



Environmental Social Movements and the Politics of Place

ARTURO ESCOBAR,
DIANNE ROCHELEAU
AND SMITU KOTHARI

ABSTRACT *Arturo Escobar, Dianne Rocheleau and Smitu Kothari examine the growing relevance of environmental movements in the world today, and their importance for a women-centred politics of place. They argue that many of today's environmental movements are largely struggles for the defence of place, and that for historical reasons women are often located at the forefront of these struggles and are hence central to any politics of place. The authors suggest that there is a mutually beneficial convergence between women's and environmental movements, a synergy and enrichment that finds a meeting ground in place.*

KEYWORDS *Colombia; community; Dominican Republic; globalization; identity; India; women*

Introduction

As the repeated mobilizations of the last few years indicate, in its current neo-liberal form – under the aegis of TNCs, multilateral lending institutions, the G-7, the WTO and national elites worldwide – globalization is a mixed blessing at best. Perhaps the most powerful indictment of this model comes from ecological and cultural perspectives. Not only is the natural environment being damaged and destroyed at an unprecedented historical rate, but many world cultures can also be said to be under attack by a media and commodity-driven globality largely controlled from the countries of the North, particularly the United States. If the aim of globalization is the extension and deepening of a global modernity – characterized chiefly by a capitalist economy and the cultures of consumption – it is not a coincidence that its effects are felt very directly, and more acutely than at other levels, by nature and Third World cultures, especially the poor, women and ethnic minorities. Place is the anchoring point of many women's lives, and the source of livelihood and culture for ethnic peoples; place is also the space where socio-natural worlds (including what is usually called 'the environment') are produced. By place we understand the ensemble of relations and practices between the natural and the social

worlds at the levels of body, home, habitat and community. In place we thus find a convergence of nature and culture, women and environment, ethnicity and ecology. There is also a growing convergence between women's and environmental movements, a synergy and enrichment that finds a meeting ground in place (Rocheleau et al., 1996).

However, this rapprochement between environmentalism and feminism is often subverted by a partial disconnect: whereas environmental groups tend to be concerned about the habitat, emphasizing the link between the first and the fourth dimensions of place (body/habitat), women's groups tend to be focused on body, home and community, with the habitat often playing an instrumental role in relation to the maintenance of the others. Our argument is that the new politics of place integrates them all. We live in place. The body never exists out of a place, so body, habitat, home and community are all integrated in places. Even if people are on-the-move (as many of us are), we still have that ability to create home, to create community, and this creation takes place in particular environments. Women and environmentalists alike assert that place is both social and biological, natural and cultural. Place, moreover, is the space of integration of these dimensions, in such a way that the very boundaries are often blurred if not dissolved.

We suggest that this is a useful vantage point from which to understand many contemporary social movements. The social movements we emphasize in this journal issue are social movements for the defence of place; this means that they are struggles over the natural and social conditions of existence, over place as an integrating instance of these conditions (Escobar, 2001; Kothari, 2000). In what follows, we present three brief examples from our own experience that illustrate this basic argument. These cases come from Colombia, the Dominican Republic and India. In the conclusion, we draw some general lessons for the interrelation among place, environment and social movements. As we shall see, the 'places' social movements seek to defend are not isolated locations kept alive by timeless cultures. They are local and regional worlds that are immersed in the conditions of globality, yet retain a degree of ecological

and cultural difference that people want to continue to re-create in their own way.

Place, territory and culture in the Colombian Pacific

The Colombian Pacific (extending between Panama in the north and Ecuador in the south, and between the westernmost chain of the Andes in the west and the Pacific littoral to the east) is a large rainforest area, known worldwide for its indices of biological diversity, among the highest in the world. It is also home to close to 900,000 Afro-Colombians and about 50,000 indigenous peoples of several ethnic groups. About 40 percent of these populations live in small settlements along the innumerable rivers that cross the region, and maintain distinct traditions, even if hybridized with, and increasingly shaped by, dominant modern cultures. Along the rivers, settlements are usually of a few houses clustered together, bringing together family and kin, occasionally giving rise to a small town of a few hundred people. People engage, on a daily basis, in a multiplicity of diverse productive strategies that include farming (for maize, rice, plantain, coconut, cacao), fishing, hunting and collecting products from the forest and mangroves, and some activities for the market, such as low-intensity gold mining and timber extraction. These 'traditional production systems' of the river communities, as ecologists call them, have been chiefly oriented towards self-subsistence and have been largely sustainable until recently.

According to anthropologists, black and indigenous groups have a particular way of relating to the natural environment – a 'local model of nature', in anthropological parlance (Restrepo and del Valle, 1996). This model is characterized by certain rituals, distinctions among various worlds, and structuring procedures for classifying the beings of this world and their interrelations. A key cultural practice, for instance, is that of the *ombli-gada*, concerning the birth of a child (Losonczy, 1989). For black groups of the Pacific, conception is a divine matter, and children thus originate in an extra-human domain. Childbirth takes place in the home, the mother surrounded only by women, including the midwife, who cuts the umbilical cord

and receives the placenta. The way in which the cord is cut is fundamental for the sexual identity of the child. The midwife buries the placenta and the cord under the house, in between the poles that support it (when the child is a girl), or under a tree by the edge of the forest (for boys). The navel of the newborn baby is subsequently filled with a natural substance (animal, plant or mineral) that has been pulverized in such a way as to transmit the substance's properties to the individual – such as strength, fertility, luck, wisdom, hunting ability, healing power, or what have you. The ritual separates the child from the supernatural world from where s/he comes, joining her to the human world. By burying the placenta and the cord, the midwife connects the child with the communal territory. At the same time, by filling in the navel with a substance separated from the natural world, she establishes a link with this world.

The local model of nature is characterized by other features. Several types of worlds are distinguished from *this world*, chiefly the world of humans, to various worlds above and below, inhabited by beings such as saints, virgins and *visiones* (visions) of various kinds. These worlds are not completely cut off from each other; rather, there are moments and ways in which they interact. Some experts in the oral traditions of the Pacific find in some of the local narratives (poems, tales, proverbs) ecological lessons, for instance, when *visiones* punish people at night in the forest for abusing natural resources. Be that as it may, what is important to emphasize is that the local model constitutes a unique cognitive universe that organizes the world in particular ways. In short, people's ecological and economic practices are quite different from those of the moderns even in the same region (for instance, capital intensive oil palm plantation and industrial shrimp aquaculture, both of which are now practices in the Pacific with very destructive consequences for local peoples and ecosystems). At the same time, the more people start to re-orient their productive activities towards the market, the lesser the degree of food security and environmental sustainability. In short, the underlying *cultural difference* of the black and indigenous groups of the Pacific finds a reflection in different ecological and economic practices, which

are today under attack by the onslaught of capital, development and consumer culture.

It is precisely this place-based model of nature and the entire cultural universe of the black groups that the social movement of black communities that emerged in the early 1990s is trying to defend. This movement started as a struggle to ensure the collective titling of territories for the river communities, legally allowed by Colombia's constitution of 1991. Since its inception, this movement has been a struggle for cultural difference based on four rights: to the territory; to black identity; to a certain measure of political autonomy; and to their own vision of development (Grueso et al., 1998). In this way, for instance, movement activists cannot conceive of biodiversity conservation outside of the local control of territory or independent of local cultural practices. And while the movement's main emphasis is on ethnic identities, women are among the most active members of the movement, at all levels, from the national to the local committees, and women have begun to organize on their own as well, even if within the context of a largely ethnic orientation (see article by Grueso and Arroyo in this issue). The movement as a whole is indeed a movement for the defence of place and culture: the practice of the *omblligada* involves body and person in a very direct way; the cognitive model distinguishes between house and forest, for instance, and assigns particular gender roles; it also dictates the modes of interacting with the habitat. These dimensions of place, in sum, are brought together as much in the popular practice of the local communities themselves as in the political strategy of the social movement. Body, home, community and habitat, in their gendered articulations, constitute the foundation of life in these communities. In articulating a strategy for the defence of culture and territory, the movement is engaged in the defence of the very life project of the communities – which, in the last instance, can be seen as one of the most radical orientations of the politics of place.

Landless people in place: the Rural Federation of Zambrana-Chacuey

The politics of place are often associated with ethnicity and nationality, and environmentally linked

politics of place have been associated closely with indigenous people or people with long histories on the land, linked by a single culture to a specific landscape and ecosystem. The experience of the Rural Federation of Zambrana-Chacuey in the Dominican Republic provides an example of a profoundly place-based politics among people whose culture is derived from and defined by a mixing of peoples from across the planet. Throughout the Caribbean, including the Dominican Republic, people have been brought together in place by a long history of encounters, many of them violent or coercive. Yet, people have created communities from the combined legacy of indigenous cultures, conquest, colonization, slavery, resistance, persistence, cultural innovation, commerce, chance, and choice.

Both the Afro-Colombian people in the Pacific Coast rainforest and the people of the Dominican Republic have historically experienced the ravages of displacement and slavery, as well as a mixing of indigenous, African and European peoples and a recombination of cultures. Yet, the terms of attachment to place are somewhat distinct. Many of the people in the land struggle movements in the Dominican Republic have been displaced from former home places or have lived as landless and near landless farmers within the recent past (mid 20th century to the present). They have sought to re-gain their former lands or to claim new lands where they can re-build community and make new homes, with some sense of permanence and security. Rather than defence of a regional realm or forests and rivers, the environmental concerns of the Federation were initially included within land acquisition, since people felt the lack of secure access to resources and control over land prevented care and management of their habitat. Zambrana-Chacuey is an area defined in large part as the home of a strong rural federation and illustrates the workings of women's politics of place within land struggle movements and environmental initiatives.

Zambrana-Chacuey is a hilly region with a patchwork of farms and forests, and is home to roughly 12,000 people. The residents are small-holder farmers, many of them members of a popular rural movement that secured land for

hundreds of landless and near landless farm families during the 1970s and 1980s. Among the federation members and their families the politics of place is entwined with the practices of solidarity, of affinity and mutual support across lines of difference (race, class, gender and political affiliation). In the early 1990s the Federation consisted of approximately 800 members and served roughly 4000 household members and related people through 59 associations, including women's (housewives'), farmers' and youth groups. The peasant movement, forged out of decades of struggles for land by smallholder and landless farmers, represents a coalition of three distinct groups: liberation theology focused on human rights and social justice, cooperatives to serve farm enterprises, and traditional church-based support for community development.

The bedrock of solidarity among these groups is the shared sense of place, with a very strong current of shared commitment to basic political and human rights for the poor, as well as an emphasis on land, basic infrastructure and services, and support for farmers in dealing with markets. Land was secured as private property, through collective struggle in regionally coordinated non-violent campaigns. Public services and infrastructure were developed through collective demands (including non-violent protest and mobilization) to convince state agencies to engage in collaborative efforts with local communities and the regional Federation to provide roads, schools (with teachers), and clinics (with medical staff). Federation members often built school or clinic buildings and then challenged the government (through direct negotiations or through civil disobedience) to provide staff and supplies. Marketing and purchasing assistance has also been pursued as a collaborative effort between the Federation members at local and regional level and, sometimes, national agencies. In each case women members of the Federation have played a major part in defining and creating viable, secure places for rural farm households and communities.

Women were key actors in the land struggle and many were recognized and visible leaders at local, regional and national levels. From the outset the Federation had a base in women's groups and

women's politics of place, though that history is often partially forgotten or subsumed under a more economic or traditional political explanation. One of the four original human rights promoters sponsored by the Catholic Bishop in the 1970s, Tito Mogollon, noted he and other organizers originally approached women's groups in a nearby community threatened with eviction by the Rosario-Dominicano Gold Mine in 1974. Eventually two women's groups formed the nucleus of two new associations, which grew into the Federation. These in turn joined 17 other similar regional federations throughout the country in a confederation named for 'Mama Tingo' (Florinda Soriano), a charismatic and beloved woman leader of the land struggle, assassinated in 1978. The successful, non-violent land struggle waged by these groups was rooted in symbols and icons that appealed to long histories in place and the rights of rural people to maintain or re-gain lands lost to the US-based sugar corporations, the Trujillo regime and its wealthy clients. However, the movement also proclaimed the right and the profound need to create space, through land reform, for displaced and landless people who had migrated from other regions to make new homes and new communities based on a shared sense of purpose, respect and mutual support.

Place and women's creation and defence of it has many dimensions in Zambrana-Chacuey. From the land struggle in the 1970s and 1980s, to the herbal medicine, garden, and forestry projects of the 1990s, women leaders in the Federation reflected women's sense of place as a continuum between body, home, community and land. Two women who served as president of the Federation and as members of the Board of Directors were also midwives, herbalists, gardeners, farmers, and religious leaders (in formal and popular religious practices), combining leadership roles in different dimensions of place. Men leaders in the Federation often focused on land, cash crop production, the regional political movement and environment as a context for production. Women were often more focused on body (health and safety), home (household food security and patio gardens), and community (church and women's associations as mutual support in everyday life), with environment as a

broader habitat supporting each of the prior three elements of place.

Women's sense of home and body as central places from which to create and maintain environmental quality can be seen in the patterns of plant species distribution in the landscape. The highest number of forest tree species occurs not in the remaining patches of forest but in the home gardens or patio gardens created and maintained primarily by women. Forest tree species are combined with domesticated trees and crops as well as medicinal plants in complex ecologies that form a bridge between home and forest, providing food, shelter and shade for people as well as wildlife habitat. These islands of domestic space form part of a regional *polka-dot* forest. Women also raise health concerns about the use of pesticides in citrus and other cash crops and about the continuing contamination of water supplies by the nearby Rosario Mine. In these last two cases, women focus on the body and the habitat as places, through their health concerns about the body/ecosystem connections of their families and communities.

Within both women's and environmental movements, as well as broad based rural people's movements for land and social justice, there are sometimes contradictions between the different dimensions of place: body, 'home', community and habitat. The Rural People's Federation of Zambrana-Chacuey have faced hard choices in the form of trade-offs at different times between the integrity of home versus community places, and between broad environmental quality and bodily health versus community and home places, with distinct consequences for different groups. Even the definition of such concepts as home may vary from a focus on the house as dwelling place, to an emphasis on family, household, or residential property. The complex places created and maintained by the Federation constantly reconcile and even build upon these tensions, rather than attempting to erase them.

The material space for community was created through regional and local collective struggles for household plots as private property. Communal life, and the living landscape that supported it, was largely built and maintained through social

networks, with women's groups providing a long term continuity through boom and bust agricultural enterprises that occupied the farmers' associations. Women's groups were built on everyday constant mutual support, and formed the basis for mobilizing around specific places and everyday needs. Midwives and religious leaders (both Catholic and 'traditional') played leadership roles in health, 'ethnobotany' and gardening projects. A few of those same women played important roles in a community-based timber project that included planting of timber and processing at a community-owned sawmill.

The importance as well as the complexity of gendered space was expressed in the fact that many women's groups requested governance reforms in the relation between the Federation and the spin-off Wood Producers Association. They wanted a greater role in decision making, as individuals and as a group, in order to maintain or strengthen control over their home places and their spaces of production, as well as over the broader trends in community landscape, land use and livelihoods. Some women wanted to exclude their husbands' timber project plantings from their forest gardens around the house. Others wanted the right to plant their own trees at home and sought direct individual or women's group access to the regional organizations' resources to support women's tree planting enterprises. Yet others wanted to bypass household lands, either because the family did not have enough land for both patio gardens and timber lots, or because they wanted an autonomous space of forestry production for women's groups and/or individual women.

The earlier land struggle movement had focused on household lands as a means to create local and regional environments to sustain daily life, home, community and production. The two elements of environment most strongly defended were the community and the home, in the form of household property as both residential and production space. The response of many women to the farm forestry timber project was to look for ways to protect women's spaces within the household property from displacement by men's timber, to support women's rights to plant timber on household lands, and to link individual women to new production

organizations and spaces outside of household land. They variously proposed:

- group liaison with the Wood Producers' Association;
- women's group or farmers' association timber plots with individual tree plots;
- project guarantees of individual land leases; and
- new non-farm enterprises for women.

In more recent developments the Women's Associations have been largely replaced (or displaced) by a more explicitly feminist and also more narrowly defined organization. The new group focuses on women's economic and political rights and supports women's enterprises. While the group did negotiate loans for 10 women to start timber lots, the main objective of the group as of 1996 was to support small businesses and independent income for women. The scope for women to create and defend their own places was to be mediated by their participation in the cash economy and the political process. The new politics of place became more focused on women's opportunities for autonomy and terms of operation within existing places in the form of household, community and habitat.

Some men, particularly the members of the Wood Producers' Associations, have promoted the timber enterprise at farm and regional level as sustainable development and also a way to gain a place at the table in the national economy. Other men have rallied to support the farmers' associations and a larger federation, fearing that they will be eclipsed by the timber producers and other recently formed specialized production associations. Likewise some women have sought to maintain body/home/community/habitat by continuing to work on farms and gardens and through broad mutual support groups, while others have looked toward an economic enterprise and political rights framework. In each case the goal is to maintain oneself, and larger collectives of people, in viable relation to place.

In spite of differences in emphasis, both men and women have often focused on production as a means to be in a place, to support continuity rather than production for its own sake. This is crucial and has become a defining point in many recent

discussions within the Federation and its affiliates. While the Rural Federation and similar land movements elsewhere have been portrayed as class-based struggles over the distribution of land as both assets and means of production, the experience in Zambrana-Chacuey demonstrates a place-based movement deeply rooted in culture and shared experience. The Federation struggles with the contradictions of gender and other differences, including class, and is immersed in the constant making and un-making of forest and farm ecologies.

Justice and culture in India's Koel and Karo Valleys

In the mid-1970s, over a decade before the historic mobilization in the Narmada Valley and the subsequent formation of the Narmada Bachao Andolan (Movement to Save the Narmada), a remarkable struggle of tribal (*adivasi*) communities took root in a cluster of valleys in the hilly, resource-rich southern part of the eastern state of Bihar.¹ This democratic struggle against a hydroelectric project on the Koel and Karo rivers has been one of the most sustained struggles for identity, justice and place – a struggle that has contributed hope and inspiration to a wide cross-section of people's struggles throughout India.

The project, targeted to generate 710 MW of electricity, consists of two dams, one each on the Koel and its tributary Karo, linked through a 34.5 km long trans-basin channel. Planned as far back as 1955, officials have sought to displace 7063 families from 112 villages in the predominantly *adivasi* districts of Ranchi, Gumla and West Singhbhum, home to the *Munda adivasis*. Community estimates suggest that the actual displacement will be of about 200,000 people, nearly two-thirds *adivasi*. Some 66,000 acres of land will be submerged, of which 33,000 acres are under cultivation. The rest is forest land over which the *adivasis* have traditional rights – 152 *sarnas* (sacred groves, places of traditional religious worship) and more than 300 *sasandiris* (sacred graves) will be inundated.

When initial construction started, the local people launched a peaceful Satyagraha² (Gandhian non-violent resistance) at the dam site and on its approach roads. Soon after, they came together

in an organization, the Koel-Karo Jan Sangathan (KKJS, the Koel-Karo People's Organization). As the movement gathered momentum, and facts about the full extent of the impacts of the projects became clearer, it became evident that the scale of displacement would be much more severe and extensive than officially acknowledged. A powerful slogan took root at this time: 'we will give our life but not the land'.

The united response of the villagers in not allowing any land acquisition brought the project to a halt. Some of the most creative strategies of resistance evolved during this period. Dayamani Barla, an activist of the KKJS, says:

Developmental intervention has resulted in reducing the tribal population in this area by 30 percent. The participation of the *adivasi* women in our struggles has been more than that of men. They are more vociferous as they have to bear the major brunt of the economic and cultural destabilization. *Adivasi* women in the villages facing the threat of displacement by the proposed Koel-Karo dam have clamped a people's curfew. They equally participate with men in blocking any project-related vehicles, machinery or personnel inside their villages. Women ploughed up the roads and sowed seeds. Volunteers stood as watch guards to see that no one tramples upon their sown fields. Organizations involved in the struggle cannot take any decisions or make any settlements without consulting women's groups.

Given that production and reproduction are so linked to place, and in tribal India women are central to this process, it is no surprise that they were some of the most militant peaceful defenders of nature and culture. The resistance and defence of place was so strong that even India's then Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, who was to inaugurate the project on 6 July 1995, had to cancel his visit. The project was suspended soon thereafter.

In late 2000, the newly elected government of Jharkhand – ironically, the state came into being after over a half century of *adivasi* struggle that argued that internal boundaries in India had been drawn based on dominant languages and tribal culture and language had been marginalized in this process – sought to revive the project. The local communities re-ignited their collective resistance. A public expression of solidarity was planned for 3 February 2001 in response to the police destroying

a people's barricade, an emotional symbol of their decades-old struggle. It was to break this sustained unity that the police, without provocation, opened fire. Nine people died and at least 12 others were seriously injured. The police claimed that they had to resort to firing 136 rounds because the crowd had attacked them with stones and bricks.

The struggle in the Koel and Karo valleys and villages is a struggle against development policies that have privileged the needs of industries and urban centres over those of the local communities, policies that have been made primarily by those who have little comprehension of the importance of place and of the critical issues that this essay and this issue of the journal raise. The place-based interests of local communities have come into sharp conflict with the national interest of states and of national and global capital and their remote-controlled extractive governance. State and central governments have sought to keep the channels of extraction open and, towards this end, they have resorted to numerous strategies – from financial incentives to engendering community rivalry and conflict – to manipulate and divide the *adivasi* population. The biggest threat to the tribal people is the large-scale alienation from their land through major projects like mines, industry, animal sanctuaries, new townships, highways, military cantonments and army firing ranges, all in the name of national development and national interest. Displacement disrupts collective identity which itself is integrally linked to the geographical place where the communities have historically resided. When people are displaced, the very cohesion and interdependence of community life is broken. Alienation, emotional distress and tribulation inevitably result. The processes of economic globalization that have placed additional pressures on resource-rich Jharkhand have compounded these conflicts of interest.

Koel-Karo is also the site of another contestation – of electoral democracy that most often privileges privilege versus direct democracy rooted in place.

The latter has been no stranger in Munda areas where consensus-based local governance has historically been part of a sophisticated political and social system.

There has been a long history of repression and state high-handedness in the Jharkhand region. Almost 200 years ago, the first acts of resistance to British colonization occurred in these areas and some of India's most sustained struggles – from the Santhal rebellion to the struggle led by Birsa Munda – are part of the collective history of those in the movement in the Koel-Karo valleys. Women have been at the forefront of most of these movements.³ The mobilizations have strengthened collective solidarity and self-confidence as people have moved out of their homes and participated collectively in marches, Satyagraha and collective social activity. These processes are part of a long-evolving process of people-centred politics that has suffered periodic setbacks but has emerged again and again to assert a place-based vision of cultural and ecological plurality and justice.

Conclusion

The experiences of the Federation, the black movement and the Koel-Karo movement illustrate that the politics of place are more than gender, class and ethnic struggles over environment as a collection of resources in a specific location. Women's and environmental movements as well as ethnic, tribal and rural farmers' struggles, are about the terms of connection between people and between groups of people, other species, artefacts (houses, gardens) and the surrounding physical world. They are also about the terms of connection between local and larger places, both earthly and spiritual. Places, in turn, are not treated as real estate, as exchangeable and interchangeable commodities, but rather as the ground where body, home, community and habitat are joined in everyday experience as well as in history.

Notes

1 The state has since been

bifurcated into the predominantly

tribal southern state of Jharkhand and the state of Bihar.

2 "Truth (*Satya*) implies love, and

firmness (*Agraha*) engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian movement "*Satyagraha*",

that is to say, the Force which is born of Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the use of the phrase "passive resistance" (Gandhi, 1979).

3 Women have also been at the forefront of politically influential movements like the Chipko (Hug the Trees) and Narmada movements in non-*adivasi* India.

References

- Escobar, A. (2001) 'Culture Sits in Places: Reflections on Globalism and Subaltern Strategies of Localization', *Political Geography* 20: 139–74.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1979) *Satyagraha in South Africa*.
- Grueso, L., C. Rosero and A. Escobar (1998) 'The Process of Black Community Organizing in the Southern Pacific Coast of Colombia', in S.E. Alvarez, E. Dagnino and A. Escobar (eds) *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Culture. Revisioning Latin America Social Movements*, pp. 196–219. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kothari, S. (2000) 'A Million Mutinies Now. Lesser-known Environmental Movements in India', *Humanscape*, October.
- Losonczy, A-M. (1989) 'Del ombligo a la comunidad. Ritos de nacimiento en la cultura negra del litoral pacifico colombiano', *Revindí* 1: 49–54.
- Restrepo, E. and J.I. del Valle, eds (1996) *Renacientes del Guandal*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional/Biopacifico.
- Rocheleau, D., B. Thomas-Slayter and E. Wangari, eds (1996) *Feminist Political Ecology*. New York: Routledge.

Fleshly Politics: Women's bodies, politics and globalization

WENDY HARCOURT
AND KHAWAR
MUMTAZ

ABSTRACT *Wendy Harcourt and Khawar Mumtaz, who have worked together for the last decade on many issues around women's rights, environment and reproductive health, reflect on how globalization has impacted on women's place-based organizing. They take the processes around the International Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo in 1994 and the work of Shirkat Gah in Pakistan as reference points for their discussion.*

KEYWORDS *Cairo; glocalities; meshworks; networks; Shirkat Gah*

Rethinking Cairo

One of the most influential processes over the last years that has focused on women's bodies in the social public domain has been the debates around the International Conference on Population and Development held in 1994, popularly known after the city where it was held, as 'Cairo'.

Cairo's agenda was built on women's movements' struggle for rights around the world. Its recognition of the holistic concept of reproductive health that embraces well-being, the breaking of taboos around sexuality, sexual health, the

discussion on autonomy, empowerment, gender and cultural difference on the international agenda were major breakthroughs in gender and development policy. However, for many political women's organizations, these gains were made at the expense of leaving economic development issues unproblematized. As Sonia Corrêa from Development Alternatives with a New Era (DAWN) stated:

Transforming the population field in order to apply the reproductive rights and health framework is conditioned upon a virtual revolution in prevailing gender systems