THE DIALECTICS OF INSTITUTIONALISATION AND RADICALISATION IN SOCIAL MOVEMENT

ALKA PAL[1]

[1]Ph.D Research Scholar, Centre for Political Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, INDIA

ABSTRACT

Movements in contemporary times are not radical at one moment and then institutionalised at another moment instead they are caught in a dialectic process of the two moments and sometimes the two process are simultaneously maintained. They are trying to maintain themselves at both the levels and thus there exists a constant struggle between 'organisational' and 'radical protest' imperatives of the movements. There is a back and forth flow mechanism between the two moments. There is a cyclical relation between these moments, conceptualised as 'cycles of protest'. Movements oscillate between moments of institutionalisation and radicalisation. And thus they hold a dialectical relationship between them. And the various aspects of the dynamics of this dialectical relationship are: organising, framing, networking and alliance making. Thus a period of 'visibility phase' of the movement is followed by a 'latency phase' where the movement exists in the form of 'hidden networks'. This can be understood in terms of 'struggle phase and dialogue phase' or as 'politics of contention and politics of engagement'.

KEY WORDS: *Social Movement Organisation, Institutionalisation, Radicalisation, Autonomy.*

*In its beginning a social movement is amorphous, poorly organised, and without form, the collective behaviour is on a primitive level…and the mechanisms of interaction are the elementary spontaneous mechanisms…*But, he continues, *As social movement develops, it takes on the character of a society. It acquires organisation and form, a body of customs and traditions, establish leadership, an enduring division of labour, social rules – in short, a culture, a social organisation and a new scheme of life.* (Blumer, 1969, p. 99)

This paper basically tries to map the various theoretical dimensions of the interaction between social movements and institutions. The terrain is first laid out by the cross-fertilisation of the two sets of literature by bringing the concepts, categories, and logics used by them for analysing their interaction. The Social Movement literature has pointed out that the trajectory of their interaction with institutions can move in different directions, from being institutionalised with in itself to being institutionalised in the formal terrain of politics and most of the times maintaining both the dimensions simultaneously and still retaining its movement and fluid nature by way of social movement organisations, coalition or alliance building, and movement net working. The paper is divided into seven sections: The first section, tries to chart out the different trajectories into which a movement can straddle into.

The second section discusses those scholars who have tried to use the concepts used by the literature on social movements to understand institutional change. The third section focuses on the aspect of movement as 'challengers' and movements as 'institutional processes'. The fourth section tries to evaluate the importance of social movement organisations. The fifth section focuses the 'latency' and 'visibility' phase of movements. It argues that both the phases correspond to the 'institutionalisation' and the 'radical' phase or the 'dialogue' and 'struggle' phase of the dialectics of movements. The sixth one is a short section on two case studies of National Alliance of People's Movement (NAPM) and Ekta Parishad (EP). By applying the theoretical formulations over the empirical observations made in all the sections and the case studies the last section tries to conclude the paper.

The source of the problematic from which this research work took its inspiration is based on certain empirical observations. On one hand we find that movements and parties are mutually supportive of each other and mostly what we observe is that, movements leading to some organisational structure (political parties) or that political parties leading to movements and sometimes the flow mechanism from party to movement and from movement to party is such that their boundaries become blur to the observer. Take for instance the case of Indian National Movement which

led to the formation of the Indian National Congress party (INCP). The two have been existing almost simultaneously. Then another instance is that of communist movement in India which again has its direct link with the left parties (Communist Party of India, Communist Party of India- Marxist, and Communist Party of India Marxist-Leninist).

Then on the other hand, there is just the contradictory observation that, slowly both the movements have subsided or that there has been a shift in their concerns. Their radical nature is lost or has got toned down. The left parties in India are now more concerned about electoral and parliamentary politics. INCP has also shifted its focus to larger goals of development and industrialisation. Also take for instance the contemporary movements like Anti-Corruption Movement in India, popularly known as Anna Hazare Movement. The movement has taken a back seat with the making of the Aam Adami Party (AAP).

The two observations are somewhat contradictory, on one hand it can be seen that movements and organisations coexist together but on other hand we find that the moment the movements start getting institutionalised within the formal terrain of politics (electoral and parliamentary politics) the movement phase starts getting phased out. But this appears to be a very simplistic observation that movements lead to organisations and then with further institutionalisation there comes the decline of the movements. It is these kinds of observations which must have compelled several social scientists to investigate the issue and to come to conclusions like, Max Weber's 'routinisation and bureaucratisation' and Michel's 'iron law of oligarchy.' The argument coming from the Weber-Mcihels model is:

"As a movement organisation attains an economic and social base in the society, as the original charismatic leadership is replaced, a bureaucratic structure emerges and a general accommodation to the society occurs, the participants in this structure have a stake in preserving the organisation, regardless of its ability to attain goals. Analytically there are three types of changes involved in this process; empirically they are often fused. The three types of change are goal transformation, organisational maintenance, and oligarchisation" (Zald & Ash 1966, p 327-341).

What needs to be investigated is that, do these arguments hold their validity for all cases. Making such sweeping generalisations and imparting any kind of rigid 'essentialism' to such maxims/ or theoretical formulations might be a futile exercise, since social phenomena's are complex things. Thus there is a need for further introspection on this issue.

MOVEMENTS AND THEIR DIFFERENT TRAJECTORIES

There are different trajectories into which the movements can straddle into, that is the movement can in the process either get split apart, or get co-opted, or there can be decline of the radical activity of the movement precisely because of the decline in people's enthusiasm or the movements may get institutionalised within itself by developing an organisational structure. The organisational structure can be kept strictly centralised or decentralised in terms of power holding and decision making. The movements can also get institutionalised by entering the formal institutional terrain of politics by adapting to electoral politics, entering the legislature, being part of the executive structure involved in policy construction. Now it is both these instances of institutionalisation that create the problematic but in contemporary times the social movements, from being institutionalised within itself to being institutionalised into the formal terrain of politics and most of the times maintaining both the dimensions simultaneously have managed to retain its movement and fluid nature by way of social movement organisations (SMOs), movement networking and alliance making.

Institutionalisation of a movement is seen as the end phase of the movement and as something which blunts the disruptive force of the movement primarily because of the shifts in the goal. Initially the emphasis is on movement level activity but after institutionalisation of the movement there is a shift towards the goals of organisational survival, managing of resources, funding of the organisation. Also there is an increasing tendency for relying on formally institutionalised, conventional, and constitutionally legitimate means of politics in order to bring about social change. Thus the general argument is that, with the institutionalisation of the movements their radical nature gets degenerated. But there is an ever increasing empirical evidence in the contemporary times which goes against to what is being argued above. It might be noteworthy to analyse that what are the various trajectories that a movement might follow after succumbing to routinisation. M.S.A.Rao, in his analysis on the routinisation of movements has thrown some light on this question, according to him the movement "might die a natural death; or it might lie dormant for some time and pick up new interests which will give it a new life;

or it might develop internal contradictions that will throw up new forces directed towards increasing radicalisation" (Rao, 1979, p.1-21).

Movements in contemporary times are not radical at one moment and then institutionalised at another moment instead they are caught in a dialectic process of the two moments and sometimes the two process are simultaneously maintained. They are trying to maintain themselves at both the levels and thus there exists a constant struggle between 'organisational' and 'radical protest' imperatives of the movements. There is a back and forth flow mechanism between the two moments. Just as exhibited by communist movement and Communist Parties of India, or dalit assertion movement and the making of the Bahujan Samaj Party, or the Indian National Movement and the making of the Indian National Congress Party. Such empirical evidences where there is constant flow mechanism between parties and movements. Movements leading to organisations and organisations leading to movement makes the oft-cited argument of institutionalisation as the end of the movement phase or as de-radicalisation of the movement phase as problematic which needs further evaluation and research so as to see whether the argument holds its validity for all cases or that it depends upon the external and internal environment in which the movements finds itself and thus dependent upon the context for its validity. This research work tries to deal with this problematic.

Our first problematic also creates the space for a second level of thinking as to what fills that space where the flow mechanism occurs, between the two moments of institutionalisation and radicalisation? What gives this dialectical relation a processual form and allows for the balance between the two moments? Contemporary movements are mostly engaged in multiple activities and are acting at multiple levels. They are engaged in movement networking and alliance making with other movements and organisation. The interactivity between movement activists and extending of support to other movements allows for this networking to take shape. If movements would have been completely spontaneous occurrences implying that the masses mobilise and create a political force and then this spontaneous activity slowly fades away. But then, this is not the case movements do come up with some organisational structure so as to maintain the survival of the movement and movement networking takes place between these organisations and their all time social activists. Movements in the contemporary times are also engaged in 'framing of the grievances' by creating a space for deliberation and dialogue. Thus there is a need to further to evaluate that, whether there is a link between the 'organising' 'framing' and 'alliance building' activities of the movements with the dialectics of institutionalisation and radicalisation moments of the movements?

Related to the above research problems and somewhat overlapping with them is the problem of autonomy of the movement. Complete autonomy of the movement from other movements, from the state, from other socio-economic-political-cultural aspects which perpetrate structural violence, and from the prevalent ideological discourses upheld by the State, is not possible. The autonomy aspect of the movement becomes crucial so as to avoid the co-option of the movement and thus facilitates the survival of the movement till it achieves its goals. Hence this autonomy aspect of the movement requires further elucidation and introspection regarding the dimensions of this aspect and also that what are the necessary and sufficient conditions which facilitates the autonomy of the movement.

There might be many ways in which one might interpret a particular concept or a category or a phrase and hence it seems categorical for the purpose of this research work to explain at the very outset, the particular way in which this research work interprets those categories. The category of institutionalisation as used in the explanation of the dialectic relationship between institutionalisation and radicalisation implies: A movement can get institutionalised within itself or within the formal terrain of politics. By institutionalisation within itself the implication is not for a typical bureaucratic organisation. A movement organisation is different from bureaucracy since its aim is not to provide regular services to the society it simply identifies itself with the movement goals, mobilises the masses, and remains decentralised in terms of power and decision making. It can be more or less institutionalised in that sense. Even when the movement enters the formal terrain of politics, institutionalisation implies the insider activists. And not that movement become a part of the established structure.

The category of radicalisation implies: In the contemporary times and after the severe repression faced by the Maoist Movement in India, the idea of radical violent protest has got declined. Movements are radical in the sense that they are not ready to give up on their demands and the praxis used is that of the 'Gandhian

Radical' of civil disobedience, making the masses self-reliant and going for struggle-dialogue praxis.

The category of autonomy simply means that the movements have maintained efforts for not being co-opted by the bureaucracy. Though complete autonomy is not a possibility but still a modest attempt is made by the movements to remain autonomous from the state and capitalist regime, from other movements, and the popular ideological discourses.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL CROSS-FERTILISATION

There can be many entry points for studying the relationship between the social movements and institutions: first, may be how do you understand institutional change and variation? Second, what are the various changes that occur in the movement when it starts getting institutionalised? Third, how do social movement organisations factor in this relationship between movements and institutions? There has been a large amount of scholarship which has tried to study all these aspects of the relationship between movements and institutions.

There has been a shift in the analysis of institutionalisation and institutional change. This shift has large implications for both the organisation theorists and social movement scholars (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005). Before understanding institutional change it will be categorically necessary to define institutionalisation in the very first place, "institutionalisation- the activities and mechanisms by which structures, models, rules and problem-solving routines become established as a taken-for-granted part of everyday social reality" (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005). Now how do you understand institutional change, change can be both gradual and rapid, as far as rapid change is concerned, social movements can play the causal role. The taken-for-granted image of institutions and their legitimacy is not something eternal and is continually under question, "Thus the response to institutionalisation may manifest in different forms: conformity, differential interpretation, acceptance of but rejection of the institutional role-incumbents, *opposition*; etc. this means institutionalisation can occasion both bureaucratisation and mobilisation" (Oommen, 1990, p.145).

The literature on social movements has largely considered collective actions and movements as disengaged from institutions and structures and as Indian scholars like T.K.Oommen opines, that there exists an interim social state between the two phases 'solid state' (institutions) and 'fluid state' (movements) and that the social scientists have scarcely paid attention to this dimension of social reality (Oommen, 1990). In the same strain Amita Bavsikar, who has largely written on displacement and movements related to it, argues that one of the key features of social movement politics, since 1990's has been the institutionalisation of campaigns, but still the relations between social movements and political parties and the complementarities between movement dynamics and more institutional politics remains under studied and requires further exploration, (Baviskar, 2010). There is a need to study the relation between social movements, social movement organisations, parties, and the state (political institutions). The relation between the Ram janam bhoomi movement and the Bhartiya Janta Party, the Dalit movement and the Bahujan Samaj Party, a large number of contemporary movements for instance the Right to information movement have started engaging directly with the political parties and parliamentary democracy in order to further their goals (Baviskar, 2010).

T.K.Oommen (1985), in his work, 'From Mobilisation to Institutionalisation: The Dynamics of Agrarian Movement in Twentieth Century Kerala', analyses the agrarian movements in India and has suggested that the conventional distinctions made between social movements, political parties, and voluntary associations based on the western empirical experience do not apply to the explanation of Indian social reality. He cites certain empirical observations on farmer's associations and agricultural unions in Kerala, which are basically front-organisation of one or another political party.

"Thus it seems, the conventional dichotomisation between institutionalisation and mobilisation is a misplaced polarity. Even the institutionalisation of popular participation by inducting people's representatives onto the official bureaucratic structures and instituting popular committees to assist official committees have not rendered the ongoing process of mobilisation entirely redundant". (Oommen, 1985, p. 248).

Since 1990's there has been a proliferation of literature, which has started linking social movements and institutional analysis, and have tried to throw light on the various aspects of their interrelation, an analytical focus on the institutional variation can help us move beyond the understanding of the "ideologically loaded

and the teleological conceptualisation of social movement institutionalisation as cooption and towards the specification of how and what kind of changes occur in social movements over time" (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008, p. 648). A large number of scholars have started analysing the concept of 'institutional activists'. The scholars of the women's movement have been on the front to analyse the working of the institutional activists, for ex, Eisentein (1995), emphasise on the idea of 'femocrats' (female civil servants) who are social movement actors working within the bureaucratic structures of the state in order to advance women's policy concerns.

Such an analyses of the relationship between movements and institutions can help us go beyond that teleological conception that, as the movement starts getting institutionalised there is the end of its movement phase. The literature on the achievements of the institutional activists emphasises on the fact that even when the movement activists enter the formal terrain of politics, it does not amount to cooption. The movement can still maintain its autonomy, "instead of simply being co-opted, social movements often become embedded in multiple and overlapping institutions that enable continued struggle for change, albeit in ways that may be hidden and less dramatic than street protests" (Lounsbury, 2008, p. 194).

MOVEMENTS AS CHALLENGERS AND MOVEMENTS AS INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS

Institutional change which can be both gradual and rapid. A sudden and rapid change occurs when the given rules-of-the-game (which the institutional structure lays down) are put to contestation from outside the structure, by way of social movements. This argument goes against the 'excessive institutional determinism' according to which the taken-for-granted rule is that, it is the formal institutions of the society which lay down the rules of the society. It is these rules-of-the game which shape the strategies and concerns of the struggling masses. But social movement theorists are of the opinion that this is not valid for all times and that movements can act as potential agents of change and change the rules-of-the -game. Though complete autonomy is not a possibility but still movements have been capable of acting both as challengers and as institutional process.

Scholars, who have been analysing the dynamics of institutional change, have tried to reintroduce "agency, politics and contestation into institutional analysis" (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008, p. 648). And there has been a tendency to move out of "excessive institutional determinism by turning to social movement theory and study of collective action" (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008, p. 648). One can figure out two strands in the literature which tries to integrate movements and institutional analysis. One which sees movements as deliberate mobilisations trying to contest/challenge institutions from outside while the other strand tries to analyse movements within institutions, thus seeing collective mobilisation as institutional process.

(a) *Movements as Challengers*: Movements can act as important "antecedents to deinstitutionalisation" (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005, p. 153) and give shape and direction to "pre-institutional processes," (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005, p. 153) and they do this "by promulgating critiques and introducing alternative logics into a setting; movements can fuel controversies, political conflicts and crises of both cognitive and socio-political legitimacy, shattering the taken-for-granted character of existing arrangements." (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005, p. 153).

(b) *Movements as Institutional Processes*: "movements can also enter into or develop within fields, deliberately exploit institutional processes and shape institutionalisation and deinstitutionalisation at any stage" (Schneiberg & Soule, 2005, p. 153). Over here it becomes important to study the 'institutional activists' or insider activists.' These 'insider activists', straddle the institutional/non-institutional boundaries. Their aim is to achieve movement goals by conventional bureaucratic channels (Santoro & Gail, 1997, p. 503-579). Movements have recognised the state as a partner rather than a target and thus have associated their strategy of 'politics of contention' with 'politics of engagement' in order to achieve their goals by entering into the formal terrain of politics, thus institutionalisation of movements is to be seen as a strategic action (Sooh, 2011, p. 442-471). Movements can operate within the structures of power (political institutions) and act as agents of theorisation, classification and diffusion of alternative logics.

The idea of 'movements as challengers' corresponds with the idea of 'contentious politics' and 'movements as institutional processes' corresponds with the idea of 'politics of engagement'. The contemporary social movements have adopted a strategic behaviour and have started using both the strategies to achieve their movement goals. For instance the Women's Movement in India has for long been characterised by the puzzle that whether it should remain "'in and out of the state' or

simultaneously 'anti- and pro- state'"(Gudavarthy, 2013). A note worthy observation is that the second phase of the Women's Movement was marked by an absence of street protest politics (contentious politics) and the emphasis shifted more on achieving legal reforms. Thus amounting to an engagement with the institutions of the State (politics of engagement), in this phase the Women's Movement accumulated all the formal features which an organisational structure possess but it this moment of formalisation which also provided the moment of radical politicisation (Gudavarthy, 2013). Thus the contemporary social movements have moved towards the dual strategy of challenging and engaging with the state (political institution) rather than simply challenging and trying to bring the state down. The implication of this argument is that, "the democratic potential in each institution needs to be exhausted before we really understand the potential of alternative radical politics" (Gudavarthy, 2013, p.75). The Maoist movement in India, which has been facing repression from the Indian state, has for long been engaging in contentious politics and has adopted an anti-state stance and has questioned the legitimacy of the state. But what the movement needs to recognise is that "the target of revolution is also the site for revolutionary politics…merely bombarding institutions and the legitimacy of institutionalised practices might end up destroying the site and not the target" (Gudavarthy, 2013, p.75).

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANISATIONS

Recently social movement scholars have started analysing the role of social movement organisations (SMOs), their evolution, and contribution to social movement's formation, mobilisation, maintenance, outcomes and goals. But since the emphasis has been more on movement-level issues, there has been a lack of systematic theorising and a cogent set of theoretical questions on SMO's. An SMO is a "complex, or formal organisation, which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a counter movement and attempts to implement those goals" (McCarthy & Zald, 1977, p. 212-241). There is an analytical difference between the SMO and other organisations, prevalence of bureaucratic structures can be of common existence to both of them but "analytically they differ from 'full-blown' bureaucratic organisations in two ways. First, they have goals aimed at changing the society and its members; they wish to restructure society or individuals, not to provide it or

them with a regular service and second SMO's are characterised by an incentive structure in which purposive incentives predominate" (Zald & Ash, 1996, p.327-341).

Weber's concept of 'routinisation and bureaucratisation', Michel's 'iron law of oligarchy' and Piven and Cloward have argued that once the movements get institutionalised they loose their radical nature. Piven and Cloward have argued that all the efforts on the part of the movement leaders to "build enduring formal organisations has blunted or curbed the disruptive force which lower-class people were sometimes able to mobilise" (Piven & Cloward, 1977, pg. xii). The implication is that, as the movements become formalised they inevitably tend to divert their energies from mobilising mass defiance's and move towards accommodating with the status quo. Thus the literature on social movements views formal organisation and anti-institutionalisation politics as being antithetical. It is this dilemma which brings the movement's organisational structure and its strategy into a problematic relationship. The key questions which this problem poses are: "do social movements necessarily lose their anti-institutional character as they become more formally organised? Does the adoption of strategies of emphasising institutionalised politics necessarily lead to increasingly formal organisation?" (Aminzade, 1995).

There are scholars, working on the analysis of social movements who have pointed out that, both formalisation and institutionalisation and radicalisation can go together (Gudavarthy, 2013). The processes of "mobilisation and institutionalisation can co-exist and furthermore the process of institutionalisation provides new possibilities of mobilisation"(Oommen, 1985, p.248). Thus in the modern democratic societies the boundary between institutionalised and non-institutionalised politics is "fuzzy and permeable" (Gold Stone, 2003). A discussion on Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT) can be helpful for the purpose of our analysis that whether institutional organisation of social movement's amounts to de-radicalisation or the decline phase of the movement. From the late 1960's, the RMT has criticised the dominant theories of collective behaviour, which equate social movements with 'spontaneous' and 'irrational' forms of behaviour and has offered an alternative perspective by arguing "that collective action is a rational response that only can occur when adequate resources are available" (Caniglia & Carmin, 2005, p.201-212). The approach has focused

its attention on SMO's, defined as "rational organisations capable of gathering resources from their surrounding environment and allocating them with the aim of bringing about political transformation" (Porta & Diani, 1999). These SMO's serve as anchors for social movements, and contributes to the survival of the movement when there is a constraint on the availability of resources or when the political and social climate is inhospitable (Staggenborg, 1988, p.586-606). Macarthy and Zald have treated formal organisations as resources that facilitate rather than suppressing mobilisation, the more organisation the better prospects for mobilisation and success.

Mayer N. Zald and Roberta Ash, in their study of SMO's have argued that, organisations are embedded in their larger environment to which they keep responding and are also being affected by them. Thus there is no necessary social-determinism about the evolution of SMO's and their tendency towards displacement of goals from being more radical to being conservative, from innovativeness and creativity to being more accommodative, from achievement of movement goals to organisational survival (as suggested by Weber-Michels model). Thus according to them the SMO's respond to a lot of external forces which shape and guide their evolutionary trajectory rather than simply being governed by the internal logic of formalisation (Zald & Ash, 1966).

The emergence of studies on new social movements which emphasise on the cultural and identity formation and symbolic interactionism aspects of the movement, has contributed to the enrichment of the RMT, by foregrounding the social movement analysis around the question of "how people actually manage acting together and becoming a 'we'" (Melucci, 1996, p.15). Such an interpretation of social movements and movement organisations restores the creative and generative quality of their interaction rather treating them as configurations of resources.

The argument being made in this article is in favour of SMOs and emphasises on their importance. It argues for not completely rejecting but toning down of the 'essentialism' that is given to Weber's concept of 'routinisation and bureaucratisation' and Michel's 'iron law of oligarchy' and Piven and Cloward's argument that efforts on formal organisation tends to blunt the disruptive force of the insurgent mass action. SMOs are important for the purpose of mobilisation of resources and for the survival of the movement.

INSTITUTIONALISATION AS LATENCY PHASE AND RADICALISATION AS VISIBILITY PHASE

Another important aspect which allows for the continuity and survival of the movement is its alliance building and networking capacity. Alliance making activity allows the movement to create a network of resistance so as to strike the target of resistance at multiple levels. There also has been an extensive amount of research on the networking aspect of the movement activity. Scholars like Alberto Melucci (1994), have emphasised on the importance of the 'social networks'. He argues that, social movements in the contemporary times exhibit a two-pole pattern of functioning and oscillate between the two poles. The 'latency' and the 'visibility' phases are the two poles of this bi-polar model and they are reciprocally linked to each other (Melucci, 2012). The latency phase is the normal situation of the movement activity, where it exists in the form of 'hidden networks,'

"A movement network is a field of social relationships where, through negotiation among various groups, a collective identity is structured...a terrain in which identity is recomposed and unified…insure a certain degree of continuity and stability in the identities of individuals and groups…" (Melucci, 2012).

Melucci (2012), argues that contemporary movements display a two-pole pattern of functioning, the 'latency' and the 'visibility' phase. During the latency phase the movement exists as 'hidden-networks' and during the visibility phase they come out in the open and confront the authorities. Both the phases mutually support each other and thereby creating the dialectics of institutionalisation and radicalisation in the movements

The movement networks are 'hidden' and 'submerged' in "daily life that requires personal involvement in the creation and experimentation of cultural models." These hidden and submerged networks allow for "multiple membership" and acts as "a circuit of exchanges" providing an "underground laboratory for antagonism and innovation," and "creation and experimentation of cultural models." The visibility phase is the phase when the hidden solidarity networks get mobilised and come out in the open to confront the political authority. For Melucci, social movements are not residual elements or occasional emergencies located on the margins of the great institutions, "in complex societies movements are a permanent reality. They may be more or less visible and they may emerge as political mobilisation in cyclical form but their existence and their effects on social relationships are neither sporadic

nor transitory" (Melucci, 2012). He has further argued that:

"Latency makes visible action possible because it provides the solidarity resources it needs and builds the cultural framework within which mobilisation takes place. Visible action strengthens the hidden networks, boosts solidarity, creates further groups, and recruits new militants who, attracted by the movement's public action, join its hidden networks" (Melucci, 2012).

This two-pole dialectics of 'latency and visibility phase' can be understood as the dual strategy of movements, using both 'contention and engagement' and can be with some ease incorporated into the theoretical frame work of 'cycles of protest' provided by Sidney Tarrow. According to him mobilisation proceeds in waves "from institutional conflicts to enthusiastic peak to ultimate collapse," (Della & Diani, 2006, p.189) "as the cycle continues, the reaction of the authorities produces simultaneous processes of radicalisation and institutionalisation," (Della & Diani, 2006, p. 189) "periods of relative quiet alternate with waves of intense mobilisation that encompass large sections of society, and quiet often affect many societies simultaneously" (Koopmans, 2004, p.21).

THE CASE OF NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT(NAPM) AND EKTA PARISAD IN INDIA

Applying the theoretical formulations on the empirical evidence can help us to make a better sense of what is happening at the ground level and makes the picture clear to arrive at some at general conclusions in terms of the observations made. If we take the theoretical formulation of 'cycles of protest', 'latency and visibility phase' which have been discussed in the earlier sections one can make better sense of the NAPM movement. NAPM has been involved in both: struggle and dialogue. NAPM, following a period of 'latency phase' where movement organising, framing, networking and alliance making and also deliberation and dialogue take place, took to a period of struggle which we call a the 'visibility phase'. NAPM together with all its allies decided to go for Action 2007 (Sangharsh). The Action 2007 protest struggle was launched so as to pressurise the government to repeal the SEZ Act and to stop land acquisitions. This struggle was a long drawn one which involved deliberation with the people, government authorities, and also protests marches. The 'visibility phase' allows for the public display of people's anger and the political force which the masses can create when they mobilise. The Action

2007 was followed by a period of latency and then again NAPM took to a National level struggle, the Lok Shakti Abhiyan which was conducted from December, 2011 to February 2012. This was followed by the Jansasad (people's parliament) from 20 to 22 March, 2012, where the activists of various movement's organisations and people collected to discuss and deliberate over issue of land.

Even in the case of EP , the movement can be seen in terms of 'cycles of protest' or in terms of their 'latency phase' and 'visibility phase'. The Parishad organised a six-month-long 'bhu – adhikar – satyagraha padyatra' on Deccember 1999. This was the 'visibility phase of the movement'. This 'visibility phase' of a radical protest struggle was followed by some gains made by the movement in terms of a JTF, which was like a 'public-private-partnership' between the movement and the government and both were supposed to work together for land reforms. This phase of the movement can be viewed as the 'latency phase'. During this 'latency phase' movements work as somewhat 'hidden networks'. This was again followed by a call for a radical struggle and this time it was on a larger scale. The Janadesh march of 2007, around 25,000 people participated in the process covering around 340 kilo meters of walking distance on foot from Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh to National Capital, New Delhi. This 'visibility phase' of a radical protest struggle again led to some concessions from the government which showed some forth coming political will and the government announced that it was willing to address the issues of land rights of the people within the frame work of the Unfinished Land Reform Agenda that started after independence. The prime minister agreed to chair the newly formed National Land Reform Council to initiate dialogue with the committee of experts and negotiate a land reforms policy.

Again as the EP movement went into its 'latency phase' after the Janadesh march the government again took a back seat in terms of implementation of its promises made during the Janadesh struggle. Hence EP was forced to launch another struggle, the Jansatygraha march. But between the two visibility phases of Janadesh and Janasatyagraha, EP was involved in other activities which have been explained as activities of the 'latency phase'. For instance it conducted a Jansamvad Yatra, a mobilisation campaign which led to consciousness raising of the people. It also conducted international meetings to establish links with activists, movements, organisations of other countries. The Jansatyagraha

march was held in October 2012 from Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh to New Delhi and was participated by about 100,000 people (approx.)

CONCLUSION

The article has tried to throw light on the various trajectories which might develop out of the interaction of social movements and institutions and has tried to argue against the widely held opinion that with the increasing formalisation, the movements lose their radical nature and succumbs to the institutional politics and thereby abandoning the non-institutionalised forms of protest and street politics. Various theoretical approaches like RMT and POS have started highlighting that, movements can maintain their autonomy and retain their radical nature. With the division of labour, the work being divided between at so many levels, one being the central organisational structure of the movement, the institutional activists, and the other being the mass organisation it becomes possible that a certain core set of individuals keep interacting with the political institutions and the local activists keep mobilising the masses to launch a radical attack. Movements can both act as challengers (contentious politics) or enter the institutional fields (politics of engagement) and that movements can maintain both of its aspects simultaneously and thus avoid being co-opted and maintain their autonomy. The emergence of SMOs, coalition or alliance building and the movement networking, has provided continuity and stability to movements with all these aspects of movement activity going-on, on an everyday basis the possible potentiality of the latent hidden networks of movement to take a radical turn is an always existing reality.

Movement organisations and institutionalisation of movements is necessary for the survival of the movement, when the insurgent masses have receded back to their normal lives after a period of spontaneous struggle. The poor- people who are struggling for their livelihood resources cannot be expected to stay on the roads all the time to protest for the redressal of their grievances and institutionalisation of social change demands a long drawn battle. Movements cannot all the time stay in their spontaneous phase. Thus a period of 'visibility phase' of the movement is followed by a 'latency phase' where the movement exists in the form of 'hidden networks'. This can be understood in terms of 'struggle phase and dialogue phase' or as 'politics of contention and politics of engagement'. There is cyclical relation between these moments, conceptualised as 'cycles of protest'.

Movements oscillate between moments of institutionalisation and radicalisation. And thus they hold a dialectical relationship between them. And the various aspects of the dynamics of this dialectical relationship are: organising, framing, networking and alliance making.

This dialectical relation does not mean that more institutionalisation leads to more radical movements. The implication as derived from the case of NAPM and EP is that movements must be able to maintain a balance between the two moments. Through the twin strategy of struggle and dialogue. Thus movements should be able to maintain their autonomy and radical nature by way of local activism and building up large networks and alliances which help the movement in maintaining its autonomy and avoid being co-opted.

REFERENCES

Aminzade, R. (1995). Between movement and party: The transformation of mid-nineteenth century french republicanism. Minneapolis. MN: University of Minnesota Press.

"Against Indiscriminate Acquisition of Agricultural Land, Massive Displacement, Undermining Sovereignty of Gram Sabhas and Colossal Loss of Life and Livelihood." *Delhi-Mumbai Sagharsh Yatra,* National Alliance of People's Movement, March 8-10, 2013. http://napm-india.org/content/delhi-mumbai-sangharsh-yatra (accessed April 25, 2014).

Baviskar, Amita (2010). Social Movements. In Niraja Gopal Jayal and Pratap Bhanu Mehta (Eds), *The Oxford Companion to Politics in India.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press. 382-390.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. & Debera C. Minkoff (2004). Beyond The Iron Law: Rethinking The Place of Organisation in Social Movement Research. In David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi (Eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. U.K.: Blackwell Publishing House. 155-170.

Carr-Harris, J. *Struggle-dialogue: tools for land movements in India*. New Delhi: Ekta Parishad, 2005.

Dontella, Della and Mario Diani (2006). *Social Movements an Introduction.* U.K.: Blackwell Publishing House.

Doowon Sooh (2011). Institutionalising Social Movements: The Dual Strategy of The Korean Women's Movement. *Sociological Quarterly,* 52(3), 442-471.

Gold Stone, Jack A.(2003). Introduction: Bridging Institutionalised and Noninstitutionalised Politics. In Jack A. Goldstone (Eds), *States, Parties and Social Movements.* U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Gudavarthy, Ajay (2013). Democracy Against Maoism and Maoism Against Itself. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII (7).

Gudavarthy, Ajay (2013). *Politics of Post - Civil Society – Contemporary History of Political Movements in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Herbert Blumer (1969). Collective Behaviour. In A.McClung-Lee (Eds), *Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Koopmans, Rudd (2004). Political Opportunity Structure: Some Splitting to Balance the Lumping. In Jeff Goodwin and James J. Jasper (Eds), *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotions.* United States of America: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

"Lokshakti Abhiyan: Against Corruption, Injustice and Inequality…Towards Peace, Justice, Progress , napm-india.org/Lokshakti_Abhiyan (accessed June 12, 2014).

McCarthy, John D. & Mayer N. Zald (1977). Resource Mobilisation and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *Ameriacan Journal of Sociology,* 82(1), 212-241.

Oommen, T.K. (1985). *From Mobilisation to Institutionalisation: the Dynamics of Agrarian Movement in Twentieth Century kerela*. India: Hindustan Publishing Corporation.

Oommen, T.K. (1990). Movements and Institutions: Structural Opposition or Processual Linkage. *International Sociology,* 5(2), 145-156.

Piven, Frances Fox & Cloward Richard (1979). *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.

Pai, Sudha. "Janadesh 2007: The Land Question in India", *Economic and Political Weekly 42*, no. 45 (2007): 10-12.

Rao, M.S.A. (1979). *Social Movements in India: Studies in Peasant, Backward Classes, Sectarian, Tribal and Women's Movements.* New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Ramagundam, Rahul. *Defeated Innocence: Adivasi Assertion, Land Rights, and the Ekta Parishad Movement*. New Delhi: Grassroots India Publishers, 2001.

Santoro, A. Wayne & McGurie Gail (1997). Social Movement Insiders: The Impact of Insitutional Activities on Affirmative Action and Comparable Worth Policies. *Social Problems, 44(4), 503-579.*

Schaefer, Beth Caniglia & JoAnn Carmin (2005). Scholarship on Social Movement Organisations: Classic Views and Emerging Trends. *Mobilistion: An International Journal,* 10(2), 201-212.

Schneiberg, Marc & Michael Lounsbury (2008). Social Movement and Institutional Analysis. In, Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin, and Roy Suddaby (Eds), *The Sage Hand Book of Organisational Institutionalism*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sieppel, Ornulf (2011). From Mobilization to Institutionalization?: The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism. *Acta Sociologica,* 44(2), 123-127.

Staggenborg, Suzanne (1988). The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalisation in the Pro-Choice Movement. *American Sociological Review,* 53(4), 86-606.

Suh, Doowon (2011). Institutionalising Social Movements: The Dual Strategy of the Korean Women's Movement. *The sociological quarterly,* 52(3), 323–494.

Zald, Mayer N. & Ash Roberta (1966). Social Movement Organisations: Growth, Decay and Change. *Social Forces,* 44(3), 327-341