new social movement in India from NSM perspective. According to Dhanagare (1983), conventional movements attracted more attention of the scholars than some of new social movements. The new social movements are predominantly plural and their expressions range from anti-racism, anti-nuclearism, disarmament, feminism, environmentalism, regionalism and ethnicity, civil libertarianism to issues of personal autonomy, freedom and peace.

Contemporary movement studies in India have made use of the notion of identity, action and community defence. These movements in India represent a range of collectivities, which are oriented towards the 'grass roots' with new instruments of political action. They can be seen as attempts to open alternative socio-political space for collective action outside system. In India, ecology and environmental movements have received greater attention from social scientists and activists. The contemporary environmental movements with regard to the issues of dams, human displacement and resettlement effectively articulate ecological concerns. Similarly women's movements are IOMs seeking equality and social justice in patriarchal societies. Indian women have been making their presence felt as an important factor in various protest movements in India.

Balgovind Baboo (1991) articulates the reconstruction of life by the oustees of the Hirakud dam of Orissa and traces the genesis of the project, the processes involved in its construction, displacement of local population and rehabilitation of local people and their resistance to the project. Inquiring tribal conflicts over development in Narmada valley, Baviskar (1995) examines the experience of Bhilala tribe in opposing the construction of the dam that threatens to displace from their homeland. Patel and others give a descriptive account of economy, social structure, people's agitation and rehabilitation program of National Missile Testing Project in Baliapal, Orissa (Patel 1989; PUDR 1988)

D. R. Sahu (2004) analyses the genesis, processes and consequences of one of the successful protests against the proposed National Missile Testing Range in Baliapal of Orissa during 1980s. The cash-crop economy in general and betel vine economy in particular facilitated the crystallisation of collective action and the process of mobilisation articulated the ideology of home and hearth, that is, *Bheeta Mati*. Sahu explores early stage of collective action, peak mobilisation and post-movement phase. The competitive capitalism initiated by betel vine production strengthened the local economy and further it was enriched by prawn cultivation during the post-movement phase. He finds that the cash-crop economy facilitated the anti-missile movement. On the contrary, the prawn economy became the major issue of protest by the local leaders who were earlier involved in the anti-missile movement. But the protest against the prawn cultivation could not garner support from the local people as it had received during the anti-missile protest.

Ranjit Dwivedi (2006) analyses the policy debate and collective action in opposition to, and in support of, the Sardar Sarovar Dam Project. Based on a 'project cycle model', the study focuses on design, appraisal, construction, evaluations, reviews, impact and alternatives on an empirical basis.

It highlights a collision between provincial governments, disagreements among people, clashes among non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and differences among evaluators. The central theme of his research is an outcome of an ethnographic study about the nature of conflict in Sardar Sarovar Dam Project and in particular the collective action led by the Narmada Bachao Aandolan.

III Themes and Layout of This Volume

The volume has been thematically divided into four parts. The first theme broadly deals with the conceptual and theoretical issues of social movements. The second theme articulates the issues of agrarian unrest, mobilisation and movements in India. The third part focuses on movements of adivasis and minorities of the subcontinent. The fourth theme relates to empirical accounts of contemporary environmental movements in India. The introduction provides a sociological understanding of various social movements and attempts to contextualise the perspectives that emerged from the selected articles.

The first theme, with three chapters, is on conceptual and theoretical issues on social movements. There were few scholars who spelled out the theoretical and conceptual issues in the study of social movements in Indian context in 1970s. Partha Nath Mukherji in Chapter 1 argues that social movement is a product of the social structure and an agent of change. He classified movements based on quality of change with respect to a society: accumulative, alterative and transformative. Changes in the system are accumulative, whereas changes of the system are alterative or transformative. The alterative changes could be different from transformative changes. Alterative change is geared to create new structure and transformative changes aim at replacing the existing structure.

Mukherji distinguished between three types of movements based on the nature of change. He considers the terms 'quasi-movement', 'social movement' and 'revolutionary movement' for conceptual clarifications. Social or collective mobilisations that intend to bring about changes within the system are quasi-movements, while those targeting alterative or transformative changes are social movements (alterative and transformative). Means per se do not determine what kind of movement a social mobilisation is. Intrasystemic changes can be accompanied by a lot of violence, whilst national independence can be won largely through non-violent social movement. Means used by social mobilisations can be institutional, non-institutional

or a combination of both. Ultimately all depends on what kind of intended change these are deployed as tactics and strategies.[1]

In his theoretical framework, he attempts to study the nature of society and societal conflicts. He examines the necessary conditions and processes of transformation of collective mobilisations into social movement. He observes that no society is in perfect equilibrium, hence provides scope for conflicts. Every society develops some ways of conflict articulation and resolution and gets them institutionalised. When the degree and intensity of inconsistencies increases in such proportion that available mechanisms cannot accommodate these, the contradictions reach subjective perceptual level of actors and is shared in common and discussed in ideological terms amongst its elite. Mass mobilisations can take place under such circumstances if a leadership that is able to comprehend and communicate these to the people is available, defining the goals of the movement. Thus collective mobilisations taking place in such framework transform into social movement.

While examining the relationship between historicity, social structure and value system of Indian society on the one hand and the nature and types of social movements that originated in India on the other, T. K. Oommen argues in Chapter 2 that movements are conditioned by socio-structural factors and are the mechanism through which the deprived categories try to demonstrate their power. He identifies theoretical and methodological issues in the analysis of social movements from a sociological perspective. There are three basic flaws of structural-functional approach advocated by Neil J. Smelser: source of deprivation, ignorance of man's creativity and considering human being as mere creatures of societal determinism, and its unit of analysis for analysing movements.

The social movements are mechanisms through which men attempt to move from the periphery of the system to its centre in order to reduce the feeling of deprivation and secure justice. Moreover, movements are fruits of continuous conscious efforts involving human creativity through voluntaristic actions. His emphasis has been on mobilisation and institutionalisation aspects and not on 'roles'. Further, there is need to recognise the importance of the divergence in structural positions of men and groups, the efforts needed to arouse their consciousness, inevitability of conflict in the process of their mobilisation and desirability of institutionalisation of collective efforts to provide them with purpose. Social movements provide the stage for confluence between the old and new values and structures. Political values of a system along with other competing ideologies are the most significant factors which facilitate the emergence of social movements.

He mentions two methodological issues: the problems related to the scale of the movement and the issues related to the units and levels of observation. The aspects of number of participants, time span of movements and social composition of participants and both macro and micro dimensions are central to the study of social movement. While studying the lifecycle of social movement, Oommen suggests that scholars must pay attention to both mobilisation and institutionalisation aspects on equal footing.

The third chapter reflects upon movements of protest in construction of centres and state formation in India and Europe on a comparative basis. Eisenstadt and Hartman articulated that ideological reconstruction is a significant aspect of the process of reconstruction which led to struggle/protest movements in India and Europe. Construction and reconstruction of political centres is the central theme of this essay. Collective consciousness is found to be different in both nature and context.

The movements have influenced the process of construction of the Indian civilisational framework and its institutions and political regimes but these movements did not develop strong alternative conceptions of political order. In India, in contrast to Europe or China, the principled reconstruction of the political (or economic) arena did not constitute the major institutional focus or aim of most movements of protest and dissent or of the numerous sectarian activities that developed overtime. Movements in India could not reconstruct the premises of the political centres, although they were associated with change of political boundaries and dynasties.

European history has been marked with continuous construction and reconstruction of chiefdoms, municipalities, feudal fiefs, cities as well as tribal regional, proto-national and national communities. The basic feature of European civilisation was the presence of continuous constitution and existence of multiple communities in complex network with symbiotic relations in a hierarchical manner. Centre–periphery relations are also significant. But presence of structural and cultural pluralism determines the mode of construction and reconstruction of centres in Europe. Multicultural, multistructural and political-ecological conditions led to development of various tensions between hierarchy and equality. These continual tensions or competitive orientations led to strong articulation of symbolic and ideological aspects of political movements and struggles.

Drawing the comparisons, authors concluded that even if in rather generic terms the organisational changes in Europe were affected through the restricting of institutions with relatively clear borders, in India, they were affected through networks with much more penetrable borders. It was the contexts that emphasised the importance of the ways in which religious heterodoxies

influenced the institutional dynamics and historical experiences of their respective civilisations.

The second theme with three chapters is on agrarian unrest, mobilisation and movements in India. Rajendra Singh in Chapter 4 presented an empirical analysis of the land-grab movement in Basti district of Uttar Pradesh. Singh has dealt primarily with two issues: analysis of the genesis of the 'land-grab' movement, which subsequently developed into an organised and violent attempt by the poor and landless peasants at occupying the surplus land of the big landholders in the Basti district and identifies those structural factors that resulted in the termination of this movement. He analysed the following issues: impact of post-independence land reforms on caste, class and land relations in Basti, gainers and losers of land post reforms, their caste and class positions and the impact of reforms on power structure. Land reforms gave birth to the emergence of new rich peasant class from lower middle caste (kurmi and ahirs). Though the causative factors lie deep in the pre-independence period, the emergence of this peasantry is a post-independence phenomenon.

While analysing the causes and preparatory process of the movement, Singh termed it as political socialisation for land grab and discussed the rise and fall of the land-grab movement in Basti with reference to the objective and subjective prerequisites of a peasant movement. This catalytic process transformed the passive peasants into political beings and subsequently became the agents of politicisation in countryside.

Further, he explored the reasons of failure of the movement. The class polarisation which is one of the essential conditions favourable to a peasant revolution could not take place due to primordial loyalties and strong *jajmani* relations. Absence of local leaders of lower castes proved to be significant weakness of the movement because poor but educated high-caste brahmins and rajputs who provided leadership at local level could not go far with the movement against their own kin. Widespread poverty was another peculiarity of that agrarian social structure which also served as reason for termination of the movement. Lack of 'peasant' class consciousness, lack of potential power of the peasantry and absence of a leader from the lower castes and classes are some of the weaknesses of the movement.

While delving into the genesis of Bharatiya Kisan Union (BKU) in western Uttar Pradesh, Gaurang R. Sahay in Chapter 5 discusses the relationship between traditional socio-cultural institutions and cultural practices on the one hand and agrarian mobilisation on the other and its eventual fate when it entered electoral politics.

Sahay highlights two contradictory theoretical positions on caste and agrarian mobilisation: caste as an impediment in the process of agrarian consolidation and mobilisation advocated by Barrington Moore Jr, Rajendra Singh, Gail Omvedt and K. K. Sarkar; caste indispensability in organising and mobilising the farmers/peasants for agitation and movement articulated by Ghanshyam Shah, M. H. Siddiqi, D. N. Dhanagare, Stepehen Henningham and Dipankar Gupta.

The BKU operated on these factors: mobilisation of farmers through primordial institutions of caste and clan; generation of consciousness, sentiments and enthusiasm through traditional cultural practices or symbols and through traditional institutions of Panchayat. Amidst all its politically oriented decisions and its interventions in national and state politics, Sahay wraps up in saying that the BKU lost its non-political and secular credentials among the farmers and it is on a declining stage.

In Chapter 6, Vibha Arora, examines the validity of the NSM paradigm to analyse the farmers' movement in India through a case study of the Shetkari Sangathana (SS) in Maharashtra. Arora selected SS as a case study primarily because of its socio-economic history, articulation of gender programme, reflections on major contradictions in the agrarian sector and the interface of farmers' movements with women, dalit and cooperative movement.

The central questions posed by Arora in this chapter are: Whether the farmers' movements in India are for genuine democracy? Is there a dominant class character in these movements? Whose class interests are presented in such movements?

She attempts to examine whether there is disjunction in the discourse and praxis in such movements. Arora has given emphasis on class character of farmers' movements and the key to the debate on their being a 'new' or 'old' social movement. She has spelled out a discourse on NSM and deliberations of various theorists in the context of developing countries, emergence of farmers' movements in India and the rise of SS in Maharashtra in terms of its organisation, mobilisation strategies, leadership and ideology and in-depth analysis of SS.

Arora takes into account of arguments of Omvedt and Lindberg for farmers' movement as new social movement and contests such claim through her case study of SS based on the following aspects: land continues to be an agenda in a different form (shift from subsistence-oriented peasantry to the commodity-producing farmers), novelty in methods of agitation, newness in ideological discourses, symbolic participation of some poor and landless labourers, dalits and women in the agitations due to caste, kinship or *jajmani* links with the dominant peasantry. The claims made for SS of being a new

social movement, according to her, are not legitimate and it represents the dominant-class interests and locates SS within the rubric of the 'old' class-based agrarian movements.

The third part focuses on movements of janjati/adivasi and minorities of the subcontinent. Reflecting upon the ethnic revival after the restoration of democracy in Nepal, Gérard Toffin in Chapter 7 analyses janjati/adivasi movement in Nepal. He attempts to explore the ethicising discourse in matters of autochthony, social grouping, religion and federalism and further articulates its essentialist rhetoric and the possible contradiction with democratic rules and practices in Nepal from a macro perspective.

Toffin's analysis begins with the viewpoints on caste–tribe continuum by Indian sociologists and anthropologists, especially by Dumont, G. S. Ghurye and A. M. Shah. Toffin argues that in analysing South Asian tribes, one has to take into account of two complimentary (continuity and interconnectedness within caste and tribe) and opposing trends (isolationist indigenous group).

The scheduling of Indian tribes and janjati/adivasi movement in Nepal has facilitated the old phenomenon of ethnic consciousness, which he termed as 'ethnic revival'. The higher representations of ethnic indigenous nationalities led to the formation of janajati organisations which have played a major role in recent political events in the former Hindu Kingdom of Nepal. It has contributed to general ethnicisation of politics and successfully engendered the change in political consciousness. The factors mentioned above laid the foundation for janajati movement in Nepal.

Toffin observes that underrepresentation of ethnic communities in decision-making process and complex set of discriminations and inequalities resulting from unification process of Nepal are main causes of the movement. Nepal Janajati Mahasangh provided the required leadership for the movement and brought all liberation movements with various nomenclatures under one umbrella. Their ideology is predominantly anti-Hindu and anti-Brahman in character. Toffin claims that all Nepalese minorities are 'indigenous' only because of their land occupancy before Parbatiya Hindu castes. The notion of federalism is being critiqued by him and he finds such indigenous rhetoric emphasising on blood and soil ties as blatant racist ideology of extreme right-wing parties of Western countries.

Toffin articulates two paradoxes: Issues of ethnic group and identities are context specific. Above issues are gaining currencies in Nepalese Sociology and Anthropology, whereas in the West, these concepts are being looked upon with more and more suspicion and moreover it promotes a melting-pot phenomenon; growing communalisation or ethnicisation of Nepalese

politics is taking place when the various ethnic groups of Nepal are being highly influenced by modernisation and globalisation, and subsequently it leads to internal differences and retribalisation of ethnic groups at the time of losing their identity.

Chitra Sivakumar in Chapter 8 explores the genesis and development of militant movement for the creation of *Eelam* or a separate state for Tamils in Sri Lanka. From a sociological perspective, she tries to trace the significance of caste, class, political and regional factors in the formation of a movement.

The movement was an outcome of a radical shift in the balance of power from the Tamils to the Sinhalas. Sri Lankan Tamil society has been historically characterised by the dominance of the Vellalas. Vellalas of Jaffna, who were earlier dominant castes but later due to over-importance and favour to Sinhalas, got attached with the movement and provided the main leaders for movement. Velupillai Prabhakaran is also one of the leaders from Jaffna, except he was of a different caste background. The creation of consciousness is vital element for any movement. The consciousness cropped up with change in system of electoral representation by colonial government which adversely affected the Tamils and favoured the Sinhalas. Later in post-independence era, political situations and ventures created a rift between dominating Sinhala majority and Tamils. It accelerated the feelings of alienation among Tamils. The Sinhala hegemony exclusively recognised the Sinhalese interests in the political, religious and cultural domains. Development policies of Sri Lankan government intensified the feelings of alienation. For instance, 'standardisation policy' in education system denied a large number of qualified Tamil students to obtain admission to various courses in universities. Later it was observed how this policy mobilised disenchanted Tamil youth to contribute in 'Tamil United Front Leadership' for creation of separate Tamil state.

Earlier, an awareness about their powerlessness against the dominance of Sinhalese led to creation of separate political organisation named Mahajan Sabha. It is observed that prevailing movement is an outcome of endogenous structural changes in Sri Lankan society in general and Sri Lankan Tamil society in particular.

The fourth theme relates to empirical accounts of contemporary environmental movements in India. These movements are relatively new in origin and an outcome of processes and consequences of development of post-independence India.

The rise and development of protected areas, mainly national parks and wildlife sanctuaries affected the people living in and around these areas. They are facing restriction of access. Further, people are frequently displaced from their original settlements. Such actions treat local communities as the

principal threat to forests and wildlife. With the intensification of resource conflict around protected areas, a new discourse of conservation has arisen. Ranjit Dwivedi in Chapter 9 critically examines a collective action campaign march known as *yatra*, passing through several national parks and sanctuaries in central and western India. Such mobilisation process was organised by a conglomerate of NGOs, conservation groups, grass-roots organisations and environmentalists. This collective action articulates the struggle over resource use and abuse in protected areas and sanctuaries. *Yatra*, as an instrument of collective action, has been helpful for tracing the pre-occurred incidences of mobilisation and struggle of masses against their deprivation and alienation from their age-old traditional rights over forests and its produce as well as mobilise them.

Dwivedi presents a critical discourse on how de facto rights of local community has been systematically eroded through state policies along with illustrating incidences from various reserved forests and sanctuaries. Forest-dwelling communities completely rely on forests for their livelihood. State-led/state-sponsored deprivation of exercising customary rights of forest dwellers and their displacement in the name of conservation of forests has promoted many agitations and struggles against the state and private and commercial industries. Conservation politics has undergone a shift in agency as well as focus of agitation. Grass-roots activists have taken charge of urban environmentalists. Integration of human needs into conservation rather than mere conservation of wilderness has gained momentum. This recent trend concentrates on grass-roots activism and importance to human rights along with animal rights.

In analysing *yatra*, he argues that it can be an effective mobilisation and movement strategy. The rural communities are not projected just as an interest group but also as essentially conservationist in their approach to the nature and environment, and *yatra* embraces hope and concern as it put forwards the hurdles blocking resolution of conflicts over conservation and further highlights the opportunities to resolve them.

This collective action was criticised on the basis of clashes regarding the leadership where the rural participants had very little role to play in organising and decision-making during the *yatra*. Further, it conceptualises the rural people as homogeneous entities, because of which the disparities and differentiation that exist among rural population get neglected. The gender divide within the rural population is also neglected. Dwivedi stresses upon the requirement of a well-formulated strategy, manifesting the perception of women and sensitivity regarding the specific nature of their problems.

Manish K. Thakur in Chapter 10 examines the nature of claim-making and the mobilisation politics of 'Barh Mukti Abhiyan' (BMA) in the state

of Bihar. He articulates the significance of linkages between local mobilisations and global discourses and contextualises it in understanding BMA. Thakur explains the localised practices of BMA and its networks and explores types of strengths derived from such networks. Further, he deals with issues concerning social justice, equitable access to information, the bureaucratic dominance, livelihood struggles and traditional knowledge systems.

The mobilisation strategies of BMA aim at promoting local and indigenous ways against the prevalent ways of flood control, based on scientific and indigenous knowledge systems, are being seen as empowering local communities. In order to get indigenous knowledge system more appropriated with the global discourses, Thakur argues for the integration of indigenous knowledge system of flood management and control with the state-level policy. He states that the understanding of BMA necessitates a sociological approach that goes beyond the Cartesian dualism of society and nature. The case of BMA foregrounds the centrality of the local–global nexus in understanding the collective forms of protest and dissent in globalising times.

Satyapriya Rout in Chapter 11 analyses Baliraja Dam struggle in Sangli district of Maharashtra in a wider framework of Indian environmental movement. His analysis comprises of key components of a movement, that is, ideology, leadership, strategy and its success and failure. In contrast to protest or movement against the dam construction, the present agitation was in favour of construction of the dam known as 'Baliraja'.

Rout subscribed to perspectives of both ecological Marxism and appropriate technocratism in order to understand the ideological dimensions. Further, the characteristics of twin-leadership structure—the local and outside leadership—of environmental movement in India are observed by the author in the Baliraja movement.

He admits that this movement is an unfinished struggle with partial success with respect to its logical and desired ends in terms of conservation, equity and sustainability. Rout observes that such movements represents a case of competing over natural resources and it has two faces the private (struggle for ensuring social justice and sustainable livelihood) and public (concerns for environment, ecological degradation and issues of sustainability). It also forces us to rethink our developmental strategies and resource management policies.

In recent times, studies and literature on protests, resistances and movements has considerably grown in India. Some of the sociological studies of peasants, dalits and marginalised groups find a place in other volumes of the series.

Notes

1. There have been some unfortunate editorial mistakes made by publishers in the past who have arbitrarily replaced 'alterative' with 'alternative' in Partha N. Mukherji's formulations with reference to social movements. This arbitrary replacement changes the very meaning and logic of his argument. For example, in his article: 'Study of Social Conflicts' in the *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 27, 19 September 1987, on page 1608, in both the text and the table this error is made. In one of his latest publications: 'Social Movement, Conflict and Change', in Debal Singharoy (ed.). *Dissenting Voices and Transformative Actions*, the mistake is repeated in the table presented on p. 127.

References

Aberle, David F. 1966. 'The Peyote religion among the Navaho'. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Akerkar, Supriya. 1995. 'Theory and practice of women's movement in India', *Economic and political weekly*, Vol. 30, No. 17.

Baboo, B. G. 1991. *Technology and social transformation: The case of the Hirakund multipurpose dam project in Orissa*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing House.

Baviskar, Amita. 1995. *In the belly of river*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Blummer, Herbert. 1969. '*Collective behaviour*', in A. M. Lee (ed.): *Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Nobel, Inc.

Cohen, Jean L. 1985. 'Strategy of identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements', *Social research*, 52(4).

Dhanagare, D. N. 1983. *Peasant movements in India 1920–1950*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dhanagare, D. and J. John. 1988. 'Cyclical movement towards the "eternal": nine thesis of social movements: A critique', *Economic and political weekly*, 20 (21): 1089–92.

———. 2007. 'Practising sociology through history-II', *Economic and political weekly*, XXXV.

Dwivedi, Ranjit. 2006. *Conflict and collective action: Sardar Sarovar project In India*. New Delhi. Routledge

Eyerman, R. and A. Jamison. 1991. *Social movements: A cognitive approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gore, M. S. 1989. *Non-Brahman movement in Maharashtra*. New Delhi: Segment Distributors.

Gough, Kathleen. 1979. 'Indian peasant uprisings', in A. R. Desai (ed.): *Peasant struggles in India*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Gupta, D. 1982. *Nativism in a metropolis: The Shiv Sena in Bombay.* Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Guha, R. and M. Gadgil. 1989. 'State, forestry and social conflict in British India: A study of the ecological bases of agrarian protest', *Past and present*, 123.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1981. 'Social Movements', *Telos*, 19 (Fall).

Heberle, Rudolf. 1951. *Social movement*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Klandermans, Bert. 1984. 'Mobilisation and participation: Socio-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory', *American Sociological Review*, 49.

Klandermans, Bert. 1986. 'New social movements and resource mobilization: The European and the American approach', *Journal of mass emergencies and distress*, special issue on collective behaviour and social movements.

Kothari, Rajni. 1984. 'Party and state in our times: The rise of non-party political formations', *Alternatives*, 9 (Spring).

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. 'Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory', *American Journal of Sociology*, 82.

Melucci, A. 1980. 'The new social movements: A theoretical approach', *Social science information*, 19.

———. 1985. 'The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements', *Social research*, 52 (4): 789–816.

———. 1996. *Challenging codes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mukherji, P. N. 1977. 'Social movements and social change', *Sociological bulletin*, 26 (1).

———. 1987. 'Study of social conflicts: Case of Naxalbari peasant movement', *Economic and political weekly*, 19 September.

———. 2010. 'Social movements, conflict and change: Towards a theoretical orientation' in Debal K. Singharoy (ed.): *Dissenting voices and transformative actions* (121–43). New Delhi: Manohar.

Offe, Claus. 1985. 'New social movements: Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics', *Social research*, 52 (4): 817–68.

Oommen, T. K. 1977. 'Sociological issues in the analysis of social movements in independent India', *Sociological bulletin*, 26 (1).

———. (ed.). 2010. *Social movements—I: Issues of identity & II: Concerns of equity and security*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Omvedt, G. 1976. *Cultural revolt in a colonial society: The non-brahman movement in Maharashtra in western India, 1873–1930*. Bombay: Scientific Socialist Education Trust.

———. 1984. 'Ecology and social movements', *Economic and political weekly*, XIX (44).

Patel, Sujata. 1989. 'Baliapal agitation: Socio-economic background', *Economic and political weekly*, XXIV (12).

———. 1990. **'**Baliapal agitation: Leadership crises', *Economic and political weekly*, XXIV (230).

PUDR. 1988. Bheeta Maati: *A report on Baliapal missile base and people's struggle*. Delhi: People's Union for Democratic Rights.

Rao, M. S. A. (ed.). 1978–79. *Social movements in India* (Vols I–II). New Delhi: Manohar.

Sahu, D. R. 2004. 'Caste, tribe and peasantry in emergence of a people's movement', *The eastern anthropologists*, 57 (I).

Seth, D. L. 1983. 'Grassroots stirrings and the future of politics', *Alternatives*, 9 (Spring).

Sethi, H. 1993. 'Survival and democracy: Ecological struggles in India', in P. Wingaraja (ed.): *New social movements in south: Empowering the people*. London: Zed Books.

Singh, Y. 1986. *Indian sociology, social conditioning and emerging concerns*. New Delhi: Vistaar Publication.

Singh Rajendra. 1988. *Land, power and people: Rural elite in transition, 1801–1970*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

———. 2001. *Social movements, old and new: A post-modernist critique*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Singharoy, Debal K. (ed.). 2010. *Dissenting voices and transformative actions social movements in a globalizing world*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Sharma, K. L. 1985. *Caste, class and social movements*. Jaipur: Rawat.

Smelser Neil J. 1962. *Theory of collective behavior*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul and New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr, Steven K. Worden and Robert D. Benford. 1986. 'Frame alignment processes, micromobilisation and movement participation', *American sociological review*, 51 (4): 464–81.

Tarrow, S. 1994. 'National politics and collective action: Recent theory and research in Western Europe and the USA', *Annual review of sociology*, 14.

———. 1998. *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, C. 1986. 'European violence and collective violence since 1700', *Social research,* 53.

Touraine, Alain. 1977. *The self-production of society*. London: The Cambridge University Press.

———. 1981. *The voice and the eye*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1985. 'An introduction to the social study of social movement', *Social research*, 52 (4).

Turner, R. H. and L. M. Killian. 1957. *The collective behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Princeton Hall.

Wilkinson, Paul. 1971. *Social movements*. London: Macmillan.

Wilson, John. 1973. *Introduction to social movements*. New York: Basic Books.