

1 | Introduction: mobilization and social movements in the South – the challenges of inclusive governance¹

LISA THOMPSON AND CHRIS TAPSCOTT

The latter half of the twentieth century witnessed an upsurge in mobilization and collective action in states of the global South, which has continued to this day. While this mobilization in its early phases comprised part of either ongoing anti-colonial struggles for national independence or struggles against despotic rule (especially in Latin America), the forms of social movement to which this has given rise have mutated over the years and they now reflect a broad array of social, political and economic concerns differentially expressed at local, national and global levels. While the literature on social movements is vast and extends back nearly a century, it remains a truism that by far the bulk of the writing and theorizing in this field has been oriented to the analysis of movements in the global North.² There has been little attempt to engage with the writings of Southern scholars on the topic. Where research has focused attention on transitional states, social movements have invariably been analysed in terms of criteria derived from Northern experience. While some of this comparative work retains undeniable universal validity, a good deal of it clearly does not. In the absence of historically grounded empirical research, social movements in these societies and the struggles that underpin them are not infrequently reduced to caricature. This mode of investigation, typified by long-range event analysis, denies the complexity of social formations in the South, and, ignoring any prospect of agency, portrays their members as the hapless victims of tyrannical rulers and traditional culture or the passive recipients of Northern-led actions.

While the quest for meta-theory, with its all-embracing power of explanation, remains an alluring one for social and political scientists the world over, the latent weakness in the approach remains, as always, a lack of empirical validation across different social, political and historical contexts. As Oliver et al. (2003) point out, there is a need for mainstream theory to ‘continue to address a geographically and substantively broader empirical base, breaking out of a preoccupation with Anglo-America and

Europe and becoming truly global in its orientation. This broader base will open new empirical problems that will point to weaknesses in current theory and lead to the development of new theory.' They argue for a 'growing focus on mechanisms and processes that occur in many different movements, and decreasing attempts to develop universal propositions about the causes, effects or trajectories of whole movements' (ibid.).

Although this volume makes no pretence of advancing a coherent theoretical framework for understanding collective action and social movements³ in the global South (if indeed such a project were feasible or academically useful), it does seek to present new understandings of the ways in which, and the reasons why, communities mobilize in the South. In so doing, it raises questions about the applicability of social movement theory based mainly on experiences in the North. While social movements in both the North and South have in common a desire to mobilize towards a collective goal, whether it be the attainment of rights denied or the reversal of adverse state policy, their genesis, form and orientation are likely, in many, but not all, instances to be significantly different. As Stammers (2005, 2009) has pointed out, historically the attainment of rights in the North was the outcome of sustained social movement activity. In contrast, many social movements in the South have arisen as a consequence of the opportunities presented by rights entrenched in relatively recently instated constitutional democracies. In such contexts, social mobilization is, in many respects, aimed at achieving substantive citizenship which yields material gains.

This is not, however, to suggest that the extant body of social movement theory is irrelevant to experiences in the South, and the resonance of the dominant theoretical positions is to be found in virtually all of the case studies which follow in this volume. What is significantly different, however, is the departure point for an analysis of the factors that give rise to collective action and social movements in the South. On this point most Southern theorists concur, namely that the inequalities that prevail in the world political and economic order (and which have given rise to the descriptors North and South) have played and continued to play a major role in shaping relations of power and patterns of inequality within Southern states. The economic dependencies that have arisen as a consequence of the current world order, and the internal distortions that have arisen from this, however, have not been factored into analyses in the North simply because they have not been of any significance in understanding why and how social mobilization takes place in post-industrial societies.

Particularly since the end of the cold war and the emergence of the neoliberal consensus, which Castells (2003: 327), quoting Ramonet, calls '*la pensée unique*' (the only thinking), the linkages between exclusion at the level of the state and exclusion in global terms have become decidedly more pronounced. Marginalization in the South, and of the South, is a dominant characteristic of current global political and socio-economic processes. As Castells (ibid.: 325) states:

[t]he global economy is characterised by a fundamental asymmetry between countries, in terms of their levels of integration, their competitive potential, and share of benefits from economic growth ... [t]he consequence of this is the increased segmentation of the world population ... leading to increased inequality and social exclusion ... [t]his pattern of segmentation is characterised by a double movement: on the one hand, valuable segments of territories and people are linked to global networks ... [o]n the other hand, everything, and everyone, which does not have value, according to what is valued in the networks, or ceases to have value, is switched off the networks, and ultimately discarded altogether.

The effects of global capital on development and democracy have been emphasized in the older research and literature on mobilization and social movements in the South. Scholars such as Wignaraja (1993), Amin (1976, 1993), Kothari (1993, 2005) and Mamdani et al. (1993) drew on an eclectic mix of Marxist theory to underline the importance of social movements for state transformation. According to these perspectives, the structural effects of global neoliberalism, with the emphasis on markets and the transmission of modern technology, are key to an understanding of the reasons why more unified social resistance has not taken place in states labelled Third or even Fourth World. Nevertheless, and perhaps paradoxically, in the past decade the role of popular mobilization and social movements has increasingly been seen as central in pressuring states and global organizations to reconfigure the socio-economic order both within national boundaries and beyond.

Kabeer (2005: 23) discusses the importance of understanding collective action in terms of two axes of participation, horizontal and vertical. Horizontal forms of participation are the linkages forged between mobilized citizens and communities at local, national and global levels. Such horizontal spaces of participation, which might also be called 'self-created' or 'invented' spaces, are where citizens themselves define their modes of engagement with the state and with other interest groups and resort to different forms of collective action. These linkages are not necessarily

stable, nor do they represent a fixed notion of citizen identity on the part of those who participate. The ways in which mobilization, collective action and social movements manifest themselves in these spaces are key to understanding the processes of collective identity formation as citizens attempt to exercise both their individual and collective rights. Vertical spaces are those created by the state and which 'invite' citizens to participate. Elaborating this point in a recent volume in this series, and flagging their limitations, Cornwall and Coelho maintain that 'the institutions of the participatory sphere are framed by those who create them, and infused with power relations and cultures of interaction carried into them from other spaces' (Cornwall and Coelho 2007: 11).

Globally, horizontal forms of networking and identity formation characterize what is discussed in the literature as 'new social movements' (hereafter NSMs). These new movements, unlike 'old' or classical social movements (SMs), tend to lack clear organizational structures and internal bureaucracies, and, effectively, function by coalescing political identities and agendas both nationally and globally. Hajer (1995) calls these 'discourse coalitions' and, in many ways, they represent the new wave of social movement organization globally (see also Leach et al. 2005). It is worth remembering, however, that NSMs represent a specific progression in civil society organization in the post-industrial North, where issues not always directly related to economic practice, but triggered by the impacts of neoliberal economic development, have given rise to social movement action (the environmental movement is a key example). The environmental movement characterizes this diversification of civil society action and organization into new forms of movement creation, organization and networking.⁴ Many of these NSMs, of which the women's movement is another exemplar, have helped to bolster similar movements in Southern contexts, notwithstanding lower levels of economic development.

The degree to which mobilization and the formation of social movements at the grassroots level are necessary for the realization of fundamental rights is a question that extends back to the origins of social movement theory. As Stammers (2005) points out, struggles for rights (natural, political or socio-economic) have both shaped and been shaped by the evolution of the modern liberal democratic system. The focus of this book is precisely on the ways in which different mobilization strategies in the South, and the forms of social movements to which they give rise (or not, as the case may be), support mainstream understandings of what the predominant modes of interaction are between society and the state.

As other research from the CDRC has emphasized, notions of citizen-

ship and of rights broadly understood are not in themselves fixed and immutable.⁵ The types of identity formation and forms of collective action evident in communities in the South occur in contexts where the meanings of citizenship and rights are far more nebulous and contested, as well as globally referenced, than in the history of the North. New understandings of citizenship are perhaps most clearly understood in terms of emergent forms of collective action in the South, although of course the interplay between collective and individual identities remains crucial to democratic practices, a point that is well emphasized in the chapters by Osaghae and Cortez in this volume. The chapters explore the distinction between forms of unorganized and ad hoc mobilization and more organized forms of collective action, with more clearly developed leadership, goals and agendas, and social movements. As Alonso et al. (this volume) point out, the critical difference between ad hoc mobilization and social movements is that the latter, through a variety of means, have the capacity to develop the political and social cohesion necessary to ensure enduring (usually at least somewhat effective) concerted action on common rights.

Notwithstanding the profound disparities extant in the world political order, there is a need to broaden the case base if the universality of social movement theory in the North is to be tested in any meaningful way. The case studies presented in this volume are from countries (Bangladesh, India, Brazil, Mexico, Nigeria and South Africa) where, at least formalistically, multiparty democracy exists. As such, they present evidence of the very real challenges which exist in developing substantive forms of participatory democracy even where the requisite democratic institutions are in place. They underscore the significance of social movements in these ongoing struggles for substantive citizenship. We readily acknowledge that the case study material does not fully capture a wide diversity of other contexts, such as how movements emerge in settings with weak states, one-party states and military juntas.

As will be seen in the discussion that follows, all of the chapters in this volume stress the importance of the struggle for socio-economic rights in the emergence of social movements in the South. They also reflect on the ways in which developmental and global political economy discourses and agendas influence mobilization and social movements, both directly and indirectly. The first two sections of the book deal specifically with these two themes. The final section examines the extent to which formal channels of participation promote more inclusive citizenship and facilitate the realization of political as well as socio-economic rights.

The structure of the book, key themes and issues

Social movements in the South, both nationally based and those which have global linkages, tend to be much weaker than in the North, owing either to political control on the part of the state, or because understandings of citizenship do not always coalesce into clear patterns of mobilization and resistance of either the organized or unorganized variety (Amin 1993; Bond 2002; Kothari 2005). In some cases, owing to a combination of socio-economic circumstances and the lack of a strong collective political identity, groups that are systematically discriminated against do not mobilize in clearly discernible ways at all. There are, nevertheless, notable success stories in the extent to which social movements in the South have managed to assert their rights and to extract concessions from the state, and a few of these are captured in the chapters that follow.

Two key strands of mobilization emerge in the case studies presented: the dominant type can be understood as self-organized collective action around issue-based socio-economic rights. These arise, in many instances, in response to state-initiated development programmes that sacrifice individual or collective socio-economic rights in the name of national interest, and which, by forcefully suppressing protest action, also effectively trample on political rights. The other form of mobilization is by social movement groups or their representatives in spaces created by government, either for socio-economic or political rights, or to ensure and extend these rights through 'participatory democratic processes'. Both forms of mobilization, nevertheless, are directed towards the attainment of socio-economic rights in the South. This is referred to as the political economy of rights by Newell and Wheeler (2006: 9):

in which questions of access to and distribution and production of resources are paramount. A focus on resources changes the way we think about the relationship between rights and accountability. The challenge is not to overemphasise the material dimensions of this relationship and to acknowledge instead that economic rights are in many ways indivisible from social, political and cultural rights.

The book is divided into three broad sections. Section One highlights the significance of historical context in the analysis of social movements, since the genesis of contemporary collective action can often be traced back to perceived or real discrimination or oppression stretching back into a distant past. The rationale, the framing, as it were, of such movements is that those involved have suffered from collective social and

political injustice and, consequentially, that their struggle is, in the first instance, for communitarian rather than individual rights (Osaghae and Cortez, this volume). Such movements, not infrequently, are ethnically or class-based and derive their cohesion both from a sense of collective oppression and/or pre-existing sociocultural identities. The case studies in this section also include instances where mobilization has failed to take place despite severely adverse conditions (Mahmud on garment workers in Bangladesh), or where the process of mobilization, despite material gains, has failed to lead to any sense of citizen empowerment (Simpson and Waldman on transnational litigation on behalf of asbestos workers).

Osaghae, in his chapter on social activism in the Niger Delta, emphasizes that social movements in the region have built their national and international profile and support base on campaigns for collective rights based on the failure of the state to provide rights to ethnic minorities. Osaghae reminds us of the ethnic and collective dimension to many rights claims, both political and socio-economic, in the larger African context, and discusses the failure of the state to guarantee either. In the context of the Niger Delta, the question remains whether political or socio-economic rights assume precedence, since each appears to be a necessary and inseparable adjunct of the other. Osaghae also points out that while the appeal to communitarian rights serves as an important vehicle for popular mobilization, it is no guarantor of individual rights, and suggests that this might become the source of future struggles.

In their chapter, Simpson and Waldman examine the role of global partnerships and transnational litigation in the mobilization of social movements. As a case study they look at the struggles of two South African communities to extract compensation from a British mining company for health damages suffered as consequence of pollution caused by asbestos mining. Their research highlights the role that the solidarity of exogenous agents (in the form of international NGOs) can play in advancing the goals of a transnational social movement, but not necessarily in satisfying local perceptions of socio-economic entitlements by those affected by asbestos pollution. Their findings also show that different social identities in the two communities studied led to both different understandings of the nature of the struggle for compensation and different forms of engagement with, and acceptance of, their international partners. Simpson and Waldman argue that there is a need in social movement theory for a closer examination of how movements are influenced by identity struggles and in turn influence the processes through which people construct meaning

and interpret cultural attitudes. In particular, they assert, there is a need for greater understanding of how the new social identities of movements may interact with, or be shaped by, other deep-rooted identities.

Mahmud's chapter demonstrates that there is nothing inevitable about the emergence of national or global social movements, even where the proximate conditions for these forms of mobilization exist. Her research on garment workers in Bangladesh seeks to explore why, despite extremely adverse labour conditions, there is so little organized opposition to the practices of the industry at the national level and virtually none at the international level. Her research reveals that a range of local factors (cultural, economic and political) act to inhibit the emergence of national or transnational social movements. In the first instance, the bulk of those employed in the factories are young women from the rural areas who have limited education and who have grown up under a patrimonial regimen that encourages subservience towards male authority. This factor, combined with poverty, a lack of awareness of labour rights, a vast pool of surplus labour, outdated labour legislation, the brutal suppression of organized labour activities by employers, and an indifferent state bureaucracy serve to further suppress prospects for social mobilization. As a result, the risks, and consequences, of losing their jobs are, for workers, high, and outweigh the perceived gains of social mobilization. Her chapter suggests that in the absence of collective action, there is a need to think in terms of 'cultural opportunity structures' or, perhaps even more broadly, 'social opportunity structures', which might serve to explain how economic, cultural and political factors impact on the prospects for mobilization and movement activism.

In the second section, the social movements under discussion focus more on actualizing the rights that have been constitutionally assigned to them. To that extent, the case studies focus on the political opportunity structures (POS) which have opened up for issue-based social movements that aim to transform civic rights into socio-economic rights. Thus environmental movements in Brazil, India and South Africa have managed to gain some national legitimacy and global (if sporadic) political influence, as the chapters by Alonso et al. and Mehta et al. discuss. Yet Mehta et al. argue that even where socio-economic rights are entrenched in both legislation and policy, in many instances this is insufficient ground to assume that these rights exist in practice. The findings of all three of the cases in this section (in Brazil, India and South Africa) demonstrate that rights need to be claimed, both through more conventional forms of participation, but often through protest action when more formal chan-

nels uphold the status quo. In the South African case study, for example, the national right to Free Basic Water policy is at loggerheads with other neoliberal state policies which emphasize cost recovery. The necessity of citizens emphatically claiming their rights through mobilization and activism in the South is clearly brought home by this case, as well as in the case of dam-building in India, where government macroeconomic policy, predicated on the development of major infrastructural projects, is in direct conflict with the rights of communities to their traditional livelihoods. It is clear from both cases studies that governments justify broader economic policies without necessarily deliberating on the contradictions these may bring to community or individual rights. In this sense the need for activism, and protest, is, for many poor communities in the South, not a luxury but a necessity.

Alonso et al. demonstrate that the evolution of the Brazilian environmental movement has differed in substantive ways from the evolution of social movements in more democratic contexts. This case also illustrates the importance of environmental movements in the South, and challenges the predominant focus on socio-economic rights in the literature. They emphasize that new approaches to social mobilization move beyond discussions of political opportunity structures to embrace '... symbolic and cognitive features and collective identity building processes ...' (see also Diani 1992). Central to this latter understanding is what they term 'micro-mobilization contexts' – that is, more locally based broadly organized social activism which shapes the identities of activists in relation to their struggle for political influence. The chapter traces the internal dynamics of the environmental movement to show the ways in which POS enabled the movement to flourish. In the Brazilian case, a distinct feature of this process was that, in the context of a broader process of national democratization, state institutions became more 'permeable' to lobbying by civil society groups. Significantly, environmental social movements emerged at the same time as a global environmental agenda was being set, creating a unique global precedent for environmentally sustainable practices.

Cortez's chapter on the Zapatista movement examines how deep-seated grievances over a loss of access to land in the Chiapas state in southern Mexico (aggravated by a free trade agreement with the United States) led to a sequence of protest action, military repression, armed resistance and subsequent evolution into a social movement organization. The analysis illustrates clearly the limits to protest action in the context of repressive state action – a characteristic not exclusive to states in the South, but one

which is clearly made more problematic by weak democratic institutions. Cortez points out that the strength of the Zapatista movement has centred on its ability to mobilize not only local indigenous peoples, but also other social and civic association actors, both within and outside the state. As such it has grown from a movement campaigning for basic needs and resources, to an anti-state, anti-systemic, anti-capitalist movement demanding both social justice and socio-economic rights.

Section Three emphasizes the challenges faced by social movements that seek to advance their cause through government-created participatory spaces, and the often tenuous linkages between these modes of interaction and the development of more inclusive democratic processes.⁶ Coelho and Favareto show the limited impact of small environmental groupings at the local level in Brazil, where participation of these groups in invited spaces is often more about building political alliances and coalitions than power sharing, and where the interests of the poor are seldom taken up in meaningful ways. Tapscott, Piper and Nadvi examine the extent to which grassroots mobilization and social movements in South Africa are able to take advantage of available political opportunity structures (Tilly 1978; Tarrow 1989), including participatory spaces created by governments to achieve both political and socio-economic rights claims.

Mohanty's chapter examines the struggles of the rural poor in India against the imposition of macroeconomic growth strategies which have led to their further impoverishment and disempowerment as citizens. In this context, she asserts, the struggles against the state's economic development policies are effectively struggles for citizen rights and for a more inclusive and deliberative form of democracy. For the state and ruling elites, 'development', broadly defined, became associated with modernity and the attendant rationality of technocratic growth. In this discourse, development has come to be seen as a component of globalization and as a necessity in the inexorable march towards a modern state. The pursuit of this form of economic development, however, has frequently led to the dispossession and displacement of the poor, leading to lost access to land, water and other resources. The social movements that have arisen to challenge this process have framed their loss in terms of three sets of meaning, namely the loss of material meaning (in terms of the expected benefits of development), the loss of social meaning (consequent to their loss of social networks following displacement) and the loss of political meaning (stemming from their exclusion from decision-making on issues affecting their livelihoods). In this context, the movements inextricably

link their right to resources with their rights as citizens, and view their struggle for more equitable development policies as a struggle for a more inclusive democracy.

While the chapter documents the struggles of the rural poor against the forces of globalization and the relentless quest for foreign direct investment, it is noteworthy that these social movements are largely endogenous in nature and they have not attempted to form linkages across national boundaries. In similar vein, although their protest is directed against state policy, the movements largely eschew party political affiliation in advancing their cause. In part this is due to a disillusionment with self-interested, and often rent-seeking, political elites, but it is also due to the fact that party affiliations limit their capacity to mobilize across the varied strata of society. In that respect, the way in which these social movements define and conduct their struggle provides a basis for the formation of new and more egalitarian social identities which overcome pre-existing, and atavistic, forms of social hierarchy based on caste, class and gender.

Tapscott's chapter explores the extent to which better-educated, resource-endowed and politically adept activist groups are able to use POS in ways that less privileged groups cannot. These include an ability to shape public opinion through the media, through economic pressure, through rate-payers' associations and through a range of informal social networks which influential elites typically establish. In contrast, poor communities seeking access to state resources through formal participatory channels fare considerably worse and bring little pressure to bear on the state. It is in response to this inability to effect meaningful change through formal political channels, furthermore, that the resort to protest (and often violent protest) on the part of disempowered communities can perhaps best be understood.

Piper and Nadvi examine the ways in which ward committees were established as formal invited spaces to promote participatory democracy at the grassroots level. Their chapter speaks of a sorry tale of political co-optation and subjugation where the ward committees have become an extension of the party political battlefield. In this context, instead of addressing local concerns about service delivery, community safety and the like, ward committees have become sites of destructive intra-party and interpersonal power struggles as both social movement representatives and political and government representatives vie for greater political influence or higher political office. Confronted with the failure of these invited spaces and a consequent general disillusionment with politics

at the local level, a range of social movements have arisen to provide an alternative voice for expression of popular concerns. The chapter examines how these movements have adopted a non-political standpoint as a means of forging a more inclusive agenda.

The cases described above point to the need to further explore the distinctiveness of social mobilization and social movements in the South and to consider the extent to which mainstream theory encapsulates their essence. Before doing so, we turn to a brief, and necessarily truncated, discussion of some of the central debates on social movement analysis in the literature.

Mobilization and social movements in the North and South: analytical debates and comparative understandings

In the extensive research on social movements, three central questions are dealt with – namely, what motivates groups or communities to take collective action; how do social movements coalesce around different forms of collective action; and who mobilizes within social movements? We consider each of these in turn, paying attention to the different approaches in the literature to each question while at the same time attempting to link a broad analysis of mobilization in the South to some of the key texts on mobilization and social movements in the North. In so doing we examine, in brief, some of the dominant approaches in the study of social movements, namely, resource mobilization theories, political opportunity theories and theories of political identity formation and collective action, otherwise known as frame theory.

What triggers collective action? Within the large body of thought emerging from North America and western Europe, two major strands of discussion originally predominated in analysis of the triggers of collective action, these being the grievances approach and resource mobilization theory. In the North American context, initial understandings of collective action and social movements revolved around exploring either grievance or available resources or a combination of the two as the precipitators of social mobilization. Since the early work of Park (1969 [1921]) and Smelser (1962) on grievances that serve as triggers for collective action (then portrayed mainly as irrational behaviour and mob action, especially in the context of the civil rights movement), the ongoing analytical debate has developed into a sophisticated account of the linkages between relative deprivation and the ways in which communities develop and use a variety of resources in order to effect change to their material, social and politi-

cal circumstances. Instrumental in the development of the latter body of work is the analysis of McCarthy and Zald (1977), McAdam et al. (1996, 2001), Tilly (1978, 2003) and Freeman (1999), each of whom has progressively added to understandings of the importance of resources, including more intrinsic, or intangible, resources (such as social cohesion), in the process of mobilization (Jenkins 1983: 533). These scholars have also discussed the ways in which effective mobilization requires what later came to be known in the literature as political processes and their relation to ‘political opportunity structures’, defined as ‘... consistent, but not necessarily formal, permanent or national, dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for people to undertake collective action by affecting their expectations for success or failure’ (Tarrow 1994: 85, in Ballard et al. 2006: 4). A great deal of the discussion and debate that have followed has focused on the relationship between grievances, the mobilization of resources, what are referred to as ‘selective incentives’ (for participation) and the structural (and in some case historical) incentives for social activism and social movement behaviour.

Emerging out of a concern that the resource mobilization and political opportunity approaches had overlooked the importance of collective identities and ideology in the shaping of social movements, a group of scholars (most notably Snow and Benford 1988, 1992) emphasized the need to study the discursive and interpretive practices that ‘frame’ the way in which movement participants understand their circumstances and weigh alternative courses of action (Edelman 2001). According to Benford and Snow, what they term collective action frames come about ‘as movement adherents negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation they define as in need of change, make attributions regarding who or what is to blame, articulate an alternative set of arrangements, and urge others to act in concert to affect change.’ (Benford and Snow 2000: 614).

While many theorists (McAdam et al. 1996, 2001; Ibarra 2003; and Tilly 2003 to name just a few) use resource mobilization theory in combination with explorations of grievance, framing and political opportunity structures, these have not always been systematically adapted to southern contexts. As Amin (1993: 88) emphasizes, historical context is essential to understanding the interplay between internal and global dynamics as ‘the effectiveness of the social movement cannot be assessed by the same criteria in different periods ... periods of structural crisis are defined by uncertainty as to the rules of the game ...’. Since the South has been subject to such crises regularly, by virtue of ‘... unequal development

engendered, reproduced and endlessly deepened by capitalist expansion', the ability of movements to coalesce into substantial political forces that can challenge the status quo has been limited. The availability of resources for organized action is one limiting factor, although the chapters in this volume show that even the resource-deprived mobilize, and, in fact, do so precisely because they are resource-deprived, and are claiming resources as socio-economic rights.

It is clear, nevertheless, that these (what may be termed) 'middle-range'⁷ theories of social movement action do help us to understand the rise and evolution of social movements in the South. Alonso et al. in this volume demonstrate the importance of political opportunity structures and framing processes, as well as political identity and networking, to the 'dynamic and interactional character' of collective action processes and cycles of protest in the formation of a national environmental movement in Brazil. The ability of activists to develop common collective frames for environmental concerns was key to their successful engagement in three specific political opportunity structures. The significance of framing is also to be found in the Zapatista movement, where struggles for agrarian reform in the Mexican countryside were depicted as part of a global anti-capitalist struggle. Evidence of framing is also to be seen in local-level struggles in the Niger Delta, where armed struggle is rationalized as a necessary response to an anti-ethnic onslaught by the state.

There are, nevertheless, limits to the application of these theories in Southern contexts. This is because frame theorists, together with those focusing on collective political identity formation and networking, generally presume levels of political identity and strategic sophistication that are often absent among movements comprised of people existing on the margins of survival. For such communities it is often merely a question of political opportunity, driven by desperation that leads to collective action rather than a conscious framing of options. Thus, for example, the immediacy of the threat posed by forced eviction is such that there is little need to persuade slum dwellers of the need for collective action. Their course of action, furthermore, is more frequently conditioned by the latitude granted to them by the state than carefully selected from an array of alternatives. At the same time, while some collective action in the South does succeed in coalescing into broader social movement organizations, a large proportion of these mobilizations are more localized, sporadic and discontinuous, implying that their ideological mobilization was (and sometimes stays) shallow or non-existent. This phenomenon is, of course, not unique to mobilization in the South, suggesting that

these theories have analytical limitations when applied to less formalized social action in the North.

What makes a movement? Later research by Ibarra (2003) and Tilly (2003) and others argues that a combination of political opportunities and economic incentives gives rise to social movements. The work of theorists like McCarthy and Zald (1977, in McAdam et al. 1996) and Opp (1988), however, focuses on the agency of a more educated, politically conscious, normative North American or European activist, in contexts where grievances and ideology play a significant role, as opposed to the earlier understanding of social movement activism as arising from relative economic deprivation and/or the denial of political rights. The tendency to conflate social movement organizations with broader social movements has also implied that the bureaucratization of collective action emphasized by the earlier work of McCarthy and Zald (1977) has been perhaps overemphasized (Jenkins 1983).

Distinguishing between collective action and social movements, furthermore, continues to present itself as an analytical problem (Leach et al. 2005). The question that may be posed in the context of more unorganized forms of collective action is 'how many people does it take to make a movement'? Relatedly, the organizational dimensions and elite structures of both 'official' social movement organizations and broader decentred movements have been the subject of further debate. The dominance of middle-class, educated elites, or what some analysts (such as Jenkins and Wallace 1996; Norris and Cable 1994) refer to as the 'new class', is seen in some contexts as a positive development, and as opening up opportunities between the 'old working class' and the 'middle class'. Yet in both the North and the South, the danger of presuming the representativeness and legitimacy of organizations calling themselves 'social movements' lies in the overlapping structures of patronage and power that so frequently characterize the relationships between these groups and the 'the marginalized'.

Again, in the national context, while raising critical questions about how formative social movements articulate their demands to structures of political authority, and the role of political legitimacy, questions about the longevity of social movements have been framed largely within the analysis of the historical evolution of social movements in the North (Gamson 1992; Jenkins 1983). The ways in which social movements have continued to evolve collective agendas and forge enduring relationships within the polity has to be seen in the much longer historical context of

societal challenges to the state and the evolution of democratic practices, and these formative contexts certainly differ considerably in the North and South as a result of the impact of accelerated globalization (Held and McGrew 2003; Castells 2003; Karns and Mingst 2004; Amin 1993; Kothari 1993, 2005). Thus, while more fluid forms of social mobilization organized across local and global contexts, such as those described by Offe (1985), Melucci (1995) and Touraine (1985), have opened up new possibilities for the formation and growth of social movements, the national context still remains critical in understanding the relations of power between state and non-state actors, as is emphasized by Osaghae and Mohanty in this volume.

Mushakoji (1993: xiii–xiv) refers to three dominant understandings of mobilization and social movements in the South that are useful to this discussion. The first is that social movements in the South were originally preoccupied with the struggle against colonization and were in effect struggling within their own ranks for access to state structures. Ongoing social movement activity is thus not necessarily part of the solution to the crisis of the state in these countries, but is in actual fact a manifestation of the crisis itself. The second view looks at social movements as new actors; these actors are not aiming at assuming power, ‘... but rather in creating free space from where a democratic society can emerge’. The third view sees social movements as ‘... preparing a future desirable society’ that in its grassroots authenticity will move the current state of democratic ‘window dressing’ to one of true democratic development. Theorists such as Amin (1993: 97–8) and Kothari (2005: 122), respectively, have also discussed the need for and roles of ‘revolutionary intelligentsia’ or mediator activists who will enable the masses to organize themselves sufficiently to challenge the state.

While the chapters in this volume examine the role of social movements in claiming rights and ensuring ‘real’ or ‘people’s’ democracy, the role of ‘liberation movements’ that have transmuted into political parties and the effects of this process on social organization should not be underestimated. Osaghae’s chapter examines the interplay between the state as the ‘authentic representative of the people’ and the kinds of resource inequalities that arise from the disjunctures between ethnic domination and class and political power. Tapscott’s chapter, similarly, considers how a former liberation movement has dominated formal participatory structures and arrogated the right to decide on citizens’ needs, while Piper and Nadvi demonstrate how political parties not only dominate local democratic structures, but also crowd out any attempts at popular

participation. Cortez’s detailed analysis of the Zapatista movement in Mexico also focuses on the ways in which social movements can give rise to parallel governance structures that directly confront the state’s resource allocation biases.

The impact of mobilization strategies and social movements on democratization processes also raises the troublesome question of locating the ‘sole and authentic’ representatives of the people. The role of professionalized NGOs, which simply reproduce resource inequalities while at the same time speaking the language of development and democracy, is a critical issue, as is the question of who legitimately speaks for the masses. Amin and Kothari, among others, refer to the need for leaders or mediators to enable the masses to organize themselves. At the same time, Tapscott in this volume illustrates how knowledge of the media and the courts privileges middle-class movements in the South, while Alonso et al. emphasize the trade-offs with government that sometimes have to be made in order for issue-based movements such as the environmental movement in Brazil to become a ‘visible’ political force.

As Kothari (2005) and others have pointed out, political parties are fond of reminding society of their sole and authentic status, especially where this is as a result of previous liberation struggle credentials, or as a result of previous CSO- (civil society organization) or NGO-based activism. Mushakoji (1993) points out that where popular movements have gained access to political power, the ongoing struggles between themselves and other mass-based forms of political organization have often given rise to the very instability and lack of popular democracy they are ostensibly working to overcome. Osaghae’s and Cortez’s chapters in this volume underline this point in relation to oppressive policies advanced by ruling elites in the name of democracy and stability.

Who protests? The North American literature on the protest potential of the marginalized refers back to the Gamson (1990 [1975]) versus Piven and Cloward (1979) debate. Gamson’s study, which examined which forms of social movement activity lead to ‘success’, defined as the provision of tangible benefits for movement members and political legitimacy, concluded that levels of organization are key to success. Piven and Cloward, on the other hand, argued that movements characterized by large numbers of the poor tend to be largely unorganized, as the poor do not have the resources to mobilize large-scale resistance, and that such organization is in any case not desirable since it leads to eventual demobilization owing to the high costs involved. Later texts (Norris and

Cable 1994; Jenkins and Wallace 1996) place a heavy stress on the protest potential of certain groups over others (for example, African-Americans; 'autonomous' women; secularist groups; and educated professionals) as well as the position of certain groups in broader socio-economic and political contexts, portrayed as the new 'class discussion'. Yet it is not clear how these discussions translate into recognizable patterns of activism (organized or unorganized) in contexts of both absolute as well as relative deprivation, even though the North American study of social movements tends to posit a reasonably high-level correlation between deprivation and protest potential. While the older literature on social movements places a strong emphasis on structural (socio-economic) factors, the literature on new social movements, as indicated, strongly emphasizes the importance of networks, the framing of collective grievances and movement coalitions.

The question of state and non-state political power structures and the relationship between rights and 'realized' rights in determining 'protest potential' is clearly at issue. Alonso et al. (this volume) trace the evolution of the environmental movement in Brazil to the opening of the political opportunity structures and the ability to frame collective issues, but it is clear that in this instance the role of educated groups was pivotal. In contrast, it is evident that the movement to claim compensation for asbestos-related illnesses in South Africa relied heavily on transnational linkages, knowledge and litigation processes to realize its claims, albeit, as intimated, in ways that were felt to be ultimately disempowering to some indigenous communities (see Simpson and Waldman, this volume). The Zapatista movement in Mexico and the Treatment Action Campaign (pressing for the rights of HIV/AIDS sufferers) in South Africa show, perhaps most clearly, the collective power of global networks and the ways in which issues of education and class may, in some cases, be superseded by other aspects of collective organization and action.

While a determination of the extent to which the link between formal organization and mass defiance constitutes a social movement remains conceptually vague, subsequent theoretical developments in the literature on social movements in the North have included a much more nuanced take on how collective action arises. In that respect, Klandermans and Oegema (1987: 520) state that '[h]owever successfully a movement mobilises consensus ... if it does not have access to recruitment networks, its mobilisation potential cannot be realised'. Such networks include civic organizations, but also, very importantly, religious, friendship and family networks. Again, what motivates collective action, effected either

through professional SMOs or through more unorganized forms of mass action, remains debated. The importance of 'micro-mobilization contexts', including the differential role of formal and informal networks in participation, as well as the actual context of interpersonal relationships within specific networks, nevertheless, is recognized to be of significance in when and how people mobilize (McAdam et al. 1996; Guigni 1998).

Micro-mobilization contexts, together with the 'framing' of collective action, are often necessary preconditions for the successful negotiation of political opportunity structures, as Alonso et al. argue in this volume. Yet the chapters by Mohanty on social movements of the poor in India and Tapscott's discussion of the limits to mobilization in accessing state housing in South Africa show the importance of understanding the overlap between global and national political, historical and 'micro-mobilization' contexts. They also illustrate the necessity of analysing the role of the state and its structural element even in these contexts, as Tilly (1978, 2003) and others have continued to emphasize. It is the combination of these endogenous and exogenous factors in specific historical contexts and moments which helps to explain successful social movement formation and mobilization in the South.

As Mohanty's, Coelho and Favareto's, and Mahmud's chapters also underline, those who are not part of organized labour, or who do not have access to strong mediator support through NGOs or the like, are often unable to manage collective action in ways that challenge the status quo. As a consequence, we need to think through the linkages between more issue-based social movements and development and democratization processes to better understand why '[h]istory does not give a single example in which the urban movement, or the religious movement on its own, or the workers' movement without alliances succeeded in changing fundamentally the existing system of domination' (Comacho 1993: 54). While Comacho wrote in the context of Latin America, his point is applicable to the South in general, and, as will be seen in the discussion that follows, also to social mobilization in the North.

In summation, in considering the type of people who protest, the factors that trigger collective action and those who create movements, we can distil three key interrelated themes from the broad strands of Northern and Southern thought on mobilization and social movements. First, there are perspectives that emphasize the role of grievances, resource mobilization and political opportunity structures to both informal and more formal types of social movement action. Second, there are perspectives that emphasize the importance of the collective framing of issues and the

forging of collective identities, networks, alliances and coalitions, both within states and in the global context, even where these may shift and change over time and historical and geographical context. These may be broad-based or issue-based, but they have at core a commitment to working towards socio-economic justice. Finally, to effectively understand the question of what triggers collective action in the South, we need to remember Amin's (1993) caution that social movements need to be contextualized historically in relation to broader global configurations of political power and capital accumulation.

The next section examines the linkages between the literature on social movements in the North and some of the debates surrounding the critical issue of who mobilizes in the South. The final section of the chapter turns to a discussion of the linkages between local and national social movements and the global political economy, and the ways in which social movements in the South are integrated into global social movements (GSMs).

The transformative potential of social movements in the South

Analysts in both the North and the South have argued that the material conditions of the very marginalized can act both as an incentive and a disincentive to mobilization. Notions of the transformative power of social activism and social movements are balanced by the acknowledgement of the limited resources and political power of the very marginalized (Castells 1997, 2003; Amin 1993; Kothari 1993, 2005). Social movements, nevertheless, do hold the potential to challenge the hegemony of states exercised through formal democratic institutions and practices. In that respect, while much of the focus in mainstream literature has been on the genesis and character of social movements, relatively little attention has been paid to their collective impact in shaping state–citizen relationships. While Marxists scholars have portrayed these multiple protests as the manifestation of ongoing class struggle, they do not necessarily represent a direct challenge to the legitimacy of the state. As Kothari (2005) has pointed out in the context of India, despite the poor treatment they have received from the state, most still turn to the state for services and resources. Thus, it is not always the political order which they wish to change, as much as their position in that order. In this context, social movements in the South should not be seen simply as anti-statist organizations in the making (although some undoubtedly are), but as new forms of citizen engagement with the state which have replaced other less successful political channels.

The legitimacy of protest, especially of the mass-action variety, or 'unconventional political action', as Dalton (2002) refers to it, has historically been viewed with some scepticism by influential theorists in the North such as Samuel Huntington (1991). In fact, given the tendency towards mass action and the resultant political and socio-economic turmoil, some analysts (again, the work of Huntington is an exemplar) have argued that growth and development may not be reconcilable with democracy in the South. For many years Huntington and others debated the relationship between the demands of social movements for greater availability and dispersion of public goods and the ability of the state, even in the North, to function effectively (Huntington 1984, 1991; Dalton 2002). The limits-to-public-goods argument cannot be dismissed out of hand, but it clearly has unsavoury implications and possibly repressive policy applications when applied to states in the South. Perhaps more importantly, far from being a deviation from the norm of democratic practice, social mobilization and protest have increasingly become an integral part of the political landscape in some states in the South and coexist with, and in some instances supplant, formal institutional channels for engagement with the state. In such contexts (evident in the case studies of India and South Africa in this volume), social movements have become the conventional vehicle for the attainment of democratic rights for ever-increasing numbers of citizens, and particularly for the poor. In this context, it must be noted, resource mobilization and political opportunity structures assume significance in the extent to which such movements are able to effect changes in the economic and political order.

The idea of mobilization that is aimed at transforming state–society relations framed by theorists such as Amin (1976, 1993), Mamdani (1996) and others rejects the type of 'bourgeois democracy' that serves elites inside and outside of the state, and which does not redress resource inequalities that are much more starkly unequal in the South than in the North. The language of political opportunity structure in this sense is potentially problematic as it implies distinct institutional options that movements may pursue, which may not always be present in states controlled by powerful political and economic elites. Thus, while resources and political opportunity structures clearly cannot be ignored, the struggles of communities through collective action in the South are also more likely to relate to issues of basic socio-economic entitlements which are no longer in question in more developed states.

The next section examines the linkages between notions of global

citizenship in the context of the marginalization of certain groups in the South and local, national and global social movements.

Globalization, marginalization and social movements

In recent years there has been a growing interest in the notion of global citizenship (see Edwards 1999; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Mayo 2005, among others) as a vehicle for forging a transnational solidarity that is capable of transcending the often undemocratic political formations of the South and the seemingly inexorable forces of global capital. As McIntyre-Mills asserts: 'The concept of global citizenship shifts rights and responsibilities from a national to an institutional context' (McIntyre-Mills 2000: 19). For some scholars, global citizenship is not just an important area of research on citizenship, it is of central importance to any theorizing on the topic. Thus, according to Mayo, '[t]he emergence of global citizenship action has been widely recognised as having been key to the discourse and practices of democratic politics and social change' (Mayo 2005: 1).⁸

While the move towards global mobilization remains an important field of study, however, its proponents tend frequently to overstate its importance in the broader scheme of 'everyday' resistance which makes up the bulk of social protest and mobilization (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Appadurai 2002; Leach et al. 2005, 2007). Various chapters in this volume reaffirm the significance of global social movements (Alonso et al., Mehta et al., Cortez), but others also underscore the fact that there is nothing inevitable about the emergence of this form of social mobilization (Mahmud). They point out that even where the conditions lend themselves to the growth of global action, this may not occur owing to the specificity of the prevailing political, economic and cultural conditions.

The connections between national and global forms of activism, and what has become known as the local-global content of social mobilization, has been the focus of a great deal of research on the transformative potential of global networks. Multilevel case-study analyses that show the positive linkages between the local and the global have gained popularity, despite reservations from critics about combining very different levels of analysis (see, for example, Dahl 2003 and Habermas 2003 for a critique of the notion of democratic global institutions and global citizens respectively). There is also related debate about the extent to which GSMs bring about *change* in the global arena, although it is mostly agreed that GSMs do exercise some *influence* over multilateral institutions (Stavenhagen 1997; O'Brien et al. 2000; Murphy 2002). O'Brien et al. (2000: 12) define

GSMs (as distinct from global civil society, or international society) as being

[b]y definition not members of the elite in their societies. They are anti-systemic. That is they are working to forward priorities at odds with the existing organisation of the system. They rely on mass mobilisation because they do not directly control the levers of power such as the state. A global social movement is one which operates in a global as well as local, national and international space.

The ability of Northern-interest and social movement organizations to represent very different contexts and political, social and economic identities (see, for example, Held and McGrew 2003; Held et al. 2003), nevertheless, remains a real concern. Steady (2002: 79–94), for example, argues that global solidarity with the 'white feminist' movement has been of limited usefulness to African women's movement needs, particularly in terms of economic marginalization. There are, furthermore, numerous examples of these contradictions of representation, which characterize both 'old' (e.g. trade unions) and 'new' (e.g. women's rights, environment and HIV/AIDS activist) social movements (see also Held et al. 2003).

Who speaks for whom? Global social movements in the global political economy

Inherent in left-oriented perspectives on social action is the conviction that social movements, represented by organizations with the correct political orientation, can bring about transformation as they truly represent the poor. In a similar fashion, by conflating social movements with social movement organizations (or interest groups), some INGOs claim social movement status despite the lack of clear linkages to a collective global support base.

Those who support the normative project of global social movements underline the fact that the strength of GSMs is their 'global vision' and '... the way in which they might contribute to increasing democracy by creating a global civil society' (O'Brien et al. 2000: 22). Yet analysts such as Dahl (2003), Habermas (2003), Held and McGrew (2003), Karns and Mingst (2004) and others range from cautious to sceptical about the degree to which global social movements are truly able to be democratically representative of any transnational group, including the poor, as issues relating to identity and action may be superseded by elite agendas and a lack of accountability, among other things. This reality is evidenced in the case study of the Griqua community discussed by Simpson and

Waldman in this volume, which makes the point that, despite the solidarity shown towards their cause, their cultural identity was such that they remained deeply distrustful of and resentful towards those attempting to assist them.

As the chapters in this volume emphasize, it is in challenging global marginalization that the positive strength of global linkages is most evident, and it is in this realm that movements in the South have the most to gain from global social movement solidarity, knowledge and resources. Stavenhagen (1997: 33) points out, for example, that ‘... in the span of a few years, the international human rights movement has become a major actor in the multilateral field. Governments can no longer afford to violate the rights of their citizens with impunity, arguing undue interference in their internal affairs.’ The relative success of the human rights movement, however, can be juxtaposed against the relative lack of influence of movements opposed to the globalization of capital or globalization more broadly stated. Yet Rucht (2003: 211–22) reminds us that global mobilizations against neoliberal capitalism, as witnessed in Seattle (and later Prague, Genoa and New York), have forged collective social movement solidarities but have achieved relatively few substantive gains.

Also pertinent here are the arguments made by, among others, Touraine (2001), Arrighi et al. (1989) and Amin (1993), who argue that globalization is in fact the globalization of capital or what Castells (2003) refers to as ‘global informational capitalism’ – that is, capitalism based on information, technology and capital flows. This changing global milieu is said to severely restrict the ability of less-informed and less-educated communities in national contexts to overcome their marginalization. Thus, as O’Brien et al. (2000: 15) point out, ‘[w]hile social movements may extol the virtues of global civil society, that space has been and is largely dominated by the extensive formal and informal contacts of transnational business and their allies ... any arrangement that limited the prerogatives of global business would encounter great resistance’. This view is reinforced by compelling arguments, made by Kothari (2005) and others, about the effects of markets and technological innovation on increasing economic inequalities in the South.

It is also clear that the internationalization of social movements and the opportunities for local and national movements to link and find additional support for normative causes relating, for example, to gender, the environment, health and even socio-economic exploitation are *far greater* than they were in the evolution of social movements in the

North American and western European contexts (see Held et al. 2003 and Kothari 2005 for a discussion of this). Underscoring this point, Waldman and Simpson discuss the challenges of a relationship established between local resistance organizations and broader forms of social movement representation, effected through transnational litigation, showing both the potential as well as the limitations of the local–global nexus. Cortez’s chapter on the Zapatista movement also echoes the possibility of successful alliances between national and global social movements. In contrast, Mehta et al. and Mohanty stress the challenges of linking to global social movements where local forms of resistance and organization are relatively constrained.

In short, we re-emphasize that it is hardly possible to discuss the potential for democratic gains and losses on the part of social movements in the South without discussing the global political economy, and global social movements and their links with national and local movements. At the same time the role of the state in the South should not be underestimated, nor should the degree to which citizens are constrained by the repressive potential of even so-called democratic regimes in the South.

Social movements in the North and South: towards more synthetic understandings

Much of the research in this volume seeks to speak to mobilization that originates at the local or grassroots level, but it is recognized that much more needs to be done to achieve an understanding of broader trends and tendencies. Relating forms of mobilization and protest action (and, in some instances, their absence) at the local level to broader social movements helps to understand the ways in which certain issues give rise to collective action and others not, as well as which types of activism have more impact and are more readily taken up by new or existing national and global social movements. This book explores the potential for developing more synthetic analyses as well as contextual understandings of why and how social movements arise in relation to historical, geographical and global contexts. It also considers the role played by social movements in defining collective identities and agendas, while at the same time remaining mindful of the fact that not all mobilization and collective action, nor indeed even all social movement action, necessarily implies the development of democracy and citizenship either locally, nationally or globally.

As we have discussed, the analytical understandings of the factors giving rise to and shaping social movements in the South share some

similarities with their Northern counterparts, as well as a few critical differences. Many of what we have termed ‘middle-range’ theories of social movements, which aim to synthesize grievance, resource mobilization, political opportunity structures and framing approaches, assist our understanding of how movements arise and sustain themselves. There are, nevertheless, a number of significant differences in the form and content of social movements in the North and in the South which must be taken into account when applying Northern theory in Southern contexts.

The first of these differences relates to the fact that the global economic order not only shapes power relations between states but also, in the context of the South, within states. Thus, access to resources on the part of the poor in Southern states is constantly mediated by a range of both national and global factors, which, in turn, impact on the extent to which they are able to mobilize, and the extent to which they are able to extract concessions from the state.

The second discernible difference relates to the fact that mobilization and social movements in the South have become a key (in some instances the most prominent) form of popular engagement with the state. To that extent, and in contrast to conditions which prevail in most Northern states, social mobilization and the social movements that emerge from them have become an important vehicle for the attainment of citizenship rights and, significantly, they have, in many instances, supplanted, or rendered irrelevant, extant political channels, the invited spaces for state–citizen engagement.

In this context, a third discernible difference is evident, namely that the bulk of the social mobilization described in this volume is oriented towards the attainment of socio-economic rights rather than more generalized human rights. The struggle for socio-economic rights, furthermore, has in many respects become the key dimension in the struggle to realize citizenship rights in the South. In that respect, it is significant that the case studies discussed in this volume all involve states that already have in place the institutions necessary for the development of substantive forms of democracy. In most instances, furthermore, formal channels for citizen–state engagement have been established. It is clear, nevertheless, that the poor and disempowered are, for the most part, unable to realize their rights through these invited spaces and have consistently striven to create their own forms of engagement with the state.

The case studies discussed, furthermore, explicitly challenge the notion that development, conceived predominantly in terms of economic growth, will facilitate the deepening of democracy in highly dualistic

societies. As the case studies of South Africa, Nigeria and India illustrate, major infrastructural and extractive projects, undertaken in the name of the public good, can serve to adversely affect the rights and livelihood of the poor and disadvantaged. The mobilization of communities against these projects, consequently, represents not only resistance to adverse policies but also an assertion of their status and rights as citizens. Social movements, in this context, form part of a broader process of holding the state accountable for the welfare of all its citizens.

Notes

1 We would like to express our appreciation to Neil Stammers, John Gaventa and Eghosa Osaghae, who provided invaluable advice on this chapter.

2 Our categorization of states as being situated in the global ‘North’ or ‘South’ is unavoidably an analytically imprecise one. Since the end of the cold war, the global order has undergone enormous changes and former states of the Eastern bloc now coalesce uneasily in ‘Northern’ or Western alliances such as the European Union without the necessary structural economic strength of many of their partner states. In contradistinction, some states in the ‘South’, or which have allied themselves with the South, are becoming much stronger international economic, if not political, players, and here China, Brazil and India are of particular note. The distinction between North and South is retained here as a way of distinguishing between historical economic blocs.

3 The terms ‘collective action’, ‘social mobilization’, ‘social movements’ and ‘social movement organizations’ are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature. In this context we refer to social mobilization as a prerequisite of collective action. We distinguish between col-

lective action and social movements in our exploration of why certain forms of collective action give rise to social movements while others do not (see the section in this chapter entitled *What makes a movement?*).

4 We are grateful to Neil Stammers for reminding us of this point.

5 See in particular Kabeer (2005).

6 The linkages between mobilization and democratic practices are to be further explored in a forthcoming Zed volume entitled *Mobilizing for Democracy*, edited by Coelho and von Lieres.

7 We term them ‘middle-range’ in the sense that they do not aspire to the status of meta-theory and they provide at least a partial framework for the analysis of social movements in the South.

8 This theme is explored at length by Gaventa and Tandon in a forthcoming volume in this series.

References

- Alvarez, S., E. Dagnino and A. Escobar (eds) (1998) *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amin, S. (1976) *Unequal Development*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- (1993) ‘Social movements at the

- periphery', in P. Wignaraja (ed.), *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Appadurai, A. (2002) 'Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics', *Public Culture*, 14: 21–47.
- Arrighi, G., T. K. Hopkins and I. Wallerstein (1989) *Anti-systemic Movements*, London: Verso.
- Ballard, R., A. Habib and I. Valodia (eds) (2006) *Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, University of KwaZulu Natal Press.
- Benford, R. and D. Snow (2000) 'Framing processes and social movements: an overview and assessment', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, August.
- Bond, P. (2002) *Unsustainable South Africa: Environment, Development and Social Protest*, London: Merlin Press.
- Castells, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity: The Information Age*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2003) 'Global informational capitalism', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Comacho, D. (1993) 'Latin America: a society in motion', in P. Wignaraja (ed.), *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Cornwall, A. (2004) 'New democratic spaces? The politics and dynamics of institutionalised participation', *IDS Bulletin*, 35(2).
- Cornwall, A. and V. S. Coelho (eds) (2007) *Spaces for Change? Participation, Inclusion and Voice*, London: Zed Books.
- Cox, R. (1987) *Production, Power and World Order, Social Forces and the Making of History*, New York: Columbia.
- (ed.) (1997) *The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (2003) 'Can international organisations be democratic? A sceptic's view', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2002) *Citizen Politics: Public opinion and political parties in advanced industrial democracies*, 3rd edn, New York: Chatham House.
- Della Porta, D. and M. Diani (1999) *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Diani, M. (1992) 'The concept of social movement', *Sociological Review*, 40: 1–25.
- Eckersley, R. (1994) *Environmentalism and Political Theory*, London: UCI Press.
- Edelman, M. (2001) 'Social movements: changing paradigms and forms of politics', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, October.
- Edwards, M. (1999) *Future Positive, International Co-operation in the 21st Century*, London: Earthscan.
- Edwards, M. and J. Gaventa (eds) (2001) *Global Citizen Action*, Colorado/London: Lynne Rienner/Earthscan.
- Epstein, S. (1996) *Impure Science: Aids, Activism and the Politics of Knowledge*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Escobar, A. (1996) 'Imagining a post-development era', in J. Crush (ed.), *The Power of Development*, London: Routledge.
- Freeman, J. (1999) *Waves of Protest: Social Movements since the Sixties*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gamson, W. (1982) *Encounters with Unjust Authority*, Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- (1990 [1975]) *The Strategy of Social Protest*, Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- (1992) 'The social psychology of collective action', in C. M. Mueller and A. D. Morris (eds), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.
- Gaventa, J. (1999) 'Crossing the great divide: building links between NGOs and community based organisations in North and South', in D. Lewis (ed.), *International Perspectives on the Third Sector*, London: Earthscan.
- (2000) 'Exploring, citizenship, participation and accountability', *IDS Bulletin*, 23, April.
- Guigni, M. G. (1998) 'Was it worth the effort? The outcomes and consequences of Social Movements', *ARS*, 24.
- Habermas, J. (2003) 'The post-national constellation', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hajer, M. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Held, D. and A. McGrew (eds) (2003) *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton (2003) *Global Transformations*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Huntington, S. (1974) 'Postindustrial politics: how benign will it be?', *Comparative Politics*, 6.
- (1984) 'Will more countries become democratic?', *Political Science Quarterly*, 99.
- (1991) *The Third Wave*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ibarra, P. (ed.) (2003) *Social Movements and Democracy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jenkins C. (1983) 'Resource Mobilisation Theory and the study of social movements', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9.
- Jenkins, J. C. and M. Wallace (1996) 'The generalised action potential of protest movements: the new class, social trends, and political exclusion explanations', *Sociological Forum*, 11(2).
- Kabeer, N. (ed.) (2005) *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*, London: Zed Books.
- Karns, M. P. and K. A. Mingst (2004) *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Klandermans, B. (1984) 'Mobilization and participation: social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory', *American Sociological Review*, 49(5).
- (1997) *The Social Sociology of Protest*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Klandermans, B. and D. Oegema (1987) 'Potentials, networks, motivations and barriers: steps towards participation in social movements', *American Sociological Review*, 52(4).
- Kothari, R. (1993). 'Rethinking development and democracy', in P. Wignaraja (ed.) (1993) *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- (2005) *Rethinking Democracy*, New Delhi: Orient Longman.

- Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*, London: Verso.
- Leach, M., I. Scoones and B. Wynne (eds) (2005) *Science and Citizens: Globalisation and the Challenge of Engagement*, London: Zed Books.
- Leys, C. (1996) *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*, Oxford: EAEP.
- Lindberg, S. and A. Sverrison (eds) (1997) *Social Movements in Development*, London: Macmillan.
- Luckham, R., A. Goetz and M. Kaldor (2000) 'Democratic institutions and politics in contexts of inequality, poverty and conflict', *IDS Working Paper 104*, Brighton: IDS.
- Mamdani, M. (1996) *Citizen and the Subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*, Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Mamdani, M., T. Mkandawire and E. Wamba-dia-Wamba (1993). 'Social movements and democracy in Africa', in P. Wignaraja (ed.) (1993), *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Mayo, M. (2005) *Global Citizenship, Social Movements and the Challenge of Globalisation*, London: Zed Books.
- McAdam, D. (1986) 'Recruitment to high risk activism: the case of Freedom Summer', *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(1).
- McAdam, D., J. D. McCarthy and M. N. Zald (eds) (1996) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilising Structures and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, D., S. Tarrow and C. Tilly (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J. D. and M. N. Zald (1977) 'Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory', *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6).
- McIntyre-Mills, J. (2000) *Global Citizenship and Social Movements: Creating Transcultural Webs for the New Millennium*, Amsterdam: Hartwood Academic Publishers.
- Melucci, A. (1995) 'The new social movements revisited: reflections on a sociological misunderstanding', in L. Malhue (ed.), *Social Movements and Social Classes: The future of collective action*, London: Sage.
- (1996) *Challenging Codes: Collective action in the information age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mhone, G. (2003) 'Democratisation, economic liberalisation and the quest for sustainable development in South Africa', in G. Mhone and O. Edigheji, *Governance in the New South Africa: The challenges of globalisation*, Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Murphy, C. N. (ed.) (2002) *Egalitarian Politics in the Age of Globalisation*, London: Palgrave.
- Mushakoji, K. (1993) 'Foreword', in P. Wignaraja (ed.), *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Newell, P. and J. Wheeler (eds) (2006) *Rights, Resources and the Politics of Accountability*, London: Zed Books.
- Norris, I. and S. Cable (1994) 'The seeds of protest: from elite initiators to grassroots mobilisation', *Sociological Perspectives*, 37: 24–268.
- Nyamu-Musembi, C. (2005) 'Towards an actor oriented perspective on human rights', in N. Kabeer (ed.), *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and expressions*, London: Zed Books.
- Oberschall, A. (1973) *Social Conflict and Social Movements*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Brien, R., A. M. Goetz, J. A. Scholte and M. Williams (2000) *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Offe, C. (1985) 'New social movements: challenging the boundaries of institutional politics', *Social Research*, 52(4).
- Oliver, P., J. Cadena-Roa and K. Strawn (2003) 'Emerging trends in the study of protest and social movements', in B. Dobratz, T. Buzzell and L. Waldner, *Political Sociology for the 21st Century*, vol. 12, Oxford: Elsevier.
- Olsen, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oommen, T. K. (1997) 'Social movements in the Third World', in S. Lindberg and A. Sverrison (eds), *Social Movements in Development*, London: Macmillan.
- Opp, K. (1988) 'Grievances and participation in social movements', *American Sociological Review*, 53(6).
- Park, R. (1969 [1921]) 'Collective behavior', in R. Park and E. W. Burgess (eds), *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, New York: Greenwood Press.
- Piven, F. and R. Cloward (1979) *Poor People's Movements: Why they succeed and how they fail*, New York: Pantheon.
- Robins, S. (2005) 'Rights passages from "near death" to "new life": AIDS activism and treatment testimonies in South Africa', *IDS Working Paper 251*, Brighton: IDS.
- Rucht, D. (2003) 'Social movements challenging neo-liberal globalisation', in P. Ibarra (ed.), *Social Movements and Democracy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smelser, N. (1962) *Theory of Collective Behavior*, New York: Free Press.
- Snow, D. and R. Benford (1988) 'Ideology, frame resonance and participant mobilization', in B. Klandermans, K. Hanspeter and S. Tarrow (eds), *International Social Movement Research: From Structure to Action*, Greenwich: JAI Press.
- (1992) 'Master frames and cycles of protest', in C. M. Mueller and A. D. Morris (eds), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.
- Stammers, N. (2005) 'The emergence of human rights in the North: towards historical re-evaluation', in N. Kabeer (ed.), *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*, London: Zed Books.
- (2009) *Human Rights and Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.
- Stavenhagen, R. (1997) 'People's movements, the anti-systemic challenge', in R. W. Cox (ed.), *The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Steady, F. C. (2002) 'Engendering change through egalitarian movements: the African experience', in C. N. Murphy (ed.), *Egalitarian Politics in the Age of Globalisation*, London: Palgrave.

- Stienstra, D. (1999) 'Of roots, leaves and trees: gender, social movements and global governance', in M. K. Meyer and E. Prugl (eds), *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, Boston, MA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Tarrow, S. (1989) *Democracy and Disorder: Protests and Politics in Italy 1965-75*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, L. (2005) 'Managing mobilization? Participatory processes and dam building in South Africa, the Berg River project', IDS Working Paper 254, Brighton: IDS.
- Tilly, C. (1975) *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1978) *From Mobilization to Revolution*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- (2003) 'When do (and don't) social movements promote democratisation?', in P. Ibarra (ed.), *Social Movements and Democracy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Touraine, A. (1985) 'An introduction to the study of new social movements', *Social Research*, 52(4).
- (2001) *Beyond Neoliberalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wignaraja, P. (ed.) (1993) *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.