

Do we have A Theoretical Framework to explain Social Movement? Third System, Third Sector, Third Way - No Way

LALIT KUMAR *

Deputy Adviser, Planning Commission, Yojana Bhavan, New Delhi-110001

Tel: 91-11-371 0956, Fax: 91-11-3717681, e-mail: lalitplan@hotmail.com

Introduction

The story of Social Movements (SMs) / New Social Movements (NSMs) is continuously unfolding. Several SMs have taken place in the past, several NSMs are taking place now and many more such movements are expected in future. Similarly the theoretical frameworks forwarded to explain SM phenomenon have changed over time and would be changing with times. Although civil society and third sector refer to the set of institutions such as Voluntary or Non-Profit Organizations, Non Governmental Organizations, Social Economy Institutions and SMs, Muukkonen (2000) has rightly observed that ‘it is a pity that there has been so sharp distinction between the literature on social movements and non profit organizations’. Recent studies on third sector and civil society are providing opportunities to look at the SM phenomenon from a multi-disciplinary perspective (Fox & Brown 1998, Sachs 1998, Gidron et al 1999, Waterman 1999). This emerging collective wisdom was needed to examine the collective behavior of collective identities inherent in SMs, in newer holistic ways. Part-I of the paper reviews the available major theoretical frameworks on SMs / NSMs; Part-II, describes the SM scenario in India; Part III discusses the problems of applications of EurAm theories in understanding SMs in India and finally Part-IV provides some possibilities for future research / ways out on the subject.

(I) Theoretical Frameworks to explain Social Movement

According to Rudolf Heberle (1949), SMs are “collective attempts to bring about a social change” and Herbert Blumer (1939) also views SMs as “collective enterprises to establish a new order of life”. David Aberle (1966) had suggested that “relative deprivation” is a necessary condition for precipitating social movements, however, later research, has identified ideology, informal or formal organization and orientation to change as the other necessary ingredients for sprouting SMs.

As defined in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, SM is “loosely organized but sustained campaign in support of a social goal, typically either the implementation or the prevention of a change in society's structure or values. Although SMs differ in size, they are all essentially collective. That is, they result from the more or less spontaneous coming together of people whose relationships are not defined by rules and procedures but who merely share a common outlook on society.” Collective behaviour in crowds, panics and elementary forms are of brief duration or episodic and are guided largely by impulse. When short-lived impulses give way to long-term aims, and

* Views expressed in the paper are of the author alone and are not attributable to the organization where he is employed.

when sustained association takes the place of situational groupings of people, the result is a SM. Wignaraja (1993:17) calls these short-lived impulses as ‘bubbles’ and SMs, which are sustained for longer times as ‘seeds’.

As various scholars focus on different aspects of movements, different schemes of classification emerge and there is no single - standard typology of SMs. Many attempts at categorization direct attention to the objective of the movement. The social institution in or through which social change is to be brought about provides other basis for categorizing social movements as political, religious, economic, educational, and the like.

When micro-level people’s responses, experiments and struggles are linked together to reinforce a protest action at regional or national level they become SMs. When SMs establish cross-border linkages or operate at international level with the help of global CSOs or international NGOs (INGOs), they become mega-movements or trans-national social movements (TSMs). How INGOs and TSMs are accommodating diversity of interests and are managing their massive communication problems is getting attention of the third sector study scholars (Young et al 1999).

A commonly used but highly subjective distinction is that between ‘reform’ and ‘revolutionary’ movements. Such a distinction implies that a reform movement advocates a change that will not only preserve the existing values but will provide improved means of implementing them. The revolutionary movement, on the other hand, is regarded as advocating replacement of existing values. Almost invariably, however, the members of a so-called revolutionary movement insist that it is they who cherish the true values of the society and that it is the opponents who define the movement as revolutionary and subversive of basic, traditional values. Some attempts to characterize movements involve the direction and the rate of change advocated. Adjectives such as radical, reactionary, moderate, liberal, and conservative are often used for such purposes.

Since the early 1970s two new strands of theory and empirical research have arisen, one in the United States and one in Western Europe. The first, called resource mobilization theory, takes as its starting point a critique of those theories that explain SMs as arising from conditions of social disorganization and strain and as finding their recruits among the isolated and alienated. By contrast, resource mobilization theorists argue that the success of SMs rests mainly on the resources that are available to them; this means forming coalitions with already-existing organizations, securing financial support, and mounting effective and organized campaigns of political pressure. As a result of this emphasis on strategy, resource mobilization theorists downplay the factor of ideology in the study of SMs. The second theory is the NSM theory. It derives from an intellectual dissatisfaction with the predominantly Marxist view that treats SMs as reflecting a fundamental struggle among classes organized around economic production. That theory, it is argued, has become less relevant as these classes have been drawn into collective bargaining, the welfare system, and other social advancements within the state. The NSMs that have arisen in their place are interpreted as struggles against the social inequalities, the dominance of the mass media, and other features of post-industrial capitalism and the welfare state. These include youth, feminist, peace, and ecological movements, as well as the rise of group conflicts based on ethnicity and race.

SM theories dominant in the 1990s are all rooted in the collective social action approach, which can be traced back to the origins of sociological theories. Collective behaviour and collective action, necessary for SMs / NSMs, according to Finger (1993:49), can occur - either a) as a result of relative deprivation, b) as a strategy to articulate common interests, or c) as a response to economic or political conflicts. Finger further provides an overview of SM theories, at national level under the heads of cyclical, linear and historical theories, as briefed below.

Cyclical theories: the example of Alain Touraine

Cyclical theories assume that SMs occur for similar reasons and have similar destinies. The conceptual framework that helps to explain the emergence of the labour movement in the nineteenth century, therefore, is equally valid to explain the emergence of the green movement in the early 1970s.

Alain Touraine's theory looks at movements in terms of political cycles: social movements strive for political power at the national level, but, in the process of reaching that power they are co-opted. Consequently, NSM arise. NSM, such as the green movement, are seen as the equivalent in a post-industrial society of the old SMs, such as the labour movement, in an industrial society.

Touraine has heavily influenced the SM theory and provides a strong conceptual framework. He locates SMs within civil society and views them as pure forms of social activity outside the political activity. Basically, to deserve the label, a SM needs to be struggling to participate in the national political power. Consequently, Touraine rules out pressure groups, which only struggle for their interests; anti-systemic movements, which destroy the very instrument they are supposed to conquer; national movements, which are prehistoric in the sense that they fight to establish the nation-state system; and cultural movement, whose main error is to conceptualize transformation as value change and not as a political struggle. Finger (ibid:50) feels that had Touraine been aware of the international environmental NGO phenomenon, he would certainly have ruled it out as well. International NGOs (INGOs), especially, are not struggling for state power; they are tugging and pulling at the states.

When defining SMs, Touraine assumes that a continuous, linear process underlies the development of productive forces, a process that conveys more and more power to the national political system; that all social forces must struggle to participate in this power at the nation-state level; and that all movements can be described, therefore, in political, class-struggle terms. All three assumptions are questionable today, particularly when considering the globalisation of ecological problems or of gender or human rights issues. The application of Touraine's theory to the INGO sponsored SM phenomenon, therefore, appears to be rather limited.

Linear theories of SMs – the case of Claus Offe and Jurgen Habermas

Linear theories state that SMs, whenever they emerge, are unique, and must be analyzed as such. A movement's uniqueness is tied to the fact that the process of industrial development is linear and produces unique societal effects.

Claus Offe views SMs, in particular NSMs, as means to help the political system evolve and adjust to the new requirements industrial development places upon it. According to Offe, the political system - the nation-state - is the key to managing the process of industrial development and its societal consequences because the political system is viewed as a regulator between the economic system, on the one hand, and civil society on the other. Between the political system and the unpoliticised civil society, because of this historically unavoidable process, is some sort of grey zone that is about to become politicized. SMs according to Offe, emerge within this field of not-yet-institutionalized politics. SMs, therefore, are social actors that help politicize a field that previously belonged entirely to civil society. Offe's approach, therefore, remains limited to the nation-state, a limit INGOs precisely seek to overcome in practice, and which theorists seek to overcome conceptually.

Sociological theories of SMs such as that of Habermas can be traced back to the first generation of critical theorists. For Habermas SM is not the conflict between classes but between the social world and nature. Their reference for SMs is the National Socialist movement in Germany of the 1930s. If rationality prevails, a society becomes unhealthy because technical rationality is said to destroy a society's capacity to critique and reflect. It alienates people and diminishes a society's ability to learn and master its one evolution and future. In practice, however, Habermas's theory remains limited by the fact that the political system he envisions, in which SMs strive to restore the autonomy of the system and of the life-world, is practically a national system.

Historical theories: resource mobilization theory

Resource mobilization theory (RMT) actually does address some of the weaknesses of Marxist-inspired SM theories, as it combines collective action theory with organizational theory. But the price is the loss of a historical, dynamic perspective on SMs. RMT assumes that it is rational for citizens to participate in the political system, which is simply the steering system of society and not necessarily the nation-state referred to by Marxists. Society is therefore, basically an aggregate of rational individual actors and not necessarily, as Marxists saw it, a structured mass of (potentially) responsible and autonomous citizens who always remain defined relative to the nation-state. Moreover, society, according to RMT, is made up of multiple organizational structures. SMs, then, are basically organizations like all other that aggregate rational individuals.

The historical origins of RMT stem from the conceptualization of consumers' movements and public interest groups in the United States. RMT continues to reflect a typically American approach to public participation; SMs remain simply one means rational actors can choose from if they want to make a difference in the political system.

RMT stresses the ways in which movements are shaped by and work within limits set by the resources (especially economic, political and communications resources) available to the group and the organizational skills of movement leaders in utilizing those resources.

According to RMT, SMs are organizations that help rational actors participate more effectively in the political system than in other kinds of organizations or in purely individual capacities. To help them make a difference, SMOs mobilize various resources for example, skills and values.

Such organizations quite naturally, compete with lobbies and political parties a competition, however, that is not always fair. Quite logically, the latest version of RMT studies the role of so-called political opportunity structures to explain SMs the mobilization of resources for political participation as a function of a particular political system. Political opportunity structures is the branch of RMT that probably comes closest to the ones inspired by Marxism, because it ultimately defines SMs with respect to and as a function of nation-state and their political structures.

The RMT assumes that participation is usually in the national political system. It is difficult, then, to apply the theory successfully to TSMs. National NGOs can, indeed, be captured by RMT, but as such they become lobbies. This fundamentally functionalist definition of NGOs, SMs, and, more generally, public participation neglects the political dimensions of SMs highlighted by Habermas, Touraine and Offe. RMT has a strong bias toward (individual) rational choice, which in turn, neglects the emotional dimensions of social activism.

Attempts at synthesis of American and European theories

While European theorists have shed light on the problem of actor formation and American authors on the problem of social co-ordination, the problem of political strategy is shown to lie outside the reach of either approach (Munck 1995). An analyst of SMs must confront three problems in the light of a conceptualization of SMs as a type of collective action oriented toward change by a decentralized mass or collectivity of people led, in a non-hierarchical fashion, by a social actor. Briefly, the problem of actor formation pertains to the emergence of a movement's founders or organizers, or the social actor who organizes and orients a SM; the problem of social co-ordination relates to the constitution of a SM as a movement or the challenge of organizing a decentralized mass or collectivity of people in a non-hierarchical fashion; and the problem of political strategy is linked to a SM's orientation toward change. An explanation of these three problems constitutes the building blocks of a comprehensive theory of SMs.

The shortcomings of one-sided theoretical approaches that stress either the structural constitution of a SM's identity, or its ability to engage in strategic action, are clearly seen when approximating SMs in terms of what is probably their most widely accepted defining feature, that is, that they are a type of collective action oriented toward change (Melucci 1989:29; Tarrow 1994:3).

The challenge faced by movement organizers in seeking to bring about change - a challenge that forces a SM to engage strategically as a social actor, with its political-institutional environment - has received, however, relatively little attention. Seeking to fill this gap, Munck (1995) argued that the distinct analytical issues raised by the problem of political strategy which SMs face can only be addressed through a synthesis that builds upon, but goes beyond the contributions made by American and European scholars.

All the SM theories discussed have a major bias that makes it difficult to use them as models for theorizing TSMs particularly. They are biased towards politics at the nation-state level. Unfortunately, none of SM theories discussed can be used to conceptualize and theorize the other functions that INGOs fulfil, which might well be at the core of what they are all about. The bias

of the dominant SM theories towards nation-state politics goes hand in hand with another, more profound, bias towards industrial development. All the theories discussed above implicitly consider industrial development to be inevitable, sustainable, desirable, and even necessary, so that the nation-state can fulfil its political functions. Moreover, all the theories discussed assume that the national political system, the nation-state is the key actor, a neutral instrument that helps society manage the process of industrial development as well as its consequences. The SMs then are conceptualized relative to that neutral instrument. They strive to conquer it (Touraine), or to help it evolve, learn and extend its influence into not yet politicised civil society (Offe), or to restore its autonomy as a mediator between a labor and interaction, that is, between the infrastructure and superstructure (Habermas).

Movements are said to mobilize (human, financial, institutional) resources to participate in the national political system, which is seen as a neutral tool to manage industrial development and, thus, help individuals to fulfil their aspirations. For many INGOs the idea that the nation state is the ultimate actor, especially in environmental and development areas, is obsolete. All SM theories that conceptualize NGOs and similar actors as striving to participate in the management of industrial development at the national level, therefore, fail to account not only for the NGOs functions today, but also for their nature. Considering these limitations, are SM theories at a global level better suited for conceptualizing environmental and other INGOs? Although a number of authors have been writing about the global SMs, Marc Nerfin's theory of the third system best encapsulates their main theoretical strands.

Third System

In Marc Nerfin's terms, in contrast with government power - the Prince, and economic power - the Merchant, there is an immediate and autonomous power, always present: the power of the people. Some among the people, become aware of it, get together, act and become citizens. The citizens and their associations, or movements, when they neither search nor exercise governmental or economic power, constitute the third system. The third system equals the currently oppressed people of this planet. They must move out of oppression to become citizens. The term 'third system' reflects this fundamentally emancipatory idea.

The third system theory has the potential to overcome the main limitations of SM theories as one theorizes the nature and the roles of INGOs. Instead of focusing on citizens' participation in national politics, third system theory concentrates on people as the link between the global and the local levels. People seek a political expression of this linkage, the NGOs, and bypass national politics. Political action takes place on global as well as local levels. The third system theory links and comes much closer to what INGOs are about. NGOs are the most typical actors encapsulating this link between global action and the citizens: through NGOs citizens have found a means to express themselves on a global level. Therefore, NGOs draw their legitimation from citizens who no longer refer to national boundaries.

In short, the third system theory is about the participation of citizens in global decision-making. SMs on a national level and NGOs on a global level share certain similarities. SMs functioned as key actors to get citizens' voices heard at the national level; in the third system theory NGOs function as global SMOs, expressing people's needs and interests, and seeking participation in

global decision-making. Because it is people-centred, the third system theory considers NGOs to be beyond the traditional lines of North-South or East-West conflict. The third system theory defines politics to suit oppressed people's needs and aspirations.

The third system theorists attempt to redefine development (or define another development) from the perspective of the people. Ultimately, the third system theory is about the global democracy (global domestic politics). But global domestic politics calls for a global system modelled basically after the nation-state. NGOs are, therefore, conceptualized as global SMOs, whose main activity, in essence, is to lobby the global political system. Finger (1993:59) criticized this view from four different, yet related, perspectives: philosophical, cultural, political, and ecological. The third system theory can be criticized on the same grounds as RMT and theories of collective action because it conceptualizes global citizens politics via NGOs as some sort of interest aggregation, thus ignoring such sociological phenomena as institutionalization, power and control. The third system theory's point of departure is in a political rather than cultural definition of people. People are defined as individuals, so-called 'world citizens' without cultural roots. As a result, needs and interests of all oppressed citizens are considered similar, comparable, of equal value, and, therefore, aggregatable.

The global political system that third system theory calls for does not exist yet. Conceptualized as a SM on a national level, third system politics defines itself as a lobbying activity of a basically non-existent global political system, rather than as the innovator inventing new forms of politics. In brief, third system theory is a too-rapid extrapolation of SM, in particular RMT, from a national to a global decision-making about development. However, it is a theory with a global focus and has shaped the dominant view of what NGOs are all about.

Third Sector

The 'social origins' theory of third sector treats the non-profit sector not as an isolated phenomenon floating freely in social space but as an integral part of a social system whose role and scale is a by-product of a complex set of historical forces. This theory, according to (Salamon & Anheier, 1998) has the potential to explain cross-national variations in the size and structure of the nonprofit sector and integrates the study of nonprofit sector into the social analysis of societies more generally. Based on empirical data, four models of non-profit regimes have been proposed under this theory. These are: (i) Liberal - determined by limited state activity but a strong non-profit sector, (ii) Social-democratic – characterised by expanded state activity in social welfare activities and limited NGO involvement, (iii) Corporatist – in which both the state and third sector are actively involved and (iv) Statist – where limited state activity and a weak third sector is observed.

During the Panel Session on "Third Sector Research and Social Movement Theories", on 9th July 1998 at the Third International Conference of ISTR at Geneva, Helmut Anheier informed that he is planning to examine the SMs under the lens of Social Origins Theory of Third Sector. On my asking, "what are his expectations from this exploration?" Anheier explained that there is a probability of high SMs in Social Democratic model and low SMs in Statist model under their theory. The situation, under Corporatist model would be either low or high and it is likely to be a tricky affair under the Liberal model. This prompted me to examine the subject of SM and third

sector research and results based on the application of social origins theory to the Indian SM scenario are discussed later in the paper.

Third Way

The notion of a "third way" as an alternative to both capitalism and communism has long been popular among assorted European thinkers. Over the years the phrase has been employed by a variety of theoreticians representing a host of diverse ideas. Some authors like Alexander & Skapska (1994) have termed this idea as the "fourth way" also. What unites them all, though, is a sense that politically, economically, socially and religiously something had gone fundamentally wrong with the direction of Western Man and that radical solutions are necessary to deal with this derailment. Recently the term Third Way has been popularized by Anthony Giddens (1998,1999a&b) and has also been used by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair. Giddens (1999a&b) feels that the Third Way thinking is likely to be at the core of political debates over the next decade or two, just as neo-liberalism was for the previous 20 years and old-style social democracy the 20 years before that.

Incidentally, Third Way is also a UK political party, formed in the UK on St. Patrick's Day, 17 March 1990, which advocates the decentralization of power through constitutional reform and the creation of a society in which wealth is more equitably distributed. Third Way combines democratic socio-economic reform and inclusive nationalism with ecological awareness, and supports the right to self-determination for peoples throughout the world. The resultant synthesis, still evolving, offers an alternative approach to politics - a new perspective, in contrast to the failed and outdated dogma of past and present governments.

Third Way politics is social democracy, revived and modernized. The Third Way seeks to go beyond the two hitherto dominant political philosophies of the postwar period. One is old-style social democracy, which held prime place for a quarter of a century or so after the war. It was rooted in Keynesian demand-management, interventionist government, the welfare state and egalitarianism. The other is neo-liberalism or market fundamentalism. The neo-liberals believe that markets are always cleverer than governments, and that therefore the scope of government and the state should be reduced to a bare minimum. Neo-liberals are hostile to the welfare state, which they see as crippling productivity through stifling individual initiative.

Third Way is a positive social democratic response to globalization and calls for active government at all levels - global, national and local. Third Way looks for dynamic government rather than big government and places a strong emphasis upon reviving public institutions.

Giddens asserts that in an era of globalization, big business cannot simply trample over people's interest, as there is a globalization from below as well. Globalization from below is precisely the globalization of Third Sector groups and NGOs, which can create a global culture of corporate responsibility. He cites the case of a conflict between Third Sector groups and Shell around the Brent Spa platform (Giddens 1999b:8), in which Shell¹ realized the great power of non-governmental, third sector and consumer groups and shifted, very fundamentally, its definition of corporate responsibility. Thus, Third Way theory/politics, in a way, predicts increased role of

SMs in the coming decade. We would be discussing some such SMs spearheaded by Third Sector groups in India in the following paragraphs.

(II) The SM Scenario in India

With its unbelievable 4,635 communities and 325 languages spoken by a population of a billion plus, India has been the home of rich and diverse SMs representing protest, dissent, reform or reassertion. A large number of studies on SMs have been conducted by Rao (1978, 1979), Singh (1982,1983), Sharma (1986), Raj & Choudhury (1998), Chakraborty (1999). In India, the major movements began during the colonial period, when struggles and ideological ferment coalesced under two encompassing movements (Omvedt 2000:4). One was the struggle for Independence - spearheaded by the English educated elites. This expanded under the leadership of Gandhi and the Indian National Congress to win a mass base in the 1920s. With its combination of mild socialism, secularism and Gandhian non-violence absorbed much of the thrust of working class and peasant movements. The second movement, is usually described as a social reform movement – aiming at improving / changing the Indian society. It had varying expressions: Upper-Caste Reform Movements, which sought to remove the ‘excrescences’ of Hindu society (Rammohan Roy, M G Ranade) or to return to the allegedly more open Vedic-Aryan society (Swami Dayananda Saraswati). Its extreme version solidified as a “Hindu nationalism” with Savarkar proclaiming that for a Hindu, holy land and fatherland were the same.

In contrast, the militant anti-caste movement pioneered by Jyotiba Phule and carried on by Periyar and Ambedkar aimed at abolishing and not just reforming Indian social inequalities. Its leaders argued against the nationalists that no real “nation” could exist until equality was built and the hierarchy and fragmentation of caste removed. In the 1920s as the *kisan sabhas* (farmers’ associations) and unions were formed, as Dalits and non-Brahmins fought for equality and as Muslims and other minorities asserted their separate identities, all of India was throbbing with SMs, often at odds with one another. Even the environmental movement could claim roots in this period, with struggles for forest land, while the women’s movement dates back to at least Phule and Pandita Ramabai (who worked for women’s education and better life of widows) in the 19th century. Ray (2000:36) reminds that women were active in the 19th century reform movements as well as in India’s struggle for freedom.

The initial post-independence period saw a subsiding of all movements for some time, though by the 1970s, as the glimmering promises of development became tarnished, new struggles arose. Among these four have been most renowned; the dalit movement, the women’s movement, the environmental movement and farmers’ movement.

The rise of Dalit Panthers in Mumbai in 1972 and a militant Dalit struggle in Bihar under Naxalite leadership marked the explosion of a new anti-caste movement throughout the country, giving birth to organizations and growing to encompass the other “backward castes” or “bahujans”. The fight was often for reservations or against atrocities, for the simple symbols of human dignity such as the right to share tea-cups or over the renaming of a university, the Dalit-Bahujan movement more than other focused on sharing political power. Besides the dalit movements, another set of SMs called Schedulization² movements (Kumar1989,1997) also

flourished during this period. A new women's liberation movement arose, spearheaded by urban-based 'autonomous feminist groups' targeting patriarchy but with new vigor.

By the 1980s, the rise of rural mass movements was shown by the massive Shetkari Sanghatana rally of women at Chandwad, and campaigns for property rights and political power emerged. Farmers caught in the trauma of commercial crop production confronted the state over the prices of their crops and the supply of inputs, claiming the urban-rural (India versus *Bharat*) contradiction as primary and organizing road and railway blockages, closing down villages to bureaucrats and massing in lakhs to demand their rights. In many ways, 1980s was the golden decade of NSMs, which appeared to have a greater mass base and fresher visions of a renewed national existence. The new movements took the left parties as allies and were part of a broad progressive upsurge that reached its height when the "National Front" formed its government. Yet it was not to last; the one point programs of the new movements appeared like the six blind-men and an elephant, each targeting a very different aspect of the exploitative society – patriarchy, Brahmanism, destructive development, urban-industrial exploitation. They never coalesced into an overall alternative vision, and the movements never could join on a common political platform. This decade also witnessed renewed upsurge of Hindu nationalism and the sub-nationalist movements in Kashmir and Punjab.

The 1990s brought new uncertainties. The NSMs split on issues of economic reform, with leading activists from environmental and women's movements and a major section of farmer's movement joining the opposition, while the anti-caste movement remained aloof and another section of farmer's movement, led by Sharad Joshi, actively supported the open market. At the end of the decade, Nanjundaswamy of the Karnataka farmers leading a small band of activists uprooted experimental cotton planted by Monsanto-Mahyco and Arundhiti Roy urged the professionals and middle-classes of the world to join the "Rally for the Valley" (for the *Narmada Bachao Andolan* or Save the Narmada Movement), symbolized the ongoing fervour; yet mass response remained limited.

Regarding the future of SMs, Gail Omvedt observed that they have proved no more capable than the traditional left, of articulating a compelling, totalistic vision and many have been caught in their own rigidities. Yet the questions of patriarchy and Brahmanism, problems of drought, floods and eviction, the oppression of weaker sections, the entire issue of defining Indian culture, all remain for the new movements. New expressions, new incisive analyses, more balanced critiques, may well emerge, but SMs will continue. Three cases of continuing contemporary SMs in India are presented below.

Fishworker's Movement

In India, fishworkers movement is perhaps the only movement of our times, which has continued for more than two decades without deviating from its original mission. As very little attempt to unionize the fishworkers was made until 1970, either by the left parties or other political parties, a large number of them remained outside the organized trade union movement. Initially started with mobilization of fishworkers of Goa against the chemical pollution caused by Zuari Agro Chemicals, which was affecting the fisheries and consequently livelihood of the local people, gradually the movement spread in all the coastal states of India. After a series of informal get-

together with the unions of different states the National Fishworkers Forum (NFF) was created in 1978. Gradually the movement successfully mobilized many other forces from within the country as well as from abroad resulting in remarkable success to the movement (Chakraborty 1999:83). Through persistent efforts NFF conscientised the community about the crisis in the fishery industry, adopting a non-religious and non-casteist view and promoted sustainable fishing. It has been forcefully established by fishworkers movement that regulating deep sea fishing is necessary not because it threatens the livelihood of the traditional fisher folks but more than that it endangers the balance of the rich marine biodiversity and invites ecological crisis.

Recent decision of Father Thomas Kocherry, President, NFF to spurn the Pew Fellowship of \$150,000, an American award intended to support marine conservation, has been hailed by the local media. Father Kocherry, the leader of India's fishworkers movement, declared that if he accepted \$150,000 from a foundation started by the owners of the Philadelphia-based Sunoco (or Sun Oil) company, it could compromise the fishworkers's fight against pollution. He alleged that Sun Oil has been one of the world's largest polluters and "a polluter giving an award for marine conservation is a contradiction."

Environmentalists blame Sunoco for habitat destruction and water pollution in many areas of the world. For years they have pointed to the destructive effects of the company's oil drilling near Lake Maracaibo in Venezuela. In the 1970s, the company also drilled for oil on Shapra-Candoshi Indian land in the northern Peruvian Amazon rain forest.

For these reasons, Father Kocherry has reportedly refused the award. Industrial pollution that has caused the severe degradation of marine and coastal environments has led to reduced fish availability and affected the livelihoods of traditional fishing communities within India and worldwide, he says. One of Father Kocherry's biggest concerns is over-fishing in the waters of southern countries, both by local large-scale concerns and by the fishing fleets of industrialized countries who have already depleted northern stocks. Liberalization has caused an increase in these fleets and polluting industries along the coasts of developing countries.

Industrialization and Western technologies, such as bottom trawling for large-scale fish harvest, have led to the current fisheries crisis. In India, the NFF, has fought large fleets and polluting industries through legal battles and protests. In 1989, the forum organized 'The Kanyakumari March' along the entire coastline of India to create awareness on the coastal environmental problems affecting traditional fish workers. In 1991, the NFF won a case in the Supreme Court against the government's joint venture or deep sea fishing policy that opened up India's water to large commercial vessels. Because of this victory, in 1996 the court ordered to demolish all coastal industrial aquaculture farms while allowing the traditional practices to continue. But with the government's recent introduction of an aquaculture bill aiming to circumvent the court ruling, Father Kocherry's battles are far from over. Father Kocherry is continuing as coordinator, of the World Forum of Fish-harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF) as well as of the National Alliance of Peoples Movements (NAPM) in India.

Donyipolo Movement

Regunathan (2000) has recently reported a revivalistic movement from Arunachal Pradesh, embracing 25 distinct tribes with more than 110 sub-tribes. The Donyipolo movement, however, is being carried on by five tribes (Apatanis, Adis, Nishis, Tagins and Hill Miris) of the state, who are reviving their indigenous faith against the onslaught from Christianity, Islam and Hinduism. Among other denominations, the American Baptist, Welsh Presbyterian, London Baptist Church and New Zealand Baptist Church are reportedly active in the area. There were no Christians in Arunachal Pradesh in 1951, majority being of animists, nature-worshippers and Buddhists. The number of Christians in the state has increased from 27,306 in 1981 to 89,013 in 1991 (Census of India 1981,1991). During the same period, the Muslim population has grown steadily from 5,073 to 11,922 mainly because of infiltration from Bangladesh. The Hindu population is relatively small but now there are some pro-Hindu organizations, like Vanvasi Kalyan Ashram, which are establishing their roots in Arunachal Pradesh.

The followers of Donyipolo movement believe that when Donyi (sun) and Polo (moon) combine, they denote the union of the male and female energy in the Supreme. They do not create images of deities, but Donyipolo temple, locket and calendar are new symbols of their new identity.

The Donyipolo movement neither had a dramatic beginning nor a charismatic leader. It is a movement that has not been born out of crisis. The Donyipolo Mission was set up in 1979 by Gegong Apang as a service-oriented VO to uphold the tradition, culture and faith of the people. Tolam Rukbo set up an association named Donyipolo Yelam Kebang in 1986 and many other organizations sprang around that time in central Arunachal Pradesh as custodians of indigenous culture and faith. Following are some of the main associations, which are active in spearheading the Donyipolo movement in Arunachal Pradesh.

1. Indigenous Faith and Cultural Society, Nirjuli;
2. Adi Literary and Cultural Society, Pasighat,
3. Donyipolo Mission, Itanagar.

Regunathan (2000) compares this revivalistic movement of Arunachal Pradesh with a similar Zeliangrong movement of Nagas of Nagaland started in the 1920s. In both the movements revival of the traditional faith was the main focus. It may be noted here that revivalistic, nativistic, messianic movements, which are generally regarded now as older SMs may also be active as newer SMs in certain other areas. Therefore, the adjectives old, new or newer added to SMs may be misleading at times.

Swadhyaya Movement

Founded by Indian reformer Shri Pandurang Shastri Athavale in 1958, Swadhyaya (self-awareness) movement refuses any external, official or foreign aid. Athavale has been carrying on his mass movement bestowing dignity on the underprivileged and bringing about social harmony cutting across the narrow grooves of caste and creed for the last four decades. Although primarily based on the western coast of India, its followers in the millions, living throughout in India's villages have given up alcohol, gambling and petty crime, while farmers and fishermen

share their daily harvests with the hungry. The Swadhyayits are advocated to transcend the barriers of caste, gender and religion in order to recognize the true equality of people.

The movement defies simplistic definition. As expressed by Srivastva (1992) 'Swadhyaya is neither a cult nor a sect; it is neither a party nor an association; it is neither messianic nor limited to a particular section of society; it is neither directed against centralizing state power nor to overcoming flaws in Indian society, though such consequences may follow. Swadhyaya is both a metaphor and a movement. It is a metaphor in the sense of a vision, and a movement in terms of its orientation in social and economic spheres.'

The Swadhyaya Movement is an example of a community of discourse. It was the discourse engendered by the founder, notably amongst an initial group of 19 that set the pattern for future development. A remarkable key factor was the encouragement given to participants to wander the villages, as a form of pilgrimage, purely to enter into dialogue with villagers. This remains a key activity of the movement, with sophisticated townspeople devoting part of their spare time to visiting the humblest villages on foot and simply entering into dialogue with people in an informal way over an extended period of time - possibly years. In no way is it a question of giving speeches and responding to queries.

In contrast to western perception of missionary activity, such as the courageous door-to-door initiatives of the Mormons or the Jehovah's witnesses, the emphasis in this Indian movement is not to impose a particular belief system. Rather the purpose is to evoke a bond and to involve others from the village in the pattern of discourse. Essentially the discourse is "non-directive", although clearly it is difficult to grasp what this might mean across cultures, especially in the case of cultures, which are already non-directive in western eyes.

But although non-directive in many respects, the dialogue is clearly intentional in the case of the Swadhyaya Movement. Beyond evoking bonds, whether with visitors or between villagers, a concern is with how the villagers might better help themselves with their own resources in response to the challenges and problems of their daily lives - in the absence of any external assistance. Such assistance is in most cases unavailable anyway or, if this is not the case, is subject to suspect, or unwelcome, conditions and constraints.

Building on qualities long articulated within the Hindu spiritual tradition, emphasis is placed on the quality of relationship between people, especially within the context of the most impoverished villages. This has led to a remarkable, and growing, capacity to regenerate village life. Refusing any economic assistance from either Indian government or foreign sources, unusual achievements have been made in thousands of villages, even in such physical terms as replenishing wells and managing farms.

(III) Discussion

It appears that the genesis, processes, implications of diverse range of SMs in India cannot be explained by the EurAm theories as they are mostly focusing on nation-state as the unit of analysis and are based on studies on relatively homogenous societies. Views of Touraine, Offe or Habermas do not help much, as in India political forces have a significant role in augmenting

SMs, as we have observed in the Fishworkers movement mobilizing fishworkers and lobbying with Government. Moreover, class has been observed to be still an important category in social conflicts in India. RMT may have problems in explaining movements like Swadhyaya, where resources are considered secondary. Third system's problems are: considering citizens without cultural roots and proposing a global political culture not yet available. The example of Donyipolo movement flags the point that some type of movements considered to be the older SMs may be going on in contemporary world, therefore this distinction of old and new SMs has some problems.

After testing the applicability of Social Origins Theory of third sector in 15 states of India (Kumar 1998), it was found that states of Karnataka, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Assam and Madhya Pradesh are under the Statist model and Orissa, West Bengal fall under the Liberal Model. Under the Social Democratic model we have neighboring states like Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Haryana and Punjab and states like Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh fall in the Corporatist model. How far Anheier's expectations are fulfilled, if we analyze from the ongoing SM scenario in different states of India? Although there is no quantitative data available, one may say that broadly speaking SMs are high in both (states falling under) Social Democratic and Statist model. However, one does not know how to explain Fishworkers movement spread in all coastal states of India and having links with INGOs, under the Social Origins Theory of third sector, which claims to explain third sector variations at national level? Similarly, the third way politics / theory may find it difficult to explain SMs in some leftist state governments continuing in India.

Appreciating the diversity of collective identities in the SM scenario of India, Oommen (1998:1) suggested that there can be a wide variety of collective actions, and all collective actors have multi-identities. Most of the theories of SM have not appreciated this variety in the collective identities and collective actions. A multiplicity of groups coexist and mobilize themselves into collective actions to pursue their interests: A classification of collective actions should take into account at least two factors: (a) the bases of group formation, that is, the type of collectivities, and (b) the nature of goals the collective actors pursue. Oommen (ibid:3) has categorized the collectivities into three: biological collectivities (e.g., gender, race, age groups), civil collectivities (e.g., workers, peasants, students, professionals) and primordial collectivities (e.g., regional, linguistic, religious, caste groups). The rationale of the three-fold categorization of collectivities should be noted here; they can be placed on a fixity-flexibility continuum. While the attributes of the biological collectivities are largely fixed, although, often buttressed by socio-cultural stereotypes, the attributes of civil collectivities are invariably acquired, a product almost entirely of the socialization / enculturation process.

In the case of primordial collectivities it is partly given and partly acquired. Given the relative fixity or flexibility or attributes, the possibility of crystallization of a collective conscience also varies among these collectivities. In the case of biological collectivities, it is a function of elective affinity and in the case of civil collectivities it is gradual and prolonged. The case of primordial collectivities comes in between.

The nature of the goals that collective actors pursue may be categorized into two: instrumental and symbolic. Instrumental goals are those oriented towards the re-allocation of wealth and

power and symbolic goals are those that are geared towards the redefinition of status and privilege. Collective actors may pursue one of the above goals or they may combine both instrumental and symbolic goals.

Social mobilization of a collectivity implies its active involvement and conscious participation in terms of the goals pursued. In turn, the crystallization of collective consciousness is not only a precondition for mobilization, but it takes place as the very process of mobilization proceeds. The understanding of this dialectical intertwining between the nature of the attributes of a collectivity, the prospects of its mobilization and the shaping of its consciousness is of utmost importance for an adequate analysis of SMs. By tabulating these two dimensions, collectivity types and the nature of goals, Oommen (1998) proposed a nine-fold typology. The point to be noted is that there is not only overlaps in the goals pursued by a given collectivity but the goals they pursue may also undergo transformation over time.

The types of collective actions identified vary in terms of their consequences for the system. For example, those collective actors who pursue exclusively symbolic or instrumental goals rarely question the basic norms and values of the system. They only strive towards a change in the system; although some of these collective actions may cause structural transformation, that is, change of the system, through an accretive process. Trans-national linkages are being forced among biological, primordial and civil collectivities. Such linkages are needed because one of the principle features of transnational corporations is their rapid ability to relocate their operations. If one community, region or country successfully resists, another gets it in the neck. In this regard, it would be relevant to cite a classic case, described by Kumar (1996), of pushing out of DuPONT by people's movement in Goa³. In India, there are examples of movement launched against many World Bank funded projects (e.g. Narmada⁴ dam and Singrauli power projects). Similarly, many movements against Foreign Direct Investments have come up in India; examples include campaigns against the Union Carbide, Cargill, Enron, and Nestle. Since the territory of finance capital is new to Indian groups they are, increasingly, realizing the importance of understanding new issues. Coordinated resistance across the countries, continents and planet is required and for that some of the networks are making this coordinated action a reality. In India, the National Alliance of People's Movements (NAPM) is doing this job successfully. A copy of the NAPM Press release of March 2000 highlights the struggles and alternatives going on in the fields of agriculture, labor, politics, globalization, water, energy, weaponization, art and culture.

Citizen action is as multidimensional as the diversity of human endeavors. It may be local or global, small or massive, permanent or ephemeral, highly dramatic or almost invisible, confrontational or collaborative, spontaneous or organized, promoted by associations of like-minded individuals or by large civic movements. Its breadth and diversity range from women in India hugging trees to save them from being felled to global environmental organizations lobbying governments to come to terms with ecological imbalance (Darcy de Oliveira & Tandon 1994). Recently, Singh (1998) pointed out some new agenda for SMs, including the issue of effectively responding to the globalization of financial markets and has suggested the need for providing necessary information to the movements to take up these new challenges.

At this juncture, when we are witnessing a large number of SMs going on for democracy, decentralization, emancipation, environment, consumer, gender and human rights, nuclear-disarmament and so on having global linkages, there are many more such networks that are coming up all over the world linking / connecting various SMs, NSMs and newer SMs. Thanks to the power of Internet, it has become much easier now to build bridges across nations. There are a number of social mobilization WebPages and sites where SMs are joining hands. For example, for a critique of the World Bank and some of its links, one may like to visit <http://www.whirledbank.org> and <http://www.worldbankboycott.org>. To understand and explain these newer globalized SMs or transnational social movements (TSMs), it is obvious that newer knowledge and theoretical frameworks would be required.

(IV) Concluding Comments

It appears from the foregoing discussion, that we cannot explain all sorts of SMs in time and space, under a macro theoretical framework. Notwithstanding the commonness of doctrines and struggles around the world, as expressed by Mooney (1896) ‘doctrines of the Hindu avatar, the Hebrew Messiah, the Christian millennium, and the Hesunanin of the Indian Ghost Dance are essentially the same, and have their origin in a hope and longing common to all humanity’ or as conceptualized by Cohen (1998) ‘The struggle in Baton Rouge and Bhopal and Nigeria is the same struggle for human rights and ecological sanity’. However, there can be a number of theories keeping up with the diversity and dynamism of the SM phenomenon.

Most of the earlier SMs were confined to small geographic domains and concentrated on limited issues but now a days, due to globalization, SMs / NSMs are growing in number and interconnectedness and becoming increasingly transnational, consequently contributing to social transformation in newer ways. During these neo-liberal days, now SMs are being coordinated at the global level by International Third Sector Organizations, like during the socialist heydays, the Third International (or Comintern) formed after the Russian Revolution in 1917, for promoting revolutions at international scale. The next phase may bring different socio-political models and consequently newer SMs, requiring fresh theories. We are now at an exciting stage, where many new experiments, coordinated struggles and NSMs have been initiated and newer SMs are going to be launched soon, with the help of New Information & Communication Technology (NICT) revolution and globalization.

Theoretical frameworks explaining grassroots, regional and national movements have to take into account the emerging ‘transnational advocacy networks’ (TANs), ‘transnational advocacy campaigns’ (TACs) and transnational social movements (TSMs). To capture the dynamics of SMs / NSMs and newer SMs spearheaded by INGOs, fresh studies of Social Movement Organizations (SMOs) and Social Movement Communities (SMCs) are being undertaken in a multi-disciplinary mode to arrive at new theories of SM. In this regard, there is a need to know how much social capital, social cohesion and social infrastructure is created by SMs / NSMs / TSMs and to assess the capacity building needs of NGOs / SMOs, to prepare them to face the emerging challenges of globalization.

Notes

1. Shell, Brent Spar and Greenpeace: During the summer of 1995 the Dutch oil company Shell announced plans to destroy the Brent Spar offshore oil rig located in the North Sea because it became unusable. This decision provoked the immediate reaction by outraged environmentalist groups, especially Greenpeace, which foresaw an ecological disaster and called for a boycott of Shell products worldwide. Many consumers took the boycott seriously and the company's sales went down considerably in the days following the appeal. Particularly in Germany, drivers avoided Shell's gas stations in favor of other companies. Worried by the fall of sales and the bad public image it was receiving, the oil company abandoned the project of destroying the oil-rig, thus conceding a significant victory to Greenpeace and the environmental movement.
2. Schedulization Movements: Schedulization is a conscious process, in which a community or a part of a community changes or reaffirms its customs, rituals, ideology and way of life in the direction of a scheduled community to claim a berth in the schedule for listing Scheduled Tribes (STs), Scheduled Castes (SCs) or Backward Classes (BCs). It is practical, materialistic reformulation process and is opposite to the well-known imitative, emulative and gentlemanly passing process of social mobility called "Sanskritization". Schedulization processes started in the late 1960s when some of the communities came to know about preferential policies of the government for the STs, SCs and BCs in the form of reservations in admissions to various educational institutions, jobs, etc. There are different type of communities involve in schedulization movements, e.g. communities scheduled in one state but not in the neighbouring ones, scheduled in parental state but not in the state where the community emigrated such as the tea garden labourers of Assam, scheduled as ST in one state, SC in another and not at all scheduled in other states such as Banjaras or Lambadas and so on.
3. Dupont pushed out of Goa by People's Movement: In 1985, DuPont decided to set up a synthetic nylon 6,6 factory at Goa in collaboration with one Indian Company, to capture the booming market in automobile tyres. Local activists and Panchayat (local self-government) leaders when came to know, with the help of some INGOs, that primary chemicals used in the production of nylon 6,6 process had been classified as hazardous substances the US Government, launched their movement to oust the proposed plant out of Goa. After a prolonged struggle, involving some writ petitions and death of an activist in police firing etc. the mighty multi-national DuPont was humbled by the people's movement and moved out of Goa in 1995.
4. Save the Narmada Movement (Narmada Bachao Andolan): There are a number of web sites giving detailed information on this movement, which started in mid-1980s against a project fraught with environmental and resettlement problems. Prompted by Indian grassroots activists, an international campaign emerged around the issue of Narmada Dam and led to the formation of an unprecedented independent Commission of the World Bank to review the whole project (the Morse Commission). The Commission underscored the problem of project planning and design without informed public participation and access to information and on its recommendation World Bank funding was withdrawn.

Reference Cited

- Aberle, D.F. (1966) *The Peyote Religion among Navaho*. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation.
- Alexander, G. S. & G. Skapska (1994,eds) *A Fourth Way? Privatization, Property and the Emergence of New Market Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Blumer, H. (1939) *Collective Behaviour*. c.f. Lyman, S.M. (1995, ed) *Social Movements – Critiques, concepts, case studies*. London:MacMillan
- Chakraborty, Somen (1999) *A Critique of Social Movements in India*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.
- Cohen, Gary (1998) Environmental movements. *Social Policy* 28(3):79-82.
- Darcy de Oliveira & Rajesh Tandon (1994) *Citizens — Strengthening Global Civil Society*. Washington DC: CIVICUS.
- Encyclopædia Britannica (2000) "social movement". *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*.
<<http://members.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=109128&sctn=12&pm=1>>
- Finger, Matthias (1993) NGOs and transformation: beyond social movement theory. In: *Environmental NGOs in World Politics* by T. Princen & M. Finger (eds) pp. 48-66. London: Routledge.
- Fox, J.A. & Brown, D.L. (1998eds) *The Struggle for Accountability: The World Bank, NGOs and Grassroots Movements*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1998) *The Third Way, The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1999a) The way beyond. *LSE Magazine* 11(1):16-17.
- (1999b) The role of the third sector in the Third Way. *CAF Focus*, paper no.2.
- Gidron, B. et al (1999) Peace and Conflict Resolution Organisations in Three Protracted Conflicts: Resources and Ideology. *Voluntas* 10(4):275-98.
- Heberle, Rudolf (1949) The Sociology of Social Movements. *Amer.Sociol.Rev.*14:346-57.
- Kumar, Lalit (1998) Civil Strife and Civil Society in India. *Jour. Institutional Develop.* 5(2):37-50.
- (1997) Engaging ethnic enclaves as an ensemble for nation building. *Jour. Soc. Sci.* 1(2): 137-141.

--- (1996) Environmental Awareness and Conflict Resolution: Role of People Oriented Institutions. Presented at a Conference on “Livelihoods from Resource Flows” held at Linköping, Sweden.

--- (1989) Grassroots Movements for social and economic change in India. Paper presented at the Western Conference of the Association for Asian Studies held at California State University, Long Beach, USA.

Melucci, A. 1989. *Nomads of the Present - Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mencher, Joan (1999) NGOs : Are they a force for change? *Econ. Pol. Weekly* 34: 2081-86.

Mooney, James (1896) *The Ghost Dance – Religion and Wounded Knee*. New York:Dover.

Munck, Gerardo L. (1995) Actor formation, social co-ordination and political strategy: Some conceptual problems in the study of social movements. *Sociology* 29(4):667-86.

Muukkonen, Martti (2000) Comments on “Profits vs Services” at the Nonprofit & Voluntary Action Discussion Group (ARNOVA-L) on 1st June.

Nerfin, Marc (1987) Neither Prince nor Merchant: Citizen – An Introduction to the Third System. *Development Dialogue* 1:171-95.

Omvedt, Gail (2000) At the cross-roads. A Future Past the Present. p.34. New Delhi: The Hindustan Times.

Oommen, T. K. (1998) Identities for Collective Action: Class, Nation, Ethnicity and Gender. In: Raj S L & A R Choudhury (eds) pp. 1-11.

Princen, T. & M. Finger (1993,eds) *Environmental NGOs in World Politics*. London: Routledge.

Raj, S.L. & A.R. Choudhury (1998 eds) *Contemporary Social Movements in India: Achievements and Hurdles*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.

Rao M.S.A. (1978,1979, ed) *Social Movements in India*. Vol. I & II. New Delhi: Manohar.

Ray, Raka (2000) *Fields of Protest – Women’s Movements in India*. New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Regunathan, Sudhamahi (2000) *SIKU-Faith and Conversion: Donyipolo Movement in Arunachal Pradesh*. New Delhi: Har-Anand.

Sachs, Ignacy (1998) The State and the Social Partners – Towards a Development Compact. *Econ. Pol. Weekly* 33(33):2233-39.

Salamon, Lester & Helmut Anheier (1998) Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Non-profit Sector Cross-Nationally. *Voluntas* 9(3):213-248.

Sharma, K.L. (1986) *Caste, Class and Social Movements*. Jaipur: Rawat.

Singh, Kavaljit (1998) New Challenges for People's Movements. *Seminar* (Dec): 15-19.

Singh, K.S. (1982, 1983 ed) *Tribal Movements in India. Vol. I & II*. New Delhi: Manohar.

Srivastav, R.K. (1992) *Swadhyay Movement*. Delhi: Centre for the Study of Developing Societies.

Tarrow, S. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Waterman, Peter (1999) Activists beyond borders - and theorists within them. *Transnational Associations* 51 (1): 39-40.

Wignaraja, Ponna (1993,ed) *New Social Movement in the South*. London: Zed.

Young, D.R., D.L. Koenig, A. Najam & J.Fischer (1999) Strategy and Structure in Managing Global Associations. *Voluntas* 10(4):323-43.