CHAPTER-II

PROTEST MOVEMENTS: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

The very word movement suggests ‘people on the move’ rejecting the existing arrangements and seeking new ones. A protest movement is generally oriented towards bringing about change either partial or total, in the existing system of relationships, values and norms. According to one view, a movement can be a change promoting or a change resisting phenomena. A mere change without affecting or intending to affect the societal structure does not consistute a protest movement. According to Gusfield, social movements are socially shared demands for a change in some aspects of the social order\(^1\). Which means to hint out that social movements are not protest movements?

A protest movement may also be seen as symptomatic of some mal functioning within a given society. Deprivation, discrimination, inequalities, social unrest is the conducive factors of a protest movement. But mere social imbalance is not sufficient to spurn a protest movement. An awareness of the discrimination or deprived condition is necessary. This awakening created in a sufficiently large number of people leads to a widespread collective mobilization. Often this consciousness exists in the middle class and the intelligentsia, who tend to be the
leaders of a movement. Movements begin in the minds of those with ideas. Hungry men do not revolt as such; as they are deeply involved in the primary act of survival it is said.

Movements are conscious efforts on the part of men to mitigate their deprivation and to secure justice. While movements are conditioned by social structural factors, they imply voluntaristic action. Men who create movements to achieve goals can also be classified as a change for mobility for better. Movements are perhaps the chief mechanism through which the deprived categories demonstrate their power and call the attention of the State. Thus, protest movement is defined as a collective attempt to bring about a change in certain social institutions or to create an entirely new order to overhaul a system to bring about an inclusive change or to modify the existing system, institution and proctivate to achieve social equality. While a social movement is definite aimed at enlargement of social space for the deprived to provide greater visibility, accessability and equity^2.

The basic elements considered essential in identifying a protest movement are collective mobilization; the presence of an ideology; organization an orientation towards change; and growth of collective consciousness. Only when collective action is somewhat sustained and is able to create an interest and
awakening in a sufficiently large number of people, does it take the form of a protest movement. Contrary to this a social movement may employ the same method of collective mobilization but without an Ideology, not directed towards change but correction in the system and is not a sustained one.

Ideology is considered to be a crucial aspect of a protest movement. According to M.S.A. Rao, it is an essential component distinguishing a protest movement from any organized effort involving collective mobilization. Ideology, according to the Oxford Dictionary is the manner of thinking characteristic of a class or an individual. A movement implies sustained pursuit of shared and collective action which is either organized or spontaneous. The processes of social mobilization include meetings, campaigns, demonstrations, conferences, literature all expressive of interests and beliefs. Interest, which is immediate in terms of motivation and demands, is rooted in a more fundamental belief system which is called ideology\(^3\). Thus Andre Beteille defines social movement as a kind of collective behavior mobilized on the basis of a belief which redefines social action.

A social movement on the other hand has to justify the need for social change. It therefore must develop sooner or later a comprehensive ideology or a theory which should be convincing to those who participate in these movements and to those who sympathise with them. Where as a protest movement has to have
project, a cause to struggle for a present a version of a more valued alternate system. Ideology helps the concerned section gain self respect, honour and worth. The shared ideology forms the basis of the identity of the group in a movement. While an ideology directs the course of events, the results of the events themselves have a crucial influence on the character of the ideology, changing the pattern of communication with different symbols and codes. Thus, it is a dynamic, symbolic system. It helps towards the codification of beliefs and myths in order to define a group’s aspirations and responses to reality. Ideology then is closely related to the problems of identity, i.e. the way in which a group perceives itself in relation to other relevant groups and vice-versa. It provides the yardstick for accessing the nature and degree of commitment of both leaders and followers and for evaluating the results of events. Besides, it provides the logic of the communication system in a protest movement encoding and decoding messages as it presents the insider’s view or participant’s view, which enable us to understand the meanings of the symbolic actions of the participants. On the whole it aims at breeding a new consciousness among those aspiring change and participate in the movement.

In the absence of a charismatic leadership a social movement requires an elaborate belief system (ideology) or a definite action programme. Ideology is based on the structural conditions of existence of the concerned group, on the one hand, and the level of consciousness and resources on the other. A movement may
start with an ideology or it may acquire one in the course of its development. In either case, it is continually revised in the light of subsequent events and the reaction of opposition reference groups, but if that does not succeed in sustaining and getting codified, such movements will be characterized as ‘social movement’ and not a protest movement\(^5\).

United by an ideology, the leaders of the movement create organizational devices to fight the evils and redress grievances. A protest movement must thus evince a minimum degree of organization, yet it is not organized like clubs and other associations. Some kind of organization enables certain persons to act as authorized spokesmen and representatives. Thus both protest movements and social movement have certain but limited similarities.

A Protest movement is a deliberate collective endeavour to promote a change in any direction and by any means, not excluding violence, illegal means, revolution or withdrawal into utopian community\(^6\). The social movement is aimed at mobility and change that are brought about by consent, convincing and consensus, although the tools employed may be protest, dissent, confrontation, aggression and revolt, as opposed to acquiescence.
All movements have political implications even if their members do not strive for political power. Heberle holds that all social movements fulfill two key functions in societies: they help both in the formation of a common will or a political group (will) and in the process of socialization, they train and recruit political elites. Movements that are directed only at change in ideology or culture, movements that are primarily non-political can have a fairly widespread impact, but this impact tends to be diffused and impermanent are actually social movements which taken birth now and then.

The study of any social movement is the study of social change. It is generally aimed at egalitarian social structure. Social movement primarily results from the conditions of deprivation and exploitation and they aim at social change. As Wallace points out, they develop out of a deliberate, organized and conscious effort, on the part of members of society, to construct a more satisfying culture for themselves. On the one hand, while they express the agencies of deprivation and exploitation of the existing conditions, on the other, they enumerate a detailed programme of social action to achieve better conditions. It can be defined as a voluntary association of people engaged in a concerted effort to change altitudes, behaviour and social relationships in a larger society.
Social movements are type of group action. The term “social movements” was introduced in 1850 by the German Sociologist Lorenz von Stein in his book History of the French Social Movement from 1789 to the present (1850). They are large informal groupings of individuals and/or organisations focused on specific political or social issues, in other words, on carrying out, resisting or undoing a social change.

Sidney Tarrow defined social movement as collective challenges to elites, authorities, other groups or cultural codes by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities, he specifically distinguishes social movements from political parties and interest groups. Charles Tilly defined social movements as a series of contentious performances, displays and campaigns by which ordinary people made collective claims on others. For Tilly, social movements are a major vehicle for ordinary people’s participation in public politics.

The Indian independence struggle incorporated the efforts by Indians to liberate the regioni from British rule and form the nation state of India. It involved a wide spectrum of Indian political organisations, philosophies, and rebellions between 1857 and India’s emergence as a unified nation-state on August 15,1947.
Social movements are highly organised and are relatively long-term collective efforts. According to Y. Singh, social movements are characterized by a specific goal which has a collective significance ideological interpretation, of the collective goal, a rank of committed workers and a strong leadership.

Till the British period, the orientation of social movements in our country was religious. But after independence, the new situation emerged led to divergence in the targets of attack, economic exploitation, cultural domination, male domination.

All the social movements display the following three characteristics. These are:

- Social movements are cohesive social organisations.
- Social movements have a unifying ideology. They have a set of ideas or ideology which justifies the protest or change.
- Social movement’s sek specivic goals.
- Neil Smelser Makes a distinction between norm oriented social movement and value oriented social movement. Norm Oriented social movement is an attempt to protect social norms, for example, the labour union movement. Value oriented social movements seek to protect social values. For
example, the abolitionist movement which was a moral crusade against slavery.

T.K. Oommen states that all social movements in India centre around three factors. These are: Locality, Issues, Social categories. P.N. Mukherji also observes that a study of social movements in India implies a study of social structure.

The position of the backward classes in their social and cultural systems is characterized by relative deprivation. Serfdom and slavery existed in parts of India, where agricultural labourers were recruited from among the untouchable castes and, in some cases, from among the tribes.

The untouchable suffered from many kinds of religious and secular disabilities. On the religious side they were not allowed to study the sacred scriptures nor to worship at the temples of the caste Hindus. Their touch was considered defiling by the caste Hindus. Hence, they were not allowed to use the tanks and wells of the latter.

Any violation of the customary norms of behaviour was rewarded with very severe forms of punishment from decapitation to mutilation.
Thus, the backward castes in India suffered from intense forms of relative deprivation in the fields of religion, education economics and politics. They were discriminated against in the dress they wore, their speech, the houses they built, the way they carried themselves and the manner in which they interacted with the privileged. The latter zealously guarded their privileges and brutally punished those who violated the customary laws.

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the scheduled castes largely accepted their lot. Some of them rebelled against their helplessness, but the vast majority believed that their real chances lay in obedience and hard work as there was some reward for these ‘virtues’.

The backward classes, who suffered from different degrees of relative deprivation, became aware of their status with the spread of new liberal ideas and alternate sources of legitimacy that were ushered in by British rule.

The idea in such attempts to claim a higher varna status was to establish a new identity so as to gain self respect, honour and esteem. This was not a process of imitation but a language of aggression, by which section of the backward classes challenged the monopoly of the upper castes in terms of access to the
rituals and religious services of brahmanical Hinduism from which they had been barred for centuries.

Another variation in his approach of reinterpreting Hindu religion in search of self-determination, was developed by the Sri Narayana Dharma paripalana Movement (Movement for the Propagation of Sri Naraya Guru Swamy’s Philosophy) among the Izhavas (toddy-tappers) of Kerala. Until 1935, the Izhavas belonged to the scheduled castes category. They were considered to be unapproachables by the clear castes. The Izhavas, who formed about twenty-six per cent of Kerala’s total population, suffered from many religious, economic, educational and political disabilities. Around the turn of the present century a charismatic leader, Sri Narayana Guru Swamy, gave them a new religion of one God, one religion and one caste which transformed their life styles and outlook. He established a set of religious institutions (temples, priests, monasteries, monks, household disciples) parallel to that of the totalitarian and vegetarian variety of brahmanical Hinduism. Thus, although the Izhavas were not born in the upper castes, they could acquire the religious goods and services of the upper castes something which had been denied to them for centuries. This helped the Izhavas both to gain self respect and to adopt a protest ideology to challenge the religious, economic, educational and political supremacy of the upper castes.
A second variety of protest ideology was based on the rejection of the brahmanical Aryan religion and culture. The Dravida Kazhagam Movement in Tamil Nadu idealized the Dravidian culture and religion and attacked the Aryan culture and religion. For the followers of the D.K. Movement, Ravana was virtuous whereas Rama (an incarnation of God) was wicked. The Self Respect movement started by Ramaswamy Naicker advocated that his followers should have their own priests. The movement drew its main support from the low castes/classes. Its leaders worked hard to escape the tyranny of the Brahmans and their culture, and to extol the virtues of the Dravidian culture and religion. In its extreme form, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam advocates the separation of Tamil Nadu from the Indian Union.

The Mahar movement under the leadership of B.R. Ambedkar exemplifies as variation of the principles of rejection in protest ideology; namely, abandoning Hinduism altogether and embracing another religion (in this case Buddhism). The Mahars formed an important section of the scheduled castes of Maharashtra, constituting about ten per cent of that state’s population. They served as village watchmen, messengers and removers of cattle carcasses. These services were hereditary and were paid for in kind. The Mahars were also weavers, petty traders, carpenters and cultivators. Thus, they occupied a low position in the caste and occupational hierarchy, and as such suffered from many religious, economic,
educational and political disabilities. In the third decade of the twentieth century, the mahars organized themselves under the leadership of Dr. Ambedkar. Dr. Ambedkar vacillated between adopting one of two themes of identity to fight against the discriminations imposed by the upper castes whether to stay within the Hindu fold or to abandon Hinduism which also meant giving up caste. A large number of his followers embraced Buddhism which upheld egalitarian values and was also, at the same time, within the Indian tradition.

Thus the ideology of the Mahar movement reflects a total rejection of the religion of the caste Hindus which was identified with hierarchy and inequality. It also reflects the message of new identity that the Mahars now belong to a religion which stands for egalitarian values and hence they are superior to the caste Hindus. This is another strategy to gain self respect and esteem on the one hand and to negate or protest against the religion of the upper castes on the other.

While these two types of ideologies reinterpreted and rejection have, in one way or the other, a religious dimension, the ideologies of civil rights and class conflict are secular in character.

Thus the protest ideologies of the backward classes movements reveal four organizing principles: (i) reinterpretation of myths of origin or of one’s religion;
(ii) rejection of Hinduism and Aryan religion and culture; (iii) civil rights; and (iv) class conflicts.

Protest ideologies; have been dominant in establishing new identities among the backward classes, characterized by conflict with the dominant groups. There have been attempts on the part of certain sections of the backward classes to move up the social ladder not by claiming equality with the dominant groups but by adopting certain elements in the lifestyles of the upper castes without courting conflict with them. For instance, the Chambhars, an untouchable caste of Maharashtra, accepted their position as leather workers, and gained upward mobility without coming into conflict with the dominant groups, the Marathas and the Brahmins. The Chambhars larger identity was with the Hindus. Their self image was to be good boys in the eyes of the dominant groups and to gain access to modern economic and educational opportunities through request, acquiescence and good conduct. However, this approach or ideology has not resulted in any recognized social movement, but has remained largely at the level of individual efforts.

In the 1980s two new theories of social movements challenged resource mobilization framework; Social Constructionism, New Social Movement theory. This theory employs framing and social constructionist paradigms. It deals with
social interactionism paradigm. It focuses on the symbolic presentation of a movement to its participant and to general public. Framing has been utilized to explain the process of social movements. Movements are carriers of beliefs and ideologies. They are part of the process of constructing meaning for participants and opposers. Mass movements are said to be successful when the frames projected align with the frames of participants to produce resonance between the two parties. This is a process known as frame alignments.

The term “New Social Movement” is used to describe movements which have come to prominence since the 1960. they include, the student movement of that time, the Civil Rights movement, the women’s movements, the environmental movement, the Piece Movement and more recently, anti racist movements, movements for the rights of indigenous peoples, the ‘anti-political’ movements of Eastern Europe and so on. They have been seen as ‘new’ in two main respects, both of which have been subject to extensive debate. First, they are characterized by a set of features which distinguishes them as quite different from previous social movements. Secondly, their novelty is due to their appearance in the context of a new social formation they are taken to be new because they are exemplary of new social and political relations. Those features of new social movements said to make them novel in terms of their orientation, organization, and style may be listed in kind of ideal type construction.
Mass mobilisation (also known as social mobilisation or popular mobilization) refers to mobilization of civilian population as part of the contentious politics. Mass mobilization can be used by social movements, including revolutionary movements, but also by the state itself. Mass mobilization commonly mass meetings, parades or demonstrations which usually serve as a form of protest action. Traditional mass mobilization occurs within local communities to which individuals have long standing commitments, such as peasant villages or urban craft guilds. New of political change are common triggers for such mass mobilization, which aim is to call attention to economic distresses of the community. Peasant rebellions are an example of such an occurrence.

Social movements do not just happen. It is social unrest which gives rises a social movement. The main causes are:

- Cultural Drifts
- Social Disorganisation
- Social Justice

The society is undergoing constant changes. The values and behaviour are changing in all civilized societies. In the course of cultural drift, most of the people
develop new ideas. To get these ideas operative, they organise a movement. The development of a democratic society, the emancipations of women, the spread of mass education, the removal of untouchability, equality of opportunity for both the sexes, growth of secularism are the examples of cultural drift.

A changing society is to some extent disorganize because changes in different parts of society do not take place simultaneously. Industrialization has brought urbanization which has in turn caused numerous social problems. Social disorganization brings confusion and uncertainty. The individuals become rootless. They feel isolated from the society. When groups of people feel that injustice has been given to them they become frustrated and alienated. Such feeling of injustice provides fertile soil for social movements.

Some scholars are of the opinion that social conflicts are endemic they are a function of social dynamics. But some others opine that social conflicts are engineered by individuals or groups to realize their goals and promote their interests. A social conflict may be integrative or disintegrative; it may produce violence or peace; it may consolidate and old value or bring into being a new norm. A social conflict is not inherently good or bad. Whether it is good or bad is related to what it seeks to realize or promote. One has to find out whether a conflict has been
started to promote the interest of the exploiter/oppressor or the
exploited/oppressed.

**Typology**

There is no single criterion for the classification of a movement in to
protest or social movement can be accurately categorized in terms of only one
ideal type or conceptual framework. We find therefore a number of classifications
and typologies in the literature on movements. It is observed that the attempt
hitherto made to evolve conceptual frameworks for analyzing protest and social
movements remain at best tentative, preliminary and bold beginnings. None of the
attempts made so far is comprehensive enough to encapsulate all varieties of
movements found in India. The bases for the typology are derived from the
defining characteristics of the these movements. The typologies adapted by the
social scientists depend on the area of their interest and on the thrust of their
contentions. Movements are generally classified on the basis of locus, ideology,
consequences and scale and spatial spread apart from their period of sustenance.

The criterion of locus indicates the section of society which is involved in
the movement linguistic, religious, and sectarian, caste, peasant, worker, tribal
racial, ethnic, student and women etc., however, region is also a matter of great concern these days.

Similarly, the nature of their ideology provides another criterion by which social movements can be classified as millenarian, chiliastic, messianic, cargo, cult, sectarian, secessionist, revitalization movements, consisting of revivalistic and nativistic movements and protest movements.

Taking the nature of social change or scope or consequence as the criterion, social movements can be classified into revolutionary, reformatory protest, social or Transformative. A movement can be classified according to its scale to number of participants, the time span, or the social composition of a movement. Movements may also be classified on the basis of their spatial spread.

Turner and Killian classify movements, according to three fundamental types: value oriented, power oriented and participation oriented. Gusield typologises a movement as withdrawal, protest, reform and revolution. Smelser’s classification of movements as (i) value oriented and (ii) norm oriented is akin to revolutionary and reformatory movements. The value oriented movement is collective action mobilized in the name of generalized belief envisioning a reconstitution of values; whereas the norm oriented movement is action mobilized
in the name of generalized belief envisioning a reconstitution of norms. There are different opinions on what is meant by revolutionary or radical types. Some define it on the basis of violence and others on the basis of its scope.

M.S.A. Rao distinguished between three levels of structural change and three types of social movement’s reformist, transformative and revolutionary. Partha Mukherjee classifies movements based on the quality of change accumulative, alternative, and transformative. T.K. Oomen classifies social movement as charismatic, ideological and organizational according to the response pattern towards a situation of strain prevailing in a society.

It is necessary to stress that a movement tends to acquire new features during its course, and that the classification remains relative to a particular phase in its development. However, classification provides broad guidelines for further analysis there are possibilities that these clarifications change over a period of time due to the influences of socio economic and global factors.

While the earlier studies of social movements have concentrated on ideas, more recent sociological research has given equal attention to structural and psychological aspects. In certain types of movements, the mass of supporters are attracted by the personal charm of a leader rather than being oriented towards an
elaborate belief system or a definite action programme. But quite often, psychological explanations based on pathological traits and tendencies of leaders and followers of movements neglect the situational conditions from which these movements arise.

The genesis of different kinds of social and cultural movements has been analyzed with reference to the concepts of strain, revitalization and relative deprivation:

**Strain:** Smelser treats structural strain as the underlying factor leading to collective action or movement. According to him, there can be no social movement without a previous sub system strain. This theory fits in the structural functional explanation. The structure of society affects the origin and form of movements in a variety of ways. This phenomenon has been referred to by Smelser as structural conduciveness. Sub systems of a society are related and interdependent. So strain even in one sub system affects the functioning of society as a whole.

**Revitalization:** Revitalization has been defined by Anthony Wallace as a conscious, organized effort on the part of some members of a society to create a more satisfying culture. Nativism and revivalism are two types of revitalization.
Nativism is an attitude of rejection of alien persons or culture or rejection of varying from a dominant society. In revivalism, the aim of the movement is to return to a former era of happiness, to go back to a golden age, to revive a previous condition of social virtue. This theory indicates adaptive processes like an imitative or emulative process of social change centered around acquiescence\(^13\). Revitalization is considered to be an adaptive process in establishing an equilibrium, which is a postulate of the structural functional approach. Here the significance of conflict in bringing about change is underplayed.

**Relative deprivation:** Relative deprivation means a widespread feeling that people are deprived of some desired state or thing in comparison with some standard or with the real or imagined conditions of other people\(^14\). The notion of relative deprivation is to be found in the thoughts of Marx and Engels. Marx, Engels and Aberle used the term relative deprivation as the basis of conflict, to explain the genesis of social movements and social change. Merton and Runciman used it as the basis of studies of social mobility in relation to the lifestyles of positive reference groups. The credit of developing this concept goes to Abele. He defined relative deprivation as a negative discrepancy between legitimate expectation and actuality. According to Tocqueville, what is significant is not the absolute level of poverty or prosperity, but what people have come to feel as their just due as compared with their present or threatened future existence.
A position of relative deprivation alone will not generate a movement. But it is the perception of a situation and the estimation of capabilities by certain leaders that they can do something that is required for the emergence of a social movement. Rao further stresses that relative deprivation refers not only to material condition but also to the other spheres of life such as religion, education, politics and civic life.

It is interesting to note that till recently no social scientist had ever ventured a study of protest movements as it was long considered to be the sole concern of historians. In the past, social scientists concentrated on analyzing the structure rather than the processes of change as they were highly influenced by the conventional model of equilibrium\textsuperscript{15}.

During the period 1920-1965, there was a great impact of social anthropological theories, including the structural functional theory, on Indian Political Scientists. The pet areas of research were mainly caste, family and village the change of approach from system maintaining to change inducing factors has been a recent development in the field of sociology\textsuperscript{16}.
The sixties were a period of tumultuous social movements the world over, not excluding India. Widespread discontent owing to deterioration in economic and political conditions, and discrimination between the affluent and poorer sections of society gave birth to different types of movements, embracing such underprivileged sections of the population as peasants, workers, women, students, etc. The studies on social movements became an important preoccupation of social scientists by the third decade of independent India. One can safely assert that there has been an explosion of movement studies during the period 1968-77. However, the field of social movements is still a relatively less explored field in Social Sciences. Among the areas of social movement’s studies so far, the substantive and more frequently studied areas are religious, caste, tribal and peasant movements, thus, the study of protest movements has taken a back seat.

In sociological studies of movements, we can identify three major frameworks of analysis (i) the functional framework; (ii) the Marxian framework; (iii) conceptual framework. All of these have contributed much in enriching the understanding the phenomenon of social movements. However, the structural functional approach has not been found suitable for analyzing social movements, because the movements are viewed essentially as adaptive mechanisms in a period of social change. T.K.Oommen has pointed out three basic flaws of the approach: (i) it does not specify the source of deprivation; (ii) it considers human beings as
mere creatures of social determinism, sapping their creative vitality; and (iii) its unit of analysis role is not appropriate of analyzing movements. Gupta points out that though functionalists (the conflict theorists) allow for conflict tension and social change in society, as these are postulated without a philosophy of history they have an ad hoc character. It is primarily for this reason that the functionalists are restricted to the given social structure and their scholarship is focused on the analysis of stability inducing and enduring factors of society rather than change inducing factors. However, the functionalists have enriched our understanding by a detailed study of organizational and ideological complexities of structural aspects of a movement.

The Marxian approach to the study of social movements has provided us valuable insights into the nature of contradictions and conflicts that form the basis of ideology and collective mobilization. However, in the opinion of Rao, there are certain limitations to the Marxian analysis in running its full course, to its logical end. In actual empirical situations, the class character of the revolutionary group gets blurred by caste, race, religious and other ethnic affiliations. Moreover, a class situation might change over time and new alignments could occur contrary to class ideology. Secondly, class cleavages themselves get blurred because of a lack of polarization of classes. Thirdly, in the Indian context, there are multiple modes of production which prevent the emergence of clean categories such as capitalist,
wage labour and domestic labour, which is central to the analysis of gender roles and women’s movements.\(^{18}\)

MSA Rao has thus put forth a conceptual formula to avoid the above said weaknesses of the two approaches. He employed it to explain the complexity of the socio economic structure of Indian society, which is blured by caste, class, religious and ethnic elements. It also indicates that there is a middle path to bringing about changes in the power structure in a discrete manner, apart from the revolutionary changes visualized in the Marxian frame of reference. However, according to T.K.Oommen, many conceptual and theoretical issues cannot be clarified within the classificatory scheme proposed by MSA. Rao In fact he distinguishes between three levels of structural change, and consequently three types of social movements; reform, Trans formative and revolutionary. According to him, reform movements bring about partial changes in the value system, Trans formative movements aim at bringing about middle level structural changes, and revolutionary movements effect radical changes in the totality of social and cultural systems. T.K.Oommen points out that different types of movements cannot be classified within this formula such as (i) a movement which effects either partial middle level structure change or total middle level structural change, (ii) a movement which aims at bringing about a partial as against total change in the value system (iii) a movement pursuing revolutionary radical change through
non violent means, (iv) a movement with frequent intense violent conflicts which occur in the course of movements which have primordial collectivities as their locus and not class.

A study of these frameworks of analysis has thus, enriched the knowledge of theoretical aspects of social movements. It is to be now not confined to any particular approach. The present study, as one can note is rather chosen and adopted given to its characters specific of these three approaches, wherever they are suitable, it is up to us to analyse the Dalit movement in Karnataka in any frame we like. It is one thing to recognize the importance of a theoretical framework, in the absence of which one cannot adequately analyse the data on hand. But it is another fact to take a ‘live movement’ and categorise it. Because there is an interaction between conceptualization and empirical reality. Empirical research, at the field level without conceptualization is blind and conceptualization without empirical research is barren. Having said that it becomes the responsibility of a researcher to find a path to analyse the Dalit movement in Karnataka both from its historical context as well as in its empirical status as the movement is considered to be a dynamic process of social change and was once seen as a potential catalyst to catapult the so called Sanathana Hindu society from its herarchical and Structural shape to a flattened Society.
Thus, this study attempts to analyze the Dalit movement in Karnataka within the framework of political and sociological perspectives of a protest movement as we believe that protest movement essentially involves a sustained collective mobilization through either informal or formal organization including political parties, official agencies, and through popular quests. Our concern here is all the three to frame dalit dalit movement in Karnataka so as to characterize it as either a social movement in which case to understand how this has lead to enlargement of space socially-politically-economically to dalits, whether or not there is an increase in their accessibility to power structures, social (status) institutions, economic positions, visibility to them in matters of social and political issues and equity in terms of the proceeds of the state and state sponsored scheme for development\textsuperscript{20}. Or to see it as a protest movement in which case to understand what is its ideology, what is it rejecting an existing social system to replace it with an alternative, has it been able to bring about such a desired change either partial or in total in the existing relationships values and norms\textsuperscript{21}?
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