
24. Social movements in India

Dip Kapoor

INTRODUCTION

India has a rich history of organized and spontaneous social activism from across the political-ideological spectrum. Social movement scholarship, however, has been relatively slow to acknowledge these political and social formations and to develop knowledge *of* and *for* social movements. The dominant scholarship on the subject has been the province of historians, sociologists, and, until more recently, political scientists. Of late it has also become the province of the relatively nascent fields of political sociology/anthropology/ecology; development studies; environmental studies; Dalit¹ (caste) and women's/gender studies; and critical adult/popular education, with the latter more evident in materials produced by people's movements and NGOs. Academic, as in the case of the widely acknowledged *Economic and Political Weekly*, and popular journalism have been more diligent about consistent reporting and analysis on the social movement front. Websites dedicated to specific movements or movement sectors, such as the National Alliance of People's Movements India; Mines, Minerals and People India; Mining Zone Peoples' Solidarity Group and Sanhati; and the *Lokayan Bulletin* are rich sources of information and political analysis pertaining to contemporary social movements in India.

A cartography of the scholarship to date suggests a cacophony of case and empirical studies littering the social movement academic landscape, along with rich discussion and clarification around movement typologies and taxonomies and intra-movement micro-characteristics of one variety or another (M.S.A. Rao [1979] 2006; G. Shah [1990] 2004; Oommen [1990] 2010). Structural-functionalist and dialectical-Marxist (including later versions of a post-Marxist ilk and/or class analysis and its variations with caste and gender – see Omvedt, 1993) theoretical and methodological perspectives dominate the theoretical-analytical milieu. Building on the classical traditions are re-contextualized Euro-American perspectives and debates pertaining to old and new movements (Omvedt, 1993; R. Singh, 2001) or the imbrications of a Red and Green politics noted in political/cultural ecology (Guha, 1997a; Baviskar, 2008) or versions of popular democracy/micro-movements (R. Kothari, 1984; Sheth, 1993) and development-displacement-related movements (Baviskar, 1995;

Mehta, 2009; Oliver-Smith, 2010; Padel and Das, 2010) addressing accumulation by dispossession in the post-1991 era of the neoliberalization (globalization) of the Indian economy (Oommen, 2010b). Caste politics adds a unique Indian dimension if not socio-political complexity to movement analysis in India (Omvedt, 1993, 1994, 1995; Guru and Chakravarty, 2005; Chatterji, 2009; A. Rao, 2009) – a dimension that has also made a contribution towards the broader discussion around race/class politics internationally, as was the case at the first UN World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in Durban, South Africa in 2001.

This chapter sketches a map of Indian social movements by adhering to the contours of the dominant scholarship, while taking detours to integrate relatively unacknowledged areas of scholarship pertinent to the contemporary social movement landscape of the country. The emphasis is on the post-independence period and on foregrounding contemporary movements that continue to provide opportunities for movement scholars and activists to make knowledge contributions towards movement politics and to academic inter- and non-discipline-specific (G. Shah [1990] 2004) knowledge production. After introducing some of the prominent and different theoretical approaches to the study of various movements in India, the chapter considers the literature and some key contemporary observations pertaining to social movements concerning peasants and new farmers, informal economy and industrial workers, women, and human rights. Brief paragraphs concerning Dalit and environmental movements are included in relation to particular theoretical orientations considered in the first part of the chapter. Finally, a few key projections and pointers regarding the future of social movements and research in India are proposed.

Movements not considered due to these delimitations include sub-national/autonomy and separatist/independence movements (e.g., Kashmir, Assam, and eastern states/regions) and conservative/right-wing movements (linguistic and religious chauvinism, including the Saffron/Hindutva² movements) (see Oommen, 2010a on this, for example); and a fading literature on student movements given Ghanshyam Shah's ([1990] 2004, p. 217) observation that these movements have been few and far between on university campuses since the 1980s.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN INDIA

Key compilations of movement studies and literature across movements, whether defined by constituencies (e.g., Dalit or peasants) or issues (e.g.,

environment or human rights) have been undertaken since the late 1970s with repeat or new editions (partially updated) published in the early 2000s (e.g., Rao [1979] 2006; Shah [1990] 2004; Oommen [1990] 2010; Omvedt, 1993; Singh, 2001; Ray and Katzenstein, 2005). The contributions by Gail Omvedt (1993) and Raka Ray and Mary Katzenstein (2005) discuss a cross-section of movements in historical and macro-contextual terms. Collections by Ghanshyam Shah ([1990] 2004) and two volumes (2010a, *Issues of Identity* and 2010b, *Concerns of Equity and Security*) edited by T. Oommen address several movements delineated in terms of issues and/or constituencies, while providing some insights and findings potentially relevant to all or some of these movements, with Shah ([1990] 2004, p. 12) unequivocally stating that he 'does not feel confident enough to arrive at generalization on social movements' in India. There is an apparent scholarly consensus that Indian authorship has tended to focus on case studies of particular movements with little attempt at extrapolations to formulate theories or a general theory of social movements (R. Singh, 2001; Oommen, 2010a).

Theoretical and methodological approaches in social movement studies have distinctly tended to rely on structural-functionalist and dialectical-Marxist approaches, while the focus on studying social movements has simultaneously introduced innovations in sociological paradigms and methods of observation (e.g., social historiography and theories of collective behaviour) that have encouraged innovation and enormous variations as well. Furthermore, the study of movements particular to Indian society and polity, such as tribal (Adivasi), anti-caste (e.g., Dalit), peasant and religious movements, has innovated and added to processual studies of *becoming* (rather than formal treatment of social structures or studies of *being*), which in turn have encouraged inter-disciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity (particularly between history, political science, and psychology, if not sociology), while encouraging paradigm mixes as well, such as Marxism with structuralism and functionalism, with phenomenology or ethno-sociology (R. Singh, 1986, p. 102).

Structural-functionalist Approaches

The functionalist paradigm (framework) is variously deployed in the work of several scholars (K.S. Singh, 1982; Surana, 1983; Oommen, 1984; [1990] 2010; K. Shah, 1984; P. Mukherji, 1987; Gore, 1989, 1993; G. Shah [1990] 2004; Chaudhuri, 1992; Y. Singh, 1993). Society is defined as an organized whole based on values consensus, norms, ideologies, relational structures, and the social structuring of symbolic and cultural heritages, which taken together glue interconnected parts while demonstrating an

ability to resolve conflict and deviance by producing adaptive/adjustive possibilities, enabling reforms. These studies also demonstrate wide variations in application including: the ethno-symbolic (Bagahi and Danda, 1982; Hussain, 1987; V. Das, 1990); critical (Gore, 1989, 1993); interactionist (Oommen, 1972; [1990] 2010); civilizational (Y. Singh, 1993); and structural-historical (K.S. Singh, 1982; Sinha, 1984; Sachchidananda, 1985; Chaudhuri, 1992) traditions, along with the frequent use of mixed methodologies. For instance, the work of sociologist M.S. Gore, which addresses leadership, identity, and movements in relation to Jyotiba Phule and the non-Brahman movement (1989) and Ambedkar's protest ideology (1993), epitomizes a critical functionalist orientation in Indian movement studies, while demonstrating the related utility of ethno-methodological socio-analysis and phenomenology. His conception of society is values based and norm/principle centered while also being in a constant state of socio-political praxis (an emphasis on the interplay of values, ideologies, and social action) given the imperfections of social stratifications and hence the related germination of movements for liberty, justice, equality, and freedom. The role for sociology and movement studies, according to Gore (1983) then, is to inform social policy for social welfare. In a similar vein, T.K. Oommen's Weberian construction of charismatic movements (1972) and his prognosis for Indian social movement studies defines a rather eclectic approach to functionalist applications where he combines a 'dialectics between historicity (past experiences), social structure (present existential conditions) and the urge for a better future (human creativity)' as 'the focal points to the study of social movements' ([1990] 2010, p. 30).

In methodological terms, structural functionalist studies have relied on a variety of possibilities as well, including phenomenological (Sengupta, 1982) and ethno-symbolic (K.S. Singh, 1982) approaches to the study of meanings that social collectivities such as tribes, castes, and communities have attached to indigenous social and cultural institutions and practices and symbolic heritages. The ethno-symbolic approach has sought to demonstrate the millenarian core in tribal movements and assertions and/or the role of precipitating factors in social movements in the setting of conflict and contestation (R. Singh, 2001, p. 170).

Dialectical-Marxist and Related Critical-structural Approaches

The dialectical-Marxist paradigm (framework) of movement studies (Banerjee, 1980, 1984; Byres, 1980; Gough, 1980; Omvedt, 1980a, 1981, 1993, 1994; Upadhyaya, 1980; Dhanagare, 1982, 1983; Gupta, 1982; Desai, 1986a; Patnaik, 1987; Singh, 1987; Dhanagare and John, 1988; Patil, 1988; Sharma, 1988) deploys material class dialectics as a philosophy

and methodology understood in terms of modes of production, class formations, and social structure and a materialist conception of social transformation and history, including material determinations of class consciousness and the related notions of ideology and alienation. This paradigm has made a prolific contribution towards Indian social movement studies, especially in relation to peasant (rural) movements/studies if not industrial working class movements.

Subaltern studies (Ludden, 2005), influenced by the political theory of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (Guha, 1983), critiques notwithstanding (Alam, 1983; Bannerji, 2000; Brass, 2001; H. Singh, 2003; S. Sarkar, 2005), represents attempts to write histories of peasant and tribal insurgency and rebellion *from below* while emphasizing the politics of an *autonomous domain* of subaltern political consciousness (as opposed to the standard pejorative reference to a pre-political or elite-determined consciousness) and a colonial elite/class dominance without hegemony (Guha, 1997b). Contrary to colonial/elite historiography, peasant and tribal counter-insurgency 'was a motivated and conscious undertaking' (numerous planned revolts of peasants/tribals are cited including the Santhal *hool*, the Kol, Rangpur *dhing*, Munda, Chuar Rebellion etc.), a point that has either been glossed over or pejoratively described as a 'natural phenomenon', 'spontaneous' and wherein 'insurgency is regarded as external to the peasant's consciousness' (see Chatterjee, 2009, pp. 195–6 on the works of Ranajit Guha).

Contemporary discussions in subaltern studies have introduced the concept of 'political society' (Chatterjee, 2004, 2011) and allude to the prospect of understanding subaltern activism and movements (e.g., by Adivasi/tribal, Dalit/untouchable castes, peasants, agricultural/unfree labour) in terms other than that of old-new civil society movement approaches. In fact, in a Weberian analysis that is contrary to the Gramscian origins of the subalternist project pioneered by Ranajit Guha (see S. Sarkar, 2005 on the same topic) pertaining to the prospects and requirements of 'democracy and economic transformation in India' in the contemporary period, Partha Chatterjee (2008) suggests that civil society will need to address (in what amounts to an act of containment of the dangerous classes) 'the bulk of the population in India that lives outside the orderly zones of civil society', that is, a '*political society* where people have to be fed, clothed and given work, if only to ensure the long term and relatively peaceful well-being of civil society' (p. 62; my emphasis). He suggests that the widening and deepening of the state (apparatuses of government and governmentality) has transformed the quality of mass politics in India over the last two decades, enabling a shift from rebel consciousness characteristic of the colonial subject and period (peasant

insurgency politics characterizing Ranajit Guha's earlier analysis) when the state and ruling authority was outside the bounds of the peasant community, to citizens demanding inclusive justice and fairness pertaining to governmental services today given that the state has 'penetrated deep in to the everyday lives of rural people' (Chatterjee, 2012, p. 46). Echoing Kalyan Sanyal's (2010) analysis on how primitive accumulation of capital today is being accompanied by a reversal of its effects through various social expenditure schemes (e.g., National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, NREGS) akin to a *passive revolution* wherein left and right politics do not question the dominance of capital but merely contest social expenditures, Chatterjee suggests that the mass agitation tactics of today (road blocks, disruption of train services, street violence etc.) are more likely within the theoretical ambit of a politics of *governmentality* (tussles over distribution of governmental services) rather than a politics of *sovereignty*, which characterized peasant colonial subject insurgency captured in an earlier period of subaltern studies. Referring to an 'overlap of the politics of sovereignty with the politics of governmentality' (2012, p. 47), he does acknowledge that if the former predominates (as may be the case with Adivasi and Dalit politics at the margins of or outside political society (Chatterjee, 2008, p. 61), then it is Ranajit Guha's colonial subject peasant analytic/framework that is still relevant in terms of understanding today's mass politics in the country.

Ranajit Guha (2001, pp. 41–2), however, acknowledges that the 'colonial experience has outlived decolonization and continues to be related significantly to the concerns of our time' in relation to subaltern political projects, echoing the 'double articulation' (p. 11) of governance thesis by the British and by Indian elites, currently referencing the agents/institutions of a globalizing (colonial and imperial) capital and local/national comprador³ classes. In keeping with Guha's conflict perspective, Partha Chatterjee's Weberian conception of 'political society' can be potentially reinterpreted as a space of contestation, distinguishing a political (uncivil) society subaltern social movement politics, addressing, for example, Special Economic Zones (SEZs) and pre-/post-independence 'accumulation by dispossession' (Harvey, 2003) and development-displacement (Baviskar, 1995; Rajagopal, 2003; Patel and McMichael, 2004; Menon and Nigam, 2007; Neeraj, 2007; Mehta, 2009; Sundar, 2009; McMichael, 2010; Oliver-Smith, 2010; Oommen, 2010b; Padel and Das, 2010; Sahoo, 2010; A. Shah, 2010; Kapoor, 2011, 2013; Levien, 2012; Munshi, 2012) from a civil-societarian new social movement (NSM) or a labour OSM politics in a post-1990 globalizing phase/era of economic liberalization, 'triggering off a new set of mobilizations' wherein 'economic re-colonization and cultural invasion are inducing sporadic collective mobilizations in India,

although not yet crystallized into sustained movements' (Oommen, 2010b, p. 37).

Considerations of the wider political economy and societal conditions and social movement germination/prospects, maturity and/or suffocation, dissolution, and longevity discussed in terms of political opportunity structures or master frames or Pierre Bourdieu's notion of fields are relatively recent theoretical-analytical deployments pertaining to social movement analysis in India. For examples, see Khagram (2004) in relation to big dam politics and political opportunity structures, or Raka Ray (1999) with respect to women's movements and 'fields of protest', or Raka Ray and Mary Katzenstein's (2005) edited collection and analysis of several movements in relation to a shifting or replaced Nehruvian social-democratic master frame.

Studies rarely begin with any explicit clarifications about Indian society and there is generally a lack of conscious effort to relate the transforming structure of Indian society to the changing forms and strategies of social movements (R. Singh, 2001). Dipankar Gupta's (1982) study of the Shiv Sena (Hindu right) mobilizations in Bombay between 1966 and 1974 or Gail Omvedt's study of Dalit movements (1994) are exceptions in this regard, illustrating social-movement–society imbrications while providing examples of post-/neo-/Marxist versions for understanding movements.

In sum, few studies actually deal with the problems of definition and meaning of a social movement and these attempts are often indicative of a neoclassical (functionalist and Marxist-structuralist variations) theoretical orientation of Western scholarship (R. Singh, 2001), which has moved towards new paradigms for social movement studies and is applying new methods of explanation as in the case of the predominantly non-class–centric models entertained in discussions about new movements – a discussion/application that is in an embryonic stage in Indian scholarship (Guha, 1982, 1989; Sheth, 1983; R. Kothari, 1984; Sethi, 1984; Frank and Fuentes, 1987; Omvedt, 1988; Gadgil and Guha, 1992).

New Social Movement Approaches

According to Rajendra Singh (2001, p. 154), 'the emergence of NSMs can, in many ways, be seen as the positive consequence of the paradigmatic collapse and crisis in the structure of the [dominant – my addition] theoretical models of movement studies'. Gail Omvedt (1993, p. 302) suggests that the concept of NSM does delimit a genuine empirical phenomenon. According to Omvedt, these movements are defined by the following characteristics (*ibid.*, pp. xv–xvi):

- They have a broad overall organization, structure, and ideology aimed at social change.
- They are 'new' in that their ideologies define, explain, and address exploitation in a manner related to traditional Marxism but with clear differences as well (e.g., they are not popular movements willing to follow under the vanguardship of the working class and its parties or accept their working class ideology).
- They are movements of groups that were either ignored as exploited by traditional Marxism (women, Dalits and Shudras⁴) or who were exploited in ways related to the new processes of contemporary capitalism (e.g., peasants forced to produce for capital through market exploitation managed by the state, or peasants or forest dwellers victimized by environmental degradation) but left unconceptualized by a Marxist preoccupation with private property and wage labour.
- An analysis of their position requires a modified Marxist analysis of contemporary capitalism, that is, 'while Marxism has been called the historical materialism of the proletariat, what is needed today is a historical materialism of not only industrial factory workers, but also of the peasants, women, tribals, dalits and low castes and oppressed nationalities' (p. xvi). Omvedt presents a novel approach to defining movements by adhering to Marxist class analysis while simultaneously incorporating the discourse of non-class new movements (Omvedt, 1993) and referring to the anti-caste movement as the central democratic movement of Indian society (1994, p. 10), an approach that has been described as being 'contradictory' if not 'theoretically inconsistent' (R. Singh, 2001, p. 145).

Studies on *Dalit movement politics* have identified the following historical and contemporary actions (Guru and Chakravarty, 2005; Kumar, 2010) by Dalits against caste/ism and untouchability and to forge a new social location in India with varied success and always faced with the paradox of naming and subsequently inscribing caste in order to disinter its strictures from Hindu society:

- socio-religious movements to escape and/or modify the Hindu social order (e.g., Dr. Ambedkar's conversion to Buddhism in 1956);
- Dalit political mobilization and the formation of the Independent Labour Party (ILP) formed by Ambedkar in 1936, which was the foundation for the Republican Party of India (RPI) – and the recent arrival of the Dalit-based Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) in Uttar Pradesh (UP);

- a Dalit intellectual movement spearheaded by Dalit writers like Jyotiba Phule and E.V. Ramaswamy;
- radical struggle and the formation of the Dalit Panthers by rural Dalit youth in 1972;
- the movement of Dalit employees under Kanshi Ram and the establishment of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes and Minorities Welfare Association in 1971;
- the Dalit women's movement that established the National Federation for Dalit Women (NFDW) in 1994 in Delhi; and
- mobilization through Dalit NGOs and the National Campaign for Dalit Human Rights (NCDHR).
- (Gokhale, 1979; Jogdand, 1991; Omvedt, 1994, 1995; Ilaiah, 1996; Mendelsohn and Vicziany, 1998; Ghosh, 1999; Zelliott, 2001; Pai, 2002; Rodrigues, 2002; Rao, 2003)

Dalit scholars have intimated that the historic moment open to a consideration of mass poverty and social justice for Dalits has lapsed. The fundamental economic and social questions relevant to Dalits are being side-tracked by the soft resistance of social movements, political parties and NGOs (Guru and Chakravarty, 2005, p. 154).

Red–Green and In-between Approaches: Political Ecology, Cultural Politics, and Popular Democracy (Micro-movements)

In relation to Indian environmentalism, Amita Baviskar (1995, 2005, 2008) suggests another approach to movement studies, one that explores Indian 'environmentalisms of the poor' as combining a 'Red' politics preoccupied with material and distributive justice and a 'Green' politics pertaining to ecological concerns in contrast to a post-materialist wilderness and/or aesthetic environmentalism in the 'First World'. In other words, environmental degradation and social injustice are seen as two sides of the same coin, an insight she suggests is endorsed by the environmentalist Anil Agarwal of the NGO Center for Science and Environment, Medha Patkar of the Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA) (Movement to Save the River Narmada), and Father Thomas Kocherry of the Kerala Fishworkers' Forum alike. This ideology has been translated into scholarly terms through the work of Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha (1992) on the non-violent Chipko movement against tree-felling in the Garhwal Himalayas in the 1970s, and shared by several leading environmentalists in India who point to the lopsided, iniquitous, and environmentally destructive development in India, pitting 'omnivores' (iron triangle of political-economic class elites) against ecosystem people submerged

in a sea of poverty as development-displacement forces subalterns to migrate to urban slums, augmenting the swollen ranks of the impoverished (Baviskar, 2005, p. 163). In addition to Chipko, similar movement analysis pertaining to Red–Green varieties and environmentalisms of the poor (Guha and Martinez-Alier, 1998) have been made with reference to Narmada (NBA), the Chilika Bachao Andolan (Movement to Save Chilika Lake) against aquaculture in Orissa, the Kerala Fishworkers' Forum campaign against mechanized trawlers and movements against eucalyptus plantations on common lands in Karnataka, among several other displacement-related mobilizations in the country.

As a *political ecology approach* to Indian environmental movements that 'assumes that cultural identities are pre-formed, derived directly from an objective set of interests based on shared locations in terms of class, gender or ethnicity that challenge nationalism and/or capitalism' (Baviskar, 2008, p. 6), which subsequently forms the basis of contention over forests and other environmental resources, material use value is seen as the primary significance of natural resources, setting up the binaries of 'virtuous peasant' versus 'vicious state' (Sivaramakrishnan and Agrawal, 2003, p. 391). A *cultural politics approach* to environment/movements, on the other hand, treats culture itself as a site of struggle wherein identities, interests, and resources are not predetermined givens but *emergent*, that is, the practices of subjects are not understood through structurally determined categories but through the specificity of contradictory lived experience as the environment has value within a larger economy of meaning or the social life of things (Sivaramakrishnan and Agrawal, 2003; Cederlof and Sivaramakrishnan, 2006; Baviskar, 2008; Subramanian, 2009; A. Shah, 2010). According to Baviskar (1995), political ecology approaches, while intended as a gesture of solidarity, resort to an uncritical reproduction of claims by marginalized groups (singular narratives to explain natural resource struggles) thereby failing to offer much analytical purchase. In other words, 'we need to locate environmental movements within a discursive framework constituted by unequal structures of the global political-economy, while also examining the negotiation of meanings between different (unequal) groups that constitute social movements' (e.g., environmentalism of the poor emerging as collaboration with middle-class actors and audiences) (Baviskar, 2005, p. 161). Critical ethnography is proposed as the methodology with the best tools to represent such contingent processes under which people make history (Baviskar, 2008; A. Shah, 2010).

Seminal contributions towards the study of *environmental movements* include contributions by Guha and Gadgil (1989) on the resistance of hunter gatherers and shifting (*jhum*) cultivators and an overview of

resource conflicts in colonial India; Guha on the Chipko movement (1989); Shiva and Bandopadhyaya (1986) and Shiva (1988) on passive resistance (people's ecology movements) to save trees and wildlife (e.g., the Bishnois of Khejri in Rajasthan) from three centuries ago to today; and Baviskar's research on the Narmada Bachao Andolan (1995). Gadgil and Guha (1998, p. 469) provide a useful classification of various strands of Indian environmental movements, including crusading Gandhians, ecological Marxists, appropriate technologists, scientific conservationists, and wilderness enthusiasts, while Harsh Sethi (1993) provides another five-category scheme based on resources and their exploitation/exploiters and resistances. Andharia and Sengupta (1998, pp. 429–31) provide a very useful classification scheme identifying ecological categories (e.g., forests), issues (e.g., right to forest access) and resistances (e.g., Chipko and Appiko). Similar schemes for identifying and studying urban environmental movements are yet to be attempted.

Social movements in India have also been understood in relation to the reinvention of *participatory democracy by micro-movements* (Sheth, 1984) in the mid-1970s in opposition to the hegemonic forces of globalization, while expanding the arena of politics beyond representational institutions of elections and political parties. Various referred to as grassroots movements, non-party political formations, social action groups, and movement groups, these micro-movements differentiated themselves from welfare, philanthropic, and non-political NGOs and numbered some 30 000 movement groups by the turn of the century. The goal of these micro-movements was to democratize development and transform society through the empowerment of the people (people power or *lokshakti*) (R. Kothari, 1984; Sethi, 1984; Sheth, 1984, 2005). According to Rajni Kothari (1984), the decline of mainstream institutions of representative democracy including the legislatures, elections, political parties, and trade unions that had begun in the late 1960s, became apparent when the 'Emergency'⁵ was imposed (1975–77) by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the highest-intensity and the politically largest example being the Jayaprakash Narayan or J.P. Movement led by the popular socialist leader of the independence movement who dedicated his whole life to the 'Gandhian way'. Such movements took up issues and constituencies abandoned by political parties and trade unions and those poorly served by the bureaucracy, developing as civil-associational groups (often led by men and women who had left their professional careers to join) leading political struggles on issues articulated to them by the people themselves (Sethi, 1984; Sheth, 2005). The influence of these micro-movements waned in the late 1980s/early 1990s as many were transformed into bureaucratic NGOs with funding, losing the motivation for social transformation, while

others splintered for lack of a coalescing political purpose. The specter of globalization and the neoliberalization of the Indian economy by the mid-1990s revived protests and coalition politics and NGOs were reversed into movements countering the forces of hegemonic globalization, including the emergence of the National Alliance of People's Movements, The Living Democracy Movement, the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace, and the National Campaign for People's Rights (Sheth, 1999; S. Kothari, 2001). The main effort of these micro-movements today is to make development into a bottom-up process, seeking to change the power relations on which the conventional models of development and globalization are premised. In other words, their objective remains the same as before, which is to ensure that those at the lowest rungs find their rightful place as producers in the economy and citizens in the polity, but they are formulating these old issues of development in new political terms (A. Roy, 1996; B. Roy, 1999; Tarkunde, 2003; Sheth, 2005). Drawing liberally on Gandhian economic and political thinking including conceptions of *swaraj* (self-governance), *swadeshi* (community control over resources) and *gram swaraj* (village republic) to reinvent a politics of participatory democracy and non-violent activism (e.g., organizing walkathons of *pad yatras*), a badge that not all of them would care to claim, these movements and non-party political formations have also (contrary to any such claims by their main intellectual protagonists) been likened to NSMs and described as displaying a 'conscience perspective' (R. Singh, 2001, p. 207). The latest expression of an urban middle-class populist Gandhian-inspired 'conscience perspective' is the Anna Hazare-led anti-corruption movement, culminating in the passage of the Lokpal Bill (passed in the Lok Sabha in December 2013) sanctioning a corruption watchdog body, which would include the PM's office under its purview.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Peasant and New Farmer Movements

Peasant movements have been active in British colonial and post-colonial periods despite the caste fatalisms of Hinduism, according to Kathleen Gough (1974) who counted 77 revolts during the British colonial period (classified as restorative, religious, social banditry, vengeance, and mass insurrection) over the last two centuries (ibid., p. 1319). Ranajit Guha (1983) counts 110 known instances over 117 years during British rule, and similar conclusions are drawn by A.R. Desai (1978, p. xii; 1986a) who points to militant struggles lasting over many years involving hundreds of

villages. This is contrary to Barrington Moore's (1967) conception of the Indian peasant as passive and docile and Eric Stokes's (1978) observation that peasant rebellions were strangely absent in Indian history.

There is a strong (200-year) tradition of armed uprisings reaching back to Moghul times in all regions against landlords, revenue agents/bureaucrats, money-lenders, police, and military forces. Peasant revolts since the 1920s have been coordinated with oppositional political parties and have either been struggles for regional autonomy by tribals/Adivasis (e.g., Santhals, Oraons and others in Jharkhand or Kashmiri and Naga/Mizo tribal nationalisms in the eastern states) or class struggles under the tutelage of India's communist parties, seven of which began in the 1960s. The most successful communist-led uprisings, all involving a large component of tribal/Adivasi people, were those of Tebhaga in 1946 (demand for a greater share of crop for share-croppers [*adhiars*] from occupying tenants [*jotedars*]), Telangana in 1946–48 (cancellation of peasant debts and abolition of illegal exactions by landlords [*desmukhs*]) and Naxalbari in Bengal in 1967 and Andhra Pradesh in 1969–71 (land occupation and hand-overs to peasants/tribals from landlords and *zamindars* [aristocrats]/*jotedars* under the Land Act) (M. Rao, 1971; Alavi, 1973; Gough and Sharma, 1973; Mukherji, 1987).

The sheer volume of peasant movement studies (see related listings in Dhanagare, 1983; G. Shah [1990] 2004; Omvedt, 1993; R. Singh, 2001; SinghaRoy, 2004; Oommen, 2010b), suggests that the peasantry is a viable concept (in relation to other categories of locating subalternity like tribe/Adivasi) in India and does refer to a contemporary category of people in the Indian countryside accounting for 70 per cent of the population who are rural labour/smallholders (Oommen, 2010b, p. 45).

A considerable amount of ink has been spilt by the left intelligentsia (for Gandhian-inspired Sarvodaya and non-violent movements like Bhoodan-Gramdan initiated in 1951 by his disciple Acharya Vinoba Bhave, see Oommen, 1972 – a movement that inspires the current Ekta Parishad land initiative led by P.V. Rajagopal in Bihar/Eastern India) over how to divide and classify peasants and related claims pertaining to the political goals/unity, degree and methods of social movement activism entertained by the various categories. Hamza Alavi notes that several modes of production coexist and are structurally differentiated, thereby making it unfeasible to suggest one hierarchical class structure (1973, p. 293). His three-sector classification scheme includes:

- landlords and land owners and poor peasant classes who cultivate their land as landless/share-croppers;
- independent subsistence smallholder cultivators who do not exploit the labour of others (middle peasants); and

- capitalist farmers who employ capital and turn farming into a business by exploiting poor peasants.

The middle peasant category is an ongoing source of debate, with some even suggesting there are no middle peasants. Others have even classified contemporary farmers' movements as 'new' and 'non-class movements', which coincide with an environmental thrust/movements (Omvedt, 1993, p. 125), an assertion that is contested as being purely rhetorical while enabling rich peasants to reinforce their hegemony over the movement (Dhanagare, 1995), if not helping an agenda where new farmers, ecofeminists, and sections of the left (new movements?) become complicit in reproducing an ideological space permitting right-wing political organizations to reappropriate the Indian past (Brass, 1994, p. 48).

Alavi's (1973, pp. 333–4) analysis in relation to the political role of the various peasant classes of Tebhaga and Telangana movements in India led by the Communist Party, when compared to the Chinese and Russian revolutions, led him to conclude that middle peasants, by virtue of their relative economic independence, had greater revolutionary potential than dependent poor peasants who are initially the least militant class. Referring to this as the replacement of one myth by another, Dhanagare (1983) and others (Gough, 1968; Alexander, 1975; Sarkar, 1979; Pavier, 1981; A. Das, 1983, 1987; Duyker, 1987) assert otherwise, based on their respective studies of Tebhaga, Telangana, Naxalite, Bhoomi Sena and other movements. Some of these studies and experiences demonstrate how rich and middle-class peasants used the movement (poor peasants) to secure their own class/landed interests only to abandon the struggle thereafter. Similar studies in relation to the Naxalite and Telangana movements point to the limited longevity of industrial-worker/agricultural-labour movement solidarity under the auspices of Communist Party-led efforts, if not the inability of the Naxalite movement to organize and mobilize poor and landless peasants (Banerjee, 1980). Dhanagare's (1983) extensive review of Marxist literature on peasant movement studies (socio-historical treatments of movements), including the Moplah Rebellion in Malabar, Tebhaga in Bengal, Bardoli Satyagraha in Gujarat, and the peasant uprisings/struggles in Telangana in Andhra and Oudh in UP, leads him to conclude that the poor peasant class movements were generally millennial and insurrectionary while rich/middle-class peasantry resorted to non-violent resistance that was of a nationalist political tenor. Other scholars have suggested that it is difficult to arrive at a theory regarding the revolutionary potential of different classes because of the complexity of such struggles in relation to the colonial experience (Chatterjee, 1986).

New farmers' movements (unlike peasant movements, these movement

constituencies produce for the market to a greater extent and are influenced by capital in agriculture) that emerged in the 1970s and the 1980s in the form of the Bharatiya Kisan Sangh (BKS; Punjab and then UP), Vivasayigal Sangam (Tamilnadu), Shetkari Sanghatana (Maharashtra), Khedut Samaj (Gujarat) and the Rajya Rayatu Sangha (Karnataka/KRRS⁶) (Omvedt 1993, 2005; Dhanagare, 1999; Herring, 2005) took up concrete issues affecting all rural classes. These pertained to terms of trade, prices, technology, GM seeds, water/irrigation, Bt cotton, and the Dunkel-GATT prescriptions and capital accumulation in agriculture in the post-Green Revolution (HYV⁷) era unevenly, forming a tenuous coalition plagued by differences in vision and politics (e.g., embracing globalization/liberalization and genetic technologies) between its outspoken leaders (e.g., Sharad Joshi/Shetkari Sanghatana, which claimed to have 70 per cent of farmer/peasant support for liberalization/technology versus Nanjundaswamy/KRRS), political party affiliations and internal schisms. Still able to mobilize large constituencies, the new farmers' movements gradually lost momentum in the mid- to late 1990s (Omvedt, 2005). Today, cotton farmer suicides (17 638 in 2009 alone) linked to agricultural liberalization and GM technologies plague the current rural landscape (Center for Human Rights and Global Justice, 2010).

Recent debates about the 'agrarian question' in India and left politics (Lerche et al., 2013), while preoccupied with the semi-feudal versus capitalist agriculture thesis and its implications for Communist Party of India (Maoist/Marxist) political strategy, also provide insight into the current impetus/direction for peasant/rural politics in the countryside. The classical theory of agrarian transition based on the semi-feudal thesis (landlord classes and peasant differentiation in the country) points to the need for peasant/rural organizing to focus on semi-feudal relations *within* and to enable state-led national (agrarian and industrial) development strategy (radical land reforms agenda) by breaking with the neoliberal world order that is the current trajectory of the communist parties and of the Maoist movement (D'Souza, 2009; Mukherji, 2012). The Maoist movement was recently dubbed by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh as the greatest threat to India's internal security, which warranted the launching of Operation Green Hunt (2009), arguably the single largest deployment of state paramilitaries and armed police. Alternatively, another proposition emphasizes the need for a 'people's' (popular as opposed to class-specific) struggle including landless peasants, Adivasis, Dalits and Other Backward Castes against state/corporate/civil-society-led global capitalist development-displacement, which is increasingly fusing local and global markets, domestic and multinational capital, and has involved a growing dispossession of the peasantry and usurpation of national resources (McMichael, 2008;

Patnaik, 2010; Basu and Das, 2013; Via Campesina – www.viacampesina.org). Examples include SEZ-based and other industrial acquisitions – land acquisition protests in Singur, West Bengal against Tata Motors with Tata withdrawing in 2008; the Plachimada, Kerala water protests leading to Coca Cola’s withdrawal in 2003; Adivasi NBA protests against UK-based Vedanta-Sterlite bauxite mining in Niyamgiri, Lanjigarh, in Orissa (now Odisha). Such development-displacement-related movements (variously analyzed in terms of their movement teleology) dot the rural landscape in the post-liberalization era (Routledge, 1993; Baviskar, 1995; Kamat, 2001; Rajagopal, 2003; Whitehead, 2003; Patel and McMichael, 2004; Menon and Nigam, 2007; Sundar, 2009; Da Costa, 2010; McMichael, 2010; Nilsen, 2010; Oliver-Smith, 2010; Oommen, 2010b; Sahoo, 2010; A. Shah, 2010; Kapoor, 2011, 2013; Mookerjee, 2011; Levien, 2012; Munshi, 2012; Choudry and Kapoor, 2013).

Informal Economy and Industrial Working Class Movements

The Self-employed Women’s Association of India (SEWA) is a flagship organizing and social action effort addressing women workers in the informal economy, which includes 92 per cent of the work force (Chakrabarti, 2011, p. 39). The formative conflict addressed by the emerging organization in 1972 was over the right to form a trade union (TU) normally focused on wage labour in the urban economy with self-employed casual labour associated with the textile industry. The TUs argued that the self-employed had no employers by definition. Establishing a precedent, SEWA’s approach and success at organizing casual labour (subordinate/marginalized caste women) helped spur on the development of similar organizing and activism (with varied organizational forms in rural contexts) by women in the informal economy across the country. These included the waste pickers in Pune (KKPKP); the Karnataka Domestic Workers’ Union in Bangalore; a sex workers’ collective in two states (VAMP); Uttarakhand Mahila Parishad (UMP) and the associated Environmental Education Center; and SNEHA, a fishing women’s organization in Tamilnadu (see chapters by Pande, Rethinam, Menon, Narayan and Chikarmane, Seshu, and Bhatt in Kabeer et al., 2013). They also included women garment worker organizing under Center for Development Initiatives (CIVIDEP, Bangalore) (RoyChowdhury, 2005); the Karnataka Koligari Nivasa Sangathana (KKNS) addressing marble and construction workers (RoyChowdhury, 2003); and the Working Women’s Forum (WWF, Madras) (Kalpagam, 1994). These contributions, while foregrounding the relative socio-economic success of these initiatives, despite socio-political tensions created by public/private-sector micro-credit and self-help group

interventions (de-politicization impacts), continue to point to informal economy gender-/caste-based organizing efforts and movement tensions around gender, caste, and dealings with the TU sector, if not state/corporate actors. Disempowered by class and gender, such credit-based service-focused developmental approaches (micro-battles), which have moved from a politics of class to one of community, do not necessarily address exploitation by capital through extraction of surplus value from a relatively disempowered population as capital-labour relationships become fluid, temporary, and in search of lower wage/working condition environments in the 'Third World'. However, SEWA has become a national union with a membership of over 500 000 across eight SEWA organizations in the country in a federated structure, becoming a founding member of the new International Trade Union Confederation (INTUC) in 2006. SEWA has also been a major actor in the global movement of workers in the informal economy, organizing street vendors into an international organizing and advocacy network called StreetNet in Durban in 2000, with organizations from over 27 countries involved (Chen, 2010).

Recent analyses of SEWA and informal labour organizing and activism in India (Breman, 2004; Bhatt, 2010; Gillan, 2010; Harriss-White, 2010; Hensman, 2010; Webster, 2011) suggest the following: (1) the growing willingness of TUs to organize informal workers in India may be the beginnings of a new counter-movement, despite suspicions both ways; (2) Barbara Harriss-White (2010) in particular also speaks to a counter-movement from above as the Indian state has opened up new possibilities for organizing in the informal economy (since 2004), echoing similar analyses suggesting a 'passive revolution' advanced by Kalyan Sanyal (2010) and Partha Chatterjee (2012); and (3) there is an emergence of a new form of unionism that protects workers within their informal employment status, rather than trying to transform them into formal sector workers, recruiting members through slums rather than worksites, that is, demands are not just aimed at employers but also on the state for benefits (Agarwala, 2006). There is a paucity of studies on unorganized workers in the non-industrial sector and the use of strikes, with a few exceptions including women workers' struggles in the coir industry in Kerala (Velayudhan, 1985) and Kannan's (1988) study on cashew workers, toddy tappers⁸ and bidi workers⁹ demands for more wages. Relatedly, as rural development-dispossession forces urban migration, creating a planet of slums (Davis, 2004), shack/street/platform-dweller movements (see Patel et al., 2001; McMichael, 2010) will continue and also raise the decibel level of urban movement activism in the unorganized sector.

Karnik (1966) considers the Bombay textile workers' strike in 1877 as marking the beginning of the labour movement in India, with the end

of the nineteenth century witnessing numerous strikes in textiles, jute, plantations, mines, and railways in Bombay, Calcutta, Ahmedabad, and Madras. Trade unions along modern lines developed after World War I with the Madras Labour Union textile workers' strike in 1918 (leading to the subsequent establishment of the Textile Labour Association in 1920) followed by the TISCO iron and steel workers union/strike in 1920, with strikes in this period taking place without effective trade union initiatives (Chandavarkar, 1998). Statistical reviews of strike action suggest 396 strikes in 1921 with a peak of 1811 strikes at the time of independence in 1947 (Vaid, 1972; Ramaswamy and Ramaswamy, 1981; Pattnaik, 1993). Most studies examine methods for securing worker demands including strikes (and causes for strikes), the use of Gandhian *satyagrahas* (hunger strikes), *gheraos* or encirclements, *bandhs* and *hartals* (general strikes), demonstrations, mass casual leave, work to rule, cutting of the electricity supply and so on (Kannappan and Saran, 1967; Aggarwal, 1968).

Numerous studies also examine strikes and working class struggles historically and in relation to the socio-economic structure and political system influencing these processes from a social and political perspective (Newman, 1981; Lieten, 1982, 1983; Patel, 1987; Chakrabarty, 1989; Chandavarkar, 1998; Gooptu, 2001). The studies include descriptive accounts of various strikes by jute, railway, tramway, and Bata shoe workers in the 1920s–30s (Saha, 1978) and in four South Indian centers around social origins, recruitment patterns and leadership (Murphy, 1981; Newman, 1981); of working class (consciousness) movements in Bombay (Lieten, 1983); and of the unparalleled textile workers' strike in Bombay (1982–83) given the numbers organized, including unorganized labour and in/outside leadership (Bakshi, 1986; Lakha, 2002).

Recent historical and contextual analyses of the trade union movement in India (Sodhi, 1994; Bhowmik, 1997; Bhattacharjee, 2000; Chibber, 2005) suggests that the class compromise has been replaced by a politics of accommodation as trade unions have substituted inclusion in policy agencies for mobilization. Vivek Chibber's (2005) analysis suggests that this occurrence was predetermined and settled in the post-independence period by the Indian National Congress and the demobilization of labour (including the largest militant unions like the All India Trade Union Congress formed in 1920 and the Indian Federation of Labour, which were part of a labour upsurge in the colonial era) via the Industrial Truce Conference in 1947, and preceding steps to legislate a bigger role for the state (The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947). This Act reduced the scope for collective bargaining and the establishment of a mega-federation called the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC) committed to arbitration, labour peace and Congress resolutions, which disavowed militancy and cleared the

way for a compact with capital. Contrary to this national model, Chibber (2005) points to the case of the Kerala Confederation of Trade Unions that mobilized under-class interests to empower union bargaining with employers, given that they could rely on a sympathetic state government in the Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPM). This compelled employers to upgrade plant and equipment. According to Bhattacharjee (2000), the demise of the post-independence tripartite industrial relations system of state–union–employer at the national level by the forces of neoliberal globalization and regional competition in the post-1991 economic environment has led to the decentralization of bargaining across regions, sectors and unions, weakening labour’s prospects in a competitive system.

Women’s Movements

Colonial rule, the independence movement and international/Western women’s activism have together contributed towards the development and maturation of women’s movements in India, which go back a century in the making (Sangari and Vaid, 1989; Agnihotri and Mazumdar, 1995). Responses to male dominance have also been addressed with an eye to the specificity of national history and culture as the nature of such dominance is different/specific in ways peculiar to India, calling for locally tailored resistances/responses (Liddle and Joshi, 1986; Niranjana, 2000). Others, like Madhu Kishwar (editor of the journal *Manushi*), have argued for the need to look into Indian cultural resources to transform these relationships (Kishwar and Ruth, 1984; B. Ray, 2002).

Participation of women in various movements (freedom movement, peasant, tribal, student movements etc.) have been described as ‘pre-movements’ as they raise social and class issues but not issues affecting women per se, while nonetheless politicizing women (Omvedt, 1978, p. 373). The role of women in these movements has not been researched adequately and where it has (as in the case of the freedom movement) they often played the role of helpers based on community and home involvements (Alexander, 1984; Kelkar, 1984). Ilina Sen’s (1990) anthology on women’s participation in post-independence movements confirms this tendency. Social reformist movements including the establishment of the Women’s Indian Association and the All India Women’s Congress (AIWC) in 1920 (Everett, 1979) worked to spread education among women, enact laws against *sati*,¹⁰ permit widow remarriage and abolish child marriage. These movements, however, continued to strengthen the role of women as wife, housekeeper, and mother within the inferior role confines of the Hindu/Vedic concept of *pativrata* (devoted, chaste, and tolerant wives) (K. Shah, 1984, pp. 135–45), an approach similar to

Gandhian (-inspired women's movements) essentialism around the same time (Patel, 1988). Similar analyses of women's activism along communal lines (communal riots) suggests that Hindu women's organizations championing Hindutva (Saffron politics) reinforce patriarchal values while mobilizing along communal affiliations (Sarkar, 1991; Omvedt, 1993; Agnes, 1994). Women's roles in agrarian movements (peasant and tribal and Communist Party-led activisms including armed struggles in the 1940s or trade union activism) have also been studied, coming to similar conclusions – women struggle to articulate issues specific to women within these movements and these movements fail to address (and ignore) patriarchy (Custers, 1986; Kannan, 1988; Sen, 1989; Agarwal, 1994).

A number of micro/macro-studies (Omvedt, 1980b; Kishwar and Ruth, 1984; Desai and Patel, 1985; Agnes, 1992; Datar, 1993; Purushothaman, 1998; R. Ray, 1999) have begun to document women's movements on 'women's issues' including addressing rape, sexual harassment in the work place, violence against women in private/public spaces, dowry, amniocentesis and sex selection, population policy, political violence, the rise of fundamentalism and communalism and gender inequality, and women as economic beings (e.g., 94 per cent of women workers are part of the informal sector; Agnihotri and Mazumdar, 1995). Rajni Palriwala's case study (2010, p. 210) of the anti-dowry (and bride-burning) movement and the development of the women's coalition, the Forum for Consciousness Against Dowry (DVCAM) discusses action strategies employed by women's movements including:

- struggle within parliament/lobbying;
- legal aid, counselling, consciousness raising;
- collective educational and research actions (including street theater, poetry, and public seminars);
- signature and postcard campaigns; and
- *dharnas* (sit-ins), rallies, and marches including neighbourhood actions (leafleting and shaming of bride-burners).

Women's organizations and approaches across the board have been classified into the following (Desai and Patel, 1985):

- agitational and consciousness raising;
- grassroots mass-based organizations (e.g., labour organizations);
- groups concentrating on service provision (e.g., shelter, medical);
- professional women's organizations (e.g., lawyers and doctors);
- women's wings in political parties; and
- groups involved in research and documentation of women's issues.

The historical evolution of the women's movement tracing key conferences and forums has been addressed in different studies as well (Everett, 1979; Gandhi and Shah, 1991; Kumar, 1993; Omvedt, 1993). The literature suggests that the women's movements in India today need to form broad-based alliances (e.g., neoliberalism today provides such an opportunity); try to get passed an essentially middle-class/Western-centric feminism; and consider 'focus', as women's politicization often gets blurred in movements addressing numerous issues/concerns.

Human Rights Movements

Human rights movements (HRMs), like environmental movements are assumed to be the concerns of all segments of society given their alleged universal import by HRM activists in India. Whether HR is or should be primarily state-centric or determined or leveraged by radical movements and civil society watchdog groups to hold the state accountable to various inter-/national HR commitments; whether it is or should be primarily about individual civil and political rights and/or collective economic, social and cultural rights; whether there is a single HRM in India today or many running parallel to each other or on mutually exclusive sets of assumptions; and whether the movement(s) can actually mobilize a mass base (who is its constituency?) beyond certain segments of the middle are some of the perennial questions for human rights movements and researchers today (Baxi, 1998; G. Shah [1990] 2004; Gudavarthy, 2008; Chakrabarti, 2011).

Although the movement did not acquire an organizational form before 1936, when the Indian Civil Liberties Union (ICLU) was established with Tagore as president, the seeds of germination were planted during the Indian Civil Rights Movement through direct actions and critical incidents, especially during the 1920s and 1930s (e.g., the 1931 protest against police firing on political prisoners in Hijli Jail, Calcutta). The ICLU played a key role in developing a civil liberties consciousness among a significant section of the population in colonial times. HRM scholarship traces the history of the HRM in India in terms of four phases including:

1. the civil liberties phase working within state-civil-society complementarity and the struggle to establish a rights-based civil society (1970s);
2. the democratic rights phase with a state versus civil society frame (1980s), post Indira Gandhi's imposed Emergency consisting of radical/militant movements squarely 'outside' the state;
3. the human rights phase (end of the 1990s) or political/civil-society split wherein radical movements were scrutinized for HR violations as well; and

4. the contemporary phase where the HRM is increasingly basing itself on an abstract moral/ethico-political dimension (beyond politics), while some are imploring for a return to collective rights orientations and a social movement politics given the rise of neoliberalism and religious fundamentalisms (Gudavarthy, 2008; Chakrabarti, 2011).

The Indira Gandhi Congress-imposed Emergency, suspending fundamental rights, led to the civil and democratic rights movement in its current shape, leading to the establishment of the People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) (taking up civil rights) and the People's Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR; taking up democratic rights) networked through various states and extended through the establishment of Committees of Concerned Citizens. The two unions differ on roles and political ideology (Haksar, 1991; Haragopal and Balagopal, 1998). Human rights groups have taken up different issues including: HR violations of rights of the poor (Desai, 1986b) and land, labour, police lawlessness, suppression of free expression, urban housing, academic freedom, communal conflict, treatment of women and so on (Rubin, 1987; Haksar, 1991). Haksar (1991) divides these issues into: (1) rights of prisoners; (2) police violence (e.g., torture); (3) anti-people laws (e.g., TADA/MISA/POTO; and (4) state oppression of bonded labourers, tribals, slum dwellers, landless peoples, and religious minorities. Common movement activities in HRMs include documentation of violations; fact-finding teams; dissemination/media; signature campaigns (including email campaigns); petitions; *dharnas*; public meetings and marches; and public interest litigation (Rubin, 1987; G. Shah [1990] 2004). The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) was established shortly after passage of the Protection of Human Rights Bill (1993).

SOCIAL MOVEMENT RESEARCH IN INDIA: LOOKING BACK TO LOOK AHEAD

The following are a few key projections and pointers regarding the future of social movements and research in India:

1. Social movements will likely be triggered and shaped by the twin contemporary macro-forces of a conservative Saffron politics (the resurgence of Hindutva in the electoral realm post-2004 expressed through the current emergence of Narendra Modi as Prime Minister) or Hindu religious fundamentalism and the deepening and expansion

of neoliberalization of the economy (market fundamentalism). This will fuel, for example, religious/communal movements (and women's movements in response to and as part of same) and anti-displacement subaltern-class/social-group movements in rural/semi-urban areas, as SEZs are encouraged (particularly around mines and minerals), slum/informal-economy labouring class movements (with increased forced or voluntary rural–urban migrations) along with middle-class-consumer/anti-corruption/eco-aesthetic movements (see Baviskar and Ray, 2011). Many of these movements will likely resort to eco/human-rights-based strategic/real politics in order to achieve the global boomerang amplification effects ('marketing of rebellion'; Bob, 2005) as movements compete for attention and mass base.

2. There will be calls for a contextualized-theoretical eclecticism that reflects the multifaceted complex nature of Indian material and cultural politics today, as the question of one central conflict uniting disparate movements and cultural/material histories is increasingly more unlikely.
3. The study of movements to date has primarily been focused on academic knowledge production (scholarship *about* movements) as opposed to movement-relevant knowledge *for* social movements (Bevington and Dixon, 2005; Choudry and Kapoor, 2010). The line between the academic study of movements and participation in movements (as scholar activists and not just public sociology) will continue to blur (for academic and movement-political reasons) along with the development of research methodologies that are increasingly more action oriented and movement embedded (e.g., collective ethnographies; participatory action research).
4. There is a need for more studies on: (a) neglected regions and social groups (e.g., peasants/Dalits/Adivasi in Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan), (b) issues (e.g., anti-displacement and slum-dweller movements), (c) movement dimensions (e.g., the role of learning and knowledge production in and by movements – Indian adult education remains aloof and state/industry-centric); and (d) spatio-temporal connections in movements and scholarship (local–regional–national–global linkages and movements).

NOTES

1. Dalit is the term for a group of people who are traditionally regarded as 'untouchable' in the caste system.

2. Right-wing Hindu nationalist movement.
3. Formerly in China and some other Asian countries, a native agent of a foreign enterprise.
4. Fourth and lowest of the traditional *varmas*, or social classes of India.
5. Controversial 21-month period of state of emergency across the country. Elections were suspended, civil liberties curbed, political opponents were imprisoned, and the press censored.
6. Karnataka State Farmers' Association.
7. High-yielding varieties.
8. Professional tree climbers who specialize in collecting the sap from the bark of the coconut tree.
9. Workers who painstakingly place tobacco inside a small tendu leaf, roll the leaf, and secure the product with a thread.
10. Funeral practice where recently widowed women immolate themselves, typically on their husband's funeral pyre.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. (1994), 'Gender, resistance and land: interlinked struggles over resources and meanings in South Asia', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **22**(1), 81–125.
- Agarwala, R. (2006), 'Form work to welfare: a new class movement in India', *Contemporary Asian Studies*, **38**(4), 419–41.
- Aggarwal, A. (1968), *Gheraos and Industrial Relations*, Bombay: Tripathi.
- Agnes, E. (1992), 'Protecting women against violence: review of a decade of legislation, 1980–89', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **27**(17), 19–33.
- Agnes, E. (1994), 'Women's movement within a secular framework – redefining the agenda', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **29**(19), 1123–7.
- Agnihotri, I. and V. Mazumdar (1995), 'Changing terms of political discourse: women's movement in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **30**(29), 1869–78.
- Alam, J. (1983), 'Peasantry, politics and historiography: critique of new trend in relation to Marxism', *Social Scientist*, **11**(2), 43–54.
- Alavi, H. (1973), 'Peasants and revolution', in K. Gough and H. Sharma (eds), *Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Alexander, K. (1975), 'Genesis of agrarian tension in Thanjavur', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **10**(49), 1881–6.
- Alexander, R. (1984), 'Participant's perceptions: women and the Indian independence movement', *Samya Shakti – A Journal of Women's Studies*, **1**(2), 1–5.
- Andharia, J. and C. Sengupta (1998), 'The environmental movement: global issues and Indian reality', *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, **59**(1), 422–49.
- Bagahi, S. and A. Danda (1982), 'NE-BU-LA: a movement for regional solidarity', in K.S. Singh (ed.), *Tribal Movements in India, Vol. 1*, New Delhi: Manohar.
- Bakshi, R. (1986), *The Long Haul, the Bombay Textile Worker's Strike*, Bombay: BUILD Documentation Centre.
- Banerjee, S. (1980), *In the Wake of Naxalbari: A History of the Naxalite Movement in India*, New Delhi: Selected Books Publishing.
- Banerjee, S. (1984), *India's Simmering Revolution: The Naxalite Uprising*, New Delhi: Selected Books Publishing.
- Bannerji, H. (2000), 'Projects of hegemony: towards a critique of subaltern studies' resolution of the women's question', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **35**(11), 902–20.
- Basu, D. and D. Das (2013), 'The Maoist movement in India: some political-economy considerations', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, **13**(3), 365–81.
- Baviskar, A. (1995), *In the Belly of the River: Tribal Conflicts Over Development in the Narmada Valley*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Baviskar, A. (2005), 'Red in tooth and claw? Looking for class in struggles over nature', in R. Ray and M. Katzenstein (eds), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Baviskar, A. (ed.) (2008), *Contested Grounds: Essays on Nature, Culture and Power*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Baviskar, A. and R. Ray (eds) (2011), *Elite and Everyman: The Cultural Politics of the Indian Middle Classes*, New York: Routledge.
- Baxi, U. (1998), 'The state and the human rights movements in India', in M. Mohanty and P. Mukherji (eds), *People's Rights: Social Movements and the State in the Third World*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Bevington, D. and C. Dixon (2005), 'Movement-relevant theory: rethinking movement scholarship and activism', *Social Movement Studies*, 4(3), 185–208.
- Bhatt, E. (2010), *We Are Poor But So Many: The Story of Self-employed Women in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhattacharjee, D. (2000), 'Globalising economy, localising labour', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(42) 3758–64.
- Bhowmik, S. (1997), 'On worker takeovers', *Seminar*, 452, 45–50.
- Bob, C. (2005), *The Marketing of Rebellion: Insurgents, Media and International Activism*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brass, T. (1994), 'Introduction: the new farmers movements in India', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 21(2), 3–26.
- Brass, T. (2001), 'Moral economists, subalterns, new social movements and the (re) emergence of a (post) modernized (middle) peasant', in V. Chaturvedi (ed.), *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*, New York: Verso.
- Breman, J. (2004), *The Making and Unmaking of an Industrial Working Class: Sliding Down the Labour Hierarchy in Ahmedabad, India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Byres, T. (1980), 'Peasants as unfinished history', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 15(31), 1308–13.
- Cederlof, G. and K. Sivaramakrishnan (eds) (2006), *Ecological Nationalisms: Nature, Livelihoods, and Identities in South Asia*, Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Center for Human Rights and Global Justice (2010), 'Every thirty minutes: farmer suicides, human rights and the agrarian crisis', New York: NYU School of Law, accessed 21 May 2014 at <http://chrj.org/documents/every-thirty-minutes-farmer-suicides-human-rights-and-the-agrarian-crisis-in-india/>.
- Chakrabarti, D. (2011), 'The human rights movement: in search of a realistic approach', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(47), 33–40.
- Chakrabarty, D. (1989), *Rethinking Working Class History: Bengal, 1890–1940*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chandavarkar, R. (1998), *Imperial Power and Popular Politics: Class, Resistance and the State in India, 1850–1950*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (1986), 'The colonial state and peasant resistance in Bengal 1920–1947', *Past and Present*, 11, February, 169.
- Chatterjee, P. (2004), *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (2008), 'Democracy and economic transformation in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(16), 53–62.
- Chatterjee, P. (ed.) (2009), *The Small Voice of History: Ranajit Guha*, Ranikhet, India: Permanent Black.
- Chatterjee, P. (2011), *Lineages of Political Society: Studies in Postcolonial Democracy*, Ranikhet, India: Permanent Black.
- Chatterjee, P. (2012), 'After subaltern studies', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(35), 44–9.
- Chatterji, A. (2009), *Violent Gods: Hindu Nationalism in India's Present – Narratives from Orissa*, New Delhi: Three Essays Collective.
- Chaudhuri, B. (ed.) (1992), *Ethnopolitics and Identity Crisis: Tribal Transformations in India*, New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.

- Chen, M. (2010), 'The Self Employed Women's Association', in T.K. Oommen (ed.), *Social Movements II: Concerns of Equity and Security*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chibber, V. (2005), 'From class compromise to class accommodation: labor's accommodation in to the Indian political economy', in R. Ray and M. Katzenstein (eds), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Choudry, A. and D. Kapoor (eds) (2010), *Learning from the Ground Up: Global Perspective on Social Movements and Knowledge Production*, London/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Choudry, A. and D. Kapoor (eds) (2013), *NGOization: Complicity, Contradiction and Prospects*, London: Zed.
- Custers, P. (1986), 'Women's role in Tebhaga movement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **21**(43), 97–101.
- Da Costa, D. (2010), *Development Drama: Reimagining Rural Political Action in Eastern India*, New Delhi: Routledge.
- Das, A. (1983), *Agrarian Unrest and Socio-economic Change in Bihar, 1900–1980*, Delhi: Manohar.
- Das, A. (1987), 'Revolutionary movement in Bihar', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **22**(22).
- Das, V. (1990), 'Jharkhand movement: from realism to mystification', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **25**(30), 385–400.
- Datar, C. (1993), *The Struggle Against Violence*, Calcutta: Stree Publications.
- Davis, M. (2004), *Planet of Slums*, London: Verso.
- Desai, A. (1978), *Peasant Struggles in India*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Desai, A. (ed.) (1986a), *Agrarian Struggle in India After Independence*, New Delhi: Oxford.
- Desai, A. (ed.) (1986b), *Violation of Democratic Rights in India*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Desai, N. and V. Patel (1985), *Indian Women: Change and Challenge*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Dhanagare, D. (1982), 'Telangana: a movement revisited', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **17**(51), 2045–6.
- Dhanagare, D. (1983), *Peasant Movements in India, 1920–1950*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Dhanagare, D. (1995), 'The class character and politics of the farmers' movements in Maharashtra during the 1980s', in T. Brass (ed.), *New Farmer's Movements in India*, Ilford, UK: Frank Cass.
- Dhanagare, D. (1999), 'The new farmers' movement in Maharashtra', in F. Ishikawa (ed.), *South Asia Under the Economic Reforms*, Osaka: Japan Center for Asia Studies.
- Dhanagare, D. and J. John (1988), 'Cyclical movement towards the 'eternal' – nine theses on social movements: a critique', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **33**(21).
- D'Souza, R. (2009), 'Sandwich theory and Operation Green Hunt', *Sanhati*, December 2009.
- Duyker, E. (1987), *Tribal Guerrillas: The Santhals of West Bengal and the Naxalite Movement*, Delhi: Oxford.
- Everett, J. (1979), *Women and Social Change in India*, Delhi: Heritage.
- Frank, A. and M. Fuentes (1987), 'Nine theses on social movements', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **32**(35), L45–L52.
- Gadgil, M. and R. Guha (1992), *This Fissured Land: An Ecological History of India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gadgil, M. and R. Guha (1998), 'Towards a perspective on environmental movements in India', *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, **59**(1), 450–72.
- Gandhi, N. and N. Shah (1991), *The Issues at Stake: Theory and Practice in the Contemporary Women's Movement in India*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Ghosh, A. (ed.) (1999), *Dalits and Peasants: The Emerging Caste-Class Dynamics*, Delhi: Gyan Sagar Publications.
- Gillan, M. (2010), 'Trade unions and the political representation of unorganized workers in India', draft paper presented to the Labour Movements Research Committee (RC44), International Sociological Association (ISA) 17th World Congress of Sociology, Gothenburg, Sweden, 11–17 July.

- Gokhale, J. (1979), 'The Dalit Panthers and the radicalization of untouchables', *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, **17**(19), 77–93.
- Gooptu, N. (2001), *The Politics of the Urban Poor in the Early Twentieth Century India*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gore, M.S. (1989), *The Non-Brahman Movement in Maharashtra*, New Delhi: Segment Book Distributor.
- Gore, M.S. (1993), *Social Context of an Ideology: Ambedkar's Political and Social Thought*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Gough, K. (1968), 'Peasant resistance and revolt in South India', *Pacific Affairs*, **16**(4), 526–44.
- Gough, K. (1974), 'Indian peasant uprising', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **9**(32–34), 1391–412.
- Gough, K. (1980), 'Modes of production in Southern India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **15**(5/6/7), 337–64.
- Gough, K. and H. Sharma (eds) (1973), *Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Gudavarthy, A. (2008), 'Human rights movements in India: state, civil society and beyond', *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, **42**(1), 29–57.
- Guha, R. (1982), 'Ecological crisis and ecological movements: a bourgeois deviation?', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **17**(52), 2093–5.
- Guha, R. (1983), *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R. (1989), *The Unquiet Wood: Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the Himalaya*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R. (1997a), 'The environmentalism of the poor', in R. Fox and O. Starn (eds), *Between Resistance and Revolution: Cultural Politics and Social Protest*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Guha, R. (1997b), *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guha, R. (2001), 'Subaltern studies: projects for our time and their convergence', in I. Rodriguez (ed.), *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Guha, R. and M. Gadgil (1989), 'State forestry and social conflict in British India', *Past and Present*, **123**(1), 141–77.
- Guha, R. and Martinez-Alier, J. (1998), *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, D. (1982), *Nativism in a Metropolis: The Shiv Sena in Bombay*, New Delhi: Manohar.
- Guru, G. and A. Chakravarty (2005), 'Who are the country's poor? Social movement politics and Dalit poverty', in R. Ray and F. Katzenstein (eds), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Haksar, N. (1991), 'Civil liberties movement in India', *The Lawyers*, June.
- Haragopal, G. and K. Balagopal (1998), 'Civil liberties movement and the state in India', in M. Mohanty and P. Mukherji (eds), *People's Rights: Social Movements and the State in the Third World*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Harriss-White, B. (2010), 'Globalization, the financial crisis and petty production in India's socially regulated informal economy', *Global Labour Journal*, **1**(1), 155–77.
- Harvey, D. (2003), *The New Imperialism*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Hensman, R. (2010), 'Labour and globalization: union responses India', *Global Labour Journal*, **1**(1), 112–31.
- Herring, R. (2005), 'Miracle seeds, suicide seeds, and the poor: GMOs, NGOs, farmers and the state', in R. Ray and M. Katzenstein (eds), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hussain, M. (1987), 'Tribal movement for autonomous state in Assam', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **22**(32), 1329–32.

- Ilaiah, K. (1996), *Why I Am Not a Hindu: A Shudra Critique of Hindu Culture, Ideology and Political Economy*, Calcutta: Samya.
- Jogdand, P. (1991), *Dalit Movement in Maharashtra*, New Delhi: Kanak.
- Kabeer, N., R. Sudarshan and K. Milward (eds) (2013), *Organizing Women Workers in the Informal Economy: Beyond the Weapons of the Weak*, London: Zed.
- Kalpagam, U. (1994), 'The discourse and practice of informal sector politics', in U. Kalpagam (ed.), *Labour and Gender: Survival in Urban India*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing.
- Kamat, S. (2001), *Development Hegemony: NGOs and the State in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kannan, K. (1988), *Of Rural Proletarian Struggles: Mobilization and Organization of Rural Workers in South-West India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kannappan, S. and D. Saran (1967), 'Political strikes and violence in labour disputes', *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 3(3), 123–7.
- Kapoor, D. (2011), 'Subaltern social movement (SSM) post-mortems of development in India: locating trans-local activism and radicalism', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46(2), 130–48.
- Kapoor, D. (2013), 'Trans-local rural solidarity and an anti-colonial politics of place: contesting colonial capital and the neoliberal state in India', *Interface: A Journal For and About Social Movements*, 5(1), 14–39.
- Karnik, V. (1966), *Indian Trade Unions: A Survey*, Bombay: Manaktalis.
- Kelkar, G. (1984), 'Women's movement studies: a critique of the historiography', *Samya Shakti – A Journal of Women's Studies*, 1(2).
- Khagram, S. (2004), *Dams and Development: Transnational Struggles for Water and Power*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kishwar, M. and M. Ruth (ed.) (1984), *Search for Answers*, London: Zed.
- Kothari, R. (1984), 'The non-party political process', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 19(5), 216–24.
- Kothari, S. (2001), 'Globalization, global alliances and the Narmada movement', in K. Kumar (1984), *Peasants in Revolt: Tenants, Landless, Congress and the Raj in Oudh*, Delhi: Manohar.
- Kumar, K. (1993), *A History of Doing: An Illustrated Account of Movement for Women's Rights and Feminism in India 1800–1900*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Kumar, V. (2010), 'Different shades of Dalit mobilization', in T. Oommen (ed.), *Social Movements I: Issues of Identity*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Lakha, S. (2002), 'Organized labour and militant unionism: the Bombay textile workers' strike of 1982', in G. Shah (ed.), *Social Movements and the State*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Lerche, J., A. Shah and B. Harriss-White (2013), 'Introduction: agrarian questions and left politics in India', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 13(3), 337–50.
- Levien, M. (2012), 'The land question: special economic zones and the political economy of dispossession in India', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3–4), 933–69.
- Liddle, J. and R. Joshi, (1986), *Daughters of Independence: Gender, Caste and Class in India*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Lieten, G. (1982), 'Strikes and strike-breakers: a Bombay textile mills strike, 1929', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27(14–16), April.
- Lieten, G. (1983), *Colonialism, Class and Nation*, Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi.
- Ludden, D. (ed.) (2005), *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning and the Globalization of South Asia*, New Delhi: Pauls Press.
- McMichael, P. (2008), 'Peasants make their own history, but not just as they please...?', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2–3), 205–28.
- McMichael, P. (ed.) (2010), *Contesting Development: Critical Struggles for Social Change*, New York: Routledge.
- Mehta, L. (ed.) (2009), *Displaced by Development: Confronting Marginalization and Gender Injustice*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Mendelsohn, O. and M. Vickziany (1998), *The Untouchables: Subordination, Poverty and the State in Modern India*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Menon, N. and A. Nigam (2007), *Power and Contestation: India Since 1989*, London: Zed.
- Mookerjee, S. (2011), 'On learning how to liberate the common: subaltern biopolitics and the end-game of neoliberalism', in D. Kapoor (ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Neoliberal Globalization, Development and Education in Africa and Asia*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Moore, B. (1967), *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, London: Allen Lane.
- Mukherji, N. (2012), *The Maoists in India: Tribals under Siege*, London: Pluto.
- Mukherji, P. (1977), 'Social movement and social change: to a conceptual clarification and theoretical framework', *Sociological Bulletin*, **26**(1), 38–59.
- Mukherji, P. (1987), 'Study of social conflicts: case of Naxalbari peasant movement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **22**(8), 1607–17.
- Munshi, I. (ed.) (2012), *The Adivasi Question: Issues of Land, Forest and Livelihood*, New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Murphy, E. (1981), *Unions in Conflict: A Comparative Study of Four South Indian Textile Centers, 1818–1939*, Delhi: Manohar.
- Neeraj, J. (2007), *Globalization or Re-colonization*, Pune: Lokayat Press.
- Newman, R. (1981), *Workers and Unions in Bombay, 1918–29*, Canberra: Australian National University.
- Nilsen, A. (2010), *Dispossession and Resistance in India: The River and the Rage*, New York: Routledge.
- Niranjana, S. (2000), 'Transitions and reorientations: on the women's movement in India', in P. d'Souza (ed.), *Contemporary India: Transitions*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Oliver-Smith, A. (2010), *Defying Displacement: Grassroots Resistance and the Critique of Development*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Omvedt, G. (1978), 'Women and the rural revolt in India', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **5**(3), 370–403.
- Omvedt, G. (1980a), 'Caste and agrarian relations and agrarian conflict', *Sociological Bulletin*, **29**(2), 147–67.
- Omvedt, G. (1980b), *We Will Smash This Prison*, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Omvedt, G. (1981), 'Capitalist agriculture and rural classes in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **16**(52), 140–59.
- Omvedt, G. (1988), 'New movements', *Seminar*, **352**, 39–44.
- Omvedt, G. (1993), *Reinventing Revolution: New Social Movements and the Socialist Tradition in India*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Omvedt, G. (1994), *Dalits and the Democratic Revolution*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Omvedt, G. (1995), *Dalit Visions: The Anti-caste Movement and the Construction of the Indian Identity*, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Omvedt, G. (2005), 'Farmer's movements and the debate on poverty and reform in India', in R. Ray and M. Katzenstein (eds), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Oommen, T. (1972), *Charisma, Stability and Change: An Analysis of Bhodan-Gramdan Movement in India*, New Delhi: Thomson Press.
- Oommen, T. (1984), *Social Structure and Politics: Studies in Independent India*, Delhi: Hindustan Publishing.
- Oommen, T. ([1990] 2010), *Protest and Change: Studies in Social Movements*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Oommen, T. (ed.) (2010a), *Social Movements I: Issues of Identity*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Oommen, T. (ed.) (2010b), *Social Movements II: Concerns of Equity and Security*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Padel, F. and A. Das (2010), *Out of this Earth: East India Adivasis and the Aluminum Cartel*, New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Pai, S. (2002), *Dalit Assertion and the Unfinished Democratic Revolution: The BSP in UP*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Palriwala, R. (2010), 'The anti-dowry movement in Delhi', in T. Oommen (ed.), *Social Movements II: Concerns of Equity and Security*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Patel, R. and P. McMichael (2004), 'Third Worldism and the lineages of global fascism: the regrouping of the Global South in the neoliberal era', *Third World Quarterly*, **25**(1), 231–54.
- Patel, S. (1987), *Making of Industrial Relations in the Ahmedabad Textile Industry, 1918–19*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Patel, S. (1988), 'Construction and reconstruction of women in Gandhi', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **23**(8), 377–87.
- Patel, S., S. Burra and C. d'Cruz (2001), 'Slum/shack dwellers international: foundations to tree tops', *Environment and Urbanization*, **13**(2), 45–59.
- Patil, C. (ed.) (1988), *Revolt Studies: One*, Calcutta: Asiatic Book Agency.
- Patnaik, U. (1987), *Peasant Class Differentiation: A Study in Method with Reference to Haryana*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Patnaik, U. (2010), 'The new primitive accumulation and the peasantry', abstract of P. Sundarayya Memorial Lecture, 19 May, Hyderabad, accessed 30 April 2013 at <http://indiacurrentaffairs.org/the-new-primitive-accumulation-and-the-peasantry-utsa-patnaik/>.
- Pattnaik, S. (1993), *Strike: A Study of Conflict*, New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Pavier, B. (1981), *The Telangana Movement, 1944–51*, Delhi: Vikas.
- Purushothaman, S. (1998), *The Empowerment of Women: Grassroots Women's Networks and the State*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Rajagopal, B. (2003), *International Law from Below: Development, Social Movements and Third World Resistance*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramaswamy, E. and U. Ramaswamy (1981), *Industry and Labour: An Introduction*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, A. (ed.) (2003), *Gender and Caste*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Rao, A. (2009), *The Caste Question: Dalits and the Politics of Modern India*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rao, M. (1971), *Maoism in India*, New Delhi: Vikas.
- Rao, M.S.A. ([1979] 2006), 'Conceptual problems in the study of social movements in India', in M.S.A Rao (ed.), *Social Movements in India: Studies in Peasant, Backward Classes, Sectarian, Tribal and Women's Movements*, New Delhi: Manohar.
- Ray, B. (2002), *Early Feminists of Colonial India: Sarala Devi Chaudhurani and Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ray, R. (1999), *Fields of Protest: Women's Movements in India*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ray, R. and F. Katzenstein (eds) (2005), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Rodrigues, V. (2002), *Essential Writings of B.R. Ambedkar*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Routledge, P. (1993), *Terrains of Resistance: Nonviolent Social Movements and the Contestation of Place in India*, New York: Praeger.
- Roy, A. (1996), 'From bureaucracy to people's movement', *Lokayan Bulletin*, **13**(1), 51.
- Roy, B. (1999), 'The politics of waste and corruption', *Lokayan Bulletin*, **16**(1), 19–40.
- RoyChowdhury, S. (2003), 'Old classes and new spaces: urban poverty and new trade unions', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **38**(50), 5277–84.
- RoyChowdhury, S. (2005), 'Labor activism and women in the unorganized sector', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **40**(22–23), 2250–55.
- Rubin, B. (1987), 'The civil liberties movement in India', *Asian Survey*, **27**(3), 371–92.
- Sachichidananda, S. (1985), 'Tribal studies', *Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, 1969–79 (ICSSR), Vol. 1*, New Delhi: Satvahana Publications.
- Saha, P. (1978), *History of the Working Class Movement in Bengal*, New Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- Sahoo, S. (2010), 'Political mobilization, the poor and democratization in neo-liberal India', *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, **40**(3), 487–508.
- Sangari, K. and S. Vaid. (1989), *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.

- Sanyal, K. (2010), *Rethinking Capitalist Development: Primitive Accumulation, Governmentality and Post-colonial Capitalism*, New Delhi: Routledge.
- Sarkar, K. (1979), 'Kakdwip Tebhaga movement', in A.R. Desai (ed.), *Peasant Struggles in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sarkar, S. (2005), 'The decline of the subaltern in subaltern studies', in D. Ludden (ed.), *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning and the Globalization of South Asia*, New Delhi: Pauls Press.
- Sarkar, T. (1991), 'Woman as a communal subject: Rashtrasevika Samiti and Ram Janmabhoomi movement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **26**(35), 2057–65.
- Sen, I. (1989), 'Feminist, women's movements and the working class', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **24**(29), 1639–41.
- Sen, I. (1990), *A Space Within the Struggle: Women's Participation in People's Movements*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Sengupta, N. (ed.) (1982), *The Fourth World Dynamics: Jharkhand*, Delhi: Authors Guild Publication.
- Sethi, H. (1984), 'Groups in a new politics of transformation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **19**(7), 305–16.
- Sethi, H. (1993), 'Survival and democracy: ecological struggles in India', in P. Wignaraja (ed.), *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Shah, A. (2010), *In the Shadows of the State: Indigenous Politics, Environmentalism, and Insurgency in Jharkhand, India*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shah, G. ([1990] 2004), *Social Movements in India: A Review of the Literature*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Shah, K. (1984), *Women's Liberation and Voluntary Action*, Delhi: Ajanta Publishers.
- Sharma, J. (1988), *Total Revolution*, Delhi: Jan Hit Prakashan.
- Sheth, D. (1983), 'Grass-roots stirrings and the future of politics', *Alternatives*, **9**(1), 1–24.
- Sheth, D. (1984), 'Grass-roots initiatives in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **19**(6), 259–62.
- Sheth, D. (1993), 'Politics of social transformation: grassroots movements in India', in R. Falk, R. Johannan and S. Kim (eds), *The Constitutional Foundation of World Peace*, New York: State University Press.
- Sheth, D. (1999), 'Globalization and the grassroots movements', *Seminar*, **473**, 77–82.
- Sheth, D. (2005), 'Micro-movements in India: towards a new politics of participatory democracy', in B. Sousa Santos (ed.), *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, London: Verso.
- Shiva, V. (1988), *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India*, Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Shiva, V. and J. Bandopadhyaya (1986), 'Environmental conflicts and public interest science', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **21**(2), 84–90.
- Singh, H. (2003), 'Princely states, peasant protests and nation building in India: the colonial mode of historiography and subaltern studies', *Social Movement Studies*, **2**(2), 213–28.
- Singh, K.S. (1982), *Tribal Movements in India, Vol. I*, Delhi: Manohar.
- Singh, R. (1986), 'Agrarian social structure and peasant unrest: a study of land-grab movement in district Basti', in A. Desai (ed.), *Agrarian Struggle in India After Independence*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, R. (2001), *Social Movements, Old and New: A Post-modernist Critique*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Singh, Y. (1993), *Social Change in India*, New Delhi: Haranand Publications.
- SinghaRoy, D. (2004), *Peasant Movements in Post-colonial India: Dynamics of Mobilization and Identity*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Sinha, S. (1984), *Life and Times of Birsa Bhagwan*, Patna: Secretariat Press.
- Sivaramakrishnan, K. and A. Agrawal (eds) (2003), *Regional Modernities: The Cultural Politics of Development in India*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Sodhi, J. (1994), 'Emerging trends in industrial relations and human resources in India', *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, **30**(1), 19–37.
- Stokes, E. (1978), *The Peasants and the Raj: Studies in Agrarian Society and Peasant Rebellion in Colonial India*, Delhi: Vikas.
- Subramanian, A. (2009), *Shorelines: Space and Rights in South India*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sundar, N. (2009), *Subalterns and Sovereigns: An Anthropological History of Bastar (1854–2006)*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Surana, P. (1983), *Social Movements and Social Structure*, New Delhi: Manohar.
- Tarkunde, V. (2003), 'Partyless politics and people's (humanist) state: a picture for public discussion', *The Radical Humanist*, **66**(10), 1–4.
- Upadhyaya, A. (1980), 'Peasantization of Adivasis in Thane district', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **15**(52), 134–46.
- Vaid, K. (1972), *Gheraos and Labour Unrest in West Bengal*, New Delhi: Shri Ram Centre.
- Velayudhan, M. (1985), 'The crisis and women's struggle in India (1970–77)', *Social Scientist*, **13**(6), 145–57.
- Webster, E. (2011), 'Organizing in the informal economy: Ela Bhatt and the Self Employed Women's Association of India', *Labour, Capital and Society*, **44**(1), 98–125.
- Whitehead, J. (2003), 'Space, place and primitive accumulation in Narmada Valley and beyond', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **38**(40), 4224–30.
- Zelliot, E. (2001), *From Untouchables to Dalits and Other Essays*, New Delhi: Manohar.