QUERIES: to be answered by AUTHOR

Dear Author
Please address all the numbered queries on this page which are clearly identified on the proof for your convenience.
Thank you for your cooperation

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
1	Seekings and Natrass is not in the references, please provide full details of this publication.
2	'Likewise in Peru . . . ' please check the sense of this sentence.
3	Note rephrasing.
4	Provide COSATU in full.
5	Provide SAIRR in full.
6	Skuse and Cousins 2007, please provide full details of this publication.
7	'delink' should this be 'disengage'?
8	Rust 2006, please provide full details of this publication.
9	Should this be Garcia Perez as in the references?
10	'peasantries' should this be 'peasants'?
11	Li 2007, please provide full details of this publication.
12	Please check this url.
13	Li 2006, please provide full details of this publication.
14	Appadurai 2004, please provide page numbers for this chapter.
15	Bebbington 2008a, please provide a translation of this title.
16	Burneo 2008, please provide a translation of this title.
17	De Echave and Torres, please provide a translation of this title.
18	Hall and Patrinos, please provide a translation of this title.

QUERIES: to be answered by AUTHOR

Dear Author
Please address all the numbered queries on this page which are clearly identified on the proof for your convenience.
Thank you for your cooperation

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
19	Li and Murray, please cite this reference in the text or delete it. If you cite it, please provide an initial for Murray.
20	Ospina et al. 2008, please cite this reference in the text or delete it.
21	Peet 2002, please provide a volume number.
22	SAIRR 2008, please check this url.
23	Scurrah 2008, please provide a translation of this title.
24	Seekings and Nicoli 2005, please cite or delete.

Decentring Poverty, Reworking Government: Social Movements and States in the Government of Poverty

A. BEBBINGTON*, D. MITLIN*, J. MOGALADI**,
M. SCURRAH*** & C. BIELICH***

*University of Manchester, UK, **University of the Western Cape, South Africa, ***Peruvian Centre for Social Studies-CEPES, Peru

ABSTRACT *The significance of social movements for pro-poor political and social change is widely acknowledged. Poverty reduction has assumed increasing significance within development debates, discourses and programmes – how do social movement leaders and activists respond? This paper explores this question through the mapping of social movement organisations in Peru and South Africa. We conclude that for movement activists 'poverty' is rarely a central concern. Instead, they represent their actions as challenging injustice, inequality and/or development models with which they disagree, and reject the simplifying and sectoral orientation of poverty reduction interventions. In today's engagement with the poverty-reducing state, their challenge is secure resources and influence without becoming themselves subject to, or even the subjects of, the practices of government.*

I. Introduction

Poverty research has said relatively little about social movements and social movement research has said relatively little about poverty.[1] This is not surprising – it reflects the fact that most social movements also say little, *directly*, about poverty, and very few social movements emerge on the basis of a poverty discourse. Movements rarely assume the mantle of 'being poor' as an identity-based grievance with which to negotiate, and many movement leaders we have interviewed do not want to think of themselves or their bases in this way. Their emphasis, instead, is on having been denied, excluded or treated unjustly and inequitably.

   This does not mean that movements are irrelevant to debates on poverty. However, tracing the linkages between the two domains requires a conception of poverty as more than income based, of the causes of poverty as rooted in

relationships of power, and of poverty reduction policy as determined by political and discursive processes in which movements are embedded (see Mosse, this issue). This paper argues that social movements have a great deal to say about the ways in which poverty is understood, governed and acted on in society, and that they can also have significant direct impacts on the cultural and political dimensions of 'being poor' as well as on the factors that drive different dimensions of poverty. They can contest how discourses of poverty are governed and by whom, how poverty is produced as both category and material experience, and how government intervenes in the pursuit of poverty reduction (as defined by government). We make these arguments on the basis of research in South Africa and Peru that asks if and how social movements engage politically, conceptually and tactically with the issue of poverty.

The paper proceeds as follows. In the first section we elaborate themes for addressing the relationships between movements, government and poverty, and in the second section we briefly explain the methods used in the research underlying our argument. Section III then describes the ways in which movement organisations in South Africa have engaged with state policy around shelter, land tenure, housing acquisition and access to basic services. Notwithstanding the fact that labour market dynamics continue to be the primary source of poverty and inequality in South Africa (Seekings and Nattrass, 2005), these areas of collective consumption have drawn most movement activism (Mitlin and Mogaladi, 2009). As the state has rolled out interventions designed to address shelter needs, diverse approaches have been followed by organisations to increase the relevance and effectiveness of such measures for their members.

If collective consumption has induced the most vibrant movement activity in South Africa, in Peru it has been the economy that has been the centre of movement concerns. At the core of this economic model has been the rapid expansion of extractive industries (mining, oil and gas), and the fourth section discusses the emergence of social movement activity related to this sector. We trace how new organisations have emerged and older movement organisations have re-oriented their claims towards the issue of extraction and development. These processes have been highly conflictive (Defensoria del Pueblo, 2007).[2] These conflicts hinge partly around a profound disagreement with the Peruvian government's argument that in many locations extraction offers the only hope for a pathway out of poverty, *and* that at a national scale poverty will only be reduced through extraction-led economic growth and the fiscal resources that it generates.

On the basis of these empirical discussions, the paper closes with conclusions as well as questions for further enquiry.

II. Movements, poverty and the state

Lacking the market opportunities open to economic elites, the social networks that upper classes enjoy, or the bureaucratic authority available to state agents, low-income people have to find alternative sources of power if they are to be successful in demanding changes required for poverty reduction. Particularly in a democratic state, social movements or mass actions are one of the legitimate sources of power that are open to them, helping poor people secure a political response to the

problems that they face (Moore, 2003: 303). But what is the nature of such movements, how do they emerge, how do they go about securing success and under what conditions are they able to induce the state to address their needs and interests?

Movements and their Emergence

Both the analysis and *realpolitik* of social movements are characterised by discrepancies over what constitutes a social movement. Where activists and commentators see a social movement around mining in Ecuador, the country's president Rafael Correa sees only '*cuatro pelagatos*' (four nobodies) (Moore, 2009); and where some writers see movements, others see only organisations, networks or mobilisations. These differences are partly political, partly definitional. In this paper we understand movements as a process of mobilisation that is sustained across time and space, rather than as a specific organisation. Thus, while formal organisations can be *part of* social movements, movements are more than formalised actors and also include the more nebulous, uncoordinated, and cyclical forms of collective action, popular protest and networks that serve to link organised and dispersed actors in processes of social mobilisation. They are more akin to political campaigns (Tilly, 1985), or in the words of Ballard et al. (2005: 617) discussing South Africa, social movements are 'politically and/or socially directed collectives' of usually several networks and organisations aiming to change elements of the political, economic and social system.

Social movements rarely emerge around poverty *per se* (Mitlin, 2006; Bebbington, 2007). Rather they appear to emerge in response to processes implicated in the creation and reproduction of poverty, even when these processes are not necessarily viewed in 'poverty' terms by the movements themselves. Three broad types of social movement might be identified. The first emerges in response to dynamics of capital accumulation. Harvey (2003) distinguishes between accumulation through exploitation hinging around the wage relationship and accumulation through dispossession involving expropriation of land, water, natural resources, territory and other assets that sustain the material and cultural dimensions of livelihood and collective reproduction. While exploitation is more likely to induce union type organisation and movement, dispossession induces emergence of movements around territory, ethnicity, environment, justice or place (see Escobar, 2008).

Movements responding to accumulation dynamics emerge around conflicts in the sphere of production. A second type of movement is that which emerges around the distribution and provision of services and assets that are collectively consumed and provided by the state. These can include shelter, basic services, education, and tenure regulations. While the first type of movement may deal with business as much as the state, this second type articulates more directly with the state as service provider and/or regulator. A third type of movement has roots less in production or collective consumption dynamics, but rather in structured relationships of prejudice based on identity (gender, ethnicity, race and so on). These movements can be understood as challenging the 'terms of recognition' (Appadurai, 2004; Lucero, 2008) under which certain identity-based groups are subject to disadvantage as a consequence of the ways in which they are viewed and governed by other, more powerful groups. Most such movements have a basis in shared social *identities* (for example, ethnic

movements), though some have a basis in shared social *convictions* (for example, human rights movements).

Domains of Activism

Comparing these movements in terms of the domains in which they are active, the first type contests relationships linked to production, the second contests relationships linked to the state and collective consumption, whilst the third contests relationships within society. The boundaries are, however, fluid – for instance, a movement protesting dispossession of territory may often overlap significantly with ethnic movements themselves committed to the recuperation of territory. However, the distinctions help order discussion of movements, the issues around which they emerge, and the strategies they use.

This three-way taxonomy also helps draw attention to themes relating to poverty and movement strategy. While the second and third types of movement might make significant gains within their particular domain, the evidence that such gains translate into material poverty reduction effects is not yet convincing. While over the last 20 years ethnic movements in the Andean countries have secured significant political and cultural gains (Andolina, 2003; Van Cott, 2008), poverty rates among indigenous people in Latin America have scarcely changed (Hall and Patrinos, 2005). Similarly, while collective consumption movements have helped place water and sanitation in the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals,[3] actual service provision reforms continue to emphasise corporatisation and cost recovery (von Weizsäcker et al., 2005). This takes us back to Du Toit's (2004) insistence that adverse incorporation (and not social exclusion) is the relational base of chronic poverty. Even when movements succeed in addressing the conditions of exclusion, they may have little effect on the conditions of adverse incorporation, with the effect that material poverty persists.

Engaging the State

While we have noted that movements operate in different domains, almost all at some point engage the state as they press for changes in regulation, legislation, constitutional principles, entitlements, service provision, and budget allocation. In each of these ways, they seek to change the way in which the institutions of the state *govern*, including how they govern poverty both as an idea and as an object of state intervention. *How* they do this varies. We outline three dimensions of this variation: those around scale, around strategy and around political process.

Scale.   Movements operate at distinct levels, and orient their actions towards different levels of the state. In collective consumption movements members often share a strong neighbourhood and district base, and such movements are often urban based (Castells, 1983; Sassen, 2004: 650). The city is the primary sphere of political action because of the significance of local authorities in influencing the rules and regulations that govern access to collective consumption goods, livelihood opportunities and the conditions under which informal enterprise activity takes place.[4] However, building linkages across places to be able to reach up to the central state is a challenge that has been overcome by

only some urban movements (such as certain national members of Slum and Shackdwellers International, SDI: Swilling, 2008). It is even less frequent that urban and collective consumption-oriented movements succeed in building transnational linkages, though SDI is again an exception.[5]

Movements operating in production and identity domains can likewise emerge from place-based processes (such as conflicts with particular extractive industries, the creation of specific ethnic federations, and so on). However, they appear to be more successful in building linkages across localities, operating at national scales, and engaging both central state and transnational public entities. This may be because their issues are not locally bound, and are the object of both central state policy and institutions, *and* international campaigns and treaties. It is not an accident that documented cases of transnational movements and activism have been around issues of the environment, human rights, indigeneity, globalisation and free trade, but very rarely around service provision and the government of urban poverty (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Waterman, 2001).

Strategy.   We identify three broad strategies that are used in an attempt to shift the state. All involve governance and resource allocation issues, going beyond simple attempts to influence 'policy' and engaging the state at more fundamental levels.

In the first strategy the movement seeks to broaden governance practices so that they can monitor government and affect resource allocation in ways that the formal democratic process does not allow because movement concerns are in the minority or because formal democratic process allows dominant coalitions to ignore concerns of poor people. Examples include movement led efforts to introduce participatory budgeting (Abers, 1998) or forms of people's assembly that shadow local governments (Andolina, 2003). A second strategy involves the promotion of new ways of thinking about poverty and government intervention with a view to influencing public debate and programme and policy design. That such challenges to dominant discourse are largely what define social movements is not a claim only of post-structural authors (Alvarez et al., 1998; Escobar, 2008); hard-headed, in many cases market-minded, leaders of movements might say the same thing. For instance, while the agrarian movement in Peru ultimately failed to influence the design of Peru's Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with the USA, its leaders declared their several years of mobilisation around the FTA a success precisely because they had made small and medium scale agriculture and its relationship to trade liberalisation a topic of political and public debate (Burneo, 2008). Likewise in Peru, the idea that indigenous peoples have the right of free, prior and informed consent before economic activities can be undertaken on their lands. Until recently invisible, the idea is now part of the political debate largely because indigenous and extractive industry movements have placed it there through their discourses and protests.

The third strategy, particularly apparent among urban social movements, has been to challenge bureaucratic modes of service delivery by engaging the state in programmes hatched by movements themselves. Given the massive scale of informality in urban areas and chronic resource scarcity, the state has been ineffective in addressing poor people's needs for secure tenure and basic services (UN-Habitat 2003). Hence some social movements have sought state resources for their own practices as they uncover and validate '. . . those subaltern knowledges

and cultural practices worldwide that modernity itself shunned, suppressed, made invisible and disqualified' (Escobar, 2004: 210). Through strategies of co-production – joint programmes in which state and movement each make resource, design and management contributions – social movements seek to engage the state on the terms of the poor (Mitlin, 2008).

Political process.   The third axis around which movement strategies differ relates to their engagement with political processes. One theme here is the recurrent (Ballard et al., 2005) argument over the relative effectiveness of negotiation with authorities as opposed to the use of confrontation and direct action. While some studies and movement leaders suggest that in the absence of direct action, state (and company) policy would not change (Bebbington et al., 2008a,b), others insist that within-system negotiation is the only sustainable and feasible way of advancing movement interests (MacFarlane, 2004). As a compromise argument, some authors show the importance of combining direct action with strategic negotiating capacity – as for example in Racelis' (2003) discussion of Quezon City and Barbosa et al.'s (1997: 28) review of the Goiânia Federation for Tenants and *Posseiros* in Brazil. Ultimately, movement choice on this issue (both substantive and representational) seems to depend on a combination of strategic calculation of the costs and benefits involved, and ideological conviction based on the movement leaders' own (radical or reformist) theories and experiences of socio-political change.

   A second dimension of these calculations is if and how to enter alliances with politicians and formal political groupings (Crossley, 2002). The issue here seems to hinge around movement capacity to know *how and when* to engage in such alliances. Close to election time, large, active, mobilisations are more likely to induce responses from politicians, meaning that the capacity of a movement to mobilise significant numbers of supporters may matter more than its ability to negotiate alliances. At other times, alliances with politicians and parties might be the more fruitful option – as was arguably the case (albeit with many nuances) in the more or less structured relationships between movements and parties in Brazil (the PT), Kerala (the Communist Party) and Bolivia (the Movimiento al Socialismo). The complexity of such alliances is illustrated by the changing and often strained relationships between social movements, the African National Congress and the trade unions in South Africa.[6] Many alliances with formal political parties lead at worst to a political instrumentalisation of the movement (Hickey and Bracking, 2005), or at best to recurrent tensions. Such tensions arise because while movements pressure parties to adopt policies that further the interests of their members, so parties also seek to influence the political position of the movement in the search for electoral support. It is perhaps such experiences that influenced Jockin Arputham, president of the National Slum Dwellers' Federation in India, to persuade the Federation to adopt a policy of avoiding alignment with any single political party in order to be able to negotiate with whichever party is in power (Appadurai, 2001: 29).

III. Methods

Given that political relationships occupy a central place in this approach to social movements and poverty, the research reported on here sought countries with

relatively consolidated state bureaucracies, as well as significant movement activity. This was one of the considerations that led us to conduct the work in South Africa and Peru. The selection was also driven by human and logistical criteria. The relative sensitivity of the issues being addressed required research in countries where we already had well-established partnerships and relationships with movement organisations and research centres themselves linked to or at least respected by such organisations. In each country, the research aimed to: assess the overall significance of social movements for poverty reduction; document and analyse the strategies used by these social movements; identify those social movement strategies that are recognised to have secured enhanced inclusion and recognition, and the redistribution, transfer or generation of material benefits; and analyse the influence of both state and movement characteristics on social movements' choice of strategy and the relative success of these strategies.

While much research on contemporary movements hinges around case studies and is sectorally focused and issue based (Alvarez et al., 1998; Ballard et al., 2006; Robins, 2008), this project took a different approach. We conducted an overall 'mapping' of movements in each country, tracing the main domains of movement activity, the main organisations involved in this activity, and the interactions among these domains and organisations. The mapping considered if and how movements thought about and addressed the question of poverty. This phase of research involved interviews with established movement leaders, movement intellectuals and key informants and culminated in a mapping paper[7] which was then discussed at workshops with movement leaders, movement organisations, researchers and activists.

This 'mapping' approach had distinct advantages. While not allowing the depth of analysis that case studies offer, it permitted a view of movements over a broader reach of space and time. This made it easier to identify and trace relationships among movements, and the ways in which some movements have grown out of or in relation to others. Likewise it gave a clearer sense of patterns in how different movements interact with the state, political parties and NGOs. It also permitted comparison among different movements' discourses on poverty, and among the strategies assumed for engaging with the state on issues defined as poverty reduction by government. Finally, it also helped understand how the most visible movements exist in relation to other movements that while less visible, have played important roles in their emergence. Thus, while the following two sections focus on prominent movements in South Africa and Peru, they understand these movements and their approaches to poverty and the state in relationship to other movements.

IV. Struggles for Shelter and Services in South Africa

Mapping South African Movements: Political Transition and Movement Emergence

Before 1994, most social movements rallied primarily around their opposition to apartheid. While movements emerged at different times and with different purposes, for example the trade unions sought to protect workers while more political groups sought an end to the apartheid regime, the nature of the anti-apartheid struggle dominated movement discourse and activities. One of the most important groupings

330   within these earlier movements was the 'civics' who acted as quasi local government in black African townships. The civics illustrate both the significance of anti-apartheid movements and the scale of transition that such movements have experienced. With democratisation, they experienced a considerable loss of purpose as the political emphasis switched to engaging and building the democratic state

335   (Cherry et al., 2000). Their demise reflects the 'taken for granted' belief that the ANC's Reconstruction and Development Programme would be implemented and poverty addressed.

       The apartheid state faced, and ultimately fell because of an organised political opposition, sustained legal challenges from civil society, strong local organisations in

340   black townships and spontaneous protests (Robins, 2008). Current movement organisations draw on these historical trajectories of action in multiple ways as they pursue their goals (Swilling, 2008). The historical strength of these movements is reflected both in a strong present-day sense of citizen entitlement towards the state and, on the part of the state, in a recognition of the potential power of street politics.

345   The historic importance of these movement organisations is also reflected in the continued dominance of the African National Congress (ANC) which has just won its fourth election remaining the automatic party of choice for the majority of the black African population disenfranchised, exploited and dispossessed by the previous regime. While the government's economic policy is widely considered to

350   have been abruptly changed in 1996 away from the poverty-driven approach of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) and towards the more neo-liberal and market-orientated policy of Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) (Peet, 2002; Everatt and Maphai, 2003), the government has maintained and extended social grant transfers to needy individuals with programmes to provide

355   housing and to facilitate improved access to basic services (Van der Berg et al., 2007; Muller, 2008). The outcomes of the mapping exercise reflect this history. Eleven of the 36 movement organisations included in the mapping were formed between 1994 and 2000 and a further 18 movement organisations have been formed since that date.

       It is striking that despite increasing income poverty and inequality, labour

360   relations do not emerge as a significant source of contestation. The-long standing alliance between COSATU and the ANC may be a significant reason. However, it may also be that due to the lack of formal employment opportunities, collective consumption struggles are more important for the urban poor (Castells, 1983; Mitlin, 2006). Certainly there is intense activity seeking to influence state policies in

④

365   this domain, particularly at the level of city politics (Pieterse, 2005). This level of activity may also be rooted in political culture. Historical familiarity with neighbourhood struggles, a sense of entitlement based on the citizenship achieved with the end of the apartheid state, the lack of adequate shelter, and collective experience all result in a diversity of political challenges to state programmes. While

370   movement organisations may not agree on the solution, they are united in a belief that the state needs to change delivery strategies, and in urban politics being a site of struggle.

       Among collective consumption struggles, those around shelter are particularly prominent with various differing loci of activity (or sub-movements), each with

375   distinctive constituencies, grievances and strategies/tactics. Of the 36 movement organisations in the study, 14 focused on shelter issues (broadly defined to include

land, housing and services). Shelter sub-movements include tenants (particularly tenants of formal housing), home-owners struggling to pay bond (mortgage) payments, those living in shacks and/or informal settlements who seek housing, and households struggling to pay for services. These movement organisations and activists are seeking to change policies and programmes in areas rich in state intervention.

Movements, Poverty and Poverty Reduction

Economic opportunities remain limited for many of the urban poor. As noted above, the government has adopted a broadly neo-liberal approach to its economic policy. Poverty and inequality appear to have increased although recent figures are more encouraging, partly as a result of social transfers (Van der Berg et al., 2007). Despite its economic policies, the government remains committed to investing in a range of social programmes (Seekings and Natrass, 2006; Van der Berg et al., 2007), and some of the domains in which the government intervenes have also been those in which movements have emerged and sustained their activities.

To improve shelter options, the government has introduced a number of different programmes. The ANC election campaign in 1994 placed emphasis on housing, reflecting a resonance between legal shelter, citizenship and the promises associated with democratic transformation. The government's housing programme has been subject to little substantive modification since 1995. Provision is dominated by a capital subsidy with units being constructed primarily by private construction companies and local government (Gilbert, 2002).[8] The programme is large with two million units having been constructed since 1995.[9] The government itself has conceptualised the programme as an asset transfer to low income households (Department of Housing (DOH), 2004).

However, for the landless and homeless, and in the context of a growing number of families in housing need, it has been recognised that the scale of the housing programme is inadequate (Statistics South Africa, 2001; SAIRR, 2008). Many low income families continue to live in informal housing – and these households see access to state subsidies as the way to end their housing poverty (Smit, 2007). In terms of poverty effectiveness, the professional critique has centred primarily on the location of the dwellings and the creation or reinforcement of spatial exclusion (the apartheid city) with low income households being relocated far from services, jobs and in some cases their previous social networks (Huchzermeyer and Karam, 2006). The Department of Housing recognised these concerns in a strategy statement in 2004 (DOH, 2004) but the effectiveness of programme amendments remains moot. There have also been concerns (if less widespread) about the tendency of such programmes to individualise the relationship between the needy citizen and the state, and in so doing to reduce the potential for movement type organising (Huchzermeyer, 2003: 597–598; Robins, 2008: 83).

Service provision constitutes another major area of intervention with a programme to introduce free basic water and improve access to electricity (Muller, 2008). Despite this, movement organisations have argued that the state's efforts are inadequate (McDonald and Pape, 2002; Bond, 2008). Public campaigns have been combined with direct action (Egan and Wafer, 2006) and legal challenges in the

courts have been made to prevent the use of pre-paid meters (which reduce
providers' financial risk) (Bond, 2008: 1044).

Strategies, Tactics and Approaches to the State

Movement organisations respond to the needs, interests and expectations of their
members. In engaging the state, shelter movement organisations use both
confrontation and negotiation. This is not a simple continuum, however, as
organisations also seek different ends – some favouring state housing provision and
others favouring state-financed self-development, in part due to a Foucauldian-
based mistrust of the ability of state systems and structures to deliver what is needed
(Khan and Pieterse, 2006; Robins, 2008; Appadurai, 2001). South African movement
organisations have to respond to multiple ideological and pragmatic faces of a state
which, within and between different programme areas, can be simultaneously neo-
liberal and pro-market, developmentalist and redistributive, bureaucratic and
regulatory, and clientelist and self-interested (Pieterse, 2005; Robins, 2008).

There is ongoing adjustment between approaches as activists seek to draw out
more favourable state responses to shelter need while at the same time contesting
actions that are perceived as hostile. A representative of the Landless People's
Movement commented '[t]he relationship oscillates between confrontation and
negotiation even if the former has an upper-hand . . .' An interviewee from the iLitha
Park Anti-Eviction Campaign stressed that for this network the balance between
negotiation and confrontation depends on the particular context of individual
organisations. The work of FEDUP (another network) is positioned more towards
collaboration but the neighbourhood associations that make up its membership
include land invasion as a potential tactic. The strategies spoken of by activists
within organisations active in service provision also include confrontation and direct
action, with tactics including the reconnection of cut-off meters, demonstrations and
other protests. Interviewees from two organisations consider that the balance has
shifted in recent years with greater weight now being placed on negotiation. In both
cases, these are organisations that have engaged with the courts to advance the
interests of their members and these legal processes may have legitimated the
position of the organisation enabling negotiations to take place within a more
favourable context .

While the above discussion assumes that movement organisations exist outside the
state and exert an autonomous influence on the state, the reality appears to be more
complex. In practice, some movement activists have longstanding and embedded
interactions with the state and relations are influenced by numerous factors including
ideology, rights and political decision making.

Movement organisations working in the area of access to services have the most
diverse ideological direction, in part influenced by a leadership that includes
individuals expelled from the dominant political party (the ANC) alongside more
local grassroots activists. The nature and direction of these organisations emphasise
the importance of understanding movements within their political context and not as
isolated phenomena. The formation of some movement organisations owes as much
to the strategies of the ANC and its management of internal opposition to its
economic policy as it does to locally experienced inadequacies in service provision.

The Anti-Privatisation Forum was formed in direct response to the government's cost recovery measures and associated labour restructuring,[10] while other organisations in this sub-movement have been initiated by local households seeking to access affordable services and avoid being cut-off because of failing to pay bills.

When individuals expelled from the ANC chose to locate themselves within movement organisations rather than attempt to create new political parties, they returned to the drama of the street protests that challenged and defeated apartheid. At the same time, they began to engage with the current difficulties faced by low-income residents who cannot afford service payments. Such movement organisations experience the state as potentially antagonistic, and interviewees spoke at length about how the state is active in legitimising some movements and movement organisations, and de-legitimising others, and generally government is seen as wanting to control movement activity (Oldfield 2008). Yet despite such concerns, movement leaders legitimate their activities in terms of the government's own poverty objectives and seek to participate in state programmes that enable them to address the needs of their members.

A second area in which relations between state and movements are complex is that of rights. The mapping exercise notes the significant overlap between the shelter movement and the human rights movement which occurs in part because 'rights' remains a significant discourse for civil society and one that is seen to have direct relevance for poverty reduction programming (Jones and Stokke, 2005). Not only are rights used as the basis for extending the provision of state support to those in need, but legal protection is seen as a means of preventing the scale of exploitation, dispossession and discrimination that existed previously. The historic power of a rights discourse has been enhanced through the new Constitution and the creation of the Human Rights Commission (Sachs 2005: 134).[11] 'Rights' remain a movement goal but one that has now been incorporated within the state. In terms of our research, the language of rights seems to be used by movement organisations to offer tactical advantages to the dispossessed, excluded or otherwise disadvantaged; but the rights discourse is not an all-encompassing vision through which citizens challenge for power and negotiate their 'right to have rights'. The mention of rights, when made by interviewees, was related to court actions and legislative processes to prevent or delay evictions, to prevent cut-offs and more recently challenge the installation of pre-paid meters. There was no discussion about the use of rights to frame a more substantive anti-poverty discourse (see also Skuse and Cousins, 2007). This may reflect the fact that court actions depend on professionals and have dynamics that delink them from local communities and their frustration with poverty and structural disadvantage (see Oldfield and Stokke, 2006). It may also reflect the level of formalisation around the legal process which validates 'rights' but at the same time fits uneasily with the informal societal relations that are more dominant in the lives of the poor (Hickey and Mitlin, 2009). Finally, some rulings suggest that the law is as much to do with confirming disadvantage as it is about framing structures for equal citizenship (Sachs, 2005).

There is also evidence that a particular sort of movement politics is emerging in which they engage the state in order to re-negotiate how decisions are made, and to promote locally devolved decision-making in the face of otherwise hierarchical and state-centred authority. Within the housing subsidy programme, such a devolved

space is provided through the People's Housing Process, a community self-management option negotiated in part through the efforts of the South African
Homeless People's Federation (Miraftab, 2003; Khan and Pieterse, 2006). The
People's Housing Process has been promoted by the state with a clear commitment
to embed empowerment and pro-active collective citizenship within approaches to
poverty reduction (DOH, 2004). While not all movements engage with the PHP,
those that do appear to seek a relation of co-production with the state (Evans, 1996)
in the recognition that normal clientelist political strategies are not viable for the case
of mass housing delivery because of the scale of resources involved (Cherry et al.,
2000). Indeed, despite tricky local political relations involved,[12] movement
organisations seem aware of the value of this strategy, and have themselves been
pro-active in developing locally controlled alternatives to state programmes.[13] One
motivation here may be that in the face of a highly and increasingly regulated sector
(Huchzermeyer and Karam, 2006; Rust, 2006), self-help solutions are unlikely in the
absence of cooperative relationships with the state.

Faced with such an ambitiously developmental state that seeks to expand rights
and deliver goods and services (Van der Berg et al., 2007), it may be as important for
movements to influence the detail of policies and programmes as to change the
nature of relations between the state and society. Whatever the case movements
work across the spectrum: some seek to influence explicit ANC ideologies (or the
balance between competing ideologies) while others follow a more 'Hirschmannian'
(1984) path in which the main contribution of civil society is to enable citizens to
influence agendas within a decentralised and devolved system of decision making. In
this sense, as they engage the government of poverty reduction, movements tackle
both the broader societal framings of poverty and development, as well as the nitty-gritty of state intervention.

V. Extractive Industry Movements in Peru

Mapping Peruvian Movements: Political Economic Change and Movement Emergence

Peru has seen significant movement activity since the second half of the twentieth
century. Early movements contested questions of land and labour, above all in the
rural economy (Cleaves and Scurrah, 1980). These movements intersected with those
of the political left which, in addition to pursuing their own political agendas, played
important roles in the struggles for peasant access to land and for fairer labour
relations, as well as those for unionisation. Once Lima, Peru's capital, began to
grow, urban mobilisations and place based movements also appeared (Mangin and
Turner, 1968; Stokes, 1995; Schönwälder, 2002), and more generally there is a clear
relationship between the development of Peruvian political economy and movement
dynamics. In this historical context, the mapping exercise identified 10 movements
currently active in Peru: the agrarian, cocalero (coca growers), environmental,
extractive industry, feminist, human rights, indigenous, union and popular women's
movements as well as a collective of regional movements each demanding
government and fiscal decentralisation. The boundaries between these movements
are far from clear cut, and many actors appear in more than one movement. Human
rights groups are, for instance, active in a range of movements, and there are

important overlaps between the extractive industry, indigenous and parts of the environmental movement. Of these 10 movements, perhaps the most visible over the last decade has been that around extractive industry (certainly it has been the movement that has attracted most government opprobrium: Garcia, 2007). ⑨

Over the last 15 years, governments of Peru have prioritised the extractive over the agrarian and manufacturing economies and have increasingly tied their macro-economic strategy to a rapid expansion of mineral, oil and gas investment. As indicators of the scale of this expansion, between 2003 and 2007 the proportion of the Peruvian Amazon affected by hydrocarbon concessions increased from 14 to over 70 per cent, while over half of the country's registered peasant communities are affected by mining, mostly by concessions for mineral exploration. This has had significant macroeconomic effects – Peru's economy has had sustained growth (at 8% in 2008) and mining and hydrocarbons accounted for 63.8 per cent of exports between 2000 and 2007. The potential contribution to poverty reduction is more circuitous (depending on the payment and then redistribution of taxes, and on *indirect* employment generation), while the potential effects on impoverishment due to asset dispossession, capital intensive technological change and environmental externalities become great (see Harriss-White, 2005).

Several characteristics of this expansion are important for understanding how movements have emerged around the issue. First, the process is led by international companies. This has raised concerns among traditionally nationalist and anti-imperialist organisations and movements. Second, it has been facilitated by incentives that give companies significant tax and royalty advantages, raising concerns among similar groups that the country is unable to benefit from its subsoil and convert those assets into other resources that could be used for development and poverty reduction. Third, the expansion involves competition over natural resources in rural areas. Deposits and concessions are mostly located in areas occupied by low-income peasantries and indigenous peoples. This raises concerns among peasant and ⑩ indigenous movements regarding the vulnerability of their members' livelihoods, the security of the land and water resources on which they depend, and their ability to exercise power over the territories and community spaces which they have historically governed. Fourth, expansion introduces new (real and perceived) environmental risks – particularly risks regarding the future quality and quantity of water resources. It raises rural, urban and environmentalist worries regarding the water on which the consumption side of livelihoods depends.

These rapid and multi-faceted changes have induced new forms of organisation and movement around extractive industries. This process has involved both the emergence of new movement organisations as well as their articulation with other movements. Locally, urban and regional defence fronts have emerged to question the effects on water supplies, quality of life and the distribution of benefits between territory and central state. Within these defence fronts one encounters both new actors as well as more traditional leftist and anti-imperialist activists. At a national level, and for the case of mining, the formation of the Coordinator/Confederation of Communities Affected by Mining (CONACAMI) has been central to the emergence of a specific movement around mining. Unlike miners' unions which represented workers and (à la Harvey, 2003) reflected responses to accumulation through exploitation, CONACAMI is an organisation seeking to represent territories

(peasant communities) within areas of mining influence whose assets are threatened by processes of accumulation through dispossession. Since its creation in 1999, CONACAMI has gained more and more visibility in the country's mining conflicts. Its position has also become more radical with time and has incorporated increasingly indigenist discourses. This discursive shift has helped to create ties with indigenous organisations as well as to link arguments around mining to other transnational indigenous processes, especially those around the ILO 169 convention. The visibility, activism and growing radicalisation of CONACAMI led to its 'delisting' as an officially registered NGO by the government in 2005, following concerns expressed by the Office of the President and parts of the mining industry.

CONACAMI is a new organisation whose creation has served to articulate and give public face to a national movement around mining. The situation is rather different for the case of hydrocarbons. Given that almost all new hydrocarbon investment has occurred in the Peruvian Amazon, the response has been led by existing indigenous peoples' organisations that come together under the umbrella of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the Peruvian Jungle (AIDESEP). Thus, while a mining movement exists in Peru, a hydrocarbons one does not – rather the indigenous movement, its organisations and some of their already existing allies have assumed hydrocarbon extraction as one of the most significant issues of concern within their existing platforms, primarily because it has such potentially negative implications for their longstanding concerns about territory. These two issues came together powerfully when in 2008 the government attempted to pass legislation that would ease the sale of community lands to third parties (legislation designed particularly with the mining sector in mind). In response AIDESEP mobilised an Amazonian strike that ultimately led the executive to suspend the legislative proposal. In the face of continued political manoeuvres by the government, AIDESEP called a second strike in 2009. While this culminated in the tragic deaths of 33 people, the result has been to place the issues of hydrocarbons and indigenous territory squarely in public debate (Bebbington, 2009).

At its core the extractive industry movement is a movement around dispossession, inspired by concerns about imperialism, neoliberalism and loss. As it has evolved, its links to an already existing indigenous movement and movement organisations have become progressively stronger, and it has interacted in important ways with the human rights and agrarian movements, though the positions of these remain secondary in how the movement positions itself. Sub-nationally, the multiplicity of currents appears even greater. Movement positions in some sites seem mostly about environment, in others about threats to land and territory, in others about nationalising extractive industry, and in others about employment and the local distribution of benefits. Thus, while there is a recognisable national movement around extraction, it and its links to other movements are multifaceted.

Movements, Poverty and Government

The extractive industry movement has framed its concerns around rights, dispossession, indigeneity, territory and environment. Poverty has *not* been the leitmotiv, though concerns for development *have* been closer to the surface, above all

locally. While in some instances movement activities have seemed opposed to the unbridled expansion of the extractive economy in just as many cases movement initiatives have been oriented towards demanding an increase in the benefits that extraction brings to local populations. Movement organisations have thus pressed (with some success) for: increases in the revenue returned to the regions where extraction occurs; greater financial contributions from companies; and increased employment generation (this latter demand being particularly visible in local movement initiatives).[14]

These concerns for 'development' have been framed in terms of rights and equity rather than poverty. This suggests discrepancy with the ways in which poverty is framed and understood in international development policy, counter-posing a view that embeds poverty in social relations against policy views that extract it from these relations and turn it into an object of intervention (see Li, 2007). However, movements have had to engage in a debate on poverty because government and the industry have framed the case for the expansion of extractive industry within a narrative of poverty reduction. The President of Peru has argued that transnational investment, above all in extractive industry, offers a pathway out of rural poverty that peasant agriculture does not (Garcia, 2007). Industry representatives similarly insist that, to paraphrase, 'mining is the only option if such high altitude, primitive communities' are to escape from poverty.[15] Technocrats and politicians alike argue that the extractive economy is critical for to the financing of social policy. Taken together, extractive industry growth is presented as a poverty reduction intervention and placed in contrast to the existing agrarian economy that, such actors insist, will only mean continued poverty. Organisations such as CON-ACAMI are framed as wanting to condemn rural communities to continuing poverty (Garcia, 2007).

This framing has forced movements to respond. From NGOs and more professionalised social movement organisations,[16] the response has been more analytical with books produced seeking to counter government and industry claims and to demonstrate that at best there is no link between extraction and poverty, and at worst regions of extraction are poorer than others (De Echave and Torres, 2005). Some organisations also respond that given the multidimensional nature of poverty, *even if* incomes were to increase, the environmental damage, infringement of rights and general loss of prior forms of social order imply a net negative effect. For their part, membership organisations and their leaders have responded in less technically substantiated ways but have made similar points. The resonance of their claims was sufficiently strong that the absence of 'trickle-down' from the extractive economy became one of the core themes in the presidential elections of 2006.

The effects of these arguments about poverty and extraction are complex. They have induced increased efforts by the mining sector (writ large) to increase its impact on poverty. Many companies have rethought their social responsibility programmes with a view to increasing poverty reduction, and the World Bank group has run pilots to improve the use of the mining generated tax revenue that is returned to the directly affected regions. Conversely the state's response has been to intensify its attempts to delegitimise and in some cases partially criminalise movement organisations and activities, an authoritarian response that has deepened state

presence in the self-government of movement organisations. Some organisations have toned down criticisms and distanced themselves from more radical movement organisations; some have had to protect or defend their staff against criminal investigations initiated by the state; and others have to dedicate resources responding to state demands for information and conformity. Many organisations also find themselves having to respond to that part of the state's poverty discourse that insists that they want to trap the rural population in perpetual poverty. Increasingly they dedicate resources and time to elaborate 'development alternatives' rather than critique the adverse effects of extraction.

Approaches to the State

While the extractive industry movement is reined in by these insinuations of government into their operations, they also suffer weaknesses of their own, in particular the ability to work across scales and coordinate national agendas and local concerns. However, it is undeniable that they have made extractive industry a topic of public and political debate in a way that would not have occurred otherwise. They have also challenged easy associations made between poverty reduction and extraction, and the ways in which these are debated in the public sphere.

As they have done this, strategies have mixed the confrontational with the negotiated, the analytical, and the occasional alliance with political figures. There is not the space here to assess the relative effects of these distinct strategies, though analytically it appears to be the case that absent direct action, neither government nor companies pay attention (Scurrah, 2008). It also appears that the use of direct action has opened the political space within which other negotiations over policy have occurred (Bebbington et al., 2008 a, b).[17] While not all (perhaps none) of these discussions have evolved exactly as movement organisations hoped, they have challenged the way in which extraction is governed, and its effects on the asset bases of local populations. They have called into question the adequacy of existing public institutions for ensuring that economic growth results in poverty reduction, and have challenged how poverty is publicly discussed in Peru in relation to extractive industry.

VI. Conclusions

Several patterns emerge from the mapping exercises in South Africa and Peru. Movements contest a broad range of domains, and while class-based identities are no longer dominant in movement organising (if ever they were), a range of other collective identities and platforms have emerged around which the organisation of society, state and economy are negotiated. In these negotiations the state is their primary interlocutor. They seek both to change its institutions, policies, presumptions about poverty *and* to make it the propagator of the changes in society that they, the movements, seek. While such strategies are often couched in terms that criticise the 'neoliberal' state, movements and movement organisations often seem more concerned to gain concessions from, rather than transformations of, this state and its dominant mode of engagement with the contemporary capitalist economy.

The mapping exercises also problematise any simple associations between movements and poverty. First, people do not mobilise primarily around poverty, even if the issues they address can be causally linked to the creation of poverty. Generally, movements resist being framed as 'poor' – other identities appear to be viewed as both more powerful and more empowering. The sense from interviews is that leaders view the label of 'poor' as demeaning, and some also see it to be a vehicle through which movements and their bases can be converted into objects of state programmes that divert attention from the issues of real concern to them.[18] Indeed, it may be that the deeper issue is who governs the meaning of the terms 'the poor' and 'poverty'. Movements might be more inclined to assume those labels if they were able to given them meanings that are more empowering – but as long as the state and elites control the meaning of these terms, then movements worry that the labels can become mechanisms of social control.

Second, social movements are never only movements 'of the poor'. Important roles are played by political activists, NGOs and other social movement organisations that are more often than not staffed by professionals. Some movement leaders (for example, those of the extractive industries and indigenous movements in Peru) insist that these support organisations are not movement members (they are just sympathisers). Analytically, however, it is hard to sustain the case that such organisations are not also part of the movement in question, particular given the process and discursive definition of social movement we have adopted here.

In addition to these observations, two larger and more important themes emerge from the mappings. The first is the importance of history. Contemporary movement dynamics – both for the sector as a whole as well as for the movements that we have discussed in more detail – reflect histories of state–society interaction, of perceptions of the state, development and political parties, and of the formation of individuals who subsequently emerge as leaders, influenced by the culture that their own histories lead them to carry with them. The imaginaries that lead movements to frame demands about housing (South Africa) or extractive industry (Peru), are likewise embedded in histories: of white suburbanisation in South Africa, and of appalling environmental and social performance by pre-1990s extractive industry in Peru. Modern history also has much to do with movement emergence. As new forms of accumulation by dispossession unfold, as in Peru, new social movements have emerged to engage them (at the same time as union-based movements from earlier periods have weakened). As the post-apartheid state has assumed a more prominent role in service provision, it has marked out spaces of negotiation into which movements have stepped. At the same time, tensions among movements as well as between them and the South African state reflect debates over how to manage the relationship between economic management and the provision of collective consumption goods.

Movements are, though, *only* partly derivative because their emergence also reflects people's desire to exercise expanded control over the conditions of their existence. While political economy dynamics influence which among these conditions of existence becomes a domain of contention, these dynamics do not necessarily and always induce movements into being. In that process, people's agency, *habitus* and simple sheer determination are also key (Crossley, 2002).

The second larger point relates to our distinction between capital accumulation, collective consumption and identities/convictions as the three basic domains of

movement activity. Empirically the distinction appears valid – movements in the two countries *do* prioritise one or other of these domains. However, to the extent that poverty reduction is a direct or indirect concern, then to operate in just one of these domains is insufficient. In South Africa, if employment generation is central to poverty reduction, struggles around shelter, land and services will, though of immense importance for citizenship, have little impact on the material dimensions of poverty. In Peru, if extraction will ever have any significant effect on poverty this will be because of the taxes that it generates and the ways in which they are spent. Therefore, while struggles around the effects of extraction on territory, land and environment are central to the defence of citizenship, if movements are to influence material poverty dynamics they will also need to engage seriously in arguments over how these fiscal resources should be invested and who should control decision making regarding this investment. In each instance, then, it becomes critical to engage production and collective consumption jointly if movements are ever to influence citizenship and poverty jointly.

There is a more general point here. The message of the mapping exercises is not only that the social movement sector is active; another message is that the sector is also fractured, with many movements co-existing (and overlapping) in sometimes confusing ways. Put another way, we might suggest that movements have emerged around issues and identities within their respective societies, but not in response to the structure of their societies as a whole. To the extent that they elaborate alternatives (which is at best occasionally), they do so only for their specific issues. That they do this reflects the specialist nature of movement support organisations, the sectorally based responses of the state to movements, the issue specific expectations of their bases and the weakness of political parties (which, if stronger, would play the role of defining platforms and proposals combining a wide range of interests). Systemic alternatives that deliver proposals for rethinking the relationships between production and consumption are conspicuous by their absence. While some movements (like academics) call for alternatives to neoliberalism, it is difficult to claim that these calls are anything other than symbolic and rhetorical. Indeed, it may be that for movements to embrace the bigger picture requires that themselves they control the state (as happened with South Africa's liberation struggle and has recently occurred in Bolivia). Taking the state, however, immediately presents them with unanticipated challenges and myriad other realities, including international definitions of responsible government. The irony is that having only been rhetorical in their pre-governmental calls for alternatives to neoliberalism, once in government some of their practices become neoliberal in ways that are much more substantive than rhetorical.[19]

Notes

1. For reference to some exceptions see discussion in Bebbington, 2007 and CPRC, 2008.
2. We use hydrocarbons as shorthand for 'oil and gas'.
3. Though of course, many movements and NGOs take issue with an MDG approach to poverty reduction, emphasising instead rights-based approaches, not least in the water sector (Nelson, 2007). Nevertheless in South Africa there is a long tradition of NGOs working in what is broadly defined as the 'urban sector'.
4. The exception appears to be those cases (for example, India, South Africa, Brazil) where there is a greater potential to secure state financed subsidies – in such instances, higher levels of government have become a target for movement activities (Ballard et al., 2006).
5. As Perreault (2006: 151) notes, one of the exceptional aspects of the struggle against privatisation in Cochabamba was the fact that it transcended the local.
6. Evelina Dagnino (2008) gives a personalszed analytical account of the many things that went wrong in movement alliances with the PT in Brazil, while the relationships between MAS in Bolivia and the indigenous movement are also increasingly strained.
7. These papers are available at http://www.sed.manchester.ac.uk/research/socialmovements/
8. The interests of private construction companies in the programme design and realisation have also been noted (see Gilbert, 2002).
9. http://www.housing.gov.za/default.htm (media release, 15 December 2008. Accessed 15 February 2009).
10. A broader network of organisations with a common political purpose are cooperating under the banner of Social Movements Indaba; for a summary of their position see, for example, http://apf.org.za/article.php3?id_article=177
11. Sachs himself provides a further example of the integration of state and civil society in respect of the rights movement; he is a Justice of the Constitutional Court and was an active lawyer within the anti-apartheid movement.
12. Robins (2008) argues that many movement activists blend rights campaigning with the more pragmatic realities of clientelist politics.
13. For example, one representative of SECC spoke of encouraging old age pensioners to build rooms to rent, thereby augmenting their own income, and developing a concrete example of community controlled densification which was a state objective raised in negotiations with the local community and in which the state was also developing its own initiative.
14. The redistribution of economic and financial benefits from mining has not been as high on CONACAMI's agenda as one might expect perhaps because the tax redistribution mechanism passes through the regional and local governments that traditionally ignore and exclude the communities that are CONACAMI's core constituency.
15. We refer to our own interviews and discussions with the industry conducted in Peru, Ecuador and the UK.
16. There is a wider issue here. In the research, it was evident that leaders of CONACAMI and AIDESEP did not view such NGOs and sympathisers as being part of the movement. While welcoming their support, they did not see them as insiders. Other observers would be more inclined to see these NGOs as part of the same movement – understood as an assemblage of actors, organisations, ideas and discourses all pulling in the same normative direction. While this is in part a difference of view on the meaning of the term 'movement' it also suggests a difference of viewpoint on the permissible class and ethnic base of social movements.
17. The effectiveness of direct action is perhaps what has induced an increasing criminalisation of protest – a phenomenon that may have made some movement organisations less inclined to continue using forms of direct action.
18. There are echoes here of both Arturo Escobar's argument (Escobar, 1995) and Tania Li's (2006) more recent rehearsal and elaboration of the idea.
19. As, arguably, is also the case in South Africa and Bolivia.

References

Abers, R. (1998) Learning through democratic practice: distributing government resources through popular participation in Porto Alegre, in: J. Friedmann and M. Douglass (eds) *Cities for Citizens* (Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons), pp. 39–66.

Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E. and Escobar, A. (1998) (eds.) *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures. Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements* (Boulder: Westview).

Andolina, R. (2003) The sovereign and its shadow: constituent assembly and indigenous movement in Ecuador. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 35, pp. 721–750.

Appadurai, A. (2001) Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2), pp. 23–43.

Appadurai, A. (2004) The capacity to aspire: culture and the terms of recognition, in: V. Rao and M. Walton (eds) *Culture and Public Action: A Cross-disciplinary Dialogue on Development Policy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Ballard, R., Habib, A. and Valodia, I. (2006) (eds.) in: D. Narayan and E. Glinskaya (eds) *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apatheid South Africa* (Scottsville: University of KwaZulu Press).

Ballard, R., Habib, A., Valodia, I. and Zuern, L. (2005) Globalization, marginalization and contemporary social movements in South Africa. *African Affairs*, 104/417, pp. 615–634.

Barbosa, R., Cabannes, Y. and Morães, L. (1997) Tenant today, posserio tomorrow. *Environment and Urbanization*, 9(2), pp. 17–46.

Bebbington, A. (2007) Social movements and the politicization of chronic poverty. *Development and Change*, 38(5), pp. 793–818.

Bebbington, A. (2009) The new extraction? Rewriting the political ecology of the Andes? *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 42(5), pp. 12–20.

Bebbington, A., Scurrah, M. and Bielich, C. (2008a) *Mapeo de Movimientos Sociales en el Perú Actual* (Lima: Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales).

Bebbington, A., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Bury, J., Lingan, J., Muñoz, J.P. and Scurrah, M. (2008b) Mining and social movements: struggles over livelihood and rural territorial development in the Andes. *World Development*, 36(12), pp. 2888–2905.

Bond, P. (2008) Social movements and corporate social responsibility in South Africa. *Development and Change*, 39(6), pp. 1037–1052.

Burneo, M-L. (2008) La movilización de los agricultores frente al TLC Perú-Estados Unidos: hipótesis para la discusión. *Debate Agrario*, 43, pp. 61–87.

Castells, M. (1983) *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (London, UK: Edward Arnold).

Cherry, J., Jones, K. and Seekings, J. (2000) Democratization and politics in South African townships. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(4), pp. 889–905.

Cleaves, P. and Scurrah, M. (1980) *Agriculture, Bureaucracy, and Military Government in Peru* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

CPRC (2008) *Chronic Poverty Report 2008–09: Escaping Poverty Traps* (Manchester and London: Chronic Poverty Research Centre).

Crossley, N. (2002) *Making Sense of Social Movements* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Dagnino, E. (2008) Challenges to participation, citizenship and democracy: perverse confluence and displacement of meanings, in: Bebbington, A., Mitlin, D. and Hickey, S. (eds.) *Can NGOs Make a Difference: The Challenge of Development Alternatives* (London: Zed Books), pp. 55–70.

De Echave, J. and Torres, V. (2005) *Hacia una estimación de los efectos de la actividad minera en los índices de pobreza en el Perú* (Lima: Cooperación).

Defensoria del Pueblo (2007) *Socioenvironmental Conflicts due to Extractive Activities in Peru* (Lima, Defensoría del Pueblo). (in Spanish).

Department of Housing (South Africa) (2004) Breaking new ground: A comprehensive plan for the development of human settlements, approved by Cabinet and presented to MINMEC, 2 September 2004. http://web.wits.ac.za/Academic/EBE/ArchPlan/Research/informalsettlements/Governmentpoliciesandprogrammes.htm

Du Toit, A. (2004) Social exclusion discourse and chronic poverty: A South African case study. *Development and Change*, 35(5), pp. 987–1010.

Egan, A. and Wafer, A. (2006) Dynamics of a 'mini-mass movement': origins, identity and ideological pluralism in the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee, in: R. Ballard, A. Habib and I. Valodia (eds) *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Durban: University of KwaZulu Press), pp. 45–66.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Escobar, A. (2004) Beyond the Third World: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalization social movements. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), pp. 207–230.

Escobar, A. (2008) *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Evans, P. (1996) Government action, social capital and development: reviewing the action on synergy. *World Development*, 24(6), pp. 1119–1132.

Everatt, D. and Maphai, V. (2003) *The Real State of the Nation: South Africa after 1990* (Johannesburg: Interfund).

Garcia Perez, A. (2007) El síndrome del perro del hortelano. *El Comercio*, 28 October 2008.

Gilbert, A. (2002) 'Scan globally; reinvent locally': reflecting on the origins of South Africa's capital housing subsidy policy. *Urban Studies*, 39(10), pp. 1911–1933.

Hall, G. and Patrinos, H. (2005) *Pueblos indígenas, pobreza y desarrollo humano en América Latina: 1994–2004* (Washington: World Bank).

Harriss-White, B. (2005) Poverty and capitalism. Queen Elizabeth House Working Paper Number 134, Oxford.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hickey, S. and Bracking, S. (2005) Exploring the politics of poverty reduction: from representation to a politics of justice?, *World Development*, 33(6), pp. 851–865.

Hickey, S. and Mitlin, D. (2009) *Exploring the Pitfalls and Potentials of the Rights Based Approach to Development* (Sterling VA: Kumarian Press).

Hirschmann, A. (1984) *Getting Ahead Collectively* (New York: Pergamon).

Huchzermeyer, M. (2003) A legacy of control? The capital subsidy for housing, and informal settlement intervention in South Africa. *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), pp. 591–612.

Huchzermeyer, M. and Karam, A. (2006) *Informal Settlements: A Perpetual Challenge?* (Cape Town: UCT Press).

Jones, P. and Stokke, K. (2005) *Democratising Development: The Politics of Socio-economic Rights in South Africa* (Leiden and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers).

Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Khan, F. and Pieterse, E. (2006) The Homeless People's Alliance: purposive creation and ambiguated realities, in: R. Ballard, A. Habib and I. Valodia (eds) *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Durban: University of KwaZulu Press), pp. 155–178.

Li, T. and Murray (2006) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Lucero, J.A. (2008) Indigenous political voice and the struggle for recognition in Ecuador and Bolivia, in: A. Bebbington, A. Dani, A. de Haan and M. Walton (eds) *Institutional Pathways to Equity: Addressing Inequality Traps* (Washington DC.: World Bank), pp. 139–168.

MacFarlane, C. (2004) Geographical imaginations and spaces of political engagement: examples from the Indian Alliance. *Antipode*, 36(5), pp. 890–916.

Mangin, W. and Turner, J.F.C. (1968) The Barriada movement. *Progressive Architecture*, May, pp. 154–162.

McDonald, D.A. and Pape, J. (2002) *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa* (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council).

Miraftab, F. (2003) The perils of participatory discourse: housing policy in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22, pp. 226–239.

Mitlin, D. (2006) Social movements and urban chronic poverty. CPRC Working Paper 64, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, London and Manchester.

Mitlin, D. (2008) With and beyond the state: coproduction as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organisations. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(2), pp. 339–360.

Mitlin, D. and Mogaladi, J. (2009) *Social Movements and Poverty Reduction in South Africa* (Cape Town and Manchester: PLAS/University of Manchester).

Moore, M. (2003) Arguing the politics of inclusion, in: P. Houtzager and M. Moore (eds) *Changing Paths: International Development and the New Politics of Inclusion* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press), pp. 261–284.

Moore, J. (2009) Ecuador: mining protests marginalized, but growing. *Upside Down World*, 21 January 2009. http://upsidedownworld.org/main/content/view/1673/1/.

Muller, M. (2008) Free basic water – a sustainable instrument for a sustainable future. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(1), pp. 67–88.

Nelson, P. (2007) Human rights, the millennium development goals, and the future of development cooperation. *World Development*, 35(12), pp. 2041–2055.

Oldfield, S. (2008) Participatory mechanisms and community politics: building consensus and conflict, in: M. van Donk, M. Swilling, E. Pieterse and S. Parnell (eds) *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience* (Cape Town: UCT Press), pp. 487–501.

Oldfield, S. and Stokke, K. (2006) Building unity in diversity: social movement activism in the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, in: R. Ballard, A. Habib and I. Valodia (eds) *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Durban: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal), pp. 111–132.

Ospina, P., Santillana, A. and Arboleda, M. (2008) Neocorporatism and territorial economic development: the Ecuadorian indigenous movement in local government. *World Development*, 36(12), pp. 2921–2936.

Peet, R. (2002) Ideology, discourse and the geography of hegemony: from socialist to neoliberal development in postapartheid South Africa. *Antipode* 55–84.

Perreault, T. (2006) From the Guerra Del Agua to the Guerra Del Gas: resource governance, neoliberalism and popular protest in Bolivia. *Antipode*, 38(1), pp. 150–172.

Pieterse, E. (2005) At the limits of possibility: working notes on a relational model of urban politics, in: A. Simone and A. Abouhani (eds) *Urban Africa: Changing Contours of Survival in the City* (London, New York and Senegal Zed Books in association with CODESRIA), pp. 138–175.

Racelis, M. (2003) Begging, requesting, demanding, negotiating: moving towards urban poor partnerships in governance. Paper presented at the Urban Research Symposium, World Bank, Washington DC, 16–18 December.

Robins, S. (2008) *From Revolution to Rights in South Africa* (Pietermaritzburg: UKZN Press).

Sachs, A. (2005) The judicial enforcement of socio-economic rights: The Grootboom case, in: P. Jones and K. Stokke (eds) *Democratising Development: The Politics of Socio-economic Rights in South Africa* (Leiden and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers), pp. 131–152.

SAIRR (2008) From bare fields to the backyards of properties: the shifting pattern of informal dwelling erection, 24 November 2008, Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, www.sairu.org

Sassen, S. (2004) Local actors in global politics. *Current Sociology*, 52(4), pp. 649–670.

Schönwälder, G. (2002) *Linking Civil Society and the State: Urban Popular Movements, the Left, and Local Government in Peru, 1980–1992* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press).

Scurrah, M. (2008) *Defendiendo derechos y promoviendo cambios: El Estado, las empresas extractivas y las comunidades locales en el Perú* (Lima: IEP/Oxfam).

Seekings, J. and Nicoli, N. (2005) *Class, Race and Inequality in South Africa* (Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press).

Smit, W. (2007) *Voices of the Poor: Synthesis and Recommendations* (Cape Town: Development Action Group for the Urban Landmark).

Statistics South Africa (2001) Census 2001 primary tables South Africa. Report No. 03-02-04 (2001), Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

Stokes, S. (1995) *Cultures in Conflict: Social Movements and the State in Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Swilling, M. (2008) Beyond cooption and protest: reflections on the FEDUP alternative, in: M. van Donk, M. Swilling, E. Pieterse and S. Parnell (eds) *Consolidating Developmental Local Government: Lessons from the South African Experience* (Cape Town: UCT Press), pp. 501–510.

Tilly, C. (1985) Models and realities of popular action. *Social Research*, 52(4), pp. 717–747.

UN-Habitat (2003) *The Challenge of Slums: The Global Report on Human Settlements* (London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.).

Van Cott, D.L. (2008) *Radical Democracy in the Andes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Van der Berg, S., Louw, M. and Berger, R. (2007) Post-apatheid South Africa: Poverty and distribution trends in an era of globalization. UNU/Wider Research Paper No. 2007/57, United Nations University and World Institute for Development Economics Research, Helsinki.

Von Weizsäcker, E.L. Young, O.R. and Finger, M. (2005) *Limits to Privatization: How to Avoid Too Much of a Good Thing* (London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.).

Waterman, P. (2001) *Globalisation, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms* (London, Washington: Continuum).