GROUNDED UTOPIAN MOVEMENTS:

SUBJECTS OF NEGLECT

***** DRAFT VERSION: NOT FOR CITATION OR QUOTATION ****

Charles Price, Erich Fox Tree, and Donald Nonini

THE GHOST DANCE (1889-1920s): A GROUNDED UTOPIAN MOVEMENT

In 1889, coming out of military defeat and loss of tribal lands, subject to the tyranny of reservation agents, their children sent to government schools and required to learn the white man's language, thousands of native Americans belonging to scores of tribal groups throughout the Great Basin and Great Plains regions enthusiastically took up the Ghost Dance.[1] They followed charismatic prophets who showed them the dances whose performance led to their falling into trances in which they saw a new world where they were reunited with happy ancestors, the buffalo and their old ways, and foreswore the work set out for them by whites.[1] Beginning with the Paiute prophet Wovoka in Nevada, the movement spread rapidly to the south, north and east for hundreds of miles in each direction. New prophets arose among the different groups, confirming (but in some cases repudiating the authenticity of) Wovoka's visions, and in turn converted new followers within their groups and those nearby to the Ghost Dance. Among most tribes, its doctrine "remained one of peace, a simple hope that a change was coming which would give the Indians back their land, their buffalo and their old life" (Lesser 1978: 59), but during the Sioux rebellion of the Dakotas the Ghost Dance movement had its violent moment when braves thought that the Ghost Dance provided invulnerability against the

army's bullets, a tragedy that ended in the massacre at Wounded Knee in late 1890.

Word of Wovoka's visions, the dances and songs he had learned, and the new world his visions revealed, the idea that the whirlwind that was to precede the new world would also extinguish whites from the earth, traveled quickly in the matter of days or weeks, carried by visits between tribal groups who spoke different languages mediated by sign language, by letters written in English by young native Americans educated in government schools, and by trips of tribal "delegates" via railway to inquire about the Ghost Dance among faraway groups. Leaving off the white man's work of farming, people revived the old customs, dances, songs, the "societies" (sodalities) organized around hunting and war, the bundles believed to carry ritual power, and games, revealed to them in their visions of the new world. Within and across tribes, kin passed the word to kin, and local segments of kin came together with others nearby to celebrate the Ghost Dance, and to await the coming of the new world. The groups sought to revitalize their civil society and used indigenous networks and formations to diffuse information, without reliance on telephone or newspaper.

By the early 1890's, made fearful by the uprising at Wounded Knee, government agents and law enforcers had had enough. One agent, for example, announced to Pawnee assembled for the Ghost Dance that "'the dance could not be tolerated and would not be; that this government would last and assert her power, and that they should be obedient to the law and be good Indians, return to their homes and cultivate their farms and raise something to eat'" (Lesser 1978: 65). Within the broader consolidation of U.S. government power and the expansion and settlement of whites across the Plains and into the Great Basin from the 1890s onward, agents and police sought to suppress the

dances. However, when extinguished in one locale, dancing would occur elsewhere on tribal lands; the manifestations were flexible and ephemeral, but grounded. Eventually performances of the Ghost Dance became more secretive, unannounced, and unnamed. Still, there is evidence that, despite suppression, it lasted for at least two more decades into the 1920s. It may even still be discreetly performed in some tribal powwows at present (Kracht 1992).

The Ghost Dance movement in the United States, the Rastafari of Jamaica and the Mayan Movement of Guatemala discussed in this article, and other movements like them have been widely referred to in the anthropological literature as "cultural revitalization," "cultural revival" and "nativistic" movements. Although these ascriptions have been debated in that literature, central to these movements, as illustrated in the Ghost Dance, have been processes of cultural production and the creation of new cultural formations. What do dominant approaches and theorizations in the social movement literature have to say about such movements? To our dismay, not much, as it turns out. When, for instance, we searched the ten years' contents of *Mobilization*, we found no articles out of the entire number of 365 that referred to any of the following terms used in the anthropological and historical literatures to refer to what we call *grounded utopian movements*: "messianic," "millenarian," "chiliastic," "nativistic," "revitalization," and "articulatory."[2] When we searched these contents for references to the related concept "moral economy" set out in the well-known works of E.P. Thompson (1971) on the moral economy of the 18th century crowd, or of James C. Scott (1976) on the moral economy of the peasantry, we found exactly one article for each of the two authors citing that author during the entire publishing history of *Mobilization*. We were somewhat more

heartened by finding forty seven references to "culture," and "cultural" out of 365 articles, alluding to issues of cultural "framing," "narrative," and "biography," which provide useful affinities to our own approach of studying movements in terms of lived experience, but were far less encouraged when we found that the analyses utilizing these concepts did not appear to extend to movements like the Ghost Dance, Rastafari or Maya Movement.

Therefore, we think it safe to conclude that, to start with, such movements – what we call grounded utopian movements – have been largely neglected and left out of the dominant approaches to social movements, if our negative searches of this journal's contents are a fair indicator. However, our argument in this article is more ambitious. In the next two sections of the article we argue that not only are analyses of grounded utopian movements like these largely absent from the literature, but so too are the theorizations, the ethnographic and historical methods and techniques and orienting philosophical values and perspectives appropriate to their study. Since we find that the historical, spatial, and social characteristics of these movements have largely been ignored in the literature – characteristics that contribute to their being neglected – we briefly address these characteristics in the third section. Our analysis is informed by decades of research into grounded utopian movements by anthropologists and others, and in each section we use an example of one of these movements. In the fourth section of the paper we propose in a provisional way that the global social justice movement shows many grounded utopian movement characteristics, and that the theories, methods and philosophical perspectives we draw on in describing past grounded utopian movements may apply as well to it. We conclude with a summary of what grounded utopian

movements offer social movements theory.

GROUNDED UTOPIAN MOVEMENTS:
TAKING "THE STATE" AND "THE MARKET" BACK OUT

In this section we define what we mean by grounded utopian movements and begin to address the methods and approaches appropriate to their study which have been left out of dominant theorizations in social movement studies. We are in particular referring to movements of peoples emerging in the interstices within, on the edges of, or even left out altogether from modern nation-states and capitalist markets – although these movements have been affected by the expansion of both – during the last three to four centuries that make up the history of modernity to the present. Grounded utopian movements of marginalized peoples, that is, are thoroughly modern, and not "archaic" or "pre-modern" formations. They have emerged, persisted, disappeared, and re-emerged in new guises, over this same period of modernity.

By writing of "grounded utopian movements" like the Ghost Dance, Rastafari and the Maya, we mean to elaborate upon the apparent paradox in the notion of "grounded utopia" that we suspect may be generic to dominant approaches in social movement studies. These movements are "utopian" in that they point to a "good place" (eu-topos) – like the new world of the Ghost Dance or Mount Zion for the Rastafari – and by implication to a better time as well where life is more satisfying than it is at present. Within conventional categories, however, "utopian" also carries unfavorable associations of being impractical, quixotic, idealized, romantic, unreasonable, irrational, insubstantial and flighty. To the extent that these movements are deemed "otherworldly"-focused they

are treated as conservative and not progressive. These associations, we believe, underlie the derogation or even marginalization of movements like those discussed here within mainstream social movement studies: they are considered insufficiently real, substantial, determinate, or even muscular to be considered *proper* social movements. This is why, in part, we point to the *grounded* feature of these utopias – utopias which are grounded in several different and often overlapping senses, first, grounded in land, an assemblage of places, in territory, a literal "ground"; second, grounded in the foundation perceived by members of a past lifeway and practices and values a group deems intrinsic to its identity; and third, grounded by quotidian interactions and valued practices that connect the members of a community, even if diasporic. All three social movements discussed here – the Ghost Dance, Rastafari, the Maya Movement – show these overlapping meanings of being grounded in the utopian visions and transcendental ideals of those who belong to them.

It is worth asking why grounded utopian movements have been so neglected within the dominant approaches within social movement studies. Dominant approaches within social movement theory, whether the older sociological approach of "resource mobilization," or more recent developments such as "political opportunity structure" approach or even newer approaches such as the "culture and cognition" or "narrative" approaches, generally make two assumptions which marginalize the study of grounded utopian movements.

Dominant approaches to social movements give central priority to, and take for granted, the existence of the modern nation-state and capitalist markets as either the objects of strategic contention by social movements or as the fields of contention within

which social movements arise and develop. In this sense social movement political practice, organization, and mobilization are assumed to be oriented toward achieving change by transforming conditions within capitalist markets or within the formal political institutions situated within the "container" of the nation-state. On this assumption, "real" social movements seek to affirm the rights to representation by their members in decisions related to practices of capitalist market competition (e.g., rights of labor unions or women for equal employment and pay), or seek recognition by the nation-state of the rights of their members within political institutions (e.g., the right to vote, allocation of public monies, or to have partner relationships among gays or lesbians given legal recognition). More rarely, "revolutionary" movements, seek to gain control of the pre-existing state apparatus, and to transform or eliminate capitalist markets.

We suggest that the parameters of what are acceptable "social movements" within the dominant approaches remain set by assumptions about the pervasiveness of the institutions of capitalist markets and the nation-state as setting the framework for the operation, goals and strategies of social movements. Charles Tilly (1984: 304) stated these parameters in his widely cited essay "Social Movements and National Politics": "The general phenomenon we are examining is the organized, sustained, self-conscious challenge to existing authorities. A wide variety of authorities receive such challenges: not only rulers of states, but also bishops, bosses, landlords, and college presidents. Let us retain the name *social movement* for that general sort of challenge to existing authorities" (emphasis added). Tilly then goes on to cite what has become a canonical definition of a social movement: "A social movement is a sustained series of interactions between power holders and persons successfully claiming to speak on behalf of a

constituency lacking formal representation, in the course of which those persons make publicly visible demands for changes in the distribution or exercise of power, and back those demands with public demonstrations of support (1984: 306). What, we ask, of movements whose members are simply seeking to be left alone, attempting to find new identities or reinvent older ones, or trying to realize the values of community within the "life world" as Habermas (19xx) called it, unencumbered by the administered life of the "system world" of capitalism and the modern nation-state? What of movements that do not aspire to gain political power within the secular modern state – but whose internal identity-work, not oriented toward visible expansion in members, resources or representation vis-à-vis capitalist markets or the nation-state, transforms the lives of their members, and even the world around them, as they seek to bring about a more satisfying world?

Second, social movements, it is assumed, engage in actions within the container of a certain kind of nation-state – the Westphalian state which, in Weber's (1918) classic typology of the modern European state, has come to be taken as "the state" (see also Giddens 1985). This assumption finesses major questions about the heterogeneity and restructuring processes affecting contemporary states. For instance, are they always easily coupled via a "hyphen" with a nation where the latter is a "political formation" coextensive with a "racial grouping" (Williams 1976: 168-9)? Do all states have legitimate monopoly over the means of violence within "their" territories? Do they all show the features of rational bureaucratic administration which Weber and successors (e.g., Giddens; Foucault) found extant in European states from the late 17th century to the present? Do they all have the capacity to raise revenues from among those they rule

over? And, challenging Foucault's claims, do they always have the resources and opportunities to successfully transform the people they rule into "disciplined" citizens?

Both these assumptions made by dominant theories about social movements limit the allowable range of the social movements considered worth studying to those oriented toward states of a certain kind, and implicitly privilege certain modes of knowing, or epistemologies, of acquiring knowledge about the movements. The focus in resource mobilization theory on rational choice which investigates the availability of resources that allow movements to take actions vis-à-vis the state or capitalist markets – gain control of a political party or start one, achieve recognition as labor unions, get legislation passed, etc., is well known. This theory's focus on "structures" is understood to refer to a context in which agents of the state are present (sometimes viewed as omnipresent), recognize these structures, attempt to coopt or eliminate them, etc. Much important work has been informed by this theory, but it is confined to Westphalian nation-state domain. The "political opportunity structure" approach sets out its state-based assumptions out even more explicitly, because it is the precisely the state which is implicated in many of the "opportunity structures" which social movements must capitalize on, if they can. In contrast, the current "post-structural" turn in social movement studies challenges this approach's assumption that such structures control the course of movement mobilization (Kurzman 2004).

The questions above that challenge the Westphalian model of the state and the issues they raise are particularly pertinent to the need to rethink the implications of grounded utopian movements and how they are now to be studied in a postcolonial world whose complexity and instability is belied by the impedimenta of the global "nation-state

system" of embassies, flags, anthems and postage stamps. This postcolonial world is not only dominated by a single financial and military super-power (the United States) and by "multilateral financial institutions" (e.g., World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund and the World Bank), but also manifests novel and restructured emergent transnational states like the European Union (previously composed of Westphalian entities) (Shore 2000); ethno-nationalist armed separatist movements that rule over peripheral zones (Ekholm Friedman 2003); transnational corporations seeking geostrategic control of oil and natural resources whose proxies are regional mafia/ warlord or other organized criminal networks exercising state-like functions across in subsaharan Africa, central Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America (Reyna 2003; Nazpary 2002; Nordstrom 2000, 2005); NGO-ruled mini-states (Hanlon 1991); "white jeep states" (Sampson 2003) and other forms of "apparent states" (Glick Schiller and Fouron 2003: 233-4). It is notable that, as we discuss below, the emergence of the three grounded utopian groups we discuss here is associated with a prior period of turmoil in state formation – the expansion of European colonial rule. The turbulence, re-formation, and disorder associated with contemporary state formation processes should raise broader questions about the appropriateness of assuming the existence of the Westphalian state model even for the kinds of movements studied by the dominant theoretical approaches to social movements.

For the purposes of this article, what matters is that the high modern epoch of European Westphalian states incorporating secular political, labor, etc. movements within their "civil societies" is passing, that a new period of states' recomposition now exists, and that, like a prior period of colonial expansion and imperialism, the times are

propitious for the emergence and resurgence, of grounded utopian movements.[3] All the more pity, therefore, that the social movements literature does such a poor job of analyzing them or even acknowledging their existence. In the latter part of the essay, we argue that the global social justice might best be thought of as a new grounded utopian movement that flourishes in disruptive and transformative conditions for states like the ones present today.

We hold that grounded utopian movements represent modernity's other side: these movements, although not unconstrained by the rationalizations associated with the penetrations and expansion of modern nation-states and capitalism(s) – analyzed closely in the classic works of Marx, Weber, Giddens and Foucault – show dynamics that are by no means confined to either the logics of "capital" or of "the state" set out by these theorists. And some grounded utopian movements, we venture to say, may be on liberal modernity's other side in yet another sense: some religious fundamentalist movements (e.g., the Christian identity movement or transnational Wahabhist Islam) incorporate the identity-work being performed by their members in pursuit of grounded utopias into violent strategies aimed at repressive political objectives vis-à-vis states and "heretic" populations that few outside their movements would approve of. Irrespective of the normative issues this raises, the broader point is that we see many contemporary social movements as being hybrids whose members, internal politics and networks, worldviews, and strategies incorporate features of both being oriented toward gaining power and representation vis-à-vis the state and capitalist markets, *and* of seeking to constitute more satisfying lives by personal transformations in pursuit of grounded utopias. If this proposition is correct, not only the distinctive grounded utopian movements discussed

here but also the grounded utopian dimensions and elements within what are conventionally being viewed as secular, state-oriented and market-oriented movements are being left out of or misrecognized by dominant theorizations in the literature.

Like the Ghost Dance, the Rastafari of Jamaica provide a different example of a grounded utopian movement. In the following section we address the Rastafari and disciplinary practice as it relates to social movements.

II

THE RASTAFARI: A GROUNDED UTOPIAN MOVMENT

Jamaica's Rastafari emerged in the early 1930s out of clusters of small groups led by charismatic individuals. They were seeking to make sense out of the crowning of Ras Tafari as Emperor of Ethiopia. Their movement "tendencies" are unmistakable at some points in time, invisible at others. Thus, they appear fragmented, dispersed, and perhaps even as weak. Their ideology and discourses exhibit continuities with previous movements from the late 19th and early 20th century in Jamaica (e.g., the Alexander Bedward and Marcus Garvey movements) in their focus on race and redemption; hence identity, morality and the supernatural are central themes. They are deeply influenced by what has been referred to as a Black moral economy (Price 2001: 87-94), a localized and racialized conception of what constitutes the good and just in relationships and ways of life.

The Rastafari imagine a world free of oppression and oppressors, and treat the past, especially slavery and racial injustice, as central to understanding the present and creating a more satisfying future. They express no desire to rule any state or to gain representation in parliament. Their numbership, through the 1970s, has consisted

primarily of the poor, yet they have not sought class-based solutions to what they see as problems. A moral vision animates them: freedom from oppression and symbolic and literal pursuit of liberation, dignity, justice. The tools of government are not viewed by them as the way to change society or their circumstances. Ritual gathering focused on extinguishing evil, deep introspection and contemplation, spiritual discipline discourses of communalism, and rejection of status quo trappings are primary tactics, not membership drives, fund raisers or analysis of political opportunities. Key resources involved are not buildings, elites, institutions and volunteers, but cultural resources and ideologies around which movement commitment is built. Direct action is a part of the Rastafari repertoire, though mobilization is more often than not spontaneous instead of planned. Power, authority, and control are dispersed; there is no central command, no "official" position, no single leader. The Rastafari want their own state (their new society), but none that currently exist, including the Ethiopian nation state that they cherish. The Rastafari state will be a "theocratic government" guided by a constitution based on divine principles – a moral state. Though many Rastafari eschew politics, their practices make them political and reactions to them, are one way in which they are politicized. Like so many grounded utopian movements, the Rastafari have tremendously influenced the sociocultural milieu around them. Indeed it is difficult to imagine that any movement strategy could have as deep and lasting an impact on Jamaica as what the Rastafari have done in the course of pursuing their own agenda.

GROUNDED UTOPIAN MOVEMENTS AND MARGINAL PLACES, PARADIGMS, METHODS AND THEORY

A disciplinary division of labor (Edelman 2001) and affiliated paradigmatic and theoretical lenses explain partially why some movements get more attention than others, why some movement practices are naturalized and exalted, while others are disparaged and problematized. This imbalance in assessing movements in their diversity through time and across space hints at a persistent ethnocentrism in terms of how researchers conceive of institutions and civil society in Eurocentric terms.

The division of labor within social movements studies deserves attention since it implies that different research practices and modes of theory construction are at work, and engagement of these differences and what we draw from them may further enrich social movement research and theory. Grounded utopian movements have especially been the focus of anthropologists (e.g., Wallace 1956a, 1970), although sociologists, historians and others studied these movements through the 1970s (e.g., Brian Wilson (1973); Norman Cohn (1970); Vittorio Lanternari (1963); and Peter Worsley 1968). By the 1970s, sociological attention became more focused, at least theoretically, on the nation state as container of social movement activity, and more rationalist and structuralist modes of analysis. Contemporary social movements theory does not show any recognizable influence resulting from the work of scholars of grounded utopian social movements.

In this section we focus especially on the anthropology of grounded utopian movements. Anthropologists, by not rejecting the social movement practices in the

peripheries as irrational and illegitimate, by focusing on “exotic” others, by not privileging “scientific” research methods, by engaging their and others’ subjectivities, anthropologists may have “othered” themselves in the academy and in social movement studies. In the process they must take some responsibility for marginalizing the movements they have studied.

Anthropology’s primary engagement with movements did not begin with efforts to understand collective behavior, crowds, and fads in urban, industrialized nation states. Anthropological engagement with movements grew out of efforts to understand resistance, reaction and rebellion in areas peripheral to or appendages of capitalist development and industrial nation states (though such areas might be important in terms of supplying natural resources and human labour). Although the movements may not have been focused on governmental and market institutions, governments were often interested in them (as being potentially disruptive) and sometimes sought anthropological insight into the matters.

Generally speaking, anthropologists were likely to be studying rural and submerged movements operating within colonies and peripheries, consisting of people who had been conquered or colonized. Many of the movements studied by anthropologists can be described as expressing some combination of prophecy and eschatology (Nicholas 1973). These movements were often focused on resuscitating or maintaining their lifeways and autonomy. These movements were definitely expressive and defensive. However, in terms of their own logic, they were also instrumental and proactive. Social movement theory has privileged the proactive and instrumental movement focused on changing politico-economic institutions (Foweraker 1995),

consigning others to the bin of neglect. This is ethnocentric to the extent thatI it does not recognize people seeking to change non-Wesphalian institutions that presumably are "mired" in culture, and it does not acknowledge indigenous associations organized around kin, religion, cultural practices, and the supernatural as legitimate versions of what constitutes civil society.

Some of the kinds of movements anthropologists have in the past studied may be construed as relics in relation to analytic preoccupations with proactive and instrumental movements focused on changing governmental institutions. There is the assumption that somewhere in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century, a transition occurred where movements shifted from "communal and reactive struggles to national and proactive" struggles (Foweraker 1995:14). The latter are privileged though we know the former continue to exist in myriad forms. An unsurfaced corollary of this assumption is that "archaic" movements have disappeared, or are unimportant.

In the academic division of social movements studies anthropologists have spent much time studying grounded utopian social movements, using research methods and strategies that characterize their discipline.

Emic Perspective: Methods and Theory

Anthropological research practices involve "being there," experiencing or intervening into the phenomena being studied through participant observation and extended field research projects. The anthropological ideal is to understand how people organize their social and cognitive world, in their own terms, and to not conflate

anthropological categories with those that the "other" uses to make sense of her world. This is the emic perspective. Anthropologists have taken seriously protestors' beliefs, which is what Kurzman suggests for contemporary social movement theorizing (2004: 115). Anthropologists, by focusing on culture, often imagined comprehensively ("...that complex whole that includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals....") and as situated in places, exerted less effort than other social science disciplines in peeling apart movement politics, identity, and strategy from other concerns such as kinship and beliefs about the supernatural. The "irrational" and supernatural were treated as legitimate practices, at least as recognized from the position of the movements:

> There are some...cultural systems that define politics in a seemingly odd way or do not include a political domain even though we can find forms of action in the corresponding societies that strongly resemble what we, from our peculiar cultural perspective, call 'politics' (Nicholas 1973:65)

Anthropological research practices involve problem formulation in ways different from other disciplines (acknowledging that sociology has a longstanding qualitative research tradition). The emic perspective, ethnography, analytic induction, a focus on lived experience, and finding the research problem in the field as well as in the literature, create a situation whereby a research problem cannot not be unalterably defined. Nicholas noted more than 30 years ago that movements that anthropologists study were a bundle of contradictions: "unstable"; "evanescent"; and potentially "disruptive" (1973:64). An anthropologist may enter the field seeking to explore a particular problem, but find that he or she has to change or elaborate the original conception based on what people are doing and saying. This need to be flexible and open ended contests the view

that research is a linear process that follows a sequence of well defined research practices from reviewing the literature to writing up the results at the "end" of the research. Methodological purists may acknowledge the need to reformulate hypotheses and research questions behind the scenes, although their canon argues differently (one might invalidate one's findings if the sequence is violated). Anthropologists, in contemporary terms, were often encountering emergent processes, studying movements while they happen. We are not suggesting that anthropological research and analysis does not have shortcomings, or that no anthropologists held to rigid conceptions of research practice. We do suggest that anthropological approaches to studying movements do not easily fit with perspectives that emphasize rationality, objectivity, control measures, analytic distinctions between economy, politics and religion, and grand narratives, which has been the case for much of post 1970s social movements theory. However, the constructionist turn in social movement studies offers the possibility of rapproachment between anthropology, grounded utopian movements and social movements studies.

When Secularity, Rationality and the Nation State Do Not Frame Movement Practice

Social movements study has been embedded in a discourse framed by secularity, rationality, modernity, and the modern nation. Sociology and political science, in particular, address the secular, modern nation-state. Both disciplines emphasize roles, structure, institutions and power in ways not always applicable to people whose social organization predates the nationstate or who are not organized in relation to the nation-state. Imagine, for instance, an analysis of movements that occur in contexts where they

have no king or state; or, where people have no authority to coerce each other? Grounded utopian movements are often only tangentially concerned with the nation-state. For instance, for most of their existence, the Rastafari were concerned with the nation state and market institutions only to the extent that they could avoid being ensnared in the tentacles of both. Many Rastafari wanted to leave Jamaica and repatriate to Ethiopia (and begin building the new order that they believe could not be built in the West). Moreover, coercion is treated as problematic by the Rastafari since there is a widely held belief that people really should have no power over each other.

From the perspective of contemporary social movement theory, most of the movements studied by anthropologists were no threat to capitalism or the state. However, locally they were often perceived as being very dangerous, especially in disrupting status quos favorable to elites and exploitative relations. The British were acutely aware of this, for example, and were clever at disrupting or exterminating such movements as quickly as possible. Official records show that British agents were "spying" on Rastafari meetings in Jamaica within three years of their emergence. Though not worried about the racial "lunatics," the British kept close tabs on them knowing that if left unchecked, they could disrupt the order of social inequality, as the Alexander Bedward movement had taught them a decade earlier. Sociologists and political scientists (and historians), on the other hand, pay much attention to movements that directly challenge states and markets. Labor, civil rights, revolutionary, antiwar, welfare, women's, Black Power and other movements were focused on the state, government and markets: smashing them, democratizing them, reforming them, nationalizing them, socializing them, depending on the movement and the point in time being investigated.

Grounded utopian movements commonly are internally or temporally oriented (looking to the past and/or future through their particular cultural lenses), rather than focusing directly on the structure and institutions of government and market, though the issues addressed by these movements may have been related to them. Thus, it is unsurprising that these movements are socially, politically, and geographically peripheral to market and government rationalities. These movements of the periphery rarely play according to the rules of mainstream western sociological and political theory; they often are amorphous, decentralized, ephemeral, segmented, and culturally embedded, to list a few characteristics. Anthony Wallace's (1956a) analysis of such movements identified commonalities in the diverse movements which emphasized people's efforts to create a more satisfying culture or society, and transformations in personal and group worldviews attendant to these efforts. Wallace's approach did not require marking movements as one kind or another (e.g., religious, political, revolutionary) due to the overriding commonality. Wallace's definition can be read as being inclusive of contemporary movements since all or nearly all movements, even the ones we do not like, are working in some way that relates to creating a more satisfying lifeworld.

Movements that challenge views from windows framed by secularity, rationality, modernity, were given labels that disparaged them as movements. They were cultists, millenarians, messianic, and revitalizers of culture (perhaps neglect may partially be related to the labels and the theories that inform them). Anthropologists are deeply implicated in this labeling, and hence marginalization of some movement expressions and practices. One of the earliest recorded studies of the Rastafari (Simpson 1955), for example, categorized them as a cult, a label that was hard to shake well into the 1980s.

They were later variously defined as a millenarian, messianic, and even as a visionary movement (e.g., de Albuquerque 1977 and Yawney 1978). But these discourses allowed for them to be left out of other movement discourses, discourses that focused on changing state policies and structures, that sought representation in parliaments, governments, and occupational sectors. Yet, the Rastafari did end up influencing the Jamaican state, even though this was not their goal. Such unintended outcomes have many cross-cultural parallels among the “neglected” movements. They provoke change and transformation in spheres outside of their own, without consciously intending to do so. As we can imagine, such results deeply challenge how we think of “opportunity” and political process in relation to movements (e.g., Kurzman 2004).

Even though the kinds of grounded utopian movements anthropologists have studied have been neglected by contemporary social movement studies, there is no doubt much that the post 1970s analytic approaches can offer our understanding of grounded utopian social movements. New social movements theory for example, failed to recognize the many long extant identity-focused movements such as the Rastafari, Maya, or Ghost Dance. To look at these movements anew in terms of identity might offer rich insights. Similarly, Resource mobilization and political process theory might provide interesting lessons about mobilization among marginalized and less powerful movements. Fox-Piven and Cloward (1979) made an observation that we believe has contemporary parallels:

> Insofar as contemporary movements in industrial societies do not take the forms predicted by an analysis of nineteenth century capitalism, the left has not tried to understand these movements, but rather has tended simply to disapprove of them.

The wrong people have mobilized, for they are not truly the industrial proletariat. Or they have mobilized around the wrong organizational and political strategies. *The movements of the people disappoint the doctrine, and so the movements are dismissed*" (1979:x-xi, italics added).

We could replace Fox Piven and Cloward's "the left" with dominant social movements theory insofar as grounded utopian movements are the wrong people mobilizing around the wrong strategies using the wrong tactics. However, the more recent sociological turns that draw upon narrative, biography and culture in the study of social movements show some common ground with established anthropological approaches to studying movements, and offer exciting possibilities for cross-fertilization, especially in terms of cross-cultural understandings.

Study of social movements, though embedded in particular places, has been imagined in cross cultural terms by anthropologists, as widely recognizable expressions of human behavior that speak to a general class of collective behaviors. Some anthropologists, like Hallowell, argued that that the study of grounded utopian movements, especially those focused on attaining a new dynamic equilibrium (e.g,. after conquest, disasters, disease) and cultural reclamation, could provide insight into the addressing problems of modern western societies, such as the damage wrought by the Nazi movement in Germany, and the challenge it posed to democratic societies and their values (1943: 240).

Although anthropology and the movements it has addressed have played a marginal role in social movement studies, this may be changing. Since the 1990s there are emergent anthropological orientation toward speaking directly to the dominant social

movement schools of thought (e.g., Escobar and Alvarez 1992; Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar 1998; Nash 2005), though we believe the lessons we enumerate below have yet to be articulated in what anthropologists bring to social movement studies *prope*r.

The Maya movement provides still another perspective on grounded utopian movements. After discussing the Maya we address issues of structure and orientation in terms of grounded utopian movements with the intent of emphasizing how these movements challenge contemporary social movements theory.

TWO VISIONS OF THE MAYA MOVEMENT

According to popular academic perspectives, Guatemala's "Maya Movement" Guatemala emerged in the 1980s, when schooled Mayas stepped outside the left-right political struggles that had dominated that country during its civil war to form organizations promoting cultural activism and revitalization. The Maya Movement of the last few decades has received much attention from sociologists, political scientists, and anthropologists, who have given special attention to movement organizations and urban activist-intellectuals (c.f. Bastos and Camus 1995, 1996; Gálvez Borrell 1997; Humberto Flores 1998; Warren 1998a, 1998b). It has been portrayed as a new social movement, an identity movement, a civil rights struggle with an ethnic flavor, and (reviving and modernizing theories of Anthony C. Wallace [1956a, 1959], a "revitalization movement."

Yet Mayas themselves often have a different opinion. Ask contemporary Maya activists when the Maya Movement began, and many will answer that it began in 1492. Ask who is the prototypical Maya activist, and a Maya might describe ancestors who

deliberately kept speaking their languages, weaving their own clothes, planting their maize-fields, cooking traditional foods, and praying at sacred sites, in the face of cultural (and biological) shock, colonialism, and continuing political domination. Rhetoric referring to the year of Columbus' arrival in the Americas encourages Mayas to not only value long persistent struggle, but to link Maya activism to myriad resistance struggles by indigenous groups throughout the Americas. Yet more importantly, 1492 symbolically marks the start of prolonged internally-oriented Native struggles to adjust, maintain, and rearticulate Native cultures in response to Europeans and Euramericans.

For many Mayas, cultural activism in Guatemala, Mexico, and the United States since the 1980s (or the Zapatista uprising since the 1990s) is only the "Maya Movement of today": the most recent phase of a centuries-long struggle for autonomy and a deliberate effort to re-articulate Maya culture and conserve the resilience of Maya lifeways (Esquit and Borrell 1998; Raxche 1989; Waqi' Q'anil 1991, 1994, 1997). Mayas' emic understanding of the movement does not fit with dominant scholarly perspectives, not only because of its extremely long-durée, but because of its structure. Like the "articulatory movement" Nancie Oestereich Lurie (1988) believed encompassed the contemporary Native "scene" in North America, the Maya movement is essentially acephalous, even if it has no shortage of activists. While not entirely non-confrontational, Maya activism is in large part inwardly oriented towards maintaining the resilience of Maya culture and community vis-à-vis the larger socio-economic system. By necessity, Maya activism has changed form repeatedly over the years, but it has always featured grassroots networking and a segmentary mobilization structure, characterized by fission and fusion of participant groups. Everyday efforts to secure moral/cultural/spiritual

lifeways are punctuated intermittently by charismatic moral leaders, violent rebellions, and messianism. The long history of how marginalized people adapt to colonial hegemony is not merely the "background" or "framing" of a modern social movement; such a "collective enterprise of survival" (Farris 19XX) is a movement in itself.

ISSUES OF MOVEMENT STRUCTURE, PROCESS, ORIENTATION

Identity, security, lifeways, culture survival

As the Ghost Dance, Rastafari and Mayan Movement suggest, some movements may be neglected in contemporary social movements studies because of their very nature, given the theories, methods, and paradigms that dominate the field. The structure, process, and orientation of grounded utopian movements might lead the state, media, some academics and others, to overlook them. Some social movements --especially those that are small scale, primarily among marginalized populations, or focused internally, rather than vis-à-vis the state and dominant society-- may even seek to avoid classification as movements in order to "pass under the radar" of those who might interfere with them, such as governments or other bureaucratizing institutions. It is an error to suppose that the members of all social movements consider themselves to belong to "social movements," or that that every social movement even has a name. Scholars should consider broadening taking into account a number of factors that cause some movements to be neglected, whether by oversight, strategic neglect, or intentional design. The following observations highlight interconnected structural, processual, and orientational factors that explain some of the challenges that grounded utopian movements pose for post 1970s social movements theory. The observations are related to

the epistemological and state-centric criticisms discussed above.

Some social movements are not oriented around an instrumental rationality (unless we consider their action from their point of view). Movements characterized as expressive and defensive emphasize social and cultural survival. They may give importance to supernatural influences. Charismatic leaders sometimes succeed in succinctly articulating a movement's aims, but these cannot be understood simply in terms of instrumentality; they require an emic understanding -- a Weberian *Verstehen*-- that is ideally gained through close ethnographic study of the lived experience of members of the movements. Once we take an emic perspective, defensiveness may turn out to be proactivity, and expressiveness embedded in instrumentality.

Some social movements seek to restore or create alternative realities. Empire building, colonization, oppression, and segregation can create situations in which movements emerge around reclaiming past heritage and statuses and imagining alternative futures. Too often, these movements have been marginalized and dismissed as archaic cults. Nancie Lurie, in her formulation of "articulatory movements" among Native Americans in North America, notes that *"They have old tried models of community and culture that have stood the test of adversity and have proved flexible and adaptable to the technological complexities that so many people fear will dehumanize us" (*1988: XXX, emphasis added). Anthropologists, to their credit, have had a consistent interest in

such movements, though their work has had relatively little effect in influencing the orientation of the social movement studies.

<u>Some movements are small</u>. While it may seem absurd to assert that small movements attract less attention, it is crucial to recognize that the scale of a movement is not always an indicator of stages in its life-cycle or a measure of its vitality and success. Small size may not mean recent birth, impending death, or lack of strength, especially among groups that are small, relatively marginal to the dominant society, and seeking changes that do not challenge established power structures. Small size can also have advantages; scaling-up often means getting violently suppressed by nation-states that cannot tolerate looming alternative realities within their boundaries. Scholars may only observe many hitherto neglected movements at the moment that they are large enough to arouse the attention of the state. Such a "critical mass" approach may not serve to identify social movements, but rather social movements that run a greater risk of being challenged by the state and others.

<u>Some social movements are acephalous, dispersed, and (to western eyes) even anarchistic</u>. Because some movements do not fit models that emphasize scale, organization and structure, they are left outside of contemporary social movements discourse. As with small scale, there may be some strategic advantage to being loosely structured. More generally, a movement's actual composition, operation, and objectives may not require a leader --or at least not a permanent one-- especially if a movement

seeks cultural change through personal conversion and re-alignment, rather than command from leaders. Charismatic leaders, such as those that characterized "revitalization movements" in Wallace's classic formulation (1956a, 1970) may emerge, but movements do not always require them for leadership, or even as examples.

Some movements have unfamiliar structures (from the perspective of dominant social movements theory). Movements like grounded utopian ones operate in ways that resemble "segmentary mobilization"(i.e., situational fission and fusion) of participant-supporters, in accord with the needs of the moment. Rather than exhibiting the institutional forms familiar to analysts of western politics, segmentary mobilization can allow movements to be both large and small at the same time. While common throughout the world and often described by anthropologists studying small scale societies, segmentary structures are not familiar to analysts of western politics, and perhaps not amenable to analytic strategies focused on order and Eurocentric conceptions of civil society. In many societies power cannot be exercised "over" people as we think of it in the West; thus politics and mobilization take different forms, and may be bundled with cultural rituals and the supernatural. While the segmentary nature of movements may appear to be a weakness, it might add to the survivability of a movement because segments do not require the direction from an overarching leadership and can survive independent of the larger movement. Moreover, segmentary systems may maintain social control not through top-down orders, but from the common interests of allied and structurally proximal segments.

Segmentary structures are not archaic or pre-modern; they antedate and coexist

with modernity and capitalism, even if politically and academically hegemonic groups have been slow to recognize this fact. What some analysts today call "swarming" behavior by alter-/anti-globalization and other activists is similar in many ways to the practice of segmentary mobilization. (Arquilla and Ronfeldt et al. 1996). Modern technologies that contemporary protestors and activists employ to organize collective action have finally brought attention to such structure and networking. According to Nash (2001: 173),

> The fissioning and fusing that took place in [the] indigenous movement during these years of ferment are difficult, if not impossible, to comprehend in the Aristotelian and Cartesian traditions that dominate Western perspectives. In this framework, hierarchy and opposition are the framework for thinking about social mobilization. Continuity and persistence of the same organizations are applauded, and the shifting processual 'coming into being only to become something else' is often considered a sign of failure. The closest we come to appraising the subtle maneuvers of oppressed people who are trying to make a bid for change is through the Marxist dialectical approach that sees contradictions within a structure as the emergent framework of opposition. Even within that framework, it is almost impossible to conceptualize the fluid and often acephalous organization of *campesino* mobilizations. Self-designated names for the resistance groups and settlements, such as 'Abejas' (Bees), 'Hormiga' (Ants), and 'Kiptik ta Lecubtesal' (United by Our Strength), give us clues to the collective base of their organizational practices (Nash 2001: 173).

Long ago Gerlach and Hine (1970: **) recognized virtues in movements that are "…decentralized, segmented, reticulate…." in how these qualities allowed for security, innovation and minimization of failure. Twelve years later McAdam decried such characteristics as a weakness because of a lack of "centralized direction" (1982: 185). We believe that there are strengths and weaknesses in grounded utopian movement characteristics, but we do not privilege centralized organization as a virtue.

<u>Some movements make network part of the objective of the movement itself</u>. Zapatistas, for example, consider the segmentary networking along the traditional model of "bees" and "ants" as an end in itself, noting that such organization gives power to a community. By performing countless minute tasks without detection, a community can accomplish great work --such as the securing their colony/community. However, movements oriented toward networking may not always even focus on networks between human beings; they may be focused on supernatural relations with animals, human beings and other worlds. Anthropologists have been less apt to assume divisions between the social, material, and supernatural.

<u>Some social movements are ephemeral</u>. Grounded utopian movements can be short-lived; they may dissipate only to later emerge again, perhaps in a different place. Their short lives, however, may reflect a structure that defies how officials of a nation-state grasps these movements' operation. For example, Linbaugh and Rediker (1990) have described England's frustrating inability to prevent rebellion and movements among the "lower classes" and slaves from emerging anew in different sites, even with repeated,

brutal state repression. English colonial administrators referred to the situation as "the Many-Headed Hydra," but English strategy might better be described as a deadly game of imperial Whack-a-Mole.

Some movements only visibly coalesce intermittently. Related to the preceding observation, some grounded utopian movements intermittently coalesce, especially during periods of rapid change, making them appear ephemeral or recent in origin. They may exhibit a punctuated equilibrium in that it may be the moments of rapid change, rather than the long periods of stability, that leave the most evidence of their ever having existed . For example, long struggles for autonomy among dominated groups (such as indigenous peoples), may normally consist of virtually invisible and indistinguishable everyday forms of existence: speaking one's own language, eating one's traditional diet, engaging in traditional labor, without afterthought. Such deliberate, but unorganized cultivation of one's culture may only become visible during brief moments of outward confrontation or non-confrontational, internally-directed adaptation that punctuate long periods of stability. It should not be surprising that scholars interested in structure, resources, and social change tend to focus on state-based social movements that seem more tangible, influential, secular, and oriented to the present.

HE GLOBAL SOCIAL JUSTICE MOVEMENT

The global social justice movement provides an example of a contemporary grounded social movement, although this has not been recognized. Like the Ghost Dance, Rastafari and Maya movements, it is animated by moral and religious values grounded in overlapping but not identical visions of an emergent transnational and translocal community – after all its rubric is that "another world is possible." These visions are grounded in histories of the past and past struggles; in specific "good places" that members hold to be central to their identities; and in specific human (and even biotic) communities to which their members belong. That the grounding takes place in these three ways provides a common reference point, despite acknowledged and even celebrated differences among its members: notions of "sustainability," "livelihood," and "dignity" provide elements within a shared discourse. The global social justice movement shows dispersed, decentralized, and acephalous organization which can shift and re-form at multiple scales rapidly. It has decentralized and charismatic leaders (who more often than not, like Subcomandante Marcos of the Zapatistas) refuse to identify themselves as leaders.

The movement has a heterogeneous cross-class membership of religious lay people, activists from the peace, labor, women's and anti-racism movements in the global North and global South, environmentalists, university students, labor union members and organizers, and anti-capitalist anarchists. What may confound many observers and perhaps prevents them from seeing its underlying grounded utopian features are its use of hypermodern electronic technologies such as the internet and cell phones, and recourse to jet travel. However, far from implying subscription to an instrumental rationality that values technology, as does capitalism and modern nation-states, in order to transform the

world, commoditize it and rule over it, members of the global social justice movement employ these technologies to transform themselves – to order, re-order, assemble, re-assemble, their own forms of organization in struggle.

Affinity groups allow members to develop close solidarities among a limited number, typically ten to fifteen people who work together over a long period of time but shift priorities depending on the tactics at hand (Notes from Nowhere 2003). Cell phones and the internet merely assist their integration. Networks link affinity groups, and individuals within and across larger organizations: these networks require cultural work, and here again, the instantaneous communication allowed by cell phones, email and internet, and the frequent travel via air make such cultural work feasible and flexibly carried out. The "swarming" of members into sudden gatherings followed by dispersal and reassembly elsewhere noted for the Zapatistas above (Arquilla and Ronfeldt 1996) has become more generalized for the global social justice movement: groups and allied individuals in the movement form disperse then re-form to organize and create protests, banners, messages, manifestos, Indymedia films, communiqués, marches, sit-downs, etc. (Notes from Nowhere 2003). It thus becomes possible for local groups (affinity groups and local grassroots organizations) to coalesce via networks into larger aggregates to engage in solidarity building and protests focused rapidly and flexibly on specific *local* sites where the rites of neoliberal globalization are performed, e.g., Seattle, Genoa, Davos, and Cancun, at meetings of the WTO, the World Bank, IMF and World Economic Forum. However, the hypermodern technologies in question should not be over-emphasized; they are subordinate to the message, the stories, the narratives that link up individuals, groups, and networks within the movement. Moreover, activists engage in

the daily work of self-fashioning in working with the messages and narratives of solidarity with others – whether in "direct action" mode or in the more quotidian work of organizing while making a living.

Outside observers may also be confounded by the fact that despite its other similarities to the groups we discuss above, unlike these its shifting tactical objectives target states and "multilateral institutions" of many states, although both its organization and objectives seek to transcend individual states. However, members of the movement do not seek incorporation into the contemporary state system or into contemporary capitalism, but instead seek to disrupt or interrupt the incursions of both into the "lifeworld" of the communities to which they belong and with which they identify. This is paradoxical in that the members of the global justice movement have intimate experiences of living with –and living within -- the institutions of capitalist markets and contemporary nation-states, and are quite adept in understanding the modus operandi of these institutions. Yet, like the Ghost Dance, the Rastafari and Maya, they are repelled by their contact with (and prior cooptation by) these institutions. They thus refute theorists such as Hardt and Negri who argue there is "no outside." This theoretical view is, in our opinion, a kind of inverted Fukuyama-esque view of the "end of history" which forgets that values and interests are created in struggle, and are always contingent and not set in advance as the predetermined outcome of the structures of American "Empire" and the generation of a stripped-down "multitude."

Fortunately, what we merely describe from within this essay from afar are, for movement members up close, enacted daily practices of identity reformation created through solidarity with others very different from them, to whom they are allied by

overlapping visions of other, more satisfying ways of life and good places. As Notes from Nowhere (2003) observes, this "movement of movements" shows the major features of complex, emergent, self-descriptive systems – what complexity theorists call "distributed intelligence" leading to "nearest neighbor"-based actions (e.g., with this affinity group linked to another, or networks within networks) that can come together, when necessary, in large assemblies of protest.

Are grounded utopian movements like the global social justice movement (and we could name others, like the environmentalist movement) to be regarded as a recursion during this period of late capitalism to an earlier period, like that of European colonial expansion, or are they to be viewed as an Hegelian transcendence of the secular, expanding, rationalizing social movements oriented to modern capitalism and modern nation-states favored for study in the social movements literature?

To suggest an answer, we return to our contention above that the contemporary period is one of active state recomposition and destabilization – but certainly not the "disappearance" of states. We believe that the processes of "globalization" which the expansion of neoliberal states like the U.S. and of transnational corporations into the lifeworld of peoples everywhere have brought in the trail of their operation, necessarily and ineluctably, new forms of global consciousness, organizations, technologies, learning practices, narratives, and experiences of transnationality to the heterogeneous members of the global social justice movement. Most contemporary states in the global South, for example, have been reconstituted so as to have imposed on them the conditions of "free trade," which also requires the implementation of the new electronic technologies that movement members use for flexible and rapid communication, solidarity creation and

coalition building. Or, to take another example, threats to livelihood created by "free trade" treaties have thrown large numbers of displaced people, like the native peoples of Chiapas, Mexico, into situations where allies must be found if people are going to survive, and with dignity – and they have been found among the disenchanted children of the downwardly mobile (if still very privileged) middle classes of the global North.

This is not to say that there is some necessary convergence toward a happy global cosmopolitanism on which the social justice movement can surf to an early and easy utopia. NAFTA (and the neoliberal conditions previously created by the Salinas government of Mexico in the 1980s (Collier 19xx) not only served to force the transnational alliances made by the Zapatistas in the 1990s, but also dispossessed millions of other rural Mexicans, many of whom have headed to "El Norte" – and to stigmatized experiences of remittance wage labor, to hyper-exploitative working conditions, and to hostile greetings by a zenophobic native U.S. labor force itself undergoing systematic dispossession by corporate capitalism.

The global social justice movement is indeed, a movement "without guarantees," in Stuart Hall's words. But the resilience, endurance, and flexible strength of the global social justice movement as a grounded utopian movement are, we believe, a source of great hope in this particular conjuncture.

CONCLUSION

Drawing on decades of ethnographic and field research into what we call

grounded utopian movements, we made three primary claims in reference to contemporary social movement theory and studies.

First, we challenged the deeply held view that movements should be defined by their relation to the nation state or "authority," whether in opposition or pursuit of recognition, or both. This view privileges reforming governmental and market institutions and movements that grow in size and "power" (i.e., gaining power and influence in relation to mainstream institutions). We point out some problems in assuming a modal state and suggest how what we call utopian grounded movements challenge state-centric movement conceptions. Second, we identified an academic division of movement studies that allocated core, urban and mass movements to sociology (and political science) and the periphery, rural , grounded utopian movements to anthropology (and history and some sociologists). Anthropologists pursued an emic perspective and long term field research, and were less inclined to deem grounded utopian movements of the periphery as irrational, anachronistic or irrelevant. We suggest that these may be reasons that both anthropology and grounded utopian movements have been neglected in social movement studies from the 1970s on. Third, we examined issues of structure and orientation in grounded utopian social movements in terms of features that make them distinctive and those that they share in common with other kinds of movements. The distinctive factors may partially explain why social movements theory has neglected them, and we draw out what we see as the significance of the distinctions and commonalities.

We believe that there are many lessons that can be drawn from analyses of grounded utopian movements that will enrich social movements theory (especially in

cross-cultural perspective) and offer different ways to think about contemporary movements. Movements that focus on social, cultural and physical survival, identity formation, cultural and lifeworld regeneration, that are embedded within social forms different from Eurocentric conceptions of civil society, and that engage the supernatural, are not as different from the movements of mainstream social movements theory study as we might imagine. Acephalous pods that segment and recombine, that are here one moment and there the next, that are ephemeral and culturally embedded in places, could describe the Ghost Dance movement, Guatemalan Maya, Rastafari, and the global justice movements. The he power of charismatic prophet-like leaders and the supernatural and visions of a satisfying collective past which motivate and galvanizegrassroots members of America's powerful religious right cannot be denied, just they cannot be for the Ghost Dance and the Rastafari.

We call for incorporation of cross-cultural lived experience and emic perspectives, gained through ethnographic and historical accounts, into social movement theorizing. We recognize that some sociologists, historians and anthropologists are moving in this direction, and we are inspired by their work and hope they push it further. Perhaps as a result we can better grasp social movement phenomena across time and space, and as a result develop analyses of more significant theoretical and tactical value, and that will help movements themselves more rightly locate their practice and place within all the venerable movements before them that have searched for a more satisfying world. After all, grounded utopian movements have been saying for centuries that a "better world is possible."

REFERENCES
***= not yet cited in text**

*Aberle, David. 1962. "A note on relative deprivation theory as applied to millenarian and other cult movements". Pp. 209-214 in *Millennial Dreams in Action: Essays in Comparative Study*, S. Thrupp, ed. Netherlands: Mouton & Co.

Albuquerque, Klaus de. 1977. *Millenarian Movements and the Politics of Liberation: The Rastafarians of Jamaica.* Dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds. 1998. *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

*Barber, Bernard. 1941. "Acculturation and messianic movements." *American Sociological Review* 6:663- 669.

Bastos, Santiago and Manuela Camus. 1995. *Abriendo Caminos: Las organizaciones mayas desde el Nobel hasta el Acuerdo de derechos indígenas.* Guatemala: FLACSO.

----- . 1996. *Quebrando el Silencio: Organizaciones del pueblo maya y sus demandas, 1986-1992.* Guatemala: FLACSO.

*Burridge, Kenelm. 1969. *New Heaven, New Earth: A Study of Millenarian Activities*. NY: Shocken Books.

Cohn 1970. *The Pursuit of the Millennium*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Edelman, Marc. 2001. "Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30:285-317.

Escobar, Arturo, ed. 1992. *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy, and Democracy*. Boulder, CO. Westview Press.

Esquit, Alberto Choy, and Victor Gálvez Borrell. 1997. *The Maya Movement Today: Issues of Indigenous Culture and Development in Guatemala*. Guatemala: FLACSO.

Farriss, Nancy. 19XX. *Maya Society Under Colonial Rule.* XXX: XXX University Press.

Foweraker, Joe. 1995.*Theorizing Social Movements*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Friedman, Ekholm. 2003.

Gálvez Borrell, Victor, Claudia Dary Fuentes, Edgar Esquit Choy, and Isabel Rodas. 1997. *¿Qué sociedad queremos? : Una Mirada desde el Movimiento y las organizaciones mayas.* Guatemala: FLACSO.

Giddens, Anthony. 19**.

Glick Schiller & Fouron. 2003.

Graeber, David. 2004.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1984.

Hallowell, A. Irving. 1943. "Discussion." *American Anthropologist* 45:240.

Humberto Flores, Alvarado. 1993. *Movimiento Indígena en Guatemala: Diagnostico Expresiones de Unidad.* Guatemala: Instituto de Investigación y Autoformación Política; Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

*Hobbsbawm, Eric. 1963. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Manchester: Manchester University.

Jasper, James. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lanternari, Vittorio. 1963. *The Religions of the Oppressed: A Study of Modern Messianic Cults*. NY: Alfred Knopf.

*Lesser, Alexander. 1978l

*Linton, Ralph. 1943. "Natavistic Movements." *American Anthropologist* 45:230-240

Linbaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. 1990. "The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, and the Atlantic Working Class in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 3(3): 226-252.

Lurie, Nancy Oestereich. 1988[1971]. "The Contemporary American Indian Scene." Pp. 418-480 in *North American Indians in Historical Perspective,* Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Oestereich Lurie, eds. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

*Mair, Lucy. 1958. "The pursuit of the millennium in Melanesia." *British Journal of Sociology* 9:175- 182.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nash, June C. 2001. *Maya Visions: The Quest for Autonomy in an Age of Globalization.* New York: Routledge.

----- 2005. (ed.). *Social Movements: An Anthropological Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kracht 1992.

Kurzman, Charles. 2004. “The Poststructuralist Consensus in Social Movement Theory.” Pp. 111-120 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning and Emotion*, Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littleman Publishers, Inc.

*Poletta, Franscesca. 2002. *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nicholas, 1973. “Social and Political Movements.” *Annual Review in Anthropology* 2:63-84.

Nordstrom 2000

---- 2005

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People’s Movements: How They Succeed and Why They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.

Price, Charles. 2001. No Cross, No Crown: Identity Formation, Nigrescence, and Social Change Among Jamaica=s First and Second Generation Rastafarians. Dissertation. City University of New York Graduate School.

Raxche' (Demetrio Rodríguez Guaján). 1989. *Cultura Maya y Políticas de Desarrollo.* B’okob’, Guatemala: COCADI.

Sampson 2003.

Scott, James. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsitence in Southeast Asia.*

New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Shore 2000.

Simpson, George. 1955. "The Rastafari movement in Jamaica: A study of race and class conflict." *Social Forces* 34(2):67-170**.**

Thompson, E. P. 1971. The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century. *Past & Present: Journal of Historical Studies* 50: 76-136.

Thrupp, Sylvia. 1962. "Millennial Dreams in Action: A Report on the Conference Discussion." . Pp. 11-27 in *Millennial Dreams in Action: Essays in Comparative Study*, S. Thrupp, ed. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Tilley, Charles. 1984.

----- 2001.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.. 1956a. "Revitalization Movements." *American Anthropologist*, 58, 2: 264-281.

Wilson, Bryan. 1973. *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. NY: Harper & Rowe.

Worsley, Peter. 1968. *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "Cargo" Cults in Melanesia*. NY: Shocken Books.

Yawney, Carole D. 1978. *Lions in Babylon: The Rastafarians of Jamaica as a Visionary Movement*. Dissertation. McGill University (Canada).

RED CITATIONS ARE NOT YET USED

--. 1956b. "The Mazeway." *Explorations*, 6.

--. 1956c. "Tornado in Worcester: An Exploratory Study of Individual and Community Behavior in an Extreme Situation." Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science-National Research council, Publication 392, Disaster Study No. 3.

--. 1956d. "Mazeway Resynthesis: A Biocultural Theory of Religious Inspiration. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences,* 18: 626-638.

--. 1978. *Rockdale: The Growth of an American Village in the Early Industrial Revolution.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

--. 1970. *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca.* New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Waqi' Q'anil (Demetrio Cojtí Cuxil). 1991. Configuración del Pensamiento Político del Pueblo Maya. Asociación de Escritores Mayances de Guatemala.

--. 1994. Políticas para la Reivinidacación de Los Mayas de Hoy. Iximuleew/Guatemala: Seminario Permanente de Estudios Mayas.

--. 1997. Ri Maya' Molo pa Iximulew = El Movimiento Maya (En Guatemala). Iximulew/Guatemala: IWGIA.

Warren, Kay B. 1998a. "Indigenous Movements as a Challenge to the Unified Social Movement Paradigm for Guatemala." Pp. 165-195 in *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures,* Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

--. 1998b. Indigenous *Movements and their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wilson, Richard. 1995. Maya *Resurgence in Guatemala: Q'eqchi' Experiences*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press. (REFERENCE HAS NOT YET BEEN USED)

---

[1] We are grateful to Michal Osterweil for providing us with valuable insights into the global social justice movement, and to Erik Reavely for his research assistance in thematic searches of the journal *Mobilization*.

1. Sources used for this description of the Ghost Dance movement are Mooney (1896), 1965; Lesser (1933), 1978; Kracht 1992; and Wallace 1965.

[2] We searched the titles, keywords or descriptors, abstracts and references cited for all articles in

Mobilization over this period.

[3] This contention is of course quite different from the naïve claim that "states" as such are now powerless, "globalization" reigns supreme, etc. (Ohmae 1985; Appadurai 1996). Some states are more powerful than ever (e.g., the U.S.), and others were never as powerful as nationalist theorists imagined (or hoped) they would be (see Weiss 1998).