

offer a positive programme of action to remedy the situation.

To my mind, the relative deprivation theory offers a more satisfactory explanation of the genesis of social movements for it is pivoted around conflict and cognitive change, motivating people and mobilizing them around certain interests and issues. Secondly, it offers the best explanation for the change-orientation of movements rather than to looking at movements as adaptive mechanisms restoring functional unity and equilibrium. However, the relative deprivation theory needs refinement in two directions. First, it is necessary to make the concept sociologically more relevant by eschewing individual and psychic deprivations. Such deprivations remain personal, arbitrary and even frivolous. For instance, it is hard to find anyone in the world who does not suffer from one kind of imagined or real deprivation or the other. The richest man may feel deprived of the peace of mind that a poor man has. Hence it is necessary to define deprivations in terms of collectivities and in the situational context of a differential allocation of rights and privileges in different spheres of social and cultural life.

Secondly, in considering areas of deprivation, Aberle, Glock (1964) and Gurr hardly include religion. It is necessary to note that deprivations in the religious sphere are as important as those in the spheres of economics, education, and politics. The participants in a movement, especially among the backward classes in India, view their deprivation in different areas—such as, religious, economic, educational and political—as interrelated, for they are different manifestations of inequalities and discriminations based on a differential allocation of diverse goods and services. The leaders of a movement simultaneously open up multiple fronts to attack the monopoly of the upper castes in various fields.

Ideology and Identity

Another set of conceptual problems in the study of social movements relates to ideology and the kind of identity the concerned groups establish. While Marx (1904) located ideology within the class structure, Mannheim (1960) considered it as a means of discrediting an adversary. In the context of the sociology of knowledge, his treatment of ideology acquired a perjorative connotation. However, Geertz (1964) lifted it out of this connotation by viewing it as a system

of interacting symbols. As a symbolic system it acts as a bridge between source analysis on the one hand, and consequence analysis on the other. It interprets the environment and projects self-images. It codifies and organizes beliefs, myths, outlook, and values, defines aspirations and interests and directs responses to specific social situations. Thus it is not only a 'framework of consciousness' but also a source of legitimizing action.

The formulation of ideology is an important aspect of any social movement. The leaders work out different themes by which the concerned section in the movement attempts to improve its self-image, respect and honour. For instance, I have identified elsewhere (1977) a number of different themes in the ideology of backward classes movements: withdrawal and self-organization (as exemplified by the Sri Narayana Dharma Paripalana movement in Kerala and the Veerasaiva movement); claiming a higher *varna* status (Yadava movement) as a variation of the re-interpretation principle; and extolling the virtues of the Dravidian culture as against Aryan culture (DMK movement) and negating Hinduism altogether and embracing Buddhism (Mahar movement) as variations of the rejection principle. Then there is the Marxian ideology of class conflict combined with an anti-caste anti-Hindu bias (Dalit Panthers).

I would like to add two other themes based on relative deprivation. They are the Marxian ideology of class struggle without an ethnic component, and the millenarian ideology. Many peasant movements have the class struggle as their ideology. However, within this ideology one can identify several variations ranging from left radicalism to the extreme left position. At this point, peasant movements, like trade union movements, get affiliated with or involved in sharply defined political parties and movements.

The millenarian theme has been the dominant expression of relative deprivation among many tribal movements (see Fuchs, 1965). Here the future state of affairs to come (which will see a complete reversal of the present state of deprivation) acts as the motivating force for action in the present so as to prepare for the millenium. The millenarian ideology is the opposite of the ideology of the Yadava movement, in which the past glory of the Yadavas acts as a motivating force for action in the present. The millenarian ideology is characteristic of 'colonial' situations where deprived groups feel helpless in regard to their perceived capabilities in being able to alter the existing situation.

The leaders of a movement select different elements of relative deprivation and combine them in different ways to formulate an ideology. The organizational principles so selected depend upon the objective conditions of deprivation, the way the leaders perceive the situation in the context of wider interacting forces, and the assessment of their resources or capabilities to meet the challenges. The ideology also provides the source of legitimization of the new values, norms and relationships envisaged by the leaders. It provides the basis of interest articulation and of establishing a new identity.

An important aspect of the ideologies based on relative deprivation is establishing identity in relation to other groups. The concerned deprived sections draw boundaries based on the ideology of their movement. While the boundaries tend to be soft with regard to cognate groups, they tend to be hard with regard to reference groups to which the deprived sections are opposed. I call the latter opposition reference groups.

Opposition reference group implies that the deprived sections do not just imitate the styles of life and adopt the privileged customs of the reference groups, but that they attack the monopoly of the reference groups in the use of economic, educational, political and religious goods and services. They attempt to take away these privileges from them. They not only attempt to lower the ceiling of the privileges enjoyed by the upper castes and classes but also raise their floor level through a conflict relationship with the privileged sections. It is not a situation of social mobility characterized by gentlemanly passing, but one involving confrontation and conflict which is a characteristic of the notion of opposition reference groups. Thus, although the Veerasaivas adopted many brahmanical customs, they were in conflicting relations with the Brahmins. The former attacked the monopoly of the latter and created a set of religious institutions parallel to that of the Brahmins. In so doing they did not seek legitimacy from the Brahmins but established independent sources of legitimacy through their priests and kings.

Collective Mobilization, Organization and Leadership

Collective mobilization, which is crucial in a movement, is not only related to ideology but to the nature of leadership and organization.

In the case of charismatic leadership, collective mobilization tends to be spontaneous. The process of recruitment, which is an important aspect of collective mobilization, tends to be highly diversified, depending on the talents of the people involved. While the traditional intellectual elite are drafted to formulate the ideology and to spread the message, others who do not have specific talents are recruited as volunteers for specific tasks.

Many social movements tend to be characterized by collective leadership with a division of labour among different types of elites. While the business elite gives donations supporting the various activities of the movement, the political elite takes leadership positions in the movement. Normally, social movements tend to develop a loose federal structure with central and regional associations being held together by relationships of local autonomy and external links based on common interests. This is different from the organization of political parties and trade unions where there is a centralized authority structure. Associations based on primordial ties or relations of production form the over-arching organizational framework of a movement.

One may identify different levels of commitment on the part of leaders and others, from faith to fanaticism. Commitment is manifest in the adoption of the belief system, willingness to volunteer in performing various tasks, readiness to take risks of different kinds. The more committed persons are rewarded in terms of higher status, honour, and tangible positions. In the process of collective mobilization, leaders tend to exploit the pre-existing kin, caste and linguistic ties of individual recruits and use the traditional institutional framework. They also operate through the idioms and symbols familiar to people, besides creating new units of organization.

Any social movement tends to develop an event structure over a period of time. A past event influences the choice of strategy in the events that follow in the context of interaction with other groups and opposition reference groups. Occasionally, an event within a movement gets connected with an event or events that occur elsewhere. A set of events centered round an issue constitutes a phase, and the course of a movement consists of several phases. It would be necessary not only to identify these events and phases but also to analyse why a movement takes a particular course and not another in the context of relevant alternatives.

When the organization of a movement becomes more formal and

rigid and when it accumulates property, there is a tendency for schisms to develop and splits to occur. One may identify three patterns of rifts that might occur during the course of a movement. While some conflicts are in the nature of personal rivalries, others are based on divergent ideological differences. Still other conflicts are based on complementary ideological differences, which generally lead to splinter movements.

Besides internal schisms, a social movement is subject to the process of routinization sooner or later. Often a protest movement starts off with a radical ideology but develops its own establishment in turn. A protest movement which rejects existing institutions will in turn attempt to codify its own belief system and provide institutionalized arrangements to enforce a code of conduct.

It is relevant to raise the question as to what happens to a movement after routinization in all areas of social life sets in. There are several possibilities: It might die a natural death; or it might lie dormant for some time and pick up new interests which will give it a new life; or it might develop internal contradictions that will throw up new forces directed towards increasing radicalization. In any case, the most crucial variable is the wider political context in which it operates. It is likely that the ruling or dominant party might absorb the radical elements present in the protest movement and render them ineffective by taking the lead in spearheading radical changes in society. In this context, the part played by the state in implementing radical changes becomes highly significant. The various programmes of the state may not be regarded as social movements, because these are aspects of established and institutionalized procedures to implement policies.

Social Consequences and Change

Any theory of social movement has to grapple not only with the dimensions of genesis, ideology, collective mobilization, organization and leadership, but with the conceptual problems relating to social change. In fact, the nature of the changes that a social movement brings about or intends to bring about is a crucial criterion in the classification of movements. The results of a movement bear a closer relationship with the ideology, interests and organization of a movement rather than with the structural conditions of relative