1
Introduction: The New Local Politics of Democratisation

John Harriss, Kristian Stokke and Olle Törnquist

Contemporary discourses about the politics of developing countries have brought together an unlikely set of bedfellows. Intellectuals and policy actors whose ideas are rooted in very different values and theoretical assumptions nonetheless converge around the view that there is a 'new politics' grounded in *local* political spaces and practices. The circumstances are those of globalisation, a diverse set of phenomena which include – or so it is argued – a hollowing out of nation states, in the sense that certain regulatory capacities have been reduced and transferred to institutions operating primarily at global or local scales (Jessop 2002). Simultaneously, local identities and identity politics are constructed anew in a context of global transformations (Appadurai 1996). Thus what some have labelled 'glocalisation' – simultaneous globalisation and localisation processes – is reconfiguring politics (Cox 1997). These transformations are also reflected in development theories and practices, which have increasingly turned to the 'local' as a prime site of development in the context of globalisation.

The dominantly liberal discourse emanating from the World Bank is one powerful voice expressing this idea, but there are remarkably comparable views being articulated by intellectuals who may be described as 'post-structuralists'. Meanwhile there are significant thinkers and activists from the left who advocate what appear to be similar ideas. All these groups of actors share a conception of the vitalisation of democracy (or the establishment of more meaningful alternatives to it) through popular participation in local public spheres.[1] Part of our purpose here is to tease out the significant differences between the ideas of these different groups of thinkers and policy actors; and then through the various chapters of

this book to subject them to *political* analysis, taking account of the ways in which local politics work in different contexts in developing countries. These politics are characterised by 'changing continuities' (a phrase that we take from the chapter by Henk Schulte Nordholt). In other words previously existing structures of thought and action exercise a persisting influence upon the politics of the present and constrain (though they do not exclude) possibilities of change.

Localisation of politics in the context of globalisation

The contemporary world is characterised by both globalisation and *localisation of politics*.[2] Local politics have usually been given little attention within development studies; and local authorities, identities and associations used to be seen as traditional features or colonial constructions that would dissolve with modernisation and post-colonial state building. This reasoning reappeared in the 1990s through analyses that portray globalisation as a homogenising force that subordinates people and states everywhere to the global market and thereby eradicates local distinctiveness. Contrary to these expectations, however, localisation of politics has proved to be a product of modernity and an integral part of globalisation and the associated restructuring of nation-states.

Globalisation[3] processes are important, complex and contradictory features of the contemporary world that integrate some states, economies and societies into global networks and flows while marginalising others. Contrary to one popular belief globalisation does not mean the end of sovereign states and of politics, but rather open-ended transformations of state power and politics. Under pressure from global market forces and neo-liberal discourses, many states are undergoing transformations towards *de-statisation* (i.e. reduced state authority in favour of market liberalisation) and towards *de-nationalisation* (i.e. scalar reconfiguration of state power in favour of regionalisation and localisation). This means that political authority is becoming increasingly diffused among state, market and civil society actors at local, national, regional and global scales (Jessop 2002).

In terms of the scale of politics, a dual movement can be observed. On the one hand, the role of supranational institutions is increasing. Formal institutions at global and regional levels – such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation, United Nations, the World Bank and Regional Development Banks – exercise considerable power over the institutions and peoples of the South. They do this largely through economic and legal instruments but also through

discursive power. These institutions create and sustain political and discursive frames for thinking and acting, frames which are strongly influenced by a technocratic and apolitical approach that is itself rooted in the most powerful global institution of all – the market (McNeill and Bøås 2003).

On the other hand, the local level of politics is also becoming more prominent. Localisation of politics is mediated through *institutional reforms* towards decentralisation, local democratisation and good governance, *development discourses* on local participation and civil society, and localised *political mobilisation* around local, national and global issues. The last two decades have seen a renewed interest among national governments and international development agencies in administrative decentralisation, i.e. a deliberate transfer of responsibilities from central state institutions to local state institutions (deconcentration) and to non-state actors (privatisation). There has also been an added emphasis in recent years on political decentralisation (devolution) of authority to local governments (Crook and Manor 1998, Olowu 2001). Such reforms are coupled with development discourses that emphasise local partnerships between actors in state, market and society. The common assumption is that mutually enabling relations between decentralised state institutions, local businesses and civil associations will generate economic growth, poverty alleviation and good governance.

There are few critical analyses of whether this localisation actually generates the expected outcomes, especially in terms of democratisation. Existing studies commonly emphasise the crafting of local institutions of governance and downplay local politics. This collection aims at filling this gap. Our purpose is to examine the conjunction of discourses and institutions that define local political spaces and the political practices of actors operating within these spaces, with a special emphasis on the implications of local politics for democratisation.

Democratic transitions in the context of globalisation

These processes of globalisation and localisation of politics coincide and relate to contemporary democratic transitions, what Samuel Huntington famously described as 'the third wave of democratisation' (Huntington 1991).[4] One set of calculations shows that 69 per cent of the countries of the world had authoritarian regimes in 1975, while only 24 per cent could be described as liberal democracies. By 1995 these proportions stood at 26 per cent and 48 per cent respectively. The proportion of countries that could be described as being liberal democracies had doubled over

20 years (Potter 1997). Another calculation is that 'In the 1980s and 1990s...some 81 countries took significant steps towards democracy' (UNDP 2002: 1). In some ways the occurrence of this wave of democratisation (meaning, simply, 'political changes moving in a democratic direction': Potter 1997: 3)[5] is surprising, since those social conditions that have been most important historically in bringing about democracy seem to have been *reduced* by globalisation, and they have certainly not very commonly been present in the countries that have undergone some degree of democratisation.[6] One recent account of the major theoretical approaches to the explanation of patterns of democratisation distinguishes the 'modernisation' approach, the 'structural' approach and the 'transition' approach (Potter 1997; Törnquist 1999). The first of these, exemplified in the work of Seymour Lipset (1959), focuses on socio-economic development and suggests that economic development and widespread higher education are conducive to democratisation, partly because they strengthen the 'moderate' middle class. Yet a good many of the countries that have experienced democratisation in the 'third wave' had not previously been doing at all well in terms of economic development, and their middle classes were not always expanding. At least one country, Indonesia, actually saw movement away from democracy during the period (of the New Order regime of President Soeharto) in which economic development accelerated and the middle class grew in significance. There the members of the middle classes mostly supported an authoritarian regime (Törnquist 2000). In the worlds' largest democracy India, moreover, while people from lower castes and classes are increasingly active in elections the middle classes are not. Rather they seem to bank on a combination of market driven politics and the reinvention of reactionary forms of democracy, including manipulation of religious and ethnic loyalties. (Hansen 1999; Corbridge and Harriss 2000).

The second, 'structural' approach, exemplified in the work of Barrington Moore (1966), and following him in that of Rueschemeyer *et al.* (1992), emphasises changing structures of class, state and transnational power. While Moore's dictum 'no bourgeoisie, no democracy' has been almost as problematic in Third World contexts as the modernisation and middle class thesis, Rueschemeyer *et al.* argue that a shift in the balance of class power in a society towards the working classes creates structural conditions that have, historically, been favourable to the development of democracy. Yet this has not been true of most of the countries that have recently experienced democratisation, and indeed it is very widely held that the circumstances of globalisation towards the end of the 20th century have quite seriously weakened the organised working class.

These circumstances have also hollowed out the state and reduced the significance of programmatic political parties, which historically have been further conditions of democratisation on the basis of popular interests (Castells 1996; Therborn 2001; Held and McGrew 2002; Scholte 2000). In his chapter, Beckman actually questions this pessimistic view with regard to labour. From a poor country perspective, he argues, capitalist relations of production are spreading; expansion of wage labour is taking place, and not just the marginalisation of many people but also the growth of huge new workplaces This is not necessarily taking place in all areas but it is in strategic sectors. And workers are indeed interested in basic civil and political rights, if for no other reason than in order to fight for their own so-called special interests. For some analysts, promising tendencies are found in on-going transformations of organised labour struggles towards *social movement unionism* (Munck 2002). This refers to attempts to link old and new movements in global and local labour and community struggles. These are based on broad conceptions of who the working people are and seek to break down binary oppositions between workplace and community, between economic and political struggles and between formal-sector workers and the working poor. Chapter 6 by Stokke and Oldfield discusses some opportunities and constraints in such local community-centred struggles for livelihood and against global neo-liberalism.

The apparent weaknesses, however, of both the modernisation and the structural approaches for the explanation of the third wave of democratisation have certainly contributed to the ascendancy in the contemporary literature of the 'transition' approach, exemplified in the work of O'Donnell and Schmitter (1986), Linz and Stepan (1996) and others, which focuses on the agency of political elites.[7] Democracy is here conceptualised as a set of government institutions and procedures (rather than 'rule by the people') that are negotiated between political leaders, especially between reformers within an authoritarian regime and moderate dissidents. This theory lends support to the notion that democracy can be 'crafted' because the political alliances that are conducive to democratisation can be encouraged by internationally promoted policy interventions in support of 'good governance', including privatisation and decentralisation, and the strengthening of civil society.[8]

As is often the case, the strength of one approach is the weakness of the other. Whereas the structure-oriented approaches provide limited insight into context-specific actors and processes (as illustrated by the failure to account for recent democratic transitions) the actor-oriented approach does not pay sufficient attention to structural contexts and constraints

(as illustrated by their difficulties in explaining different experiences with democratic consolidation). Both remain largely within the confines of the self-contained territorial nation-state and pay scant attention to the role of processes at other scales (Whitehead 2002).[9] Following from such shortcomings, it can be argued that studies of democratisation should broaden the understanding of both *democracy* and of the *dynamics of democratisation*. On the first issue, the minimalist definition of 'formal' democracy as the regular holding of relatively free and fair elections should be replaced with a broader 'substantial' definition that emphasises the introduction of democratic principles, institutions and citizenship rights (Beetham 1999; Grugel 2002; Törnquist 2002b). This means that the test for democracy is not about the existence of formal democratic rights and institutions, but whether they have real meaning for people. On the second issue, current theories of democratisation should be replaced with more holistic approaches, focusing on how collective and individual actors engage in struggles to transform authoritarian states and build democracy but also how they are enabled and constrained by structured environments. This yields an analytical focus on (1) *the state* as an arena, an actor and an outcome of democratic transitions; (2) *civil society* as the space where associations and individuals can hold the state accountable and join in struggles for citizenship rights, and; (3) *globalisation* as the contemporary structural context for democratic transitions (Grugel 2002). Regarding the aforementioned question about the link between economic development and democratisation, it can now be observed that the global political economy of the present period reduces the political and economic options available to developing states, as it facilitates and demands transitions to a hegemonic model of economic liberalisation coupled with formal liberal democracy. This has led some observers to describe the new liberal democratic regimes in many African countries as 'choiceless democracies' (Mkandawire 1999), i.e. formal liberal democracies but with limited capacity to deepen democratisation in the context of economic globalisation and structural adjustment.

Approaching local democratic participation

'Crafting' democracy as participation

The possibility of crafting of democracy is very clearly reflected in the pronouncements of the most influential voice in international development, that of the World Bank – which is, we have argued, the voice of

liberalism (or what is often but unnecessarily qualified as 'neo-liberalism'). The high water mark of economic liberalism in development policies, and the 'rolling back' of the state that economic liberalism advocated, was reached in the 1980s. By the 1990s it was recognised that the policies of economic liberalism, implemented in stabilisation and structural adjustment programmes, were failing partly because of failures of government. In 1992 the World Bank published a paper on *Governance and Development* in which it began to lay out a new approach, summarised as follows by Lewis Preston, then the President of the Bank, in his Forword to the paper:

> Good governance is an essential complement to sound economic policies. Efficient and accountable management by the public sector and a predictable and transparent policy framework are critical to the efficiency of markets and governments, and hence to economic development. The World Bank's increasing attention to issues of governance is an important part of our efforts to promote equitable and sustainable development (World Bank 1992: v).

'Good governance' – understandably, in view of the World Bank's formally non-political role – was defined in technical, managerialist terms. It involved, as well as 'sound public sector management', establishing a strong legal framework for development, and mechanisms for securing transparency and accountability. Though it might have been expected that the role of democratisation would have entered into the consideration of 'good governance', it did not – and, on the face of it, still does not. A great deal of information about governance, which it identifies as a 'hot topic', is readily available on the World Bank's website, but there is very little there about democracy.[10] The major statement that appeared in the *World Development Report* of 1997, particularly in chapter 7 of that Report, entitled 'Bringing the State Closer to People', more or less assumed the existence of electoral democracy. But perhaps because of a recognition of the limitations of 'electoral democracy', the Bank's real focus turned out to be 'participatory mechanisms' that are represented as extending and going beyond the limits of representative, electoral democracy. It is argued, for instance, that 'In most societies, democratic or not, citizens seek representation of their interests beyond the ballot as taxpayers, as users of public services, and increasingly as clients or members of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and voluntary associations. Against a backdrop of competing social demands, rising expectations and variable government performance, these expressions

of voice and participation are on the rise' (World Bank 1997: 113).[11] The World Bank has thus come to identify as a key element in good governance citizen participation, seen as being articulated by and through NGOs and a variety of local associations, which are in turn held to constitute civil society. It is also argued that the differences that exist between societies in terms of 'the depth and intensity of popular collective action' may be explained in terms of 'differing endowments of *social capital*, the informal rules, norms and long-term relationships that facilitate coordinated action' (World Bank 1997: 114, see also World Bank 2000; UNDP 2002). Thus the Bank has come to emphasise in its rhetoric, and to a much more limited extent in its practices (Bebbington *et al.*, forthcoming), a set of closely connected and partly overlapping concepts – participation, civil society and social capital – that are frequently associated empirically with NGOs and local voluntary associations, within the framework of decentralised and to a large extent also privatised government and administration. These concepts are in the end represented as standing in the place of what may be described as 'conventional' democratic politics, in which different interests and values are aggregated and articulated by political parties. It is a society-centred perspective which, as we have argued before, represents a 'depoliticised' view of processes of social change (Törnquist 1999; Mohan and Stokke 2000; Harriss 2002). These ideas hold out the prospect of a democracy with substance and depth but without political competition or conflict between different social groups and classes. It is this very particular construction of an increasingly unconstitutional, de-institutionalised and de-politicised democracy, created through the crafting of local organisations and facilitated by NGOs, which is now seen as being a condition both for 'good governance' and for successful economic development.

'Radical polycentrism'

Another interpretation of the perspective presented by the Bank is that it sensibly reflects the 'new politics' of the present – the politics of new social movements, of civic activism and of NGOs – as opposed to the 'old politics' of the labour movement and of programmatic political parties. This 'new politics' has been described by Peter Houtzager in terms of 'radical polycentrism': 'a loosely bounded set of ideas and beliefs that the uncoordinated and highly decentralised actions of civil society entities, market actors and local government agents are engaged in a mutually reinforcing movement to produce all good things for all people' (compare the normative arguments of UNDP 2002). Houtzager continues: 'both neo-liberal [e.g. World Bank] and post-structuralist development

discourse and practice are radically polycentric and share a strong belief in the ability of local-level associational activity...to solve an ever-expanding list of problems'.[12]

The 'post-structuralist' discourse highlights the multitude of collective struggles around culturally constructed identities. Such movements are commonly portrayed as forms of resistance against the state and the market and are said to operate outside major political alignments and the formal political sphere (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Shiva 1989; Escobar and Alvares 1992; Alvarez, *et al.* 1998). Thus, local civil society is conceptualised as a relatively autonomous site of resistance, while broader material and political processes are analytically marginalised (Mohan and Stokke 2000). Arturo Escobar's (1995) well-known critique of state-sponsored development is a strong statement along these lines (for a discussion see Corbridge 1998). Focusing on the power of representations, he argues that the development discourse suppresses local cultures, identities and histories and thus functions as mechanisms of oppression. This produces various forms of cultural resistance (e.g. grassroots movements and local knowledge) that entail a search for radical *alternatives to development* rather than simply more appropriate *development alternatives*. Amongst the 'post-structuralists' are also those in the diverse group of Indian scholars whom Bardhan (1997) calls the 'anarcho-communitarians', including Ashis Nandy, Rajni Kothari, and Partha Chatterjee, who are critical of the centralising and elitist character of the modernising state – which is not changed, they hold, by the institutions of liberal democracy. They too defend aspects of 'tradition' and espouse the cause of decentralised, autonomous community-based development.

The literature on social movements and resistance in civil society brings forth the issues of scale that we have discussed with reference to localisation of politics in the context of globalisation. For many post-structuralist thinkers answers to the problems of creating meaningful democracy and development in the context of globalisation are sought in local communities and their resistance from below. This poses the problem of breaking out of localism and scaling up place-based struggles to challenge the state or the global market in significant ways. For others, like Mary Kaldor in her book *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War* (2003) the answers are sought in what she calls the 'activist' vision of global civil society, which is 'about the empowerment of individuals and the extension of democracy...about "civilizing" or democratising globalisation, about the process through which groups, movements and individuals can demand a global rule of law, global justice and global

empowerment' (2003: 12). The actual civic organisations, social movements and transnational networks that constitute her global civil society, however, should have roots and bases in local public spheres as well as involving new actors who have 'found it possible and necessary to make alliances across borders and to address not just the state but international institutions as well' (2003: 76). Kaldor quite fairly distinguishes this vision of global civil society from the 'neo-liberal' version propounded by the World Bank. Yet it too is in some senses a depoliticising discourse, as Neera Chandhoke has argued, certainly if international NGOs and transnational movements come to represent the poor people of the 'Third World'. These organisations may be quite effective but does their activity 'substitute for the activity we call politics?', Chandhoke asks, when 'to be politicised is to acquire consciousness that collective endeavours offer possibilities of self-realisation' (2002: 47). She worries that what the development of global civil society actually connotes is 'the collapse of the idea that ordinary men and women are capable of appropriating the political initiative' (2002: 47) (and so of moving towards the realisation of democratic values). Kaldor surely does not envisage that global civil society, as she defines it, works in this way, but Chandhoke's concerns are justified because of the concentration in Kaldor's work on transnational actors.[13]

The worries of Houtzager, Chandhoke and others are further substantiated in Törnquist's case studies of popular politics of democratisation (2002b and Chapter 9 in this book). In Kerala, Indonesia and the Philippines, alike, he finds those he describes as 'fragmented prodemocrats'. Their efforts tend to suffer, on the one hand, from the lack of linkage between civil and political society activism at both central and local levels and, on the other hand, divisive politicisation of single issues, special interests and identities.

Experiments in popular democracy

There are some continuities between Kaldor's arguments and those of another distinct group of thinkers and political actors, coming (like her) from the left, but who have responded to the crisis of confidence within the political left – arising from recognition of the failures of statist projects of social transformation – by proposing new 'transformative democratic strategies'. This is the phrase of Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright who have advanced ideas about what they refer to as 'empowered participatory governance' (Fung and Wright 2003a). Comparable ideas are found also in the recent work of Leonardo Avritzer (2002), writing about Brazil, and in that of Hilary Wainwright (2003) who brings together experience

both from Brazil and from the United Kingdom. Interestingly and significantly, all these writers – Fung and Wright, Avritzer and Wainwright – refer extensively to the experience of Participatory Budgeting in Brazil, especially in the southern Brazilian city of Porto Alegre.

The challenge for the left, Fung and Wright say, is 'to develop transformative democratic strategies that can advance our traditional values – egalitarian social justice, individual liberty combined with popular control over collective decisions, and the flourishing of individuals in ways which enable them to realise their potentials' (2003a: 5). With their co-workers, they have analysed several recent attempts to realise such strategies, including the People's Planning Campaign in Kerala (which is also the subject of Chapter 5 by Tharakan and, in part, of Chapters 1 and 9 by Törnquist in this book) and the experience of Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre (referred to here in Schönleitner's chapter), as well as initiatives in North America. All of them involve action in local political spheres. There are three principles, they find, that are common to the democratic experiments that they have studied: they have a practical orientation, focussing on specific, tangible problems; they involve ordinary people who are affected by these problems and the officials who are close to them; and they involve the *deliberative* development of solutions to these problems. They represent, indeed, attempts to realise the idea of deliberative democracy, in which, it is held, by coming together and discussing the ideas and interests which they bring to public decision-making, it is possible for people to arrive at those decisions through a consensual process rather than by majority voting. It involves an idea of bargaining as taking place through conversation, much of which necessarily takes place in local public fora, requiring 'civility' (or respect for others' positions and values), and the application of reason, rather than the conflict of interests alone. 'In deliberative decision-making, (say Fung and Wright) participants listen to each other's positions and generate group choices after due consideration . . . (and although) . . . (r)eal world deliberations are often characterised by heated conflict, winners and losers (the) important feature of genuine deliberation is that participants find reasons that they can accept in collective actions, not necessarily that they completely endorse the action or find it maximally advantageous' (2003a: 19). There is an important assumption here that it is possible for individuals, through reasoned deliberation, to transform their preferences. Attempts to realise deliberative democracy, however, in common with democracy in general, confront the problem of inequality. Fung and Wright clearly recognise the danger that 'some participants will use their power to manipulate

and enhance positions motivated by particularistic interests' (2003a: 20) and they argue that the chances that institutions designed to establish deliberative democracy will actually have their desired effects 'depends significantly upon the balances of power between actors. . . . When individuals cannot dominate others to secure their first best preference they are often more willing to deliberate' (2003a: 26). A fundamental question in regard to the sort of 'deepening' of democracy that Fung and Wright envisage, therefore, is that of what really determines this balance of power.

Let us ground this discussion by referring further to the example of Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre and elsewhere in Brazil (Abers 2000; Baiocchi 2001). This is an important case, as we mentioned, for Fung and Wright, and also for Leonardo Avritzer – whose work is discussed in Schönleitner's chapter in this book. Avritzer's starting point is with the view that the 'transition' theory of democratisation that has been especially well developed in regard to Latin America, and which – as a version of the theory of democratic elitism[14] – privileges the role of political elites, does not account for nor recognise the significance of recent popular political movements. He refers to the emergence of democratic forms of collective action in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, in the human rights movement, in urban social movements which have, he says 'challenged one of the region's most deeply ingrained traditions – the idea that material improvements for ordinary citizens represent favors to be delivered by elite political mediators' (2002: 5), and the *Alianza Civica* in Mexico, created in response to citizen concerns about electoral fraud. These show, Avritzer thinks, the potential that is there for establishing what he refers to as 'public space' and a form of popular democracy that goes well beyond competition between elites: it is 'a conception that links the emergence of political democracy to the formation of a *public space in which citizens can participate as equals*, and by arguing ['deliberating'] about collective projects for society, guide formal decision-making' (2002: 5, emphasis added). Elsewhere he says that he aims to develop 'a theory of democratisation based on the construction of what I call participatory publics' (2002: 35) – and the idea of 'participatory publics' clearly implies public deliberation over political matters in the local political sphere. Indeed Avritzer's 'public space' requires the existence of public fora where face-to-face deliberation can take place. A concrete case of the creation of what he means by public space is in the experience of Participatory Budgeting (PB). Here, building (according to Avritzer's account) on initiatives made in the first place by The Union of Neighbourhood Associations of Porto Alegre, the

Workers' Party (*Partido dos Trabhalhadores*, or PT), once it had secured office in the municipal government, has established a set of arrangements whereby it is possible for large numbers of people to join in deliberation and decision-making on public projects and investments, and to monitor their outcomes. The People's Planning Campaign in Kerala attempted very much the same thing. What is distinctive about PB in Porto Alegre for Avritzer – and what helps to make it such an important experiment – is that it involves deliberation and institutional mechanisms which connect that 'public reasoning' with the political system in a way that is stronger than just 'influence',[15] whilst not conflating deliberation with administration (which is the critical failing of many attempts at realising 'participation').

Avritzer's work combines positive analysis and normative reasoning in such a way that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the one from the other. He aims to show that democratic collective action, within Latin American societies, has opened a space for political participation and challenged 'traditional (hierarchical and clientelist) understandings of politics' (2002: 3), and that there are institutional designs (as in PB) whereby the democratic practices that have emerged may be linked into the political system: there are ways, then, of transferring 'democratic potentials that emerge at the societal level to the political arena through participatory designs' (2002: 9) – and ultimately perhaps of changing the entire political culture. But he also recognises the potential or actual conflict between the kind of democratic action that he analyses – and this normative understanding of democratisation – and the old clientelist structures and hierarchical culture of Latin American politics. The demands that have arisen within Latin American societies come into conflict with 'political society', as for instance in Brazil and Mexico, where 'The autonomy of neighbourhood associations and the public presentation of demands were undermined by the reintroduction of clientelism, which became [once again] one of the principal ways of building political majorities' (2002: 7).

A realistic assessment, therefore, of the prospects for the sort of participatory deliberative democracy that Avritzer advocates, and that may have been realised in Porto Alegre and in some other cases (Fung and Wright 2001; Wainwright 2003), calls for analysis of the politics of the local political sphere. As a matter of fact, in several of the cases that seem to have worked (like Porto Alegre) or to have had some limited success (such as the People's Planning Campaign in Kerala) the role of political vehicles that have successfully mobilised people from the lower classes – and hence shifted the balance of social power – seems to

have been one of the crucial factors. In Porto Alegre, which, like Brazil in general is marked by considerable inequality, it is hard to imagine that the condition that Avritzer identifies as being necessary – the creation of 'a public space in which citizens can participate as equals' – would have been satisfied without the securing of political power in the city by the PT and then the progressive top-down measures from the mayor's office, at the expense of the elected but often clientelistic councillors. Similarly, according to Tharakan and Törnquist, radical civil society activists in Kerala would never have been able to launch the massive People's Planning Campaign had it not been for successful simultaneous engagement and partial support from the Left Front government – particularly sections of the CPI-M – and access to the powerful state planning board. Unhappily, it was also other sections of the party and of the Left, in this case, that hijacked some parts of the Campaign, bringing them within the framework of conventional clientelistic polit-ics and thus contributing to its undermining. But there is no question that the role of the PT in Porto Alegre, or of politically organised activ-ists in Kerala contradicts Avritzer's idea that democratic forces arise from within society and have to be transmitted into the political system or into 'political society', when it seems quite clear that without the commitment of the political parties and activists in these cases public space would not have been opened up at all.[16] It surely remains a moot point as to whether it is ever possible to establish deliberative structures in a social context where a small number of relatively powerful people can exercise dominance and so 'secure their first best preferences' (Fung and Wright, quoted above); and a moot point, too, as to whether the kind of civility, or civic values that are an essential aspect of public deliberation are produced by the deliberative process or are instead a precondition for it.

'New politics' and the agenda of the book

The discourses that Houtzager labels as those of 'radical polycentrism' – whether of the liberals or the post-structuralists – evade the problem of power. They sideline, if they do not altogether ignore the role of political society, including political parties that negotiate between and aggregate together different interests and values, and contend for the authority to make decisions on matters of public importance. It is true that political activists, in turn, may be elitist and lack genuine bases on the ground, in civil society. But a major problem seems to be that of what Törnquist calls 'pro-democratic fragmentation', when there are insufficient links between civic and political activism, as well as divisive single issues,

interests and identities. On the other hand, the thinkers and activists from the left to whose ideas on popular democracy we have referred, do recognise the need for links between civic and political activism and the generation of common agendas. Their main strategy is to facilitate and design the best possible public spaces for popular deliberation. But it is far from clear how it is possible to create those spaces in the first place, and then actually to practice 'deliberation', given the balance of power in most societies.

Public decision making through deliberation may sometimes be possible, but collective action in any society invariably involves contention – and that means what is generally understood as 'politics' (which begins whenever two or more people try to realise some objective together). This is brushed away in much of the society-centric discourse about participation and civil society, and in discourses about community. Of course there are new trends and features in contemporary politics. It probably is true that workplaces are less significant political arenas than they were, and communities more so; there are 'new' social movements; and there is a congeries of new types of associations, including the burgeoning numbers of NGOs in many countries. But there is still no substitute for a citizen based state and independent political vehicles. It is theoretically misleading to try to conceptualise 'civil society' except in relation to the state (Chandhoke 2002). As a matter of historical fact, significant developments in civil society in the best studied cases of the United States (Skocpol 1992; Fiorina and Skocpol 1999) and of Italy (Tarrow 1994) seem to have *followed from* rather than to have given rise to significant developments through state and politics. The reality and the possibilities of substantial democratisation – movement towards people's capacity actually to make use of democratic means to promote democratic ends (in Törnquist's terminology in Chapter 9 in this book) – necessarily involves citizens who are made politically equal by meaningful constitutional rights and institutions, and who as actors and agents of political society are in contention for the authority to make public decisions. Whereas much of the mainstream development discourse (including, ironically, that of the critics of 'development') is marked by a strong tendency to essentialise and romanticise local communities, and to downplay questions of citizenship and power (and inequality), the aim of this book is to develop critical examinations specifically of local power relations and politics. All the chapters of the book have an analytical focus, first, on the factors that may open up local political spaces so as to create what Avritzer describes as 'public space', and, secondly on the factors that influence the capacities of actors to make

use of and further improve the rights and institutions within these spaces – thereby furthering a process of substantial democratisation.

Analysing local politics and democratisation

Our discussion points to a need to understand the local politics of democratisation in relational and contextual terms. Our approach to the analysis of local politics and democratisation combines analysis of the balance of power with that of the ways in which actors try to master and alter those conditions by employing and developing, or avoiding and undermining democratic instruments in local and non-local political spaces.

An illustrative way of conceptualising power relations is suggested by a reading of the work of Pierre Bourdieu (Stokke 2002).[17] Bourdieu – as a theoretician of power – seeks to conceptualise both the structural balance of power and the practices of actors. Three core concepts in Bourdieu's (1990, 1991) work are those, first, of 'habitus', second, his particular conception of 'capital', and thirdly the idea of a social 'field'. Bourdieu uses the term 'habitus' to refer to 'dispositions' – or internalised norms, understandings and patterns of behaviour – which clearly differ from one group of people to another. They are acquired, structured and durable and they establish classificatory principles and organising principles of action that in turn generate 'practice', in different social fields. A 'field', for Bourdieu, is a relational space of positions, occupied by actors, and the forces, or relations of power obtaining between those positions. Both 'positions' and 'forces', the key aspects of any social field, are defined – in turn – by the various forms of capital: *economic capital* (material wealth in the form of property, money, etc.),[18] *social capital* (social resources in the form of networks and contacts based on mutual recognition) and *cultural capital* (informational assets in the forms of knowledge and skills acquired through socialisation and education).These fundamental forms of capital are different forms of power, and they are convertible, the one to another. The most powerful conversion to be made is to a fourth form of capital: *symbolic capital* (meaning legitimate authority in the form of prestige, honour and reputation). This is of central importance in any political field for legitimate authority implies above all the power to create the 'official version of the social world'. People's actions, then, and their strategies, derive from their dispositions and their positions (implying access to different forms and combinations of capital) in the social field, and their perceptions of it. 'Practice', over time, may bring about change in both the constitution of the field and in habitus.

Bourdieu's idea of 'habitus' may be understood in terms of the more familiar concepts of 'institutions' and 'culture'. When Bourdieu talks of 'dispositions', as we have explained, he is referring to structured patterns of behaviour and the norms and understandings associated with them. He implies the existence of 'institutions', or the formal and informal rules that constrain and facilitate human action and social interaction, and 'culture', or the habits of thought and behaviour, and the meaning underlying them, that are characteristic of a particular group of people. Understood in this way the two terms have inter-linking or partly over-lapping meanings. Formal, particularly legal rules and contracts are always and necessarily 'embedded in deep, informal social strata, often involving such factors as trust, duty and obligation (so that) a formal contract always takes on the particular hue of the informal social culture in which it is embedded' (Hodgson 2001: 304) Mamdani's account (1996) of the construction of 'Indirect Rule' in Africa shows just this kind of complex relationship between legal institutions and an informal social culture in which they are embedded, and which they were both influenced by and also contributed to forming. In colonial and post-colonial Africa the distinction between customary law and 'modern' law has clearly been of fundamental significance in defining the political terrain. The power of the native chiefs in local politics arises from the establishment of customary law. While certain political and public spaces were generated among the usually urban white settlers-cum-citizens, and while these spaces were later on 'africanised' in the process of national independence, little changed with regard to the indirectly ruled majority of the population. They generally remained, as they had been in the colonial era, 'subjects' rather than citizens. Without major changes in these respects it may be counterproductive to craft decentralisation, civil society and electoral democracies. Nordholt (in this volume) develops a comparable argument in relation to the current process of decentralisation in Indonesia. With regard to Latin America, too, it has been argued that 'the development of Latin American societies always involved different combinations of traditions, in particular different combinations of universalism with the specific particularisms formed in the region prior to its encounter with the main Western tradition' (Avritzer 2002: 70).

The institutional and cultural context (habitus) and *the balance of social power* in a political field are intrinsically inter-related. Political fields are according to Bourdieu characterised by a competition for the legitimate right to speak on behalf of others. Positions as spokespersons may be based on personal symbolic capital (e.g. fame, honour and popularity), but

more significantly reside within state institutions and political parties and are granted to individuals as representatives. This means that the balance of power in local political spheres will influence and be influenced by the resources (in terms of different forms of capital) of political institutions and actors and the relations among them.

This provides some critical guidelines for analyses of local politics. The possibilities for strategic practices within a political field are shaped, in the first place, by the institutional and cultural constitution of political spheres and by the balance of power within these. The fundamental question, then, is what social movement analysts call the 'political opportunity structure' – referring to opportunities and hindrances such as the degree of openness of the political field, the presence of allies and the risk of repression. Bourdieu's focus on institutionalised political capital highlights the critical role of political parties. Whether or not political parties have programmatic ideologies, whether they have symbolic power, and whether or not they are themselves institutionalised and embedded in local communities, are factors of wide significance. In Brazil the Workers' Party is now institutionalised in a way that the right wing parties are not. In India, similarly, the left parties have organisation and an institutionalised presence, certainly in the states of Kerala and West Bengal, that other parties generally do not have.[19] This is likely to make a considerable difference, in fact, to the nature and functioning of civil society organisations. Houtzager, Lavalle and Acharya, for example, report from recent research in Sao Paulo that 'the actors most likely to participate [in the institutional arrangements recently established for citizen participation] are those with institutionalised ties to two traditional political actors – political parties and the state. Ties to unions and the Catholic Church, however, do not affect civil society actors' propensity to participate' (Houtzager *et al.* 2003: 5–6). Similarly, as is shown in the chapters by Tharakan and Törnquist, while it is true that the development of the relatively vibrant associational life of Kerala is rooted in the socio-religious organisations of the 19th century that fought caste dominance and demanded equal rights, the development of more universalistic solidarities and wider mass movements came with the growth of class-based movements and organising amongst socialists and communists – since the mid-1960s mainly that of the CPI-M. The extent and nature of political competition is another vitally important factor. Heller has shown how political competition has influenced the extent and character of democratic decentralisation in Porto Alegre and Kerala on the one hand as compared with South Africa on the other. The compulsions of political competition drove the Workers' Party in Porto Alegre and a substantial

number of members of the CPI-M in Kerala to try to reach out to new political constituencies through decentralisation, whereas, he argues, 'in the absence of countervailing forces, either in the form of viable opposition parties or autonomous social movements the African National Congress has succumbed to the centralising and autocratic tendencies of the iron law of oligarchy' (Heller 2001: 157).

Bourdieu's concrete studies focus mainly on the powers and practices of dominating forces. He rarely conceptualised and studied – although he actively supported – the efforts of dominated groups. This means that his work provides more insight into the mechanisms and continuities of domination than into processes and moments of transformation. A fundamental question then is how actors strategise to increase their capacity to pursue democratic objectives within a political field. Törnquist (1999, 2002a) argues that three sets of factors are especially important in studies of the strategies and capacities of different political actors.

The first set of factors addresses the location of political actors in political and other fields: where are different groups active in the political terrain of state, business, self-managed units and, in between them, the public sphere (where people can meet, communicate, organise and do things together)? And what of central as against local political levels and the linkages between them? Törnquist's comparative research indicates, for instance, that new pro-democrats are often weak within the state and at workplaces but comparatively strong within self-managed units (such as NGOs and cooperatives) and in the public sphere. It is also clear that fragmentation and the lack of links between different sectors and political levels have been a frequent and serious problem.

The second set of factors covers the politicisation of issues, interests, ideas and identities. Törnquist observes that, apart from what is prioritised, it is the *character* of politicisation that seems to be crucial. Pro-democrats tend to focus on single issues and specific group interests, and are rarely able to transform this into a synthesis of broader interests, perspectives and ideologies. This leaves them vulnerable to fragmentation and 'alternative' ethnic and religious unities. We may also think in terms of the differing combinations of individual/collective action and self-help/claims-making. In tackling their problems, people may make claims upon the state, at some level, as individuals, probably through patrons. This is what generally happens in the slums of Delhi, where unelected local leaders, known as *pradhans*, who are themselves linked to political leaders in different parties, are key intermediaries for most people.[20] Or people may make claims on the basis of collective action. Again in Delhi, this is happening now under the leadership of a movement for homeless

people initiated by the former prime minister V. P. Singh. Or people may seek to resolve their problems through collective action with the purpose of self-help, as for example when they combine together with others to obtain land for housing. A further aspect of politicisation is that of whether or not, and in what ways, claims and issues are aggregated together (Collier *et al*. 2002).

The third set of factors raises questions about how and at what level(s) actors mobilise support for their policies. In other terms: what is the mode of political inclusion? Nicos Mouzelis (1986) has suggested that we may distinguish historically 'between the *integration* of people into politics on the basis of relatively autonomous broad popular movements generated by comprehensive economic development (as in many parts of Western Europe), and the elitist *incorporation* of people with less solid organisations of their own' (Törnquist 1999: 155). Incorporation has two distinct forms: *clientelism* and *populism*. 'Clientelism' refers to the existence of bosses on different levels who have the capacity to deliver patronage in return for services and votes. The Congress Party in India for instance, in the 1950s and 1960s was organised by clientelism: 'That chain of important individuals stretching from village to state, and eventually to the national capital, welded by bonds of patronage, was one central feature of Congress's success into the 1960s' (Kohli 1990: 186). Populism provides another framework for bringing the lower classes into politics. In this case charismatic political leaders are able to mobilise people directly – in the way, for example, that Indira Gandhi was able to in India in the early 1970s when she was able to reach the people with a populist discourse, over the heads of the party bosses and faction leaders. The term 'populism' embraces a range of political ideologies and leaders. What is common to them is an appeal to an idea of an undifferentiated 'common people', who are either excluded from or only have limited access to privilege. Populist politics proposes to secure access to spheres of privilege, but without necessarily changing the system which generates differentiation in the first place. These concepts are ideal types and in practice it is possible to find differing combinations of populism and clientelism, or of integration and incorporation. The CPI-M in the state of West Bengal, for example, has integrated people into politics on the basis of a broad popular movement, but it also involves structures of clientelism. The two major Dravidian parties of the south Indian state of Tamil Nadu are both fairly described as 'populist' but one (the AIDMK) relies much more on the charisma of the leader than the other (the DMK), which does have a good deal of local organisation and structures of clientelism (Widlund 2000).

Integration of people into politics on the basis of relatively autonomous broad movements, on the other hand, is what pro-democrats usually strive for. Historically one may distinguish with Sidney Tarrow (1994) between two basic forms of 'mobilisation structures' that help movements to coordinate and persist over time by linking the 'centre' (of formally organised leadership), and the 'periphery' (of collective action in the field). One goes back to the anarchist and syndicalist tradition of trusting people's natural and spontaneous ability to resist oppression and exploitation through autonomous collective action – even though in reality organic leaders often function as spearheads. Today's networking and polycentric groups are quite firmly within this stream. The other tradition stresses political ideology, organisation and intervention through integrated structures of parties, unions and self-help organisations – which, however, in reality may hamper dynamic collective action. This tradition rests primarily with the European social democratic movements but also organisations of a similar kind in the developing world, such as the CPI-M in Kerala and to a certain degree the Workers' Party in Brazil.

The contributions

The aim of a systematic approach of this kind is not to prescribe how local politics and democratisation should be analysed but rather to initiate a discussion on the direction in which it may be fruitful to proceed. Whilst addressing the overall theme of local politics and democratisation, the individual contributions to this book address very different actors and contexts and do so by way of distinct approaches. In general terms, Chapters 2 and 3 (Henk Schulte Nordholt and John T. Sidel) examine the field of changing continuities in local elite politics; Chapters 4 and 5 (Günther Schönleitner and P. K. Michael Tharakan) analyse deliberative arrangements between local government and civil society, and; Chapters 6–9 (Kristian Stokke and Sophie Oldfield, Joel Rocamora, Björn Beckman and Olle Törnquist) address the local political spaces and strategies of popular movements.

Henk Schulte Nordholt critically examines the assumption that Indonesia is undergoing a transition from authoritarian centralist rule by a strong state towards a new democratic and decentralised system of governance in which civil society will play a prominent role. Nordholt challenges the simplistic notion of 'transition' as a fundamental and irreversible shift from one situation to another and especially the expectation that decentralisation reforms will automatically produce local democracy. Contrary to this model, Nordholt demonstrates the need for contextual

analyses of the 'changing continuities' in political relations and practices. One such changing continuity is the persistence of patrimonial hierarchies from pre-colonial politics through the 'New Order' period to post-Soeharto politics. This yields a blurring of boundaries between state, society and market, between formal institutions and informal networks and between centre and periphery. In the context of entrenched patrimonial practices, decentralisation does not necessarily result in democratisation and good local governance. Instead Nordholt identifies tendencies towards decentralisation of corruption and political violence, which are likely to prevent the establishment of democratic transparency and accountability at the local level. Indeed decentralisation offers regional elites with access to strategic political positions new opportunities to expand and maintain patrimonial political networks.

John T. Sidel further investigates these links between decentralisation, local elites and democratisation through a comparative analysis of local bossism in the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia. Contrary to the assumptions made by advocates of decentralisation, and in agreement with Nordholt's critique, Sidel argues that local elites may hamper rather than promote local democratisation. He provides a critique of the dominant view that local strongmen flourish in web-like societies and utilise their societal power to capture parts of the state. This capturing of state power is said to cause state weakness and impede policy implementation. Sidel argues on the contrary that local strongmen are shaped by the opportunities and constraints for accumulation and monopolisation of local economic and political power, which are provided by the macro- and micro-structures of the state. He especially emphasises the subordination of the state to elected officials at an early stage of capitalist development (described as 'primitive accumulation'), and asserts that democratisation and decentralisation have given local powerbrokers unprecedented political and economic opportunities. This conception of local bossism leads the author to the conclusion that democratisation through decentralisation requires societal challenges and constraints to the rules of bosses. This theme is further developed in subsequent chapters of this book.

Günther Schönleitner develops the theme of participatory governance through an analysis of local arrangements for political participation in Brazil. Focusing on deliberative sector-policy councils – joint decision-making bodies of local government and civil society – the author discusses the democratising effects of deliberation. The point of departure is Avritzer's (2002) normative assumption that institutionalised fora for face-to-face deliberations over contentious issues enable the transfer of

democratic practices from civil society to a political society with ambiguous stances towards democracy. Schönleitner argues that this democratising effect of deliberative public spaces must be examined contextually rather than assumed *a priori*. Towards this end, he provides a comparative analysis of four local health councils, displaying different combinations of local government commitment to deliberation and associational vibrancy in civil society. This comparative analysis leads to the conclusion that democratisation through deliberative public spaces requires a positive interaction between an appropriate institutional design that ensures deliberative equality, government commitment to deliberation and civic participation in local deliberations. In reality, the different combinations of government commitment and civic organising that exist in Brazil produce diverse political outcomes, ranging from situations with highly unequal power relations and top-down political incorporation to situations with political equality and bottom-up political integration.

P. K. Michael Tharakan is also concerned with arrangements for deliberation between local government and civil society. Complementing Schönleitner's comparative analysis of deliberative public spaces in Brazil, Tharakan provides a contextual and historical account of the development of the campaign for decentralised participatory planning within the state of Kerala (India). He outlines the roots of the Communist Party in popular movements, emphasising the mobilisation of underprivileged groups and the use of state power to implement comprehensive land reforms in the 1970s and a campaign for democratic decentralisation from the mid-1990s. The latter was conceived and implemented as a 'top-to-bottom' programme with the expectation that it would take root within civil society and thereby be turned into a 'bottom up' programme for radical social change. Tharakan observes that this expectation of participatory planning driven by movements in civil society – facilitated and supported by a left party with a long history of social mobilisation – has not proven valid. Instead there has been a process of divisive politicisation of associational life according to clientelistic party affiliations. This exclusionary party-politicisation of civil society combined with the problems of mobilising marginalised social groups and providing significant socioeconomic benefits remain hurdles in the course of deliberative planning in Kerala.

The remaining four chapters share a common concern with the ways in which different collective actors – popular movements, trade unions and political parties – make use of local and non-local political spaces to pursue instrumental and democratic interests. *Kristian Stokke* and *Sophie*

Oldfield analyse the challenges of substantial democratisation in the context of the post-apartheid state and economic liberalisation in South Africa. The authors observe that material deprivation and state repression of popular protests have produced and radicalised new post-apartheid social movements, which politicise socio-economic rights. Contestation over the meaning of democratisation, and especially the relationship between economic liberalisation and social justice, are at the core of this new struggle. These movements display a diversity of strategies *vis-à-vis* state actors, combining various forms of political collaboration and adversarial struggle. On the one hand, political engagement may grant access to resources for community development, though it may also undermine the movements' legitimacy as autonomous representatives of marginalised groups. One the other hand, adversarial struggle may mobilise community support, but may also label a movement as a disruptive force that is targeted for state repression. Stokke and Oldfield conclude that the present period is characterised by growing mistrust between civil society movements and state actors. The post-apartheid state's way of handling this challenge from the new social movements will be decisive for the future of substantial democratisation in South Africa.

A persistent challenge for new popular movements in South Africa and elsewhere is the need to 'scale up' from local single issues to an ideological and co-ordinated political movement. *Joel Rocamora* addresses this challenge of building a social movement-based political party while engaging in local participatory governance in the Philippines. This is examined through an analytical focus on the strategies and experiences of *Akbayan* (Citizens Action Party) and *BATMAN*, the main civil society coalition working on participatory local governance. Akbayan has emerged from social movements of workers, peasants, urban poor, women and others, but also with close links to work within BATMAN to maximise the participatory and governance potential of decentralisation. While the main organisational challenge of BATMAN is to scale up from local governance issues, Akbayan's challenge is to accumulate political power within a political system characterised by a polarised conflict between right-wing populism and militant leftism, and a general political crisis of both. The new left-centre movement that is being built through Akbayan and BATMAN is consciously different from established parties, especially in its focus on pluralism and democracy within the movement, on the local political arena of the *barangay* and on goals of political and economic reforms.

Björn Beckman examines the capacity of trade unions to represent the interests of their own members and in support of wider popular and democratic interests. The author counters the view that unions are being

marginalised by globalisation processes and constitute obsolete obstacles to institutional reforms. On the contrary, trade unions actively engage in reform processes and remain one of very few institutions that have the organisational capacity to represent popular interests and ensure their political inclusion. Most importantly, unions have the capacity of developing institutions that are vital for regulation of conflicts of interests and thereby sustain economic and political reforms (e.g. institutionalisation of union-based labour regimes protecting workers' rights to organise and bargain collectively). Since union rights are both a form and a basis for general political rights, unions also have a vested interest in these rights and play an important role in democratic movements. These arguments are grounded in analytical comparisons of unions and liberalisation in Nigeria, South Africa and Uganda. Whereas South Africa is a case with major union engagement in reform processes, Ugandan unions have largely been destroyed and marginalised. The Nigerian experiences fall somewhere between these two, displaying evidence of both union achievements and failures.

Olle Törnquist provides a conceptual and contextual analysis of the challenges of substantial democratisation. He defines the essence of democracy as popular control of public affairs based on political equality. Substantial democratisation means that people in general possess sufficient powers to make use of significant democratic rights and institutions. Following from this, Törnquist examines conceptual obstacles and political solutions for promoting substantial democratisation. One main obstacle is found in hegemonic conceptions of democratisation, focusing on negotiations and pacts between authoritarian and democratic elites rather than popular struggles for democratisation. This understanding of transitions has yielded a narrow and insufficient focus on institutional changes, while obscuring the role of both structural preconditions and popular mass action for substantial democratisation. Another major obstacle is found in the 'political deficit' of popular experiments for substantial democratisation. Just as in Porto Alegre, thinkers and activists affiliated with the popular democratic experiments in Kerala, the Philippines and Indonesia realise the need to link polycentric activities in civil society with politics and government, but it remains unclear how such public spaces emerge, endure and expand. Thus, there is a need for expanding the contextual and comparative knowledge, among academics and activists alike, of the *politics* of fighting for and implementing substantial democratisation.

Törnquist's conclusion brings us back to the starting point for this introductory chapter: Although the recent past has witnessed a wave of democratic transitions, many of these have yielded formal and minimalist

liberal democracies rather than processes of substantial democratisation. Furthering these transitions towards substantial democratisation requires that democratic rights and institutions are re-appropriated by capable and committed actors. The argument that runs through this book – in sharp contrast to the common de-politicisation of development and democracy in mainstream academic and political discourse – is for the need to bring the political back into democratisation, in other words, for *politicising democracy*.

Notes

1. In accordance with what has become common practice, we shall use 'sphere' and 'space' synonymously. This may refer to institutional frameworks, forums and practices that are public and open (as opposed to private and closed), for people to come together and deliberate and negotiate. Sphere/space may also, for instance, refer to political institutions and practices – which may then be more or less public. The concept of 'arena', on the other hand, is used to indicate more structured and formalised parts of such (more or less public) spaces and has a metaphorical association with the idea of a game, which is particularly apposite in regard to politics. When we want to indicate the room for manoeuvre that may be available for an actor outside or inside the public or political sphere we will specify that in terms of 'space for action'. Likewise, when we only talk of politics in a territorial sense we will indicate that with formulations such as 'politics at the local level' or 'village politics'.

2. In general terms, localisation refers to the 'grounding' of human activities in specific places. We use 'localisation of politics' to refer to the location of state power and politics to sub-national spatial scales.

3. Globalisation refers to 'a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions... generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power' (Held *et al.*, 1999: 16). This suggests that globalisation should be understood as multiple processes (rather than just economic integration) and open-ended transformations (rather than an historical end-point or epoch).

4. The first ('long') wave, according to Huntington, developed in Europe, the United States, Argentina and some British colonies between the early 19th and early 20th centuries; the second ('short') wave after the Second World War up to the early 1960s, in the former colonies and in West Germany, Italy and Japan. Each was followed by a 'reverse wave', as for example when most Latin American countries reverted to authoritarian forms of rule in the later 1960s and early 1970s.

5. This definition of democratisation, of course, begs the question of 'what is democracy?'. This is not the place to enter into an extended discussion of a vast literature. At the core of the idea of democracy are the principles of *popular control* (the Greek words that make up the English 'democracy' mean 'rule by the people') and its concomitant, *political equality* (necessary if there is to be meaningful popular control). The variety of ways in which these core principles

have been sought to be realised is explained in terms of ten different 'models of democracy', by David Held (1996). Beyond this, as Laurence Whitehead (2002) has argued, persuasively, democracy should be seen as an ideal, to be defined and approached by social actors – or in his words as an open-ended process, subject to reflexive definition.

6. According to Larry Diamond *et al.* (1997), the number of liberal democracies has increased in the third wave, but not by nearly so much as that of narrowly electoral democracies. He suggests that the proportion of countries with liberal democracies increased from less than 30 per cent in 1974 to just over 40 per cent in 1991, and that this proportion then remained more or less the same through to 1996. Diamond describes 'electoral democracies' as those regimes in which multiple parties regularly compete for power through at least relatively free and fair elections, while the term 'liberal democracy' for him embraces protections for individual and group freedoms, inclusive pluralism in civil society and political parties, civilian control over the military, institutions to hold officeholders accountable, and a strong rule of law secured through an independent, impartial judiciary.

7. This is the approach that is reflected in a general work such as Laurence Whitehead's recent book *Democratization* (2002).

8. Whereas it had generally been held previously (in line with the modernisation approach) that economic development was a key condition for democratisation this understanding of causality began to be reversed in the 1990s, when it started to be argued that successful economic development actually requires the establishment of democracy. For example, Baroness Chalker, the then Minister for Overseas Development in the British government (the post that was renamed as Minister for International Development in 1997), argued in 1991 that 'a major new thrust in our policy is to promote pluralistic systems which work for and respond to individuals in society. In political terms this means democracy . . . we firmly believe that democratic reforms are necessary in many countries for broad-based sustainable development' (quoted from notes made at the time by John Harriss). She and others had in mind a set-up with competitive party systems, regular and fair elections, an independent judiciary, a free press and protection of human rights – and these (certainly the holding of regular elections and the setting up of multi-party competition) began to be made into conditions attached to aid agreements. The consequence was that the already existing pattern of the establishment, in many cases, of partial, electoral democracies – rather than full liberal democracies – was extended.

9. Huntington (1991) did in fact identify globalisation as the primary cause of the third wave of democratisation. He failed, however, to provide a convincing account of the mechanisms whereby international factors or globalisation produce democratic transitions.

10. As of August 2003 the Bank's 'Governance' website defines its topic as: 'the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good. This includes (1) the process by which those in authority are selected, monitored and replaced, (2) the capacity of the government to effectively manage its resources and implement sound policies, and (3) the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interaction among them'.

11. A more recent, but very similar statement appears in the *Human Development Report* for 2002; e.g 'Over the past two decades there have been many new ways for people to participate in public debates and activities' (UNDP 2002: 5).

12. The quotations in this paragraph are taken from a manuscript by Peter Houtzager, the draft of the Introduction for the book *Changing Paths*. See Houtzager 2003.

13. Chandhoke's argument is, however, in line with Hilary Wainwright's: 'to be effective, international campaigns and networks need to be rooted in people's everyday lives' (2003: 32)

14. This is the theory that holds, following Weber and Schumpeter, that the complexity of the administration of a modern state means that the only realistic form of democracy is one which involves competition between elites.

15. This is what distinguishes the idea of 'public space' from Habermas's conception of the 'public sphere', as Avritzer (2002) explains at length.

16. See Schönleitner's extensive discussion (2004, ch. 2). As Schönleitner says, 'in Avritzer's own case studies of Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte institutionalisation required the prior election of the PT into power, in other words, the establishment of PB required the transformation of political society (via elections) as a precondition for, not a consequence, of public deliberation' (2004: 43).

17. We use the work of Bourdieu to illustrate an overall analytical agenda that is shared by the contributing authors in this book, but not as a joint substantive theoretical framework. The concrete analyses of each chapter are obviously informed by diverse theoretical frameworks, including Bourdieu's notions of power.

18. Bourdieu's categories of economic resources may be supplemented with that of the ability to block economic resources through strike action.

19. There are indications that the Bharatiya Janata Party now also has such an institutionalised presence, at least in some parts of the country.

20. This, and the following comment are based on research in Delhi conducted by Neera Chandhoke and her colleagues from the Department of Political Science in Delhi University.