Social movements and the dynamics of rural territorial development in Latin America[1]

Anthony Bebbington

IDPM, School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester, UK

Tony.bebbington@manchester.ac.uk

Ricardo Abramovay

Departamento de Economia, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

and

Manuel Chiriboga

Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development, Ecuador

Summary. - This special section brings together four of twelve studies conducted within a research program analyzing the relationships among social mobilization, governance and rural development in contemporary Latin America. The introduction gives an overview of the contemporary significance of social movements for rural development dynamics in the region, and of the principal insights of the section papers and the broader research program of which they were a part. This significance varies as an effect of two distinct and uneven geographies: the geography of social movements themselves; and the geography of the rural political economy. The effects that movements have on the political economy of rural development also depend significantly on internal characteristics of these movements. The paper identifies several such characteristics. The general pattern is that movements have had far more effect on widening the political inclusiveness of rural development than they have on improving its economic inclusiveness and dynamism.

Key words - social movements; territorial rural development; Latin America; environmental governance; participation.

1. SOCIAL MOVEMENT AND NEW "RURAL QUESTIONS" IN LATIN AMERICA

The last two decades have witnessed significant changes in the patterns and processes of territorially-based rural development in Latin America. Beyond local differences, certain generic trends seem apparent. First, there has been a noticeable return to large-scale public and private investment in programs of infrastructural and economic development. This is most evidently so in investments in hydrocarbons, minerals, roads and water management and the massive South American Initiative for Integrating Regional Infrastructure (IIRSA).[2] Second, and in sharp contrast to this necessarily technocratic and centralized approach to territorial development, ethnic and grassroots politics have become increasingly important in debates over rural development, be this as a result of armed protest (Mexico), the emergence of national indigenous (Ecuador) and landless or family farmers (Brazil) movements, the movement of indigenous organizations into government (Bolivia and Ecuador) or the emergence of organizations contesting this infrastructural expansion (e.g. Peru, Argentina, Chile) (Ospina et al., 2006; Bebbington, 2007; Lucero, 2007; Wolford, 2004). Third, the relative significance of agriculture in the rural and peasant economy continues to diminish and off-farm incomes (including transfers from long distance migration, government programs etc.) are becoming ever more important (Reardon et al., 2001). Fourth, in the policy domain a range of rural and social programs have emerged that offer levels of formal participation that are unprecedented in the region (Melo, 2007; Arriagada, 2005). Fifth, processes of decentralization in the region, however uneven and incomplete, have given sub-national

governments and local organizations an increased role in rural development processes (Chiriboga, 1995; Tendler, 1997; Schejtman and Berdegué, 2007). Sixth, the environmental question has become increasingly visible, debated and central to discussions not only of rural development but also of national development and regional integration as suggested by recent interventions by the Ecuadorian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Maria Fernanda Espinosa (Espinosa, 2007).

In the face of such changes, if once it was possible to talk of the "agrarian question" (de Janvry, 1981) this is no longer the case. One now has to talk of the "rural question," and quite conceivably – given the depth of urban-rural articulation – the "territorial question." Given these deepening market and rural-urban linkages, the progressive globalization of parts of the rural economy, the (still limping) steps towards increased decentralization and participation, among others, as well as the more general "spatial turn" in economics, Schejtman and Berdegué (2007)[3] have argued that rural dynamics must now be approached – both analytically and in policy terms – through the lens of what they call rural territorial development (RTD). For purposes of analysis, this lens implies considering the productive and institutional dimensions of rural change together, and taking territories (comprising urban and rural spheres and a variety of sectors, both agricultural and non agricultural) as the unit of analysis on the grounds both that transaction costs and potential synergies depend on spatial arrangements, and that much socio-political action is itself motivated and oriented by territorially based identities. For policy, Schejtman and Berdegué's approach implies devising territorially based (rather than sectoral) interventions that explicitly seek to build and catalyze virtuous

relationships between productive and institutional change and that absolutely do *not* focus only on the agricultural economy as a vehicle for addressing rural poverty and exclusion (see Reardon et al., 2001; Graziano da Silva, 2002). A successful RTD policy would, then, be one that built such synergies in a way that strengthened inclusive territorial identities, reduced poverty and created more opportunities for poor people to participate in both the economics and politics of rural development.

These new rural questions and the concept of RTD constitute the context for the papers in this supplement. Together they analyze the roles that social movements have played in the emergence and governance of these new dynamics of territorial change, as well as in the promotion of alternative, more inclusive forms of rural development.

2. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, GOVERNANCE AND RURAL TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT: THE PAPERS IN BRIEF

Much writing on social movements is inflected with a normative commitment that, even in critical research, is ultimately sympathetic to and hopeful about the potential of social movements in fostering processes of social change that lead towards societies that are more participatory, just and able to deliver human development more effectively.[4] At their inception, the studies on which these papers are based demonstrated a similar inflection, for the question that they sought to address was "to what extent have social movements contributed to forms of territorial governance that foster development that reduces poverty and social inequalities while also conserving the environment?" The

program uniting the papers was motivated by the belief that this was indeed possible, and the purposes of the individual research projects was to demonstrate this and explore the causal processes at work that lead to such types of effects.[5] As we will see, the extent to which the studies ultimately demonstrated this relationship varied greatly, and over time the research question became instead a hypothesis that was only partially accepted.

This overarching question/hypothesis was also embedded in the conception of rural territorial development already outlined because, at a more abstract level, the notion was that social movements would induce certain forms of *institutional* change that would in turn lead to forms of *productive* change. While each paper struggles with the linear conception of causality implied in this general question (with several seeing more interactive relationships in which, at certain points, movements can be understood as consequences of productive change rather than vice versa), they do all address the relationships between mobilization, institutional change and productive change. As will become apparent, this triad of relationships proved to be a particularly productive lens for understanding the potential, and limits, of movements' contributions to enhance justice and well-being. To anticipate, the program's results suggested that movements *often* induced institutional changes in the sphere of governance, but that these institutional changes *rarely* translated into productive changes.

Just as they share the same big question, the papers also have in common a basic definition of social movements. This shared conception sees social movements as processes of mobilization that involve protest and a demand for some sort of alternative

society and development (Peet and Watts, 2004; Escobar, 1995). The papers also share the notion of social movements as processes of mobilization that stretch (often discontinuously) across space and time, linking persons and groups identified with particular claims and values. In this sense, they see movements as much more than just organizations, even if it is certainly the case that formal organizations play vital roles as coordinators, resource mobilizers, and leaders etc. of movements (Crossley, 2002). That said, the papers differ in the extent to which the movements they deal with seek radical alternatives as opposed to reformist ones, or pursue confrontational tactics as opposed to conciliatory ones. The papers also differ in the extent to which they focus on the roles of particular social movement organizations, or the broader movement process.

The papers in this supplement[6] discuss material from Brazil (two), Ecuador (two) and Peru (one)[7] and deal with a range of identity and issue-based movements: indigenous people's movements, environmental justice movements, farmers' movements, AfroBrazilian movements, agricultural workers' movements and dam-affected peoples' movements. The first of the papers by Bebbington and colleagues explores the effects that environmental justice movements and movement organizations have had on paths of territorial development in areas affected by the current expansion of large scale mining in Latin America. Working from the concept of "co-production," this paper argues that territorially-based rural development can be understood as the product of negotiation, interaction and conflicts among a range of social actors each of whom operate with distinct ideas about the nature of "development" and the place of rural areas within national growth and distribution strategies. In the contemporary context of Latin

America – one marked by spectacular growth of investment in extractive industries – the co-production of rural territories by social movements, mining investment and government is of particular significance, as various forms of social movement have begun to question and challenge elite arguments about the positive role of "modern" mining in fostering rural development. The interactions between these movements and patterns of investment – each of which have distinct geographical forms – contribute significantly to the forms and trajectories of development currently emerging in the rural highlands of Latin America. The paper explores this co-production of rural territories through a comparison of two locations in the Andean highlands, each with significant mineral deposits but which have been characterized by quite distinct development trajectories over the last two decades. One of these sites (Cajamarca, Peru) has been dramatically transformed by mining, while the other (Cotacachi, Ecuador) continues to be an agrarian economy. Focusing in particular on the forms of social mobilization in each site, and the particular interactions between movements and government, the comparison identifies factors inherent to these movements and their alliances that appear to determine the ways in which they affect development processes in mine affected areas.

A focus on the internal dynamics of movements and movement organizations also characterizes the second paper, prepared by Abramovay, Magalhães and Schroder. The authors take a critical look at the involvement of two distinct social movement organizations in processes of territorial development in the South of Brazil. It asks how far these movement organizations' have helped foster forms of territorially based development that are more participatory and economically inclusive – and in particular,

how far they have been able to catalyse economic innovations that can further such inclusion. The paper demonstrates a fundamental difference between the behavior of rural workers' unions and family farmers' credit cooperatives. In the union based movement, shared identity and strong ties (Granovetter, 1983) are central to the governance and internal coherence of the movement. However, over time and partly because of the emphasis on these strong ties and the failure to cultivate new, weaker ties with actors other than central government, union capacity to innovate and contribute to territorially based development has become progressively weaker and unions have slowly become trapped within the iron cage of bureaucratization. The credit cooperatives provide a contrast because, even though they share many of the same social and political origins as the unions, and likewise cultivate strong internal ties, they have also invested in the development of a series of weaker ties with actors who are neither part of their membership base nor their immediate social world. In particular they have developed weak links with economic actors, links that facilitate their access to information on the local economy and help them identify new opportunities for their members. The cooperatives also open up their internal governance processes to external assessment. These external relationships (of linkage and accountability) create incentives and governance arrangements that lead these cooperatives to play a stronger leadership role in local development than do unions. They have helped the organizations within the cooperative movement co-produce a brand new (and wide reaching) credit market that responds to member needs while also respecting the formal rules governing Brazil's financial service sector.

The study by Ospina, Ortiz, and Arboleda resonates in various interesting ways with that of Abramovay et al. even though its focus seems at first sight quite different. The paper deals with the experiences of indigenous movement organizations in local government in Ecuador. It is written from the perspective of a research centre that has a longstanding relationship with the highland indigenous movement in Ecuador, while having retained a critical posture at the same time. This combination of commitment and critique is apparent in their paper. The first main argument that the authors advance is that the entry of the indigenous movement into elected local government has led to a significant democratization of municipal and provincial administration, at least in the two cases they study in depth. This democratization, however, is of a specific type, which they label "neo-corporatist." It is not a democratization based on the extension of individual citizenship (though this has also become stronger) so much as on the elaboration of participatory institutional frameworks which serve as channels for the expression of organized social movement demands. That is, the participation that they promote is less one of citizens and rather more one of organizations (and especially organizations with members that have typically not participated in decision making about the use of local government resources). The second question that the article addresses is whether this neo-corporatist approach is better able to promote territorial economic development processes than prior forms of local government. Here results are more mixed, and the capacity of these "movements in government" to foster viable income-generating activities for poor rural areas remains limited. Indeed, while the level and quality of participation in Cotacachi (one of the territories they study) are truly remarkable, the area remains among Ecuador's very poorest counties. Here is the

resonance with Abramovay et al. – the tension between participation and innovation seems to continue when movements move into government. On balance, the authors conclude that forms of neo-corporatist government fostered by the indigenous movement *can* have positive impacts on economic development, but that they are confronted by two serious limitations. First, it continues to be difficult to foster a process of territorial economic development that effectively addresses the distinct interests that exist among different community organizations. Second, the negative effects of the wider economic context in which local territories find themselves remain beyond the control of the local government and thus of any participatory mechanisms that they may foster.

The final paper takes us back to Brazil and is written by Vera Schattan and colleagues. It takes as it point of departure the explosion of participatory institutions in Brazil's recent history – with the Brazilian state estimating that at the beginning of the decade there were 27,000 or so such forums in existence across the country's Brazil's 5,507 municipalities. The paper analyses the cases of two such institutions in the rural São Paulo region: one intended to foster participation in discussion of regional water resource management (including dam building) and the other seeking ways of combining environmental conservation and economic growth in areas of pressure on Atlantic rainforests. The authors ask how far social movements and movement organizations are, in practice, able to take advantage of the existence of such institutions, and through them influence the dynamics of territorially based development. In particular, they ask how far the potential of movements to influence RTD through such forums is influenced by institutional design and management, with a special focus on the mechanisms for selecting councilors, and the

use of facilitative techniques during forum meetings to aid the participation of historically excluded and relatively voiceless groups. They also assess the hypothesis that the more evenly distributed the seats among different interest groups in the forum, the more likely it is that the forum will deliver proposals deemed viable by all.

The conclusions of this final paper make sobering reading while also illuminating several important analytical issues. The authors conclude quite forcefully that design and management really *do* matter in determining how far forums are genuinely participatory, and how far movements can use them to leverage greater influence. Yet even though these forums were conceived in order to expand participation, in actual fact design criteria have in both cases led to the exclusion of both the poorest and the economically most powerful actors. This is because these criteria state that only organized groups can participate (akin to Ospina et al.'s neo-corporatist model), and these two groups are not formally organized. Likewise the cases make clear that the quality of facilitation matters greatly in determining how far movement knowledge gains credence and visibility in these forums, or how far it is crowded out by technical knowledge. Finally, and of most concern – but also analytical interest – is the conclusion that participation in these forums does not lead actors to change their views of development, nor their sympathies and alliances. Instead the internal dynamics of these forums replay already existing political alliances in the region – alliances structured in large measure by party politics. The implication is that the types of institutional transformation required for more inclusive and pro-poor RTD need to go well beyond the mere (and very common) creation of round tables. This finding resonates with

Bebbington et al. who conclude that round tables in mining conflicts have done little to change the dynamics of development or relationships of power.

3. MOVEMENT DYNAMICS AND TERRITORIAL DYNAMICS: CONTRADICTIONS IN SEARCH OF A SYNTHESIS

These papers, and the research program of which they are a part (Bengoa, 2007), share two principal conclusions. First, social movements have sought change and innovation in governance arrangements far more than they have in economic processes. They have struggled for increased levels of inclusion and participation in decision making, local planning and policy formation, and have more generally sought greater transparency and accountability in the governance of territorially - based development processes. They have done this in various ways – through pushing for and then participating in roundtables, commissions, budget management committees, and oversight councils (Bebbington et al.; Schattan et al.); and sometimes through seeking direct participation in local government through the electoral process (Ospina et al.). Indeed, they have enjoyed significant success in opening up and democratizing this governance.

The second and related conclusion is, however, that "in spite of [social movements'] significant achievements and victories …..These institutional changes have neither given rise to nor stimulated transformative processes that modify in any significant sense the opportunities of rural people and particularly of the poorest and most socially excluded"

(Abramovay et al., 2007: 24).[8] Explaining this pattern implies comparative analysis of the inner workings of the movements themselves. This analysis suggests several characteristics of these movements that are a source of political strength, but that simultaneously weaken their capacity to foster pro-poor economic transformations.[9] In this section we elaborate on these characteristics.

Movements gain strength and cohesion from a strong identity in which members are aware of sharing a number of cultural and socio-political commitments and attributes. This very strength of shared identity – and the sense that it is critical in defining the boundaries and allies of movements – can, however, get in the way of building links to other actors, many of whom movements would need to engage with in order contribute to a rethinking and reworking of territorial economic dynamics. This very strength of identity not infrequently has the adverse effect of fostering within movements (implicit or explicit) discourses that revolve around notions of allies and enemies, or the trusted and untrustable. Such languages can frustrate the building of wider ties. If we were to speak of this in terms of social capital (Abramovay et al., 2007), the very same bonding social capital that gives movements such strong identity can make it that much more difficult to build bridging and linking forms of social capital (c.f. Woolcock and Narayan, 2006). Indeed, the papers provide various cases of this. For instance, the extreme politicization of movements concerned with the adverse effects of mining makes it extremely difficult for them to reach out to mining companies and engage in dialogue on alternative regional economies – indeed, those who try to reach out can become branded as "pro-mine". Likewise the very strong ethnic identity underlying the discourse of Ecuador's national

indigenous movement has made it that much harder for local organizations within this movement to build bridges with important business actors in Cotacachi and Cotopaxi.

This same "inward lookingness" of movements can also mean they often lack the ties and linkages that they need if they are to break into those decision-making and discursive spheres in which the economic dynamics of territories are determined. Zegarra et al. (2007), for instance, analyze movements contesting the construction of large scale water diversion and irrigation projects in Northern Peru and demonstrate how these movements have no presence on those committees at which questions of design are discussed and defined. These committees are, instead, dominated by irrigation engineers. One of the reasons for this absence appears to be the fact that these movements have only very weak ties to the people and organizations that serve as gatekeepers in determining access to forums in which policies are discussed, and priorities set.

A third obstacle internal to movements derives from the contradiction between representation and innovation already noted. The idea here is that representative organizations show very little evidence of being able to foster or deliver economic innovations precisely because their focus is on politics more than markets, and their need to represent a broad constituency makes it is that much harder to find innovations that respond to such a broad base with differing economic capacities (see also Bebbington, 1996). This is a particular problem because the extreme inequality of much of Latin America leads to processes of rural innovation that often further the concentration wealth – implying that the democratization of innovation processes is an urgent task (World

Bank, 2003). That said, exceptions do exist, and in their paper Abramovay et al. discuss one farmer movement in Brazil that has succeeded in building a system of savings and loans cooperatives that now boasts some 75,000 members in almost 300 municipalities in South of Brazil. Understanding how and why such exceptions occur is particularly important for any exploration of the conditions under which movements might foster other pro-poor and inclusive economic innovations.

Fourth, social movements' normative positions and discourses can create immense resistance to anything that appears to have anything all to do with markets. Ospina et al. (2006) note a publication of an indigenous movement organization in Ecuador that comments: "the communities' conception of life bears absolutely no relation to the individualist commitment that underlies neoliberal discourse". Once again, there is a clear tension here. Discourses such as these play an important part in the constitution and identity base of a movement. However, in strengthening the movement's capacity to mobilize, the demonization of market relationships can simultaneously weaken any capacity the movement might have to negotiate new types of market arrangement. Of course, it is not the case that movement organizations never have anything to do with the economy. Some *have* become involved in trying to create certain new markets, albeit ones that are typically niche-based, solidarity or organic markets. The problem here is that even if the organizations have the internal technical, administrative and entrepreneurial capacity to build such markets, they remain relatively small. Meanwhile, movements have little or no effect on the functioning of the main labor and product

markets in which their bases are involved and which continue to work to their disadvantage.

Finally, when movements lobby government, their priorities tend not to include demands for institutions that will promote economic innovation. Put bluntly, their demands hinge much more around power and redistribution than they do around growth, and much more around *regulation of* the economy than around *innovation in* the economy. A common example in this regard is the demand for participatory planning arrangements so that the rural population might be more involved in decisions about how to allocate and use public budgets (see for instance the paper by Ospina et al.). Another example would be the demand for bodies to monitor and regulate the environmental effects of businesses (see Bebbington et al.). What social movements demand far less frequently are institutions that would allow them, their bases and dynamic local entrepreneurs to come together to discuss economic possibilities.[10]

4. GEOGRAPHIES OF TERRITORY AND MOVEMENT: MAPPING THE CO-PRODUCTION OF RTD

a) Geographies of territory

Schejtman and Berdegué (2007: 72-74) propose a two by two matrix for thinking about contemporary territorial dynamics in Latin America. They suggest that – *a groso modo* – four types of territory can be identified in the region.

Type 1 Territories are those that have enjoyed productive transformation (read modernization and market integration) coupled with institutional changes which allow "reasonable" levels of participatory governance[11] and social and economic inclusion, while at the same time reducing transaction costs in the productive sphere.

Type 2 Territories also enjoy important levels of productive transformation and economic growth, but of a form that has contributed little to local development and has created few economic opportunities for the poor.

Type 3 Territories enjoy strong institutions and regional and cultural identities, but their economies are relatively stagnant and offer little prospect of sustained, poverty reducing economic growth.

Type 4 Territories are those territories that are in processes of social disarticulation with stagnant economies, weak institutions and deep social divisions.

While categories such as these are ideal types the boundaries between which remain unclear, they do help map out four macro-tendencies among the territories of Latin America and remind us that that the actual and potential relationships between social movements and RTD will vary according to the uneven geography of territorial conditions – as well, of course, as the uneven geographies of social movements themselves. Thus, say, some Type 2 territories may be spaces in which strong peasant or

environmental movements exist, others may have strong, and urbanized worker movements, and some may have no significant presence of movements at all. Such variation across space immediately raises the questions as to why these spatial differences exist in the first place, and what implications they hold for future geographies of rural development.

To pursue such questions would demand a geographic characterization of the territories of Latin America according to Schejtman and Berdegué's typology – a form of mapping of the geographical political economies of the region.[12,13] A limit of the two-by-two typology as a filter for such an exercise is that – beyond its relative bluntness – it could treat territories as isolated and uni-dimensional spaces. A mapping of Latin America's geographical political economies would therefore also need to convey a sense of the linkages among regions as well as between them and other scales of analysis. The papers make clear why this is so. Bebbington et al., for instance note that the transformations in Cajamarca must be understood in relation to transformations in other regions in which the owners of the gold mine are operating, because the fantastic profits delivered by the Yanacocha mine have enabled those owners to operate elsewhere in ways and at scales that might otherwise not have been possible. Likewise, the same paper makes clear that these territories are not only *horizontally* networked (one to another) but also *vertically* networked, to company headquarters, financial markets, high risk stock exchanges and the like located in Denver, Toronto, Washington and, increasingly for the extractive industry sector, in Beijing, Shanghai, Buenos Aires and São Paulo. A characterization and mapping of these territorial political economies would

therefore need to convey senses of scale and network, as much as of location (c.f. Bebbington, 2003).

b) Geographies of movement

Social movement writing pays scant attention to the geographically uneven presence and absence of movements.[14] Yet this unevenness means that case study findings from an area in which there is a significant presence of social movements might be completely irrelevant to areas with no such presence. This "geography of social movements" also raises analytical questions of its own – questions as to why it is movements are so strongly present in some areas and not others. Explanations of this geography would shed light on the emergence and evolution of movements and of our understanding of them as social phenomena. Along with the challenge of mapping the territories of the region, there is therefore also a challenge of mapping its social movements. On the one hand this mapping – as in the case of territories –would have to deal with the difficulties of mapping the horizontal and vertical networks that link these movements to each other and to other actors. Likewise, and again as in the case of territories, any such exercise would have to explore movement characteristics and their variation across space.

Several of the papers demonstrate these issues of unevenness and linkage. The presence of Ecuador's indigenous movement and movement organizations is not as significant in other parts of Ecuador as it is in Cotopaxi and Cotacachi (Ospina et al.,

2006), and this demands explanation as to why. The Zapatista movement in Mexico has its clear geographies (Reygadas et al., 2007), and the geography of the environmental justice/mining movement in Peru and Ecuador is not only related to the uneven geographies of mining itself, but also to internal and local territorial dynamics that lead the movement to be stronger in some mining areas, weaker in others (Bebbington et al., 2007).

Relationships of scale are also central to the social movement geographies suggested by the papers. Returning to Ecuador, the strength of the indigenous movement in Cotopaxi and Cotacachi can only be understood in terms of the national indigenous movement and its component organizations. On the one hand, these local processes have to be understood as part of a far wider process stitched together by the national movement and its party political platform. At the same, these local processes were facilitated by the national movement in various ways. It should not be forgotten that the now mayor of Cotacachi initially stood as a presidential candidate of the National Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE).

In addition to within-country relations of scale, movement geographies are also embedded in and partly produced by international relationships with solidarity groups, activists in other countries, funders, likeminded movements and organizations elsewhere in Latin America etc. (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Tsing, 2004). The differential ability of territorially based groups to develop these linkages is part of their strength, orientation and at times survival. This ability in turn is affected by the predisposition (for diverse

reasons) of national and international groups to privilege work in, and support to, some territories and not others.

Just as the papers give pointers as to the types of horizontal and vertical relationships to which a mapping of social movements would be attentive, they also suggest some of the key characteristics of social movements that would also have to be mapped. On the basis of the papers in this supplement and the broader research program, we suggest that following Schejtman and Berdegué's two-by-two matrix for mapping territories, one could imagine a similar two by two matrix for mapping movements.[15] One axis of this matrix would relate to the identity of the movements, distinguishing between those with more communitarian identities and those with identities that emphasize the relationship between individuals and society (broadly, more traditionalist movements and more modernist ones). This axis builds on the sense conveyed by the papers that those movements that have more communitarian and traditionalist identities are less likely to influence the political economy of rural development through practices of negotiation because of their ideological aversion to markets and their greater tendency towards self-reference and inward-orientation.[16] They are, however, more likely to seek to influence RTD processes through relationships of conflict and practices of direct action.

The second axis would relate to the extent to which movements are committed to more open or more closed forms of self-governance. Abramovay et al.'s paper suggests the importance of this criterion, showing that movements with more open governance

structures are more likely to build the bridges, ties and alliances that are necessary for influencing RTD. A similar message comes from Bebbington et al.'s comparison of Cotacachi and Cajamarca where the greater openness of movements and movement organizations in Cotacachi facilitated the building of bridges between urban and rural populations and between the movement and local government institutions in ways that did not occur in Cajamarca.

This matrix would then give us four broad clusters of movement characteristics that could be mapped as four simply described movement types:

Type A movements are those with individual-societal identities and open governance structures. Movements with these characteristics are more likely to engage with other actors in relationships of collaborative negotiation on issues of RTD and more likely to contribute to processes of economic innovation.

Type B movements are those with individual-societal identities but more closed governance structures. These movements tend to shift between efforts at negotiation and relationships of conflict. While they may open up certain spaces for change their closed governance structures reduce their capacity to build the alliances necessary to sustain these spaces.

Type C movements are those that exhibit communitarian identities but more open governance structures. These movements (akin to some of the more modernizing

currents within the indigenous movement in Ecuador perhaps) also shift between negotiation and conflict, but are more likely to succeed in negotiating forms of RTD that respect local identities and in building alliances that can help sustain these (as, for instance, in Cotacachi).

Type D movements are those with communitarian identities and closed governance structures. These movements often have strongly stated identities and ideological positions and find it difficult to seek negotiated settlements to RTD conflicts. They are, however, more likely to have the capacity to mobilize in ways that affect RTD through direct action.

c) Co-producing rural development geographies

It is at the interface between these different geographies of movements and of territories that forms of RTD are produced. By exploring this interface we can say more about the ways in which movements affect RTD, as well as the ways in which economic dynamics themselves may affect the emergence of and forms taken by movements. The papers here come from cases of Type 1 (Abramovay et al.), Type 2 (Bebbington et al-Cajamarca, Schattan et al) and Type 3 regions (Ospina et al.; Bebbington et al-Cotacachi) and as such suggest how the contributions of social movements to RTD vary across different territorial types as well as providing pointers as to why movements have become present in these types of territory. Likewise the papers address all distinct types of movements, with Abramovay et al. discussing Type A and B movements, Ospina et al. discussing Type C movements, Bebbington et al. discussing Types C and B, and Schattan

et al. Types A and C. While Type D movements are not represented in the papers there are hints of such movement characteristics in the papers from Ecuador and Peru.

While we have already noted that the governance gains of movements far exceed their contributions to productive transformation, disaggregating our cases by territorial type and reading them comparatively suggests nuances to this general observation. Among these cases, the greatest governance gains of movements have been in Type 3 territories (Cotacachi, Cotopaxi), and rather less in other territorial types. This is not only an artifact of the strength of Ecuador's indigenous movement, because the papers on Cotacachi show that its environmental movement has also contributed to institutional transformation there in many significant ways. One hypothesis – for more research – would be that the pattern reflects the degree to which strong and dynamic economic elites are consolidated in different territories. The more the territory's economy engenders the emergence of such elites (as it does in Type 1 and Type 2 territories), the less movements are able to make governance gains – simply because they are dealing with more powerful actors than is the case in Type 3 territories which are, by contrast, characterized by weaker economic elites, often in a process of decline. A second and related hypothesis, however, would be that the relative openness of the ties cultivated by movements and reflected in their governance structures is also critical in determining outcomes and can serve as a counterweight to the strength of elites. Such ties and the forms of cooperation that they facilitate can change local power relations and as a result open up possibilities for social movement organizations to become significant actors in the local economy, as suggested in the paper by Abramovay et al.

A further nuance hinges around the observation that the movement that had made the greatest contributions to productive transformation and economic inclusion was in a Type 1 territory (as discussed by Abramovay et al.). The hypothesis would be that in territories with dynamic and already relatively inclusive economies it is easier for movements to craft institutions for economic inclusion. It may also be that the movements that emerge in such environments are also more likely to have more open governance structures and identities that imply less *ex ante* aversion to engaging the market.

The papers in this supplement illustrate, then, just a few of the points of contact between the geographies of territory and those of social movements. The papers cannot, however, give a sense of these larger geographies of territorial dynamics and movement presence. For this we need more comprehensive territorial and movement mapping at both national and regional scales. This work has yet to be done. Such a program would constitute part of a broader agenda that several commentators have laid out for development studies on the basis of an engagement with Cowen and Shenton's (1996, 1998) distinction between two notions of development: development as the immanent process of societal change (as in the "development of capitalism"); and development understood as an intended, goal oriented intervention (as in development projects). One of us has suggested elsewhere that one task for development studies might be to analyze how the geographies of these two types of development have unfolded over time, and in the process influenced each other and transformed livelihoods and landscapes

(Bebbington, 2000; 2004; see also Hart, 2001). In as far as social movements can be conceptualized as interventions in development processes, then the project we outline here of jointly mapping, and then understanding the articulations between these geographies of mobilization and of territorial economies would constitute part of this broader agenda.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR RURAL TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT

The InterAmerican Development Bank, World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural development and many other agencies now use the language of Rural Territorial Development as they speak of and conceptualize their rural interventions (Sumpsi, 2007; World Bank, 2007).[17] It is important not to overstate the newness of all this – the "urban functions in rural development" and decentralized development approaches of the 1970s associated with USAID and authors such as Bromley, Rondinelli and Johnson shared many of the same concerns even if their conceptual languages were less elaborate, depended more on central place theory than on theories of transaction costs, clusters and industrial district, and tended to equate the rural economy with agriculture rather than a range of economic activities. Still the return to approaches that consciously seek to understand and enhance the relationships between the geographies of local government and those of local economies, and that place the institutional question at the center of their analysis, opens up programmatic and analytical possibilities that more technocratic approaches to integrated rural development and agricultural modernization (*reconversión* in Latin America) did not.

However, a focus on "territory," "institutions" and market integration brings certain risks that the very existence of social movements helps make explicit. First, while a focus on *territorially* based dynamics is very welcome, it must come together with a sensitivity to relationships of *scale*. Territories cannot be understood independently of the scaled economic, political and social relations in which they are embedded and which, indeed, have significant influence on the very social processes through which a particular territory is constituted. Social movements – themselves often embedded in a range of national and international relationships, help make this clear. Second, while the focus on institutional transformation is also welcome, it is important to avoid using a language of institutions as a way of eliding attention to politics and relationships of power. The existence of social movements highlight just how contested rural development is, and how far power relationships influence the models of development that ultimately rise to ascendancy. Third, it is critical not to speak of development in the singular and to overstate the place of market deepening within a development process. Social movements in their role as contestors of dominant conceptions of development, and frequently of particular forms of market deepening, make evident the sense in which – within a territory – competing models and concepts of (market) development coexist in relations sometimes of both conflict and synergy.

Thus, one aspect of the significance of social movements for RTD is that they highlight potential lacunae in the approach. This is related to a second contribution of social movements to RTD – they *politicize* discussions of rural development. Their

existence, their arguments, their mobilizations and occasional direct actions all demand that rural development be seen as political and not technical. Movements make clear that making rural development choices is not a technocratic exercise, but a political process in which actors with different visions about what rural development is and should be, struggle over the ideas, with some winning out and others losing. By making visible subaltern ideas and concerns that are often hidden, and certainly less powerful, they question dominant visions of development, and force consideration of alternatives. These alternatives do not always – perhaps not even often – win out, but by forcing debates and choices, movements make both the trade-offs in development and the relationship between development and power, more explicit in society. This is clear from each of the papers in this supplement and is a conclusion that finds precedent in the ways in which authors such as Evelina Dagnino (Dagnino et al., 2006; Dagnino, 2007) and Arturo Escobar (1995) have conceptualized social movements. Indeed, perhaps the greatest impact of several of the movements discussed in these papers (e.g. the mining movement in Peru, the indigenous movement in Ecuador and the *quilombola* movement in SE Brazil) lies not in any *material* effects that they have had, but rather in the ways in which they have changed how people *think about* development in those countries – perhaps for ever, and certainly for the mid-term.

This brings us to the third and final domain in which movements are important for rural development – the *material*. These papers conclude – in ways that resonate with certain earlier interventions (e.g. Bebbington, 2000) – that movements have had important effects on governance arrangements in particular territories, making them more

participatory and inclusive. However, these changes have very rarely translated into greater economic inclusion and opportunity, nor changed the practices of dominant economic actors (except perhaps to induce them to invest somewhat more in social responsibility programs and security services). Several of the reasons for this derive from inherent characteristics of movements, characteristics which we have already noted. Others relate to the broader political economy of development. First, strong local economic actors can operate independently of any efforts to promote local coordination, development planning or the like – this because they are sufficiently powerful to seek the protection and endorsement of central government should they require it. Indeed, notwithstanding apparent commitments to decentralization, it remains the case that central authorities are still of the mind that *at the margin* local territorial concerns have to be subservient to national macroeconomic exigencies and preferences. Second, as Schattan et al. show, in those cases where significant economic actors *do* participate in round tables and local development councils, the relations of power within these councils reflect those that exist beyond and prior to them. Economic actors have more power than social movement organizations and leaderships, steer and dominate discussions within the councils, and end up molding any proposals for change that emanate from such councils. Third - and relatedly – many of the economic processes affecting given territories operate on far larger canvases than the territory in question, with many of the most important actors being located at great national and international distance from the localities in which they have effects. Except in cases where movements are able to build transnational alliances, these actors lie beyond movements' action space – and even then it is often difficult for movements to see beyond *markets* (e.g. financial and investment

markets) and identify those actors that help constitute those markets. And fourth – for Type 3 and 4 territories – movements are operating in environments whose products and services are neither great in quantity nor competitive, and are generally not highly valued by other stakeholders (be these consumers, investors or policy makers). This is not to slip into environmental determinism, but there can be no doubt that possibilities for promoting economic dynamism have very uneven geographies and movements operating in certain environments face far greater challenges in fostering economic inclusion than do others. Among our papers, the most palpable case of this must be Cotacachi in Ecuador, where one finds particularly dynamic local movements themselves well linked to dynamic national (indigenous) and international (environmental justice) movements, and operating in synergy with local government. Yet Cotacachi continues to exhibit some of the very worst economic and social indicators in the country.

Social movements are, then, no magic bullet (c.f. Edwards and Hulme, 1995 on NGOs). Rather their struggles and complaints remind us – forcefully – that rural territorial development is not a magic bullet either, and certainly not a technocratic solution to deeply grained political and economic inequalities. In making this explicit, they likely increase (rather than reduce) the shelf-life of the concept, discouraging over-enthusiasm, and instilling humility in its use.

REFERENCES

Abramovay, R., Bengoa, J., Berdegué, J., Escobal, J., Ranaboldo, C., Ravnborg, H.M., Schejtman, A. (2007) Movimientos sociales, gobernanza ambiental y desarrollo territorial. In J. Bengoa (Ed.) *Territorios rurales: movimientos sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina*, Pp. 19-41. Santiago: Catalonia/Rimisp.

Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E. and Escobar, A. (Eds.) (1998) Cultures of politics, politics of cultures. Re-visioning Latin American social movements. Boulder: Westview.

Arriagada, I. (Ed.) (2005) Aprender de la experiencia: el capital social en la superación de la pobreza. Santiago: ECLAC, United Nations Commission on Latin America.

Bebbington, A. (Ed.) (2007) Minería, movimientos sociales y respuestas campesinas: una ecología política de transformaciones territoriales. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos /Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales.

Bebbington, A.J. (2004) NGOs and uneven development: geographies of development intervention. *Progress in Human Geography* 28(6), 725-745

Bebbington, A.J. (2003) Global networks and local developments. Agendas for Development Geography, *Tijdschrift voor Economische et Sociale Geografie* Vol. 94(3), 297-309.

Bebbington, A.J. (2000) Re-encountering development: livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* Vol. 90 No. 3. Pp. 495-520.

Bebbington, A. (1996) Organizations and intensifications: small farmer federations, rural livelihoods and agricultural technology in the Andes and Amazonia, *World Development* Vol. 24(7), 1161-1178

Bengoa, J. (Ed.) 2007 Territorios rurales: movimientos sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina. Santiago. Catalonia/Rimisp.

Biekart, K. 2005 Seven Thesis on Latin American Social Movements and Political Change, *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* Vol. 79:85-94.

Castells, Manuel (1997) The Power of Identity. Blackwell Publishers

Castells, Manuel (2003) Panorama e la Era de la Información en América Latina ¿Es sostenible la Globalización? in Fernando Calderón ¿Es Sostenible la Globalización en América Latina? Volume II, PNUD – FCE, Santiago de Chile.

Chiriboga, Manuel (1995) Descentralización, Municipalización y Desarrollo Rural: la experiencia de América Latina, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Santafé de Bogotá

Cowen, M. and Shenton, R. (1998) Agrarian doctrines of development: Part 1. *Journal of Peasant Studies* Vol. 25, 49-76.

Cowen, M. and Shenton, R. (1996) Doctrines of development. London: Routledge.

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

Dagnino, E. (2007) Challenges to Participation, Citizenship and Democracy: perverse confluence and displacement of meanings. In A. Bebbington, D. Mitlin, S. Hickey (Eds.) *Can NGOs Make a Difference? The Challenge of Development Alternatives*. London. Zed.

Dagnino, E., Olvera, A. y Panfichi A. (2006) Para Uma Outra Leitura Da Disputa Pela Construção Democrática Na América Latina. In E. Dagnino, A. Olvera y A. Panfichi (orgs.) (2006) *A Disputa Pela Construção Democrática Na América Latina*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

de Janvry, A. (1981) The agrarian question and reformism in Latin America. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (Eds.) (1995) NGOs: Performance and Accountability: Beyond the Magic Bullet. London: Earthscan.

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

Escobar, A. and Alvarez, S. (Eds.) (1992) The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy and Democracy. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Espinosa G., M.F. (2007) Ecuador y Latinoamérica recuperan sus historias en busca de un camino común. Discurso de la Ministra de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio e Integración, São Paulo, 11 de septiembre del 2007, reproduced in *Resumen de Petroleo AL*, Vol 67, Envío 4

Forsyth, T. (forthcoming) Are environmental social movements socially exclusive? An historical study from Thailand, *World Development*.

Forsyth, T. (2002) Environmental social movements in Thailand: A critical assessment, *Asian Review 2002*, pp. 104-124

Granovetter, Mark (1983) "The Strength Of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited" *Sociological Theory*, 1: 201-233

Graziano Da Silva, José (2002) Local Sustainable Development, Globalization and Agricultural Restructuring in Underdeveloped Countries, *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food.* Vol. 10(1):33-39.

Hart, G. 2001 Development critiques in the 1990s: *culs de sac* and promising paths. *Progress in Human Geography* 25, 649-658

IIRSA, n.d. www.iirsa.org

Keck, M. y Sikkink, K. (1998) Activists beyond borders. Advocacy networks in international politics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lee, R. and Wills, J. (Eds.) (1997) Geographies of Economies. London. Arnold.

Lucero, J. A. (2007) 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. World Bank.

Melo, M. (2007) Political competition can be positive: embedding cash transfer programs in Brazil. In A. Bebbington and W. McCourt (Eds.) (2007) *Development success: statecraft in the South,* Pp. 31-51. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ospina, P., Larrea, C., Arboleda, M., Santillana, A. (2006) En Las Fisuras del Poder. Movimiento Indígena, Cambio Social y Gobiernos Locales. Quito: Instituto de Estudios Ecuatorianos.

Peet R. and Watts M. (Eds.) (2004) Liberation ecologies: environment, development, social movements. London: Routledge. 2nda Edición.

Reardon, T., Berdegué., J. and Escobar G. (2001) Rural nonfarm employment and incomes in Latin America: overview and policy implications. *World Development* 29 (3): 395-410.

Reygadas, L., Ramos, T., Montoya, G. (2007) Los dilemas del desarrollo en la selva Lacandona. Movimientos sociales, medio ambiente y territorio en dos comunidades de Chiapas. In J. Bengoa (Ed.) *Territorios rurales: movimientos sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina,* Pp. 200-236 . Santiago: Catalonia/Rimisp.

Schejtman, A. and Berdegué, J.A. (2007) Desarrollo territorial rural. In J. Bengoa (Ed.) *Territorios rurales: movimientos sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina,* Pp. 45-83. Santiago: Catalonia/Rimisp.

Sumpsi, J.M. (2007) Desarrollo territorial rural. Relaciones entre las transformaciones institucionales y productivas. In J.Bengoa (Ed.) *Territorios rurales: movimientos*

sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina, Pp. 84-101. Santiago: Catalonia/Rimisp.

Tendler, Judith **(**1997) Good government in the Tropics. The Johns Hopkins Studies in Development. The Johns Hopkins University Press, England.

Tsing, A. (2004) Friction. An Ethnography of Global Connections. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wolford, W. (2004) This land is ours now: a new perspective on social movement formation, *Annals of the Association of American Geographiers* Vol. 94(2): 409-424.

Woolcock, M. and Narayan, D. (2006) Social capital: implications for development. Theory, practice, and policy revisited. In A. Bebbington, M. Woolcock, S. Guggenheim and E. Olson (Eds.) *The search for empowerment. Social capital as idea and practice at the World Bank,* pp. 29-62. West Hartford. Kumarian.

World Bank (2007) World Development Report 2008. Agriculture for Development. Washington DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2003) Reaching the rural poor. Strategy and business plan. Washington DC: World Bank.

Zegarra, E., Oré, T. and Glave, M. (2007) El Proyecto Olmos en un territorio árido de la costa norte peruana. In J. Bengoa (Ed.) *Territorios rurales: movimientos sociales y desarrollo territorial rural en América Latina*, pp. 514-550. Santiago: Catalonia/Rimisp.

ENDNOTES

[1] Corresponding author: tony.bebbington@manchester.ac.uk. The authors are grateful to Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development for support in preparing this supplement, and especially to Julio Berdegué. The supplement reports on research supported, via Rimisp, by Canada's International Development Research Center. Anthony Bebbington also acknowledges with thanks a UK Economic and Social Science Research Council Professorial Research Fellowship (RES-051-27-0191) that supported much of his time in the joint preparation of this chapter and latter stages of the editorial process.

[2] IIRSA is, sponsored by the governments of the region, the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), Andean Development Corporation (CAF) and the Financing Fund for the Development of the River Plata Basin (FONPLATA) (IIRSA, n.d.).

[3] This paper was only formally published in 2006. However it has circulated widely in electronic form since early 2003 initially as a briefing paper for the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The term in Spanish is *Desarrollo Territorial Rural* or DTR.

[4] See for instance, Escobar (1995); Escobar and Alvarez (1992); Alvarez et al. (1998); Biekart (2005). Forsyth (2007; 2002) makes similar observations.

[5] This program was entitled "Social Movements, Environmental Governance and Rural Territorial Development in Latin America" and was financed by the International Development Research Center, Canada. It was coordinated by Rimisp: Latin American Center for Rural Development, and involved seven major studies, five minor studies, literature reviews and events aimed towards conceptual development and dissemination (e.g. Bengoa, 2007). The program was initially coordinated by Manuel Chiriboga and subsequently by Jose Bengoa, with interim coordination roles played by Julio Berdegué and Claudia Ranaboldo. The program partners were, in addition to Rimisp, CEPES (Peru), DIIS (Denmark), GRADE (Peru), PIEB (Bolivia) and the The Faculty of Economics of the University of São Paulo (Brazil).

[6] The program as a whole also included papers from Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Nicaragua.

[7] Bebbington et al. compare movements in Peru and Ecuador.

[8] The original is in Spanish.

[9] This section follows the argument of Abramovay et al. (2007).

[10] An example of the sort of initiative we have in mind here might be the recently formed Round Table on Responsible Soy in which social movements, businesses, class based organizations and consumer group representatives come together to elaborate plans that are then taken up in business strategies with significant impacts on rural territorial dynamics.

[11] The term in Spanish is "concertación", not readily translatable to English.

[12] The principle behind such an enterprise would not be that novel – there is a long history of efforts to map urban-rural systems, regional systems and the like, and to think geographically about the economy (as for instance in the catchily titled "Geographies of Economies" by Lee and Wills (1997).

[13] The risk, of course, would be that such an exercise might be viewed as an instrument for identifying "viable" and "non-viable" regions as a pre-cursor to writing the latter off as lost causes unworthy of significant public investment. Such a concern is not without substance, for one senses that agency officials often operate (implicitly at least) on the basis of just such a mental map.

[14] Just as the study of NGOs pays little attention to their geography (Bebbington, 2004).

[15] The criteria we suggest here are those that seem of particular relevance for considering the relationship between movements and RTD.

[16] Manuel Castells differentiates social movements based on "strong identities", apparently based on historic tradition from those based on individual identities, self references and linked to personal projects (2003; 1997)

[17] While more general intellectual thinking on clusters, urban-rural linkages, the new economic geography and local development have each influenced this shift, Schejtman and Berdegué's argument – first circulated in 2003 – has also been an important catalyst in this process. It is also the source of the notion that rural development strategies need to seek synergies between productive transformation and institutional transformation and take territories rather than sectors as their object of intervention.