

## Part I

### Theoretical Perspectives on Revitalization Movements

#### The Study of Revitalization Movements

The scholarly literature addressing the empirical and theoretical study of revitalization movements is voluminous, to say the least. It is understandable that the various social scientific disciplines which emerged during the twentieth century have concerned themselves with these movements, which constitute some of the more unusual expressions of human social behavior. Anthropologists and sociologists have been joined in recent years by historians of religion and others, who have expanded the interdisciplinary scope of this field of study, stimulating even more research.

One measure of the dimensions of this literature is represented by the Project for the Study of New Religious Movements in Primal Societies, a major bibliographic project begun in 1973 at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Harold Turner has coordinated this effort since its inception, reorganizing it in 1981 as the Centre for New Religious Movements. What was originally planned to be a four-volume set has been expanded, with a volume now devoted to each of six major geographic/cultural areas: Black

Africa (Turner 1977), North America (1978), Oceania (1990), Europe and Asia (1991), Latin America, and The Caribbean (both forthcoming). "The religious movements dealt with in this bibliographic series are defined as those which arise in the interaction of a primal society with another society where there is a great disparity of power or sophistication" (1978, vii). The volume on North America (which Turner defines as northern Mexico, the United States, Canada, and Greenland) contains some 1,607 items, including both theoretical and empirical works. The Centre's resources are being updated on a continual basis, and Turner even claims to have information about movements on which there are no known published reports.

With the literature on these movements as extensive as it is, one can readily appreciate why there is also a great deal of diversity in the terminology used to describe them. La Barre (1971, 11), Wallace (1956a, 264), Lanternari (1974, 486-87), and Blumer (1957, 145) together list more than 75 labels that have been applied to these movements in the literature. Some of the more interesting terms are: adjustive movement, prophetism, religious innovation, movement of salvation, revivalism, archaic form of social movement, awakening, cultural renewal, visionary heresy, reform movement, utopian community, independent religious movement, accommodative movement, dissident religious movement, politico-religious sect, movement of mythic

liberation, cooperative movement, ideological movement, and ethical movement.

### Theoretical Approaches

The availability of so many different theoretical perspectives on revitalization movements makes it difficult to determine which ones will be most helpful for the study of any particular movement. Theories developed within anthropology, especially the revitalization movement theory articulated by Anthony Wallace, along with sociological approaches, particularly resource mobilization theory and the identity-oriented paradigm, are the most mature and current theoretical interpretations. But there are other theoretical perspectives that might be employed and that deserve at least brief mention.

Scholars working in the history of religions incorporated the theoretical insights of Wallace and other anthropologists into their more general concern with the development of religion. Vittorio Lanternari (1960) was one of the first to propose a global, comparative approach that relates the diverse nativistic, prophetic, and messianic movements to the revolutionary struggle against colonial oppression. His initial work was criticized on a number of points, not least of which is the presence of a number of ethnographic and historical errors (1965). Other articles by Lanternari (1962, 1974) explored morphological, theoretical, and methodological questions raised by recent

scholarship in a variety of fields. Harold Turner, in addition to the bibliographic work mentioned above, has also made theoretical contributions regarding new religious movements. He suggested that a new field of study be designated under the general rubric of the history of religions (1971), and also pointed out the implications of these movements for the field of Christian missiology (1973a, 1973b).

Sociologists also took up the study of revitalization movements, though in a way that distinguished their work from the sociological study of social movements in Western societies that will be considered below. Bryan Wilson's (1973) monumental study of religious movements of protest presented a comparative analysis similar to Lanternari's, but did so in a way that is much more thoroughly researched. Other sociologists applied quantitative analysis to the Ghost dance phenomenon in order to investigate the circumstances surrounding the rise of revitalization movements. Michael Carroll (1975) was the first to suggest the methodological advantages of this approach and to demonstrate the way quantitative analysis might be used to confirm or to refute certain theoretical assumptions. Russell Thornton (1981, 1986) extended this methodology to the consideration of demographic variables, and suggested that the concept of demographic revitalization actually yields new insights on aspects of movement ideology that

might otherwise be dismissed (i.e., that the Ghost dance teaching of the dead returning to life addressed the need for demographic recovery among depopulated tribes).

Historians may also have something to contribute to the study of revitalization movements. Raymond Fogelson (1984) studied a Cherokee legend about an ancient priesthood called the Ani-Kutani, whose members were massacred in a revolt against their corruption and immorality. Fogelson concluded, on the basis of a handful of fragmentary primary sources, that "what we seem to perceive, however faintly, is recollection of an ancient religious revitalization movement preserved in memory through legend" (258). William McLoughlin (1990) considered a later period in Cherokee history, examining the series of religious movements that occurred during the nineteenth century. Eight distinct cultural crises during this period marked "continual, though sporadic, efforts to reconcile old and new religious perspectives," which suggests that "revitalization need not be associated with a single prophet or doctrine or result from a single watershed" (29). Robert Brightman (1988) surveyed a number of recent works on Indian history and culture that emphasize processes of religious change in Native American societies. Rather than treating religious systems of belief and ritual as static objects, this new approach recognizes the dynamic nature of religious traditions. Because there is "nothing 'non-Indian' in the

event of religious change," religious movements are just one aspect of the "religious experimentation and innovation" that characterized Native American religious traditions even before European contact (240-41).

#### Revitalization Movements and Primitive Religion

While Wallace's revitalization movement theory has proved influential for several other academic disciplines, it has also exerted some degree of influence over the anthropological study of religion. This influence is particularly demonstrated by changes in the ways that anthropologists have approached the subject of "primitive" religion. Growing awareness of the importance of revitalization movements has led to changing conceptions of the scope and nature of primitive religion.

When Robert Lowie (1924) wrote his introduction to primitive religion, he understood the relationship between psychological and historical factors in a way that was characteristic of the period. For decades, scholars such as Edward Tylor, R. R. Marett, and James Frazer had sought to understand the psychological origins of religion and had considered historical processes of change to be peripheral to their endeavor. Lowie concurred: "In the study of comparative religion it is the psychological point of view that requires emphasis; and however important history may be for an elucidation of psychology, its part is ancillary" (v). He did make reference to the Ghost dance and the

Peyote cult as illustrating his contention that psychological and historical factors are interdependent, but he did not attempt to incorporate these and similar movements into his general theory of primitive religion. Paul Radin (1937) surveyed the same ground thirteen years later, though he wanted to break with the psychological tradition as developed by his predecessors. "I have throughout sought to interpret religion in terms of human personalities and not in terms of generalized men and women who are made to serve as a kind of academic cement . . ." (vii). Yet despite his emphasis on religious experience, individual expression, and "social-economic forces," Radin apparently made no use of revitalization movements in the course of his analysis.

In contrast to both Lowie and Radin, Edward Norbeck (1961) recognized, in his survey of primitive religion, that religious movements are an important part of a total religious experience. Writing shortly after Wallace had published a series of articles outlining revitalization movement theory, Norbeck devoted an entire chapter to considering the variety of movements and the theoretical understandings that have developed based on them. He believed that religious movements were an important dimension of primitive religion, and that they "carry significance beyond that of serving merely as subjects of academic interest" (266). Another anthropologist, Weston

La Barre (1970), even went so far as to structure his general theory of religion around the Ghost dance phenomenon. He considered revitalization movements to be "grotesque acculturational cults" and that the study of pathological functioning, as in other scientific fields, yields "insight into normal functioning" (41).

A society's culture is a set of defense mechanisms, both technological and psychological. If technical means fail to protect the people against anxiety and stress, then psychological means must be fabricated to maintain homeostasis. All religions, perhaps, began as crisis cults, the response of society to problems the contemporary culture failed to resolve. . . . Each religion is the Ghost Dance of a traumatized society. (44)

#### Revitalization Movements in Cross-Cultural Perspective

Revitalization movement theory developed out of the comparative study of tribal cultures; it has been inherently cross-cultural in scope since its inception, though many American anthropologists have relied primarily on American Indian cultures, for obvious reasons. It is interesting to note the increasing interest in revitalization movements during the twentieth century, particularly since Wallace's formulation was developed. While the theory continues to be used to interpret movements among various tribal societies, it has also been applied increasingly to movements arising in cultural contexts that have not traditionally been the subject of anthropological study. This situation points out a certain restricted scope in the historical development of anthropological theory, so that the extension of this theory



implies a certain broadening and reinterpretation. In recent years scholars studying movements originating in African American and Judeo-Christian contexts have employed revitalization movement theory, and these two groups are particularly useful for a comparative study of the use of revitalization movement theory. African Americans share with American Indians both a tribal cultural background and a traumatic history of contact with Christianity, while the Judeo-Christian tradition represents (in the Western view) the very antithesis of "primitive" religion and tribal society. A brief, selective review of revitalization movements in American Indian\*, African American, and Judeo-Christian contexts will highlight the range of variation in the phenomena and may shed some light on the way the theory is used cross-culturally.

#### **American Indian Movements**

Though Wallace made use of information on revitalization movements from around the world, his theoretical approach developed primarily through his study of the Seneca prophet Handsome Lake. Wallace (1969) documented the eighteenth-century decline of Iroquois society and showed how Handsome Lake, through a series of visions beginning in 1799, was able to bring about a

\*While this review will limit itself to American Indian movements north of Mexico, the forthcoming Turner bibliography on Latin American movements will demonstrate that these movements have been widespread among Central and South American Indians as well.

renaissance among the Iroquois. The Old Way of Handsome Lake survives today as a vital expression of Iroquois religious life. It revolves around the *Gaiwio*, the Code of Handsome Lake, which is passed on by word of mouth and includes "history and prophecy, commandment and exhortation" (8). A contemporary of Handsome Lake was the Shawnee prophet Tenskwatawa, who, along with his brother Tecumseh, forged an intertribal confederacy opposing U. S. aggression in the Old Northwest. Though Handsome Lake and other Iroquois leaders opposed Tenskwatawa's political agenda, the two prophets experienced similar visions and preached similar doctrines to their followers. David Edmonds (1983) acknowledged that both the conditions facing the Shawnee during this period (25-26) and Tenskwatawa's teachings "fit into a pattern of Native American revitalizations" (200 note 26).

Another nineteenth-century prophet was the Kickapoo leader Kenekuk, who brought unity and stability to his people even as they were forcibly removed from their homes in the Ohio Valley to what is now northeast Kansas. Around 1795 tribal leaders had begun a new strategy of response to white encroachment on their lands, emphasizing accommodation to white society without assimilation to white culture. Kenekuk assumed leadership of this revitalization movement during the 1820s, preaching peaceful efforts to ensure cultural survival. Joseph Herring (1983) employed Wallace's

theory and Fred Voget's typology in describing this movement as an example of "'positive nativism'--an attempt to attain social regeneration through a selective rejection, modification, and synthesis of both traditional and alien cultural components" (134 notes 1, 2).

Though it is often overshadowed by the more famous 1890 Ghost Dance movement begun by Wovoka, the 1870 Ghost Dance movement was an important revitalization movement in its own right. The prophetic vision experienced by a man named Wodziwob initiated the movement among his Paviotso (Walker River Paiute) people during the late 1860s; its central doctrine was a belief in the imminent return of the dead, though there was some variation in the teachings on how this was to be accomplished (Thornton 1986, 3). Beginning in 1870 and continuing for several years, the movement spread to many other tribes in Nevada, California, and Oregon and took a variety of forms including the Earth Lodge Cult, the Bole-Maru, and the Big Head Cult. The classic studies of this movement were completed in the thirties, when some participants were still living (Gayton 1930, Du Bois 1939). Du Bois saw in the 1870 Ghost Dance both the general and the particular; she recognized that it is both "allied with a cultural category of universal if sporadic distribution" and "bound up in its specific aspects with the struggle" of western Indians against European invasion (v). She advocated a multi-disciplinary approach

to anthropological interpretation at a time when the study of acculturation was just emerging.

Joseph Jorgensen (1972) studied the Sun dance religion among the Shoshones and the Utes as a religious movement "born of misery and oppression in the early reservation period" (1). He identified the Sun dance and peyotism as the two principle movements to follow the failed Ghost dance among these tribes. The Sun dance is, employing David Aberle's typology, a redemptive movement, which seeks "total change to the individual" rather than to the society (7). Peyotism and the Native American Church have also been interpreted as a twentieth-century religious movement, taking place in the context of the growth of "pan-Indianism." Hazel Hertzberg (1971) argued that "the peyote faith was the Pan-Indianism of the reservation" (239), and that it was this religious pan-Indianism, rather than reform or fraternal varieties, "which reached the largest number of Indians and from them received the most enduring loyalty" (284).

#### **African American Movements**

The African American experience has been marked by a long history of religious movements concomitant with the liberation struggle, though anthropologists have ignored them almost completely. Turner (1978) relied on this tradition of scholarship when he explicitly excluded African American movements from the North American volume of his

bibliography. Fortunately, sociologists and historians (the traditional interpreters of African American culture) have documented a number of such movements. Roger Bastide (1971) listed a number of slave revolts beginning in the sixteenth century, many of which "were most carefully organized and planned over a long period; and the leaders of such movements tended to be religious figures" (47). He described this type of movement as "cultural resistance." The great urban migration around the turn of the twentieth century was followed by a proliferation of religious movements and sects in urban black communities. Arthur Fauset (1971) surveyed five of the most influential groups during the first three decades of this century, while Randall Burkett (1978) analyzed the Universal Negro Improvement Association of Marcus Garvey as a religious movement. Hans Baer (1984) studied a variety of sectarian churches that emerged during this same period, which together he calls the Black Spiritual Movement. More recently, the Black Power movement has been interpreted as a religious phenomenon in an important article by Vincent Harding (1968).

Despite the historic aversion to African Americans by anthropologists, several scholars have made use of revitalization movement theory in this context. Leonard Barrett (1974) made use of Wallace's concept of the mazeway in trying to understand the process by which African

religious traditions were incorporated into African American life in the Caribbean. "It was African traditional religion, the motivating force of all African peoples, that was first to find expression in their land of bondage" (184).

Africans in bondage to the slaver suffered what we will call [and what Wallace called] mazeway disintegration. Slavery threatened the total African personality. The slave was forbidden his language, his religion, his traditional family life, and in the end his humanity. It is therefore something of a miracle that anything of African religion survived (190).

James Laue (1964) interpreted the Nation of Islam as a revitalization movement at the time when the "Black Muslims" were at the height of their popularity. He found this group "made to order" for analysis along the lines of Wallace's processual structure. African Americans experience individual stress caused by their involvement in a white racist society that attempts to define the parameters of their existence for them. The basic inequalities perpetuated in American society frustrate efforts to obtain the same benefits enjoyed by whites, while the emergence of African nations has heightened nationalistic expectations; in a sense, African Americans experience relative deprivation with respect to both other Americans and other Africans. The Black Muslims promoted the process of cultural/religious revitalization through the teachings of their prophet, Elijah Muhammad (mazeway reformulation); through the leadership of his disciples, Malcolm X and

others (communication); and through the activities of their temples of Islam (organization). Furthermore, the early sixties were a time of doctrinal modification (adaptation), when Black Muslim leaders changed certain teachings in order to develop a wider constituency. Laue viewed the Nation of Islam "as analogous in origin and development to the Peyote cult" (238).\*

Storefront churches have also been viewed as a revitalization movement. Ira Harrison (1966) suggested that storefront churches in the urban ghettos are "deliberate, conscious, organized efforts of migrants to create a more satisfying mode of existence by refurbishing rural religious behavior to an urban environment" (244). Harrison identified the process of migration as the source of individual stress and cultural distortion, though his understanding and interpretation of Wallace's six stages of revitalization is superficial.

#### **Judeo-Christian Movements**

Notwithstanding its historic institutionalization as a Europeanized form of religion, the Christian faith is also characterized by a long history of movements of reform and revolution. Many of these movements have challenged the Eurocentric identity of Western Christianity, as witnessed by certain American Indian and African American movements

\*I am unaware, however, of any study that has interpreted the peyote religion/Native American church in terms of Wallace's processual structure.

mentioned above. Several scholars have identified other episodes in Hebrew and Christian history as examples of revitalization movements.

T. D. Proffitt (1984) argued that Moses and the exodus should be understood as a revitalization movement among oppressed Hebrews whose "cultural integrity" was threatened by Egyptian culture (22-23). The historical record contained in the book of Exodus indicates that a period of individual stress and cultural distortion preceded Moses' encounter with the burning bush, when he received his prophetic revelation from God. A period of revitalization took place during the exodus, in the wilderness, and in Canaan, with the nation of Israel renewed and institutionalized through the new traditions of the Passover, the Law of Sinai, and the building of the tabernacle. Proffitt suggested that the exodus may be the earliest known revitalization movement in history. He also commented that this theoretical approach to religious movements has implications for Christian missions, though he did not address them. Kenneth Tollefson (1987) also recognized this connection and did address it in his study of Nehemiah's efforts to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. The book of Nehemiah is the record of a successful period of cultural revitalization; this "Nehemiah model" provides the theoretical basis for Christian mission envisioned as "an



endeavor in 'community development'" and "'cultural revitalization'" (31).

William McLoughlin (1978) adapted Wallace's formulation in his study of the five great religious awakenings in the history of American Christianity. "American history is . . . best understood as a millenarian movement" (xiv). McLoughlin interpreted the Puritan era, the three "great awakenings," and the current religious revival as each being "a period of fundamental social and intellectual reorientation of the American belief-value system, behavior patterns, and institutional structure" (10). He recognized the limitations of revitalization movement theory resulting from its dependence on tribal societies, and supplemented it with other theoretical approaches. Other Christian social phenomena that have been interpreted as revitalization movements include post-Apostolic (Patristic) traditions (Hann 1988), post-Vatican II developments among Roman Catholics (Ebaugh 1991), and the feminist theology movement (Porterfield 1987).

#### Revitalization Movement Theory

James Mooney's (1896) important work on the Ghost dance is commonly acknowledged to be the first empirical study of a major revitalization movement (La Barre 1971, 4). As a young fieldworker with the Bureau of American Ethnology, Mooney found that his initial investigation into the Ghost dance and its relationship to the "Sioux outbreak"

of 1890 indicated that "there was more in the Ghost dance than had been suspected" (Mooney 1896, 653). After six trips to the West involving twenty-two months of fieldwork, Mooney published what remains a classic in the history of American ethnology.

The importance of Mooney's study, however, goes beyond its value as an early, contemporary report on the Ghost dance phenomenon. Though Anthony F. C. Wallace omitted it when he published an abridged edition of The Ghost Dance Religion, Mooney's study contains an extended discussion of other American Indian religious movements and of "parallel" movements in Jewish, Islamic, and Christian cultures. When he chose to examine "the primitive messiah belief and . . . the teachings of the various Indian prophets . . . together with brief sketches of several Indian wars belonging to the same periods" (654), Mooney was implicitly recognizing the connection between oppression and revitalization. Wallace acknowledged his own indebtedness to Mooney in observing that

Mooney anticipated those later formulations which posit an essential processual similarity in revolutionary religious movements diverse in form and philosophical basis. Furthermore, Mooney regarded such movements as adaptive responses of peoples to intolerable stresses laid upon them by poverty and oppression. In this restricted sense, he was an early proponent of the "cultural deprivation" school of thought, which interests itself in the function of such movements as more or less effective expressions of social dissatisfaction. In these senses, Mooney foreshadows later theorists (Mooney 1965, ix).

### Acculturation

Though Mooney had provided an outline of the empirical and theoretical basis for a more comprehensive study of revitalization, four decades passed before the subject was taken up in any kind of systematic fashion. Nineteenth-century American anthropologists had devoted themselves to the reconstruction of "dead" cultures and "to gathering data for tracing the extent of diffusion of cultural elements in the past" (Spicer 1968, 21). This focus of concern continued into the early twentieth century; ethnology in the tradition of Franz Boas was "an exactly idiographic description of tribal cultures, preferably as 'untouched' as possible, and the 'detrribalized' or 'deculturated' society was not a legitimate subject matter for study" (La Barre 1971, 3). As late as the thirties a Yale dissertation proposal on acculturation was rejected on the grounds that it was "not a subject for anthropology" (3). Nevertheless, the widely-held conception of "primitive" cultures as static objects gradually gave way to a more dynamic understanding of the processes of cultural change. Anthropologists began to recognize that diffusion in the past and acculturation in the present are really just two sides of the same coin. The modern study of revitalization movements grew out of this expanding vision of cultural change.

In 1935 a research committee consisting of Robert Redfield, Melville Herskovits, and Ralph Linton was created

to formulate a systematic approach to research in acculturation. Herskovits (1938) described their attempt "to define and orient the study of culture contact" (v) by developing an "Outline for the Study of Acculturation" (131-36). Their definition of acculturation synthesized previous efforts in a broad but concise statement:

Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups (10).

Linton (1940), meanwhile, presented seven case studies in American Indian acculturation and suggested an outline guide for the collection and reporting of field data.

Both Herskovits and Linton recognized that religious movements are an important product of cultural contact. For Herskovits, their prominence stems from

the striking nature of the revivalistic movements that have arisen among primitive peoples in contact with whites, which has caused them to stand out in bold relief against the background of their respective cultures, and has thus made them ready subjects for research (Herskovits 1938, 75).

Linton also observed that what he termed "nativistic movements" are the most obvious of the phenomena associated with acculturation (Linton 1940, 501). He pointed the way for future study of these movements by suggesting that they originate out of "states of disappointment and of disillusionment with the new order" and that they rely on supernaturalism "in the hope of enlisting supernatural aid to change the current conditions" (517-18).

Bernard Barber (1941) focussed on the relationship between "Acculturation and Messianic Movements" in an important early article. He described the "messianic doctrine" common among American Indian religious movements as fundamentally "a statement of hope" about the future, requiring (1) an immediate return to "the aboriginal mode of life" and (2) the adoption of special ritual innovations. Barber located the "ideological basis" for messianic movements in the widespread North American belief in the future appearance of a culture-hero (663). These movements arise, however, due to situations of cultural and economic disorganization and deprivation; a messiah's function is "to proclaim a *stable order*." Deprivation comes about through the loss of valuable sociocultural items and activities (e.g., the buffalo hunt) as well as through the introduction of harmful influences from white culture (e.g., intoxicating liquor) (664-65). Barber's emphasis on deprivation played an important role in his understanding of movement causality:

Despite the positive correlation of the messianic movement and deprivation, there is no one-to-one relation between these variables. It is here suggested that the messianic movement is *only one of several alternative responses*. In the other direction, the relationship is more determinate; the messianic movement is comprehensible only as a response to widespread deprivation (667).

#### Nativistic Movements

While Barber had considered messianic movements as one possible response to acculturative pressure (deprivation),

Linton (1943) attempted a more systematic analysis of the ethnographic data. His definition of a nativistic movement as "any conscious, organized attempt on the part of a society's members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture" (230) was broader than Barber's. Though Linton's definition seems to contradict his own system of classification at points (e.g., the "perpetuative-rational" response would seem to be common and usually unconscious), he did provide the first working taxonomy while establishing the phenomena as an area of anthropological study (La Barre 1971, 9).

Linton asserted that "nativistic movements concern themselves with particular elements of culture, never with cultures as wholes" (230), and that these elements are selected and given symbolic value on the basis of their distinctiveness and practicability (231). He described movements according to two sets of polar positions-- revivalistic vs. perpetuative, magical vs. rational-- yielding a fourfold typology. Suggesting that these movements "have as a common denominator a situation of inequality between the societies in contact" (234), he went on to describe the relationship between cultures in contact with another dual polarity: dominant vs. dominated, superior vs. inferior. Linton's own explication of these contact situations and the types of nativistic movements they produce may be confused and incomplete, but he at least

recognized that "the troubles [contact situations] usually involve can be traced, with few exceptions, to two factors: exploitation and frustration" (239).

The forties and fifties witnessed a gradual increase in the literature on revitalization movements, and several important articles were published in the April, 1956, issue of the American Anthropologist. While Barber had considered movement causality and Linton had formulated a movement typology, Fred Voget (1956) sought to explain how certain movements function during periods of cultural transition. He extended Linton's definition of nativistic movements by identifying three types of nativism: dynamic, passive, and reformative. Dynamic (Linton's "revivalistic") nativism is an active protest against domination and deprivation that draws freely from traditional beliefs and practices, while passive nativism adopts an apathetic stance toward both traditional and alien cultural resources. Voget argued that American Indians, however, have produced religious movements that "bring a new meaning to life" while also assuming "an attitude of critical appraisal toward the past" (250). In contrast to both dynamic and passive nativism, this reformative nativism is

a relatively conscious attempt on the part of a subordinated group to attain a personal and social reintegration through a selective rejection, modification, and synthesis of both traditional and alien (dominant) cultural components (250).

Gaiwiiio (Handsome Lake), Peyotism, and Shakerism are three examples of this "third way" that eschews both purism and apathy in favor of accommodation. Voget evaluated the elements common to these three reformatory movements and concluded that they are stable and enduring, in contrast to revivalistic movements like the short-lived Ghost dances, because of several factors: they fulfill long-term needs; they provide a basis for a new sense of dignity and self-worth; and they "pave the way for a more secular, pragmatic, and accommodative adjustment" (259).

#### Revitalization Movements

The same issue of the American Anthropologist that Voget's article appeared in also featured Anthony F. C. Wallace's (1956a) highly influential work on "Revitalization Movements." Wallace included in this more general category what others had called "reformatory," "nativistic," "messianic," and "revivalistic"; he believed that "all these phenomena of major cultural-system innovation are characterized by a uniform process" (264). Like many before him, he viewed revitalization as "a special kind of culture change phenomenon," and like Linton he defined such a movement as "a deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture" (265). Though Wallace repeated "the defects of Linton's concept and [added] the overrationalistic" (La Barre 1971, 10), his outline of the processual stages that



revitalization movements go through has assumed a kind of canonical stature.

Wallace relied on two important theoretical sources--Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic dream theory and Max Weber's theory of charismatic leadership--in his interpretation of the process of religious inspiration and organization that characterizes most revitalization movements. His "biocultural" model of group psychology employed an "organismic analogy":

A human society is here regarded as a definite kind of organism, and its culture is conceived as those patterns of learned behavior which certain "parts" of the social organism or system (individual persons and groups of persons) characteristically display (Wallace 1956a, 265).

A society responds to stress (danger) by attempting to preserve its own homeostasis (equilibrium); in order for this to happen it is "functionally necessary for every person in society to maintain a mental image of the society and its culture, . . . in order to act in ways which reduce stress at all levels of the system" (266). Wallace called this mental image the "mazeway."

Religious inspiration of a prophetic individual normally takes place in the context of increasing individual stress and cultural distortion. During this period of "mazeway disintegration," and before "orderly social life and individual comfort" can be resumed, one major intellectual and emotional dilemma needs to be resolved: the problem of identification.

The cultural crisis . . . appears to imply a collapse of cultural identification, with attendant depression and deterioration of behavior; the crisis is resolved by a re-affirmation of identification with some definable cultural system (Wallace 1957, 24).

The prophet's role, then, is to accomplish a "mazeway resynthesis," which Wallace described as a sorting process; in the case of the Seneca reformer Handsome Lake, his "mission in life was to destroy, or modify, objects belonging to the bad system, and to bring into dominance the good system" (Wallace 1956b, 631). While the process of revitalization improves the "health" of a society, it may also heal the prophet; many prophets exhibit dramatic recoveries from illness or disease. Religious inspiration in the context of cultural revitalization is thus a therapeutic, not a pathological, experience. On the basis of this conceptual development, Wallace formulated another definition:

The effort to work a change in mazeway and "real" system together so as to permit more effective stress reduction is the effort at revitalization; and the collaboration of a number of persons in such an effort is called a revitalization movement (Wallace 1956a, 267).

Wallace's methodological approach to understanding revitalization movement process is the principle of event-analysis. "Events or happenings of various types have genotypical structures independent of local cultural differences." These events may be considered as "behavioral units," whose "uniformity is based on generic human attributes, both physical and psychological" (268). The

processual structure that this analytical method reveals seems to fit the religion of Handsome Lake remarkably well. Though Wallace made use of published research documenting several hundred revitalization movements around the world, it seems clear that his extensive study of Handsome Lake played a central role in his theoretical formulations. Nevertheless, his schema\* has remained a useful model of revitalization:

Pre-movement phase

Steady state  
 Period of increased individual stress  
 Period of cultural distortion

Movement phase

Mazeway reformulation (prophetic revelation)  
 Communication  
 Organization  
 Adaptation  
 Cultural transformation

Post-movement phase

Routinization  
 Steady state

Wallace also discussed "four of the many possible" variables that can be considered when trying to classify revitalization movements: choice of identification, choice of secular and religious means, nativism, and success and failure (Wallace 1968, 275-79). His debatable conclusions on these points may serve no other purpose than to reinforce how difficult it is to establish a meaningful classification of revitalization movements.

---

\*This is Wallace's (1968) own slightly modified version of his original (1956a) conceptualization.

Wallace believed that his study of revitalization movements and their causes had implications for the study of religious phenomena in general. "It can be argued that all organized religions are relics of old revitalization movements, surviving in routinized form in stabilized cultures" (268). His provocative book Religion: An Anthropological View (1966) developed a "psychological and cultural approach" to the study of religion and employed his revitalization theory as a central theme. Revitalization movements grow out of the context of struggle, "the dialectic of disorganization and organization," and this dialectic "is what religion is all about" (38). Religious ritual constitutes a form of revitalization because it is concerned with a crisis of identity having both personal and social dimensions. A religious revitalization movement must address both areas of need and thus has two aims: "to provide immediate personal salvation to the presently afflicted and to reorganize the culture in such a manner that a better way of life is brought into being to take the place of the old" (164).

#### Relative Deprivation

David Aberle (1966) developed yet another typology of movements (including, but not limited to, religious ones). He referred to two dimensions of the change that social movements seek--locus of change (individual vs. supra-individual) and amount of change (partial vs. total)--

yielding a fourfold classification. His analysis focussed on two of these types, transformative (supra-individual, total) and redemptive (individual, total), considering both constant characteristics and variable features for each type.

More important than his classification of movements is Aberle's exploration of the experience of relative deprivation that precedes them. He defined relative deprivation, a social and cultural phenomenon, as "a negative discrepancy between legitimate expectation and actuality, or between legitimate expectation and anticipated actuality, or both" (323). Any situation of relative deprivation can be met by one of only a few possible responses: fight, flight, etc. Aberle implied that a religious movement is an unrealistic, even irrational, response: "Where individual solutions fail and no realistic group solution to the deprivation is possible, magical and religious movements are a potentiality" (326).

Nevertheless, he did recognize that understanding the severity and type of deprivation does not "make it possible to predict when, where, and with what ideology a social movement [will] arise" (329). Relative deprivation is only one contributing factor in the genesis of social movements.

A suitable way to conclude this section is to consider Weston La Barre's (1971) bibliographic essay on the history of the study of what he calls crisis cults. He believed

this term is preferable because it is general and does not imply a theoretical prejudgment; "a 'crisis cult' means any group reaction to crisis, chronic or acute, that is cultic" (11). Yet in another context he stated that he

adopted the simple term "crisis cult" both for its brevity and its inclusiveness, intending only to imply the insight of Malinowski that there is no cult without crisis. That is to say, there must be an unresolved problem or crisis, chronic or acute, and unresolved by ordinary secular means, before there is cult response. The term "cult" also implies a distinction from ordinary secular actions or social movements such as war, legal or fiscal reform, economic, technological or other social change (1970, 42)

After surveying empirical studies (by continent) and synoptic surveys (from a variety of disciplines), La Barre engaged in an extensive, critical review of the diverse theories of causality put forth by anthropologists and others. Are crisis cults the result of purely political, military, or economic factors? Are they generated by hopes for the arrival of a messianic culture-hero or by the leadership of a charismatic prophet? Are they the response to acculturative pressure in society or to psychological stress experienced by individuals? La Barre was on target when he observed that "reductionism is rampant in crisis cult studies," and when he concluded that "no particularist explanation can exclusively or exhaustively 'save the data' of any single crisis cult" (26).

Rather than expect all theory to be true, we should recognize that in scientific inquiry all theory need be is useful; hence anthropologists should grasp at

each and every theory that they can find from whatever scientific discipline (26).

The most that one can concede is that, in some cults, certain components seem relatively more salient; in other cults, other components appear to be; but all components are likely, in some degree, to be implicated in any cult (27).

### Social Movement Theory

The study of social movements has played an important role in the historical development of sociological theory. Karl Marx understood revolutionary movements to be rational, inevitable responses to the inequity and disillusionment created by capitalist societies. Max Weber also saw these movements as positive forces for social change, inherent to the social structure.

### Collective Behavior School

In contrast to Marx and Weber, theorists in the collective behavior school have emphasized the cyclical nature of social change and have often viewed social movements as examples of social dysfunction. Park and Burgess (1924) were the first to survey collective behavior, which they defined as "the behavior of individuals under the influence of an impulse that is common and collective, . . . the result of social interaction" (865). They viewed "social unrest" as a product of the radical changes taking place throughout the modern world. The resulting "new and strange political movements . . . represent the groping of men for a new social order" (867).

In modern times religious sects and social movements have had their origin in crowd excitement and spontaneous mass movements (871).

Existing institutions represent social movements that survived the conflict of cultures and the struggle for existence (873).

Herbert Blumer (1957) pointed out that most of the literature on social movements from the first half of this century addressed either of two themes: movement causality or participant personality. This focus on the systemic origin of movements and on the motivation and behavior of their participants reflected the conservative political environment of the period. Neil Smelser (1963) and others followed the lead of Emile Durkheim in formulating what has been called "structural-functionalist analysis."

These theories have in common the basic assumption that sociopolitical systems tend inherently to be orderly, that the disruptive and political turmoil to which movements give rise are due primarily to the discontent generated by societal disequilibrium, and that such instabilities are normally short term or transitory in nature, at least within modern pluralistic societies (Jenkins 1981, 88).

For Smelser, social movements are caused by "structural strain" in the social order; they are made up of irrational actors engaged in "short circuited" thinking. As a group, collective behavior theorists

ignore what seems to be so essential to social movements deliberately seeking change, namely, the intricate play of factors which must be skillfully employed to forge and direct a movement, as well as the fortuitous circumstances that facilitate their use (Blumer 1957, 147).



### Resource Mobilization School

The dramatic increase in social protest activity that occurred during the sixties led to an equally dramatic change in the study of social movements. Sociologists began to frame their analysis with the concerns that are of more immediate interest to movement organizers themselves: formation, mobilization, organization, strategy. What came to be called resource mobilization theory

emphasized the continuities between movement and institutionalized actions, the rationality of movement actors, the strategic problems confronted by movements, and the role of movements as agencies for social change (Jenkins 1983, 528).

Social discontent created by structural strain is only one of several factors responsible for movement formation and growth. Jo Freeman's (1983) anthology represents scholarship emphasizing the resource mobilization approach.

Freeman argued that the formation of a social movement requires the presence of a cooptable communications network and either a series of crises or an organizing effort to bring people together. She also pointed out that the organizers and the leaders of a movement are often not the same individuals; the roles they play are different, but both are important for movement success (21-27). Others have suggested that "movements form because of long-term changes in group resources, organization, and opportunities for collective action" (Jenkins 1983, 530). While the specific factors contributing to the formation of movements

vary, it seems clear that a "multifactored" approach to analysis is necessary. "Movements are formed through diverse routes depending on the [resources] absent in the premovement situation" (532).

As the name suggests, resource mobilization theory focuses on determining what resources are needed and how movements go about obtaining them. Movements must recruit, maintain, and utilize participants, but they also need financial support, professional expertise, and legitimation by outside authorities (Freeman 1983, 33-34). While the cultivation of group solidarity and commitment is a major concern, mobilization is as much a logistical problem as an ideological one, though there is no clear consensus among scholars as to which logistical concerns are important. "The most significant contribution of resource mobilization theory has been to emphasize the significance of outside contributors and the cooptation of institutional resources by contemporary social movements" (Jenkins 1983, 533). McCarthy and Zald (1977) argued that movements in the sixties and seventies were facilitated by a "conscience constituency" made up of people willing to contribute important resources without receiving direct benefits from the movements they supported.

The organizational structure suitable for a particular social movement depends on its context and its goals. Preference for a centralized, bureaucratic structure or for

a segmentary, informal one is a central point of debate, with each model possessing certain functional advantages over the other. The choice is an important one, because a movement's structure "determines its ability to deal with its environment, to mobilize members, to formulate goals, to focus its energies, and to deal with internal problems." It also "makes a great deal of difference in its success" (Freeman 1983, 118). The success of movement strategy is an important question, the evaluation of which depends on the goals and objectives of a particular movements. Four typical patterns of decline can be identified: success, cooptation, repression, and failure. As Freeman observed, "success is a primary cause of movement decline and is sometimes consciously avoided by movement leaders, who deliberately alter their goals to avoid achieving them" (277).

A few scholars have applied resource mobilization theory to contemporary American Indian social movements, yielding some interesting insights. Deborah LeVeen (1983) studied the Chicago Indian Village, a community-based movement organized in 1970 to address the housing, education, and employment needs of the Chicago Indian community. Theorists generally agree that there are fewer political options available to the poor because of their limited resources, but they disagree as to whether such marginal groups should pursue conventional organizing or

unconventional (and possibly illegal) disruption. In short, should they attempt to change "the system" from the inside or from the outside? LeVeen pointed out that this question is doubly important for American Indians, because

they are not only institutionally marginal, like all poor people, but culturally marginal; that is, they not only lack stable positions within the central institutions of the dominant society, they do not share the values and aspirations of that society (211).

LeVeen concluded that disruption is more effective than conventional organizing for marginal groups; the real question of strategy hinges on choosing between sustained disruption and compromise. The experience of the Chicago Indian Village suggests that

as long as disruption can be neither ignored nor simply repressed--a situation that itself requires careful strategic development--it will produce concessions that bring some benefits to the larger community. Furthermore, while excluded from those material benefits, the participants gain in other ways: in personal self-esteem and political consciousness. For the act of engaging in disruption, of defying rather than accepting one's lot, clearly entails a redefinition of beliefs and expectations about the status of one's community and may for some bring about both a higher sense of political efficacy and a greater familiarity with the political process (229-30).

Joane Nagel (1982) examined the broader context of recent American Indian activism by relating it to the history of U. S. Indian policy. She suggested that American Indian political movements since the sixties have mobilized along three lines: tribal, pan-tribal, and pan-Indian. This "three-tiered" pattern of organization is the result of

both internal and external forces, with resource availability often defined by the U. S. federal government as much as it is by the human and material resources of the Indian community. Because federal Indian policy has vacillated between tribe-oriented and individual-oriented programs, American Indians have had to respond with organizations representing different--and overlapping--constituencies.

This vision of Indian mobilization as a tactical reaction to political policies and rules of access is consistent with the resource mobilization model of social movements. . . . To the extent that resources are politically controlled (as in the case of American Indians), then political policies are enormously powerful in their ability to dictate the rules for resource acquisition. Successful mobilization strategies are those that "fit" the blueprints for access and influence drawn up by the political center (39).

The mere existence of federal policy that is ethnicity-specific thus sets American Indians apart from all other ethnic groups and influences (but does not necessarily determine) the forms that their social movements may take.

#### Identity-Oriented Paradigm

At the same time that resource mobilization theory emerged in the United States as a response to the inadequacies of the collective behavior approach to social movements, a new theoretical framework also developed in Europe, one that Jean Cohen (1985) has called the identity-oriented paradigm. Both resource mobilization and identity-oriented models are concerned with the way social movements

function as normal expressions of collective action and assert that they are composed of rational participants. Identity-oriented theorists, however, are attempting to go beyond the focus on strategic action that characterizes resource mobilization theory. They intend

(a) to look into the processes by which collective actors create the identities and solidarities they defend, (b) to assess the relations between adversaries and the stakes of their conflicts, and (c) to analyze the structural and cultural developments that contribute to such heightened reflexivity (690).

Cohen asserts that the "new social movements" found in "postindustrial" societies are new in some significant ways; he calls them examples of "self-limiting radicalism" (664). Their discontinuity with previous social movement patterns stems from the fact that postindustrial society is itself a "new societal type characterized by new locuses of power, forms of domination, modes of investment, and a 'reflexive' cultural model" (701). Alain Touraine (1978, 1985), the leading theorist of the identity-oriented paradigm, asserts that "the most dynamic representation of social life [today] . . . is the call for identity and community" (Touraine 1985, 769). "New social movements are less sociopolitical and more sociocultural" than movements in the past (780). He proposes a "sociology of action" that is organized around the study of social change, particularly as it is made evident by social movements.

Touraine defines a social movement as "an agent of conflict for the social control of the main cultural patterns" (785). Important to his definition is his contention that the economic and political elite must be analyzed in these same terms, as a social movement, rather than be identified with sociocultural norms. A social movement consists of an interrelation between three components: the actor, its opponent, and the stakes (i.e., "the cultural totality which defines the field of conflict") (760). The "logic of collective interaction" thus concerns not only strategic rationality but also collective identity formation. "Collective actors strive to create a group identity within a general social identity whose interpretation they contest" (Cohen 1985, 694).

The new dimensions of the identity of contemporary actors, and what makes them radically discontinuous with earlier movements, are thus not their action repertoire but the level of reflexivity and the changed locuses and stakes of struggles that correspond to the emergence of a new societal type (702).