Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers

Boundary Crossings

The World Development Report 2009 'reshapes economic geography': geographical reflections

Jonathan Rigg*, Anthony Bebbington, Katherine V Gough†, Deborah F Bryceson‡, Jytte Agergaard†, Niels Fold† and Cecilia Tacoli††**

*Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE
email: j.d.rigg@durham.ac.uk
**Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, Manchester M60 1QD
†Department of Geography and Geology, University of Copenhagen, DK-1350 Copenhagen, Denmark
‡Department of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ
††International Institute of Environment and Development, London WC1H 0DD

revised manuscript received 18 December 2008

Introduction: geography by economists

By and large, geographers have had little to say about the World Bank's annual flagship World Development Reports (WDRs). However, with the just published WDR 2009 (hereafter referred to as the Report), things might be different, for it claims to be concerned with nothing less than 'reshaping economic geography'. In his foreword, the President of the World Bank, Robert Zoellick, writes that he expects '*Reshaping Economic Geography* will stimulate a much-needed discussion on the desirability of "balanced growth", which has proved elusive. And by informing some important policy debates, it will point the way towards a more inclusive and sustainable development' (World Bank 2009, xiii).

On the face of it, many geographers will welcome the Report, not least because it takes issues of space seriously: 'This Report advances the influence of geography on economic opportunity by elevating space and place from mere undercurrents in policy to a major focus' (World Bank 2009, 2). Placing the spatial dimensions of economic development centre stage, and recognising the reality and importance of spatial unevenness in development potentials and outcomes, may be reassuring. However, this welcome should perhaps be tempered by a concern for how an institution dominated by economists might handle geography. To put it another way, how does the World Bank – in the guise of this Report – 'do' geography? What does it say, who does it cite, what does it omit – and does all this make any difference?

The concerns and content of the Report[1]

The Report focuses on the spatial transformations that must happen for countries to develop. Cities, migration and trade, it is claimed, have been the main catalysts of progress and hence 'Growing cities, ever more mobile people, and increasingly specialised products are ... essential for economic success' (World Bank 2009, xx). These greater densities, shorter distances and reduced divisions will, the Report argues, bring about unbalanced growth: however, over time, other policies and mechanisms for integration will foster convergence in living standards. Development, seen through the Report's eyes, involves a necessary (and welcome) spatial unevenness in economic activity coupled with progressive spatial evenness in human welfare. This view is both positive (in that it reflects the way the Report reads economic history) and normative (in that the Report argues that this is how things should be). The key policy

Trans Inst Br Geogr NS 34 128–136 2009
ISSN 0020-2754

challenge is to accelerate economic divergence while reducing the time taken for welfare convergence.

A clear set of organising principles runs through the Report from beginning to end. The notion of 'Development in 3-D', meaning the intersection of Density, Distance and Division, lies at the heart of the conceptual framework laid out in Part One of the Report (with each 'D' the topic of a separate chapter). These three dimensions of development 'are easy metaphors, since density, distance, and division summon images of human, physical, and political geography' (World Bank 2009, 6). The Report claims that by promoting transformations along these three dimensions, some places are doing well. Higher densities due to urbanisation, shorter distances as people and businesses move to cities, and fewer divisions as economic borders are thinned and world markets entered, are 'the changes that will help developing nations' (World Bank 2009, xx).

Corresponding to these three dimensions (referred to as 'facts') are three drivers of change: agglomeration, migration and specialisation with trade. Part Two of the Report, more descriptive in tone, dedicates a chapter to the transformations affected by each of these drivers. These drivers in turn define three corresponding domains for policy: urbanisation, territorial development and regional integration, the themes of Part Three. Structuring the Report around these groups of three has the effect, the authors suggest, that it can be read 'by part or policy'. The reader interested in concepts can read just Part one, while people interested in agglomeration can read the Report 'vertically', looking only at the chapters on Density, Agglomeration and Scale Economies and Urbanisation policies. Whilst this clear structure is helpful to the reader, the continuous use of tripartite divisions throughout the Report gives the impression that the desire for simplicity of structure may be obscuring complexity of experience and, therefore, is rather suspect.

In terms of policy responses, density is seen to operate most powerfully at the local level, distance is the most critical dimension at the national level, and division is the most important dimension at the international level. Governments can intervene to reduce spatial disparities through three types of instrument: institutions (which should be spatially blind and universal in coverage), infrastructure (to drive spatial connection) and incentives (which are spatially targeted interventions). The preference is for policies to focus on spatially blind institutional interventions. Consistent with recent trends in multilateral lending, the Report is also supportive of infrastructural investments. It is most diffident about spatially targeted interventions to foster economic activity on the grounds that historically they have failed to offset tendencies toward economic concentration.

The Report is packed full of examples drawn from across the world and, unlike many preceding WDRs, this one is particularly concerned to draw inspiration from advanced as well as developing economies. This approach to the use of example has two consequences. It allows the authors to put their stylised facts and 3-D structure 'in place' – indeed, they claim that 'Place is the most important correlate of a person's welfare' (World Bank 2009, 1). Second, it gives the Report a vaguely evolutionist feel. It is hard to escape the sense that, in the final instance, the experiences of the US and (to a lesser extent) Europe and contemporary China offer models from which the rest of the world ought to learn. Thus one encounters sections entitled 'Overcoming distance in North America' (pp. 45–6), 'Overcoming division in Western Europe' (pp. 122–4), and 'Distance and division in East Asia' (pp. 194–6), which are positive in tone and therefore become exemplar experiences. The African regional vignette, by contrast, highlights multiple disadvantages:

> Sub-Saharan Africa today suffers from the triple disadvantages of low density, long distance, and deep division that put the continent at a developmental disadvantage. These spatial dimensions reduce proximity between economic agents within Sub-Saharan Africa, and between Africa and the rest of the world. 'Cumulative causation' between these forces catches many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa in a 'proximity trap'. (World Bank 2009, 283)

Argumentations, simplifications and omissions

The Report purports to re-energise geography's place in understanding economic and human development. In this section we reflect on the literatures that are cited in the Report, the approach that is taken and the evidence that is deployed to make the case. What, in other words, is the disciplinary span, the historical reach and the evidential substance of the Report?

ISSN 0020-2754

Selecting literatures

The main perspective adopted in the Report derives from the relatively new and growing body of literature known as 'new economic geography'. The inspiration for this literature is not the discipline of geography. Economists' theoretical constructs have avoided reference to existing economic geography. Instead they have theorised agglomeration with the intention of revising neo-classical equilibrium models to take scale into account. New economic geography theorists see their initiative as a major contribution to economics as a discipline by helping to resolve the distortions of market imperfections that have plagued modelling exercises. Scale, it is believed, adds complexity and most importantly realism to their analyses. This view has been validated by the award of a Nobel prize to Paul Krugman this year for his pioneering work in new economic geography.

Few geographers would claim to be the fount of all wisdom on the spatial dimensions of development, but one would have thought that the discipline had something relevant to say as well. Yet this report cites scarcely *any* geographers – neither those early analysts of the relationships between space, economy and society, nor subsequent critics and innovators. Consider some of the more startling gaps. There is considerable discussion of the role of secondary urban centres in the Report but no mention of Dennis Rondinelli's work on secondary cities and area development. Much play is made in Chapter 7 on the possibility of fostering 'Concentration without congestion', but no reference is made to Terry McGee's pioneering work on extended metropolitan regions in Asia. Tracking back in time, a geographer might also have expected some reference to early work on spatial location such as that by Peter Haggett,[2] Peter Gould or Dick Chorley, to name just three. All this is absent. Even more remarkably, Gunner Myrdal's work on circular and cumulative causation (despite circular causation being one of the Report's 'stylized facts') is ignored, as too is Michael Lipton's work on urban bias, and all the literature by earlier development economists and others that followed his key contribution. Among more recent authors, Doreen Massey's sustained, critical (but also practically engaged) interpretations of regional inequality and policy merit no comment. Nor will one find here serious engagement with the work of Allen Scott, Peter Dicken, or any number of geographers[3] who have a great deal to say about the issues addressed in the Report, and whose work can hardly be dismissed as irrelevant to policy, or as unduly critical of orthodox institutions.

As a result, the Report appears, to geographers at least, academically narrow and historically shallow. It gives the impression that scholarship on economic geography began in the last decade or so. The result is that at times 'old' issues and debates are presented as 'new' insights (cf. Martin 2008). This, in turn, means that the evolution of scholarship and understanding has been underplayed in general, and often overlooked entirely. Had the authors of the Report taken the time to read these geographical and historical literatures and cast their net more widely, they could have made some of the discussion both stronger and more nuanced. The Report's enthusiastic discovery of central place theory could, for instance, have been tempered by the longstanding professional experience of previous agglomeration modellers from geography who know all too well the complexities of urban growth and welfare. More generally, the Report would have been less mechanical in its depiction of the links between space, economic activity and welfare (Smith 1977); it would have gone much further in considering the politics of spatial processes (Massey 1984); it would have, at a higher level still, 'humanised' the spaces of economic activity (Wills and Lee 1997); and it would have recognised the many co-constituting intersections between economy and environment (Bridge 2002). We expand on some of these points below.

Of course, one might say that the absence of geographers' work, and the almost total absence of geographers from the team that prepared the Report as well as the advisory Academic and Policy-maker Panels, reflects our discipline's failure to engage as much as the Report's failure to recognise. This may be so, but boundaries can be crossed from both sides and this WDR makes precious little effort at boundary crossing. While the Report calls for spatially blind institutions to foster density, reduce distance and weaken division, its authors have assumed a monochromatic view of the world that has the effect, in disciplinary terms, of creating distance and deepening divisions.

Argumentation and privileging evidence

A second concern we have relates to the way in which argument is constructed and supporting evidence selected in the Report. The style of expression tends

ISSN 0020-2754

towards simplification and at times smugness. Countries and regions are uncomfortably prised into singular models. Difference is overlooked in the interest of the argument that the Report constructs and projects. There may be examples drawn from around the world, but they are cherry picked and exceptions to the rule are not explored. The Report asks complex questions and then provides simple answers. As just two examples:

> Are the policy messages of this Report anti-rural? No. (World Development 2009, 200)

> Are the policy messages of this Report anti-decentralization. No. (World Development 2009, 231)

Yet such difficult questions deserve far more deliberation since the reality of difference is eschewed. So, for example, in considering urban transitions there is no attempt to think about whether there are important differences between urbanisation processes across the world, and to ask why that might be so. More generally, the Report offers little embedded understanding of the empirical material that it uses to make its case. This is jarring, for two reasons. First, space, difference, distance and division are treated out of context. Historical examples are used not as contingent phenomena from which to learn, but rather as examples from which lessons can be transferred elsewhere. Positivism trumps realism here, and all the work done since the 1970s to demonstrate the embeddedness of spatial relationships and the co-constitution of geography and political economy might as well not have happened for this Report (see, for example, Bebbington 2000; Corbridge and Jewitt 1997; Johnson *et al.* 2005; Li 1999; McEwan 2005; Mood 2005; Radcliffe and Laurie 2006). Second, qualitative analysis is eschewed. Discussing the Report in a workshop, one of its authors characterised such analysis as merely anecdotal. In Habermas's (1971) old terms, there is so much desperation for instrumental knowledge that anything vaguely hermeneutic or critical is treated as an irrelevance. This is extreme even for the World Bank, for qualitative work *has* affected earlier WDRs. Whatever its methodological shortcomings, the 'Voices of the Poor' studies (Narayan 2000) that sought to capture people's own views and experiences of being poor and excluded had a very significant effect on the 2000/2001 WDR on poverty (World Bank 2001). In that sense, this Report reflects the extent to which relatively orthodox economists are once more in absolute ascendance inside the Bank following a decade of internal debate about development, perhaps best reflected in the furore over the 2000/2001 WDR, which led to the resignation of the team's Director, Ravi Kanbur (see Maxwell 2001; Kanbur 2001; Bebbington *et al.* 2004).

Condensing scale

The twin problems of how evidence is used and argument constructed are brought together in the Report's treatment of scale. There is, to be sure, a good deal of multi-scalar discussion. Indeed, a three-fold scalar division lies at the heart of the Report. Where the Report fails is in taking forward any analysis of relationships between scales. Local-level difference becomes lost by the time the discussion gets to generalisations at higher levels of analysis. Maps of poverty are drawn at such a small scale that they hide as much as they reveal. Issues such as the transference of poverty from rural to urban areas is hidden, while the delocalisation of livelihoods and the dissolution of the household as a co-residential dwelling unit comes to be seen as mere distraction rather than a critical process in the shaping of spatial transformations.

At their highest level, the typologies that the Report constructs, while possibly useful didactic starting points can, if taken too far, become absurd abstractions or even dangerous ones if translated into policy. As just one example, in the Report's final chapter 9, the world is subdivided into three types of country, which are then boxed into three types of developing region. Type I are countries in regions close to large world markets; Type II are countries in regions with big neighbours far from world markets; while Type III are countries in regions far from world markets and without a large neighbour. This means that within the category Type II we have one of the world's most connected countries (Singapore) and one of the world's least connected (the Lao PDR). This crude typology then leads to a discussion of the 'integration options' for countries of each type.

What is here and what is not

Texts are as much defined by what they omit as by what they say, and this is certainly so with this Report. A number of serious omissions compromise the Report's central arguments and policy prescriptions. In this section we focus on the Report's *exclusion* of society and environment, its

ISSN 0020-2754

simplification of politics and institutions, and its *erasure* of history.

Exclusions: society and the environment

The most important paragraph in the Report, to our mind, comes in a short box in the introductory chapter entitled 'What this report is not about':

> To keep the Report focused, several important aspects of the spatial transformations do not get the attention they would in a fuller study. The main aspects not considered – except when emphasising or qualifying the most important messages – are the ***social and environmental effects*** of a changing economic geography. (World Bank 2009, 34; emphasis in original)

This orientation is justified on the ground that this is an exercise in *economic* geography and therefore such effects can legitimately be excluded. Yet these omissions leave doubts about both the *internal* coherence of the Report's argument as well as its *external* coherence with the Bank's stated mission of poverty alleviation.

On internal coherence, the Report argues that human capital must be treated as endogenous in growth processes. This is central to the ways in which the Report argues for the benefits of agglomeration, with the returns to human capital increasing the greater the concentration of human capital. This allows the report to dismiss arguments (such as Todaro's) that draw attention to the costs of urban migration and therefore raise doubts about its effects on growth (Harris and Todaro 1970). Yet, one wonders, if human capital *must* be considered endogenous to growth processes, how can it be consistent to then say that natural and social capital should be treated as exogenous, and that the social and environmental should each be relegated to the domains of 'effects' rather than of 'causes' in our understanding of development?

Second, how can it be consistent for the flagship report of the World Bank, which has as its strapline 'Working for a world free of poverty', to produce a report of 380 pages that largely ignores the social and environmental origins and consequences of the processes and policies that it addresses and promotes? What is all the more remarkable is that the Report appears to be concerned with 'point[ing] the way towards a more inclusive development', and yet evidently feels that inclusion can be examined without spending too much time considering the social and environmental aspects of inclusion.

Since the 1970s, geographers have sought to humanise space, to move from abstract geometry to inclusive geography, highlighting the differences between 'space' and 'place'. 'Space' has become a place of conflict, cooperation and interaction with people engaging with space in different ways. Rather than merely noting, measuring and costing the movement of goods or people, as the Report tends to do, geographers, sociologists and others ask questions about why some people are mobile and others are not, reflecting on how mobility re-works the nature of households and livelihoods (see, for example, Gardner and Osella 2004; Hampshire 2002; Koning 2005; McKay 2005; Rogaly and Coppard 2003; Silvey and Elmhirst 2002). Our discipline has been concerned, for example, with how young women's experience of working in factories in or close to urban centres ripples back to affect inter-generational relations, the sustainability of rural livelihoods and the meaning of 'home' to these urban sojourners. This orientation results in scholars identifying the emergence of 'remittance landscapes' in rural areas and the construction of rural villages as socially urban spaces (for just some such work in SE Asia see Rigg 2006; Mills 1999; Thompson 2007; Silvey and Elmhirst 2002).

The Report, however, has picked up on none of these debates and instead uses place as a mere adjunct to space, with the result that 'place' is conceptualised as a de-humanised and, to a large extent, de-politicised space. Space is merely a zone where economic activity occurs, or does not. The focus of the Report is on the mechanics of spatial transformations; it does not go to the next level to analyse where those mechanics take us in terms of their effects and consequences for people and places. More specifically, it means that in the Report there is no real consideration of debates that we would regard as not merely incidental, but central to building an understanding of spatial transformations and their origins and effects. For example, considerations of gender and ethnicity are notably absent from the Report; there is no discussion of the role of generational dimensions in shaping economic geographies and spatial interactions; there is no concerted attempt to look at how space, economic activity and social exclusion intersect; there is little on the politics of space; and there is nothing on environmental issues and how they emerge in spatially contingent ways. We regard these absences as major omissions – paradigmatic blind spots that arise because of the way that certain

ISSN 0020-2754

forms of evidence and approach are privileged over others.

Simplifications: politics, institutions, cultures

The Report's so-called 'new approach' regarding how to improve welfare in lagging areas is that 'territorial development policies should integrate lagging with leading areas, and the discussion of spatially targeted incentives should come last' (World Bank 2009, 231). Promoting density and human mobility towards such centres of density is, in this rendering, the cornerstone of good economic geography policy. There are echoes here of former UK Conservative minister, Norman Tebbit, who, during the 1980s recession, famously told unemployed people in the lagging regions of the UK to 'get on yer bike' and head off to regions with greater economic activity. Tebbit's intervention became so infamous because it reflected a complete erasure of histories and injustices (next section), a deprecation of regional cultures and a call for markets to resolve problems of regional politics. In arguing for increased mobility in labour markets to offset regional inequalities, and ignoring the cultural nature and consequences of such processes, the Report seems close to conveying the same impressions. Its willingness to entertain the case for targeted intervention to foster economic activity seems at best grudging. Indeed, targeted spatial interventions are presented only as a final policy option, and are portrayed mostly as exercises in economic inefficiency rather than attempts to respond to geographical injustices.

Consider just two of the simplifications at work in the text. While some institutions may be spatially blind, all are culturally embedded and culturally consequential, yet the Report skates over this quality of institutions. As a result, just as Tebbit's comments were so culturally laden, so too are the recommendations the Report makes to, for instance, liberalise rural land markets in lagging areas in order to help people sell their assets and thus have the capital to assist their out-migration to centres of agglomeration. To raise concerns about the meaning embedded in such policy suggestions and in the consequences that they might have is not just a concern for starry-eyed ethnographers and indigenous romantics. When in 2008 the Peruvian government sought to foster quite similar policies to those that the Report suggests, it induced a strike led by indigenous organisations that ultimately closed down much of its Amazon region (increasing economic distance!) and forced the government to back down. Making culturally blind institutional recommendations out of context can lead to bad policy advice.

Second, while the Report does give somewhat more attention to politics than to social issues and the environment, the political tends to be seen as a barrier to efficient spatial interaction and integration, rather than as a reason for spatial interventions. The Report favourably notes Deng Xiaoping's adage that 'if all of China is to become prosperous, some [areas] must get rich before others' (World Bank 2009, 73). This becomes the platform to state that 'This chapter shows that successful developers support's Deng's insight', while also noting that 'his wisdom may have eluded leaders in the developing world' (2009, 73). In the next sentence, the Report rather disparagingly states that 'for decades, "spatially balanced growth" has been the mantra of policymakers in many developing countries' (2009, 73). This sequence of argument is wrong, or at best narrow, in a number of respects. China has not ignored the tensions that arise from spatially unbalanced growth, and policies continue to partially control the free operation of the space economy, not least through the *hukou* (household registration) policies inherited from the Maoist period (Chan and Zhang 1999; Goodkind and West 2002). At the same time, the implication that other countries have adopted a mantra of 'spatially balanced growth' is simply myopic. Policymakers have long recognised the impossibility of spatially balanced growth. They have also well appreciated, however, the political necessity – sometimes, imperative – to have an element of regional development in their plans, even if the logic of the economy may work against those regional development efforts. The Asian Development Bank has, coincidentally, recently published a report on inequality in Asia (ADB 2007) that makes considerable play of the politics of inequality, noting that 'persistent and wide differences in mean outcomes across social groups can have serious consequences for social and political stability', further noting that 'persistent and significant mean differences can also be normatively unacceptable' (2007, 58). The Report, therefore, sets up a straw figure by misrepresenting the position of most policymakers, simplifying the experience of most countries, and overlooking the wealth of discussion and debate on this very issue.

ISSN 0020-2754

Erasures: histories, injustices

To treat regional inequality as a function of density, distance and division diverts attention from the relationships of power that also help sustain inequality (a point that *was* made in the WDR of 2006 [World Bank 2006] but is absent here). In many of the places in which each of us do our own work, the 'margins' are marginal not because they are far from centres of agglomeration, but rather because they have been produced as places that are distant from centres of power.[4] Furthermore, they are far from centres of power because these very centres have been produced through acts of dispossession and practices of racism that systematically exclude certain social and ethnic groups from exercising significant levels of political influence. This is hardly an earth-shattering observation – one only has to think of the Guatemalan altiplano or the Peruvian Andes. Yet these sorts of history are absent in the Report's understanding of how uneven geographies are produced. Understanding regional inequalities as an effect of social and power relations would make it clear that it is no accident that certain regions become poor and stay poor.

Two consequences derive from this erasure of history and they each have implications for how the report treats policy. First, understanding the production of regional inequality as a consequence of long-standing inequitable social and political relationships would imply that policies to address this inequality – be these spatially blind policies or targeted ones – are unlikely to emerge without struggle. This is for the very same reasons that produced regional inequity in the first place. In short there are interests that benefit from regional inequalities and their perpetuation; these interests are by definition over-represented in the institutions that reproduce these inequalities, and they will therefore resist efforts to address them. Policy is not then a realm only of technocrats awaiting good advice, but also of socio-political interests who are quite clear about what they want to defend. This Pandora's box is not recognised, far less opened, in the ways in which the Report talks of policy.

Second, the combined effect of these historical erasures and of the principles that underlie the Report's analysis of the space economy is to remove any notion of justice as a legitimate criterion for making policy choices. Writing off spatially targeted policies on the grounds that they ultimately waste resources overlooks the possibility that (whether or not we agree with this claim) this may not be the point. In a positive sense, such policies might be pursued because governments feel the need to do something about such histories; and in a normative sensitive, justice, an attempt to account for such historical wrongs, might be as sound a principle for policy as efficiency.

So what?

This essay clearly reveals our sense that *Reshaping Economic Geography* is a disappointment. It does a disservice to economic geography (at least as done by many geographers) and it elides many or most of the interesting debates in development geography. Most of what we feel economic geographers have and could contribute to our own work as development geographers is missing; and by the same token there is no sense in the Report that critical discussions about development have had any influence at all on how the economy is conceptualised. In the Report, even though the 'development' goals are noble, the appropriate management of the economy precedes all else and issues of power, politics and embeddedness, so creatively worked by development *and* economic geographers, have very little purchase. Certainly they seem not to have complicated the arrow that, in this report, seems to run straight from economic first principles to development outcomes. Just consider the opening and closing sentences of the Report's Overview:

> Economic growth will be unbalanced, but development still can be inclusive – that is the message of this year's *World Development Report*. (p. 1)

> Everyone should support the efforts of these 'bottom billion' countries to integrate their economies, within and across borders. A billion lives depend on it. (p. 32)

Our concerns with the Report, and our collective sense that it has not effectively bridged the gap between 'economic geography' and 'development' can be distilled down to four core issues.

First of all, we believe that the devil of spatial transformations – how they occur and what they mean – really is in the detail. While the Report is dense in the wealth of material presented, its arguments and interpretations seem ultimately thin. There is no creative attempt to think about the intersection of space, economy, society and politics. Research that might challenge the view that the Report presents is neither used to unsettle its neat

ISSN 0020-2754

structure and prescriptions, nor engaged with so as to foster creative debate over the tension between generalisation and specification. Instead it is pushed to the margins.

Second, we do not believe that a serious analysis of the spatial dimensions of development can ignore the societal and environmental sources and implications of such transformations nor treat society and environment as exogenous to growth and regional development processes. Not only do society, culture and politics shape spatial transformations, but those spatial transformations feed back into profound changes in society, culture and politics.

Third, the Report is narrow in several other key respects. It is narrow in its disciplinary reach. It is narrow in its historical perspective. And it is narrow in its attention to scale.

Fourth, and most important, the Report's exclusions, simplifications and erasures have a profound influence on the message conveyed. The socio-political causes of regional inequality are invisible, policy is treated as a problem only of design but not also of politics, questions of justice are absent and the potential environmental impacts of advanced agglomeration and large-scale infrastructure development are at best epi-phenomena. We sense that had a team of geographers written this Report, such issues would have received more treatment and would have led to different conclusions and policy prescriptions.

Is this sour grapes that the World Bank should be claiming to be 'reshaping economic geography' while ignoring the work of generations of geographers? To some extent, it is; and to some extent it is frustration that geographers' work has made so little impression on the hegemonic discipline in social science. Still, we end with a question: how would economists feel if a group of geographers sought to re-shape economics and blithely ignored their scholarship?

Acknowledgements

This paper stems from a one-day workshop held at the Department of Geography and Geology, University of Copenhagen on 31 October 2008. We are grateful to the World Development Report 2009 director, Indermit Gil, for giving us access to pre-publication copies of the report, and to Truman Packard, one of World Bank's main authors of the Report, for participating in the workshop and engaging in discussions with us. Funding for the workshop provided by the Danish Development Research Network and the Environment and Society in Developing Countries Research Group at the Department of Geography and Geology, University of Copenhagen, is gratefully acknowledged. Tony Bebbington acknowledges the support of an Economic and Social Research Council Professorial Fellowship (RES-051-27-0191).

Notes

1 The Report can be downloaded from the World Bank's website at http://econ.worldbank.org

2 Elected a Foreign Associate, no less, of the US National Academy of Sciences.

3 Michael Storper is cited once (but a co-authored paper with economist Anthony Venables) as is Ron Martin (but only an unpublished paper).

4 In terms of our field experiences, Jonathan Rigg works mainly in Southeast Asia; Anthony Bebbington in Latin America; Katherine Gough in West Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America; Deborah Bryceson in Africa; Jytte Agergaard in South and Southeast Asia; Niels Fold in Africa and Southeast Asia; and Cecilia Tacoli in Africa and Asia.

References

ADB 2007 *Key indicators 2007: inequality in Asia* Asian Development Bank, Manila

Bebbington A 2000 Re-encountering development. Livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 495–520

Bebbington A, Guggenheim S, Olson E and Woolcock M 2004 Exploring social capital debates at the World Bank *Journal of Development Studies* 40 33–64

Bridge G 2002 Grounding globalization: the prospects and perils of linking economic processes of globalization to environmental outcomes *Economic Geography* 78 361–86

Chan K W and Zhang L 1999 The *hukou* system and rural–urban migration in China: processes and changes *China Quarterly* 160 18–55

Corbridge S and Jewitt S 1997 From forest struggles to forest citizens? Joint forest management in the unquiet woods of India's Jharkhand *Environment and Planning A* 29 2145–64

Gardner K and Osella F 2004 Migration, modernity and social transformation in South Asia: an introduction in **Gardner K and Osella F** eds *Migration, modernity and social transformation in South Asia* Contributions to Indian sociology, occasional studies 11 Sage, New Delhi xi–xlviii

Goodkind D and West L A 2002 China's floating population: definitions, data and recent findings *Urban Studies* 39 2237–50

ISSN 0020-2754

Habermas J 1971 *Knowledge and human interests* Beacon Press, Boston MA

Hampshire K 2002 Fulani on the move: seasonal economic migration in the Sahel as a social process *Journal of Development Studies* 38 15–36

Harris J and Todaro M 1970 Migration, unemployment and development: a two-sector analysis *American Economic Review* 60 126–42

Johnson C, Priya Deshingkar and Start D 2005 Grounding the state: devolution and development in India's *panchayats Journal of Development Studies* 41 937–70

Kanbur R 2001 Economic policy, distribution and poverty: the nature of disagreements *World Development* 29 1083–94

Koning J 2005 The impossible return? The post-migration narratives of young women in rural Java *Asian Journal of Social Science* 33 165–85

Li T M 1999 Compromising power: development, culture and rule in Indonesia *Cultural Anthropology* 14 295–322

Martin R 2008 The 'new economic geography': credible models of the economic landscape? in **Leyshon A, McDowell L and Sunley P** eds *A compendium of economic geography* Sage, London

Massey D 1984 *Spatial divisions of labour* Methuen, London

Maxwell S 2001 *WDR 2000*: is there a new 'new poverty agenda'? *Development Policy Review* 19 143–9

McEwan C 2005 New spaces of citizenship? Rethinking gendered participation and empowerment in South Africa *Political Geography* 24 969–91

McKay D 2005 Reading remittance landscapes: female migration and agricultural transition in the Philippines *Geografisk Tidsskrift, Danish Journal of Geography* 105 89–99

Mills M B 1999 *Thai women in the global labor force: consumed desires, contested selves* Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick

Mood M S 2005 Opportunists, predators and rogues: the role of local state relations in shaping Chinese rural development *Journal of Agrarian Change* 5 217–50

Narayan D 2000 *Can anyone hear us?* Oxford University Press, New York and World Bank, Washington DC

Radcliffe S and Laurie N 2006 Culture and development: taking culture seriously in development for Andean indigenous people *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24 231–48

Rigg J 2006 Land, farming, livelihoods and poverty: rethinking the links in the Rural South *World Development* 34 180–202

Rogaly B and Coppard D 2003 'They used to go to eat, now they go to earn': the changing meanings of seasonal migration from Puruliya District in West Bengal, India *Journal of Agrarian Change* 3 395–433

Silvey R and Elmhirst R 2002 Engendering social capital: women workers and rural–urban networks in Indonesia's crisis *World Development* 31 865–79

Smith D M 1977 *Human geography: a welfare approach* Edward Arnold, London

Thompson E C 2007 *Unsettling absences: place, migration, and urbanism in rural Malaysia* NUS Press, Singapore

Wills J and Lee R eds 1997 *Geographies of economies* Hodder Arnold, London

World Bank 2001 *Attacking poverty* World Development Report 2000/1 World Bank, Washington DC

World Bank 2006 *Equity and development* World Development Report 2006 World Bank, Washington DC

World Bank 2009 *Reshaping economic geography* World Development Report 2009 World Bank, Washington DC

ISSN 0020-2754