



Agrarian Angst: Rural Resistance in Southeast Asia

Sarah Turner^{1*} and Dominique Caouette²

¹*Department of Geography, McGill University*

²*Département de science politique, Université de Montréal*

Abstract

Southeast Asia has witnessed dramatic transformations in the rural sector over the past 60 years, first with the Green Revolution, and more recently with diverse multi-scalar economic and socio-political processes including the growth of cash crops, export processing zones, land conversions, genetically modified crops, free trade agreements, and the growing complexity of rural-urban connections. With such a multiplicity of changes, many directly linked to globalisation, come numerous forms of resistance, as individuals and communities struggle against what they see as unjust consequences. These different resistance measures to rural transformations are the focus of this article. While critiquing the literature on different conceptualisations of resistance, from rural resistance at the micro level, through to collective action and open protest, revolutionary movements, and even regional and global transnational movements, we propose three core arguments. First, in order to capture the diversity of forms of contemporary rural resistance, one needs to use a multi-scalar approach. Previous analytical constructs such as 'local' and 'global' are inadequate to examine and explain the forms of resistance taking place. Second, rural resistance comes in a complexity of forms, is diversifying rapidly, and is never static. Resistance measures are context contingent, shaped by different worldviews and shift according to local circumstances, the opening and closing of opportunities structures, and the endogenous peculiarities of resistance dynamics. Third, a focus on resistance to contemporary agrarian change in Southeast Asia must recognise agency. We demonstrate that there is much to be gained by taking an interactive standpoint, arguing that local, national, regional, and even global resistance has as much to do with how the actors' themselves define their field of protest as with the specific nature of their targets.

Introduction

While arguably more visible in the form of distinct events of mass protest against specific international institutions or global gatherings of world leaders, resistance within the frame of contemporary globalisation processes encompasses increasingly eclectic expressions. Today, resistance is often

fundamentally linked to the struggle for material preservation as people around the world experience what they believe to be the injurious intrusion of the global political economy into previously seemingly impenetrable spheres of life. As such, contemporary resistance is generally seen to contest, both politically and otherwise, processes often linked to the globalisation of production and finances in their various distillations. Multiple and multifaceted forms of resistance are further shaped by the growth of communication technologies and a related cultural diffusion of global proportions (Amoore 2005; Cox 1993). Resistance to the impacts of these overarching structures manifests itself in a range of complex forms, incorporating a diversity of actors across scales, and engaging varying degrees of informality and formality, individual and collective activity, covertness and blatancy.

Conceptualisations of resistance are situated within understandings of power; power being composed of the relational interplay of dominance and subordination. Meanings of resistance are context contingent and shaped by different worldviews, while being formed hand-in-hand with understandings of dominance (Amoore 2005; Burdick 1995; Foucault 1976). Forces of resistance and dominance are thus mutually constitutive, their forms reciprocally and continually shaping each other (Foucault 1976). Notions of who is subordinated, in which ways, by whom or what, and the types of accompanying resistance employed to challenge subjugation differ according to the theoretical perspective adopted. As such, resistance is often more intricate than it is generally made out to be, and less obvious than commonly understood (Amoore 2005; Pile & Keith 1997; Roberts 2008). Indeed, it can be flat out ambiguous since resistance itself is constitutive and reflective of, as well as embedded in, socio-cultural life (Mittelman & Chin 2005).

The aim of this article is to analyse and critique the manner in which the complexity and variations of resistance to contemporary agrarian change have been theorised. We draw predominantly on cases from the Southeast Asia realm, given this region's tremendous rural transformation over the last 60 years, its rapid integration into global agri-food commodification, and the numerous shared regional experiences after the 1997 Southeast Asian financial crisis (cf. Booth 2000). We suggest that the changing forms and scales of rural resistance witnessed in the region can be understood as responses to socio-economic and political processes associated with agrarian transformation and globalisation, while also being a consequence of the partial and limited political liberalisation that has characterised a number of Southeast Asian countries (Taylor 1996). Kingsbury (2005, p. 416) notes that 'almost regardless of the political model adopted – or invented – in the region, some more traditional forms of authority continue. Most notably, variations on patron-client relations continue to dominate, running afoul of conventional statist notions of propriety and political party, not to mention law and human rights'. Unsurprisingly, transnational activist organizations have established themselves in countries where relative political

space has existed, or at least allowed, for global organizing, whereas more hidden, everyday forms of resistance have persisted in more repressive locales or in enclaves of traditional power (cf. Piper & Uhlin 2004). The specific amalgamations of these economic and political features in the Southeast Asian region lead it to be the centre of our focus here.

Our review and critique of the different conceptualisations of resistance starts with an examination of the literature that provides the theoretical backdrop to resistance debates today. We then examine rural resistance at the micro level, including recent interpretations of 'everyday forms' of resistance. Next, we analyse the literature on contentious collective action and open protest, investigating what forms the basis for such collective action. We subsequently focus on revolutionary movements, as a form of collective action, highlighting the need to 'bring agency in', while also recognising forces of state oppression. Finally, we explore transnational movements, arguing that these often form strong linkages across scale; local, national, regional and global (cf. Keck & Sikkink 1998; Risse et al. 1999). While regional and global rural advocacy can be a response to both domestic and international processes, it is also the result of a growing awareness among local and national activists across the region that they are confronted with many common challenges and share common targets. In certain instances, undertaking advocacy and organizing transnational coalitions is a way of pushing rights of dispossessed rural folks that cannot be tackled directly within the domestic arena. In other cases, transnational activism becomes a means to broaden political pressure globally on common issues affecting rural citizens, such as increasing poverty, marginalisation of the rural sector, land concentration, state and private monopolies, militarism, and a decaying natural environment. Common to many regional and transnational advocacy efforts is the central place of discourse and knowledge production and their linkages to mobilization, network building, and constituency building, in particular the growing connections between rural, peri-urban and urban-based activists.¹

This article makes three main arguments. First, in order to capture the diversity of forms of rural resistance, one needs to use a multi-scalar approach. Doing so allows us to broaden the lens of analysis from past studies to incorporate emerging transnational acts of resistance and defiance. Transnational processes and actors, including multinationals and foreign investors, are increasingly central to the stories of individual farmers and rural households, especially as agricultural policies and activities in Southeast Asia are progressively more integrated into the global market. Contemporary agrarian dynamics are marked by multi-scalar economic and socio-political processes including – but not limited to – cash crops, export processing zones, land conversion, genetically modified crops, free trade agreements, rural migrant workers, urban-rural connections, eco-tourism, and so on. Subsequently, previous categories of 'local' and 'global' are inadequate to examine and explain the forms of resistance taking place.²

Second, contemporary forms of rural resistance are numerous, diversifying rapidly, and never static. Public conflicts and debates take place between dominant elites and the oppressed, at the same time as hidden critiques of power and everyday forms of resistance stir at the local level, often in the same location. Resistance measures are context contingent, shaped by different worldviews and shift according to local circumstances, the opening and closing of political opportunities structures, and the endogenous peculiarities of resistance dynamics. Moreover, new forms of resistance do not form in a vacuum; they draw from previous knowledge, with contemporary processes rooted in historical experiences locally and elsewhere. The co-existence of old and new 'repertoires' of collective action is not unique to Southeast Asia or to rural issues, but is common to social movements as militants, activists and organizers learn from past actions and the experiences of other sectors. These are adapted, transformed and reinvented according to new contexts and issues (Ruggiero & Montagna 2008; Tarrow 1994). Indeed, this modularity of collective action was noticed early on by Benedict Anderson (1993) in his study of the rise of nationalist movements.

Third, and closely related to our second argument, a focus on resistance to contemporary agrarian change in Southeast Asia must recognise agency. Acknowledging how ordinary people are involved and make choices across scales concerning resistance actions from everyday struggles to high-profile protests is vital. While some individuals are involved in 'resistance against' globalisation, neo-liberalism and agrarian change; others are engaged in a 'struggle for' engagement with the global political economy on their own terms. These decision making processes might be individual or shared; they might be contradictory, ambiguous, or paradoxical. Alternatively, they might be highly disciplined and well-organised.³

In sum, we wish to demonstrate how such a diversity of forms of resistance are best understood on a continuum rather than as opposite poles. We argue that the globalisation of markets and their extended reach within even isolated areas has important consequences for how resistance can be conceptualised, and that there is much to be gained by taking an interactive standpoint. As such, local, national, regional, or even global resistance has as much to do with how the actors' themselves define their field of collective protest as with the specific nature of their targets.

Contemporary Agrarian Change

The agrarian transition, or contemporary elements of agrarian change, the focal point for the resistance we discuss here, consists very generally of a wide range of processes that link a country's agricultural sector with the market economy to a far greater extent than ever before. These changes affect not only those directly involved in agricultural production – via, for instance, the implementation of Green Revolution technologies and

practices – but have numerous consequences for the broader rural based population (Bernstein & Byres 2001; Wilson & Rigg 2003). Often these transformations include a move from communities that have agriculture as their core livelihood means and as the most important source of income, to those based to a greater extent on industrial production and services, alongside increasing urbanisation. Such processes are frequently correlated to a country's growing integration into the world economy (cf. Eder 1999; Goodman & Watt 1997; Li 2007; Rigg 2006).

In tandem with these transformations are multiple and complex local level changes to people's rural livelihoods (Borras et al. 2007; Hart et al. 1989). Access to land, labour, financial capital, and technology are being modified, in turn creating new class dimensions and inequalities. While some benefit greatly, others experience growing inequalities based not only on class, but also associated with diminishing indigenous rights, deteriorating resource access, and increasing cultural conflicts (see among others Hart et al. 1989; Lipton 1989; Moore 1998; Pearse 1980; Scott 1985; Shiva 1989; Yapa 1996). In some locales the growth of wage labour in tandem with the agrarian transition has resulted in increased dispossession and marginalisation, especially of smaller landowners and workers. In other places, there has been accelerated economic growth, with people able to form new, ever more flexible livelihood strategies. Such divergent outcomes even occur between neighbours in the same village because of the progressively more individualised outcomes of the agrarian transition.

Situating Current Day Resistance Debates

The literature on rural resistance is extensive (Edelman 2005). However, one can observe two broad approaches: the first emphasises the role of hegemony, domination, and the moral economy that often leads to more subvert forms of daily resistance. Such a school of thought is probably best represented by the works of James Scott (1976, 1985, 1990) and his collaborators, in particular Benedict Kerkvliet (1990, 2005; Scott & Kerkvliet 1986). The second stream covers an even larger body of literature concerned with various forms and levels of open collective action ranging from local riots and protest to transnational social movements and advocacy networks, such as Third World Network, GRAIN Asia Pacific Food Sovereignty Network, and *Via Campesina* (Borras 2004; Borras et al. 2008; Desmarais 2007). As Amoore (2005) observes, there is a tendency to emphasise more overt forms of resistance while overlooking others. It is thus important to note that resistance is not always clear-cut, and may blur into what can even appear as compliance.

Three seminal thinkers, Gramsci (1971) and Polanyi (1944, 1957) focusing on more open protests, and Scott (1976, 1985, 1990) detailing more hidden forms, have laid the theoretical foundations for the ways in which we tend to envision resistance today. Yet these key ideas are not

always neatly applicable to rural resistance in the South in the current context of globalisation. Rather, these concepts provide a conceptual base from which to develop understandings specific to the parameters of newly emerging power structures in the world today. As social life changes in the context of globalisation, so too do the 'agents' and 'targets' of resistance (Mittelman & Chin 2005).

Gramsci, Polanyi, and Scott identified formulations of resistance tied to specific historical contexts. One indeed may argue that these pairings differ in terms of the actors involved, the targets in question, and the scales and methods of contestation (Mittelman & Chin 2005). While Gramsci and Polanyi emphasise visible resistance involving concerted collective actions, this type is challenged by Scott who introduces how individual acts operating 'below the radar' together comprise an effective subversive strategy.

Gramsci (1971) envisions resistance as 'counter hegemony', involving a collective in opposition to the state and other dominant groups of civil society that uphold the privilege of the ruling elites while oppressing others. Resistance is overt and declared, but can take different forms, from 'wars of movement', which involve palpable actions such as labour strikes and military exploits, to 'wars of position', non-violent sources of ongoing pressure, such as boycotts (Cox 1993).

Polanyi (1944, 1957) conceptualises resistance as 'countermovement', taking the form of collective and openly declared forms of resistance. Polanyi differs from Gramsci in that the target of resistance is industrial capitalism, hence transcending the confines of state boundaries to transnational and global scales of market forces. For every movement there is a countermovement, or 'double-movement' composed of forces of control and subordination (Mittelman & Chin 2005). For Polanyi, one needs to perceive the extension and deepening of capitalism as creating, in the process, a countermovement of resistance. He notes,

while on the one hand markets spread all over the face of the globe and the amount of goods involved grew to unbelievable proportions, on the other hand a network of measures and policies was integrated into powerful institutions designed to check the action of the market relative to labor, land, and money. (Polanyi 1957, p. 76)

Scott (1990) diverges from both Gramsci and Polanyi in his notion of *infrapolitics*, or 'everyday forms of resistance', enacted individually or collectively but never openly declared as formal challenges. He focuses on actions undertaken in the course of everyday life to defend material and physical interests, while subverting the authority of oppressors, such as landlords or employers (Scott 1985, 1990). Rather than highlighting the role of broader structures as sources of domination as do Gramsci and Polanyi, Scott focuses upon those forces that intimately impact upon the tangible circumstances of everyday life at a very micro level. Thus, tactics in this form of resistance, such as stealing a portion of grain from a farmer's

field, aim to re-align the material inequities persistent in daily life. It is precisely this clandestine quality, the intentional masking of struggle, which makes these practices effective and distinct from those undertaken visibly in the public realm (see also Kerkvliet 1990, 2005; Scott & Kerkvliet 1986).

Contemporary Rural Resistance

Contemporary analyses of rural resistance have been influenced by these three prominent authors. Yet, grounded research and social movement theories have increasingly enriched the field of rural resistance studies. In the next sections, we critically review the main tendencies in this literature, highlighting the respective contributions of various intellectual perspectives.

EVERYDAY FORMS OF PEASANT RESISTANCE

Authors including Alavi (1973), Kerkvliet (1990, 2005), Scott (1976, 1985, 1990), and Wolf (1966, 1971) are key influences in the so-called 'neo-populist' strand of thought, or those working in the field of 'Peasant Studies'. While fuelled to a great extent by Chayanov's work (1966),⁴ their approach nevertheless introduces an explicit political component, centring on the theme of political resistance to modernisation and capitalism, and focusing on the concept of the peasant 'moral community' (Bernstein & Byres 2001). They suggest that,

peasants (and others) who are subjected to social and cultural subordination create continuous, mundane and hidden ways of resisting oppression (inequality, hierarchy) – in effect, through avoidance, ridicule and acts of petty revenge. (Bernstein & Byres 2001, p. 33)

The cumulative effects of these actions can at times be more effective than drastic, organised actions might be.

In the Southeast Asian realm, Scott (1985) suggests in Malaysia (also in Vietnam and Burma, 1976) that the market presents the peasant subsistence economy, as well as traditional social relations, with a number of risks. Scott argues that peasants will often resist the market, being risk-averse, concerned predominantly with survival. Rather than seeking profits as their primary goal, they want instead to retain their subsistence capacity and maintain or restore moral relationships. In the Malaysia case, Scott (1985) explores how peasants do this through an attention to infrapolitics that includes striking against the introduction of combine harvesters, participating in petty theft, perpetuating gossip, and killing adversaries' animals. Turning to Vietnam, Ben Kerkvliet, in his book *The Power of Everyday Politics: How Vietnamese Peasants Transformed National Policy* (2005), gives a rich account of how difficulties in the agrarian cooperatives under socialist rule led to peasant resistance and how this resistance ultimately forced the government to embark on reforms. As also underlined by

Kerkvliet (1996), dominant views of Philippine rural electoral politics tend to emphasise patron-client relations (see also Landé 1965, Novak & Snyder 1974). Oligarchic power and elite control (Hutchcroft 1991), 'cacique democracy' features (Anderson 1998), and even the neocolonial character of Filipino politics (Shalom 1986) are also frequently considered. Yet, these approaches fail to take into account various forms of contestations and resistance of the rural poor. According to Kerkvliet, such forms of the latter are expressed in a range of instrumental tactics around vote buying, kinship relations, and even outright boycott which are rooted in a 'democratic sense of proper elections' (Kerkvliet 1996, p. 163).

The neo-populists and their attention to everyday forms of resistance have not been without their critics. White (1986), Hart (1991), and Korovkin (2000) in part disagree with the neo-populists' tendencies to aggregate a wide range of practices of peasants and treat them all as resistance. White (1986) instead sees important differences between those peasants who have strategies rooted in petty commodity production and others whose positions have been strengthened by land reform and, in the case of Vietnam, revolution (Bernstein & Byres 2001). Another influential critic, Samuel Popkin (1979), developed a model of rational self-interested and utility maximising peasant behaviour which he contrasted with the moral economy view where maintaining subsistence levels and minimising risk takes priority. Popkin argued that peasants are constantly motivated to raise their subsistence level through long and short term investments, and that this investment logic applies to both market and non-market exchanges.

In the Southeast Asian realm, recent permutations of the everyday resistance approach include ethnographic works such as those of Forsyth and Walker (2008), and Isager and Ivarsson (2002) in Thailand, Kerkvliet (2005) in Vietnam, Li in Eastern Indonesia (2007), Peluso (1992) in Indonesia, and Rigg mainly based in Thailand and Laos (2006, 2007). These works use the lens of everyday resistance, subaltern strategies, and globalisation to problematise mechanical approaches to local resistance in Southeast Asia. These recent additions also come in the wake of growing attention and use of civil society discourse and analyses, notably the works of Alagappa (2004), Boudreau (2004), Hedman (2006), Loh and Öjendal (2005), Prasetyo et al. (2003) and Weiss (2006). The common threads here include the importance of moving beyond linear class analyses, directing attention toward contextual elements such as local politics and culture, democratic space and transition, and identity politics. At the same time a plea is made for more nuanced approaches to theorising how globalisation might impact various forms of resistance.

DEFIANT COLLECTIVE ACTION AND OPEN PROTEST

Coming from a different perspective, one concerned with open acts of resistance such as riots, *émeutes*, strikes, and even armed insurrections,

analyses of collective action in the 1950s emphasised the extremism of mass mobilisation, especially the dangerous and irrational character of the crowd (Arendt 1951; Hoffer 1951; Selznick 1952). This school of thought was largely influenced by the emergence of totalitarian and fascist movements during the interwar period. The second dominant perspective during the 1960s is known as 'relative deprivation' (Aberle 1966; Davies 1963; Gurr 1970). It attributes the rise of activism to the perceptions of individuals that by belonging to a certain social group they are unfairly deprived in relation to a reference group.

In 1965, Mancur Olson made what was considered an important breakthrough in the understanding of resistance and social movements by proposing a rational choice account of collective action in his book *The Logic of Collective Action* (1965). He argues that human beings are rational and self-interested and, as such, would not engage in collective action for a collective good since this good could be obtained, whether they participate or not, because of the collective action of others. This situation became known as the collective action problem or social dilemma situation.⁵ Olson argues that collective action is likely to develop only in small groups because in a larger group it is rational to 'free-ride'. Two other conditions are also considered necessary for collective action: selected incentives that increase the rewards of participation; and sanctions for non-participation. Large collective actions, maintained over an extensive period of time, are therefore very unlikely following Olson's framework.

The history of many social movements including labour, peasant, pacifist, and environmentalist movements in which a large number of individuals have been involved has, over time, challenged the Olsonian conception of collective action. In fact, since his 1965 book there have been numerous alternative explanations as to why large social movements can develop.

The Basis of Collective Action

In the 1970s and 1980s, in reaction to Olson's work and confronted by the continued existence of large social movements, several scholars began to develop alternative explanations for their existence. First, they argued that there may be individual benefits derived from engaging in a collective action itself. For example, Hirschman (1982) suggests that the possibility for individuals to engage in group action represents something exciting and new from which satisfaction can be derived. Second, the role of social movement organisers has been emphasised. For McCarthy and Zald (1973), movement entrepreneurs are those individuals capable of transforming existing collective grievances into social movement organisations. Tarrow (1994: 23) adds that social movement entrepreneurs are able to generate collective responses by transforming 'external opportunities, conventions and resources into movements'. Furthermore, McCarthy and Zald (1977) point out that these leaders usually have access to resources such as organisational structures, finance, and communication, which help generate

collective participation. However, as Edelman (2003, p. 290) notes, since not all entrepreneurs have such access to resources, a resource mobilisation approach fails to explain why social movements 'usually of the very poor, emerged with few resources'. In fact, several scholars have examined movements where the risks of repression are high and chances of success low, arguing that one needs to go beyond the surface and search for alternative forms of collective action ranging from 'hidden forms of resistance' (Scott 1990), to 'shadowy' (Piven & Cloward 1977) and 'submerged' forms (Melucci 1989), a point we return to later.

Another alternative explanation for the development of social movements is that the psychology of individuals may be something other than Olson's depiction of self-interested rational maximisers. For example, analysts of the Philippine rural insurgency movement have highlighted the importance of culture and identity in understanding how rural resistance might be conceived by the participants themselves (Rutten 1996; Weekley 1996).⁶ Such emphasis on the role of culture and identity was previously highlighted by Ann Swidler (1986). For her, culture exerts a causal influence on action not 'in defining ends of actions, but in providing cultural components that are used to construct strategies of actions' (Swidler 1986, p. 273, see also Laitin 1988). Applying such an analytical lens, Rosanne Rutten suggests in her study of sugar workers' mobilisation and support of the revolutionary movement in the Philippines that in order to understand such decisions, one needs to examine.

the interplay between peoples' own perceptions, experiences, solidarities, and actions on the one hand, and, on the other, new ideas, opportunities and constraints, organisational forms and collective actions, introduced by mobilizers. (Rutten 2000, p. 151)⁷

In their research on social dilemmas, Dawes et al. (1988) found that group interactions can generate solidarity and identity through cooperation or even just promises of cooperation. Individuals do not exist in a vacuum; rather they are part of existing social networks and communities. Such belonging is seen to create collective incentives for collective action as opposed to Olson's view of individual incentives. These social networks are referred to as structures of solidarity incentives (Fireman & Gamson 1979).⁸ As will be discussed, acknowledging the importance of agency and subjectivities has enriched previous structure-driven accounts of open and radical forms of protest.

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION AND REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS

Turning to the most visible forms of dissent and collective action, the literature on rural revolutions and revolutionary movements as a whole is imposing, and we do not review it all here. As Eric Selbin (1993, p. 1) wrote, 'revolution remains endlessly fascinating to scholars and activists

alike'. In fact, until the end of the Cold War, leftist guerrilla movements commanded widespread interest. Commenting on Latin American revolutions, Wickham-Crowley (1992, p. 4) explains:

Interest in guerrillas had grown apace with the successes of Fidel Castro in late-1950s Cuba; it latter ebbed with the death of Ché Guevara in the Bolivian jungle in 1967, and then waned further with the fall of Saigon in 1975. The 1979 overthrow of the Somoza government in Nicaragua and the recent revolutionary upsurge in Central America revived such interests, but certainly not to the levels of the 1960s.

In *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956*, Wickham-Crowley (1992) identifies five conditions that made Latin American revolutionary movements successful between 1965 and 1990: (1) the rural-based nature of guerrilla movements with strong support from the peasantry; (2) a significant level of military strength; (3) a patrimonial and authoritarian regime; (4) the possibility of establishing a cross-class alliance; and (5) the withdrawal of American support for the authoritarian regime. This work is a rich complement to earlier works on peasant rebellions (cf. Migdal 1974; Popkin 1979; Scott 1976; Wolf 1969) and social revolutions (cf. Barrington Moore 1966; Goldfrank 1975, 1979; Goldstone 1991; Skocpol 1979; Tilly 1978). Yet, except possibly for Vietnam where a revolutionary takeover did occur, these five such conditions have not materialised in Southeast Asia. Nevertheless, there is a long tradition of rural armed resistance across the region, starting with nationalist uprisings in the Philippines (Anderson 2005; Pomeroy 1963; Taruc 1953, 1967) and the spread of communist and nationalist revolutionary movements in the 1920s and 1930s (Christie 2001; Hawes 1991; Ho Tai Hue Tam 1992; Huynh Kim Khanh 1982). As such, what remains to be explored in greater detail are the internal dynamics and choices of strategic and tactical actions of revolutionary movements, including local and regional peasant mobilisations (understanding contemporary Philippine Maoist guerrillas of the New People's Army would constitute such an important case study, see Figure 1) (cf. Parsa 2000; Rutten 2008). That is, while structural conditions and social processes such as class alliances, resource mobilisation, relative deprivation, international support, unequal trade and dependency, are all important, a clearer understanding of the agency of the 'movement' itself is also warranted, a point we discuss next.

BRINGING 'AGENCY' IN

Writings on agrarian revolutions that followed Wickham-Crowley's 1992 paradigmatic study sought to understand the trajectory of rural insurgent movements. Eric Selbin's *Modern Latin American Revolutions* (1993) brings an interesting conceptual and original contribution. Concerned with the 'agency' of revolutionaries, Selbin suggests that followers of structural



Fig. 1. Members of the New People's Army, the armed wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines, resting and reading the 'Silent War' by Victor N. Corpus.

approaches have poorly understood the number of choices and actions made by revolutionaries themselves. He explains that 'the conscious choices and intentional actions of people have played clearly critical roles in the revolutionary process' (Selbin 1993, p. 3). Selbin continues that 'structuralist theories are poorly equipped to explain the even minor cross-class alliances present in some of these cases and largely deny the importance of leadership in the first generation revolutions' (Selbin 1993, p. 3).⁹ Therefore, there is a need to go beyond structuralist approaches of revolution since, in many instances, 'scholars have largely ignored the strongly voluntarist aspect of social revolutions: People make revolution' (Selbin 1993, p. 27).¹⁰ For Selbin, existing structural theories of revolutions are essential to capture broader social processes at play – driven by the state, class relations, and the international economic and political arena – but they cannot account for the very specific actions and processes that characterise the day-to-day conduct of a revolutionary struggle.¹¹

Published soon after Selbin's book, Forrest Colburn's *The Vogue of Revolution in Poor Countries* (1994) sheds further light on the dynamics of social movement agency. Comparing Global South rural revolutions that took place between 1945 and 1990, Colburn argues that existing theories of revolutions have not paid enough attention to the role of ideas, especially those held by 'revolutionary elites' and the capacity of those

elites to influence history (Colburn 1994, p. 5). More specifically, he argues that,

while the origins of contemporary revolutions are rooted in social, political, and economic conflict, the outcomes of these revolutions have been determined by the political imagination of revolutionary elites, an imagination that came to be surprisingly similar throughout the poorer regions of the world. (Colburn 1994, p. 6)

Following Colburn, we argue that to date, in the mainstream literature on revolution, it has been nation-states and struggles within national borders that have acted as units of analysis. This has had analytical consequences of not only under-theorising local dynamics, but also missing how non-armed resistance has become increasingly cross-border, especially following the end of the Cold War.

TRANSNATIONAL RESISTANCE AND ADVOCACY

Today, transnational resistance and its ties with globalisation are complex and fluid. Beginning in the late 1980s, and especially with the 'Battle of Seattle' in 1999 during the WTO Ministerial Meeting, parallel forums and protests have been occasions for those involved with national and transnational rural movements and networks to gather and act collectively to protest decision-making processes deemed undemocratic and exclusionary, especially with regards to agricultural policies, as shown in Figures 2 and 3 (Bandy & Smith 2005; Juris 2008; O'Brien et al. 2000; Smith & Johnston 2002). For these activists, trade liberalisation in agriculture as embodied in the WTO agenda constitutes a global challenge that calls for cross-border collective action to shift current neoliberal economics (Clark 2003; Keck & Sikkink 1998; Prokosh & Raymond 2002; Walker 1994).

Transnational activism can be simply defined as 'social movements and other civil-society organisations and individuals operating across state borders' (Piper & Uhlin 2004, p. 1). Such a definition is further refined by Della Porta and Tarrow (2005, p. 7) who refer to transnational collective action as 'coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of activists against international actors, other states, or international institutions.'

Recent theoretical works on transnational collective action – notably those of Della Porta and Tarrow (2005), Risse (2002), Risse-Kappen (1995), and Tarrow (2005) – suggest that three variables explain the rise and outcomes of contemporary transnational activism. These include the current complexity of internationalisation (growing density of international institutions, regimes, and contacts among states officials and non-state actors), and the multiplication of linkages across local, national, regional and international issues (Della Porta and Tarrow 2005). Similarly important are the multi-scalar political opportunities created by the interactions between complex



Fig. 2. Street protests in Manila, the Philippines, against the implementation of agricultural trade liberalisation policies.

internationalisation and domestic structures. As such, there has been the emergence of a stratum of activists described as rooted cosmopolitans, namely ‘a fluid, cosmopolitan, but rooted layer of activists and advocates’ (Tarrow 2005, p. 34).

In reality, transnational activists seldom work exclusively at the global level. They tend to be ‘rooted’ at local and national levels, simultaneously engaging different levels of government institutions. Many have remained involved in national struggles, arguing that advocacy and policy engagement at one level does not deter activism at another level. Transnational activists are thus able to create linkages and coalitions among various types of actors operating across different scales in order to respond to various political contexts, each offering a different range of political opportunities.

In Southeast Asia, for example, transnational activism emerged largely as a response to socio-economic and political processes associated with economic globalisation and agrarian transformation, and the limited political liberalisation that has characterised some Southeast Asian countries (Caouette 2006; Loh & Öjendal 2005). Furthermore, the Southeast Asian financial crises that shook the region from 1997 onwards, pushed several countries to accelerate and facilitate access to natural resources and resource-rich areas (Andrews et al. 2003; Samdup 2007). Greater integration into the global economy has resulted in an intensification and thickening



Fig. 3. Assembly of the Poor protests at the Pak Mun dam Thailand, the reservoir of which threatens local agricultural livelihoods.

of the organisational density of social movement and transnational networks in the region. In addition, the past 10 years have witnessed an acceleration in the number and intensity of contacts between social movements, NGOs, and transnational networks throughout Southeast Asia (Hainsworth 2000; Lee 2004; Loh 2004; Loh & Öjendal 2005; Mulder 2003; Piper & Uhlin 2004; Schak & Hudson 2003; Weller 2005). Unsurprisingly, transnational activist organisations tend to establish themselves in countries where relative political space exists or at least has allowed for global organising, such as the Philippines and Thailand.

Transnational rural advocacy networks expanded in the 1990s at a time when various other social sectors (workers, migrants, women, and students) were increasingly organising and seeking alternatives to the export-oriented growth model (Loh 2004; Piper & Uhlin 2004). Two themes interconnected to rural change – along with the issue of labour migration (Lyons 2005)

– have become prominent lately for transnational organising: food sovereignty and the rights of indigenous peoples to natural resources and their ancestral domains (Bolinget 2003; Brysk 2002; DuPuis et al. 2005; Maiba 2005; Morgan 2007; Sandbukt 2000; Scott & Tebay 2005; Weiner & Glaskin 2006; Yashar 2005, 2007). These themes have been at the heart of a range of campaigns launched by global networks such as *Via Campesina*, Amis de la Terre – International, Greenpeace, World Rainforest Movement, GRAIN, Oxfam-International, Indigenous Environmental Network, Third World Network, Asia Pacific Food Sovereignty Network, and Forest Peoples Programme.

In most cases in Southeast Asia, transnational activists are able and interested in creating linkages and coalitions among diverse types of actors operating on different scales (local, national, regional, and international) in order to respond to various political contexts, each offering a different range of political opportunities. In certain instances one might argue that transnational advocacy efforts produce shared identities and a common understanding of issues while also generating common campaigns and proposals that can be put forward during regional and international gatherings and implemented both at the regional and national levels. However, there are a number of dilemmas and choices when transnational networks seek to bring local perspectives to the regional and global scales. In fact, this weaving is oftentimes more problematic than usually described. Exploring further the micro processes at work when local issues and struggles become part of regional activism constitutes a key analytical challenge to the growing literature on transnational activism in Southeast Asia. As Kelly notes, ‘speaking of ‘local’ resistance to the “global” is an overly simplistic representation’ (2000, p. 158; see also Hewison 2000, 2001).

Concluding Thoughts: Conceptualising Multiple Scales of Rural Resistance

Building on previous approaches to resistance and collective action, we suggest that more nuanced understandings are now required, with greater attention paid to the complexities and inconsistencies rooted in resistance and the multiplicity of identities represented within such struggles. Social movement perspectives or even countermovement approaches, à la Polanyi (1944, 1957), often assume that action is collective and unified and do not account for intra-group fragmentation and divisions. Indeed, Mittelman and Chin (2005) offer several critiques of such an approach. First, building on the work of Gramsci (1971), they point out that resistance today is not always bound within states, and is not always enacted towards the state. Indeed, state power might not be the solution to changing power structures at the root of problems. Rather, resistance can traverse national boundaries, even reaching the global level via technology, easier and cheaper possibilities for international travel, and with shared norms and transnational advocates able to link disparate rural struggles into global action frames. As a

consequence, understandings of counter hegemony today must account for such emerging spaces.

Concurrently, a number of authors, building upon Scott (1976, 1985, 1990), emphasise the importance of less blatant forms of resistance in contemporary times. De Goede (2005) contends that resistance does not have to be global and coherent; it can be obscure and less straightforward, as in the case of laughter and comedy in challenging norms and the status quo. De Goede stresses that these common forms of daily dissent in the form of 'the strange' and the comical, have the power to transform understandings of money and finances and call attention to values underlying economic globalisation. De Goede also argues that resistance to rural change and its connections to global capital is extremely diverse and understanding such should be open to alternative interpretations. Highlighting this diversity, Turner and Michaud (2008) argue that Hmong upland ethnic minorities in northern Vietnam are part of a flexible society that resists economic and cultural changes imposed from the outside, using its home-grown tools to adapt through diversified livelihoods, engaging with the global economy only when and how individuals and households see fit, while sustaining local identity and ensuring social reproduction. Similarly, Escobar (2004) suggests that resistance is the negotiation or struggle against dominant cultures in everyday life, and that understandings of social movements need to be underpinned by how meanings come about through daily practices. Only then is it possible to comprehend more concerted efforts to cope with or redress oppressive circumstances.

Everyday forms of peasant resistance are often cited as 'non-political' and non-threatening to the status quo; not considered consequential until they erupt into more visible forms. Yet they are powerful forces of change in their own right (Cheru 1997; Kerkvliet 2005; Scott 1990). Local level actors such as peasants enact a number of strategies outside the reach of the state to improve their life circumstances, such as reviving traditional cooperatives to uphold subsistence and undertaking ingenious activities in the informal economy – strategies that at once earn them a living while providing services to other poor where the government has failed. These activities in themselves have an economic impact as people withdraw from formal avenues in order to safeguard their material welfare (Cheru 1997).

Yet Mittelman and Chin (2005) assert that infrapolitics, as supported by Scott (1990), do not give sufficient consideration to structures at the level of the state which enable and shape relations of resistance and dominance and influence how these are manifest and reproduced on a daily basis. They furthermore argue that Scott presents class as a unitary identity, while multiple identities exist within social groups and resistance may be based on power relations rooted in aspects of identity other than class. As such, we argue that it is important to recognise that resistance is context-specific and linked to meanings constructed in everyday life, as well as global level ideologies. This reflects Foucault's (1976) proposition in his

'rule of variations' that a greater focus on the processes and shifts in how power relationships are constantly transforming and the processes involved is needed, rather than concentrating minimally on who/what is powerful and who/what is not.

In sum, together with a multiplication and diffusion of structures of dominance has come a growth and spread of forms of resistance. This involves a greater variety of resistances than traditionally considered, with more undeclared and less obvious brands existing alongside vocally declared ones. Resistance to rural change now connects actors across a wider variety of spatial scales than ever before. Individuals with a range of resources are becoming increasingly interconnected, with transnational social movements at times supporting and encouraging local 'hidden transcripts'. It follows that researchers must now grapple with new ways of conceptualising resistance, in a world where the targets and scales of resistance are multiplying rapidly, and the politics of alliances are frequently shifting. This transcendence across scales is not just a case of local, everyday forms of resistance becoming open and public or vice versa. More subtle processes are at play with social movements having their own political agendas and alliances, not always allowing the voices of others to be heard. At the same time, by increasing attention to very local hidden forms, social movements might actually do more harm to disadvantaged groups (see Rangan 2000). As we have suggested in this article, rural resistance is the result of micro processes at the local level involving variables such as solidarity, identity, and social networks, as well as shifts in the political opportunity structure at the society level. In turn, these are intertwined with global-local connections brought about by expanding capitalist markets, multiple forms of commoditisation, global flows of information and people, and the diffusion of experiences of rural processes and transnational rural movements. As such, studying and understanding rural resistance opens a rich and kaleidoscopic research agenda than can help shed light on what James Rosenau (2003) has called 'distant proximities'.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions, Kris Olds for his invitation to submit an article to *Geography Compass*, and Stephanie Coen and Lindsay Anderson for their research assistance.

Short Biographies

Sarah Turner is an Associate Professor at McGill University, Montreal. Her research is positioned in the fields of development geography and economic geography, in the Southeast Asian realm. Current work is focused upon livelihoods, trade strategies, and resistance measures of upland ethnic

minorities in the borderlands of northern Vietnam and southwest China. Other research foci include small-scale entrepreneurs in Hanoi, Vietnam, and Makassar, Indonesia. Her book *Small Entrepreneurs in Indonesia: Trading on the Margins* (RoutledgeCurzon 2002) calls for a new approach to small-scale enterprise research in developing countries that acknowledges the complex interplay among social, cultural, and ethnic elements of livelihood decisions. She has authored and co-authored papers appearing in *Development and Change*, *Urban Studies*, *Journal of Vietnamese Studies*, *Journal of Development Studies*, *Professional Geographer*, *Human Organization*, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, *Annals of Tourism Research*, and *Cities*, among others.

Dominique Caouette has been an Assistant Professor with the Department of Political Science at Université de Montréal since 2004, where he teaches international relations, development studies, and Southeast Asian politics. Prior to this, he was a lecturer at the University of Ottawa and worked for over 5 years with a non-governmental organisation, Inter Pares. His current research interests include transnational advocacy networks, global social movements, and armed resistance in Southeast Asia and Latin America. His works have been published in *Kasarinlan (A Philippine Quarterly of Third World Studies)*, *Pacific Focus*, and *Relations*, as well as book chapters recently published in *L'aide canadienne au développement*, *La politique en question*, and *L'état des citoyennetés*. A revised version of his PhD dissertation completed at Cornell University entitled 'Persevering Revolutionaries: Armed Struggle In the 21st Century, Exploring the Revolution of the Communist Party of the Philippines' is forthcoming with Ateneo de Manila University Press. Dominique and Sarah recently co-edited *Agrarian Angst and Rural Resistance in Contemporary Southeast Asia* (Routledge 2009).

Notes

* Correspondence address: Sarah Turner, Department of Geography, McGill University, 805 Rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal, Québec H3A 2K6, Canada. E-mail: turner@geog.mcgill.ca.

¹ As is the case across much of the global South, there is no specific rural-urban divide in Southeast Asia and in peri-urban zones construction sites and agricultural lands frequently sit side by side (see Rigg 2007; van den Berg et al. 2003). In this article, our focus is on those resistance measures that come about in relation to the agrarian transition, wherever these might be devised and played out, be in it a farmer's field through hidden transcripts of defiance, in the urban office of an NGO, or on the streets of a capital city during large scale protests.

² We are mindful that scale has become increasingly problematised in the social movement literature, in particular by geographers. Conventional views of scale as 'a nested spatial hierarchy consisting of fixed, bounded, and reified levels – local, regional, national, global – have been challenged by more fluid approaches to spatial relations, focused upon connections and oppositions, and the processes that construct scale in the first place' (Schein 1997, p. 662). As explained by Dominique Masson, 'scale should not be thought of in a void or in the abstract, but always as a dimension of social processes' (forthcoming, no page; see also Agnew 1993, 1997; Howitt 1998; Marston 2000). We argue that different scales of resistance are co-constituted by social agents; both those dominating others, and those engaging in various forms of resistance.

³ Further supporting evidence for our arguments here, and a range of relevant Southeast Asian case studies, can be found in our edited volume (Caouette and Turner 2009).

⁴ Contrasting with the writings of Lenin (1899) and Kautsky (1899) and their classical Marxist approaches to agrarian change, Chayanov (1966) developed a model of the peasant economy that focused on the middle peasants and their particular characteristics. Arguing that the economic calculations of peasants are rooted in subsistence needs rather than profit, he claimed that peasant households would therefore increase their labour output and intensity when faced with difficult circumstances (Chayanov 1966). This approach would mean that middle peasant households could survive under difficult circumstances, while more favourable conditions would not see a change in their class characteristics nor lead to an accumulation of wealth (Brass 1991; Borchevrevink 2001).

⁵ Concrete cases of such dilemmas, for example, include whether or not to donate to public radio or ride a bicycle rather than a car during a pollution alert (Dawes et al. 1988).

⁶ We are using the term collective identity as Melucci does; that is, as 'an interactive and shared definition produced by several individuals and concerned with the orientation of action and the field of opportunities and constrains in which the action takes place'. As he later specifies by 'interactive and shared', he implies 'a process, because it is constructed and negotiated through a repeated activation of the relationships that link individuals' (1988, p. 342; see also Cohen 1985; Escobar & Alvarez 1992).

⁷ See also Gerlach and Hines (1970), and Bolton (1972) on prior contact with a movement member; Orum (1972), and Barnes and Kaase (1979) on participation in existing organisations; Gamson et al. (1982), and Lofland (1977) on history of prior activism; and McCarthy and Zald (1973), among others, on biographical availability.

⁸ McAdam et al. explain that these structures are expected to solve or 'at least mitigate the effects of the "free rider" problem' (1988, p. 710).

⁹ Forrest Colburn also makes a similar observation stating: 'The two major interpretative schools, modernization and Marxism, share a preoccupation with the long-term origins and outcomes of revolution. And in explaining both origins and outcomes, discourse and explanation center on impersonal social structures. Modernization and Marxist analyses alike deny the importance of who the revolutionaries were or what they thought they were doing. As a result, political innovations by revolutionaries seem to be either predetermined or accidental, and their consequences seem to be irrelevant' (Colburn 1994, p. 9).

¹⁰ The issue of agency and its relation to structures is not new to social sciences (see Callinicos 1988). Thompson's writings on history are solid examples of historical analysis that places an emphasis on an understanding of agency (Thompson 1978).

¹¹ As Selbin notes, the works of Eric Wolfe (1969), James Scott (1976), and – to a certain extent – the works of Jeffrey Paige (1975) and Charles Tilly (1978) are partial exceptions because of their focus on peasant mobilization and resistance. However, less emphasis is placed on the critical choices and day-to-day calculations and alliances made by revolutionaries.

References

- Aberle, D. (1966). *The peyote religion among the navajo*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Agnew, J. (1993). Representing space: space, scale, and culture in social science. In: Duncan, J., and Ley, D. (eds) *place/culture/representation*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 251–271.
- . (1997). The dramaturgical horizons: geographical scale in the Reconstruction of Italy by the new Italian political parties, 1992–95. *Political Geography* 16 (2), pp. 99–121.
- Alagappa, M. (ed.) (2004). *Civil society and political change in Asia: expanding and contracting democratic space*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alavi, H. (1973). Peasant classes and primordial loyalties. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 1, pp. 23–62.
- Amoore, L. (2005). Introduction: global resistance – global politics. In: Amoore, L. (ed.) *The global resistance reader*. Oxon, UK: Routledge, pp. 1–11.
- Anderson, B. (1993). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso (first edition 1983).
- . (1998). *The spectre of comparisons: nationalism, Southeast Asia and the world*. London: Verso.
- . (2005). *Under three flags: anarchism and the anti-colonial imagination*. London: Verso.

- Andrews, T. G., Nartalin, C., and Baldwin, B. J. (2003). *The changing face of multinationals in Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Arendt, H. (1951). *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace.
- Bandy, J., and Smith, J. (eds) (2005). *Coalitions across borders: transnational protest and the neoliberal order*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Barnes, S. H., and Kaase, M. (1979). *Political action*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bernstein, H., and Byres, T. J. (2001). From peasant studies to agrarian change. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 1, pp. 1–56.
- Bolinget, W. (2003). Asserting indigenous people's rights is not an act of terrorism. *Indigenous Affairs* 3, pp. 10–17.
- Bolton, C. D. (1972). Alienation and action: a study of peace group members. *American Journal of Sociology* 78, pp. 537–561.
- Booth, A. (2000). Rethinking the role of agriculture in the East Asian model: why is Southeast Asia different from Northeast Asia? *ASEAN Economic Bulletin* 19, pp. 40–51.
- Borchegrevink, A. (2001). Review essays. Agrarian questions and enduring peasants: a classic debate enters the age of globalisation. *The European Journal of Development Research* 13, pp. 181–192.
- Borras, S. M. Jr. (2004). *La via campesina: an evolving transnational social movement*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: TNI Briefing Series No.2004/6, Transnational Institute.
- Borras, S. M. Jr, Edelman, M., and Kay, C. (2008). Transnational agrarian movements: origins and politics, campaign and impact. *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8, pp. 169–204.
- Borras, S. M. Jr., Kay, C., and Akram-Lodhi, A. H. (2007). Agrarian reform and rural development. Historical overview and current issues. In: Akram-Lodhi, A. H., Borras, S. M. Jr, and Kay, C. (eds) *Land, poverty and livelihoods in an era of globalization*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–40.
- Boudreau, V. (2004). *Resisting dictatorship: repression and protest in Southeast Asia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brass, T. (1991). Moral economists, subalterns, new social movements and the (re)emergence of a (post-)modernised (middle) peasant. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 18, pp. 173–205.
- Brysk, A. (ed.) (2002). *Globalization and human rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burdick, J. (1995). United theory and practice in the ethnography of social movements: notes towards a hopeful realism. *Dialectical Anthropology* 20, pp. 361–385.
- Callinicos, A. (1988). *Making history: agency, structure and change in social theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Caouette, D. (2006). Thinking and nurturing transnational activism in Southeast Asia: global advocacy through knowledge-building. *Kasarinlan: A Philippine Quarterly of Third World Studies* 21, pp. 3–33.
- Caouette, D., and Turner, S. (eds) (2009). *Agrarian angst and rural resistance in contemporary Southeast Asia*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Chayanov, A. V. (1966). *The theory of peasant economy*. trans. Thornton, D., Smith, R. E. F., and Kerblay, B. Glencoe: Irwin.
- Cheru, F. (1997). The silent revolution and the weapons of the weak: transformation and innovation from below. In: Gill, S., and Mittelman, J. H. (eds) *Innovation and transformation in international studies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 153–169.
- Christie, C. (2001). *Ideology and revolution in Southeast Asia 1900–1980: political ideas of the anti-colonial era*. London: Curzon.
- Clark, J. (ed.) (2003). *Globalizing civic engagement*. London: Earthscan.
- Cohen, J. (1985). Strategy or identity: new theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements. *Social Research* 52 (4), pp. 663–716.
- Colburn, F. D. (1994). *The vogue of revolution in poor countries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cox, R. W. (1993). Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method. In: Gill, S. (ed.) *Gramsci, historical materialism and international relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 49–66.
- Davies, J. C. (1963). *Human nature in politics: the dynamics of political behavior*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

- Dawes, R. M., Van de Kragt, A. J. C., and Orbell, J. M. (1988). Not me or thee but we: the importance of group identity in eliciting cooperation in dilemma situations: experimental manipulations. *Acta Psychologica* 68, pp. 83–97.
- De Goede, M. (2005). Carnival of money: politics of dissent in an era of globalizing finance. In: Amoore, L. (ed.) *The global resistance reader*. Oxon, UK: Routledge, pp. 379–391.
- Della Porta, D., and Tarrow, S. (eds) (2005). *Transnational protest and global activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Desmarais, A. A. (2007). *La via Campesina: globalization and the power of peasants*. Halifax, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- DuPuis, E., Goodman, M., and Goodman, D. (2005). Should we go 'home' to eat? toward a reflexive politics of localism. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 359–371.
- Edelman, M. (2003). Transnational peasant and farmer movements and networks. In: Kaldor, M., Anheier, H., and Glasius, M. (eds) *Global civil society yearbook 2003*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 185–220.
- . (2005). Bringing the moral economy back in . . . to the study of 21st-century transnational movements. *American Anthropologist* 107 (3), pp. 331–45.
- Eder, J. (1999). *A generation later: household strategies and economic change in the rural Philippines*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the third world: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalization social movements. *Third World Quarterly* 25 (1), pp. 207–30.
- Escobar, A., and Alvarez, S. E. (eds) (1992). *The making of social movements in Latin America: identity, strategy, and democracy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Fireman, B., and Gamson, W. A. (1979). Utilitarian logic in the resource mobilization perspective. In: Zald, M. Z., and Mac Carthy, J. D. (eds) *The dynamics of social movements, resource mobilization, social control and tactics*. Cambridge, UK: Winthrop Publishers, pp. 8–44.
- Forsyth, T., and Walker, A. (2008). *Forest guardians, forest destroyers: the politics of environmental knowledge in northern Thailand*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Foucault, M. (1976/98). 'Method'. In *The will to knowledge: the history of sexuality, volume 1*, London: Penguin; reprinted in Amoore, L. (ed.) *The global resistance reader* (2005). Oxon, UK: Routledge, pp. 86–91.
- Gamson, W., Freeman, B., and Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with unjust authority*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Gerlach, L. P., and Hines, V. H. (1970). *People, power and change: movements of social transformation*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goldfrank, W. (1975). World system, state structure, and the onset of the Mexican revolution. *Politics and Society* 5, pp. 417–439.
- . (1979). Theories of revolution and revolution without theory: the case of Mexico. *Theory and Society* 7, pp. 135–165.
- Goldstone, J. (1991). *Revolution and rebellion in the early modern world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goodman, D., and Watts, M. (1997). *Globalising food: Agrarian questions and global restructuring*. London: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Translated and Edited by Hoare, Q., and Smith, G. N. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hainsworth, G. B. (ed.) (2000). *Globalization and the Asian economic crisis: indigenous responses, coping strategies, and governance reform in Southeast Asia*. Vancouver, Canada: Centre for Southeast Asia Research, Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia.
- Hart, G. (1991). Engendering everyday resistance: gender, patronage and production politics in rural Malaysia. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 19, pp. 93–121.
- Hart, G., Turton, A., and White, B. (eds) (1989). *Agrarian transformations: local processes and the state in Southeast Asia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hawes, G. (1991). Theories of peasant revolution: a critique and contribution from the Philippines. *World Politics* 42 (2) (January 1990), pp. 261–298.
- Hedman, E.-L. E. (2006). *In the name of civil society: from free election movements to people power in the Philippines*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii University Press.

- Hewison, K. (2000). Resisting globalization: a study of localism in Thailand. *Pacific Review* 13, pp. 279–296.
- . (2001). Nationalism, populism, dependency: Southeast Asia and responses to the Asian crisis. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 22, pp. 219–236.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1982). *Shifting involvement: private interest and public action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ho Tai Hue Tam. (1992). *Radicalism and the origins of the Vietnamese revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer: thoughts on the nature of mass movements*. New York, NY: New American Library.
- Howitt, R. (1998). Scale as relation: musical metaphors of geographical scale. *Area* 30, pp. 49–58.
- Hutchcroft, P. D. (1991). Oligarchs and cronies in the Philippine state: the politics of patrimonial plunder. *World Politics* 43 (3), pp. 414–450.
- Huynh Kim Khanh. (1982). *Vietnamese communism: 1925–1945*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Isager, L., and Ivarsson, S. (2002). Contesting landscapes in Thailand: tree ordination as counter-territorialization. *Critical Asian Studies* 34 (3), pp. 395–417.
- Juris, J. S. (2008). *Networking futures: the movements against corporate globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kautsky, K. (1899). Die Agrarfrage [The Agrarian Question]; partial trans. J. Banaji (1976) Summary of Selected Parts of the Agrarian Question. *Economy and Society* 5, pp. 1–49.
- Keck, M., and Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kelly, P. F. (2000). *Landscapes of globalisation: human geographies of economic change in the Philippines*. London: Routledge.
- Kerkvliet, B. K. (1990). *Everyday politics in the Philippines: class and status relations in a central Luzon Village*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . (1996). Contemporary Philippine leftist politics in historical perspective. In: Abinales, P. N. (ed.) *The revolution falters: the left in the Philippine politics after 1986*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Series No.15, Southeast Asia Program Publications, Cornell University, pp. 9–27.
- . (2005). *The power of everyday politics: how Vietnamese peasants transformed national policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kingsbury, D. (2005). *South-East Asia: a political profile*. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Korovkin, T. (2000). Weak weapons, strong weapons? Hidden resistance and political protest in rural Ecuador. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 27, pp. 1–29.
- Laitin, D. (1988). Political culture and political preferences. *American Political Science Review* 82, pp. 589–597.
- Landé, C. (1965). *Leaders, factions and parties: the structure of Philippine politics*. New Haven, CT: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University Press.
- Lee, H. G. (ed.) (2004). *Civil society in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Lenin, V. I. (1899; 1965). *The development of capitalism in Russia*. Moscow, Russia: Progress Publishers.
- Li, T. (2007). *The will to improve: governmentability, development and the practices of politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lipton, M. (1989). *New seeds and poor people*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Lofland, J. (1977). *Doomsdaycult*. New York, NY: Irvington.
- Loh, F. (2004). Les ONG et les Mouvements Sociaux en Asie du Sud-Est. In: Delcourt, L., Duferme, B., and Polet, F. (eds) *Mondialisation des résistances: l'état des lutes*. Paris, France: Centre Tricontinental, Forum Mondial des Alternatives et Éditions Syllepse, pp. 41–55.
- Loh, F. K. W., and Öjendal, J. (eds) (2005). *Southeast Asian responses to globalization: restructuring governance and deepening democracy*. Copenhagen, Denmark: NIAS.
- Lyons, L. (2005). Transient workers count too? The intersection of citizenship and gender in Singapore's civil society. *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 20 (2), pp. 208–248.

- Maiba, H. (2005). Grassroots transnational social movement activism: the case of peoples' global action. *Sociological Focus* 38, pp. 41–63.
- Marston, S. A. (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24 (2), pp. 219–242.
- Masson, D. (forthcoming). Transnationalizing feminist and women's movements: Towards a scalar approach. In: Dufour, P., Masson, D., and Caouette, D. (eds) *Transnationalizing women's movements: solidarities without borders*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press (pages unknown to date).
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., and Zald, M. N. (1988). Social movements. In: Smelser, N.J. (ed.) *Handbook of sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 695–737.
- McCarthy, J. D., and Zald, M. N. (1973). *The trend of social movements in America: professionalization and resource mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Melucci, A. (1988). Getting involved: identity and mobilization in social movements. In: Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H., and Tarrow, S. (eds) *From structure to action: comparing social movement research across cultures: international social movement research across cultures: international social movement research*, Vol. I. Greenwich, UK: JAI, pp. 329–348.
- . (1989). *Nomads of the present: social movements and individual needs in contemporary society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Migdal, J. S. (1974). *Peasant, politics and revolution: pressures toward political and social change in the third world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mittelman, J. H., and Chin, C. B. N. (2005). Conceptualizing resistance to globalization. In: Amore, L. (ed.) *The global resistance reader*. Oxon, UK: Routledge, pp. 17–27.
- Moore, B. Jr. (1966). *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Moore, D. S. (1998). Subaltern struggles and the politics of place: remapping resistance in Zimbabwe's eastern highlands. *Cultural Anthropology* 13, pp. 1–38.
- Morgan, R. (2007). On Political Institutions and Social Movement Dynamics: The Case of the United Nations and the Global Indigenous Movement. *International Political Science Review* 28, pp. 273–292.
- Mulder, N. (2003). *Southeast Asian images: towards civil society?* Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworm Books.
- Novak, T., and Snyder K. (1974). Clientelist politics in the philippines: integration or instability? *American Political Science Review* 68 (9), pp. 1147–1170.
- O'Brien, R., Goetz, A. M., Scholte, J. A., and Williams, M. (eds) (2000). *Contesting global governance: multilateral institutions and global social movements*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Orum, A. M. (1972). *Black students in protest*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Paige, J. (1975). *Agrarian revolution*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Parsa, M. (2000). *States, ideologies and social revolutions: a comparative analysis of Iran, Nicaragua and the Philippines*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearse, A. (1980). *Seeds of want, seeds of plenty: social and economic implications of the green revolution*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Peluso, N. (1992). *Rich forests, poor people*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pile, S., and Keith, M. (eds) (1997). *Geographies of resistance*. London: Routledge.
- Piper, N., and Uhlin, A. (2004). *Transnational activism in Asia: problems of power and democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Piven, F. F., and Cloward, R. A. (1977). *Poor people's movements: why they succeed, how they fail*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: the political and economic origins of our time*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- . (1957). The economy as instituted process. In: Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C. M., and Pearson, H. W. (eds) *Trade and market in the early empires: economies in history and theory*. New York, NY: Free Press, pp. 243–70.
- Pomeroy, W. J. (1963). *The forest. A personal record of the Huk Guerrilla Struggle in the Philippines*. New York, NY: International Publishers.

- Popkin, S. L. (1979). *The rational peasant: the political economy of rural society in Vietnam*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Prasetyo, S. A., Priyono, A. E., Törnquist, O., and contributors. (2003). *Indonesia's post-soeharto democracy movement*. Jakarta and SAREC-Stockholm: DEMOS in co-operation with ISAI.
- Prokosh, M., and Raymond, L. (2002). *The global activist's manual: local ways to change the world*. New York, NY: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books.
- Rangan, H. (2000). *Of Myths and movements: rewriting chipko into himalayan history*. London: Verso.
- Rigg, J. (2006). Land, farming, livelihoods, and poverty: rethinking the links in the rural south. *World Development* 34, pp. 180–202.
- . (2007). *An everyday geography of the global south*. London: Routledge.
- Risse, T. (2002). Transnational actors and world politics. In: Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T., and Simmons, B. (eds) *Handbook of international relations*. London: Sage, pp. 255–274.
- Risse, T., Ropp, S., and Sikkink, K. (eds) (1999). *The power of human rights: international norms and domestic change*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Risse-Kappen, T. (ed.) (1995). *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structure and international institutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J. M. (2008). Public spaces of dissent. *Sociology Compass* 2 (2), pp. 654–674.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Distant proximities: dynamics beyond globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ruggiero, V., and Montagna, N. (eds) (1979). *The dynamics of social movements: resource mobilization, social control, and tactics*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Rutten, R. (ed.) (1996). Popular support for the revolutionary movement CPP-NPA: experiences in a hacienda in negros occidental, 1978–1995. In: Abinales, P. (ed.) *The revolution falters: the left in the Philippine politics after 1986*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Publications, Cornell University, pp. 110–153.
- . (2000). High-cost activism and the worker household: interests, commitment, and the costs of revolutionary activism in a Philippine plantation region. *Theory and Society* 29, pp. 215–252.
- . (2008). *Brokering a revolution: cadres in a Philippine insurgency*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Samdup, C. (ed.) (2007). *Études d'impact des investissements étrangers sur les droits humains*. Montréal, Canada: Droit et Démocratie.
- Sandbukt, Ø. (2000). Deforestation and the people of the forest: the Orang Rimba or Kubu of Sumatra. *Indigenous Affairs* 2, pp. 39–47.
- Schak, D. C., and Hudson, W. (eds) (2003). *Civil society in Asia*. Aldershot and Burlington, UK: Ashgate.
- Schein, R. H. (1997). The place of landscape: a conceptual framework for interpreting an American scene. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87 (4), pp. 660–680.
- Scott, C., and Tebay, N. (2005). The West Papua conflict and its consequences for the island of new guinea: root causes and the campaign for Papua, land of peace. *The Round Table* 94, pp. 599–612.
- Scott, J. C. (1976). *The moral economy of the peasant*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . (1985). *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C., and Kerkvliet, B. J. T. (eds) (1986). *Everyday forms of peasant resistance in South-East Asia*. London: Frank Cass.
- Selbin, E. (1993). *Modern latin american revolutions*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Selznick, P. (1952). *The organizational weapon*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Shalom, S. R. (1986). *The United States and the Philippines: a study of neocolonialism*. Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers.
- Shiva, V. (1989). *The violence of the green revolution*. Dehra Dun, India: Research Foundation for Science and Ecology.
- Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and social revolutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Smith, J., and Johnston, H. (eds) (2002). *Globalization and resistance: transnational dimensions of social movements*. Landham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review* 51, pp. 273–286.
- Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in movement*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2005). *The new transnational activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Taruc, L. (1953). *Born of the people*. New York, NY: International Publishers.
- . (1967). *He who rides the tiger: the story of an asian guerrilla leader*. New York, NY: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers.
- Taylor, R. H. (ed.) (1996). *The politics of elections in Southeast Asia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, E. P. (1978). *The theory of poverty*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, UK: Addison-Wesley.
- Turner, S., and Michaud, J. (2008). Imaginative and adaptive economic strategies for hmong livelihoods in Lào Cai province, Northern Vietnam. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies* 3 (3), pp. 154–186.
- van den Berg, L. M., van Wijk, M. S., and Van Hoi, P. (2003). The transformation of agriculture and rural life downstream of Hanoi. *Environment and Urbanization* 15 (1), pp. 35–52.
- Walker, R. B. J. (1994). Social movements/world politics. *Millennium* 23 (3), pp. 669–700.
- Weekley, K. (1996). *From vanguard to rearguard: the communist party of the Philippines, 1969–1993*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sydney.
- Weiner, J., and Glaskin, K. (2006). The (re-)invention of indigenous laws and customs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 7, pp. 1–13.
- Weiss, M. L. (2006). *Protest and possibilities: civil society and coalitions for political change in Malaysia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Weller, R. P. (2005). *Civil life, globalization, and political change in Asia: organizing between family and state*. London: Routledge.
- White, C. P. (1986). Everyday resistance, socialist revolution and rural development: the Vietnamese case. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 13 (2), pp. 49–63.
- Wickham-Crowley, T. (1992). *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: a comparative study of insurgents and regimes since 1956*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wilson, G. A., and Rigg, J. (2003). Post productivist agricultural regimes and the south: discordant concepts? *Progress in Human Geography* 27, pp. 181–207.
- Wolf, E. R. (1966). *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- . (1969). *Peasant wars of the twentieth century*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- . (1971). *Peasant wars of the twentieth century*. London: Faber.
- Yapa, L. (1996). Improved seeds and constructed scarcity. In: Peet, R., and Watts, M. (eds) *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development and social movements*. London: Routledge, pp. 69–85.
- Yashar, D. J. (2005). *Contesting citizenship in Latin America: the rise of indigenous movements and the postliberal challenge*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2007). Resistance and identity politics in an age of globalization. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 610, pp. 160–181.