
1. *Note* how the author links a *processual* approach to processions, and then leadership, in the opening of the article. *Note* also the emphasis on literal *movement*, and its broader implications.
2. There is a widespread cultural pattern of “following” — how does that support or enforce *leadership*? In other words, how is leadership culturally rooted? What are some logical consequences of this realization?
3. Does a movement itself establish the architecture of leaders and followers?
4. Is there a correspondence between religious processions and secular rituals of the kind described by the author?
5. Based on the contents of this article alone, how might you define *leadership*?


1. Carstens appears to take issue with the concept of “leadership”. Why?
2. What kind of “leader” is a “Double Chief”?
3. What evidence of a transactionalist/instrumentalist approach can you find in this article?
4. In the contemporary context, how does a Band Chief compare to a Band Manager?
5. How does the contemporary situation undermine the notion that leadership automatically implies a following?


1. How does leadership in the case described by Keesing compare/contrast with Carstens’ case?
2. Note the extent to which the colonial situation transforms leadership, and how this can affect what learn from ethnographic fieldwork.


1. Note the elements of the basic pattern identified by Walzer, in how revolutionary change is conceived in the West.
2. Why does the Exodus pattern matter as much as it does?
3. What is a covenant and how do you see this translated in political language today?
4. What is the difference between messianism and Zionism?
5. Are all oppositional politics also revolutionary politics?