

On the Newness of New Social Movements

Ayça Berna Görmez ^{a,b}

Abstract

In this study, new social movements are examined in comparison with old social movements. It has been argued that the novelty of new social movements stems from their responses to newly emerging social and political crises, which have changed the concept of political and the nature of social movements. The central argument is that social movements defend modern values, and there is no difference between old and new social movements regarding the values they support. However, since the new social movements are often compared to the working-class movement, the values they advocate are thought to be different. However, the working-class movement is not the sole movement in the nineteenth century, and it is possible to discuss various social movements. The new social movements emerged as reactions to representative democracy and established institutional politics. As the failures of the representative democracy are recognized, and as the scope of the political expands, new social movements have emerged to provide solutions to new problems. So, their newness is related to our contemporary conception of the political.

Keywords

The New Social Movements
Social Movements
The Concept of the Political
Representative Democracy

About Article

Received: 05.04.2022

Published: 28.03.2023

Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1098724

Yeni Toplumsal Hareketlerin Yeniliği Üzerine

Özel

Bu çalışmada, yeni toplumsal hareketler, geleneksel toplumsal hareketlerle karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmiştir. Yeni toplumsal hareketlerin yeniliğinin, ortaya çıkan yeni toplumsal ve siyasal krizlere verdikleri yanıtlardan kaynaklandığı tartışılmıştır. Bu krizlerin, siyasal kavramının ve toplumsal hareketlerin doğasını değiştirdiği iddia edilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın temel iddiası, toplumsal hareketlerin modern değerleri savunduğu ve değer açısından eski ve yeni toplumsal hareketler arasında farklılık bulunmadığı yönünde olmuştur. Ancak, yeni toplumsal hareketler genelde işçi sınıfı hareketiyle karşılaştırıldığı için savundukları değerlerin farklı oldukları düşünülmektedir. Halbuki işçi sınıfı hareketi on dokuzuncu yüzyıl toplumsal hareketlerinden sadece bir tanesidir ve bu yüzyılda farklı toplumsal hareketlerden bahsetmek mümkündür. Yeni toplumsal hareketler, temsili demokrasiye ve yerleşik kurumsal siyasete tepki niteliği taşımaktadır. Temsili demokrasinin başarısız olduğu alanların belirgin hale gelmesi ve siyasetin anlamının ve kapsamının genişlemesi, ortaya çıkan yeni sorunlara farklı perspektiflerden yaklaşmayı ve çözüm getirmeyi gerektirmiştir. Sonuç olarak, yeni toplumsal hareketlerin yeniliğinin aslında siyasalın yeniden düşünülmesiyle ve kavramsallaştırılmasıyla ilgili olduğu iddia edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler
Toplumsal Hareketler
Siyasal Kavramı
Temsili Demokrasi

Makale Hakkında

Geliş Tarihi: 05.04.2022

Yayın Tarihi: 28.03.2023

Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1098724

^a gormezayca@gmail.com.

^b Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, Radyo, Televizyon ve Sinema Bölümü, 0000-0002-5782-580X

Introduction

Political sociology is concerned with politics, power, and the power relations between groups and agencies, and it can be defined as "the study of the interdependent power relationship between the state and the civil society" (Faulks, 2000, p. 11). Before the 1960s, politics and power were identified with the state. Thus, sociological and political analyses have started with the nation-state. The nation-state was perceived as the main actor, the bearer of politics, and the possessor of power. The unit of analysis of political sociology has shifted from the 1960s onwards. This exhibits a paradigm shift from a state-centric approach to power and politics to understanding politics as a potentiality of all social experiences (Nash, 2009, pp. 3-4). The paradigm shift gives rise to dichotomy, which manifests in the concepts, interests, and concerns. Moreover, it manifests itself in the definitions of identity and social structure. This dichotomy can be best comprehended between class-based and state-centric 'old politics' and the 'new politics,' which is fragmented and plural.

With this shift, the state and society started to be analyzed differently and separately. The concept of power and political has become pluralized. The reference to the state and its institutions in analyzing power and political is perceived as deficient. The paradigm shift also affects social movement studies. Before the 1960s, social movements were identified with the labor movements and later with the working-class movement. There was also an emphasis on the national movements; they were also recognized as part of the social movements. However, after the 1960s, the concept of social movement has evolved, more accurately, the new social movement started to take its place in the political sociology literature. The student movements of the 1960s, ecology and feminist movements are designated as parts of broader movements, namely the NSMs. These new social movements, it is claimed, do not belong to the 'old politics.' Instead, they are confined within the cultural realm and perceived as part of cultural politics.

In this study, the dichotomy between old and new social movements is analyzed. First, general characteristics of the new social movements are given. Then, a comparison is made between old and new social movements regarding the values they share or draw apart. It is argued that the newness of the new social movements derives from their responses to the newly emerging social and political crises. The study claims that NSMs are political and they belong to the political sphere. The old and new social movements shared the same values, modern values. However, as the crises of modernity and modern institutions have gained visibility, new social movements have emerged to offer a new project or a new hope. Social movements, in general, are the product of the transition periods, and the society that NSMs are longing for or will build may be different from the old social movements' establishment. However, in essence, the purpose of the old and new social movements is to produce a democratic society. As Eder points out, "NSMs are new only because they bear new hope for the collective realization of the predicaments of modernity" (1993, p. 108). The newness of the NSMs can be found in the solutions to the newly emerging crisis of modernity rather than the values they defend.

The Characteristics of the NSMs

Before giving common features of the NSMs, it should be stressed that NSMs are not homogenous. There are pluralities of movements, and NSMs are often entitled 'Movement of Movements' (Klein, 2001). At the same time, it is misleading to propose a single structural

change that resulted in the emergence of NSMs. Scott points out, "NSMs are not a unified sociological phenomenon which can be explained with reference to a single set of social structural changes" (1990, p. 7). Instead, there are chains of changes and diversity in the NSMs. Nevertheless, some characteristics and values are common to the NSMs.

The most salient and discussed feature of the NSMs is their non-class character and lack of ideological commitment. It is argued that old social movements were working-class movements, NSMs lack class character. NSMs base is composed of the middle class and "decommodified peripheral groups and elements of the old, often rural middle class" (Offe, 1985, p. 854). NSM theorists, in general, claim that the middle class is expanding, and its expansion is rooted in the transition to the post-industrial economy (Touraine, 1985) or disorganized capitalism (Lash and Urry, 1987). As the middle class expanded, it is argued that the working class lost its political influence. Now, the middle class is the leading political and cultural actor in social movements. The middle class is educated (Scott, 1990, p. 138), works in the service sector, and is born in a post-modernist culture (Lash and Urry, 1987, p. 15). Moreover, the middle class is not unified; they do not have shared economic interests. As it is composed of different segments, it is claimed that NSMs lack class emphasis and do not have an ideological commitment.

The emphasis on autonomy and identity is another feature that makes NSMs distinctive. The growing emphasis on the autonomy of individuals and identity politics is generally perceived as the result of the cultural turn in the studies of social movements. Individuals' autonomy is the control of the individuals in their everyday life. It is expressed through the rejection of institutionalized and bureaucratic politics and in non-alignment with party politics. NSMs explicitly reject the state "as a tool that can be utilized to create social justice and ensure democratic accountability" (Faulks, 2000, p. 88). And identity politics is the celebration of the plurality of identities within society. It is against the homogeneity of the culture and society and against what nation-state ideologues stood for. The recognition of the different sources of identities is central to identity politics. Race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity can be identified as the sources of varying identity politics. These sources do not have to be mutually exclusive, and also, these sources do not have to refer to any specific orientation. Identity politics, in general, try to reveal that some groups are oppressed because of their identity and deprived of civic and political freedom. By acknowledging that identities are plural and fragmented, identity politics demand equal rights and freedom for minority groups. It offers "recognition for new identities and lifestyles" (Polletta & Jasper, 2001, p. 286). In other words, recognition of new and different identities and lifestyles is part of the "fight to expand freedom" (Cerulo, 1977, p. 393), and expansion of freedom means a more substantial and inclusive democracy.

The non-representational and non-hierarchical characters of NSMs are also among the shared features (Sitrin and Azzellini, 2014, p. 17). These movements are the products of the crisis of modernity. Representative democracy is also a product of modernity, and the NSMs are against representative democracy. In that sense, they are against what representative democracy signifies, representation and hierarchy. Representation is considered, not only for the new social movements but also for contemporary political theory in general, an unreliable mechanism for democracy (Hardt and Negri, 2012). Representation relies on consensus, which

defines the parts of the society that can be seen and represented (Ranciere, 1999). There is always a missing part that is not represented. Thus, representative democracy is considered unreliable and inefficient since it cannot represent the whole society. Hierarchy is also one of the essential characteristics of old politics, and NSMs criticize hierarchy within the state, its bureaucracy, and its institutions. The rejection of representative democracy and hierarchy leads to the formation of a loose organizational structure in the NSMs. This flexible organization makes NSMs different from the 'old politics.' Within this loose organization, leadership does not occur or cannot be formalized. Demands are multiple and plural, and there is no hierarchy among the demands. The togetherness of the movement "depends on ad hoc deliberation and protest, not on a fulfilling a program built around specific goals" (Castells, 2015, p. 255). The NSMs are "rarely programmatic movement" (Castells, 2015, p. 255), so they reject the politics of total emancipation. These movements produce micro-movements and issue-based movements. As Castells rightly points out, "they are social movements, *aimed at changing the values of society*" (2015, p. 255) [emphasis in original].

Another feature of the NSMs is their non-violent character. The use of violence in social movements is common, and working-class movements appealed to violence frequently. All sorts of direct action contained a degree of violence. Hobsbawm argues, "the power of these early movements...lay in machine-wreaking, rioting and the destruction of property in general or in modern times, sabotage and direct action" (Hobsbawm, 1998, p. 6). As NSMs consider themselves distinct from the old social movement and unwilling to seize the state, they do not see violence as a legitimate tool for their concerns. Violence is the embodiment of what NSMs are opposed.

The last feature that defines new social movements is their cultural and social character. It is suggested that NSMs are cultural and they do not belong to the political sphere. Mellucci, for instance, argues that the form of collective action has shifted from political to cultural (1985, p. 789). Touraine also stresses that the movements of our time expand into social and cultural life and are boundless. He claims "NSMs are less sociopolitical and more sociocultural" (1985, p. 780). The cultural ground of the NSMs is emphasized in contrast to the political basis of the working-class movements. It is argued NSMs, in a sense, are against political institutions and organizations. These movements do not have political agenda as the working-class movements do; they do not want to seize the state's power. Nonetheless, they may affect the political institutions, "they modernize institutions, and they furnish them new elites who renew culture and organization" (Melucci, 1985, p. 810). The sphere of action of the NSMs is a "space of non-institutional politics which is not provided for in the doctrines and practices of liberal democracy and the welfare state" (Offe, 1985, p. 826).

Many NSM theorists underline the apolitical or cultural character of NSMs. At the same time, it is argued that NSMs politicize issues that were not political before. For instance, Melucci argues that NSMs open up a new political space (1985: 815), and Calhoun states, "NSMs are distinctive in politicizing everyday life rather than focusing on the large scale systems of state and economy" (1993, p. 398). Offe (1985) and Scott (1990) also highlight this feature of the NSMs. NSMs modify the public/private distinction. They either transform what is considered private to public or create an alternative, third category to the public/private distinction, as Offe asserts (1985, p. 826). NSMs are democratic or aim to establish a democratic society.

However, their understanding of democracy differs from the democratic institutions established with the formation of nation-states. These democratic institutions have created a limited public sphere. Within this limited public sphere, the roles and rules are pre-determined. Political participation or access to the public sphere is essentially fixed and hierarchic. NSMs are opposed to this establishment, and this will be discussed in detail in the last section. To conclude this section, NSM theorists often highlight their differences from the Old Social Movements. The strategies and techniques differ in these movements, but in the end, their main concern is democracy; to enhance democratic politics and make it more inclusive, to spread rights and freedoms. Instead of differences, the focus will be on the social movements' common values in the next section

Shared Values of Old and New Social Movements

In this section, the shared values of the old and new social movements will be given. However, the purpose here is not to underestimate the value of one of them or state that nothing is new in the new social movements. Instead, it argues that it is not the values that make NSMs new but "an awareness of the disaggregation and partial incompatibility within the universe of values" (Offe, 1985, p. 850). The new social movements do not entirely reject the values of old social movements; instead, they selectively radicalize some values (Offe, 1985, p. 853). Lack of class emphasis and ideological commitment, the cultural ground, the emphasis on autonomy, identity, non-representational and non-hierarchical character, and the stress on non-violence are considered essential features of the NSMs. It will be argued that although NSMs are generally differentiated from the old, traditional social movements through the values they defend and the structures and organizations they form, the 'old social movement' that the comparison is made is the working-class movement. Comparing NSMs to working-class movements may have resulted in the lack of proper analysis of the power and newness of the new social movements. The equation of the working-class movement and the traditional social movement is an argument and a presumption that NSM theorists are taken into account. This presumption has two implications: to treat the working-class movement as a single and unified movement from the beginning of its emergence and to neglect the presence of other social movements in the nineteenth century.

The non-class character of the NSMs is first discussed as the most prominent feature attributed to the NSMs. Old social movements are considered class-based movements, whereas NSMs are not. The presumption that the old social movements or traditional movements are class-based is based on one single premise: that is, old social movements are the working-class movement. However, in reality, the old social movements cannot only be reduced to the working-class movement. The making of the working class was not a sudden event, and the emergence of its movement as a single, coherent movement called the 'working-class movement' took some time. So in this study, it is claimed that there were separate labor movements until the working-class movements emerged. Therefore, it is misleading to categorize these movements as a single and unified movement under the umbrella of the working-class movement. Moreover, laborers were not the only ones with grievances, concerns, and demands. Other movements emerged or existed in the nineteenth century. The presence of other social movements and their purposes and values also demonstrate that old social movements and the NSMs cannot easily be differentiated based on their class basis,

ideological commitment, and values. There is something more needed to recognize the newness of the NSMs.

It is important to note that in the early nineteenth century, the labor movement was a new social movement (Calhoun, 1993, p. 391). Luddism and Chartism were crucial movements in this century, yet it is hard to argue that they were the only ones. They cannot be interpreted as working-class movements nor represent a coherent, single movement. Hobsbawm argues Luddism is "treated as a single phenomenon for administrative purposes covered several distinct types of machine-breaking, which for the most part existed independently of each other, but before and after" (1998, pp. 6-7). The members of Chartism, too, were a mixture of the industrial working class, artisans, outworkers (Calhoun, 1993, p. 402). Although they seemed to have unified goals, they could not be subsumed under a single category. Hobsbawm claims there were different labor classes that were composed of various sectors, and making the working class was a process. Hobsbawm maintains a lack of continuity between labor movements before and after Chartism (1998, p. 59). After the industrial economy, the conditions transformed; the number of labor classes increased, the occupational composition changed, and laborers began to work in industrial sectors. As Hobsbawm claims, the emergence of the traditional working-class and middle-class dates back to the 1880s. In the 1880s, he argues, the material conditions of the workers were transformed. There was an improvement in the British working class at that time. Then, by segregating the manual workers by their expectations, where they live, and how they live, "a growing sense of a single working-class, bound together in a community of fate irrespective of its internal sense" (1998, p. 69) occurred. However, class consciousness was not yet spread among the workers. After 1914, "large and growing masses of British workers regard voting Labour as an automatic consequence of being worker" (Hobsbawm, 1998, p. 72). Before 1880 traditional working class was absent, and the class-consciousness was not developed. So it might be misleading to interpret the working class as a unified body since its beginning of emergence.

The second implication of the presumption that traditional social movement is the working-class movement is the neglect of the presence of other social movements. Calhoun states early nineteenth century was fertile for the emergence of social movements as in the 1960s (1993, p. 392). It is not to suggest that nineteenth-century social movements are as effective as NSMs. Instead, it is to state that certain conditions that might trigger the emergence of social movements were also present in the nineteenth century. Tilly argues that social movements were observed from the late 18th and throughout the 19th century. (2005). An alliances among aristocrats, the bourgeoisie, and workers emerged and paved the way for creating legal spaces for social movements. Lorenz von Stein first used the term social movement, and the meaning was "the idea of a continuous, unitary process by which the whole working class gained consciousness and power" (Tilly, 2005, p. 5). In the later period, the meaning of the social movements was pluralized, and its scope was extended by including farmers, women, and others (Tilly, 2005, p. 5).

The presence of other social movements will help us identify the values that old social movements share with the NSMs. Women suffragists can demonstrate an example of nineteenth-century social movements. Many women are now entitled to rights, autonomy, and access to the public sphere, and they are equal to men by law in industrialized countries.

However, this was not always the case. A struggle was made to obtain political and civil rights, equality, and freedom. In the nineteenth century, women belonged to the private realm; they had no access to public life. They were defined through their role in the family. The nineteenth-century Suffragists tried to obtain the right to participate in public and access to public life. Dubois argues that Suffragists demanded "a kind of power and a connection with the social order not based on the institution of the family and their subordination within it" (Dubois, 1975, p. 63). They demanded citizenship rights as well as a civic identity, an identity that was not based on their role in the family. Through participation in the public sphere, they have dreamed of acquiring the possibility to alter the patriarchal order. However, Suffragists constituted a minority in the nineteenth-century movements.

The prominent women's movement in the nineteenth century was The Women's Christian Temperance Union. As opposed to the suffragists, WCTU focused on women's position within the private sphere and positioned women in the private realm. This movement also demanded female enfranchisement. However, they legitimized this demand based on women's role in the family. WCTU was a mass movement, and Dubois claims that the WCTU's insistence on female enfranchisement indicates that Suffragists succeeded (Dubois, 1975, p. 69). Even though the two movements organized around different definitions of women and attributed different roles to women, the Suffragists' movement and their demands have affected WCTU. The existence of Suffragists and WCTU also points out the presence of identity politics in the nineteenth century. Suffragists demanded and fought for civic identity. They extended and altered the scope of the fight from the private to the public sphere. They did not choose to struggle for their position within the family. Instead, they believed that another identity, a civic identity, and the right to be a citizen would help them fight against their subordinate identity. WCTU tried to increase women's position in the family and in the private realm. These two movements offer us two different identity politics. The face and the scope of identity politics have now changed and expanded. But these movements can be among the first examples of identity politics.

Abolitionists demonstrate another example of social movements. The abolitionist movement emerged separately throughout Europe and America. The Abolitionist movement in Britain officially appeared in the late eighteenth century against the slave trade. With the Slave Trade Act, the slave trade became illegal, but slavery itself still existed. With the establishment of an Anti-Slavery Society in the mid-nineteenth century, the institution of slavery became the target, and it was abolished. This movement reflected the idea of equality and freedom. According to Calhoun, anti-slavery and abolitionist movements were related to religion, but they did not have a connection with specific religious organizations (1993, p. 392). In that sense, they were autonomous movements. Autonomy is crucial for NSMs, and this autonomy does not refer only to autonomy from party politics but also autonomy from established institutions. Abolitionists were autonomous from established institutions. Also, in the nineteenth century, finding or "joining a common umbrella" for social movements was not an option (Calhoun, 1993, p. 408). Due to the absence of hegemonic movement, each movement has its specific character and a degree of autonomy.

So, it is evident from the above examples that social movements of the nineteenth century were diverse. On the one hand, one can speak of a working-class movement, but this movement

was not unified and not homogenous. It was hard to talk about class consciousness until the end of the nineteenth century. On the other, the working-class movement is not the sole social movement of the nineteenth century. There were other movements that supported freedom, civic rights, and autonomy. This proves that not all the 'traditional' or 'old' social movements were class-based. The non-class character of the new social movements does not make the new social movements that novel. Furthermore, identity politics or autonomy is not specific to the new social movements; a fight against women's subordinate roles and freedom and autonomy has existed in nineteenth-century movements.

This section discussed the shared values of the old social movement and NSMs. It is not to claim that they are identical. It is to argue that they are both modern and defend modern values. Offe points out that "the values advocated and defended by the new social movements are not new but part and parcel of the repertory of dominant modern culture" (Offe, 1985, p. 849). Between traditional social movements and new social movements, what differs is the changing perception of the political. The political takes a new form; the scope of the political and the concept of the public and public sphere began to extend beyond its established borders. These transformations provide us with the new aspects of the NSMs. The old social movements paved the way for a new order; they helped extend citizenship rights, increase working conditions, and spread access to public life. With these transformations, the public, private and political boundaries were drawn. Now, NSMs challenge the established order and seek a new one by redefining some crucial concepts, such as democracy, culture, and politics.

The Newness of New Social Movements

Social movements seek alternatives for the existing social order. They try to constitute a new one in which everyone enjoys rights and freedoms equally. The transition periods and the periods of crisis generate fertile ground for the emergence of social movements. Scott highlights this point regarding the new social movements. For Scott, the crisis that leads to the emergence of the new social movements is "the virtual collapse of single order systems of explanations" (1990, p. 4). Castells emphasizes another but related point. He argues that there is an increase in plurality and diversification of interests in network societies, and nation-states have become incapable of responding to these diversifications and fragmentation. This condition creates a legitimation crisis (1997, p. 271). So the sources of the problem seem explicit at one level. However, this does not explain how and why demands become diversified and fragmented. With the abandonment of the state-centric approach, a new space opened for new demands and the conceptualization of the political. And also, among the plural and fragmented demands, some were recognized and embodied within the public sphere and recognized as political; others were ignored, confined to the private sphere, and deemed apolitical. The difference between old and new social movements derives from the new social movements' power to mobilize new demands, make them recognizable, and be open to discussion in the political arena. New social movements destabilize the established order and challenge "the legitimacy of liberal democratic society" (West, 2004, p. 267). This marks a difference between old and new social movements, and also, this is what makes them political.

As stated above, many NSM theorists perceive these movements as apolitical or cultural. In opposition to this statement, Arrighi, Hopkins, and Wallerstein advocate the political character of the movements (1989, p. 30). For them, these movements "were rooted in the

intensification of the processes of capitalist centralization, and rationalization of economic activities" (1989, p. 77). They argue that capitalism gives rise to anti-systemic movements from the beginning (1989, p. 1). In the period of centralization of capitalism, labor movements emerged. Due to the concentration of capital and capitalist centralization, the class capacities of the proletariat increased. Thus working class increases both in quality and quantity. Due to the working class's power, the institutionalization of the labor movement has been successful (Calhoun, 1993, p. 412). It is why only the working-class movement is considered the old social movement and also why NSMs are, in the first place, interpreted as different from the old social movement. Abolitionists and suffragists also institutionalized their demands; slavery was abolished, and female enfranchisement was gained. However, after this success, they disappeared for a while as a movement. Scott argues, "success is quite compatible with, and indeed overlaps, the disappearance of the movement as a movement" (1990, p. 10). These movements emerged again later with different demands. The working-class movement is different from these movements; it became a hegemonic movement. Thus, it has never disappeared; it has always been a part of the political.

At the beginning of this article, it is stated that a paradigm shift occurred in the 1960s. For Offe this shift results from the modern critique of modernization, and Eder claims it derives from a new prescription for modernization. The nation-state, its solid institutions, the hierarchy within these institutions, and the understanding of democracy have become crucial categories of this critique. The political is equated with bureaucratic apparatus and began to be perceived as inefficient. The critique of representative democracy follows this critique of modernization. Some of the NSMs theorists' insistence on culture rather than politics reflects their perception of the failure of politics in general and representative democracy or representative politics in particular. However, the equation of the political with the nation-state, its institutions, and representative democracy is now considered misrepresentative. It leads to a limited conceptualization of the political. During the nineteenth century, representative democracy gave people limited access to the public sphere and politics. However, it now becomes evident that representative democracy is not sufficient enough and is not a democracy. Representative democracy fails to represent the parts of society.

The emergence of NSMs is an indicator of the failures of representative democracy. The non-representational and non-hierarchical character of the NSM derives from this failure; they seek alternative organizational structure to prevent hierarchy and provide participation. Representation, Ranciere argues, "is not a democracy's way of adapting to modern times;" it is not a democracy at all (2006, p. 298). Representatives do not represent the interests of society, they do not respond to the demands of society, and thus NSMs consider representative democracy as non-operative. For NSM theorists, representative democracy does not contain or 'represent' democratic values anymore. The lack of belief in representative democracy also creates hostility toward the political; the "political" that is perceived as the instrument of the state and its institutions. Thus, it is foreseeable that NSMs regard themselves as cultural rather than political.

However, a narrow conception of political is taken into account in this argument. The political that some NSM theorists are opposed to is the institutionalized politics. For Ranciere, this institutionalized politics is not politics at all but the police order. Police "is an order of the

visible and the sayable that sees that a particular activity is visible and another is not, that this speech is understood as discourse and another as noise" (1999, p. 29). NSMs are against the police order, the established and institutionalized politics, not the concept of the political itself. The political activity includes the expansion of the demos, the increase in the visibility of the people. It is also about the disruption of division and distribution. The political also displaces the limits of public and private, the boundaries of social and political (Ranciere, 2006, p. 303). Democracy is the struggle against the distribution of the public and the private (Ranciere, 2006, p. 299). The primary purpose of the NSM is to expand the demos and visibility of the people, to hear the voices being silenced. NSMs achieve this by destabilizing the public and private distinction, by claiming what is personal is public, and by politicizing everyday life.

For some theorists, everyday life is part of the cultural arena. For instance, Melucci states that in Western societies, "collective action shifts from political to cultural one" and also says that social conflicts move "from economic system to cultural ground: they affect personal identity, the time and the space in everyday life" (1985, pp. 789-795). In this argument, everyday life is positioned within the cultural sphere, not the political sphere. However, the definition of public and private may vary over time, and the distinction between public and private or political and cultural are blurring day by day. Some NSM theorists intend to equate the political with the state, thus categorizing NSMs outside the political sphere. However, political and cultural movements are "alternative forms of social integration" (Eder, 1993, p. 107). The meaning of the social and the ways of integration are changing. Now, it is hard to distinguish the cultural from the political or vice versa. One observation is obvious; the established institutions, the pre-determined boundaries between the political and cultural, are no longer responsive to the demands of society. Thus, there is a need for the re-establishment of society and its institutions. In this regard, NSM theories seek and reveal new ways to promote social integration.

There are various ways of social integration and diverse paths. One of the most recurrent critiques directed at NSMs is their path to social integration. Due to their distrust of established politics and state institutions, NSM theorists generally refuse to be part of institutionalized politics. They challenge the state and its ideology (West, 2004, p. 267). They do not want to "reform the political landscape; rather, they aim to create an alternate reality" (Saeed, 2009, p. 5). Their choice of non-alignment with the existing political parties is criticized, and their actions outside the current political landscape are deemed inefficient or pointless. Actors in new social movements are well aware that all political parties want to seize the state's power. The willingness to seize the state power and make reform or innovation with the institutions of the state belongs to the old politics. And the aim of the NSMs is rather different; they want to promote new ways of life and "invent a new way of living together" (Wieviorka, 2005, p. 6). For this invention, the tools and institutions of old politics are insufficient.

New social movements challenge the existing, pre-determined identities; they attack the political features of institutionalized politics and cultural determinants. They influence people by disseminating "ideas, identities, strategies, personnel, coalitions, networks and experiences" (Saeed, 2009, p. 7). It can be stated that new social movements' success or failure cannot be judged on the basis of the tools of the old politics; its success rather depends on how much it can create alternative spaces for people. Their success depends on the level of their

influence on people, solidarity, and guidance of other movements. Changing people's minds, shifting their perceptions, and recognizing different identities and lifestyles are sometimes more important than winning an election or being a leading political party. The effects of this transformation "are more extensive than policy shifts" (Saeed, 2009, p. 6). The cultural transformation can create alternative spaces by expanding civil society and its actors. NSMs can also create an alternative to established civil society. Or they may choose to use the state as an instrument to make transformations within society and institutions. Even in the last option, they do not aim to seize the state. Rather, they want to democratize its institutions by producing "modernization, stimulate innovation, push to reform" (Melucci, 1985, p. 813). As with the other dichotomies of old politics, the dichotomy of success and failure does not make sense when new social movements are concerned. The scope of political studies and theories has been extended with the emergence of social movements. They have the power to affect and change institutionalized politics. Thus new social movements "must be acknowledged as a proper element of the political field" (West, 2004, p. 268).

To sum up, NSMs are new in their organization and structure because it has become apparent from previous experiences that hierarchy, representation, or violence are not efficient mechanisms through which demands and rights are gained and actualized. The social movements institutionalized some rights and established order. The experiences and failures of this order have given great inspiration and ideas for the new social movements. The newness of the new social movements will be evident when the new rights and freedoms are institutionalized and when the cultural and political transformation will occur. This is the power of NSMs and the success of social movements.

Conclusion

Transition periods give birth to new ideas. Established institutions may fade away or adapt to changing conditions during these periods. Social movements emerge in such periods. In this paper, the features of new social movements are analyzed in relation to their similarity to the old social movements. There is a widespread idea that the NSMs are not political; they differ from the old or traditional social movements. The old social movements are generally considered the working-class movements, but the working-class movement was not the sole movement in the nineteenth century; there were other movements. Also, the working-class movement cannot be considered a unified movement from the beginning. Making the working class was a process, and before the working class, there were separate labor classes from different sectors.

The nineteenth century generated many social movements, which helped to draw the boundaries of public life and give meaning to the political. From these movements, institutionalized politics emerged, and the NSMs emerged as a reaction to this politics. NSMs' primary purpose is to spread rights and freedoms. NSMs' new values, such as non-class character, non-representation, non-hierarchical organization, and non-violence, manifest their attitude toward established politics and its failures. NSMs aim to expand democratic values to all spheres of life without a distinction between the public and the private. From the shortcomings of the past, NSMs embrace new perceptions. NSMs potential is determined by "its ability to relate a new way of developing society" (Eder, 1998, p. 117). This society will be different from the society that was established based on a limited concept of political,

representative democracy and its institutions. And this is the task of politics and political theory.

NSMs blur the public/private distinction and expand the conceptualization of politics and the political. NSMs politicize everyday life and daily grievances and make them visible and hearable in public. They create cultural and political awareness. They build communication, solidarity, and recognition of difference. By doing that, they alter the understanding of democracy. New social movements remind us of the prominence of political participation and recognition. The detachment of the NSMs from the established political institutions and parties is perceived as inefficient by critics. However, the success of the NSMs lies in the awareness they raise and the alternative spaces they create. New social movements generally do not want to seize state power. Thus their actions cannot be judged on how they influence the state and its power. Instead, their actions may be judged based on their influence on people, on collective and individual lives. Social movements are now global, and the networks among them and their learning process from each other's successes and failures also trigger the movements' power and accelerate their influence globally. With this influence, social change is inevitable.

References

- Arrighi, G., Hopkins, T. K., & Wallerstein, I. M. (1989). *Antisystemic Movements*. Verso Trade.
- Calhoun, C. (1993). "New Social Movements" of the Early Nineteenth Century. *Social Science History*, 17(3), 385-427.
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Polity.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Cerulo KA. (1997). Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 23: 385-409.
- DuBois, E. (2012). *The Radicalism of the Woman Suffrage Movement: Notes toward the Reconstruction of Nineteenth-century Feminism*. KG Saur.
- Eder, K. (1993). *The New Politics of Class: Social Movements and Cultural Dynamics in Advanced Societies* (Vol. 23). Sage.
- Faulks, K. (2000). *Political Sociology: A Critical Introduction*. NYU Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2012). *Declaration*. New York, NY: Argo Navis.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1998). *Uncommon People: Resistance, rebellion, and jazz*. The New Press, New York.
- Klein, N. (2001). Reclaiming the Commons. *New Left Review*, 81-89.
- Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1987). *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.
- Melucci, A. (1985). The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research*, 789-816.
- Nash, K. (2009). *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Offe, C. (1985). New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics. *Social Research*, 817-868.
- Polletta F& Jasper JM. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*27:283-305.
- Rancière, J. (2006). Democracy, Republic, Representation. *CONSTELLATIONS-OXFORD*, 13(3), 297-300.
- Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Translated by Julie Rose. The University of Minnesota Press.
- Ranciere, J. (2010). Ten Theses on Politics. *Dissensus: On Political and Aesthetics*, 27-45. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic
- Saeed, R.(2009). Conceptualising Success and Failure for Social Movements. *Law, Social Justice & Global Development Journal (LGD)*, 1-13.
- Scott, A. (1990). *Ideology and the New Social Movements*. No. 24. Allen & Unwin Australia.
- Senellart, M. (2014). Course Context. In M. Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Sitrin, M., & Azzellini, D. (2014). *They can't Represent Us!: Reinventing Democracy from Greece to Occupy*. Verso Books.
- Touraine, A. (1985). An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research*, 749-787.
- West, D. (2004). New Social Movements. *The Handbook of Political Theory*. (Ed. Gerald F. Gaus and Chandran Kukathas), 265-276. London:Sage Publications.
- Wieviorka, M. (2005). After New Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, 4:1, 1-19.