deprivation. Aberle suggests that it is possible to establish an association between the social context of the deprived group and the type of movement based on the amount of change. However, it seems to me that there are two important sets of intervening variables between the structural conditions of relative deprivation and the consequential social changes of a movement, namely, the ideology-organization aspect, and the reaction of the opposition reference groups and the wider political context.

The social changes that result from a movement may be seen first in terms of the changes in the positions of the concerned section of a movement and secondly in terms of their impact on the wider society. In the context of the latter, a basic distinction has to be made between those social movements which have brought about either partial or wholesale changes in the structure of relationships and the values underlying them, and efforts which have resulted in marginal changes only aimed at maintaining the *status quo*. This distinction overlaps with Smelser's distinction between value and norm oriented movements. Values and norms, however, cannot be isolated from the positional picture; they have to be seen in relation to the social relationships and their linkages. Further, movements oriented toward changing values also bring about changes in norms specific to situations.

Normally, *status quo* oriented attempts—such as, those of the Kshatriya Mahasabha, the Kanya Kubja Brahmins and the Sanatan Dharma—spring up as a reaction to change-oriented movements. They are more in the nature of counter-efforts launched by the establishment. Here the first-class citizens (e.g., the Brahmins, Rajputs and Baniyas) feel disinherited and threatened by the radical movement. With a view to maintaining their position, they organize themselves and mobilize their caste men in an effort to reform customs which are considered outdated so as to catch up with the times. They form associations which tend to take up welfare and service functions, especially in urban areas, and act as pressure groups on certain occasions. For instance, the all-India Kshatriya Mahasabha pressed for the retention of princely privileges when the abolition of privy purses was being considered. Thus, it can be said that the privileged classes exhibit signs of counter efforts whenever they perceive their interests to be threatened. The bases of collective mobilization among the privileged groups are self-defence, self-help, correction of self-image and consolidation of status. In contrast to the *status quo* maintaining

attempts which emerge among the dispossessed groups, social move-
ments which originate among the deprived sections are oriented to-
wards bringing about changes in the structure of positional arrange-
ments, values and norms.

A distinction is normally made between structural and organiza-
tional changes; the former refering to the changes in the totality of
relationships, relative positions and their arrangement, and values;
and the latter signifying changes in the norms, activities and person-
nel from one position to another. I regard this distinction as having
distorted our understanding of the nature of social change. For, in
this framework, structural change is said to occur only when there
is a black and white distinction; as, for example, when a society
which is capitalistic becomes socialistic through revolution and rapid
violent change. Structural change here is identified with the complete
and total change of social systems. In reality, structural changes
mainly occur in a discrete manner. They tend to be disjointed, dis-
continuous and partial. Many reform movements based on relative
deprivation are neither aimed at a total and complete change in the
social and cultural systems nor are they successful in bringing about
such changes. Hence there is a need to define valid concepts so as to
be able to analyze the different levels and kinds of structural chan-
ges. I have distinguished three levels of structural change: reform,
transformation and revolution.

Reform movements may be identified with partial changes in the
value system and consequential changes in the quality of relation-
ships. Often reforms are associated with the belief system, world
view, outlook, rituals and style of life of the affected groups. Indian
history abounds with examples of reform movements. The devotion-
al movements, which led to the formation of diverse sects in medi-
eval India, revolted against the monopoly of certain sections of
Brahmins over the various paths to salvation. These movements pro-
pounded that divine grace could be achieved through devotion which
was open to all classes and castes. In so far as these movements ab-
rogated the principle of birth which determined access to salvation
through knowledge and ritual, they brought about structural chan-
ges in the religious sphere. The reform movements that emerged in
British India, however, led to both doctrinal changes and to changes
in the structure of social relationships.

In contrast, revolution is identified with radical changes in the
totality of social and cultural systems. The changes are wholesale and

sudden and are often associated with violence. Revolutionary move-
ments are characterized by class conflict and are associated with poli-
tical parties which operate on the basis of a carefully formulated
ideology and a programme of action. The revolutions that occurred
in Russia and China are examples.

Transformative movements aim at bringing about middle level
structural changes in the traditional distribution of power and in the
system of differential allocation of resources, rights and privileges by
attacking the monopoly of the upper classes and castes in different
areas of life including religion. The element of conflict in these
movements acquires a sharper focus than in the reform movements.
The nature of conflict in the case of transformative movements also
tends to be different from that of the revolutionary movements.
While in the case of the latter the conflict is based on the Marxist
ideology of class struggle, in the case of the former, the conflict is
more between ethnic groups though not without elements of class
struggle being built into their ideologies.

A Methodological Question

In the end I shall raise a methodological question. It may be argued
that a study of social movements belongs mainly to the domain of
history and not sociology because a movement is discovered by the
sociologist after it has come into existence, or when it is on the wane.
A sociologist cannot do fieldwork while the movement is on either
because he will not be aware of it or because it is difficult to carry
out fieldwork especially when a movement is violent in nature.

As against this it may be said that social history is a legitimate
field of sociological investigation. A movement no doubt has a time
span and it is necessary for a sociologist to acquire the skills of a
historian to collect historical data. However, the nature of interpre-
tation remains sociological, and I have indicated in this paper some
aspects of the sociological analysis of social movements. Secondly,
it is not entirely true to say that sociologists cannot do participant ob-
servation in an ongoing movement. I had the good fortune to do field-
work when the Yadava movement was at its peak and was demand-
ing a separate Yadav regiment in the Indian Army. Similarly, Spe-
vak (1975) was in the field when he observed all the three phases of
the Navnirman movement in Gujarat: genesis, climax and the end.

The Kelloms, whose paper is included in volume two, studied a sect which was in the processes of being formed by Dada Sitaram in Banaras. Hence, if sociologists are on the look out, they can carry out fieldwork in an ongoing movement.

It needs to be recognized, however, that a researcher studying a social movement has to acquire training in the use of diverse techniques. The study of social movements requires somewhat different approaches from those required for the study of a village community or neighbourhood. In the former, the social space is wider and the time span longer. The field-worker faces the problem of handling diverse documentary data available in several languages. He has to travel a great deal to locate the documentary sources and interview people in different places and belonging to different generations. It involves attending conferences and meetings in different places, gathering data on different areas of the social life—religious, political, economic and educational—of the people involved in the movement, with a view to seeking interrelationships. In short, it involves the employment of such diverse techniques of gathering information as participant observation, survey method, historical and case history method, interview and content analysis, in a meaningful way. It demands the skills of building up of an event structure of a movement in relation to wider social and cultural forces. In order to handle problems of analyzing dynamic social processes over a period of time, we not only need to acquire diverse skills of techniques of gathering data but also to develop a conceptual framework to interpret and explain social movements. This paper is a step in this direction.

References

ABERLE, D.F. (1966) : *The Peyote Religion Among the Navaho*. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 42. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation.

FUCHS, STEPHEN (1965) : *Rebellious Prophets: A Study of Messianic Movements in Indian Religions*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

GEERTZ, CLIFFORD (1964) : 'Ideology as a Cultural System'. In David E. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: The Free Press. pp. 47-67.

GLOCK, CHARLES Y. (1964): 'The Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religious Groups'. In R. Lee and M.E. Marty (eds.), *Religion and*

Social Conflict.   New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 24-36.

GURR, T.R. (1970) : *Why Men Rebel.*   Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

MANNHEIM, KARL (1960) : *Ideology and Utopia.*   London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

MARX, KARL (1904) :   *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.*   Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.

MARX, KARL and ENGELS, FREDERICK (1973) :   *Selected Works* (Three Volumes). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

MERTON, R.K. and ROSSI, ALICE KITT (1950) :   'Contributions to the theory of Reference Group Behaviour'.   In R.K. Merton and P.F. Lazarsfeld (eds.), *Continuities in Social Research.*   New York: The Free Press, pp. 40-106.

RAO, M.S.A. (1977) :   'Themes in the Ideology of Protest Movement'.   In S.C. Malik (ed.), *Dissent, Protest, and Reform in Indian Civilization.*   Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study. pp. 56-69.

RUNCIMAN, W.C. (1966) :   *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice.*   London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

SMELSER, NEIL (1962) :   *Theory of Collective Behaviour.*   London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

SPEVAK, M.L. (1975) :   'Nav Nirman Movement in Ahmedabad'.   Paper presented at the Workshop on Social Movements, Department of Sociology, University of Delhi, 24-26 March 1975.

STOUFFER, SAMUEL A. *et al* (1949) :   *The American Soldier: Adjustment during Army Life.*   Vol. 1.   Princeton: Princeton University Press.

WALLACE, A.F.C. (1956):   'Revitalization movements'. *American Anthropologist,* 58 (April): 264-281.