bpd

UNIVERSITY OF BATH

bath papers in international development
ISSN 2040-3151

Hope movements: Social movements in the pursuit of human development

Séverine Deneulin
and
Ana C. Dinerstein

Working Paper no. 8
August 2010

Bath Papers in International Development
A working paper series of the
Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath
http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/

Published by:
The Centre for Development Studies
University of Bath
Claverton Down
Bath, BA2 7AY, UK
http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/

ISSN 2040-3151

Series Editor:
Graham K. Brown

bpd

bath papers in international development

HOPE MOVEMENTS: SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, DEVELOPMENT AND THE PURSUIT OF HUMAN FLOURISHING

Séverine Deneulin, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath; and, Ana C. Dinerstein, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

Bath Papers in International Development no. 8

August, 2010

The Centre for Development Studies
University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY
http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/

bath papers in international development

Bath Papers in International Development (BPD) is a working paper series of the Centre for Development Studies at the University of Bath. The Centre for Development Studies aims to contribute to combating global poverty and inequality through primary research into the practical realities of global poverty; and, critical engagement with development practice and policy making. Bath Papers in International Development publishes research and policy analysis by scholars and development practitioners in the CDS and its wider network. Submissions to the BPD series are encouraged; submissions should be directed to the Series Editor, and will be subject to a blind peer review process prior to acceptance.

Series Editor: Graham K. Brown

Website: http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/bpd

Email: bpd-editor@bath.ac.uk

The Centre for Development Studies
University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY
http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/

Hope movements: Social movements, development and the pursuit of human flourishing

Severine Deneulin and Ana C. Dinerstein

Contents

Hope movements: Social movements, development and the pursuit of human flourishing

Séverine Deneulin and Ana C. Dinerstein

Abstract

The evaluative framework of Sen's capability approach provides the most robust alternative to utilitarian economics and its income and growth oriented vision of development. However, despite its affirmation of human flourishing as development objective, it does not provide an alternative to economic and social practices which undermine that objective. It therefore needs to engage more with forms of social and political mobilisation, which seek to create an alternative social and economic world more akin to human flourishing and dignity. The aim of this paper is to analyze the role of these social and political mobilizations in development. We argue that they constitute a new type of social movements inspired by 'hope'. That is, following Bloch, they are striving forward to create another world, moved by the anticipatory consciousness of a 'not-yet-become'. We examine two seeming dissimilar social movements: the Zapatistas in Latin America and the Live Simply in Europe. Despite their differences, these movements share common characteristics, which do not fit easily within the category of 'new' social movements, in that they question the existing relation between social movements and development, and intend to offer not simply alternative forms of development but alternatives to development. We propose to name them 'hope movements' so as to better capture what they are and do. We conclude by discussing the significance and implications of the category of hope for development.

Keywords: Bloch; hope; capability approach; development, social movements; social change; Zapatistas, Live Simply.

Corresponding Authors

Séverine Deneulin and Ana C. Dinerstein,
Centre of Development Studies,
University of Bath

Email: S.Deneulin@bath.ac.uk, A.C.Dinerstein@bath.ac.uk

1 Introduction[1]

At the level of development theory, many alternatives exist to a growth-based development model: rights-based development, human development, human security, sustainable development, etc. However, at the level of policy, most countries have adopted, and continue to adopt, policies solidly grounded in a vision of development based on a specific type of economic thinking, for which increases in consumption and incomes are assimilated with better living conditions and higher levels of 'development'. What varies is the level of compensatory social and environmental policy to alleviate the human and environmental costs of such model.

Evidence is mounting that a development model based on such economic thinking is not universally sustainable. The recent idea of 'green growth', which assumes that economic output can grow with a reduction in carbon emissions, is proving to be elusive, for there is no evidence that economic growth can absolutely be delinked from environmental impact (Commission for Sustainable Development, 2009). An international report that analysed successful cases of economic growth, acknowledged that, should their stories be replicated universally, this would destroy the environment and even cancel the gains of the last 200 years (Commission on Growth and Development, 2008: 19).

In addition to its environmental damage, this development model has caused significant human damage. Data from the UK and US over the last 50 years show that affluence has been driven by a constant search for novelty which has created, among other phenomena, increased levels of addictions, depression, family breakdowns, stress and reduction in commitments (Kasser, 2002; Offer, 2006). Rather than fulfilling needs, the economic model is constantly creating new needs in an attempt to increase profit making by the expansion of differentiated markets.

In the past three decades, multinational corporations have reconfigured the division of the world according to comparative costs locating labour intensive forms of production to low wage areas where greater exploitation permits higher profits. This picture is completed by unfair trade conditions faced by poor farmers in the South, the trafficking of humans, the creation of new forms of slavery and child labour in poor countries

To date the capability approach, framed by economist and Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen, offers the most robust framework to assess the impact of this growth-oriented economic model for human lives (Alkire and Deneulin, 2009). As such, the capability approach is an evaluative framework for assessing states of affairs not in the utility space, but in the capability space, in the freedoms that people have reason to value such as the freedom to eat, to be educated, to participate in the life of the community, to live in a peaceful environment, etc (Alkire, 2010; Robeyns, 2005). In his latest book, *The Idea of Justice*, Sen (2009) re-iterated strongly that the capability approach is a comparative approach to justice and limits itself to assessing the consequences of economic and social processes for people's lives. It does not question the dominant economic model that drives the unbounded pursuit of material growth in a bounded planet, let alone provide an alternative economic and social model. All it says is that there are

[1] This paper was presented at the annual conference of the Human Development and Capability Association (Amman, September 21-23 2010), at a seminar of the Centre for Development Studies at the University of Bath (Bath, October 7 2010). We thank the participants for their comments on earlier versions of this paper, especially Graham K. Brown, Diane Elson, and others.

certain economic and social arrangements in which people enjoy greater freedoms than others, and that those should be privileged given their maximizing consequences for people's freedoms.

It is in the area of policy evaluation that the capability approach has made the biggest headway outside academic circles. Beginning with the pioneering Human Development Index in the 1990s as alternative to assessing development in terms of income, the recent initiatives of the Sarkozy Commission in France, and the OECD Measuring Progress at the global level, have been the most prominent examples of this search at policy level for new indicators of development, to include human flourishing considerations such as quality of work, environmental protection, volunteering, leisure time, health and educational standards.[2] However, by concentrating on policy evaluation, none of these initiatives question the underlying economic model, and its values and practices, which lie at the roots of poor human flourishing records. Beyond general references to agency and democratic participation, there has been little engagement between the capability/ human development approach with the forms of political mobilization that do challenge the dominant values and norms of societies and that build alternative economic and social practices more likely to promote valuable freedoms and provide the conditions for people to live lives they have reason to value.

We start discussing the role of social movements in development. We engage with current scholarly work on the role of social movements and contentious politics in development (see Reygadas et al 2009) and analyze two forms of opposition and resistance to an income and growth-based economic model that have emerged across the world and offer practical alternatives more conducive to human flourishing. We focus on the Zapatistas in Mexico and the Live Simply movement in Europe. We argue that, like other social movements, these movements contest capitalist rule over human life in search for a better world. Although this has been a concern for the past 200 years (Quijano, 2006), we argue that these movements do so in a fundamental different manner that deserves special attention. First, they are not concerned with changing the social and political order through the state but seek to 'change the world without taking power' (Holloway, 2002a). In other words, they are changing the way to change (Esteva 2003) by living out alternative values and collective ways of life. Secondly, by doing so, they question both the relationship between social movements and development and the very concept of 'development.' We suggest that their way of transforming the tangible reality of the present social context is by living out, imperfectly, what Ernst Bloch (1959/1986) calls the 'not-yet-become'. We introduce Ernst Bloch's 'principle of hope' and the religious eschatological concept of hope and detail how these new types of social movements embrace the principle of hope, in both its secular and religious form. We propose to therefore name them 'hope movements'. We conclude by discussing the significance and implications of the category of hope and hope movements for the emergence and development of 'alternatives *to* development' (de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez Garavito, 2006)

2 Social movements and 'development'

Since their emergence during the industrial revolution, social movements have always been a significant form of dissent, radically contesting norms, values and the politics that govern capitalist societies. Over the years, social movements theorists have offered a wide range of

[2] See www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr, www.oecd.org/oecdworldforum.

classifications of social movements, according to scope (reformists or radical); audience targeted (groups or individuals); methods of work (violent – non-violent); the type of change they aim to produce (introducing new values, preserving existing values) and extension (local, global). Most definitions agree that a social movement is a 'collectivity of individuals' of different kinds, they are formally organized, they have goals and they are antagonistic in that they are involved in some kind of contentious politics (Opp, 2009: 36). Most definitions include elements such as 'change-oriented goals; some degree of organization; some degree of temporal continuity; and some extra-institutional [e.g. protesting in the streets] and institutional [e.g. political lobbying] activity' (Snow and Oliver cited by Opp, 2009: 37).

Social movements are an outcome of profound changes in society, and evolve with economic and political transformations. During the 1960s, the wave of social mobilizations in Europe and the US affected the way in which theorists had understood social movements so far. Since the late 1960s onward distinctive economic, political and cultural approaches emerged seeking to grasp these new transformations. In the late 1980s, a new approach, 'new social movement theory' (NSMT) materialised through the work of Alain Touraine, Alberto Mellucci, Jurgen Habermas and Claus Offe. To provide a review of NSMT is beyond the scope of this paper. Roughly, they claimed that the transition from industrial to post-industrial societies had created a new 'societal type where the identity of social actors corresponds to their capacity to self-reflection or reflexivity' (Foweraker, 1995: 13). Unlike 'old' movements – with the labour movement and its struggle over distribution at the core of it – 'new' movements undertook collective action and struggle over recognition, with a variety of actors other than the 'working class' (e.g. anti-war activists, students, women, civil rights). The newness of these movement lie in that they were focused on quality of life, more oriented towards civil society than the state, and organised in more flexible ways, expressing universal concerns (Nash, 2000: 102).[3] Individual and collective identity formation, personal experiences of participation and everyday life and new forms of organisation and participation became crucial variables in their emergence and development (Slater, 1985).

The experience of Latin America particularly exemplifies this shift from 'old' to 'new' social movements (see for example Escobar and Alvarez, 1992). During the late 1980s and 1990s many Latin American countries witnessed struggles between peasant movements and state power. The aim of these movements –which transformed themselves from being class-based (peasant vs. landowner) to identity-based ('indigenous' vs. 'white'), was to seize political power and/or achieve social change through the state. Their demand was not so much about acquiring political power but about engaging with the state in order to promote recognition of their rights, as indigenous, as women, as human beings.

The role of social movements in development is a still unexplored dimension. As Reygadas et al (2009: 226) note, 'research on social movement seldom considers their impact on development because it is confined to the analysis of collective action, dominated by concerns about these movements roots and characteristics [and] the discussions on development has focused on other factors that support…without attributing much importance to social movements'. This is particularly problematic in Latin America, they argue, where social movements have contested

[3] It is important to note that the debates around the 'newness' of new social movements are still going on.

'dominant patterns of development and can therefore be seen as attempts to transform social relations and seek alternative forms of development '(ibid).

However, new social movements, like the old, are major drivers of social change and are critical for development and poverty reduction. Because poverty is the result of unequal power relations, resulting in unequal distribution of assets and resources and access to opportunities, and because social movements emerge to contest the extant distribution of power, social movements are a powerful force for reducing poverty (Bebbington 2010). Bebbington (2007: 794; 2010) identifies four pathways in which social movements reduce poverty: by challenging the institutions at the heart of the political economy of poverty (e.g. by reforming judicial systems that favour of the elite); by reworking the cultural politics of poverty (e.g. by addressing the stigma 'indigenous equal poor'); by affecting directly the assets of the poor (e.g. by changing the distribution of land); and, by engaging with the state (e.g. by affecting the political power balance).

But social movements are not a mere form of reducing poverty, alongside economic policy aimed at generating employment for the low-skilled or agricultural policy aimed at improving livelihoods in rural areas. They question how societies should be organized (Bebbington 2010). They contest the underlying values and practices of the prevailing economic and social order which generates inequality and poverty as well as current development discourses. Thus, by concentrating on outcomes only – as the capability approach does, one fails to appreciate the fundamental different nature that similar outcomes can hide. A reduction, say, of malnutrition rates in a rural area because of a government social policy aimed at providing a glass of milk to children in a participatory way (see Copestake 2008; Barrientos et al, 2008) is different from a reduction in malnutrition rate as a result of a social movement that has organized the rural area into a network of farmer cooperatives, educational and health centres based on the values of solidarity and equality.

Our contention is that the social movements that emerged since the mid 1990s amidst forceful processes of globalisation which violate human dignity (e.g. women exploited in *maquiladoras*, indigenous being dispossessed of land because of trade agreements, or farmers exploited and dispossessed by multi-national agro-businesses) are unique in their type, both as social movement and in their relation to development and are not completely informed by the category of 'new social movement'.

These movements do much more than contest social relationships and the dynamics of (global) capital accumulation: they have taken 'autonomous control over their development trajectory' (Earle and Simonelli, 2005: 115). Our research indicates that these movements are trying to live out a reality of a world not-yet-become autonomously from political power and current social and economic arrangements. This quasi-utopian dimension has been overlooked in analysis of social movements and signals the need for another 'conceptual turn' (Goodwin and Jasper 2009) in the study of social movements.

By engaging in innovative personal and collective practices that announce a different reality of the yet-not-become, they question the relationship between social movements and development. These movements do not fall easily within the buzzwords of 'empowerment' and 'participation' (Cornwall and Brock 2005), to be classified as community self-help alternatives, or local initiatives (Dinerstein 2010b). They radically question the meaning of 'development'. In

what follows, we examine two such types of movements: the Zapatista movement in Mexico, and the Live Simply movement in Europe. Then, we discuss 'hope' not as a philosophical or theological concept[4] but as a social and political category able to capture the uniqueness of these movements within the existing development and social movement vocabulary. We therefore propose to name these a-typical social movements as 'hope movements' and point to their contribution to 'development'.

3 Zapatistas and 'live simply': A different social movement type?

Inspired by indigenous traditions of autonomy and democracy, the Zapatistas movement in the Chiapas region of Mexico seek to create an alternative society structured around the value of human dignity as a rebellion against neo-liberal globalisation, which they define as a 'war against humanity' (Subcomandante Marcos 1997).

On 1st January 1994, the day that Mexico entered the North American Free Trade Agreement, the EZLN (National Liberation Zapatista Army) took over several municipalities and explicitly opposed the agreement since it was going to have a significant impact on indigenous lands, which were going to be opened up to large agro-businesses. But that was only the beginning of a struggle, which will become a global symbol for those struggling for dignity and new forms of democracy worldwide. First, the Zapatistas' uprising made visible the existence of deep contradictions within Mexico, between the potential wealth of the area (e.g. biodiversity, energy, oil) and the poverty of those who occupy it (Ceceña and Barreda in Holloway and Pelaez 1998). Secondly, by confronting revolutionary traditions concerned with class, exploitation and power, and by claiming that human dignity should be the fundamental value of revolutionary movements, they declared war to the Mexican government but with no intention to seize state power: their goal was to construct an alternative world based on dignity:

> *We spoke with ourselves, we looked inside ourselves and we looked at our history: we saw our most ancient fathers suffering and struggling, we saw our grandfathers struggling, we saw our fathers with fury in their hands, we saw that not everything had been taken away from us, that we had the most valuable, that which made us live, that which made our step rise above plants and animals, that which made the stone be beneath our feet, and we saw, brothers, that all that we had was DIGNITY, and we saw that great was the shame of having forgotten it, and we saw that DIGNITY was good for men to be men again, and dignity returned to live in our hearts, and we were new again, and the dead, our dead, saw that we were new again and they called us again, to dignity, to struggle.*[5]

Thirdly, they have created an alternative society with different norms and forms of government guiding economic, social and political relations. From the start, the Zapatistas rejected the notion of 'autonomy' imposed by the government through the constitutional reform of 2001, which betrayed the San Andres Accords signed between the government and the movement and

[4] For an analysis of virtue of hope in the history of philosophy and theology, see Mittleman (2009).
[5] EZLN, *La Palabra de los Armados de Verdad y Fuego*, México D.F.: Editorial Fuenteovejuna, 1994/ 1995), Vol. 1, p. 122 cited in Holloway 2002b.

which associated autonomy with 'free municipality'.[6] They believe that their integration into a state logic and incorporation into institutional designs of 'empowerment' and 'participation' aimed at depoliticising them. Feeling disappointed with the ('bad') government's attitude, the Zapatistas rejected the law and, after a process of demilitarization and reflection, created their own *autonomous* municipalities. Since 2003, the Zapatistas practice radical democracy (see Esteva 1999; 2003) and exercise 'autonomy *de facto* (Burgette Cal y Mayor 2003; Aubry 2003; Esteva 2003) in Chiapas through innovative forms of representation and self-government: the Good Government Councils (GGC, *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* organised through five Snails (*Caracoles*) (Dinerstein, 2009).

The GGC administer justice, deliver health and education to the impoverished and neglected communities of Chiapas (education serves the purposes of awareness-raising in the values of human dignity), legislate on the use of the land outside the grasp of the Mexican law, and facilitate the creation of work cooperatives for the production and commercialisation of fair trade products.

The two principles governing the Zapatistas democratic model are 'Asking we walk' (there is no definitive plan to follow but questions to answer as they go) and 'Command while obeying' (there are no established hierarchies but horizontality and radical democracy). The implementation of the principle of 'Command while obeying' requires a consultation process that constantly moves forward and backward. The Snail and its spiral shell represent this. The Zapatistas revolution also challenges capitalist 'time' as the symbol of the practice of autonomy is like the Snail that came to symbolise it: it 'spirals outward and backward, away from some of the colossal mistakes of capitalism's savage alienation, industrialism's regimentation, and toward old ways and small things; it also spirals inward via new words and new thoughts' (Solnit 2008 cited in Dinerstein 2009).

The Zapatista movement is paradigmatic and different from the 'new' social movements in that the movement is not organised around the claim for identity and recognition. They do not request, as such, another distribution of power at the political level and redistribution of resources and opportunities. They created something new altogether; they are moved by a vision of another world based on different values from the ones of the existing economic and social world. In addition to being at odds with 'new' social movements, the Zapatistas do not fit within the category of 'participatory development'. They do not seek to participate in the poverty reduction activities of the state or their policies. They are neither 'empowerment' movements who carry tasks that the state does not perform. They are not service providers or self-help organizations which might offer educational, health or employment opportunities because of state failure to do so, or state decision to devolve these responsibilities to civil society. They are not simply interested in achieving certain development goals such as reduction poverty or infant mortality or improving education, they want to create an alternative form of living guided by the horizon of human dignity. Zapatismo must be seen as both a challenge to development and an 'experiment in alternative logic' (Earle and Simonelli, 2005: 20)

These a-typical movements are not confined to the contours of Latin America. Europe too has witnessed in recent years the rise of new social movements that attempt to resist the

[6] The San Andres Accords signed in 1996 recognised the indigenous people's rights to self-government and collective production.

exploitative and environmentally destructive nature of the prevalent economic system in ways not seen before. The case of the 'live simply' movement is an example of this.

The starting point of the live simply movement is the connectedness of people's lives, and the realisation that the way many people live in high income countries has a direct impact on poverty and contributes to maintaining injustices. The consumer demand for cheaper goods is putting pressures on companies to cut down production costs, often at the detriment of labour rights. The average lifestyle of a British person would require 2.5 planets it was universalised. Participants in the live simply movement therefore seek to live an alternative lifestyle to the consumerism and materialism. The focus is on sharing and being instead of earning more and consuming more. Some concrete actions include: buying local, seasonal and fair traded products, pressing retailers to adopt more ethical practices, re-using and repairing instead of discarding and buying new, investing in ethical projects, reducing energy consumption, spending more time in volunteering, devoting more attention to relationships instead of work achievements.

The movement is a loose gathering of people, some religiously motivated, others not. Some participants are motivated by their Christian faith and 'God's call to live simply, sustainably and in solidarity with the poor'.[7] Some are motivated by other religious or spiritual traditions which put limits of greed and restrain consumption, such as in Buddhism or Gandhian spirituality. Others are motivated by humanistic concerns without reference to a religious discourse. Some are strongly motivated by social justice. Others are motivated by the positive effect of voluntary simplicity on themselves – those who volunteer and pursue less materialist goals often report higher levels of subjective wellbeing and lower levels of depression than those who endorse material values (Blackmore, 2009; Brown and Kasser, 2005). Studies on the voluntary simplicity movement conducted in the United States (Johnson, 2004; Sandin and Walther, 2009) have found that, even if the justice motivation is important, many embrace voluntary simplicity because of a greater sense of human fulfilment (spending more time with family and friends, greater closeness to the environment, less stress).

Despite its heterogeneous nature, the live simply movement has two basic common characteristics: the voluntary embrace of a simple and sustainable lifestyle and the seeking of sources of meaning and satisfaction outside non-material pursuits (Etzioni, 1998, 2004).[8] Those who embrace voluntary simplicity often form 'intentional communities' or communities of people gathered around the intention to live a commonly agreed life together.[9] The UK Commission on Sustainable Development (2009) has singled out the support of the creation of such intentional communities as a major policy to move towards a sustainable economic model. According to the State of the World Report 2010 of the WorldWatch Institute, the live simply movement is potentially one of the most powerful social movements of the near future.

The live simply movement does not fit easily the existing category of 'new' social movement. It does not seek, as such, to change existing economic and social arrangements by political engagement, either through party politics or civil society participation. It seeks to create something new by living a life based on alternative values from those of the dominant society, simplicity and sustainability instead of materialism and consumerism. It does not seek to engage

[7] See www.livesimply.org.uk.
[8] See www.voluntarysimplicity.org.uk, www.simpleliving.net or www.transitionnetwork.org.
[9] In the UK, the Findhorn community in Scotland and Schumacher College in Devon are probably the most well-known cases of intentional communities. See www.findhorn.org, www.schumachercollege.org.uk.

with political power, but to transform society through building alternative social and economic practices, autonomously from state power.

By its concern for those who suffer from injustice (the workers exploited in factories to make cheap goods for the Western markets, the people affected by climate change because of the environmentally destructive nature of consumerism), the live simply social movement is a social movement for 'development' which aim at reducing poverty and injustice and at environmental sustainability. However, it falls totally outside the existing vocabulary in development studies of 'participation' or 'empowerment'. It does not seek to participate in policy to make it more conducive to achieving the Millennium Development Goals or respect human rights. It is not a movement that creates groups that engage in development activities. It seeks to create something new, another form of life not known before.

Given the oddness of these 'new' new social movements, which have emerged since the 1990s within the existing concepts of social movement theory and development theory, we propose that the category of 'hope' offers the best analytical framework to capture the reality of what these movements are and do. In the next section we discuss the concept of hope as a social and political category.

4 The principle of hope and the 'not-yet-become'

Hope features strongly in apparently two diametrically opposed anthropological philosophies, Marxism and its hope of a classless society liberated from human exploitation and alienation, and Christianity and its hope in the Kingdom of God. This section explores the concept of hope in these two philosophies and its implications for social movements and development.

The philosopher Ernst Bloch has been the most influential thinker on hope outside theology. The basic idea of Bloch's principle of hope is that the world is unfinished, unclosed:

> *Of course, nothing would circulate inwardly either if the outward were completely solid. Outside, however, life is just as little finished as in the ego, which is working on this outside. No thing could be altered in accordance with wishes if the world were closed, full of fixed, even perfected facts. Instead of these there are simply processes, i.e. dynamic relationships in which the Become has not completely triumphed. The Real is process; the latter is the widely ramified mediation between present, unfinished past and above all: possible future* (Bloch, 1959/1986: 196).

In Bloch's hope principle, humans possess an anticipatory consciousness that enables them to have a not-yet conscious knowledge of future possibilities (Roberts, 1987). The present moment already contains in itself the 'not-yet-become':

> *The Authentic or essence is that which is not yet, which in the core of things drives towards itself, which awaits its genesis in the tendency-latency of process; it is itself only now founded, objective-real hope, and its name ultimately borders on 'What-Is-in-possibility' in the Aristotelian sense … For all its bearing, conditioning and becoming would be a concept empty of meaning if that which wishes to and can come out already existed.(…) Just as self-evidently, there is in the dialectical tendency-latency, open to the Novum, of material process no pre-ordered. i.e.*

> *likewise finally posited purpose in the style of the old teleology, let alone a teleology myth logically guided from above* (Bloch, 1959/1986: 1373).

Through hope, the future is already in the present (Dodd, 1994). In the words of the Zapatista Subcomander Marcos: 'In our dreams we have seen another world, an honest world, a world decidedly more fair than the one I which we now live...this world was not something that came to us from our ancestors. It came from ahead, from the next step we were going to take (Sub commander Marcos, 1/3/94 in Ponce de Leon, 2001: 18).

Hope, according to Bloch, rests on the basic human drive of hunger that originates in a lack, whether material or non-material (Roberts, 1987). Hope then gives us the expectation of a better life where our existing lacks would be fulfilled (Roderick, 1987).

Bloch's philosophical starting point is the awareness that the world is wrong: we 'scream' (Holloway 2002a) at the unfairness and injustice of the present economic system. One does not grasp yet what a new fair and just world would be like but one can already see that the present reality of unfairness is wrong and, because the world is unfinished and opened, another reality is possible (Levitas, 1990). Acknowledging the lack means holding on to the not-yet-become. This opens the possibility of imagining another reality in our 'daydream' (Bloch 1959/1986). Daydreaming consciously *anticipates* the future, which Bloch sees as the 'non-yet conscious' or the 'Novum'.

Bloch contrasts hope with chance. Unlike chance, which refers to the empirical reality of present possibilities, hope illuminates the present reality beyond it. Hope is the utopian grasp of the future, and chance the empirical possibility of the present. It is hope, as the daydreaming of a world not-yet-become, which informs human action and enables the creative transformation of the world (Mendes-Flohr, 1983). This vision, or anticipation, is critical for inspiring social action that seeks to remedy injustice, and indeed critical to development and social change. This other reality is not 'objectively' possible but 'really' possible:

> *Here we must of course distinguish between the merely cognitively or objectively possible and the real-Possible, the one that matters in a given context. Objectively possible is everything whose entry, on the basis of a mere partial-cognition of its existing conditions, is scientifically to be expected, or at least cannot be discounted. Whereas really possible is everything whose conditions in the sphere of the object itself are not yet fully assembled; whether because they are still maturing, or above all because new conditions –though mediated by existing ones – arise for the entry of a real. Mobile, changing, changeable Being, presenting itself as dialectical-material, has this unclosed capability of becoming, this Not-Yet-Closedness both in its ground and in its horizon'* (Bloch, 1959/1986: 196-197).

Through daydreaming, hope enables humans to creatively *imagine* another reality. As Acosta (2010) suggests, only by imagining another world we can change this one. As Bloch wrote:

> *The wish builds up and creates the real, we alone are the gardeners of the most mysterious tree, which must grow. The urge to become commensurate with self draws in soul, it is the though-solution for the complete crystal of renewed reality, and mind seeking change things out of the world and thinking things into the world creatively, directed powerful as a magnet over into our future, into the future of the*

> *world, which constantly looks towards us and leaves good and evil equally undecided solely to feeble choice. It revolves around us and does not know where it is going, only we ourselves are the lever and the engine, external, revealed life falters: but the new thought finally breaks out, into the full adventures, into the open, with our defiant premonition, with the tremendous power of our human voice'* (Bloch, *The Spirit of Utopia* (1918) cited in Bloch 1959/1986: 1371).

This imagining capacity of hope is very different from what Bloch calls 'fantasizing'. Unlike fantasizing, hope is an 'essential component of human consciousness and is soundly rooted in real possibilities in the world, even when the means for or route to realizing these may not yet be at all apparent' (Bauckham and Hart, 1999: 63). Or as Bloch (1959/1986: 144) puts it:

> *The determined imagination of the utopian function is distinguished from mere fantasising precisely by the fact that only the former has in its favour a Not-Yet-Being of an expected kind, i.e. does not play around and get lost in an Empty-Possible, but psychologically anticipates the Real Possible.*

For Bloch, the not-yet-become, is materially inherent to reality and can be 'anticipated' in our daydream. It does not bear upon the transcendence of an after-life. It is based on a 'kingdom of neighbourly love' here on earth. Bloch borrows from the religious idea of the Kingdom of God but strips it from its eternal life dimensions, for he argues that it was the dominant classes who emphasised an after-life conception of the kingdom to suit their interest (Roderick, 1987). Nonetheless, Bloch's principle of hope remains eschatological even if it bears on this history alone.

The presence of an eschatological vision, a 'beyond' that is not yet, is an essential component of the ethical project of the pursuit of a better quality of life (Simmons and Kerr, 2009: 958). Even if it is not necessary to have a perfect vision of the not yet become, even if we do not need to know what an ideal just society would be in order to judge whether one situation is more just or unjust, as Sen forcefully argued in *The Idea of Justice*, we need however to have some idea of justice, or at least some comparative framework that enables us to judge whether one situation is 'better' or more 'just' than another. Eschatology, hope and development are then closely connected:

> *Eschatology is not a goal to be achieved, but a structural possibility to be constantly maintained. Justice for the Other is not something that will happen next Thursday, say. It is, instead the constant demand upon the existing individual to live 'beyond history' from within history. Eschatology is the hope for a different history precisely in the here and now of that history to which we ourselves belong* (Simmons and Kerr, 2009: 958).

Whether this world 'beyond' is already entirely present but not fully made conscious yet, or only partially present but fully realised at the end of times, is the fundamental distinction between Bloch's atheistic vision of hope and a Judeo-Christian vision of hope. In contrast to Bloch's secular eschatology, Christian eschatology is not utopian.

Jürgen Moltmann's *Theology of Hope* is the theological counterpart of Bloch's *Philosophy of Hope*. Christian eschatology, and hope, like Bloch's, rests on the tension between what is already known – the vision of a world not-yet-become or the vision of the Kingdom of God inaugurated

by Christ – and what is not yet experienced – the coming of the Novum or the Kingdom of God (Ferguson and Wright, 1988). But unlike Bloch's hope principle, the Christian vision of hope derives from a reality already witnessed. Hope is not about daydreaming of a possible imagined future but about establishing a reality that has already been inaugurated with the incarnation of God and the ministry of Christ. This is why, in contrast to Bloch, the Christian principle of hope does not have a utopian function. Its function is to 'show present reality to be not yet what it can and will be' (Bauckham, 2005: 152), but what the reality can be and will be will never be fulfilled in this world. Human failure, and the reality of original sin, is the hallmark of any human attempt to bring the eschatological vision of the Kingdom on earth (Bauckham, 2005). The Kingdom will never come in any person's lifetime.

Hope is very distinctive from aspiration which bears on wishful thinking ('I aspire to be a multi-millionaire.') or expectation which bears on a future reality which we construct but not totally control ('I expect to graduate with a first.'). Hope is the vision of a world 'not-yet-become' but already present. In Bloch's hope principle one is conscious of such reality but it has 'not-yet-become', in Moltmann's theology of hope that reality has already been inaugurated but will only be fulfilled at the end of times.

5 Hope movements

More than two decades ago, Laclau and Mouffe (1999: 159-160) contested the traditional dogmatism of the left which embraced the working class as the subject of revolution but also pointed at the difficulties entailed in the notion of 'new social movement'. This 'unsatisfactory' term, they argued

> *groups together a series of highly diverse struggles: urban, ecological, anti-authoritarian, anti-institutional, feminist, anti-racist, ethnic, regional or that of sexual minorities. The common denominator of all of them would be their differentiation from workers' struggles, considered as 'class' struggles … what interests us about these new social movements …is not the idea of arbitrarily grouping then into a category opposed to that of class, but the novel role they play in articulating that rapid diffusion of social conflictuality to more and more numerous relations which is characteristic today of advanced industrial societies…they call into question new forms of subordination.*

We propose to name these 'new' new social movements as 'hope movements'. Our intention is not to add another classification to the already complex social movement terminology but rather to open up the discussion about classifications. Our discussion offers an opportunity to evaluate the adequacy of other perspectives on social movements and development as well as the relationship between them.

Given the close connection between eschatology and development, hope is an important category, a 'new philosophy for change' (Zournazi 2002) with considerable political implications for development and social change. With their eschatological vision of a world guided by the values of human dignity in opposition to the values of materialism and consumerism, the social movements discussed above all embrace hope. Despite their diversity and heterogeneity, the Zapatistas and live simply movements constitute a similar political reality that can be gathered

around a common 'political name', to borrow from (Critchley, 2008:104), in this case 'hope movements'. Naming is important in that, as Critchley suggests, it is around a name that 'a political subject can be aggregated from the various social struggles through which we are living' (ibid)

Four reasons justify the naming of these movements as hope movements: their eschatological dimension, utopian impulse, redefinition of 'development' and (relative) autonomy from state power.

First, they are characterised by respective eschatological visions which oppose the existing economic model and its materialistic, consumerist and exploitative nature. The Zapatistas and live simply movements both share the same starting point: a perception of the destructive nature of global capitalism and of the world as unjust ('wrong'). This is clear in the Zapatista depiction of globalisation 'as a war against humanity' and its creation of 'Good Government Councils', and in the live simply movement's rejection of consumerism as deeply flawed and detrimental to human flourishing. All participants of the live simple social movement embrace 'a shared vision of the future' (Sandin and Walther, 2009: 313), a vision of a world which upholds the values of simplicity, human relations and sustainability.

Secondly, they see the world as 'unfinished and unclosed' and reject the 'inevitability' of the present state of affairs. They show an unwillingness to surrender to the view that history has ended – that the (neo-)liberal economic system and liberal democracy together are the 'end of history',[10] and that there is no alternative. Reality is not 'ossified' but a process full of possibilities. Although this resistance to 'what it is' and the will to change the present state of affairs are necessary and complementary conditions for the functioning of any social movement, it seems to us that what matters with these movements is how they are actively shifting from a 'strategy of opposition' to a 'strategy of construction of a new world order' (Laclau and Mouffe, 1999:188). As Laclau and Mouffe (199: 188) highlight, whereas in the former case, the logic of opposition is 'not accompanied by a real attempt to establish different nodal points from which a process of different and positive reconstruction of the social fabric could be instituted. In the latter case, the element of social positivity predominates'. This is a key element considering the historical context in which hope movements emerged. The embrace of hope is a significant step forward in the process of rejection of the neoliberal dystopia (Dinerstein and Neary 2002) These movements are driven by Bloch's idea that 'reality without a real possibility is not complete … Concrete utopia stands on the horizon of every reality' (Bloch, 1959/1986: 223).

As noted earlier, for Bloch, there is a 'not-yet-become' whose realisation can already be consciously anticipated. The radical nature of this idea, or 'what makes hope radical', is not the plan to be fulfilled but, as Lear (2006: 103) puts it, the fact that hope 'is directed towards a future goodness that transcends the current ability to understand what it is. Radical hope anticipates a good for which those who have the hope as yet lack the appropriate concepts with which to understand it.'

Our two case studies embrace a vision of a new world-yet-to-become. They reveal not only that history is not finished but that, paraphrasing the World Social Forum's slogan, 'another world is possible'. The principle of hope helps them to prove practically the incorrectness of the idea that

[10] For Fukuyama (1992), the current economic, social and political arrangements cannot be better: 'We cannot picture to ourselves a world that is essentially different from the present one, and at the same time better' (p. 46).

change is no longer possible. Thus 'transcending pessimism' (Panitch and Gindin, 2000), these movements push 'possibility' to its limits. By demanding the 'impossible', and by already living the 'impossible', these movements widen the universe of what is politically thinkable. The social category of hope recuperates the long-forgotten idea that the utopian impulse is a fundamental and necessary feature of humanity.

Thirdly, these movements are challenging not only extant forms of development associated to economic growth but they reject the concept of 'development' altogether by searching for alternatives *to* development (de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez Garavito, 2006: xxxvix). The distinction between alternative development and alternatives to development made by these authors among others is *key* to our definition of hope movements as opposed to new social movements. The latter are engaged in contesting development and search of alternatives forms *of* development. de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez Garavito suggest six lines of thought and action that promote alternative development: to promote associative forms of production; to promote sustainable development; to work for womens' inclusion, to strengthen economic support to marginalised sectors and land and housing, and the revival of the local (2006: xxxxv-xxxvii).

We locate hope movements in the dimension of hope as they search for alternatives to development. They do not discuss the extent and form of economic growth but, as these authors suggests, reject the idea of economic growth altogether and advocate the subordination of such growth to the imperatives of human dignity and fulfilment. These movements offer a critique of the aforementioned six lines of thought underpinning the search for alternative development: a critique of sustainable development which is the equivalent of economic growth, a critique of programmes that aim to integrate women into alternative development programmes, defend other types of knowledge, search for non–capitalist forms of production, in favour of an anti-development pluralistic 'cosmopolitan localism' to use McMichel's apt expression [1996]' (de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez Garavito 2006: xxxix-xlii).

Fourthly, hope movements' search for alternatives to development is realised by engaging in personal and collective endeavours (autonomous in essence) that are informed by ethical and anti-capitalist values, directed to enact change without taking or sharing state power. The state being an instrument of capitalism cannot be a channel of change for the system. Hence, society cannot be transformed through the state (Holloway, 2002a). It is precisely this practical search for autonomy from the state which is the catalyst for radical change as it offers the possibility for imagining political, social, cultural and economic alternatives, and constructing them in the reality of this world. The Zapatistas are slowly building an alternative society, with forms of governance that are founded on the values of dignity and not submitted to the economic logic of profits or capitalistic imposition of time. The live simply movement has been less oriented, so far, towards constructing alternative economic practices, and has been more individually focused, but the wider religious tradition, from which part of the live simply movement operates, has been more collective and created alternatives such as cooperatives and fair trade.[11]

Hope, understood as the anticipatory consciousness of the not-yet-become, is a universal feature of a-typical social movements which emerged in the 1990s. But hope needs to be

[11]Traidcraft in the UK emerged from the Christian religious tradition, as did the world's biggest cooperative, Mondragon in the Basque country.

mediated through institutions: 'Concrete utopia', Bloch argues 'has in *process-reality* a corresponding element: that of the mediated Novum. Only this *process-reality*, and not a fact-basedness torn out of it which is reified and made absolute, can therefore pass judgement on utopian dreams or relegate them to mere illusions' (1959/1986: 197, italics original).

Given this institutional mediation, the forms of 'organising hope' differ enormously (Dinerstein, 2010a; 2012). The practical search for alternatives inspired by hope takes place within the economic, political and cultural institutions that they seek to alter. This leaves the door open for potential tensions, if not assimilation of the alternative practices into the ones they oppose. Autonomous practices are embedded in their context of emergence and as such they bear a fundamental tension which cannot be permanently resolved but must be dealt with: the tension between rebellion (resistance and world-changing action) and institutionalisation (the incorporation of ideologies and projects into state programs and legislation as officially sanctioned economic, social, cultural and political change) (Böhm, Dinerstein and Spicer, 2010). Autonomy from the state, capital and development discourses must be understood as an (im) possible project (ibid). The politics of hope movements can be seen as a praxis that seeks an 'interstitial distance from the state' (Critchley, 2008: 111).

Indeed, many alternative projects by Latin American autonomous social movements have been integrated (or attempted to be integrated) in to the logic of state power either by means of state repression or, as it has been happening lately, by integration via policies that encapsulate the ethos and functioning of autonomous practices by encouraging 'participation from below' (Dinerstein, 2010b). An example of these policies is the 2007 Sustainable Rural Cities programme which was launched to fight against 'exclusion via dispersion' in Chiapas. The programme aims at relocating and reorganising the population in eight new cities to maximise service provision. To the Zapatistas, the plan matches the Word Bank programme Puebla-Panamá, and entails a territorial reorganisation where the reallocation of the population will strategically vacate land for commercial, tourist and natural resources exploitation by private investors (CIEPAC, August 2008) (Dinerstein 2009; 2010a; 2012).

Likewise, the live simply movement is in tension with being assimilated to the economic system it opposes. 'Simple' and 'green' risk becoming marketing brands that companies may use to sell more. Moreover, the live simply movement and its focus on individual change is much at ease with the individualist capitalist environment. Participants in the social movement are more concerned with 'defining their own personal moral goals' than 'working toward any structural, lasting social change' (Sandin and Walther, 2009: 313) – although this is less the case with the religious branch of the live simply movement which is more focused on collective and structural change. There is always a risk for the radical vision of the 'not-yet' to accommodate with the present reality. As Bloch (cited in Richter, 2006: 51) argues, hope is 'perpetually exposed to the radical danger of disappointment':

> *Hope must be unconditionally disappointable…because it is open in a forward direction, in a future-oriented direction; it does not address itself to what already exists. For this reason, hope…is committed to change rather than repetition, and*

> *what is more, incorporates the element of chance without which there can be nothing new... And hope does not surrender when setbacks occur.*[12]

And yet, 'hope movements' cannot be completely integrated into the logic of state, economic power and development. If reality is incomplete without a possibility of change, hope allows a real possibility (rather than objective possibility), and as such, it escapes institutionalisation, integration, and even regulation. The autonomous symbolic/territorial/communitarian spaces created by both the Zapatista and the Live Simply movements put limits to 'the hegemonic appetites of international development' (Earle and Simonelli, 2005: 18). In other words, hope, paraphrasing Bloch, must be 'disappointable' – making the world more just is full of setbacks – but 'does not surrender'. Or as St Paul wrote, hope can never let us down.[13]

6 Conclusion

Despite underpinning social movements' discourses and practices, and despite its political significance, the principle of hope has been overlooked and/or neglected in writings on social movements and development studies. We have argued that the current economic, social and political context is leading to a new conceptual turn. We offer the notion of hope movements to account for the universal feature of a new generation of social movements that are engaging in practices inspired by the principle of hope and the anticipatory consciousness of the not-yet-become.

Conceptually, the principle of hope has twofold significance. First, it informs present individual and collective forms of resistance in, against and beyond global capitalism. It presents an alternative vision of development that will not come about through state power. Indicators of this alternative anti-development view have put at the centre of the debate the significance of nature, the use of natural resources, the construction of a solidarity economy, the idea of substantive equality, radical democracy) (Acosta, 2010). Although clearly these alternatives to development require specific investigations into each case, they do open 'the Pandora box' with unpredictable consequences and outcomes' (Reygadas et al, 2009: 227).

Secondly, the principle of hope enables to connect the categories of practice (which constitute the framework for critique) and the categories of theory (which interrogate practice) (Bonefeld et al 1995: xi). Hope movements offer a practical critique of the dominant paradigm of politics and development, paradigm that prevents us from realising that it is possible to think of the unthinkable.

Hope movements' anti-development attempts to recover the meaning of life, 'Sumak Kawsay', which translates from Kichua spirituality as plentiful life, peace and harmony with the natural order (De Souza Santos, 2010; Acosta 2010), and which capitalism has destroyed. They seek to design and implement 'public' interventions democratically devised which aim at the 'good life' in contrast to the dominant economic system which is detrimental to human flourishing.[14] This quest for the good life *(buen vivir*) at the core of development and public policy, and the search

[12] Bloch's Inaugural lecture at the University of Tübingen in 1961 (see Ritcher 2006).
[13] Romans 5, 5.
[14] Title of a forum organised by the *Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indigenas* (Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Colombia, Chile and Argentina), April 2010, CAOI INFORMA - Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas, www.minkandina.org.

for creating alternative institutional arrangements to the existing ones, is very distant, or even in blatant opposition to development ideas and practices of 'empowerment', 'partnership' and 'participation', which do not question the existing economic, political and social institutions.

We have suggested that the focus on 'hope' can assist us better understand these 'new' new movements than the usual classification based on their departure from class denominations. By looking at these social movements through the prism of hope we might achieve three things: first, to listen to movements own voice and theorising (Cox and Nilsen, 2007) and avoid to force these movements 'into categories that they are challenging thus imposing upon them the disillusionment that they are rebelling against' (Holloway, 2002b); second, to articulate a critical theory based on our ability to 'look awry' (Žižek, 2000) in order to find alternative ways of understanding movements' actions and values which reflects their intention not to simply contest capitalism but to create the world anew. Finally, to capture their critique to development and their creative process of imagining the not-yet-become that inhabits the reality of global capitalism and international development.

The shift in policy evaluation from income to human flourishing considerations, as does the human development and capability approach, is an important step in changing the dominant economic paradigm and its underlying values. But unless accompanied by different economic, social and political practices, that step risks being constantly erased. Hope movements are in that sense critical to pursuing human development, but well outside the world of 'human development policies' which seek to improve certain outcomes within existing economic and political arrangements.

References

Acosta, A. 2010 'Solo imaginando otros mundos se cambiará este' *Observatorio Petrolero Sur,* No 55-56: Reflexiones sobre el Buen Vivir y la transformación, http://opsur.org.ar/ Accessed 5/10/10.

Alkire, S. 2010 'Conceptual overview of human development', Background paper for 2010 Human Development Report, New York: Human Development Report Office.

Alkire, S. and Deneulin, S. 2009 'The human development and capability approach', in S. Deneulin with L. Shahani (eds), *An Introduction to the Human Development and Capability Approach*, London: Earthscan/ International Development Research Centre of Canada.

Aubry, A. 2003 'Autonomy in the San Andres Accords: Expression and Fulfilment of a new federal pact' in Rus, J., Hernandez Castillo, R. and Mattiace, S. (eds.) 2003 *Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias. The indigenous peoples of Chiapas and the Zapatista Rebellion,* Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, Boulder, NY, Toronto, Oxford: 219-242.

Barrientos, A., Gideon, J and Molineux, M. 2008 'New developments in Latin America's Social Policy', *Development and Change* 39(5): 759-774.

Bauckham, R. 2005 'Jürgen Moltmann', in D. Ford (ed.), *The Modern Theologians*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Bauckham, R. and Hart, T. 1999 *Hope Against Hope: Christian Eschatology in Contemporary Context*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Bebbington, A. 2007 'Social movements and the politicization of chronic poverty', *Development and Change*, 38(5): 793-818.

Bebbington, A. 2010 'Social movements and poverty in developing countries', Background paper for the UNRISD flagship report on Poverty Reduction, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Blackmore, C. 2009 'Responsible wellbeing and its implications for development policy', *WeD Working Paper 09/47*, Wellbeing in Developing Countries Research Group, www.welldev.org.uk.

Bloch, E. 1959/1986 *The Principle of Hope, Volumes I, II and III*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

Böhm, S., Dinerstein, A.C. and Spicer, A. 2010 '(Im)possibilities of autonomy: Social movements in and beyond the state, capital and development', *Social Movement Studies* 1 (9): 17 32.

Bonefeld, W. et al. 1995 *Open Marxism, Vol. I*, London: Pluto Press.

Brown, K.W. and Kasser, T. 2005 'Are psychological and ecological wellbeing compatible? The role of values, mindfulness and lifestyle', *Social Indicators Research* 74(2): 349-368.

Burguete Cal y Mayor, A. 2003 'The de Facto Autonomous Process: new juridictions and parallel Governments in rebellion' in Rus, J., Hernandez Castillo, R. and Mattiace, S. (eds.) 2003 *Mayan Lives, …op.cit.* : 191-218.

Commission for Sustainable Development 2009 *Prosperity without Growth*. Available online at: http://www.sd-commission.org.uk

Commission on Growth and Development 2008 *The Growth Report*. Available online at: http://www.growthcommission.org

Copestake, J. 2008 'Multiple dimensions of social assistance: The case of Peru's 'glass of milk' programme', *Journal of Development Studies*, 44 (4), pp. 545-561.

Cornwall, A. and Brock, K. 2005 'Beyond buzzwords: "Poverty reduction", "participation" and "Empowerment" in development policy', *UNRISD*, Overarching Concerns, Paper 10, Geneva.

Cox, L. and Nilsen, A. 2007 'Social movements and the "movement of movements": Studying resistance to neoliberal globalisation.' *Sociology Compas* 1/2: 424-442.

Critchley, S. 2008 *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance*, Verso: London.

de Sousa Santos, B. 2006 (ed.) *Another production is possible: Beyond the capitalist canon*, Verso: London – NY.

de Sousa Santos, B. and Rodriguez, G., C. 2006 'Introduction: expanding the economic canon and searching for alternatives to neoliberal globalisation' in de Sousa Santos, B 2006 (ed.) *Another production is possible …*op. cit: xvii – lxii.

Dinerstein, A.C. and Neary, M. 2002 'From Here to Utopia: Finding Inspiration for the Labour Debate' in Dinerstein, A.C. and M. Neary (eds.) *The Labour Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dinerstein, A. C. 2009 'The snail and the good government. A critique of "civil society" by the Zapatista Movement', *NGPA Working Paper* 36,London: Centre for Civil Society, LSE.

Dinerstein, A. C. 2010(a) 'Organising hope: Social movements and collective autonomy in Latin America' Paper to the 3rd Latin American and European Organisation Studies Colloquium (LAEMOS), Buenos Aires, 7-10 April 2010.

Dinerstein, A. C. 2010(b) 'Autonomy in Latin America: between rebellion and integration. Echoes from the Piqueteros experience' *Community Development Journal*, 45 (3): 356-366.

Dinerstein, A. C. 2012 *Social Movements and Collective Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organising Hope*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan (forthcoming).

Dodd, J. 1994 'The Philosophical Significance of Hope', *Review of Metaphysics*, 58: 117:46.

Earle, D and Simonelli, J. 2005 *Uprising of hope. Sharing the Zapatista journey tp alternative development,* Altamira Press: Rowman & Littlefield, Walnut-Lanham-NY-Toronto-Oxford.

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

Esteva, G. 2003 'The meaning and scope of the struggle for autonomy' in pact' in Rus, J., Hernandez Castillo, R. and Mattiace, S. (eds.) 2003 *Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias. The indigenous peoples of Chiapas and the Zapatista rebellion,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Boulder, NY, Toronto, Oxford: 243-270.

Esteva, G. 1999 'The Zapatistas and People's Power' *Capital & Class* 68: 153-182.

Etzioni, A. 1998 'Voluntary Simplicity: Characterization, select psychological implications, and societal consequences', *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 19: 619-43.

Etzioni, A. 2004 'The post affluent society', *Review of Social Economy*, 62(3): 407-420. Ferguson, S. and Wright, D. (eds) 1988, *New Dictionary of Theology*, Leicester: Inter Varsity Press.

Foweraker, J. 1995 *Theorizing Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.

Fukuyama, F. 1992 *The End of History and the Last Man*, London: Penguin.

Goodwin, J. and Jasper, M. (eds). 2009 *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holloway, J. 2002(a) *Change the World without Taking Power*. *The meaning of revolution today* London: Pluto Press.

Holloway, J. 2002(b) 'Zapatismo and Social Sciences', *Capital & Class* 78: 153-160.

Holloway, J. 2010 *Crack Capitalism*, London: Pluto Press.

Holloway, J. and Peláez, E (eds.). 1998 *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, London: Pluto Press.

Johnson, B. 2004 'Simple identity work? The voluntary simplicity movement', *Qualitative Sociology*, 27(4): 527-530.

Kasser, T. 2002 *The High Price of Materialism*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1999 *hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics,* Verson: London – NY.

Lear, J. 2006 *Radical Hope. Ethics in the Face of Cultural Devastation*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Levitas, R. 1990 *The Concept of Utopia*, Hempstead: Syracuse University Press. Mendes-Flohr, P.R. 1983 '"To brush history against the grain": The eschatology of the Frankfurt School and Ernst Bloch', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 51(4): 631-650.

Mittleman, A. 2009 *Hope in a Democratic Age*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Moltmann, J. 1967 *Theology of Hope*, London: SCM Press

Muñoz Ramirez, G. 2008 *The fire and the word. A history of the Zapatista movement,* City lights books: San Francisco.

Nash, K. 2000 *Contemporary Political Sociology*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Offer, A. 2006 *The Challenge of Affluence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Opp, K. 2009 *Theories of Political Protest and Social Movements*, London: Routledge.

Panitch, L. and Gindin, S. 2000 'Transcending pessimism: Rekindling socialist imagination' *Socialist Register* Vol. 46: 1-30.

Ponce de León, J. (ed.) 2001 *Our Word is our weapon. Subcomandante Marcos Selected writings*, Seven Stories Press, New York.

Quijano, A. 2006 'Alternative production systems?' in de Sousa Santos, B 2006 (ed.) *Another production is possible…*op. cit: 417-445.

Reygadas, L., Ramos, T. and Montoya, G. 2009 'Pandora box: the implications of social movements on development. Lessons from the Lacandona jungle in Chiapas' *Social Movement Studies,* Vol. 8(3): 225-241.

Richter, G. 2006 'Can hope be disappointed? Contextualising a Blochian question', *Symploke*, 14 (1-2): 42-54.

Roberts, R. 1987 'Review Article: An introductory reading of Ernst Bloch's "The Principle of Hope"', *Journal of Literature and Theology*, 1(1): 89-112.

Robeyns, I. 2005 'The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey', *Journal of Human Development* 6(1): 93–114.

Roderick, R. 1987 'Book Review: Ernst Bloch, "The Principle of Hope"', *Ethics*, 97(4): 864-66.

Rus, J., Hernandez Castillo, R. and Mattiace, S (eds.). 2003 *Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias. The indigenous peoples of Chiapas and the Zapatista rebellion,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Boulder, NY, Toronto, Oxford: 185-190

Sandin, J. A. and Walther, C.S. 2009 'Complicated simplicity: Moral identity formation and social movement learning in the voluntary simplicity movement', *Adult Education Quarterly*, 59 (4): 298-317.

Sen, A. 2009 *The Idea of Justice*, London: Allen Lane.

Simmons, J. A. and Kerr, N.R. 2009 'From necessity to hope: A continental perspective on eschatology without telos', *The Heythrop Journal of Philosophy and Theology*, pp. 948 65.

Slater, D. 1985 'Social movements and a recasting of the political'. In D. Slater (ed.) *New Social Movements and the State in Latin America*, CEDLA: 1-25.

Stahler-Sholk, R. 2007 'Resisting Neoliberal Hegemonization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement', Latin American Perspectives 34, 48-63.

Subcomandante Marcos 1997 'The Seven Loose Pieces of the Global Jigsaw Puzzle' http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/1997/jigsaw.html

Stahler-Sholk, R. 2007 'Resisting Neoliberal Hegemonization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement', Latin American Perspectives 34, 48-63.

WorldWatch Institute 2010 *2010 State of the World: Transforming Cultures. From Consumerism to Sustainability*. Available online at http://www.worldwatch.org/sow10

Zournazi, M. 2002 *Hope: New Philosophies for Change*. Annadale,, New South Wales: Pluto Press

Žižek S. 2000 *Looking Awry*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

The Centre for Development Studies (CDS), University of Bath

The Centre for Development Studies aims to contribute to combating global poverty and inequality through primary research into the practical realities of global poverty; and, critical engagement with development practice and policy making. The CDS currently publishes two working paper series: Bath Papers in International Development (BPD) and the Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) Working Paper Series.

Bath Papers in International Development (BPD)

Bath Papers in International Development publishes research and policy analysis by scholars and development practitioners in the CDS and its wider network. Submissions to the BPD series are encouraged; submissions should be directed to the Series Editor, and will be subject to a blind peer review process prior to acceptance.

Series Editor: Graham K. Brown

Website: http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/bpd

Email: bpd-editor@bath.ac.uk

1. Financial access and exclusion in Kenya and Uganda
   Susan Johnson, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath; and,
   Max Niño-Zarazua, Independent Consultant, Mexico City

2. Financial inclusion, vulnerability, and mental models: From physical access to effective use of financial services in a low-income area of Mexico City
   Max Niño-Zarazua, Independent Consultant, Mexico City; and,
   James G. Copestake, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

3. Legible pluralism: The politics of ethnic and religious identification in Malaysia
   Graham K. Brown, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

4. Contesting the boundaries of religion in social mobilization
   Graham K. Brown, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath,
   Séverine Deneulin, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath; and,
   Joseph Devine, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

5. The politics of financial policy making in a developing country: The Financial Institutions Act in Thailand
   Arissara Painmanakul, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

6. 'Get to the bridge and I will help you cross': Merit, personal connections, and money as routes to success in Nigerian higher education
   Chris Willott, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

7. The role of informal groups in financial markets: Evidence from Kenya
   Susan Johnson, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath,
   Markku Malkamäki, Decentralised Financial Services Project, Kenya; and,
   Max Niño-Zarazua, Independent Consultant, Mexico City

8. Hope movements: Social movements in the pursuit of development
   Séverine Deneulin, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath; and,
   Ana C. Dinerstein, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

9. The political economy of secessionism: Inequality, identity and the state
   Graham K. Brown, Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath

10. Does modernity still matter? Evaluating the concept of multiple modernities and its alternatives
    Elsje Fourie, University of Trento

11. Côte d'Ivoire's elusive quest for peace
    Arnim Langer, Centre for Peace Research and Strategic Studies, University of Leuven

12. The role of social resources in securing life and livelihood in rural Afghanistan
    Paula Kantor, International Centre for Research on Women; and,
    Adam Pain, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit

Wellbeing in Development Countries (WeD) Working Paper Series

The WeD Working Paper Series publishes work that advances research on wellbeing in developing countries. If you wish to submit a paper to the series, please send it to Séverine Deneulin. Manuscripts, which should be maximum 10,000 words and which should not have been previously published elsewhere, will be submitted to a peer review process prior to publication.

Website: http://www.welldev.org.uk/wedworkingpapers.htm

Email: S.Deneulin@bath.ac.uk