

# Toward a new typology of revitalistic attitudes

JOANNA RAK

Faculty of Political Sciences and International Studies, Batorego 39L,  
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Jurija Gagarina 11, 87-100 Toruń, Poland  
E-mail: j.m.k.rak@wp.pl

---

The article contains critical theoretical examination of approaches toward revitalization movements in Anthony Francis Clarke Wallace's meaning. The examination includes a presentation of main shortages and drawbacks which are characteristic of these movements' typologies. There is also an authorial and innovative proposal for typologies of revitalistic attitudes which may be a useful device for analysing political thought of the populations influenced by globalization. The new approach formulated encompasses entire semantic fields of revitalistic movements and simultaneously it is free from the weaknesses captured. Indeed, the dual typologies created on the basis of various criteria, that is: attitude toward indigenous culture, attitude toward foreign culture and attitude toward homeland, consist of the ideal behavioural types in Max Weber's perspective and their antinomic types, so they make up a multi-dimensional look at the subject of future empirical analysis on revitalistic thought.

**Key words:** revitalization movements, nativism, irredentism, counter-irredentism, socio-cultural attitudes, political thought

---

## INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this paper is to propose new typologies of revitalistic attitudes which are characteristic of individual revitalization movements. It is significant to indicate that the typology of revitalistic attitudes, and simultaneously revitalization movements, provides a broad range of theoretical structures which are highly applicable in the realm of reflection on social and political reality (Bengtsson, Hertting 2014: 726). The ideal behavioural types – in Max Weber's meaning (Weber 2012: 125; 137) – of representatives of revitalistic attitudes are useful when describing political thought of the populations influenced by globalization (Rosenberg 2015). The singled out asymptotic types are theoretical creations which constitute the most important distinctive features of their designata (Aronovitch 2012: 358). Indeed, the typologies can be used in the face of methodological difficulties to determine the content and structure of cleavages in the contemporary world (Collier, LaPorte, Seawright 2012: 217).

Therefore, the paper presents a critical and constructive review of theoretical approaches toward revitalization movements. It commences with description, interpretation and criticism of Anthony Francis Clarke Wallace's classic conception (Wallace 1956). Then, there is a depiction of academic attempts at improving the view mentioned. Their examination

focuses on common types of mistakes which are made in the scope of formulating typologies of revitalization movements. Discussion about exemplifications of Paul Gordon Hiebert's dual typology based on one criterion (Hiebert 1976) and Jack David Eller's multi-dimensional typology based on three criteria (Eller 2009) in particular provide us with arguments against a hasty and ill-considered semantic field of revitalization movements dividing. The analysis of the theoretical approaches sheds light on both shortages and drawbacks which reduce the potential cognitive value of typologies as a useful device in social sciences.

The criticism of theoretical approaches toward revitalization movements is acknowledged as an inspirational list of cautions against mistakes in future approaches. The cautions formulated are worth taking into consideration while making up typologies, and they reveal a theoretical need for a new approach toward revitalization movements which would be free of weaknesses. So, the last part of the paper contains new typologies of revitalization movements laid out according to the criteria of attitude toward indigenous culture, attitude toward foreign culture and attitude toward homeland. This is worth emphasizing that all components of the typologies meet the requirements of Weberian ideal types. The extremes of the first dual typology are the following: Ralph Linton's approach toward nativistic movement (Linton 1943) and its antinomic, that is, the autonegative cultural attitude in Ewa Nowicka's meaning (Nowicka 1972) which are set apart in accordance with the type of cultural attitude toward own culture. Then, the attitude toward foreign culture is the second crucial criterion which divides the semantic field of revitalization movements, and it is a source of vitalistic movements by Marian W. Smith (Smith 1954) and contra-acculturative movements by Melville Jean Herskovits (Herskovits 1960) distinction. The last typology is formed on the basis of attitude toward homeland and it is composed of irredentist movements in Eller's perspective (Eller 2009) and counter-irredentist movements in authorial approach discernment as the extremes of continuum. Last but not least, the article ends with hints for future studies on revitalization movements and their equivalents in the scope of revitalistic attitude types.

### **THE CRITICISM OF THEORETICAL APPROACHES TOWARD REVITALIZATION MOVEMENTS**

Wallace defines revitalization movements as a "deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture" in his classic work (Wallace 1956: 265). In fact, he indicates that revitalization is a particular kind of culture change phenomenon (Wallace 1972: 476). Notwithstanding, the approach mentioned has some drawbacks, namely, it does not allow to identify and to differentiate various types of revitalization movements that exist. What is worth noting is that the author abandons a typology creation, and he presents merely an exemplification (Wallace 1958: 120). Indeed, there are attempts at formulating typologies of revitalization movements in academic literature; however, they contain drawbacks which reduce their general value as analytical schemes or heuristic devices (Herdin 2012: 604).

The first kind of weakness consists in oversimplification of theoretical approaches (Sharaby 2011). It means that scholars often construct merely straightforward dual typologies on the basis of one criterion (Tollefson, Williamson 1992: 48) which do not enable us to analyse complex manifestations of social thought because these one-dimensional typologies do not fill up the entire semantic field of revitalization movements. In this way, some of exemplifications of revitalistic movements may be missed while using only one one-dimensional typology in research. For instance, Hiebert distinguishes nativistic and importation types of revitalization movements. Members of nativistic movements strive to exclude all that is alien in

their own culture and to revive that which is considerable in the scope of traditional culture. Whereas members of importation movements aim at integrating that which is significant for them regardless of its traditional or foreign sources (Hiebert 1976: 388–390). It means that the semantic field of nativistic movements in this approach is similar to Simone Clemhout's presentation so it is too broad (Clemhout 1964: 15). Therefore, Hiebert's definition is not determined carefully and accurately, namely, the type pointed out includes both contra-aculturative movements in Herskovits's presentation (Herskovits 1960: 531) and nativistic revivalistic (not revivalist) movements in Ralph Linton's perspective (Linton 1943: 231). It is worth highlighting that the approach is simultaneously limited to one of subtypes of nativistic movements so it does not enable us to identify their diversified manifestations (Turner 1971: 147). Then, importation movement, the second type, is antinomic in relation to the ideal behavioural type of nativistic movement merely in the scope of attitude toward elements of foreign cultures. Well then, Hiebert ignores a significant reference to revivalistic aspiration (Horowitz 1977: 14), and he does not propose the antinomic type in relation to the nativistic revivalistic type of revitalization movements. Therefore, this dual typology does not meet the requirements of correct typology.

On the other hand, Eller takes on making up the weakness revealed, that is, he proposes the compound typology of revitalization movements that consists of syncretism, millenarianism, irredentism, modernism, also termed vitalism, and nativism identical to fundamentalism (Eller 2009: 370–377). However, the new theoretical approach cannot be used blindly as a research device due to its shortages which are worth pondering. Firstly, Eller regrettably does not formulate any common criterion to divide the entire semantic field of revitalization movements. And this is the second type of drawbacks characteristic of theoretical approaches toward revitalization movements. For instance, nativistic and vitalistic movements are distinguished according to attitudes toward the criterion of their own and foreign culture, whereas irredentist movements are differentiated in accordance with attitudes toward homeland. Simultaneously, the criteria indicated are not applicable to identifying millenarian movements (Hill 1972: 272; Markowitz 2003: 98). Apart from that, the individual types of revitalization movements appointed are not separate (Voget 1959) and therefore their semantic fields are partially coincident. For example, syncretic movements in Peter Worsley's meaning adopted (Worsley 1957) and vitalistic movements are similar in the scope of their distinctive features, namely, creation of satisfactory for the members of movement amalgam of cultures and aspiration to inclusion of foreign culture elements in the own culture content, on the other hand. Moreover, the connective presentation of modern and vitalistic movements and nativistic and fundamentalist movements is spurious as well due to their different semantic fields (Bäcker 2011: 153–159; 179–188; Pichardo 1997: 411–430). Indeed, Eller puts supplementary *definienda* in typology; however, it is unnecessary as well because it is not crucial for the types of vitalistic and nativistic movements defining. Furthermore, Eller's typology does not encompass either all the possible types of the revivalistic cultural attitudes or their antinomies (Telban 2013). As an example, there is a lack of the antinomic type in relation to nativistic attitudes, namely, the type of autonegative attitudes (Nowicka 1972: 21).

## NEW TYPOLOGIES OF REVIVALISTIC ATTITUDES

The critical analysis of the typologies reveals a theoretical need for a new approach toward revitalization movements which would be free of shortages realized. The semantic field of a new typology may be divided by using diversified criteria (Wallace 1959: 25). The attitude toward

the native culture is the first substantial criterion which divides that field and is a source of nativistic and autonegative movements discernment. The types determined constitute extremes of the continuum between full approval of the native culture and full negation of the native culture, on the other side. The process of taking a stance on the native culture and creating its image involves indigenous components valorisation. The valorisation may take on various forms dependent on its vector, so it may be observed as revaluation or devaluation. Indeed, the revaluation or image-affirmation consists in restoring a value manufactured of the native culture or in giving an expected value to the native culture, while the devaluation or image-refusal consists in depriving the native culture of value discerned (Salmond 2004: 123). It has to be reserved that the mechanisms depicted are typical not only for this but also for the following typologies. The attitude of approval is expressed in Linton's definition of nativistic movement: "Any conscious, organized attempt on the part of society's members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture" (Linton 1943: 231). This approach concentrates on the type of attitude toward the native culture which is displayed by those members of the society who fully accept their native culture and acknowledge their past. Its antinomic type is the autonegative cultural attitude in Nowicka's meaning, that is: "a rejection of selected elements of the native culture" (Nowicka 1972: 21). It is worth adding that autonegative attitudes are conditioned by any conscious and organised attempt of eliminating certain elements of the native culture created by the members of the society so the attitude negates the indigenous culture. In sum, every manifestation of revitalistic thought may be situated between these extreme types and in the definite distances to them depending on the approbation toward the native culture intensity extent.

The attitude toward foreign culture is the second substantial criterion which divides the semantic field of revitalization movements, and it is a source of demarcation of vitalistic and contra-acculturative movements. The types mentioned are extremes of the continuum between full approval of foreign culture and full negation of foreign culture. The first type, namely, the attitude of approval is well defined by Smith as follows: "Any conscious, organized attempt on the part of a society's members to incorporate in its culture selected aspects of another culture in contact with it" (Smith 1954: 122; 1959a: 9). This approach focuses on the acceptance of the alien culture and the disdainful attitude toward the indigenous culture which is combined with the effort to replace some of its rudimentary components drawn from the dominant culture by members of the society (Smith 1959b: 28). Its antinomic type is the contra-acculturative cultural attitude in Herskovits's view, that is: "It is essentially out of contacts involving dominance of one people over another that contra-acculturative movements arise – those movements wherein a people come to stress the values in aboriginal ways of life, and to move aggressively, either actually or in fantasy, toward the restoration of those ways, even in the face of obvious evidence of their importance to throw off the power that restricts them" (Herskovits 1960: 531; 1938: 11). Besides, this approach includes the explicit need to revitalize the native culture stems from the contact with the dominant culture which impedes and limits the indigenous culture. The contra-acculturative attitude is also reactive, occurring in conditions of domination and submission and being a direct result of the society's discontent with the domination of an alien culture (Bäcker 2005: 149–156). It is worth stressing that every expression of revitalistic thought may be situated between these types and in the distances outlined to them depending on the approbation toward the foreign culture intensity extent.

The attitude toward homeland, the third important criterion which divides the semantic field of revitalization movements, is a source of distinction of irredentist and counter-irredentist movements. The types pointed out form extremes of the continuum between full approval

of homeland and full negation of homeland, on the other side. The attitude of approval is articulated in Eller's definition of the irredentist movement: "Irredentism (from the Italian *irredenta* for unredeemed) is any movement intended to reclaim and reoccupy a lost homeland" (Eller 2009: 373). The approach presented centres around the type of the attitude toward homeland which is displayed by those members of the society who fully approve of their homeland. Its antinomic type is the counter-irredentist attitude; however, it does not have a correct definition in academic literature yet. In fact, current proposals do not meet the requirements of antinomic types of Weberian behavioural ideal types, like, for example, secessionism (Saideman, Ayres 2000: 1126–1128; 1130), separatism (Kolstø, Edemsky, Kalashnikova 1993), reconciliation (Farrington 2007) or brigandage (Koliopoulos 1989). Therefore, there is an urgent need for setting up a new category which is the type of the counter-irredentist movement. The type created is defined as any conscious and organized attempt on the part of society's members to reject their homeland. Moreover, counter-irredentist attitudes are conditioned by any conscious and organised attempt. Every manifestation of revitalistic thought may be situated between these types and in the specific distances to them depending on the approbation toward the homeland intensity extent as well.

## CONCLUSIONS

The disquisition on current theoretical concepts of revitalization movements shows that they cannot be taken for granted due to their weaknesses. Therefore, this is significant to assume a critical and reflective approach while using typologies as a device for analysing revitalistic attitudes. Weberian behavioural ideal types indicated a permit to determine and compare various manifestations of revitalistic political thought of populations influenced by globalization. The dual typologies constructed constitute a handy device for empirical analyses. Nevertheless, it would be desirable to criticize, transpose or supplement these academic presentations and interpretations because they are not definitive and therefore open to improvement and any argument revolving around those approaches could expand academic knowledge about social and political reality. Furthermore, their empirical verification is an interesting challenge for all those who study sociology, political sciences and anthropology.

Received 28 October 2014

Accepted 25 May 2015

## References

1. Aronovitch, H. 2012. "Interpreting Weber's Ideal-Types", *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 42(3): 356–369.
2. Bäcker, R. 2005. "Instrumentarium ideologiczne kontrakulturacyjnych nurtów antyglobalizacyjnych", in *Europejska myśl polityczna wobec globalizacji. Tradycja i wyzwania współczesności*, eds. J. Sobczak; R. Bäcker; Sz. Ossowski. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Ibidem, 149–156.
3. Bäcker, R. 2011. *Nietradycyjna teoria polityki*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
4. Bengtsson, B.; Hertting, N. 2014. "Generalization by Mechanism: Thin Rationality and Ideal-type Analysis in Case Study Research", *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 44(6): 707–732.
5. Clemhout, S. 1964. "Typology of Nativistic Movements", *Man* 64(7): 14–15.
6. Collier, D.; LaPorte, J.; Seawright, J. 2012. "Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor", *Political Research Quarterly* 65(1): 217–232.
7. Eller, J. D. 2009. *Cultural Anthropology: Global Forces, Local Lives*. New York, London: Routledge.
8. Farrington, Ch. 2007. "Reconciliation or Irredentism? The Irish Government and the Sunningdale Communiqué of 1973", *Contemporary European History* 16(1): 89–107.

9. Herdin, T. 2012. "Deconstructing Typologies: Overcoming the Limitations of the Binary Opposition Paradigm", *International Communication Gazette* 74(7): 603–618.
10. Herskovits, M. J. 1938. *Acculturation. The Study of Culture Contact*. New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher.
11. Herskovits, M. J. 1960. *Man and His Works. The Science of Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
12. Hiebert, P. G. 1976. *Cultural Anthropology*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
13. Hill, F. R. 1972. "Nationalist Millenarians and Millenarian Nationalists: Conflict or Cooperation in the New Jerusalem?", *American Behavioral Scientist* 16(2): 269–288.
14. Horowitz, D. L. 1977. "Cultural Movements and Ethnic Change", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 433(1): 6–18.
15. Koliopoulos, J. S. 1989. "Brigandage and Irredentism in Nineteenth-Century Greece", *European History Quarterly* 19(2): 67–102.
16. Kolstø, P.; Edemsky, A.; Kalashnikova, N. 1993. "The Dniester Conflict: Between Irredentism and Separatism", *Europe-Asia Studies* 45(6): 973–1000.
17. Linton, R. 1943. "Nativistic Movements", *American Anthropologist* 45(2): 230–240.
18. Markowitz, F. 2003. "(Still) Sacrificing for Salvation: Millenarian Motherhood Reconsidered", *Social Compass* 50(1): 97–112.
19. Nowicka, E. 1972. *Bunt i ucieczka. Zderzenie kultur i ruchy społeczne*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
20. Pichardo, N. A. 1997. "New Social Movements: A Critical Review", *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 411–430.
21. Rosenberg, M. M. 2015. "The Conceptual Articulation of the Reality of Life: Max Weber's Theoretical Constitution of Sociological Ideal Types", *Journal of Classical Sociology* 15(2): 1–18.
22. Saideman, S. M.; Ayres, R. W. 2000. "Determining the Causes of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities at Risk Data from the 1980s and 1990s", *The Journal of Politics* 62(4): 1126–1144.
23. Salmond, N. 2004. *Hindu Iconoclasts. Rammohun Roy, Dayananda Sarasvati, and Nineteenth-Century Polemics Against Idolatry*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
24. Sharaby, R. 2011. "Political Activism and Ethnic Revival of a Cultural Symbol", *Ethnicities* 11(4): 489–511.
25. Smith, M. W. 1954. "Shamanism in the Shaker Religion of Northwest America", *Man* 54(8): 119–122.
26. Smith, M. W. 1959a. "Towards a Classification of Cult Movements", *Man* 59(1): 8–12.
27. Smith, M. W. 1959b. "Towards a Classification of Cult Movements: Some Farther Contributions III", *Man* 59(2): 28.
28. Telban, B. 2013. "The Power of Place: Spatio-temporality of a Melanesian Religious Movement", *Anthropological Notebooks* 19(3): 81–100.
29. Tollefson, K. D.; Williamson, H. G. M. 1992. "Nehemiah as Cultural Revitalization: an Anthropological Perspective", *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 17(56): 41–68.
30. Turner, R. E. 1971. "Models of Social Movements: An Analysis of Religion and Social Change", *International Review of Sociology* 1(2): 147–156.
31. Voget, F. W. 1959. "Towards a Classification of Cult Movements: Some Farther Contributions II", *Man* 59(2): 26–28.
32. Wallace, A. F. C. 1956. "Revitalization Movements", *American Anthropologist* 58(2): 264–281.
33. Wallace, A. F. C. 1958. "The Dekanawideh Myth Analyzed as the Record of a Revitalization Movement", *Ethnohistory* 5(2): 118–130.
34. Wallace, A. F. C. 1959. "25. Towards a Classification of Cult Movements: Some Further Contributions. I", *Man* 59: 25–26.
35. Wallace, A. F. C. 1972. "Paradigmatic Processes in Culture Change", *American Anthropologist, New Series* 74(3): 467–478.
36. Weber, M. 2012. "The 'Objectivity' of Knowledge in Social Science and Social Policy", in *Max Weber: Collected Methodological Writings*, ed. and trans. H. H. Bruun; S. Whimster. London: Routledge, 100–138.
37. Worsley, P. 1957. *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*. London: MacGibbon & Kee.

JOANNA RAK

## Link naujos atgimimo požiūrių tipologijos

### *Santrauka*

Straipsnyje pateikta atgimimo judėjimų požiūrių (pagal A. F. C. Wallace) kritinė teorinė analizė. Tyrimas atskleidžia pagrindinius požiūrių trūkumus, taip pat trūkumus, būdingus pristatant šių judėjimų tipologiją. Darbe pateikiamas autorinis ir novatoriškas atgimimo požiūrių tipologijos siūlymas, kuris gali būti naudingas analizuojant politinę globalizacijos įtaką populiacijai. Suformuluotas naujas požiūris apima visus atgimimo judėjimų semantinius laukus ir tuo pat metu jis yra laisvas nuo trūkumų nelaisvės. Iš tiesų dvejoja tipologija sukurta remiantis įvairiais kriterijais: požiūriu į vietinę kultūrą, į užsienio kultūrą ir į tėvynę. Šiuos požiūrius sudaro idealusis M. Weberio perspektyvos tipas, taip pat jiems prieštaringi tipai, todėl tampa daugiadimensine žiūra dėl būsimos empirinės atgimimo požiūrio analizės.

**Raktažodžiai:** kultūrinės nuostatos, globalizacija, politinė mintis, socialiniai judėjimai, sociokultūrinės tapatybės