Chapter I

New Social Movements: Theoretical Trends

In the last four decades, important social movements have emerged in Europe, America and in the Third world countries. They are regarded by many western social theorists as possible and relevant agents of social transformation, as authentic representatives of post-industrial social forces. Though levels of mobilization are now modest, there is good reason to think that these movements may gain force at future points. And there is also good reason to expect further movements as yet unnamed to appear. The theoretical debate on them has started since 1960’s in response to the development of new forms of collective action in developed capitalist societies, and to the advent of explosive social conflicts in the societies dependent on them. A group of Western European theorists have begun to develop a new approach to understanding social movements. New Social Movement Theory, as their work has come to be called, tries to explain the changes in social movements in the context of broader changes in late twentieth century society. This chapter addresses the four main trends within social movement analysis with a special emphasis on the New Social Movement theory. An attempt is also made to examine various approaches such as Post-Industrialism, Post-Fordism, Disorganized capitalism etc. in the understanding of new social movements. The contributions of Klause Eder, Alan Scott, Paul Bagguley and the Marxist class analysis of new social movements are also discussed. Finally, the
chapter identifies the major characteristics of the new social movements and brings to light the general trend of the New Social Movement theory.

The New Social Movement theorists argue that the movements of the post-war era differ from the movements of the earlier period in ways that call for a rethinking of theory as new movements fail to fit within the paradigm of either traditional Marxism or conventional academic social science. Marxism, on the one hand, led us to expect that the movement of the working class would be at the center of movements for social change. Academic theories of social movements that developed in the fifties and sixties, whether they dismissed social protest as irrational or defended its rationality, have had little to say about the cultural radicalism and politics of identity that have been so prevalent in the movements of the sixties and beyond. Because it has been developed in the context of academic discourse and has been relatively remote from movement practice, few activists have read New Social Movement theory. Its usefulness for the movements themselves has been limited by the fact that it has been cast in terms of academic rather than political or strategic questions. The literature that they have produced addresses some aspects of these movements but neglects others.¹

The problem is that New Social Movement theory impedes full assessment of new social movements by separating them from the questions of political economy and by placing them on the side of culture. Another problem with New Social Movement theory is its lack of interest in the working class. As Melucci observes, “the eighties seem to offer new material to this reflection, since collective

action is shifting more and more from the political form to a cultural ground". This thesis is intended to offer a critique of these theoretical trends by arguing that the theory has failed to take into account the movements' ongoing struggles with the state and capital. New Social Movement theorists emphasized culture as a terrain of struggle more in importance to politics and economy. The economy and the political arena cease to be the major terrains of social control. The new social movement practices in various spheres of life go well beyond the conservation of culture and involve the active construction and innovation of new social relations. Their trajectory is toward the amplification of civil liberties, curbing the violence of state and capitalist institutions and more equitable distribution by the employers and bureaucrats.

**Social Movements**

Social movements are hard to define conceptually, and there are a number of approaches that are difficult to compare. Various authors attempt to isolate some empirical aspects of collective phenomena but since every author stresses different elements one can hardly have valid comparison. To Tarrow, “a social movement is an aggrieved, mobilized mass opinion in contact with authorities”.

The resource mobilisation approach calls every form of non-institutional political action a social movement. Melucci defines a social movement analytically as a

---


form of collective action (a) based on solidarity (b) carrying on a conflict (c) taking the limits of the system in which it occurs.⁵

To Alain Touraine, social movements should be conceived as a special type of social conflict. Many types of collective behaviour are not conflicts. A conflict presupposes a clear definition of opponents or competing actors and the resources they are fighting for or negotiating to take control of. Explaining the various types of social conflicts he categorically states “I will use the concept social movements only to refer to conflicts around the social control of the main cultural patterns”.⁶

John D. McCarthy defines social movement as a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and / or reward distribution of a society, i.e. social movements are defined as nothing more than preference structures directed towards social change.⁷ Wilson defined social movements as a conscious, collective and organized attempt to bring about or resist large-scale change in the social order by non-institutionalized means.⁸ To Wilkinson, a social movement is a deliberate collective endeavour to promote change in any direction and by any means, not excluding violence, illegality, revolution or withdrawal into utopia or community.⁹

Alain Touraine defines the social movement as the organized collective behaviour of a class actor struggling against his class adversary for the social

---

⁵ Melucci, n. 2, p. 795.
control of historicity in a concrete community. In his cognitive approach to social movements, Ron Eyerman views social movements as a process in formation, as forms of activity by which individuals create new kinds of social identities. For him social movements are bearers of new ideas and have often been the source of scientific theories. Social Movements can be described most simply as collective attempts to promote or resist change in a society.

The term new social movement has been used to designate civil right movements, feminist movements, gay movements, environmental movements, Dalit movements, the antiwar efforts and people’s science movements. The term “new social movements” encompasses organizations and popular mobilizations ranging from those based on specific constituencies involved in defining the rights of particular communities, to those organized around a broad social vision, seeking the support of anyone willing to act on behalf of it.

Four Main Trends

The four main trends within social movement analysis are Collective Behaviour Perspective, Resource Mobilization Theory, Political Process Perspective and the New Social Movement Theory. The first three have been influential in the USA and the fourth has been mainly associated with the European
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12 Barbara Epstein, n. 1, p. 47.
Scholars, to the extent that some have even talked of an American and a European approach to the study of social movements.

**Collective Behaviour Perspective**

Turner and Killian define social movement as a peculiar kind of collective behaviour, which is contrasted to organizational and institutional behaviour. It is collectivity acting with some continuity to promote or resist a change in the society or organization of which it is part.\(^{13}\) As a collectivity, a movement is a group with indefinite and shifting membership and with leadership whose position is determined more by informal response of the adherents than by formal procedure for legitimizing authority.\(^{14}\)

Jean. L. Cohen explains the important assumptions of collective behaviour theory (i) There are two distinct kinds of action; institutional-conventional and non-institutional - collective behaviour. (ii) Non-institutional collective behaviour is action that is not guided by existing social norms but is formed to meet undefined or unstructured situations. (iii) These situations are understood in terms of a breakdown either in terms of organs of social control or in the adequacy of normative integration due to structural changes. (iv) The resulting strains, discontent, frustration and aggression lead the individual to participate in collective behaviour follows a ‘life cycle’ open to casual analysis, which moves from spontaneous crowd action to the formation of publics and social movements. (v) The emergence and growth of movements within this cycle occurs through

---


\(^{14}\) Ibid., p.223.
crude process of communication: contagion, rumour, circular reaction, diffusion etc. Accordingly, collective behaviour theorists have focused on explaining individual participation in social movements, looking at grievances and values as response to rapid social change.  

All collective-behaviour theories stress psychological reactions to breakdown, crude modes of communication and volatile goals. This indicates an implicit bias toward regarding collective behaviour as a non-rational or irrational response to change. This bias is more explicit in the mass-society approach of W. Kornhauser and the structural-functionalist model of collective behaviour. Kornhauser maintained that mobilization for non-institutional political action was the consequence of the losses inflicted upon certain parts of the population by economic, political and cultural modernizations, against whose impact these groups reacted by seeking recourse to ‘deviant’ political modes of action. Collective behaviour, according to Smelser, is an irrational and exceptional, historical and wishfully thinking, or otherwise cognitively inadequate response to structural strains emerging from the process of modernization.

Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT)

The development of RMT as a paradigm with social movement theory was stimulated by the publication of Mancur Olson’s seminal work *The Logic of Collective Action* in 1965. The premises of Olson’s work are those of neo-classical...
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16 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
economics: (i) social phenomena are to be explained with reference to the preferences and choices of individual (ii) individuals act rationally to maximize their interest and minimize their costs.\textsuperscript{19} RMT starts from the very straightforward observation that all political action is socially structured and that the resources available to activists are patterned accordingly. It makes the assumption that movement activists are at least as calculatively rational as are more conventional political actors and that they will, accordingly, devise strategies of action which make best use of the resources they have and which minimize the requirement for resources they do not have.\textsuperscript{20} RMT differs from collective behaviour approaches in that greater attention is paid to the role of organizational factors within social movements. Two important advocates of RMT, Mc Carthy and Zald present the case.

The existence of marginal resources, gathered from many middle class suppliers, or large amounts of resources, gathered through churches, philanthropic organizations, and labour unions, permits movement entrepreneurs to find an organizational niche even when mass bases of activists...are difficult to find\textsuperscript{21}. The success of the movements depends upon their organizational infrastructure. The approach deals in general terms with the dynamics and tactics of social movements' growth, decline and change. It examines the variety of resources that must be mobilized, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success and the tactics used

\textsuperscript{19} Alain Scott, \textit{Ideology and New Social Movements} (London, 1990), p.110.
by authorities to control or incorporate movements. The approach depends more upon the social psychology of collective behaviour.

Jean L. Cohen has summarized the important assumptions of RMT in the following way. (1) Social movements must be understood in terms of conflict model of collective action. (2) There is no fundamental difference between institutional and non-institutional collective action. (3) Both entail conflicts of interest built into institutionalized power relations. (4) Collective action involves the rational pursuit of interest by groups. (5) Goals and grievances are permanent products of power relations and cannot account for the formation of movements. (6) This depends instead on changes in resources, organization, and opportunities for collective action. (7) Success is evidenced by the recognition of the group as a political actor or by increased material benefits. (8) Mobilization involves large-scale, special purpose, bureaucratic, formal organizations.

The Political Process Perspective (PPP)

The political process perspective relates to the emergence of movements to political process and the collective action such a process generate. It is the fight for power between polity members and challengers, and the various political relatives and political alignments facing those challengers that gives rise to this collective action. Charles Tilly, the most important exponent of this approach focuses on the broader political process, where excluded interests try to get access to the
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23 Cohen, n 15, p. 675
established polity. In contrast to McCarthy and Zald, his emphasis is on the overall dynamics which determine social unrest and its characteristics, rather than on social movements as specific organized actors. This theoretical perspective is reflected in the definition of social movements as a sustained series of interactions between power holders and persons successfully claiming to speak on behalf of a constituency lacking formal representation, in the course of which those persons make publicly visible demands for changes in the distribution or exercise of power, and back those demands with public demonstrations of support.

Thus PPP specifically points to change in the political environment as a central determining factor in the emergence and trajectory of movements. Social movements arise, significantly expand and have their greatest impact during periods marked by a profound increase in the vulnerability of the political establishment to pressure from protest groups. Thus, under destabilized political conditions, those groups or challengers previously excluded from routine decision-making areas under otherwise normal political conditions, suddenly find the opportunities for collective action and protest greatly enhanced. Such antecedent political shifts disrupt the political status quo, level the political power playing field and weaken the position of powerful groups, creating the potential for mobilization. The actual process of mobilization further requires the favourable interplay of three crucial factors. First, a favourable structure of political opportunities must exist within the political system to aid the building of political alliances and encourage the reception of the movements' goals by established political groups and elites.
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Second, a movement must have a degree of pre-existing organization and indigenous resources to take advantage of such opportunities. Third, the existence of solidarity and moral commitment to the movement on the part of individual activists ensures loyalty to the movement's cause and supports and sustains the movement's collective identity.26

Both RMT and the political process approach analyze the how rather than the why factors of social movements. In other words, they focus on the conditions which facilitate or constrain occurrence of the existence of conflict taking of potential grievances for granted.

New Social Movement Theory (NSM Theory)

The theoretical debate about social movements has grown steadily since the 1960s in response to the development of new forms of collective action in advanced capitalist societies and the advent of explosive social conflicts in the societies dependent on them. To Michel Foucault, the conflicts in which such movements have been engaged are struggles which question the status of the individual: on the one hand, they assert the right to be different and they underline everything which makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, split up community life-forces the individual back on himself and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way... they are struggles against the government of individualization27. They are opposition to the effects of power which linked with knowledge, competence and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge. But they are also an opposition against secrecy, deformation and
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26 Ayres, n.24, p.52.
27 Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power" in Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (eds.), Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics (Chicago, 1983), pp.211-12.
mystifying representations imposed on people.... What is questioned is the way in which knowledge circulates and functions, its relations to power. ...the main objective of these struggles is to attack not so much “such and such” an institution or power, or group, or elite, or class, but rather a technique, a form of power”.28

This account claims that new forces are individualizing without being egoistic; that they oppose concentrated forms of power; and that they are preoccupied with defining and valorizing individual and collective identities.29

The NSM approach tries to relate social movements to large scale structural and cultural changes. The most explicit advocate of this is Alain Touraine. Touraine identifies social movements with the dominant conflict in a given society. To him, the social movement is the organized collective behaviour of a class actor struggling against his class adversary for the social control of historicity in a concrete community.30 Historicity is defined as consisting of the overall system of meaning which sets dominant rules in a given society. The dissatisfaction that some scholars have felt towards the theoretical emphasis of RMT has also contributed to the development of New Social Movement perspective. The Resource Mobilization theory has been attacked by scholars for leaving out the supposedly new aspects of movements that have emerged since the late 1970s. In particular they argued that RMT has overlooked the cultural and ideological content of these new movements.31 Scholars have complained that the RMT is indifferent to the type of insurgency, kind of praxis, substance of ideology and idea of society envisioned by

28 Ibid., p.212.
30 Touraine, n.10, p.77.
31 Ayres, n.24, p.51.
movements- variables that are closely identified by the NSM School as central to
the emergence of modern social movements.

People like Foucault and Offe converge in depicting new social movements
as concerned mainly with quality-of-life issues and with the definition and
valorization of personal and collective identities. This conception of new
movements, as embodying resistance to power and motivated by cultural aims has
been widely influential. The proponents of new social movement theory insist that
contemporary collective action really is about culture. There are significant novel
elements in both the context and the substance of cultural emphases of new forces.
First, explicitly cultural elements have more weight in new movements than the
prior movements. Second, these cultural concerns are increasingly framed in terms
not only of general social values and norms, but also of the definition and
maintenance of identities for individuals. The notion of conflict over culture
necessarily entails a conflict over identity.32 Kauffman observes, "Nothing
distinguishes contemporary social movement politics from those of the nineteenth
and early twentieth century more than politics of identity that have developed over
the last twenty or 50 years."33 Identity politics express the principle that identity
should be central to both the vision and practice of radical politics. The politics of
identity have led to an unprecedented politicization of previously non-political
terrains: sexuality, interpersonal relations, lifestyle and culture.

32 Plotke, n.29, pp.84-90.
The origin of NSM Theory lies in the incongruities of advanced capitalist society and in the anti-institutional and counter-cultural focus of its proponents. NSM Theorists argue that movements have arisen in protest against increasing technocratic and bureaucratic political systems based on the prerogatives of material consumption and the assumed benefits of perpetual growth. Such movements present an alternative world view, with new cultural and ideological norms, political tactics, organizational structures and aspirations which challenge the existing modes of interest intermediation in advanced societies. New Social Movements have sought to construct new 'life-spaces' or alternative life styles which are incompatible with established political institutions. Accordingly, one participates in a movement to create a counterculture.

Much theorizing on new social movements has adopted Habermas's premise that the new social movements are all about defence against 'the bureaucratization and monetarisation of public and private areas of life'. He asserts that the purpose of new social movement mobilization is primarily one of defending and restoring endangered ways of life, namely addressing issues of quality of life, equal rights, individual self-realization, participation and human rights. The epistemological and formative foundations of the 'post-Marxist' perspective were laid by Habermas. Although he did not develop a fully fledged theory of new social movements, his critique of instrumental rationality and his normative theory of discursive rationality remain influential. 
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35 Ayres, n.24, p.51.
rationality and communicative ethics provided the background for the theoretical reflections of Offe and Cohen. The new social movements, according to Habermas, appear at the 'seam between the system and life world' and are symptomatic of the waning self-evidence of the old value standards reflected in the concept of natural law, economical laws, rational man and so on. Carl Boggs sums up the project of the new social movements as "a struggle to recover community that had been destroyed by rampant urbanization, revulsion against the worst manifestations of economic modernization and the consumer society, and a sceptism toward conventional ideologies of whatever sort".

A variety of reasons are suggested by Offe for the emergence of new social movements since 1960s. Firstly, he argues that there has been a broadening of bureaucratic capitalist social relations. The negative effects of capitalism and bureaucracy now affect wide categories of the population than ever before. This generates new discontents, for example, where women are drawn into wage labour, demand for sexual equality develops. Secondly, he sees a deepening of the negative effects of bureaucratic capitalism. This involves qualitative changes in the techniques of social control with increasing state intervention in people’s lives and an increased power being exercised upon them. Thirdly, the old political paradigm is incapable of dealing with these new conflicts and demands. A class-based system of political representation and, collective action cannot accommodate and
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37 Ibid.
represent the cross-class demands of feminism and environmentalism.\textsuperscript{39}

Touraine observes

From the industrial era we have inherited the image of two opponents, the capitalists \textit{versus} the working class, confronting each other on a ground and with weapons that are those of the ruling class.... Today on the contrary, the image that prevails is that of an impersonal and integrating central apparatus that controls, beyond a service class, a silent majority, and scattered around the latter are a number of excluded, confined, under privileged, or even denied, minorities.\textsuperscript{40}

The ossification of electoral and party systems, combined with the bureaucratization of trade unions, has resulted in a displacement of political activity onto new sites which has been subject to the monetarisation and bureaucratization of the spheres of action of employees and of consumers, of citizens and clients of state bureaucracies. The historical conjunture at which many of these movements emerged, in the late 1960s and early 1970s was characterized by on the one hand, an ongoing crisis in post world war ideologies and institutions, such as development, the nation-state and democracy and on the other, an inability or failure of existing counter systemic movements and institutions to address themselves the issues raised by this crisis.\textsuperscript{41}

Kothari hailed the emergence of Non-party political formations, and, given the inability of the state to play a transformative role, expressed a hope in the

\textsuperscript{39} Offe, n.34, pp.838-48.
\textsuperscript{40} Alain Touraine, \textit{Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Post-Industrial Society} (Minneapolis, 1988), p.122.
alternative politics that had the strength of a mass base, which the traditional left was steadily losing due to its centralized leadership, politics and lack of vision.\(^\text{42}\)

In its attempts to explain a fragmented social reality, the NSM Theory overlaps with post-modernism. Krishan Kumar writes:

Much of the impetus to the new social movements will come from post-modern culture which, although it has its negative and reactionary side, is also anti-hierarchical and consistent with principles of radical democracy. It has the potentiality not simply to disintegrate older modes of individual and collective identity but also to reconstitute new ones.\(^\text{43}\)

Barbara Epstein observes:

This term encompasses a range of attempts to describe, defend or in some way establish a stance in relation to the contemporary loss of faith in absolute facts and universal values, the apparent instability in the relationship between observed realities and the meanings assigned to them. The term post-modernism has mostly been connected to the advocacy of these trends.\(^\text{44}\)

Fredric Jameson has made an analysis of post-modernism that intersects with Fordist developments within Marxism, and thus indirectly with New Social Movement Theory. He argues that the post-modern culture can be understood an expression of the extreme alienation of late capitalism. The process of commodification has been extended to all areas of life. Social control, which once operated primarily within political and economic spheres, has been extended to the cultural, the realm of culture, once relatively autonomous from the sway of state


\(^{43}\text{Krishan Kumar, From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World (Oxford, 195). P.49.}\)

\(^{44}\text{Epstein, n.1, p.49.}\)
power has merged with the realm of political economy and ‘cultural’ struggles have become as important as any other.\(^45\)

The rise of post-materialism as a widespread social value has led to the blurring of the familiar political boundaries, the Left and the Right and has created the genealogical context for the rise of the new social movements as a novel mode of relating to oneself and as a new political practice. Inglehart has noted: “the Materialist /Post-materialist dimension has played a crucial role in the rise of the wave of the new social movements”.\(^46\) His thesis is that the value systems of Western democracies are undergoing a fundamental shift from material to post-material values. For him, because of unprecedented prosperity and the absence of war in Western countries since 1945, younger groups place less emphasis on economic and physical security than do older groups. On the other hand they tend to give a high priority to non-material needs, “such as a sense of community and quality of life”.\(^47\) This argument has been highly influential in the interpretation of the rise of the new politics and the decline of social democratic politics in the west.\(^48\) Like Touraine and Inglehart, Bauman in his Memories of Class sees the underlying changes within Western societies as rendering older political divisions, particularly that between Left and Right irrelevant. New agendas have been set, new publics, and new victims created. Under the conditions of late industrialism, old political concepts have to be abandoned or recast.\(^49\)


\(^{47}\) Ibid.

\(^{48}\) Ibid.; Scott, n 19, p.69.

Most recent analysis of new social movements has concentrated on broad social changes or the middle classes as the key explaining factor. It is worth examining the contributions to the analysis of new social movements which emphasize the development of 'Post-industrialism', 'Post-Fordism', and 'Disorganised Capitalism' and recent attempts to understand new social movements as a reflection of middle class interests or values. Recent debates concerning contemporary social change have made a number of connections between economic and social cultural change and the emergence of new social movements. All the theories noted above claim certain insights into the structural changes of the recent past, and their cultural and political correlates.

**Post-Industrialism and New Social Movement Theory**

To understand the genealogy of new social movements it is proper to place them in the context of the post-industrial society and its culture shift. Alain Touraine helps us in situating new social movements in the transformed organization of what he calls as 'programmed societies', which consist of less organizing work than managing the production and data processing apparatus i.e. ensuring the often monopolistic control of the supply and processing of a certain type of data, and hence a way of organizing social life. To him, “what is crucial now is no longer the struggle between capital and labour in the factory but that between different kinds of apparatus and user-consumers”.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, several prominent sociologists elaborated a view of contemporary society that they labeled as post-industrial
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50 Touraine, n. 10. p. 781.
society. The best known proponent of this was the Harvard sociologist, Daniel Bell, as expressed in his *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973). The theory of post-industrialism gained wide currency through the works of Peter Drucker's *The Age of Discontinuity* (1969) and Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* (1970). In such works the educated public of the West was asked to prepare itself for the possibly uncontrollable transition to a new society, one different from the industrial society.

Touraine observes:

Post-industrial society must be defined in a more global and radical way today, as a new culture and a field for new social conflicts and movements. Post-industrial society must be defined more strictly by the technological production of symbolic goods which shape or transform our representation of human nature and of the external world. For these reasons, research and development, information processing, biomedical science and techniques and mass media are the four main components of post-industrial society, while bureaucratic activities or production of electrical and electronic equipment are just growing sectors of an industrial society defined by production of goods more than by new channels of communications and the creation of certain artificial languages... Only the organization of new social movements and the development of different cultural values can justify the idea of a new society that I prefer to call a 'programmed' more than just a post industrial society.

To Touraine, the shift from industrial to post-industrial society is marked primarily by a shift in the nature of production away from manufacture-based towards knowledge-based industry. Associated with this development are displacement of conflict away from the work-place, and a replacement of workers with more nebulous social groupings (the public, consumers) as the prime actors within potential oppositional forces. Similarly, it is no longer the ownership and
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51 Ibid., pp.7-8.
control of the means of manufacturing production, but ownership and control of knowledge production which forms the main source of social power. Above all, it is the technocratic state against which social movement activity is directed. The social movements of the post-industrial era are primarily concerned with defending and extending civil society against a potentially all consuming state.52

Post-industrial societies are increasingly dependent on new technologies and electronic communications which have in turn, created a tightly integrated ‘system world’ at the local, national and global levels. But a variety of communitarian and other populist political movements have brought a significant measure of participatory democracy to these societies, bringing the perspective of the dialogue: ‘life world’ as formulated by Habermas.53

Fordism, Post-Fordism and New Social Movement theory

A chunk of The New Social Movement theorists are linked to the Fordist (or Post-Fordist) political economists, who have been concerned with the question of the transformation of Western capitalism in the twentieth century. Gramsci had stated that Fordism had introduced a new epoch in capitalist civilization. It marked the passage to a planned economy. But it was not just production that was planned, it was also the person. Fordism did not stop at the factory gates but invaded the home and the most private and intimate spheres of worker’s life.54 The aim was the creation of a new type of worker and human being. The attempt made by Ford, with

52 ibid.
the aid of a body of inspectors to intervene in the private lives of his employees and to control how they spent their wages and how they lived is an indication of these tendencies. The new methods of work are inseparable from a specific mode of living and of thinking and feeling.

Just as Fordism represented, not simply a form of economic organization but a whole culture, so did Post-Fordism of a much wider and deeper social cultural development. Schematically, the features of Post-Fordism are: (i) In the economy: the rise of global market and global corporations, and the decline of national enterprises and the nation state as the effective units of production and regulation etc. (ii) In politics and Industrial relations: the fragmentation of social classes, the decline of mass unions and centralized wage bargaining and the rise of localized, plant based bargaining, a labour force divided into core and periphery etc. (iii) In culture and Ideology: the rise and promotion of individualist modes of thought and behaviour, a culture of entrepreneurialism, fragmentation and pluralism in values and life-styles, post-modernist eclecticism etc. Post-Fordism also is after all capitalism. It is driven as insistently as ever before by the motor of accumulation process. Kumar observes, “Post-Fordism is fundamentally about the fate of Marxism. It attempts to save Marxist analysis in an era when various Marxist projects have seemed to falter or fail. Mass working class movements have broken up and their parties reformed or rejected altogether”.
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55 Ibid., p.304.
56 Ibid., p.302.
58 Kumar, n.43, p.52.
59 Ibid., p.50.
Fordism was presented by the British Marxists under the banner of 'New Times'. First stated in a series of articles in the journal Marxism Today, the perspective was later substantially adopted by the executive committee of the British Communist Party and published by them as the 'Manifesto for New Times' in 1989.  

Antonio Gramsci had put forward the revised structure of capitalism in the 1920s and 1930s suggesting the need for different political strategies than those envisioned by more traditional versions of Marxism. Gramsci suggested that the increasing structural complexity of the working class, its overlapping interests with other sectors of population, suggested that revolutionary struggle would not be led by a unified working class but by a coalition of forces led by particular sectors of the working class. Gramsci called this phase of capitalism, Fordism. Gramsci's formulation retained the idea that the working class or some part of it would be at the centre of a revolutionary movement but it opened up the possibilities of including new groups within the category of the working class, creating alliances between elements of the working class and other groups. The New Social Movement Theory drew upon the theoretical advances that had been made by Gramsci.  

In the United States, a group of people put forward the argument that sectors of the middle class were being drawn into the working class by the extension of  
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60 Ibid.  
61 Epstein, n.1, p.40
corporate influence into new areas of society. These new working class theories made important contributions to theoretical development. They provided a way of thinking about the changing sector of work and working classes in Europe and the United States and also about the breakdown of boundaries between the working class and the middle class. In the last seventies, a group of French Marxists like Michael Aglietta, who is known with the Regulation School, offered an interpretation of advanced capitalism that incorporated Gramsci's analysis of Fordism into Marxist categories of political economy. Regulation theory implied that if the traditional working class had become conservative, other sections of that class, or other social groups altogether might retain the potential for revolutionary activity. A version of this approach would become the basis, in the seventies and eighties, for New Social Movement Theory.

The problem with this approach was that movements of the sixties had appeared and reached their height before the crisis of Fordism having any substantial or measurable impact on daily life. Nevertheless, the concepts of Fordism and post-Fordism provided a suggestive framework for thinking about the new kinds of movements that had appeared in the post-war era. Both the approaches had seen themselves as extending or refining Marxist theory.

New Social Movement Theorists have argued that stability has been ensured in the post-war period largely through the apparatus of a ‘security state’.
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62 Ibid., p.41.
63 Ibid., p.42.
64 Ibid., p.43.
This term is used in a double-edged way: State-supported welfare and other benefits have provided a certain security for large sections of the population; at the same time widespread dependence upon or enlargement of the state gives the state a ready means of deflecting any impulses toward revolt. The economy and the political arena cease to be the major terrains of social control. The working class meanwhile ceases to be the central agency of revolution or social change, because protest comes to be organized less around the workplace or the structure of the economy and more around resistance to the intrusion of the state into other arenas of life.\textsuperscript{66}

Disorganized Capitalism and New Social Movement Theory

The concept of disorganized capitalism provided by Offe, Lash and Urry is altogether broader and appear to be better suited for the understanding of new social movements than the narrow economic accounts of Fordism/Post-Fordism.

Capitalism achieved an organized state in most Western societies in the period from 1870s to World War II. Organized capitalism which follows liberal capitalism consisted of some familiar features of industrial society: the concentration, centralization and regulations of economic enterprises within the framework of the nation-state, mass production along Fordist and Taylorist lines; a corporalist pattern of industrial relations; geographical and spacial concentration of people and production in industrial towns; and cultural modernism.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{67} Kumar, n.43, p.48
Disorganized capitalism emerged in the 1960s and it reverses or modifies many of these central features. The development of world market has led to a decartelization and deconcentration of capital. Flexible specialization and flexible forms of work organization increasingly displace mass production. The mass industrial working class contracts and fragments, leading to a decline of class politics and the dissolution of the national corporalist system of industrial relations. A distinctive service class, originally an effect of organized capitalism in its labour department becomes a source of new values and new social movements.  

Offe sees the new movements seeking to politicize civil society in ways that are not constrained by representative – bureaucratic, political institutions and thereby to reconstitute a civil society independent from increasing control and intervention. To emancipate themselves from the state, the new movements claim civil society itself - its institutions and its very standards of rationality and progress must employ practices that belong to an intermediate sphere between private pursuits and concerns and institutional, state-sanctioned modes of politics. The new movements' space of action is 'non-institutional politics', which is not provided for in liberal democracy and welfare state.  

Clause Offe analyses the 'new politics' of new social movements in terms of a political paradigm which identifies its issues, values and modes of action, actors and social base. In this context, he describes the 'old' and 'new' paradigms of
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politics.\textsuperscript{71} The issues of old paradigm are economic growth and distribution, military and social security and social control, while that of new are preservation of the environment, human rights, peace and unalienated forms of work. The old paradigm privileges the values of freedom and security of private consumption and material progress, the new favours personal autonomy and identity, as opposed to centralized control.\textsuperscript{72}

THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE "OLD" AND "NEW" PARADIGMS OF POLITICS (Offe’s model)\textsuperscript{73}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;old paradigm&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;new paradigm&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>socioeconomic groups acting as groups (in the groups’ interest) and involved in distributive conflict</td>
<td>socioeconomic groups acting not as such, but on behalf of ascriptive collectivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>issues</strong></td>
<td>economic growth and distribution; military and social security, social control</td>
<td>preservation of peace, environment, human rights, and in alienated forms of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>values</strong></td>
<td>freedom and security of private consumption and material progress</td>
<td>personal autonomy and identity, as opposed to centralized control, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>modes of action</strong></td>
<td>(a) internal : formal organization, large-scale representative associations (b) external : pluralist or corporatist interest intermediation ; political party competitions, majority rule</td>
<td>(a) internal : informality, spontaneity, low degree of horizontal and vertical differentiation (b) external : protest politics based on demands formulated in predominantly negative terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internally, the old paradigm is based on formal organization, large-scale representative associations while the new paradigm entails informality, spontaneity, low degree of horizontal and vertical differentiation. Externally, the old paradigm

\textsuperscript{71} Offe, n.69, p.65.
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focuses on pluralist or corporalist interest intermediation, political party competition and majority rule. The new emphasises protest - politics based on demands formulated in predominantly negative terms. Finally, the actors differ. In the old paradigm, the actors were socioeconomic groups acting as groups and involved in distributive conflict. In the new paradigm actors are socioeconomic groups acting not as such, but on behalf of ascriptive collectivities. The most striking characteristic of the actors in the new social movements is that they do not rely for self-identification on either established political codes (Left or Right, Liberal or Conservative and so on) or on the partially corresponding economic codes (such as working class or middle class, poor or wealthy, rural or urban).

The social base of the movements consists of three circumscribed segments of social structure: the new middle class, elements of old middle class and the decommodified and peripheral groups. One of the primary characteristic of the new middle class is that they are, according to Giddens, "class-aware" but not "class-conscious". That is to say, there appear to be relatively clear structural determinants of agents, those likely to participate in the new politics, but the demands (and thus the beneficiaries) are not at all class-specific; they are highly dispersed and either universalistic or heavily concentrated in particular groups.

New middle class politics is, in contrast to most working class politics as well as old middle-class politics, typically a politics of a class, but not on behalf of a...
class. Structural characteristics of the new middle class core of activists and supporters of new social movements include high educational status, relative economic security, and employment in personal service occupations.

Offe observes

By decommodified or peripheral groups I mean social categories whose members' social situation is not presently defined directly by the labour market... include middle class house wives, high school and university students, retired people and unemployed and marginally employed youths.... They are in the sense "trapped" and this has often led them to engage in revolts against the bureaucratic or patriarchal regimes of these institutions.

The old middle class include independent and self employed people such as farmers, shop owners and artisan- producers. On the other side, the principal classes of capitalist societies, namely the industrial working class and the holders and agents of economic and administrative power, are least easily penetrated by the new paradigm.

It can therefore be said that the new social movements' pattern of social and political conflict is the polar opposite of the class conflict model. First, the conflict is staged not by one class but by a social alliance that consists, in varying proportions, of elements from different classes and ‘nonclasses’. Second, it is not a conflict between the principal economic agents of the mode of production, but an alliance that includes virtually every element except these agents. Third, the demands are not class-specific, but rather strongly universalistic or highly
particularistic, and thus either more or less 'categorical' than class issues. In Offe's sketchy account of disorganised capitalism new social movements appear as signifiers of incapacity of the political institutions of organized capitalism to continue to mediate between the bases of social power and political authority. He sees new social movements as expressions of the exhaustion of the old political paradigm of class politics.

Lash and Urry's Theory of Disorganized Capitalism

The theory can be summarily described as an extended model of Post-Fordism. Whereas most accounts of Post-Fordism list four or five characteristics of social types, Lash and Urry list a number of tendencies of development which are actively disorganizing contemporary capitalist societies.

The national, regulated markets of organized capitalism are being broken down by the increased internationalization of production, capital and markets. A further deconcentration of capital occurs with an increased proportion of smaller units of production, described as flexible specialization. Within nation-states the class structure is transformed. The core semiskilled occupations of the working class are shrinking, and what Lash and Urry term the 'service class' of administrative, managerial and professional employees continue to grow. The working class is increasingly divided between core skilled workers and peripheral part-time, temporary and less skilled employees as labour market dualism intensifies.
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The chief novelty of the approach, according to Lash and Urry, is the demise of the working class project to reshape history. "Time cannot be set in reverse, the moment has passed. The power of mass industrial working class to shape society in its own image is for the foreseeable future profoundly weakened".  

It is largely within these changes in the class structure that Lash and Urry locate the growth of new social movements. Their argument here seems to be twofold. First, the restructuring of working class labour markets weaken the political power and influence of unified national labour movements as expressed through the decline of class based voting. Second, Lash and Urry tend to see new social movements as partly an expression of the growing size, influence and power of the 'service class'. Finally, Lash and Urry note the increased production and dissemination of post-modern forms of culture. Again, they link the emergence of post-modernism to the increased size and influence of the service class as both consumers and producers of new cultural forms.

In Lash and Urry's analysis of new social movements, there is a lack of detail concerning the precise casual relations between the process of disorganization and the emergence of new social movements. Postmodernism may be a cultural resource for contemporary social movements, but it is by no means certain that it is a key cultural change leading to their emergence. For example,
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earlier movements for women's rights, antiwar protests and black equality had major successes without the benefit of postmodernism.

Jean Cohen and the Theory of Institutionalization of Civil Society

Jean Cohen offers a more radical critique of the class thesis than Offe. She completely replaces the Marxist class theory with a theory of civil society, that is, of the historical formation and expansion in Western societies of a sphere of social initiatives independent of the state and aiming at self-determination. The origins of political rights, pluralism and the formation of the public sphere coincided with the development of bourgeois society. They were subsequently institutionalized in parliamentary procedures, democratic constitutions citizenship rights, legal norms of due processes, and further enhanced by the development of free associations and media-related public opinion. As the experience of the fascist and totalitarian demonstrates, when stripped of these institutionalized foundations, civil society withers away. Thus, while Offe sees the new movements as harbingers of new social forms, Cohen points to their umbilical cords with the bourgeois institutions and modern capitalist development.84

New social movements are seen by Cohen as the articulation and progressive institutionalization of civil society through ongoing challenges to power inequalities and through the extension of the principles of legality, plurality and publicity to all areas of social life, including the 'last bastion' : the economy.

The theory of new social movements is thus linked with the theory of institutionalization of civil society.⁸⁵

**Klause Eder and the Theory of Petit Bourgeois Protest**

Klause Eder presents that the phenomenology of the new social movements must start from the assumption that the new social movements are part of history of the petit bourgeois protest which has from the outset accompanied the modernization of society. In the development of the bourgeois class, the petite bourgeoisie is the part of the bourgeoisie that never succeeded in becoming really bourgeois but it did not become part of the proletariat. With the social advancement of the middle class, the petite bourgeoisie have achieved a new significance. The reclassification of the social groups resulting from this development has produced a new middle class with specific internal differentials.⁸⁶

The executive petite bourgeoisie: This group contains the lower and middle white-collar workers whose functions are merely executive: they comprise those who have attained better positions in the status systems.

The declining petite bourgeoisie: It consists of the peripheral staff in the service sector, the old petite bourgeoisie directly affected by the structural changes in production.

The new petite bourgeoisie: It is made of the administrators of the new clients of the welfare state, those who provide ‘social repair’ services (e.g. social workers, teachers, psychologists etc.). This group comprises those who do not

⁸⁶ Eder, n.34, pp.874-75.
speak as a social class but on behalf of a social class. They are the people whose task is to look after the disadvantaged but they are not the disadvantaged themselves.\textsuperscript{87} What those various groups have in common is their specific social structural position. In contrast to the groups which belong to lower class and upper class, they are compelled to individualization.

A first form of the new protest of the petite bourgeoisie is based on the central position they give to moral issues. Morality becomes the subject of collective protest. Empirical examples of this type are the peace movement and the women's movement. A second form of the new petit bourgeois protest stems from problems connected with the crisis of the welfare state, the frustration and disillusionment with the party system and with bureaucratization. A third form of the new petit bourgeois protest results from problems connected with the crisis within the industrial society and its 'production-oriented logic'. The new issues are forms of social production which are more life world-oriented, and alternatives to labour in return for payment become the subject of collective protest.\textsuperscript{88}

Paul Bagguley and Social Relations Approach

Most of the analysis of new social movements so far made here, concentrated on broad social changes or the middle class as key explanatory factors. Bagguley criticizes the analysis of new social movements which emphasize the development of 'Post-Fordism' and 'disorganized capitalism' and recent attempts to understand new social movements as reflections of 'middle class' interests and
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values. Bagguley outlines an alternative theoretical approach which places at the centre of analysis the social relations in which new social movements are grounded and which new social movements seek to transform. In this alternative account the middle classes play the role of traditional intellectuals, that is, they provide the key social resources for mobilization of new social movements and all other social movements. He points out that earlier movements for women's rights anti-war protests and black equality had major success without the benefits of postmodernism. It is possible that social movements utilize emergent cultural forms and classificatory schemes in order better to communicate their particularist claims. For example, Feminism is grounded in a system of patriarchy, which is made up of diverse set of patriarchal social relations, and different feminist movements focus around different sets of patriarchal social relations.

To Bagguley, new social movements are not the political forms of expression of the interests of the service class or the expression of frustration of middle class alienation. They only facilitate the emergence of new social movements through the application of their skills as producers and organizers of knowledge. They are like many other social movements including many middle class professionals. They do so because this class posses the skills and knowledge, in short the social resources for political mobilization. They are highly articulate, very capable of manipulating ideas and concepts, well studied to the task of .

91 Bagguley, n.89, p.37.
92 Ibid., p.39.
innovating new types of social and political outlook.” Bagguley argues that the role of the public sector professional fraction of the service class in relation to new social movements is one of the 'traditional intellectual' rather than 'organic intellectuals' of new social movements because they have not been created alongside the development of new social movements, rather they emerged before new social movements.

In his brief discussion on the structural bases of feminism, Bagguley outlines a different structural approach. He rejects all the imputed characteristics of new social movements. He proposes that structural analysis of social movements should start from the following premises.

(i) All social movements have a 'structural focus'. They are rooted in and seek to transform relatively enduring sets of social relations. (ii) There is a plurality of structures which are routinely the focus of social movements. (iii) More concrete, detailed conceptualization of these social relations is needed to begin to analyze social movements. (iv) A structural analysis alone won't do. We must also examine cultural and organizational resources. (v) Social movements may both intentionally and unintentionally transform the structural focus of their collective action. (vi) The cultural and organizational resources for collective action are the product of social movements. They produce it for later or related social movements. (vii) This approach offers the potential for a unified general way of understanding social movements.

94 Ibid., pp.41-42.
Alan Scott and Middle-Range Theories

To Alan Scott, the reappearance of protest and social movements in Western Societies over the last twenty-five years is to be explained by the failure and inadequacies of institutions of interest intermediation. In particular, interest groups and especially parties have failed to respond to popular demands and feed those demands into the political system. Protest and neo-populist movements are a symptom of these failures; they appear in order to articulate concerns and issues which are excluded from mainstream political intermediation and interest negotiation. Thus new social movements are above all political phenomena. To him, new social movements can be best explained not with reference to general theories: functionalism and Marxism but rather through middle-range theories: social closure, mobilization and interest articulation. Theories developed within political science should be integrated into sociological analysis.95

To Scott, contrary to culturalist interpretations, no categorical distinction can be drawn between social movements, pressure groups and parties. Social movements are best understood in terms of a continuum stretching from informal network-like associations to formal party-like organizations. To him, we can realistically assess the effects of social movements upon their environment only by viewing them as a political phenomenon related to other more ‘institutional’ expressions of political interests. It is necessary for the sociological interpretation.

95 Scott, n.19, pp.9-10.
of social movements to return to the realist models of political action and interest representation.  

Scott argues for an accommodation of culturalist and political explanations of collective action and possible effects. Culturalist theories do have a partial explanation of social movements’ effects in terms of cultural innovation, but because they disregard political negotiation they fail to analyze the process by which such cultural innovations are fed into politics, how new political agendas become set, and how political parties, pressure groups etc. react to external pressure. Without an understanding of process of interest intermediation, as well as formation, we shall fail to produce a realistic assessment of the nature and extent of social movement effects.

To him, the limitations of both micro-level explanations of mobilization and culturalist definitions of movements can be overcome by supplementing these approaches with a sociological theory of social closure on the one hand and a political theory of interest intermediation on the other.

Social Closure: The activity of social movements are attempts by groups excluded to insert themselves into closed groups and by doing so to gain access to new resources and opportunities. The theory of social closure enables one to identify the two central types of social movement activity: first, the expansion of citizenship and second, the insertion of excluded groups into polity. These aspects of social movement activity reflect their two major projects: social movements
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articulate the grievances and demands (i) of groups who are excluded from the benefits typically available to average citizens or (ii) of those who are excluded from established elite groupings and from processes of elite negotiation.98

Political Intermediation: At the level of concrete political analysis, new social movements especially those which have taken on an overtly political form can be viewed as a reaction to the failure of interest intermediation: parliaments, the media and especially political parties. This claim of social movements raises the spectre of pluralism, and slips back into the type of institutional analysis to which the theory of social movements is often taken to be an alternative.99

Scott argues that by restricting social movements to the sphere of civil society and culture, one vital casual precondition is bypassed: the failure of institutions of political intermediation to take new political demands on board and to accommodate the interests of certain central social groups. Furthermore, neglecting political processes has meant that sociological theories of social movements fail to account for the form of movement activity that has taken in the political arena. It has thus been largely left to political scientists to point to the significance of the existing political opportunity structures in shaping the course of social movement strategy and success or failure. These political factors are important because they provide a link between the more general sociological preconditions - the growth of the middle classes etc. - on the one hand, and the more specific political preconditions on the other.100
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Clause Offe and Brigitta Nedelman have recently identified processes of political intermediation and the state/civil society relation as central to an understanding of mobilization and the political significance of new movements. To Nedelman, political parties are vital means of transmitting individual demands into the processes of political decision-making. In the absence of parties which can perform this function satisfactorily, social movements provide an alternative means for actors to aggregate and articulate interests and demands.\(^{101}\) Offe's analysis develops a similar theme with respect to the failure of main parties to remain in touch with their base, and to political decision-making to apply instrumental technocratic criteria.

It is in the more corporatist-type political arrangements that movements of political integration are more prevalent. This is for a number of reasons. First, formal democratic procedures are largely circumvented by negotiation between the partners, which takes place behind the back of formally democratic institutions. This has narrowly circumscribed the range of debate within parliament, between parties and in the media. Second, the closed and closely circumscribed nature of political decision making means that groups excluded from these processes may mobilize at grass-roots level, knowing that 'normal' channels are closed off. This is particularly the case for important social groupings who find themselves outside processes of elite negotiation, and above all for the growing middle class, especially in the service sector, the so-called new middle class. It is the paradoxical

position of the new middle class, rather than its exclusion alone, which has inclined it towards social protest and ecological ideology.\textsuperscript{102}

The aims of social movements can be defined in terms of their challenge to processes of social closure and exclusion. Social movements are agents of social change but not total social transformation. They bring about change not by opposing society as a whole but by opposing specific forms of social closure and exclusion. They do so by thematizing issues excluded from normal societal and political decision-making, and by articulating grievances of groups who are themselves excluded. These two aspects - exclusion of groups and exclusion of issues - are not separate spheres of social movement activity. An analysis of social movements in terms of social closure and interest intermediation treats the integration of issues and groups into the polity as the criterion of social movement success.\textsuperscript{103}

To Scott, none of the imputed characteristics are confined to new social movements. An emphasis upon democracy and participation can be viewed as a function of the concern of social movements in general to open up social and political decision-making procedures. It is part of the rhetoric of populism. Further example of the generalisability of the characteristics imputed to new social movements in the near universality of fundamentalist / pragmatist tension. This is not confined to so-called new social movements, but is a re-expression of the division between revolutionary and social democratic tactics within the workers'
movements. Attempts to identify at structural level criteria which distinguish new from previous social movements rest upon a static sociological analysis in two senses. First, such approaches are ahistorical in their exaggeration of the difference between new social movements and the workers' movement and second, they reify the early stage of social movement development by equating it with the movement as a whole. ¹⁰⁴

Viewing social movements in terms of the integration of groups and issues suggests that the new social movements are 'new' only in an attenuated sense. New movements carry on the project of older movements in a vital respect. They open up the political sphere, they articulate popular demands and they politicize issues previously confined to the private realm. ¹⁰⁵ Scott has been stressing on the 'ordinariness' of social movements. Even non-institutionalized forms of action are to be understood in the context of wider institutionalized political processes.

**Marxism and New Social Movement Theory**

Marxism leads one to look towards the working class as the dominant influence within social movements and to look towards the formation of a working-class party oriented toward seizing power and establishing socialism. The transformation of culture has played very little role in its vision. It has no way of accounting for movements that centre on the defense and construction of identity (as in the gay and lesbian movements), the critique of personal life and gender (as in the women's movement), or the effort to realize a utopian vision of community.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p.154.
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Traditional Marxism reinforces the temptation to dismiss these movements as self-indulgent and irrelevant to social change.\(^{106}\)

Marxist theories claim that 'Capitalism' is an analytically useful way of conceptualizing the emergence of modern industrial societies in the West. They attempt to define the normative and structural limits to capitalism as a system and propose that those limits might be surpassed by other forms of modern social organization. Within this general framework, the contemporary Marxist theories take class and mode of production as central concepts, view politics primarily as an expression of socio-economic processes and assess political projects in terms of their contribution to movements led by the working class and aimed at establishing social ownership of the primary means of production.\(^{107}\) For Orthodox Marxism, social change is to occur when social actors become class actors. This implies that there can be only one true social movement within each society, namely, that movement which is also a class one. Social movements which define themselves without reference to class are a category puzzle.\(^{108}\)

Whereas social movements require recognition of common interests on the part of social actors, in orthodox analysis classes are defined by objective structural features such as the location of a social group in relations power of ownership. In a social movement the actors adopted collective identity is linked to their
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understanding of their social situation, in the case of classes it is independent of social knowledge.  

The new social movements have fundamentally challenged the Marxist conception of power. To Marxist Scholars, oppression exercised by the capitalist class on the working class is the primary axis of the exercise of power. The working class as the vanguard of revolution has the potential of overcoming the ‘false consciousness’ imposed on them by the capitalists and realizing its real class interests, will overthrow the capitalist state, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The new social movements theory has demonstrated that the modes of exercise of power are multiple, involving not only class but also caste, gender, race, religion, nationality and so on. They also question the conception of power as a top-down, linear flow, for power is not only exercised by the state and the capitalist class, but a various levels and locations in the system: the family school, the neighbourhood etc.

The primary concern of classical Marxist analysis has been to define the preconditions of revolution by examining the structural contradictions of the capitalist system. Centering its investigation on the logic of the system, it has underestimated the process by which collective action emerges, as well as the internal articulation of social movements (mobilization, organization, leadership,
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ideology) and the forms through which revolt passes in becoming a class movement.\textsuperscript{111}

Marxism deny that basic social change have occurred (on the ground that capitalism still exists) and then reject new social movement discourse for not taking conventional production / class / politics nexus as the central referent for critical theory and political practice. New social movement discourse more accurately identifies the contemporary terrain of collective action than Marxist claims that nothing 'basic' has changed.\textsuperscript{112}

Theorists and commentators, who view the existence of new social movements as evidence of redundancy of Marxist class analysis and as evidence of a post-Marxist politics, stress the decline of class as the primary political force and its replacement by non-class agents.\textsuperscript{113}

In all the literature discussing new social movements, whether it is from a supportive or sceptical stance, their activity is regarded as cross-class, non-class or an addition to 'pure class' politics. Challenging this view, Lawrence Wilde argues for stressing on the relevance of class analysis to an understanding of the emancipatory potential of the new social movements.\textsuperscript{114} To him, it is possible for a socialist to adhere to Marxian class analysis and at the same time enthuse over the emancipatory potential of new social movements.

\textsuperscript{112} Plotke, n.29, p.87.
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\textsuperscript{114} Lawrence Wilde, “Class Analysis and the Politics of New Social Movements”, \textit{Capital and Class} No.42 (1990), p.56.
The major arguments of Wilde are: (i) The objective basis of contemporary class relations is the exploitation of workers in the capital accumulation process. (ii) There is a capitalist world system in which the global struggle between capital and labour provides the structural limitations within which social and political development occurs. (iii) Marx defines classes primarily in terms of the position of groups in the relations of production, but he also stressed the importance of factors such as organization and consciousness in class formation. (iv) The class for itself formula overlooks the potential discrepancy between the working class representing its short form economic interests and the 'historic mission' ascribed to it by Marx. (v) The working class is defined primarily by its lack of ownership of the means of production and its sale of labour power; it is not limited to productive workers. (vi) The problem of delineating class boundaries highlights the heterogeneous nature of the working class: it does not render class analysis obsolete. (vii) The politics of new social movements offer a fertile ground for the development of class consciousness. (viii) The most pressing political talk for socialist is the articulation of various struggles into an anti-systemic coalition.115

Much of the Marxist social scientific work on class has concentrated on the question of delineating the boundaries which separate the working class from other classes. The first problem that has to be confronted is the question of the productive worker. In Theories of Surplus Value, Marx defined productive labour as wage labour which produced surplus value for the capitalist.116 If the working class is to
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include only those wage labourers who directly produce surplus value, it would exclude a mass service workers, clerks and state employees. In many of the advanced industrial countries this would mean that the working class is shrinking.

'What makes a class?' Before asking this question, Marx had identified the working class as the 'owners of mere labour power' and had commented on the difficulties of drawing precise boundaries between the classes because of the existence of 'middle and transitional levels'. Marx was certainly interested in distinguishing between productive and unproductive labour, and he wrote several pages on this theme in 1866 which appear as an appendix to the first volume of Capital. As in Theories of Surplus Value, productive labour is defined as that which creates surplus value directly but with the important qualification that in developed capitalism the ‘real lever of the overall labour process is increasingly not the individual worker’. He then the argued that an 'ever increasing number of types of labour are included in the immediate concept of productive labour, and those who perform it are classed as productive workers.' The commodities are produced by the 'aggregate worker', and it is immaterial whether the particular worker is 'at a greater or smaller distance from the actual manual labour'.

But Marx was not arguing that only productive workers form the working class. Indeed he specified that the labour of clerks, while it did not directly create surplus value, enabled the capitalist to appropriate surplus value, and was therefore a source of profit to that capitalist; “just as the unpaid labour of the worker creates
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surplus value for the productive capital directly, so also does the unpaid labour of
the commercial employee create a share in that surplus value for commercial
capital. On this sort of argument we would have to say that in contemporary
capitalism there are vast numbers of wage labourers who contribute indirectly to
the production of surplus value, even when they are working for the state.

To Lawrence Wilde:

The concerns being voiced by new social movements are material, and the issues
addressed are products of the class structure of the world capitalist system. While it is true that nuclear wars or ecological disasters are likely to have cross-class
effects, socialists would argue that those dangers are created by the remorseless
struggle for profit. Violence of all kinds, theft, drug addiction, extended working
hours, ‘bleepers’ to call people back to the ‘heart attack machine’ - are these not
material? Are they not individually consumed? These issues are not separate from
the class struggle. They are not non-class issues which need to be added on to class
issues in a ‘class alliance’; they are the products of capitalism - and the victims are
multiplying.

He continues:

New Social Movements contain a potential for the development of class
consciousness. They are not non-class movements or cross-class movements; they
are protest movements within the working class whose attentions are not focused
primarily on the workplace but on society as a whole. The wider focus of new
social movements raises the possibility that activists will begin to ask the big
questions about the nature of society and its future development, and come to
realize that their particular goals are blocked by one major barrier, capitalism.

Those who have drawn into the problem of famine and poverty in the under-
developed world are naturally led towards an understanding of dependency which
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views the plight of the Third World as a necessary consequence of capitalist accumulation. Those who have become active in the peace movement may be led to inquire into the origins and development of nuclear weapons and conclude that the guiding thread of the foreign policy of the United States has been the preservation of U.S. economic hegemony. The associated authoritarianism and secrecy of the state in matters of defence has been widely exposed by peace movement activists.\footnote{123}{Ibid., p.67.}

The position outlined above runs counter to the defenders of class analysis who regard new social movements as a diversion from struggles in the production process, which are presumed to present a more direct challenge to capitalism. The acceleration of the centralization and internationalization of capital, and the ruthlessness of capital's assault on labour surely demonstrate the methodological strength of class analysis.\footnote{124}{Ibid., pp.72.}

Almost all the writings on new social movements seem to reject altogether the Marxist notion of proletariat, regarding the classical working class movements as currently irrelevant and confined to a specific historical and geographical conjuncture ‘passing phenomenon’ related to the development of industrial capitalism. In contrast to this viewpoint, Omvedt stresses the need to rethink Marxist categories, rather than discard them altogether, recognizing the relationship of new social movements to Marxism. She writes: “What the movements have been bringing forward is the central question of who is really ‘proletarian’, in the sense...
of being the most oppressed, and being at the advance point of efforts to change the system of exploitation.  

To Wilde,

If we do not accept Marx's theory of history or his theory of exploitation, then the ensuing relativism makes it difficult to link past and present developments in one area with developments in any other. There are many socialists who have used what is essentially class theory to try to understand and encourage new forms of resistance, not to reduce the struggle of groups to simple conceptions of tensions within the economic structure. The world system analysis associated with Wallerstein makes a powerful contribution through its emphasis on the global and systematic power of capitalism, and its recognition of the immense potential in the new "antisystemic movements."  

Some of the neo-Marxist thinkers treat as classes only that group which consciously recognize common interest and act as a single coherent entity. In other words, social movements are substituted for or equated with class. It is in the work of Alain Touraine that we see these principles examined and applied to contemporary social movements. Touraine's break with conventional class analysis takes place at a methodological level. He adopts a radical form of social action theory which relinquishes class as a structural category. It is useful to compare Touraine's views with central tenets of Marxist class analysis.  

126 Wilde, n.114, pp.74-75.  
It is possible to identify long-term developments on the basis of an understanding of the dynamics of the capitalist mode of production.

A sociology of action should first of all refuse to seek for the natural laws of a social system, since the system is no more than the product of social relations and, at the same time of history.

The worker’s movement has a central role in the transformation of capitalism by dint of its structural location within that society.

There can be no class without class consciousness.

It is possible to identify a priori the objective interest of those classes which challenge the dominant order on the basis of which we can assert that communism will be the aim of working-class movements in the absence of false consciousness.

The historical actors are determined as much by a cultural field as by a social conflict.

Touraine argues that in human relations, no matter how unequal, there is necessarily an element of mutual dependence and recognition between subjects occupying the subordinate and dominant positions. No one stands outside and above the social sphere; each is involved in a struggle for recognition and control within it. In his post industrial society argument Touraine states that the shift from industrial to postindustrial society is marked primarily by a shift in the nature of production away from manufacture based industry. It is no longer the ownership and control of the means of manufacturing production, but ownership and control of knowledge production which forms the main source of social power.²⁸

In his Legitimation Crisis and The Theory of Communicative Action Habermas shares Marx’s view that the central contradiction in capitalism is that between production as a social activity and accumulation as a private one. But now with the declining role of the market and consequent re-politicizing of class

---
²⁸Ibid.
relations, this contradiction focuses on the political rather than the economic system. The fundamental motivation of much of the theory of social movements within sociology remains essentially Marcusian in inspiration, that is, it is a search for some substitute for the working class.\textsuperscript{129}

In Habert Marcuse’s view capitalism had created the material conditions for liberation. What remained was ‘surplus repression’ in two forms: first exploitation of the populations of the Third World and of underprivileged sections of affluent societies; second the exploitation of the affluent through the creation of false needs which then it satisfied through consumption. The most active and radical social movements within the advanced capitalist societies during the 1960s were non-class based in their social base and in their politico-economic demands, the black power movement and the women’s movement. In particular those aspects of the women’s movement to which Marcuse drew attention towards the end of his life are still seen by theorists as the salient features of new social movements.\textsuperscript{130}

Characteristics of NSMs

Scholars of new social movements argue that recent social movements represent an entirely new form of social protest and reflect specific properties of advanced industrial societies. The rapid economic expansion of the 1950s and 1960s and the redistributive policies of the welfare state secured a level of prosperity capable of satisfying basic human needs. The delivery of this economic security was not, however, without its problems. In contrast to the industrial phase

\textsuperscript{129} Scott, n 19, p 70.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., p 61.
of capitalism, state control in post industrial society reaches beyond the productive sphere and into areas of consumption, services and social relations. Hence the participants in these new social movements seek to gain control over their personal and collective sense of identity.\textsuperscript{131}

On the basis of the above discussion, one may identify the following characteristics of the new social movements, the characteristics that the new theorists attach to them.

1. **Goal Orientation**

   It is argued that the goal orientations of the new social movements have shifted inward, in an attempt to re-appropriate dominion over their own lives from a system of supervisory institutions. Whereas prior social movements fought to secure political and economic rights from the state and other institutional actors, new social movements target their activities away from the state.\textsuperscript{132} The new social movements also differ from the past with respect to whose interests they represent. Whereas old social movements were movements of a particular class, generally the working class and articulated the interests or demands of that class, new social movements are the most effective mechanism for mobilizing a constituency and commanding attention from state actors, new social movements choose a less traditional form of organization.\textsuperscript{133} The new social movements, therefore, are defined by their non-class, non-materialistic focus and emphasis. The theory radically alerts the Marxist paradigm of explaining conflicts and contradictions in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{131} Eder, n.34, pp. 74-75.  
\textsuperscript{132} Paul D'Anieri, Claire Ernst and Elizabeth Keir, "New Social Movements in Historical Perspective", \textit{Comparative Politics}, 22(4) (1990), p. 446.  
\textsuperscript{133} Melucci, n.34, p. 221.
\end{flushright}
terms of a class. The emphasis is new social movements in direct democracy, spontaneity, nonhierarchical structure, and small scale decentralized organizations.

2. Aims

One can characterize the aims of new social movements as bringing about social change through the transformation of values, personal identities and symbols. These movements are identity involving and transforming, they self-consciously manipulate symbols and they challenge entrenched values. This can best be achieved through the creation of alternative life-styles and the discursive reformation of individual and collective wills. Joachim Hirsch identifies their aim as individual emancipation, the recovery of civil society, self-fulfillment and the ‘good life’.

3. Strategies and Tactics

The mode of action of new social movements typically involves informal, non-hierarchical forms of internal organization and protest politics. Given the importance that members of new social movements place on participatory, spontaneous and non-hierarchical organization, it is hardly surprising that their strategies and tactics are not those characteristic of conventional politics. Alan Scott observes:

---
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There are two further proposed means for defining new social movements (i) their loose organizational structures (ii) there interest in participatory democracy rather than merely the outputs of the political system. Loose network - type organization is thought to replace hierarchical organization, and an interest in participation to supersede an interest only in the outcome of political decision-making. 139

New social movements represent a rejection of the unified, disciplined and militarized party machine oriented toward seizure of the state and enforcement of a single ideological line. The newness of the new social movement is in its insurrection of subjugated knowledges, its subjectivity and a decentred, detotalised agent. 140 The movements are rooted in micro-organizations at work, in political clubs, in churches, in sport, in support and counseling centers, in spontaneous action groups and in cultural projects. To Melucci, “these are the signs of networks composed of multiplicity of groups that are dispersed, fragmented and submerged in everyday life; of short-term and reversible commitment, multiple leadership, temporary and adhoc organizational structures” 141 They are informal, adhoc, discontinuous, context-sensitive, and egalitarian without central programs or leaders who can be held responsible for their actions. 142 They have developed low-cost, relatively effective, decentralized methods of outflanking a centralized, extraordinarily expensive, high-tech adversary. Their self-limiting radicalism is an unsurprising tactical manoeuvre against a military-industrial complex with virtually insurmountable weapons of social control, from computer surveillance through

139 Scott, n. 19, p. 153.
142 Offe, n. 34, pp. 826-31.
nuclear weaponry. Their dispersion and de-totalized style, operating within everyday practice and life world networks, is perhaps the mode of politics which is comprehensible to a population faced with enormously complex modern social systems. To Carl Boggs, the new social movement strategy works from below through ‘living social change’ co-operative markets, media groups and publications, book stores, rent-control boards, rape crisis centres, medical clinics, toxic-waste projects and research organizations.

4. Membership / Social Base

It is argued that membership in contemporary movements does not follow traditional class lines but rather falls into two categories: those who are paying the cost of modernization and have been marginalized by the development of the welfare state and the new middle class. Recruitment of participants in new social movements is often based on ascriptive characteristics such as gender, race or ethnicity. As Pakulski puts it “they attract diffuse social categories formed along locality, gender, ethnic, ideological and life style lines”. Cleavages between labour and business and between left and right, typical of old social movements converge on such universal, nonpartisan issues as ecology, ‘life-chance’ considerations and disarmament.

The support for the new social movement is said to be derived from nontraditional sectors - neither worker nor capitalist, but the new middle class,

143 Cohen, n.15, p.663.
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elements of the old middle class and some of the unemployed, students and housewives. Instead, they classify the universe of political conflict in categories taken from their issues, such as gender, age and locality or even, in the case of environmental and pacifist movements, the human race as a whole.

5. Forms

A blurring of the line between the public and private spheres is reflected in the forms that these new social movements assume. To Melucci:

those areas which were formerly zones of private exchanges and rewards have become stakes in various conflict situations and are now the scene of collective action. At the same time, the field of public and political is subjected to the pressure of individual needs and demands. Birth and death, illness and aging have all become critical points capable of mobilizing collective action.148

6. Values

The values of new social movements reflect and extend their universalistic goals, new middle class participants, and organizational forms. Reflecting what Inglehart has called the ‘silent revolution’ the new movements reject the premises of the postwar compromise between labour and capital.149 Economic growth and material rewards that it provides are no longer endorsed if they entail the destruction of the natural environment and the control of collective and personal identities. Instead, new social movements seek the achievement of ‘post-material’ values, ‘the preservation of social bonds, collective goods and the quality of production and consumption’.150 Paul Bagguley finds that the values of new social

148 Melucci, n.34, p.219.
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movements are concerned with personal autonomy and identity and opposing centralized control mechanisms.\textsuperscript{151}

One of the important characteristics of the contemporary movements is their emphasis on what has been called 'life-chance' concerns. These theorists suggest that recent movements are not driven by traditional materialist values such as higher wages, safer working conditions and voting rights, but instead are motivated by qualitative values such as personal autonomy, self-actualization and worker democracy.\textsuperscript{152} The focus on symbols and identities is viewed as the source of new social movements' significance.\textsuperscript{153}

7. Ideology

The first and broad ideological theme of the new social movements is their anti-authoritarianism. Its stress is on grassroots action and suspicion of institutionalized forms of political activity, especially their suspicion of institutionalization of social movements, such as the workers' movement into trade unions, social democratic parties etc. Anti-authoritarianism shifts the emphasis towards direct or grass-roots democracy and away from formal representative democracy. Representative democracy is distrusted because it weighs power in favour of the representatives who enjoy extensive autonomy and away from those they represent. The rotation principle of leadership is seen as a pragmatic solution to the problem of iron law of oligarchy.\textsuperscript{154} The new social movement ideology is also characterized by a common societal critique; that is, a common way of
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defining those features of society of which they are most concerned to change. It is easier to characterize the common elements in this critique negatively. In the case of women's movement: patriarchy, in the case of Black movement: racism or in the case of ecology movement: industrialism.

The subject in whose name the movement acts and articulates its demands is not a class subject, but is defined across class boundaries. Reaction to these features of new social movements can be divided into two broad camps: those who view them as populist movements which have failed to identify a concrete actor likely to bring about social change; and those who see this move towards a broader, more populist, appeal as indicative of a wider social change which includes the decline of class consciousness and action or even the decline of class itself as a political force.\(^{135}\)

Theorists and commentators who view the existence of new social movements as evidence of redundancy of Marxist politics, stress the decline of class as the primary political force and its replacement by non-class agents. Carl Boggs argues: “Social movements can no longer be understood as secondary to class struggle or as tangential expressions of an assumed ‘primary contradiction’ they have a logic and momentum of their own that needs to be spelled out theoretically.”\(^ {156}\) Those inclined towards this analysis have been concerned to demonstrate that new social movements replace the workers' movement as potential bearers of a new social order.

\(^{135}\) Ibid., p.29.
\(^{156}\) Boggs, n.38, p.62.
8. Primarily Social and Cultural

It is viewed that new movements, in contrast to older ones, are primarily social and cultural in nature and only secondarily political. They stress universalistic values, expressive needs and unlike their nineteenth and early twentieth century predecessors, do not aim at controlling the state.\[157\] They mark new conflicts which, as Habermas put it:

... no longer arise in the areas of material reproduction; they are no longer channelled through parties and organizations; and they can no longer be alleviated by compensations that confirm to the system. Rather the new conflicts arise in areas of cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization. They are manifested in some institutional extra-parliamentary forms of protest.... In short the new conflicts are not sparked by problems of distribution, but concern the grammar of forms of life.\[158\]

Melucci observes “They are not oriented towards the consequent of political power or of the state apparatus, but rather toward the control of a field of autonomy or of vis-a-vis the system”.\[159\] Shah says, “They are not raising economic issues and not concerned with state power. These movements are not class based. They raise the issue of humanity cutting across the interests of all classes. In that sense ‘new social movements’ are social and not political”.\[160\] Andre Gunder Frank and Marta Fuentes make a distinction between social and political movements. According to them, the former do not strive for state power. The social movements seek more

\[157\] Pakulski, n.84, p.148
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autonomy rather than state power. There is a difference between social and political power. The latter is located in state alone. To them, the objective of a social movement is social transformation. The participants get mobilized for attaining social justice.\textsuperscript{161}

Many observers have proclaimed the coming of the new social movements in the advanced societies which “fight for symbolic and cultural stakes, for the achievement of new meaning in social action.”\textsuperscript{162} These movements are considered socio-cultural rather than socio-political, insofar as they strive to create a new collective cultural identity for people instead of fighting for resource mobilization, as did earlier social and political movements.\textsuperscript{163} Their concern is less with citizenship and hence with political power, their focus is on values and life-styles. Their aim is the mobilization of civil society, not the seizure of power.

9. Politics of Identity

To Kauffman, “nothing distinguishes contemporary social movement politics from those of the nineteenth and early twentieth century more than the politics of identity that have developed over the last twenty or 50 years”.\textsuperscript{164} Touraine claims, “We no longer demand to direct the course of things, we simply claim our freedom, the right to be ourselves without being crushed by the apparatuses of power, violence and propaganda”.\textsuperscript{165} Melucci finds them “not
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oriented towards the conquest of political power or of the state apparatus, but rather toward the control of a field of autonomy or of independence vis-a-vis the system." Habermas states, "ascriptive characteristics such as gender, age, skin colour, neighbourhood or locality and religious affiliation serve to build up and separate off communities supportive of the search for personal and collective identity. All this is meant to foster the revitalization of possibilities for expression and communication that have been buried alive." 167

10. Located Within Civil Society

The concept of civil society lies at the centre of post-Marxist theorizing. It refers to social practices which are private, located outside the sphere of political society and the state. Civil society encompasses social relations which develop in the process of self-identification and self-organization of spontaneously formed social subjects: informal groups, gender categories, local associations and so on. It involves five major dimensions: spatial/territorial (national, regional, labourhood communities); sexual (feminist and women's rights groups); religious/ethnic/racial; occupational associations (unions, professional associations); and generational categories. Pakulski observes, "Civil society, ... is a counter concept to social class, and an opposition - pair concept to the state. Its deployment is a trade mark of a radical perspective animated by a vision of self-organizing society and participatory - democratic polity." 170
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New movements are located within civil society and are little concerned to challenge the state directly. Their aim is to defend civil society against encroachment from the increasingly technocratic state or from ‘inner colonialization’ by the society's technocratic substructure. The idea of civil society is that of a highly developed web of organizations that are outside the state. The concept of civil society entered political philosophy and social theory as a way of describing the capacity of self-organization on the part of political community or the capacity of a society to organize itself without being organized by the state. It consists of the plethora of private non-profit sector including non-governmental organizations that have emerged in all parts of the globe to provide citizens opportunities to exercise individual initiatives in the private spirit for public purposes. It represents a non-state domain of protest and challenge. Social movements in civil society simply reject the right of the state to intervene in their projects, and they oppose all efforts of the state to control social life. New social movements have relocated the discourse of democracy from the political to the civil domain.

In short, the discussion leads to the conclusion that the new social movements theory concentrates on broad social changes and middle classes as the key explaining factors. It tries to link contemporary movement analysis with large-scale structural and cultural changes. Habermas asserts that the purpose of new

---
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Social movement mobilization is primarily one of the defending and resorting to endangered ways of life, namely addressing issues of quality of life, equal rights, individual self-realization, participation and human rights. To the New Social Movement theory, the new movements represent protest against increasing technocratic and bureaucratic political systems based on the material consumption and the assumed benefits of perpetual growth; they present an alternative world view with new cultural and ideological norms, political tactics and organizational structures; they seek to construct new life-spaces or alternative life styles; they aim to bring about social changes through transformation of values, personal identities and symbols; they are not driven by traditional materialist values but motivated by qualitative values like personal autonomy, worker democracy etc., their central ideological theme is anti-authoritarianism. Contemporary movements are treated as primarily social and cultural and only secondarily political as they aim at mobilization of civil society and not the seizure of state power.

The theory argues that the new social movements in the West are predominantly middle class based and this class composition of the social movements reflects the changing stratification of Western society from more to less bi-polar forms. The decline in industrial working-class employment has reduced not only the size of this social sector but also its organizational strength. The grievances about ecology, peace, women's rights community organization and identity seem to be felt and related to demands for justice predominately among the middle classes in the West.\textsuperscript{174} Whereas old social movements were movements of a
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particular class, generally the working class, and whereas they articulated the interests or demands of that class, the new social movements are interested in the provision of collective or intangible goods that would enhance the quality of life for all sectors of society. The exponents of NSM Theory argued that membership in contemporary movements does not follow traditional class lines but rather falls into two categories: those who are paying the cost of modernization and have been marginalized by the development of welfare state and the new middle class. Recruitment of participants in new social movements is often based on ascriptive characteristics, such as gender, race or ethnicity. Cleavages between labour and business and between left and right dissolve as participants in new social movements converge on such social, non-partisan issues as ecology, ‘life-chance’ considerations and disarmament.

The examination of various approaches to the study of new social movements reveals that contemporary social theory tends to base their assessment of social movements on culture and identity and not on political economy. The proposition that the new social movement which represents movements of cultural defence has failed to take into account their ongoing struggles with the state and capital. It has also limited the recognition that new social movement practice in various spheres of the life goes beyond the conservation of culture and involves the active construction and innovation of new social relations. The New Social Movement Theorizing ignores the enduring effects of the political economy of
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advanced capitalism in shaping the trajectory of new social movements. The new social movement literature altogether regard their activities as cross-class, non-class or an addition to pure class politics. The theory does not recognize that the concerns voiced by new social movements are the products of the class structure of the world capitalist system. The new social movements actually contain a potential for the development of class consciousness as Lawrence Wilde has rightly observed, "the wider focus of new social movements raises the possibility that activists will begin to ask the big questions about the nature of society and its future development, and come to realize that their particular goals are blocked by one major barrier, capitalism." 177

When the New Social Movement theorists accord the new movements the status of a post-industrial and post-modern phenomenon, one cannot ignore that all these movements have representation in Latin America, Asia and Africa. It seems that in these societies, it is a post-independent or a new state phenomenon since they emerge out of the failure of the new state to meet the participatory and distributive demands of various segments of the population. The Third World state far from living up to its promise as a guarantor of welfare and democracy in the name of development undermined the survival base of large sections of the citizens. With economic liberalization, its limited welfare function has been eroded. In the Third World, these movements mobilize and organize people in pursuit of mostly material ends which they often regard unjustly devised for them by the state and its institutions. Much of the membership and social base of these movements reflect
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the people's disappointment and frustration with the political process. One cannot reject that the broader social changes could not take place without the support and involvement of working class/have-nots. The New Social Movement theory reflects a lack of interest in the working class project. Hence theoretical works need to include the political economy in the analysis of these movements. The second chapter makes an attempt in this direction.