



The place and role of social criticism in the “research programm” on social moviments

Elísio Macamo

Conference Paper nº 25

III CONFERÊNCIA INTERNACIONAL DO IESE

“MOÇAMBIQUE: ACUMULAÇÃO E TRANSFORMAÇÃO EM CONTEXTO DE CRISE INTERNACIONAL”

(4 & 5 de Setembro de 2012)

The Place and Role of Social Criticism in the “research programme” on social movements

Elísio Macamo

Introduction

On 1st and 2nd September 2010, Maputo, Mozambique’s capital city, witnessed for the second time in two years extremely violent riots opposing people protesting against fuel and bread price increases and the police. Youngsters at large informal markets and mini-bus terminals in the sprawling outskirts of the capital city of Maputo poured into the streets, erected road-blocks, set car-tyres on fire, overturned and threw stones at passing cars and looted shops. The police stepped in using live ammunition and killed at least one person who, in the event, turned out to be a school pupil on his way back from school. The city was paralysed for two days with city dwellers afraid of venturing out of their houses. The riots, which were celebrated in the Mozambican media as the rebellion of the masses against an arrogant government, took place against the background of a political system that, in theory at least, called itself democratic. The government of the day had a few years earlier been confirmed in power with an overwhelming share of the vote that delivered an absolute majority in parliament. The riots were an impressive show of anger and outrage from a society that has remained largely peaceful in the face of much deprivation and economic suffering.

This paper discusses the sociological relevance of feelings of anger and outrage. Relevance in this context means the extent to which these notions can be usefully applied to gaining insights into the constitution of society. To start with, both emotions are key properties of social relations. They point to a condition displayed by individuals when, for whatever reason, they are strongly unhappy about a given state of affairs. This condition is especially directed against oneself or others. While anger entails a feeling of having been wronged or offended and calls, consequently, for some form of redress, outrage is simply its intensified form coupled with the idea that normative expectations have been violated. Therefore, to the extent that these emotions occur in the context of social relations, it can be argued that they are relevant to the constitution of society. The feelings of wrong-doing and violation of normative expectations assume the existence of a common framework. This framework binds the actions of different

individuals into a moral frame that enables them to interpret whatever occurs in interaction approvingly or disapprovingly.

The existence of this moral frame is of crucial importance, particularly in the discussion of the protests that took place in Mozambique in recent years. In fact, the purpose is to discuss the extent to which anger and outrage can be usefully integrated into the study of protest in general, and in Africa, in particular. Traditionally, protests have been studied within the theoretical and conceptual framework laid down by the notion of social movements. Social movements are generally understood as manifestations of dissent that translate into collective claims making through relevant repertoires of collective action (Tilly 1986; Joyce 2002). To the extent that protest is a form of dissent and collective claims making it is only logical that its study should be pursued within this conceptual framework. The starting point for the discussion proposed here is the claim that dissent and claims making are made intelligible within moral frames. In this sense, moral frames are central to the conditions of possibility of protest.

I argue however that the concept of social movements implies a research programme that draws heavily from European political experience. It may, therefore, prove inadequate to a study of contestation in African settings. After an initial discussion of the shortcomings of this research programme, I will argue that protest must be conceptualised as social action of a special kind, namely the kind that makes politics possible. I suggest that politics is basically a moral debate which, in turn, presupposes citizenship as a condition for participation. The argument will be elaborated with reference to Michael Walzer's insights into the structure and rationale of social criticism.

The idea that moral frames have a binding effect on individuals draws attention to a basic sociological fact: the intelligibility of anger and outrage lies in the extent to which these emotions are socially constructed. This is not to argue that anger and outrage do not exist beyond the vocabulary and normative sanctions which a community uses to make sense of a given set of emotions. Rather, the point is simply that the way in which these emotions are expressed, the reasons which give individuals a legitimate sense of these feelings and the circumstances under which they constitute coherent reactions to the actions of others provide the background against which members of a community know what to do with them and about them. Understanding the circumstances under which these are expressed can be an important asset in the attempt to make sense of the sociological coherence of local contexts and the phenomena taking place within them. It can be argued that anger and outrage are critical commentaries on what

holds a political community together, or, for that matter, what does it apart. This is the sociological background to my central argument. I argue that since anger and outrage are particular manifestations of contestation, contestation can be usefully looked at as a form of social criticism which finds practical expression in protest action. To put it differently, I argue that the study of protest amounts, from a sociological point of view, to the study of how individuals relate to and perceive social order. Studying the nature of contestation from the perspective of its articulation with social criticism appears fundamental to a proper grasp of what is entailed in protest within an African context.

I will discuss these issues in two steps. In the first step I position my claim within the larger field of social movements. After a brief description of the research programme on social movements I will raise doubts concerning the usefulness of this notion to the study of protest in the African context. In this paper 'social movements' will be described with reference to Imre Lakatos's idea of a 'research programme', i.e. a dynamic set of theories seeking to make sense of a given class of phenomena (Lakatos 1978). To be sure, the concern is not with the actual objects described by the notion of social movements, but rather the set of assumptions underlying the possibility of description. The main thrust of this research programme bears too many resemblances to the history of Europe. In this sense, a wholesale adoption of its assumptions would appear to distort, rather than actually represent African political reality. This discussion will pave the way for the second step, which will consist in developing the central claim. I will draw specifically on a discussion of Michael Walzer's (1989b; 1993) ideas concerning morality to argue that they offer points of anchorage for the grounding of the study of protest in society and its constitutive processes. I will offer a preliminary typology of protest to serve as a heuristic device with which description of protest can be undertaken. I will then close with a brief discussion of instances of protest in Mozambique in order to bring into relief the extent to which Walzer's ideas can yield useful insights into the study of political culture in Africa.

The social movements 'research programme'

There is something upbeat about the notion of social movements. For one thing, it suggests dynamism of a sort that is steeped in the achievement of a desirable goal. The notion carries positive connotations when it is used in the social sciences. Indeed, it describes the collective challenges thrown against a central authority on behalf of interest groups without much formal political clout (Tilly

1978; McAdam; Tarrow; Tilly 2001). The positive elements in the notion shine through in the belief that a social movement can only earn this status if it fulfils three conditions, namely (1) solidarity among its members, (2) commitment to standing up for a cause against a common enemy and (3) deployment of means of contestation that go beyond the acceptable limits within a given polity (Melucci 1989). Studying social movements, therefore, is nearly akin to taking the right side and setting about describing the right (or wrong) course taken (or to be taken) by history. This admittedly polemical rendering of the epistemological interest of research on social movements is justified, as will be seen further ahead, by the need to bring to light the shortcomings of the notion when it is called upon to account for contestation in the African context.

The three types of social movements identified by Raschke (1985) according to the rationale of their action celebrate the positive elements. In the past, back in the 17th Century, social movements were uprisings against the insidious encroachment of the State through the levying of taxes. In standing up against this encroachment into local autonomy protesters were rightfully resisting the will to power of corrupt and authoritarian aristocratic regimes by laying claims to a fairer distribution of power. Later on, with the advent of capitalism in the 19th Century, social movements formed around industrial action and laid claims on a just distribution of national resources. In more recent years, especially in the wake of the post-war welfare arrangements in Western Europe, social movements – in particular, the student revolts of the late sixties – have been about forcing polities to own up to their emancipatory agenda. They have done this by campaigning for the recognition of the rights of those condemned by bigotry to leading marginal lives - women, gays and racial minorities – in societies describing themselves as liberal (for a good overview see Staggenborg 2008). It is difficult to consider these three types without gaining a positivist sense not only of the righteousness of the underlying protests, but also of the inevitability of the changes which they are expected to achieve.

As indicated above, I borrow Imre Lakatos' notion of a research programme (1978) to briefly characterise the study of social movements for the immediate purposes of the present contribution. Bearing in mind that Lakatos defined a research programme as a set of closely related theories spread over time and based on a common idea, we could agree to describe the study of social movements as related theoretical propositions concerning legitimate and necessary social change undertaken by social groups with legitimate grievances against the dominant political order. The assumption of a necessary social

change driven by legitimate grievances constitutes the hard core of the research programme. The identification of phases and types in the historical evolution and geographical spread of social movements would correspond to what Lakatos thought a positive heuristic should be able to deliver. It gives instructions to the researcher on the kinds of phenomena to look at in order to maintain a fruitful balance between theoretical propositions and empirical reality.

While research on social movements has made important contributions to our understanding of history, particularly social and political history (Tilly 1978), traditions of resistance around the world (e.g. Abbink; de Bruijn; Walraven, van 2003 and Ahikire; Mamdani; Oloka-Onyango 1994 for Africa; Wickham-Crowley 1992 for Latin America), it can still be argued that its usefulness can be questioned, particularly as far as Africa is concerned. To be sure, the notion has not been absent from attempts at describing social processes in Africa. In fact, it has been variously used to describe peasant actions and ethnically motivated uprisings and millenarianism. In more recent years, the notion has been deployed as a catch-all phrase to account for civil society groups mobilizing against what they perceive to be the onslaught of neo-liberal thinking on African countries as represented by structural adjustment policies of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund¹. The sense of the appropriateness of the notion of social movement when it is applied to phenomena observed in Africa feeds on the plausible assumption that groups described as social movements are standing up collectively against a common enemy with a view to heralding a better social order.

The shortcomings of the notion in the context of African studies can be reduced to three main problems. The first problem is epistemological and has to do with the nature of the knowledge that one can generate within the social movement research programme. Social movements point to the articulation of collective grievances against a common enemy and against the background of knowledge of what a just and better society is. Under these circumstances, any piece of research that sees a warrant for the description of any instance of contestation as a manifestation of the presence of a social movement runs two types of risk. First, it runs the risk of confusing its own theoretical assumptions with empirical reality. Second, it runs the risk of forcing empirical reality into the straightjacket of its own theoretical strictures. Generally speaking, the normative nature of the definition of social movements gives researchers considerable leeway with

¹ The label currently in use to describe this phenomenon is “new social movements” (see Tarrow 2005; Pichardo 1997; Boron and Lechini 2005).

regard to what should count as a social movement and what should not. Any form of contestation that falls under the analytical gaze of the researcher of social movements becomes, by virtue of the researcher's attention and conceptual framework, a social movement.

The second problem is what Mahmood Mamdani (1996), in another context, described as 'history by analogy'. This refers to the tendency to look at African historical phenomena with reference to European historical development. To put it differently, history by analogy takes place when concepts and theoretical implications derived from a very specific context are used to describe a completely different context without due attention being paid to local specificities on both sides. History by analogy is the uncritical use of concepts in the social sciences. Given that the history of social movements has been extensively (and comprehensively) studied in Europe, all that remains to be done is to document instances of the phenomenon elsewhere. This procedure does not in itself constitute enough reason to frown upon history by analogy. Cause for concern emerges the moment when research is transformed into the study of what Africa lacks in order to fit into the ideal-type represented by Europe. In the study of social movements this can happen at many crucial analytical junctures. For instance, since research on social movements in Europe has shown that these reveal internal solidarity, commitment against a common enemy and deployment of non-conventional means of protest absence of any or all of these features from anything that convention has agreed to assign the label of a social movement in Africa might lead to a search for the reasons why Africa fails to live up to the model.

Again, although such a search may form a legitimate part of any inquiry into a social phenomenon when it is undertaken under the general assumption that there is an ideal form which phenomena of the same type take, it can hinder, rather than further, understanding. Equally problematic can be the assumption of a historical narrative which describes the early and later forms of social movements against the yardstick of European historical development. So-called 'bread riots' motivated by sheer want in contexts within which individuals and communities lacked political clout to make themselves heard may indeed describe an early phase of social movements in European history. Their recurrence today in societies under the grip of economic deprivation and political authoritarianism should not necessarily mean that the institutional and cultural context obtaining at the time of such uprisings in Europe is all that one needs to ascertain in order to be able to account for similar events today in

Africa. The Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos has drawn attention to the pitfalls entailed in such positions with their indictment of what they call the sociology of presences and absences (Santos 2002).

Finally, and perhaps the most serious problem, the social movement research programme seems to have difficulties in articulating the genesis of the phenomenon with the general challenge of providing sociological descriptions of social phenomena that draw directly from the way society actually manifests itself. This problem is not new. It dogged the early attempts at defining the notion of social movements in empirically useful ways (see for example Smelser 1962 and Castells 1978). To put it bluntly, the problem with the idea of social movement is its “underdetermination”. It is not clear under what circumstances a certain type of events – say, various forms of protest – warrant a description in terms of the social movement research programme. There is a historicist assumption in the hard core of the research programme. It comes into view in the implicit belief in the desirable inevitability of the change likely to be wrought by a social movement. In this connection, the research programme raises issues concerning the selected reference class. When peasants, for instance, organize to protest against the marketing board of a given country what is the particular aspect of their action that allows a researcher to claim that he or she is dealing with a social movement? When youths take to the street to protest against unemployment or food price increases what is the particular aspect of their desperate action that warrants the social movement description? It should become clear from these doubts that the “underdetermination” to which empirical material on social movements lends itself results from the difficulties evidenced by the concept to establish a convincing link between the reality of social life and the explanatory claims of the concept itself.

The three problems discussed above, namely the epistemological, the analytical and the empirical, cannot be swept under the carpet if one is serious about understanding contestation and its place and role in African social life. As a matter of fact, the problems call for a bracketing off of the notion of social movements while an account of the nature of contestation is attempted that seeks to engage with social life and reality. The American philosopher Michael Walzer seems to offer a useful point of entry into this particular challenge. In his work he is, of course, not directly interested in protest as such. However, his ideas on the nature of morality and the place and role of social criticism can be woven into an argument that can serve the purpose of linking social movements to empirical social reality. Indeed, there is a sense in which Michael Walzer’s argument could

be read as an elaboration on Edward P. Thompson's (1971) notion of the 'moral economy' and his analysis of the manner in which the poor sought legitimacy to their demands for a fair price on moral grounds. The idea of social criticism as developed by Michael Walzer can help us to articulate the feelings entailed in protest – outrage and anger – with the moral frameworks necessary to their political intelligibility.

Social criticism and morality²

In his work reflecting on what makes it possible for individuals within and across communities to be moved by the fate of others Walzer (2006) argues that a sense of good and evil plays a significant role. This, however, does not commit him to a single view of morality. In fact, he distinguishes two basic forms which morality can take, each one of which describes the context within which, and the terms under which, it becomes relevant to individuals' ability to be moved by the fate of others. More specifically, Walzer is interested in the role played in debate when it comes to answering the question as to the kinds of obligations we have to others. The first form, which he calls thin morality, has no specific individual in mind when it is called upon to help answer the question concerning the obligations we have towards others. Thin morality refers to a universal obligation to recognise the humanity of those who may be too far away from us. It is this sense of universal obligation that enables each one of us to feel solidarity with those fighting for their freedom and justice without committing us to accepting the exact details of which give substance to their sense of those values. Thick morality, in contrast, refers to the obligations individuals have towards others who share local conditions and circumstances placing them into the same community of fate and values. A simple sense of what makes individuals human is not enough to account for the obligations they must have towards others. A common historical experience, which can find expression in a common language and a common set of cultural values, binds each and every individual to a rich web of meanings which are more likely to be immediately intelligible within a specific local setting. Thick morality is local, whereas thin morality is global.

² There is an earlier literature on social movements that comments on the role of morality (Gusfeld 1986; Zurcher Jr.; Kirkpatrick. 1976). It uses the concept of "moral crusade" partly drawing from Howard S. Becker's notion of "moral enterprise" (1963) to focus attention on individuals who campaign on issues involving morality. As it will be shown in this section, this is not the sense in which the notion of morality as related to contestation will be used in this paper. Rather, the concern is with an articulation of the notion with debate in the public sphere.

Individuals draw from their sense of thick morality to understand and feel sympathy towards the moral claims made by others in far-away places. What enables them to develop this sense of obligation is not an understanding of the exact details of the meaning which others attach to the values which they pursue. Rather, it is the general recognition of the right held by every individual to be respected in their dignity as humans³.

Walzer's argument may sound relativist. In insisting on two types of moral language that are intelligible within specific contexts it does sound as though Walzer is arguing for the incommensurability of values across cultures. In actual fact, the argument is more nuanced than this. At one level his point is that it is wrong to assume that morality can be approached with a recipe-book attitude spelling out what is to count as an appropriate set of values to be deployed in every situation where individuals are called upon to address their moral obligation to others. Walzer is making a plea for a discursive perspective on morality that assumes that what comes to count as the morally right way to behave towards others is the outcome of debate within a normative community. At another level, the philosopher is also arguing that the recognition of distinct forms of moral language does not imply that all that is left for individuals who are far away from others is simply to accept the legitimacy of others' local values. In a sense, Walzer is in line with those who argue along the lines of cosmopolitanism and claim that in acknowledging difference individuals are under no obligation to accept values which offend their moral sense (see Appiah 2006).

Thick and Thin was Walzer's response to the critics of his earlier *Spheres of Justice* (1989a). In this book, he suggested that pluralism had produced a complex notion and practice of equality. This introduced into the definition of a just society the caveat that it is one which recognises complex equality. In such a society advantages associated with identity, for instance intelligence, do not translate into advantages in other dimensions, for instance political clout or personal wealth. The idea of the existence of a thin and thick moral language represented an attempt to set out the terms under which moral debate takes place against the background of complex equality. Thick morality takes stock of complexity and, for this reason it provides the ideal background for fruitful

³ I understand the right to be respected in one's dignity in the sense developed by Ronald Dworkin (1996) in his elaboration on the meaning of equality as the right to be treated with equal concern.

moral debate. This is precisely where Walzer's reflection on the role of social criticism becomes relevant.

In several works Walzer (1989b, 1993) discusses and develops ideas concerning social criticism. He lays emphasis particularly on what he considers to be the interpretative path to criticism. The main claim is that morality is something over which members of a society argue (Walzer 1993 p. 42). Moral argument addresses the question concerning what the right thing to do may be. In order to answer this question individuals have to consider the society in which they live, the means individuals have at hand, the opportunities open to them and many other structural aspects that constrain or enable action. According to Walzer, the answer has to do with the meaning which the way of life of a given community has to individuals. At the end of the deliberations individuals have to be able to say what the right thing to do is as far as they are concerned (p. 33). Social criticism, therefore, represents the different positions which individuals articulate and express in moral debate. Such positions reflect different understandings and interpretations of social order and the place which different individuals should have in it.

My point is that social criticism offers an adequate point of entry into the politics of contestation. Unlike the notion of social movement, which packages contestation into a frame of reference that lends normative and teleological legitimacy to protest, social criticism does not pass judgement on the political goals of contestation. It simply bears witness to how individuals position themselves with regard to social order while at the same time intimating the possibility that such positioning may harbour different interpretations of how a society should be organized and what life chances it should be able to make available to its members. Contestation is in this sense a critical commentary on the nature of society given by its members. Protest is the practical form taken by contestation. It deserves to be studied at its place of origin in society. Social criticism is where protest originates as contestation. Societal members offer critical commentaries from different stations, different perspectives and different existential experiences. It should be noted that these criticisms need not be coherent at all. A useful way to address the challenge of making sense of protest in Africa, therefore, is to spell out the conditions under which social criticism takes place, for it is in those conditions that the types are to be found which offer heuristic models for the study of protest⁴.

⁴ The study of social movements has sought to accomplish this task in various ways. One good example is given by the volume edited by McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001). My claim is that

Social criticism and protest

The basic sociological impulse underlying contestation is social criticism. It constitutes itself on the back of moral argument, i.e. debate about the obligations members of a community feel towards other members of the same community. The conditions under which moral argument takes place are important in any attempt at drawing analytical consequences which can inform a study of protest in African settings. These conditions do not owe their importance to the fact that they have to be met. Rather, their importance results from the fact that negotiating over whether they should exist, and how, is part of the moral argument. This applies, by extension, to the rules governing the behaviour of participants in a moral argument. These rules have to do with how dissent, difference of opinion, support and agreement are expressed. Again, the point is not that such rules should be laid down before moral argument can take place. The point is, rather, that the way in which such rules emerge and are agreed upon is part and parcel of the moral argument. Jean-Godefroy Bidima's (1997) insightful discussion of the African practice of 'Palaver' and how its progressive disappearance has impoverished the African public sphere brings to the fore the constitutive role played by argument over how to argue in moral debate.

A moral debate produces contestation that can express itself as protest within a political context. I draw on Mahmood Mamdani's distinction between *Citizen and Subject* (1996) to argue that protest is politically significant in the context of citizenship. According to Mamdani the condition of citizenship is one in which individuals relate to the state through rights. The status of individuals as citizens takes effect the moment the state takes upon itself the obligation to guarantee the conditions under which what is implied in the rights can be fulfilled. A subject, by contrast, does not relate to the state via his or her rights. A subject is defined by custom, the preservation of which is seen as an obligation by the state. Mamdani used this insightful argument to describe and analyse the extent to which the colonial state was bent on denying politics to Africans. I expand Mamdani's argument in this article to argue that, generally speaking, African states have failed to translate independence – which was fought in the name of citizenship – into the constitution of political spaces within which individual

the research programme implied by the idea of social movement attaches more importance to the macro level. Most contestation in Africa takes place at the micro level for which adequate conceptual and analytical approaches are lacking.

Africans could re-invent themselves as citizens through their participation in the moral debate constitutive of their societies. The rather normative programme implied in the notion of social movement assumes the existence of this political space and construes any act of contestation automatically as (political) protest. As we shall see further below, contestation under conditions of subjecthood does not lend itself to an analytically and theoretically useful study of protest action.

Anger and outrage are expressions of opposition to certain standpoints. They are reactions to differences of opinion concerning the interpretation of the nature of social order and that which should maintain it. How legitimate such reactions are depends, of course, on the terms under which debate takes place. What anger and outrage entitles participants in a debate to undertake is also an issue that relates to the culture of debate within which moral debate takes place. These emotions are expressions of protest, but not the kind of protest which would enable researchers to draw conclusions concerning the extent to which they stand before a social movement. Anger and outrage are expressions of protest to the extent that they draw attention to the existence of a moral community within which these emotions are potentially intelligible and of which those expressing them are members. Here again, no assumption is made regarding how such a moral community is structured or even how it should be structured in order for the articulation of protest to take place.

A typology of protest can be designed to serve as a heuristic device to make the sociological context within which protest comes to be expressed available to description and analysis. It is intended as a device to help researchers account for contestation in African settings while avoiding the pitfalls of the normatively laden social movement research programme. The typology draws from elements suggesting the conditions of possibility of moral argument. Its structure rests on the attributes that can be readily associated with contestation. Contestation is the (the self declared or guaranteed) right to differ. It can be violent or peaceful, organised or spontaneous; it can have a clear target or one that is diffuse; it articulates demands or simply rejects an imposition; finally, it articulates the will to change the framework of debate or maintain it.

These attributes can be summed up with the help of five basic dimensions: (a) forms of articulation, (b) structure of articulation, (c) content, (d) target and (e) direction. Each dimension has two values which stand in a dialectical relationship to one another. In other words, forms of articulation can be violent

(eg. looting, clashes with police, road obstructions) or peaceful (eg. marches), the structure of articulation can be organized (trade unions, interest groups) or spontaneous (eg. youth, market vendors, dwellers), the content can articulate demands (eg. new measures and policies) or reject impositions (eg. measures and policies), the target can be clear (eg. official in charge, government agency, party) or unclear (eg. general dissatisfaction) and the direction can point towards change (eg. resignation of officials, government, new elections) or preservation of the status quo (eg. corrections in favour group interest).

The cross-tabulation of dimensions and values yields a collection of properties based on empirical indicators that can be developed and some of which are presented above. The values are points of concentration of several variables that offer an empirical background for descriptive inference to be carried out. The collections of properties allow for the construction of ideal-types of protests which yield a heuristic typology based on the definition of contestation as social criticism. Three basic types emerge out of the cross-tabulation. Protest that is violent, organized, based on the formulation of demands with a clear addressee and aiming at change constitutes one type; let us call it “the upheaval type”. Protest which is peaceful, organized, formulates demands with a clear addressee and aiming at preserving the basic structures of the social order constitutes a second type that can be called “the reform type”. A third type results from the combination of violent, spontaneous acts articulating demands or rejecting policy with unclear addressees and silent on the long-term ends of the actions. It can be called “the anomic type”.

The types hinge on two dimensions, namely (a) form and (b) structure of articulation. Both the form and the structure of contestation inhere into content, target and direction to the extent that they set the conditions under which interaction can be further pursued. Whether one is making demands or rejecting them, addressing a clear or unclear interlocutor or even aiming at change or maintaining the status quo, the expressive potential of these dimensions is influenced by whether violence plays any role at all and, furthermore, whether individuals come together to organize around issues. Moreover, the emphasis on these two dimensions draws attention to a fundamental aspect of contestation as political instrument. It serves to give substance to politics.

The ideal-type of protest that comes closest to describing the normative ideal of democratic politics is the reform type. Democratic politics, like a good conversation, is based on the progressive conquering of issues by way of their clarification. This, in turn, makes new aspects visible and can also render them manageable. In the process, those engaged in the conversation get to know their own position better, identify new ways of pressing their points and canvassing their positions. The suggestion that democratic politics is mostly about reform does not mean that absence of reform implies the presence of undemocratic politics. It means simply that democratic politics is steeped in the relentless interpretation of the moral basis of society. Interpretation always takes its cue from the coherence of interests and the sense of moral obligation which individuals feel towards other individuals.

In this sense, the idea of reform should not be taken in its radical conception of a fundamental and radical break. Rather, it should be understood as the adjustment of aspects of social order to fit the levels of understanding which conflicting interpretations have reached. Democratic politics is dynamic. Reform inheres into its functioning logic. Without reform democratic politics becomes sclerotic. The critical signs of such a sclerosis are to be seen in the other two ideal-types, namely the “upheaval type” and the “anomic type”. The former is similar to a loud argument where parties to a discussion adopt radical positions, do not listen to other arguments and are attracted by the use of force as a legitimate way of asserting themselves. This type does not imply the end of democratic politics. Rather, it indicates a development which sets democratic politics into a critical path that reveals strains in the ability of political actors to reconcile their interests. When the strain degenerates into failure “upheaval” can be the outcome, often leading up to civil war, coup d’état or a protracted crisis. The latter ideal-type, i.e. the “anomic type” is similar to a conversation in which one of the interlocutors simply loses interest and withdraws into an introspective mood marked by apparent indifference. The “anomic type” is not the end of democratic politics either. However, it does signal a failure by political actors to commit themselves to values which can underlie politics. The likely downward spiral here is the emergence of authoritarianism. From the point of view of the design of typologies (see Kluge 2000) civil war or authoritarianism are

prototypes that need not concern us. They represent extreme cases that at the end of the day may obtain when political actors fail to keep their political engagement within the bounds of the “reform type”. Since the point of the typology suggested here is to provide a point of entry into the sociological description of protest and the politics of contestation the focus must be placed upon what makes discussion possible and what keeps it going.

We can bear this framework in mind in discussing the particular case of Mozambique. The aim will not be to classify forms of protest and contestation that took place in this country. Rather, I will aim at drawing attention to critical issues that result from looking at such phenomena from the point of view of moral debate and against the background of the typology suggested briefly here.

Anger and outrage in Mozambique

Mozambique achieved its independence through armed struggle. After independence it committed itself to building a socialist society based on ‘scientific Marxism’ modelled on East Germany and the Soviet Union. As a consequence thereof, it set up one-party state which was believed to be the logical outcome of the struggle for liberation. This struggle came to be interpreted retrospectively as the struggle of the exploited masses against the colonial capitalist system for the purpose of ushering in a People’s Republic run by a so-called people’s dictatorship. Mozambique fought a protracted civil war against a rebel movement. The question that should be addressed in this section relates to the meaning of contestation in the context of politics in this country. The civil war in Mozambique tended to be regarded against the background of a popular uprising along the lines of a social movement. While this has never been explicitly stated, the emphasis on how the Mozambican rebels articulated the resentment of rural communities against the forced villagisation policies of the ruling Marxist government suggested interpretive criteria informed by the social movement research programme.

The protests that shook Mozambique in February 2008 and September 2010 were clearly instances of social criticism. They were sparked off by political decisions bearing on peoples’ livelihoods. In July 2012 I conducted interviews with journalists (from newspapers and television) as well as a focus group interview with four young men who were directly involved in the riots (in Polana-Caniço) which along archival work (consisting mainly of reading newspaper reports,

internet discussions and reports) gave me an idea of some crucial elements pertaining to the structure and form of the protests. This is work in progress. Further interviews are planned with more journalists and people who were both involved or affected. A preliminary analysis of the interviews confirms the general perspective on these protests. They were mainly an outburst of violence directed mainly against the police forces and any signs of affluence, but also instances of looting. While anonymous cellular phone text messages were circulated a day before the disturbances, the protests did not have a face in the sense of people coming forward to articulate demands addressed to the government. In fact, much of the violence that marked the protests was mainly spontaneous and often a direct reaction to police heavy-handedness. The looting that ensued in many places was an ad-hoc response to the situation of chaos created by confrontations between the police and the youth.

In terms of the heuristic device suggested in this paper several points can be made. The form of articulation was clearly violent and entailed confrontations with the police, looting of shops, destruction of property and road obstructions. There were attempts on the part of some youths to stage a peaceful march to the "Presidency", but they were on their own account stopped by the police. The structure of articulation was a hybrid of organized protest (anonymous SMS) and spontaneous outbursts (attempts at staging a march to the "Presidency", looting). While the protests took place simultaneously in many locations there does not seem to have been any kind of concerted action. As far as the content of the protest is concerned all that can be said is that there was no clear articulation of demands. Rather, those who protested were reacting against increases in fuel and bread prices. They seemed merely interested in conveying to the authorities their dissatisfaction on the grounds that life was unbearably expensive. The target of the protest was ostensibly the government, but this was articulated in a general manner with the President of the Republic as the main addressee of the grievances. The protests were an expression of a general state of dissatisfaction. Finally, the direction of the protests was unclear. They did not address any major policy issue demanding its correction or lifting, nor did they seek to change the government. Given that the social groups behind the protests were also diffuse it remained unclear how the nature of the demands articulated in the protests could help meet the interests of any social group. By imposing a cap on bread prices and promising subsidies to transport companies the Government responded to the protests in ways which clearly addressed the particular

situation of sections of the Mozambican urban population living in precarious conditions.

Bearing these features of the protests of February 2008 and September 2012 it seems fair to suggest that they correspond to the third type identified in heuristic device laid down further above, namely the anomic type. It should be recalled that the anomic type was described as a combination of violent and spontaneous acts articulating demands with unclear addressees and silent on the long-term ends of the actions. In this sense, those commentators who rushed to see in these events instances of protests in the sense suggested by the research programme on social movements may have done little to help us understand the real import of what happened in the country. It is beyond doubt that the events in those fateful days articulated deep-seated grievances brought to a head by the price increases. They were expressions of anger and outrage. In this sense they carried elements of social criticism to the extent that they raised the theoretical possibility that they may have been different understandings of the moral obligations binding rulers and the ruled.

In this sense, protests such as those that have occurred in Mozambique in reaction to food price increases can hardly qualify as political protests in the strict sense. These are contestations that take place on the fringes of politics. They do not seem to hold the potential which a social movement research programme would ascribe to them. At a deeper analytical level what the Mozambican case shows is that the analysis of protest needs to be founded on a clear definition of politics to be theoretically fruitful. In Mozambique, where the political system allows for a measure of dissent and opposition parties appear to have public expression, the protests largely took opposition parties by surprise. In their wake, opposition parties were unable to profit from the contestation, a fact which can be interpreted as a sign of the absence of politics in Mozambique.

Where politics is absent no moral argument takes place. In the very specific case of protests in Maputo the contours of the moral argument underlying them are not at all clear. The main reason why they lack clarity is related to the fact that protest was too diffuse and unarticulated from an organizational point of view. This is in no small measure a consequence of the general political environment. Where no moral argument takes place, there can only be anger and outrage, which is hard to translate into politically significant protest.

Contestation is the (the self declared or guaranteed) right to differ. It can be violent or peaceful, organised or spontaneous, it can have a clear target or one that is diffuse, it articulates demands or simply rejects an imposition and, finally,

it articulates the will to change the framework of debate or maintain it. Contestation can take the form of a riot, an upheaval or efforts at reform. Riots and upheavals are the outlets which anger and outrage usually find in the absence of an overarching moral framework that would enable individuals to recognise legitimate grievances. Reform efforts point to the existence of an overarching moral framework which constitutes individuals as political actors. To look at protest as social criticism means that attention should be placed on how political actors articulate their interests. This articulation takes place against the background of an interpretation of what it means to them to have obligations towards others. Democratic politics, in this sense, describes how political actors continually adjust their interpretations of social order to fit the understandings which they have achieved concerning what each interest group can be expected to deliver to others. Confrontation with other interpretations helps political actors define their positions and identify ways of asserting themselves that do not compromise other interests. Failure to keep moral argument within the dynamic bounds of reform can lead to the attempts of different groups to win the upper-hand or simply to withdraw from the debate. In the former case, social criticism can degenerate into civil war and in the latter it can lead to authoritarianism.

In using the metaphor of a moral argument I am, therefore, drawing attention to the fact that politics is about articulating interests against the background of one's understanding of the extent to which the prevailing social order enables individuals to meet their obligations towards others without undue strain to them as individuals or groups. In this sense, identifying social criticism in protest is a heuristic device that should encourage the formulation of questions that open up possibilities for the sociological description of the context within which protest and contestation take place. This approach seems to be more suitable than the normative framework underlying the social movement research programme, for it neither takes the direction of protest for granted, nor does it assume that every form of protest is political.

Conclusion

In this presentation, I have tried to engage critically with the notion of social movements. To be sure, the notion has an enviable pedigree in research on protest. I have argued that while the notion offers valuable insights into how and why individuals organize to formulate demands, it does not appear analytically adequate to take account of contestation in Africa. One important reason that

accounts for this shortcoming is the notion's apparent inability to relate to actual social processes that can be accounted for sociologically. Therefore, I am making two sorts of arguments. The first one is that the notion of social movements is too broad to capture local political processes as they occur in African political settings. There is contestation taking place and, sometimes, this contestation can be read as political protest. However, the decision on whether contestation is protest should not be derived from the assumptions made by the analytical framework provided for by the notion of social movements. The decision should be based on a sociological account of the conditions that make contestation available to description. These relate to how anger and outrage constitute themselves as such and what kinds of outlets they find in the wider society.

The second sort of argument I am making amounts to a suggestion. The inability apparently evidenced by the notion of social movement to account for local political processes can be corrected if contestation is articulated with social criticism. The idea here is that moral debate is constitutive of politics. Therefore, an understanding of basic political processes in Africa might do well to focus on such constitutive factors and concern itself less with notions that commit analysis to macro factors less relevant to local politics. The study of protest in Africa might benefit from the analytical freedom to refrain from considering every form of contestation to be political. The case of Mozambique briefly discussed here can be used to draw attention to the need to define politics, and the context within which it becomes possible, before one draws conclusions concerning the overall meaning of contestation.

Bibliography

- Abbink, Jon G.; de Bruijn, Mirjam; Walraven, Klaas van. 2003: *Rethinking Resistance: Revolt and Violence in African History*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ahikire, Josephine; Mamdani, Mahmood; Oloka-Onyango, Joe (eds). 1994. *Studies in Living Conditions, Popular Movements, and Constitutionalism*. London: Brandes & Apsel.
- Appiah, Kwame. 2006: *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Allen Lane.
- Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders – Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bidima, Jean-Godefroy. 1997. *La palabre: une juridiction de la parole*. Paris: Éditions Michalon.
- Boron, Atilio A.; Lechini, Gladys (eds.). 2005. *Politics and Social Movements in an Hegemonic World: Lessons from Africa, Asia and Latin America*. CLACSO, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires.
- Castells, Manuel. 1978. *City, Class and Power*. London: MacMillan.
- Dworkin, Ronald. 1996. *A Matter of Principle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Gusfeld, Joseph, R. 1986. *Symbolic Crusade – Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Joyce, Peter. 2002. *The Politics of Protest – Extra-Parliamentary Politics in Britain since 1970*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kluge, Susann 2000: ‚Empirisch begründete Typenbildung in der qualitativen Sozialforschung‘. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung* Vol.1, N0.1, 14 (<http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>; checked March 2011)
- Lakatos, Imre. 1978. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes: Philosophical Papers Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- McAdam, Doug; Tarrow, Sidney; Tilly, Charles. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Neubert, Dieter. 1999. Gemeinschaften, Gerechtigkeit und Demokratie in Afrika. Zur Bedeutung der Moralökonomie in der Kommunitarismusdebatte. In: Reinhart Kößler; Dieter Neubert; Achim v. Oppen (eds.). *Gemeinschaften in einer entgrenzten Welt*. Schriftenreihe des Gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Zentrums Moderner Orient. Berlin: Das Arabische Buch, 113-134.
- Pichardo, Nelson A. 1997. New Social Movements: A Critical Review. In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 23, No., 411-430.
- Raschke, Joachim. 1985. *Soziale Bewegungen. Ein historisch-systematischer Grundriss*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2002. Para uma sociologia das ausências e uma sociologia das emergências. In: *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*. Vol. , No. 63, 237-280.
- Smelser, Neil J. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Staggenborg, Susann. 2008. *Social Movements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2005. *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Tilly, Charles. 2004. *Social Movements, 1768–2004*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Thompson, Edward P. 1971. The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the 18th Century. In: *Past & Present*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 76-136.
- Walzer, Michael. 1989a. *Spheres of Justice: a Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Walzer, Michael. 1989b. *The Company of Critics – Social Criticism and Political Commitment in the Twentieth Century*. London: Peter Halban.
- Walzer, Michael. 1993. *Kritik und Gemeinsinn*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Wissenschaft.
- Walzer, Michael. 2006. *Thick and Thin: Moral Argument at Home and Abroad*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Wickam-Crowley, Timothy. 1989. Winners and Losers and Also-Rans: Toward a Comparative Sociology of Latin American Guerrilla Movements. In: Susan Eckstein (ed.). *Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 132-81.

Wickam-Crowley, Timothy. 1992: *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Zurcher Jr., Louis A.; Kirkpatrick, George, R.1976. *Citizens for Decency: Antipornography Crusades as Status Defence*. Austin: University of Texas Press.



Av. Patrice Lumumba, 178 - Maputo
MOÇAMBIQUE

Tel. + 258 21 328894
Fax + 258 21 328895
www.iese.ac.mz