44

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Wendy Wolford and Sara Keene

Introduction

Perhaps more than any other field, political ecology grew out of a desire to understand marginalization and contestation from the perspective of those who were impoverished, excluded or exploited; the field today retains this commitment. Political ecologists have broken new ground analyzing the ways in which the social relations of production (or, the mechanisms, associations and norms of surplus creation and extraction) shape, and are themselves shaped by, unequal location *within*, access *to* and control *over* the environment. Given the "preference for the poor" that marks the field, it is not surprising that emphasis is placed on politics – on understanding the political (and thoroughly un-natural) nature of both exclusion and incorporation. What is more surprising is the marked preference among political ecologists for studying informal, unorganized politics rather than studying organized groups such as the state or social movements. There are of course excellent studies of social movements in political ecology, but fewer than one might imagine, especially given the argument that social movements will be the primary vehicle for long-term progressive change (Escobar 1995, 2008; O'Connor 1988). Almost all those who identify as political ecologists have worked on marginalization, contestation and even resistance – all of which are crucial for understanding the formation, organization and work of social movements – but the work has generally been done at the level of individuals, households, communities, groups broadly defined (ethnic, regional, national or other) or organizations (NGOs, associations, etc.). Social movements themselves are invoked but not regularly studied.

Part of the explanation for this surprising paucity of social movement studies in an otherwise expansive field may lie in the difficulty of identification, of knowing exactly who is a political ecologist or what studies can be defined as such. Wendy Wolford (one of the authors of this chapter) has worked with social movements and incorporated the tools of political ecology (2004, 2010) but she is rarely identified as a political ecologist. On the other hand, James McCarthy is identified very closely with the field of political ecology but few people think of him as having worked on or with social movements, even though his early work was an incisive examination of the Wise Use Movement in the rural US West (2002).

Beyond the issue of identification, there are perhaps four other factors that explain why political ecology has not engaged more with movements. We briefly outline them here before

turning to the substantive purpose of the chapter. First, although political ecology began as a study of land managers in the so-called global south, as a discipline it is dominated by academics in the global north, particularly by scholars in the United States and Great Britain. For better or for worse, in these two countries the study of social movements (and even of mobilization more broadly) is dominated by sociology, and there is very little interaction between sociology and political ecology. American sociology is very U.S.-centric and discussions of 'the environment' tend to be situated in either environmental sociology or environmental justice (but see the ambitious attempt to bridge political ecology and environmental justice organized by David Carruthers 2008, also see Holifield et al. 2009, and Chapter 45, this volume).

A second reason why there might not be as much political ecology work on social movements is because although social movements are highly visible, active and organized, they are in the minority. As important as it is to know when and why people organize to protest or celebrate and defend their conditions, it is potentially even more important to know when and why they do not. One of political ecology's real contributions has been to show how seemingly isolated, reactionary acts of violence are in fact often deliberate responses to historically situated inequalities. Christian Kull's (2004) work on forest fires in Madagascar and Nancy Peluso's (1993) work on community resistance to state control over forest resources in Indonesia are excellent examples of work that helps to redefine the meaning of the political, and to bring resistance to the fore, though neither author focuses on social movements (but see Peluso et al. 2008).

A third reason that may help to explain why political ecologists haven't engaged with movements as much as one might expect is the ethical dilemma of focusing on movements as objects of study. Work in political ecology tends to focus on the everyday and to employ the very intrusive tools of ethnography and in-depth participant observation. If such intimate translation and interpretation is always a violent act, it is even more so in analyses of social movements, organizations that have very specific messages they wish to transmit. Ironically, as Peet and Watts (2004) suggest, work on social movements in political ecology has often "[exposed] the limits of a naïve invocation of the local community as a theatre of governance" (18; see especially Rangan 2000). It turns out that movements are people too! And there are many different ways to be traditional (Bebbington 2004), indigenous (Li 2000, 2004; Valdivia 2005) and landless (Peluso et al. 2008; Wolford 2003) such that it isn't always clear for – or to whom – the research ought to speak (Wolford 2010). As a result, many movements (particularly new or small ones) choose not to participate in academic research, and researchers may choose to work *with* social movements rather than on them.

Finally, the fourth reason that may explain what we see as limited engagement with social movements is that our review of the literature is necessarily partial; it is partial in the sense of being incomplete and partial in the sense of privileging a particular reading of the field. We have no doubt missed many good studies or perhaps been too narrow in our definition of both social movements and political ecology.

In the rest of this chapter, we first outline the roots of social movement work in political ecology, arguing that the field's perspective on mobilization grew out of critical agrarian studies and a focus on peasant rebellions and protests. We then outline what we see as the main contributions of political ecology for analyzing social movements and, more broadly, resistance. We focus on four contributions: first, political ecologists understand all struggles to be a struggle over objective and subjective conditions – in other words, political ecologists bring together materiality and meaning, focusing on both the grounded conditions of production and social reproduction as well as the ways in which people make sense of – or bring meaning to – their situations. Second, political ecology treats movements as produced in and through particular

environments; the research emphasizes the importance of place (the spatial context) and conjuncture (the temporal context) for analyzing the formation and maintenance of protest. Third, political ecology shows particular strength in analyzing the discourses or narratives that frame contestation over natural resources, and in situating these within broader structural relationships, such as global trade flows, state power, globalizing movements and regional or global processes of land use or environmental change. Fourth, although, as noted above, political ecology's focus has tended to speak more to informal political processes than to institutional actors such as national states, important work has been done that sheds light on the relationship between the interests of the state (and state actors) and political activists on the ground. Most political ecology work on social movements incorporates some combination of all of these contributions, but in this chapter, we outline the four separately and illustrate each with key examples.

The roots of political ecology as a study of contestation

Early work in political ecology took up Blaikie and Brookfield's (1987) injunction to study the "land managers," situating them within communities, regions and states (and, eventually, within households). For those working on the topic of social movements, however, the inspiration came more directly from the field of agrarian studies. As amorphous as political ecology, classical agrarian studies dates back to the early twentieth century when socialist theorists analyzed the (expected) penetration and diffusion of capitalism into agriculture and, therefore, into rural production and society. The key question at that time was the fate of the then-numerically predominant but historically marginalized and under-appreciated peasantry (Chayanov 1925; Gramsci et al. 1971; Kautsky 1899; Lenin 1956 [1925]; Shanin 1981).

While this original agrarian question was not directly concerned with the formation of social movements, scholars took up the theoretical questions and tools again in the 1970s with the return of research on rural transformation, solidarity and revolution (Moore 1966). Although the peasantry had been declared obsolete on numerous occasions throughout the twentieth century (cf. Hobsbawm 1994), the 1970s marked a period of intense political activity among rural classes. Much more than the last gasp of a dying class, revolutions from Bolivia to Nicaragua and Peru to Kenya, Algeria and Vietnam (Paige 1975; Wolf 1969) all seemed to be fought over agrarian issues (whether this was in fact an accurate representation was debated, as in the cases of the socialist revolution in Vietnam, cf. Wolf 1969; the communist advance in China, cf. Potter and Potter 1990; and the Cuban revolution, cf. Mintz 1974). Scholars within the tradition of agrarian studies incorporated an eclectic set of tools from classical political economy (Smith 2010 [1776]; Marx et al. 1990 [1867]; Lewis 1954) and contemporary social sciences to examine the historical roots of these radical grievances, actors and movements.

As movements and revolutions for independence in Africa and Asia gained force in the second half of the twentieth century, research in critical development studies merged with agrarian studies to investigate the role of ideology, brokers and leaders, class relations, and the state in political activity from foot dragging to revolutions to nation building (Scott 1985; Starn and Fox 1997). Theories of moral economy (Thompson 1971; Scott 1976) were important in suggesting that norms and popularly held ideas of fairness were shaped by convention, custom and structures that, when violated, led to resistance. Therefore, the violation of these perceived moral economies was as, if not more, important to understand in analyzing the rise of food riots or social mobilization than unfairness or grievances per se (Shanin 1972). At the same time, social injustice was situated firmly within broader structural conditions, such as those created by the world market system, from dependency to inequality (Wallerstein 1974; Frank 1969;

Cardoso and Faletto 1979; Amin 1994). Jim Ferguson's (1990) classic study of development projects in Lesotho helped to illuminate the material effects of universalizing assumptions about the objects of development (cf. Escobar 1995).

The rise of subaltern studies in the 1980s also figured prominently in a new theoretical framing of resistance and social movements (Guha 1997; Spivak 1988a). As a project to rethink history (especially national histories) from the perspective of the subaltern, subaltern studies was a reaction to both Marxist and liberal interpretations of history as linear and neat, written from the perspective of elites. Subaltern studies scholars insisted that multiple histories lay hidden in the silences and cracks of official narratives, and that a proactive agenda was required to ferret out the meanings of (and from) the margins (Spivak 1988b, 1993, 2004).

All of these concerns influenced the study of social mobilization within political ecology, a field that itself came into being in tandem with the proliferation of new social movements around the world. Unlike many other fields of study, political ecology retains its focus on the struggles of agrarian and marginalized populations, highlighting the complex ways in which power relations condition mobilization and resistance, and with what effects. We explore these specific contributions in the overview that follows, beginning with the centrality of meaning – norms, values, customs and ideologies – in ecological conflicts and contestations.

Struggles over resources: materiality and meaning

Drawing inspiration from E.P. Thompson's seminal essay, "The moral economy of the English crowd in the eighteenth century" (1971), work on social mobilization in political ecology emphasizes the importance of norms and customs in shaping struggles over access to resources and the environment and thus the co-constitution of cultural meanings and "material forces" (Gramsci et al. 1971: 165; Moore 1993). Thompson's claim that food riots in eighteenth-century England were not simply "rebellions of the belly" (1971: 77), but instead premised on a shared sense of outrage over prices perceived to be unfairly high and new forms of exchange that prejudiced the poor, compelled scholars to take seriously not only the motivations and objectives of protestors, but also – and perhaps even more importantly – the historical conditions and relationships that conditioned collective protest. James Scott's (1976) work situated the moral economy more firmly in the peasant economy with his analysis of a 'subsistence ethic' among the rural poor that he argued created "standards of justice and equity" that applied to all peasants (Scott 1976: 157). Like Thompson, Scott argued that rebellion was directly linked to normative conceptions of obligation, right and reciprocity.

Thompson's influence is evident in a range of social movement studies within political ecology that emphasize the importance of moral economies produced through the social relations of production (or, property relations) in shaping contestation. Michael Watts' (1983) classic study of Hausa peasants in Nigeria emphasized the transformation of a pre-capitalist moral economy by a predatory colonial state and local elites in ways that not only generated recurrent famines but also naturalized the condition of food insecurity as a function of ecological and cultural incompetence. Judith Carney and Michael Watts (1990, see also Carney 2004) built on this perspective to illustrate how pre-colonial moral economies guiding access to land shaped the repeated "failure" of intensive rice production schemes in the Gambia. Women, in particular, resisted attempts to intensify production on land to which they would no longer have a claim, given its incorporation into "community resources." Matt Turner's (2004) work among pastoralists in the African Sahel also sheds light on the moral overtones of the Malthusian narratives that dominate understandings of farmer-herder conflict. As he argues, "It is only through a full and critical engagement with both the materiality which underlies all social life

and the moral claims that implicate natural resource use that the etiology of resource-related conflict can be better understood. Struggles over resources are often only superficially so—they in fact reflect not only broader tensions (with ethical dimensions) between social groups but also tensions within these groups" (866). Anthony Bebbington's work in Latin America has brought together a livelihoods framework with political ecology to focus on how people "[make] a living and [make] living meaningful" (2000: 498). Bebbington has worked with communities, non-governmental organizations and social movements and argues that there are many different ways "to be an Indian" in the highlands of Ecuador (1991, 1993, 2004) and, as such, research should focus not on romanticized notions of tradition but should analyze and situate the moral economies of *modernization* (Valdivia 2005).

In Wendy Wolford's analysis of the Rural Landless Workers Movement (the MST) in Brazil (2003, 2005), she highlights the production of moral economies of access to land and argues that claims to land by the agrarian elite in Brazil were generated through a "narrative that attributed their traditional rights to land to hard work, personal responsibility, and reliance on the market rather than on 'politics'" (2005: 251). Likewise, the moral economy of the MST, expressed as "land for those who work it," was generated through historical experiences of displacement and marginalization. In short, these competing moral economies were born out of the inherently relational practice of struggle in a moment of capitalist entrenchment. Another emblematic case of the political ecology of social movements from the vantage point of customs, values and norms is James McCarthy's (1998, 2002) study of the Wise Use Movement. Wise Use was a group of organizations and rural commodity producers in the U.S. American West who fought against state control of public land and mobilized for the right to commodity production on federally-owned lands from the late-1980s to mid-1990s. McCarthy illustrated the ways in which Wise Use activists and campaigns drew upon similar sorts of populist claims as the movements studied in the global south, with appeals to self-determination, local knowledge and local rights. While this moral economy was not framed as anti-capitalist, it did constitute an "ongoing struggle over nature" and "resistance to the perennial dynamics of capitalism" through their articulation of an alternative set of economic relations that maintained the conditions, livelihoods and culture of rural Western communities (2002: 1291).

Though diverse in their geographic, historical and cultural locations, these studies illustrate the centrality of meaning in contestations over resources and environments in the context of capitalist change. These meanings of course are not created in a vacuum; they are constituted in and by particular people, places and times. Political ecology's attentiveness to conjuncture and place is thus another of its important contributions to our understanding of social struggles.

Grounding mobilization: the importance of place

In part because of its close connection to the disciplines of geography and anthropology and in part because of its focus on land managers and material practice, political ecology has always emphasized the importance of place in shaping the conditions of exploitation and of protest or mobilization; if nature and society are co-constituted then by definition location matters. Political ecologists such as Christian Kull working on social mobilization situate movements and protest in historically rich descriptions of local environments and ecologies (2004). Arturo Escobar has been particularly important for urging social scientists to study the political construction of place (2001), which he has recently re-conceptualized as territory in his magisterial study of the Pacific Coast Black Communities (PCN) in Colombia (2008). The book brings together Escobar's focus on modernity/coloniality (in which the project of modernity is understood as predicated on coloniality) with an interest in alternative knowledges.

He argues that the peoples of the Pacific coast region have been shaped by an articulation of processes that have simultaneously produced the region, including historical processes of geological and biological formation, the daily practices of local black, indigenous and mestizo groups, capital accumulation, incorporation into the state, and cultural political practices of social movements (2008: 31). Redefining the liberal conceptions of rights, the PCN has called for collective rights to land; cultural, political and economic autonomy (on the basis of their group identity); and the right to a 'shared vision of the future' based on their cultural autonomy. Through this case study, Escobar demonstrates how identity and place are 'dialogic and relational' (2008: 203), being constantly (re)created through material and political practices that mutually condition one another.

This focus on the importance of place is visible in studies of indigenous peoples and indigeneity more generally. Tom Perreault's (2008) work in particular examines the material and symbolic importance of traditional rights and norms for governing and shaping livelihoods and political claims in Bolivia and Ecuador. In Cocahabamba, Bolivia, where the water wars erupted in 2003, most observers focused on urban movements in organizing the protests but Perreault argues that peasant movements were actually far more important and organized in utilizing the power of traditional discourses around *usos y costumbres* (customs and habits) to manage water and shape new forms of governance. With Gabriela Valdivia, Perreault has also done important work on the role of place in shaping mobilization around new resource imaginaries (2010; see also Wolford 2005). Valdivia and Perreault compare mobilizations against the privatization of natural gas in Bolivia and oil in Ecuador to demonstrate the importance of historically situated, place-based notions of citizenship and nation. The importance of place is also stressed in Donald Moore's (1998, 2005) examination of histories of settlement, freedom and resistance in Zimbabwe. Moore argues that colonial and post-colonial forms of governance called upon fixed lines and spatial concentrations – government spaces and settlement areas – that violated the fluid spaces of house and field in traditional societies and in the newly created squatter areas. Moore's work highlights what he calls the "sedimenting" of multiple spaces in any given place, all shaped by contending and racialized practices of inhabiting, laboring and suffering.

These studies help us to ground movements and mobilization in particular historical and geographic locations, without neglecting the broader global processes within which they are constituted. But what of the discourses and narratives that give life to movements? How do these inform social struggles and the environments in and for which they are waged? While movement discourses are inextricably connected to the cultural values and norms that give them meaning, they do additional work of shaping the contours of resistance – defining what (and who) is to be included and excluded, and the terms of their inclusion. Narratives and discourses are deeply political, as demonstrated below, and can have unintended effects as they travel back and forth through time and space.

Traveling narratives: of myths, discourses and representations

Movement narratives represent an amalgam of origin stories, principles, goals and visions that animate the movement and provide direction for political action. As such, movement narratives articulate specific notions of justice, modes of political participation and engagement, and collective identities. Such narratives – particularly when backed by a broad spectrum of participants – provide the ideological space to reconsider power relations, economic organization, land tenure, social relationships and rights (to name a few). In other words, movement narratives provide the impetus (and possibility) for meaningful social change. However, there are

theoretical and practical limitations posed by "movement narratives." On the one hand, having the appearance of a "united front" is necessary to movement mobilization, legitimacy and efficacy. Movements often engage in what Spivak has called the "strategic use of positivist essentialism" (1996: 214). The notion of "strategic essentialism" is fundamentally different from "a substantive or real essentialism" (Spivak 1993: 3). While the latter refers to a flattening of difference, whereby master labels such as "woman" subsume and conceal difference, strategic essentialism involves the political mobilization of such master labels alongside theoretical critique. The notion of "strategic essentialism" thus offers an intervention that recognizes difference without relinquishing the political salience of normative discourses. This approach is particularly useful in understanding how actors emphasize and mobilize categories of identification, and simultaneously re-shape those categories to define the parameters of their engagement. Yet, this sort of "strategic essentialism" can obscure differences and make it difficult to maintain the kind of ethical negotiation that is critical to democratic inclusion (and the valorization and promotion of difference).

Peter Brosius has provided insight into how environmental discourses in Malaysia – and the campaigns through which they are mobilized – have served to simplify and translate "local" or "indigenous" knowledges, thereby defining and structuring the contours of social and political debates around environmental actions (1997, 1999; Brosius et al. 1998). Brosius argues that the institutionalization of environmental politics and their accompanying discourses may in fact "obstruct meaningful change" through the naturalization, simplification and depoliticization of discourses used to advance particular political objectives and projects (1999). Haripriya Rangan documented a similar process in her study of the Indian Chipko movement and activists' attempts to halt private and national deforestation schemes (1993, 2000, 2004). While an elite group of activists was able to achieve popular and state support through discourses of ecological degradation, the narrative of the movement changed as it traveled more broadly and became "detached from its specific demands regarding access to forest resources and local economic development" (Rangan 2004: 383). Increasingly, the Chipko movement was framed in environmentalist terms emphasizing the problems of deforestation and ecological degradation. The state responded with a suite of policies that addressed environmental degradation but impeded the communities' ability to achieve forest-based livelihoods and exacerbated labor conflicts between local residents and migrant Nepalese workers.

At the same time, discourses are re-invented in different ways across time and space and Anna Tsing (2005) shows how the Chipko movement helped to serve as the basis for social change amongst environmental activists in Indonesia. There, activists brought together the story of Chipko with the story of Chico Mendes at a moment of political restructuring (i.e. the fall of Indonesia's New Order government), inspiring the production of national and transnational alliances to mobilize for ecological and social justice. In this way, allegories – or universal narratives – served to advance movement interests through the production of new forms of political subjectivities and possibilities for social action. Likewise, Tania Li (1996, 2000) analyzes the ways in which Lauje swidden farmers in Central Sulawesi strategically appropriated representations of "community" to secure land tenure rights and local control of natural resources. Although this strategy failed to address internal inequalities (i.e. gender and class) and resulted in outcomes that were not as equitable as might otherwise have been the case (1996: 521), Li's work highlights the ways in which familiar cultural categories can be discursively re-configured to serve counter-hegemonic aims.

Due to the contingent and unanticipated effects discourses can have, movement leaders carefully manage the interplay between movement narratives and objectives and the diverse ideologies and experiences of movement members. This has been particularly evident within

the MST in Brazil, where movement leaders have had to negotiate competing notions of land, property and agrarian reform in order to sustain collective mobilization. As Wolford demonstrates, members of the MST reflect diverse "work economies, family practices and community traditions," all of which condition how they understand, evaluate and participate in the movement (Wolford 2010: 17). In this case, MST leaders have carefully crafted a coherent movement narrative that emphasizes peasant unity and communalism, agricultural sustainability, horizontal governance and, importantly, opposition to the Brazilian state. Such representations are reproduced in the popular media, as well as through internal forms of knowledge production, such as oral histories and movement publications (Wolford 2010). Importantly, such efforts are never finished – narratives are ongoing and dynamic processes of movement-building.

These illustrations of translating, appropriating and reconstituting "universal" discourses illuminate the ways in which movements and social mobilization disrupt singular notions of knowledge by transforming them and imbuing them with new meanings. What political ecology contributes to the understanding of social movements is thus not only a critique of the challenges and limitations of appropriating and or imposing Western discourses and knowledge in Southern or subaltern social movements (Forsyth 2001, 2003, 2004; Brosius 1997), but also how actors strategically engage, transform, construct and deploy discourses and representations to advance specific political goals – from claims to land and resources to the "right" to livelihoods and cultural practices (Nygren 2004; Valdivia 2005). Movement narratives are powerful – in that they instigate material effects – yet like the agents of movements themselves, narratives are enmeshed in complex webs of power that continually shape and reshape their meaning and content. In attending to movement discourses, political ecology highlights the simultaneously fluid and fragmented character of social struggles, and the historical and political processes within which they are constituted.

Mobilization and the state

Political ecology's concern with power, marginalization and contestations over resources has generated a perspective on state–society relations that focuses less on "the state" per se, and more on "how power works" (Li 2005: 383) through practices of governance, discourses, state agencies and officials, and territories or communities of rule and resistance (Watts 2004), to name only a few. Indeed, one could argue that the state becomes harder (and less productive) to trace in the context of increasing transnational connections between movements (Edelman 2005; Tsing 2005) and new and fluid relations between (and within) states, capital, multilateral and non-governmental organizations (Peluso 1993; Brosius 1997). And so political ecology's focus on the everyday, messy practices of rule and resistance over formal, organized politics and institutions helps to de-center the state (Mallon 1995; Gupta 2006; Wolford forthcoming), focusing on the ways in which political power is constituted, experienced and (re)produced at multiple levels.

Judith Carney's (2004) work on gender conflicts over resources in the Gambian wetlands serves as an illustrative example. While she traces the historical development of colonial and national rice cultivation policies, she does not produce an analysis of "the state," but rather of how a confluence of state policies and global economic restructuring re-shaped gendered relations of production and household dynamics, ultimately leading to women's economic marginalization and intra-household conflicts. In Carney's work, a complex interplay between Gambian governmental officials, international donors and financial institutions, institutional legacies of colonialism and changes in the global political economy contributed to a reconfiguration of not only land use and labor relations, but also resource access within

households – engendering new forms of resistance and protests against state policies. In a similar fashion, Tom Bassett (1988) shows how conflicts seemingly between peasants and herders in Cote d'Ivoire are actually shaped by the state's privileging of herder claims over indigenous land tenure regimes.

Such approaches to mobilization and resistance in political ecology have also led to a re-working of 'the state' not as a monolithic entity but as a terrain of struggle in which multiple and shifting interests collide, converge or are transformed. In the wake of the Zapatista uprising and movement formation in southern Mexico, Aaron Bobrow-Strain (2007) provides a subtle analysis of power – including but not simply state power – with detailed work on landowners in the state of Chiapas. He argues that the landowning elite simultaneously worked to advance the agenda of the state, "subordinating themselves and their indigenous workers to the rationales of a liberal government" and negotiated their own spaces of authority that allowed them to resist later incursions by the same state (2007: 79). Tom Perreault's work on indigenous mobilization in Bolivia demonstrates how a convergence of processes – neoliberal restructuring, a shift toward export-oriented natural gas production, increasing inequality and new discourses of indigeneity – coalesced to generate social mobilization and protest in Bolivia, and ultimately resulted in the election of Evo Morales and the integration of indigenous and *campesino* movements into formal political processes (2008). As Perreault's work illustrates, states are not only fluid and dynamic, they are composed of locatable actors, agencies and institutions that are part of broader social, political and economic structures.

Concluding thoughts

This brief chapter has attempted to evaluate and summarize the contributions of political ecology to the study of social movements. Although only a handful of movements were mentioned in the piece, it is clear that social mobilization is a key subject in political ecology. The de-centering, re-working and situating of social movements reflects political ecology's broader concern with the *workings* of power – the specific and grounded ways in which struggles over resources are enacted. This approach to power treats everyday practices, cultural meanings and discourses and representations as constitutive of movements and indeed processes of state formation. Of crucial importance in all of these analyses is the contingent nature of social mobilization; outcomes are never certain, and the effects of environmental discourses and actions can have unanticipated consequences. Struggles – over meanings, representations, environments and political outcomes – are always situated within pre-existing relations of power; the social and historical contexts in which collective struggles are waged both constitute and are in turn transformed by collective actions.

References

Amin, S. (1994) "The origin and development of underdevelopment." In R.K. Kanth (ed.), *Paradigms in Economic Development: Classic perspectives, critiques, and reflections*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 161–164.

Bassett, T.J. (1988) "The political ecology of peasant-herder conflicts in the northern Ivory Coast." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 78, pp. 453–472.

Bebbington, A. (1991) "Indigenous agricultural knowledge systems, human interests, and critical analysis: reflections on farmer organization in Ecuador." *Agriculture and Human Values*, vol. 8, pp. 14–24.

Bebbington, A. (1993) "Modernization from below: an alternative indigenous development?" *Economic Geography*, vol. 69, pp. 274–292.

Bebbington, A. (2000) "Reencountering development: livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 90, pp. 495–520.

Bebbington, A. (2004) "Movements and modernizations, markets and municipalities: indigenous federations in rural Ecuador." In R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.), *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. New York: Routledge, pp. 358–382.

Blaikie, P.M. and Brookfield, H.C. (1987) *Land Degradation and Society*. New York: Methuen.

Bobrow-Strain, A. (2007) *Intimate Enemies: Landowners, power, and violence in Chiapas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Brosius, J.P. (1997) "Endangered forest, endangered people: environmentalist representations of indigenous knowledge." *Human Ecology*, vol. 25, pp. 47–69.

Brosius, J.P. (1999) "Green dots, pink hearts: displacing politics from the Malaysian rain forest." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 101, pp. 36–57.

Brosius, J.P., Tsing, A.L. and Zerner, C. (1998) "Representing communities: histories and politics of community-based natural resource management." *Society and Natural Resources*, vol. 11, pp. 157–168.

Cardoso, F.H. and Faletto, E. (1979) *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carney, J. (2004) "Gender conflict in Gambian wetlands." In R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.), *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. New York: Routledge, pp. 316–336.

Carney, J. and Watts, M. (1990) "Manufacturing dissent: work, gender and the politics of meaning in a peasant society." *Africa*, vol. 60, pp. 207–241.

Carruthers, D. (2008) *Environmental Justice in Latin America: Problems, promise, and practice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chayanov, A.V. (1966 [1925]) *The Theory of Peasant Economy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Edelman, M. (2005) "Bringing the moral economy back in … to the study of 21st century transnational peasant movements." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 107, pp. 331–345.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (2001) "Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization." *Political Geography*, vol. 20, pp. 139–174.

Escobar, A. (2008) *Territories of Difference: Place, movements, life, redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ferguson, J. (1990) *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Forsyth, T. (2001) "Environmental social movements in Thailand: how important is class?" *Asian Journal of Social Science*, vol. 29, pp. 35–51.

Forsyth, T. (2003) *Critical Political Ecology: The politics of environmental science*. New York: Routledge.

Forsyth, T. (2004) "Industrial pollution and social movements in Thailand." In R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.), *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. New York: Routledge, pp. 383–398.

Frank, A.G. (1969) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gramsci, A., Hoare, Q. and Nowell-Smith, G. (eds.). (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.

Guha, R. (1997) *A Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986–1995*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gupta, A. (2006) "Blurred boundaries: the discourse of corruption, the culture of politics, and the imagined state," in A. Sharma and A. Gupta (eds.), *The Anthropology of the State: A reader*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 211–242.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (1994) *The Age of Extremes: A history of the world, 1914–1991*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Holifield, R., Porter, M. and Walker, G. (2009) "Spaces of environmental justice: frameworks for critical engagement." *Antipode*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 591–612.

Kautsky, K. (1988 [1899]) *The Agrarian Question: In two volumes*. London: Zwan Publications.

Kull, C.A. (2004) *Isle of Fire: The political ecology of landscape burning in Madagascar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lenin, V.I. (1956 [1925]) *The Development of Capitalism in Russia: The process of the formation of a home market for large-scale industry*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Lewis, W.A. (1954) "Economic development with unlimited supplies of labor." *Manchester School*, vol. 22, pp. 139–191.

Li, T.M. (1996) "Images of community: discourse and strategy in property relations." *Development and Change*, vol. 27, pp. 501–527.

Li, T.M. (2000) "Articulating indigenous identity in indonesia: resource politics and the tribal slot." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 42, pp. 149–179.

Li, T.M. (2004) "Environment, indigeneity and transnationalism." In R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.), *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. London: Routledge, pp. 309–337.

Li, T.M. (2005) "Beyond 'the state' and failed schemes." *American Anthropologist*, vol. 107, pp. 383–394.

Mallon, F. (1995) *Peasant and Nation: The making of postcolonial Mexico and Peru*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marx, K., Engels, F., Mandel, E., Fowkes, B. and Fernbach, D. (1990 [1867]) *Capital: A critique of political economy*. London: Penguin Books.

McCarthy, J. (1998) "Environmentalism, Wise Use and the nature of accumulation in the rural West." In B. Braun and N. Castree (eds.), *Remaking Reality: Nature at the millennium*. New York: Routledge, pp. 125–148.

McCarthy, J. (2002) "First World political ecology: lessons from the Wise Use movement. *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 34, pp. 1281–1302.

Mintz, S.W. (1974) "The rural proletariat and the problem of rural proletarian consciousness." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 291–325.

Moore, B. (1966) *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and peasant in the making of the modern world*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Moore, D.S. (1993) "Contesting terrain in Zimbabwe's eastern highlands: political ecology, ethnography, and peasant resource struggles." *Economic Geography*, vol. 69, pp. 380–401.

Moore, D.S. (1998) "Subaltern struggles and the politics of place: remapping resistance in Zimbabwe's eastern highlands." *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 13, pp. 344–381.

Moore, D.S. (2005) *Suffering for Territory: Race, place, and power in Zimbabwe*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Nygren, A. (2004) "Contested lands and incompatible images: the political ecology of struggles over resources in Nicaragua's Indio-Maiz Reserve." *Society & Natural Resources*, vol. 17, pp. 189–205.

O'Connor, J. (1988) "Capitalism, nature, socialism: a theoretical introduction." *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, vol. 1, pp. 11–38.

Paige, J.M. (1975) *Agrarian Revolution*. New York: Free Press.

Peet, R. and Watts, M. (2004) *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. London: Routledge.

Peluso, N.L. (1993) "Coercing conservation: the politics of state resource control." *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 3, pp. 199–217.

Peluso, N.L., Afiff, S. and Rachman, N.F. (2008) "Claiming the grounds for reform: agrarian and environmental movements in Indonesia." *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 8, pp. 377–407.

Perreault, T. (2008). "Custom and contradiction: rural water governance and the politics of *usos y costumbres* in Bolivia's irrigators' movement." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 98, pp. 834–854.

Perreault, T. and Valdivia, G. (2010) "Hydrocarbons, popular protest, and national imaginaries: Ecuador and Bolivia in comparative context." *Geoforum*, vol. 41, pp. 689–699.

Potter, S.H. and Potter, J.M. (1990) *China's Peasants: The anthropology of a revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rangan, H. (1993) "Romancing the environment: popular environmental action in the Garhwal Himalayas." In J. Friedmann and H. Rangan (eds.), *In Defense of Livelihood: Comparative studies on environmental action*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press, pp. 155–181.

Rangan, H. (2000) *Of Myths and Movements: Rewriting Chipko into Himalayan history*. London: Verso.

Rangan, H. (2004) "From Chipko to Uttaranchal: the environment of protest and development in the Indian Himalaya." In R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.), *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development, social movements*. New York: Routledge, pp. 371–393.

Scott, J.C. (1976) *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J.C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shanin, T. (1972) *The Awkward Class: Political sociology of peasantry in a developing society Russia 1910–1925*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Shanin, T. (1981) "Marx, marxism and the agrarian question: I Marx and the peasant commune." *History Workshop*, vol. 12, pp. 108–128.

Smith, A. (2010 [1776]) *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. [S.L.]: Simon & Brown.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988a) "Can the subaltern speak?" In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271–313.

Spivak, G.C. (1988b) *In Other Worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. (1993) *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. (1996 [1985]) "Subaltern studies: deconstructing historiography." In D. Landry and G. MacLean (eds.), *The Spivak Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 203–236.

Spivak, G.C. (2004) "Righting wrongs." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 103, pp. 523–581.

Starn, O. and Fox, R.G. (1997) *Between Resistance and Revolution: Cultural politics and social protest*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Thompson, E.P. (1971) "The moral economy of the English crowd in the eighteenth century." *Past and Present*, vol. 50, pp. 76–136.

Tsing, A.L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Turner, M.D. (2004) "Political ecology and the moral dimensions of resource conflicts: the case of farmerherder conflicts in the Sahel." *Political Geography*, vol. 23, pp. 863–889.

Valdivia, G. (2005) "On indigeneity, change and representation in the northeast Ecuadorian Amazon." *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 37, pp. 285–303.

Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press.

Watts, M. (1983) *Silent Violence: Food, famine and peasantry in northern Nigeria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Watts, M.J. (2004) "Antinomies of community: some thoughts on geography, resources and empire." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 29, pp. 195–216.

Wolf, E.R. (1969) *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper & Row.

Wolford, W. (2003) "Producing community: the MST and land reform settlements in Brazil." *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 3, pp. 500–520.

Wolford, W. (2004) "Of land and labor: agrarian reform on the sugarcane plantations of northeast Brazil." *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 31, pp. 147–170.

Wolford, W. (2005) "Agrarian moral economies and neoliberalism in Brazil: competing worldviews and the state in the struggle for land." *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 37, pp. 241–261.

Wolford, W. (2010) *This Land is Ours Now: Social mobilization and the meanings of land in Brazil*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wolford, W. (forthcoming) "'*Sitting by the Pool, Having Drinks with the Fazendeiros*': state-society dynamics in contemporary Brazilian land reform." *Latin American Perspectives*, accepted November 2013.