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ABSTRACT

The City Effect: Urban Institutions, Peripheries and Political Participations in Bolivia

by

Maria Cristina Malong Cielo

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Laura Enriquez, Chair

Mass mobilizations by historically marginalized citizens of Bolivia have radically reconfigured the country’s social and political landscape in the last decade. Their protests, struggles, and eventual ascent to state power have demanded new state-society relations that challenge “modern” forms of propertied citizenship and representative democracy. Among the principal actors in these transformations are the urban poor who live in precarious, informal areas at the edges of cities, known as “periurban” areas. Such areas are now home to between 40 and 60 percent of the urban population of Latin America. According to United Nations studies, a billion people now live in peripheral urban areas in developing countries, and their number will continue to grow by 25 million a year. What does this tremendous demographic shift mean in the context of rising social demands for equality and democracy?

This dissertation explores possibilities and challenges for the contemporary construction of more equitable cities and political communities, through a focus on its most marginalized sectors. It is based on research in periurban neighborhoods of Cochabamba, Bolivia, which I analyze in the context of rapidly evolving state-civil society relations in Bolivia, and in Latin America more generally. The study explores the daily practices – as shaped by the social institutions of property, resource management and political participation – that reconstruct and reformulate political identities over time. This project, thus, focuses on contemporary forms of belonging that have emerged as a result of and a response to the structures of exclusion that persist despite national and institutionalized participatory projects. In particular, I seek to understand the role that contemporary state-directed institutions play in producing collective political subjects who struggle over legitimate definitions of property, access to resources and legitimacy.

These institutions encourage certain logics, practices and political subjectivities over others, concurrently promoting particular forms of social and political relations. I am particularly interested in the ways that the institutionalized distinctions between the formal and informal, the lived distinctions between included and excluded, and the subjective
distinctions between center and the periphery define different periurban collective perspectives. These distinctions produce the city and the state as central and determinant structures that seem to exist apart from, and shape the lives of, peripheral actors. Following Timothy Mitchell’s (1998) compelling definition of the “state effect,” in which such distinctions are embedded in institutions, bureaucracies and practices and help to maintain a given political and economic order, my dissertation explores the “city effect.” This approach highlights the ways in which the powers of the city and the state do not lie in their inviolable permanence, but rather in the institutions that stabilize their permanence. Urban and governmental institutions shape daily practices and naturalize conceptual distinctions and categories. These conceptions imply a model of liberal inclusion that reinforces inequalities by depoliticizing subject positions as it obscures the inherently political constitution of social subjects.

I focus on the formation of collective logics and political subjects in neighborhoods in peripheral urban areas of Bolivia’s growing cities, which have become important spaces in the country’s processes of change. By looking at dominant institutions that shape Bolivian cities, as well as challenges to their exclusionary mechanisms, I seek to better understand the nation’s and the region’s contemporary socio-political transformations. Periurban residents’ collective forms and practices, forged at the crossroads of the city’s institutional mechanisms and their own recombinant collective capacities, point to alternative visions of development and state-society relations. The very liminality of peripheral social forms and practices questions the legitimacy of the urban and state structures that marginalize them.
This dissertation is dedicated to James, for everything.
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INTRODUCTION

Mass mobilizations by historically marginalized citizens of Bolivia have radically reconfigured the country’s social and political landscape in the last decade. Their protests, struggles, and eventual ascent to state power have demanded new state-society relations that challenge “modern” forms of propertied citizenship and representative democracy. Among the principal actors in these transformations are the urban poor who live in precarious, informal areas at the edges of cities, known as “periurban” areas. Such areas are now home to between 40 and 60 percent of the urban population of Latin America (da Gama 2008:8-9). According to United Nations studies, a billion people now live in peripheral urban areas in developing countries (UN-HABITAT 2008:91), and their number will continue to grow by 25 million a year (UNISDR 2009:9). The urban poor the world over now number over two billion people, a full third of the world’s population (Beall and Fox 2006:4). What does this tremendous demographic shift mean in the context of rising social demands for equality and democracy?

This dissertation explores possibilities and challenges for the contemporary construction of more equitable cities and political communities, through a focus on its most marginalized sectors. It is based on research in periurban neighborhoods of Cochabamba, Bolivia, which I analyze in the context of rapidly evolving state-civil society relations in Bolivia, and in Latin America more generally. Academics, journalists and activists have hopefully discussed the third wave of democracy in the region, its insurgent citizenship, direct democracy, active participation and its citizenship from below (Holston 2009, Edwards 2004, Caldeira 2000, Cox 1999). Central to these attempts to understand contemporary social changes in the region is the fundamental theme of political collectives and subjects. That is, some of the conditions that have led to the resurgence of Latin American social movements and transformations in recent decades are reconfigurations of territory and identity, rooted in the changing parameters and functions of the region’s nation-state and the growing importance of transnational financial, communication and migratory flows.

In this context, Latin American states have had the difficult task of navigating between the severe demands of the global economy from their peripheral positions and the ascending protests against the social ravages of neoliberal restructuring. The Bolivian government responded in the 1990s with formal measures to decentralize democratic participation. The institutionalized forms of participation that were implemented temporarily pacified popular unrest, but left national and international structures of power unchallenged. Beginning in 2000, the resounding social response to this state position was manifested in the rise of social movements to power that has transformed the political landscape of the country.

Studies of Bolivian social movements (Hoffman et al. 2003, Esposito and Arteaga 2007, Mamani 2005) have helped to identify key moments in the articulation of these new political collectives as well as their broader impacts. Yet this literature has paid little attention to the daily practices shaped by urban and state institutions that reconstruct and reformulate political identities over time. My dissertation project examines contemporary forms of
belonging that have emerged as a result of and a response to the structures of exclusion that persist despite national and institutionalized participatory projects. I am particularly interested in the production of collective political subjects in struggles over legitimate definitions of property, access to natural resources and political representation. Urban and state institutions stabilize practices in these domains, encouraging certain logics and political subjectivities – that is, ways of understanding and positioning oneself within one's social relations – over others. They, thus, concurrently promote particular relations of power.

In Bolivia, struggles for inclusion in institutionalized structures, and disputes over the legitimacy of alternative property and resource regimes have been articulated in challenges to established definitions of political representation and democracy. Throughout Latin America, colonial legacies that persisted into the 20th century largely prevented state structures and representatives from attaining full social legitimacy. Decades of brutal dictatorships and structural adjustment policies in more recent periods further exacerbated the region’s crisis of representative democracy. This crisis is reflected throughout cities of the developing world, where alternative forms of organization and collective action – along with the populations of each country’s marginalized poor – have moved from rural to periurban spaces. This has led urban and political analysts to proclaim that “the slum peripheries of poor Third World cities ... have become a decisive geopolitical space. That space is now a [political] challenge – as much as it is an epistemological challenge for sociologists” (Davis 2004:np). Analyses of the experiences and contradictions that periurban citizens live with daily can help to formulate and support urban, national and regional policies that produce more inclusive cities and nations. The epistemological challenge to understand periurban socio-political organization in Bolivia is also a challenge to understand dynamics of contemporary state and civil society organization.

My starting point for approaching these questions is the literature on the political engagement of the excluded majority, which has largely been framed in terms of mass politics and populism. Within this wide-ranging literature, I draw from the historical and institutional analyses (Cammack 2000, Eckstein 2002) of social mobilization that bring together elements of the structural (Kaufman and Stallings 1991, O'Donnell 1993) and post-structural approaches (Evers 1985, Laclau 2005) to populism. Likewise, my study seeks to bring together structural approaches to the production of urban marginality (Wacquant 2007, Auiero 2007) and post-structural attention to the shifting socialities, collectivities and legitimacies produced in cities (Simone 2004, Mbembe and Nutall 2008, Arteaga 2005, Naranja et al. 2002). As such, my work is particularly influenced by urban theorists who examine questions of civil society and state relations through a focus on institutionalized inequalities in the growing cities of the developing world (Caldeira 2000, Holston 2009, Perlman 2010). I examine interactions between state institutions and the ways that these define formal versus informal practices, on the one hand, and periurban practices, logics and subjectivities, on the other (Varley 2002, Roy and Alsayyad 2003, Zapotocka 2007). My work thus brings state-civil society approaches and urban theoretical approaches to mass politics into conversation with analyses of development.

I am particularly interested in the ways that the institutionalized distinctions between the formal and informal, the lived distinctions between included and excluded, and the subjective distinctions between center and the periphery define different periurban collective perspectives. These distinctions produce the city and the state as central and determinant structures that seem to exist apart from, and shape the lives of, peripheral actors. I call the subjective and material production of such a powerful spatialized center, by institutionally shaped practices, the “city effect.” This concept closely follows Timothy Mitchell's (1998) compelling definition of the “state effect.” Mitchell argues that state institutions, such as schools, armies and bureaucracies, help to maintain a given political and economic order by making the state appear as a structuring framework rather than an effect of dominant and formalized practices. My dissertation specifies these dynamics at a more local scale, focusing on the city as an effect of institutionalized practices. This effect, nevertheless, takes on the subjective and objective power of the structure of the urban center and its periphery.

Central to this study is the notion that the power of the city and the state does not lie in their inviolable permanence, but rather in the institutions that stabilize their permanence. While acknowledging the complexity of the term “institution” and debates regarding its definition (Crawford and Ostrom 1995, Lawson 2003, Searle 2005), I use the term throughout the dissertation in the general sense proposed by Geoffrey Hodgson (2006). Hodgson writes: “Without doing much violence to the relevant literature, we may define institutions as systems of established and prevalent social rules that structure social interactions” (2). In this sense, language and regimes of exchange are institutions, as are organizations and bureaucracies. Most broadly, then, I look at the state-directed formal institutions of private property, resource management and political participation, as these literally and symbolically create the city and its inequalities.

Because I am interested in the ways that the social and economic structures in cities are reproduced, challenged and transformed, the dissertation focuses on these urban and governmental institutions that are directed at reinforcing dominant logics and practices. The “city effect” - the production of the city as distinct from the periphery, with its central status and structuring character - depends on the distinction of formal and informal practices. The chapters that follow examine the institutionalized mechanisms of formal, private property, of efficient resource management and of calculable accountability at work in periurban areas. These mechanisms shape daily practices and naturalize conceptual distinctions and categories, by creating officially sanctioned spheres of property ownership, water administration and public accountability. These formal mechanisms thus encourage particular forms of relationships to land and water, and within local collectives, and ultimately, to the city itself. Yet such dominant logics work through a model of liberal inclusion that reinforces inequalities by depoliticizing subject positions. The city effect obscures the inherently political constitution of peripheral subjects.

But the impact of state institutions is far from homogeneous. A comparison of three
distinct collective logics in sectors of the urban poor allows me to explore different responses to these inequalities. These responses are shaped by varied histories and positions in the city and society. Employing the analytic device of ideal-types, I identify three distinct and collective forms of shared practices, development paradigms and social relations. I call these neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent collective logics. Examining these prevailing logics within concrete periurban collectives allows me to explore the social and political relations produced by the mutually constitutive relationships of state structures, urban institutions and everyday practices. Each of these logics and the subjects they produce interacts differently with urban and state institutions. They, thus, reproduce, challenge or become peripheral to institutionalized formal spheres that both enable a restricted inclusion and reinscribe boundaries of exclusion.

My focus on the formation of collective logics and political subjects in peripheral urban areas of Bolivia’s growing cities helps us to understand these important spaces in the country’s socio-political transformations. National indigenous social movements and the current Bolivian government emerged from rural organizations. Yet cities have now become critical sites of political struggle, from the pivotal 2000 Water War in the city of Cochabamba to more recent, conservative and oppositional bids for power in the lowland cities of Santa Cruz and Pando. By looking at the power of dominant institutions that shape Bolivian cities, as well as challenges to their exclusionary mechanisms, I seek to better understand the nation’s and the region’s contemporary transformations. Periurban residents’ collective forms and practices, forged at the crossroads of the city’s institutional mechanisms and their own recombinant collective capacities, point to alternative visions of development and state-society relations. The very liminality of peripheral social forms and practices questions the legitimacy of the urban and state structures that marginalize them.

I begin, then, in the margins of the city and the state. I conducted my research in the peripheries of the Andean city of Cochabamba, Bolivia. Let’s sojourn into three periurban neighborhoods, each one unique in its spatial and social layout, in its ways of life and in the daily rhythms that it has collectively established. Despite their differences, we will read in these young neighborhoods, in their trajectories carved into dry land, a history which reaches before and beyond their relatively recent settlement. It is a story of migrating families, of growing cities and of a postcolonial society and state continually coming to grips with its prospects and perils. It is a story of the construction of emergent subjectivities, of everyday and political practices, of the formation of periurban perspectives and citizenships. And it is a history that launches us into the future. In this examination, I seek openings and elements to help us move towards a horizon of socio-political relations where property, shared resources and legitimacy serve to constitute collectives – be they local, national or global – that respect

---

1 In this iconic victory for the anti-globalization movement, popular mobilizations successfully prevented the private concession of public goods management to a transnational firm. The Water War began the cycle of protests that eventually led to the expulsion of a neoliberal government, propelling indigenous social movements’ rise to state power in 2005. These and other national and urban political dynamics are explored in further detail in the chapters that follow.
and integrate their differentiated participants. It is a long way towards that horizon. But we begin, step by step, on the road that leaves the city center of Cochabamba. As we make our way up the cluttered highway towards the dry hills ahead, the busy market streets and crowded buildings fall away to more dispersed constructions, rising up between increasing dirt patches and empty lots.

**Nueva Vera Cruz**

Nueva Vera Cruz is the closest neighborhood of study to the city’s center, and the first we come to in this dry and dusty southern part – the Zona Sur – of Cochabamba. It is also the most established of the three neighborhoods. Its representative neighborhood association has been officially recognized by the municipality since the 1980s, while the other two neighborhoods of study were only consolidated in the mid to late 1990s. Partly as a result of this, Nueva Vera Cruz is the most urbanized and the most diverse of the three neighborhoods: of every five residents, two are from rural areas, one is from the mining sector and two named their place of origin as cities. In comparison, less than one fifth of Mineros San Juan or Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents are from other urban areas. Yet, as we shall see in the chapters that follow, residents of Nueva Vera Cruz still identify themselves as peripheral to the city, even though they live only a few blocks from the wide Petrolera Avenue, where taxis quickly carry them from their neighborhood to the bustling central market and city center.

A steep, curved street off Petrolera Avenue winds up those few blocks to the central part of Nueva Vera Cruz. That curving street has cracks and potholes, but it is paved, unlike most streets of the Zona Sur. The street leads to a long, narrow park flanked by the neighborhood's main drive, dubbed Paris Avenue on official neighborhood maps. But all the neighbors call the drive the Prado, a term that conventionally refers to a meadow or park. The Prado of Nueva Vera Cruz has benches and struggling bits of grass on small plots of dirt. It is quite small and modest in comparison to Cochabamba’s main Prado in the city center. Cochabamba’s Prado is also a public walkway on the island of a main street, but it is in a fashionable part of town, surrounded by bars and restaurants and landscaped with well-manicured lawns, flowers and trees.

On this Sunday afternoon, the dry and humble Prado of Nueva Vera Cruz is quiet. Families are likely eating together in their homes, shading themselves from the unrelenting

---

2 Except for recognized public persona (such as municipal or national political figures), individual names used in the dissertation are concealed or replaced with pseudonyms. I have, however, chosen to use the real names of places and organizations that have been part of the study. This is, in part, because I understand this document to be a component of a continuing dialogue that includes people who live and work in or with those places and organizations. See also my discussion of participatory methods in section IB and in Appendix A.

3 The quantitative data on neighborhood demographics and participation, unless otherwise noted, is from surveys conducted in 2007 in each of the three neighborhoods as part of the research for this study. The data referred to above, on the places of origin of Nueva Vera Cruz and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents, is from these surveys. The data on the places of origin of Mineros San Juan residents, however, is from data collected by the non-profit organization San Vicente de Paul in 2007. Collection and access to all quantitative data referred to in this study is described in Appendix A.
sun. Yet the storefronts and signs suggest that this area is the center of a small, emerging commercial scene. There are a couple of internet and phone calling centers, a butcher shop, a hardware store, a hairdresser’s shop, stationery stores and mini-markets. The neighborhood constructions suggest that its residents are doing fairly well. Many of the houses are surrounded by high walls; none are of the exposed adobe ubiquitous in the other two neighborhoods of study. The largest houses, neighbors say, are of those with migrant family members in Spain, who have sent remittances back for their construction.

In the middle of Nueva Vera Cruz’s Prado, in front of a large, dry goods store that is open today, there is a high pole with a speaker attached to it. It was once used for the community radio station, but the non-profit organization that supported the station felt that there was neither enough resident interest nor participation to continue promoting it. The neighborhood board of directors still use this speaker system though. Tomorrow night, as on every Monday night, announcements will sound out in the dark, patiently calling the names of the community leaders who have yet to arrive to their weekly meeting. These small meetings are where most community decisions get made. All neighbors are invited to attend the board of directors' meetings, but only rarely does one appear. The small meeting room will be filled late into the night with discussions and debates by the six to eight dirigentes who regularly attend.

Neighbors are also invited to participate in the monthly neighborhood assemblies and some four to six dozen do attend. Yet these neighborhood-wide meetings are still relatively sparse, tame gatherings compared to neighborhood assemblies in the other two neighborhoods of study. Over the period of study, these gatherings mostly took place just outside the small community center, which remained only half-built. The foundation and walls of the community center were finished, but the construction of the building came to an abrupt halt when the water tank became a more immediate priority due to international funders' interest in supplying water to the Zona Sur. In fact, the neighborhoods' new water tank stands high above the unfinished community center. Although the community center and water tank share an open public space, along with concrete market stalls, a small church, and playing fields, that space is tucked into a corner of the neighborhood, behind the school. Even on days of neighborhood assemblies, that public space never seems quite as busy as the commercial area around the Prado. Only the water tank is visible from the neighborhood's central area, as it rises proudly above Nueva Vera Cruz's houses.

In the neighborhood assemblies on the first Sunday of each month, dirigentes will inform neighbors in attendance of their most recent work. They will occasionally bring photocopies or a white board to help describe what they have been doing to advance neighborhood interests. During these assemblies, most neighbors stand closely around their neighborhood leaders. Some of them converse among themselves, others intervene

---
4 The Bolivian term for an organizational or union leader is dirigente. This is also the term for leaders of community groups or neighborhood associations. Throughout the text, I have chosen to use the untranslated term dirigente, in order to convey its confrontational and politically charged connotations that may be lost in the English term “community leader.”
sporadically with comments or questions. But mostly, they listen. Residents of Nueva Vera Cruz generally respect their community leaders. In an estimation shared by many residents, one neighbor opined: “This group of dirigentes with [the current president] are doing well. The architect... is managing the water well... They know what they're doing” (interview 25.11.07). Confidence in their board of directors allows neighbors to leave collective decisions and actions in the hands of this handful of highly regarded and professional leaders. And those participants who stay until the end of the meeting, if they're lucky, are invited to refreshments – usually a salteña, a meat-filled pastry, and a plastic cupful of Coke – by their neighborhood association.

In the chapters that follow, I identify the collective logics and political subjects of Nueva Vera Cruz as neoliberal. The term is used to describe an urbanized collective that seeks to partake in the dominant socio-economic framework of the city. The dissertation will describe the ways that this logic is based on private and formal ownership, whose subjects participate in collectives primarily through their representative membership. Using the term neoliberal rather than liberal to describe the dynamics in Nueva Vera Cruz highlights the ways that the collective management of the common good is influenced by international paradigms of the mercantilization of resources. The water management model and entrepreneurial forms of development in Nueva Vera Cruz are framed by a neoliberal logic. We will examine the ways that this logic best positions individuals in contemporary urban society and economy, yet also reproduces its inequalities.

Mineros San Juan

We return to the Petrolera Avenue and continue to move away from the city, alongside cars, buses and trucks, all overloaded with passengers and goods bound for the adjacent provincial areas. Just after passing the last gas station of the city, a prominent official sign by a dirt turn-off points to “The Urbanization of Mineros San Juan.” Following that sign leads to a gently sloping street, wide and cobbled with uneven stones. A long ditch along both sides of the neighborhood's main street of makes for slow passage for the collective taxis, but the trench is the hopeful site where water pipes will one day be laid. Behind the piles of dirt on the street are small brightly colored shops with phone cabins, fruits and vegetables out front and a large variety of sweets to tempt the kids walking to and from their new school at the top of the street. Along this main street are several houses either under construction or recently finished. These are large brick houses with two floors and high walls, much like those recently built in Nueva Vera Cruz. But they are few. The smaller and humbler adobe houses still constitute the majority of homes in Mineros.

Sundays in Mineros are far livelier and noisier than in Nueva Vera Cruz. This mid-

---

5 All quotes, unless otherwise noted, are from interviews and observations conducted during the research period. Both quotes from my primary research and quotes from secondary literature in Spanish are my own translations. The format of the interview and field note dates listed is DAY.MONTH.YEAR.
Sunday morning, a series of sudden explosions abruptly shatter the air – three in a row, once and again. They sound frighteningly like gunshots, but are only signal flares, fired off by the dirigentes, the neighborhood leaders. The flares are the call to a neighborhood assembly. On hearing them, residents slowly wrap up what they're doing and begin to walk in small groups up to the area behind the new school, to a large sunken field where the assembly will take place. Some neighbors, mostly men, stand on the ledge from which the dirigentes will launch their rousing speeches. Most neighbors, however, begin piling flat stones to sit on and settle in around the sunken part of the field. Older women in thick indigenous skirts chat in low voices as they wait for the meeting to start. They discuss rumors regarding the most recent agreement made by the dirigentes with the supposed owner of the land. “The dirigente is really moving forward [with the land titling],” says a woman assembling a tarp. “I like how he talks,” says another. Their friend does not agree: “But why do we have to pay anything, this is our land. I’d like to see who’d dare to try to take it away” (field notes 09.09.07).

As more and more neighbors gather, kids run through the knots of people and dogs sniff around for food. Several women are setting up tarps and food stands. These will provide shade from the ascending sun and offset the hunger that will grow over the many hours that the meeting will last. Some 250-300 neighbors eventually assemble in the large recessed area. They squint against the sun to look up at the dirigentes on the high dirt promontory bordering the field. The dirigentes are still murmuring and discussing the assembly agenda amongst themselves. One of them opens up an umbrella to shade the president. The president looks around, decides enough neighbors have arrived, and begins to declaim in a strident and forceful voice. Over the course of the study, I observed two presidents of Mineros San Juan lead these large assemblies. The first of these was an ex-miner, as were all Mineros dirigentes before him. The oratorical style of each Mineros leader was impressive.

The president’s unifying discourse reinforces the sense of belonging to this marginalized yet powerful group that faces adversities collectively. As its name indicates, Mineros San Juan’s neighborhood identity has been shaped by the symbolically powerful and historically influential miners' unions. But most Mineros residents – who settled in the area in the early 1990s and obtained official recognition of their neighborhood association a decade later – were never miners. At the time of the survey in 2007, only 12% of residents were from mining areas. Two-thirds of Mineros residents were from rural areas, and 18% from other urban areas. Yet miners' organizational forms and their famously combative disposition have shaped a neighborhood unity that depends on the collective identification of common problems and enemies. A resident of the area before the influx of miners recalled their arrival: “The miners entered forcefully. They were ready to fight. They threw everyone else out”

---

6 The neighborhood named itself in honor of the 1967 San Juan massacre, in which miners' celebrating the Night of Saint John were killed in a surprise ambush by military government forces for their labor movement organization and sympathy with Che Guevara's guerrilla, then organizing an insurgency in Bolivia.

7 The 1994 Law of Popular Participation recognized one official organization per neighborhood or community, called a Territorial Base Organizations (OTB for its initials in Spanish). The Law of Popular Participation and OTBs are further described in the following chapter.
The president of the neighborhood over the period of study was not an ex-miner, yet his leadership continued to rely on the active participation of all community members and express the unity of the group. When the neighborhood sought a solution to the problem of land tenancy, the president proclaimed: “It’s up to all of you [to help decide the next steps]. In assembly, we decided that the owner should come before us all” (field notes 23.09.07). The neighborhood-wide assemblies in Mineros are the culminating moment of participation for Mineros residents. There is an ordinary neighborhood-wide assembly scheduled on the first Sunday of each month, but there are often emergency meetings called by the dirigentes' flares. Over the period of study, there were an additional one to three emergency assemblies each month. During these meetings, the large empty dirt field in which they take place becomes an amphitheater for the participatory performance of the collective. In another neighborhood assembly, responding to rumors of threats by the “enemies,” the dirigente declared, “Just as they killed Tupac Katari, so may they me. Let them slay me for defending justice, in defense of the people!” (field notes 10.02.08). This type of rhetoric illustrates to all present the president’s unreserved willingness to sacrifice to the collective cause. As the representative of neighbors' shared marginality, the maximum dirigente literally embodies the Mineros collective.

In Mineros San Juan, a counter-hegemonic logic prevails. The chapters that follow will show the ways that the unified territory of Mineros defines its collectivity in contrast to dominant urban and liberal ideologies. The term counter-hegemonic also suggests the discursive and strategic links between the Mineros collective and national and international social movements. An example of this is Mineros' challenge to the institution of urban land that draws on indigenous social movements' claims to the legitimacy of their non-titled territorializations. The approach to development within a counter-hegemonic collective incorporates a majority of neighbors and demands their constant and active presence. In such a context, resources are managed collaboratively. The counter-hegemonic participation in Mineros provides notable legitimacy to local authorities, but also depends on the construction of in-group and out-group categories. Such a collective logic challenges dominant socio-economic hierarchical relations, but does so through discouraging diversity and producing its own exclusions.

### Lomas de Santa Bárbara

Lomas de Santa Bárbara is set on a high hill on the edge of the Zona Sur. The neighborhood's most elevated point leads to even higher and unoccupied slopes of the Andean mountains that surround the city. It is difficult to get to Lomas. Most vehicles speed by its almost hidden dirt entrance, marked only by a small white cross at the junction, the site of a fatal accident. If you do turn up that entrance, you’ll find yourself among neat strips of

---

8 An indigenous revolutionary brutally and publicly executed by the Spanish colonizers in 1781.
uniform concrete houses. This is not yet Lomas de Santa Bárbara, but a planned urbanization established by a teacher’s union. Around one of the corners of this urbanization’s perpendicular streets, you will suddenly be struck by a chaos of adobe huts perched precariously on a brown hillside. This is where Lomas de Santa Bárbara begins.

Follow the narrow dirt road that zig zags up the hill, but don’t look over its steep sides. Be careful on its sharp turns, and don’t worry, it only seems to take forever this first time up. And when you get to the top (it’s really better if you arrive just before dawn), stop for a moment at the last curve before entering the central part of the neighborhood. From this point high above Petrolera Avenue, looking down, the city seems a distant mirage. You can see it all: the unpaved or newly paved streets of other Zona Sur neighborhoods, the tumultuous center with the market area already teeming at this early hour, even the sleepy and elegant distant suburbs on the northern green slopes of the city. If you stop long enough at this contemplative promontory, an older woman with her grandson may arrive, or a silent man in a wide-brimmed hat. You can share with them the extinction of a million points of light, and daybreak over the city.

It’s difficult, though, standing there, to avoid noting the immense high voltage tower just a few dozen feet from that curve. Small children sometimes clamber on its lower frame as a makeshift jungle gym. The erected tower is enormous, with a yellow sign hanging on it that warns: “DANGER OF DEATH.” The tone and the texture of the tower’s cold steel contrast starkly with the earthen colors of the dirt paths and roads and the small adobe homes around it. Its thick cables that carry electricity to other places buzz above this neighborhood where the delegates’ meeting every Thursday night is lit only by a tenuous bulb or wavering candle. Often on those nights, the light of the moon is the brightest illumination in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. The delegates who meet weekly in the two-room schoolhouse are representatives from the block groups. Aside from these delegate meetings, there are also meetings of the board of directors and monthly general neighborhood-wide assemblies. But in Lomas de Santa Bárbara, block group meetings are the central venues for organized participation for neighbors who hail largely from rural areas. In the 2007 census of the neighborhood, almost 80% of its neighbors named rural communities as their places of origin.

On this early Sunday morning, block groups are gathering along the roads etched into the hillside, small groups of neighbors wrapped up warmly against the crisp morning air. The dirt roads are narrow and bumpy, but neighbors are grateful that buses can now reach the neighborhood, at least during the dry season. For these meetings, residents come up from below the road or down from above it, stepping carefully and skillfully over uneven earth and between unstable rocks. Block groups are made up of twelve to forty neighboring families. The representative of the block group – the delegate – will already be waiting for his neighbors in the designated meeting spot, with a notebook under his arm. Everyone knows that each week without fail they must be present at their block group meetings. One neighbor from Lomas recalled:

“It’s just been six months since our meetings are just on Sundays,
because before that, they were Sunday, Tuesday and Friday, and before
that, it was every day. It’s been decreasing. At first they called lists at 10
[in the morning], 2 in the afternoon, 8 at night. Since then, it’s
decreased, in the morning, at night. Then it was only every morning,
then Sunday, Tuesday and Friday, then Sunday and Friday, and then we
decided we’d only meet on Sundays.” (interview 29.07.
These now-weekly block group meetings have always been small gatherings. During the first
settlement of the area in 1998, new arrivals were divided in lists of two dozen people who were
assigned to settle in a certain location. These were the groups which, since their arrival, Lomas
homesteaders recognized as their literal comrades in arms in the conflicts with other groups
seeking to inhabit the area. One neighbor recalled: “There at the peak there were people, they
were attacking, we had to go with petards to make them run. There were people who came
around, and if we didn’t know that man, right then we’d grab him” (interview 05.08.07). The
situation is far more tranquil now, but a sense of unity borne of these shared experiences
continues to thrive among the small block groups.

The intimate associations that shape the collective logics of the neighborhood of Lomas
de Santa Bárbara define forms of social organization and practice that neither reproduce nor
challenge dominant logics, as is the case in Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan,
respectively. Instead, Lomas’ shared practices diverge from logics and practices implicit in
dominant institutional frameworks. This neighborhood is, thus, a generative site to examine
the ways that divergent collective logics interact with state institutions. Lomas neighbors’
dependent occupation of land, their shared access to water, their pluriactive approaches to
development, and their communal organizational forms construct the most equitable forms of
social relations among neighbors. Nevertheless, these alternative practices are the most
marginalized and delegitimated by urban and state institutions.

Structure of the dissertation

My aim in the following chapters is to show how local practices and global
development frameworks are mutually shaped via municipal and state institutions’
encouragement of particular practices and social relations, and their marginalization of other
practices and relations. Examining the role of formal social institutions is critical to linking
local practices to global frameworks. The state-directed institutions that regulate private
property, resource management and public accountability are themselves mechanisms by
which dominant international logics of liberalism and neoliberalism are materialized,
reproduced and transformed. By fostering an understanding of the city, and the institutions
that shape it, as the central engines of change and development, these dominant logics
devalue and discourage peripheral practices with alternative underlying subjectivities.
Institutions that shape the city include both wider, socially structured (and internationally
influenced) institutions, such as private property, as well as the concrete and local institutions
that ground these social systems in specific urban practices, such as the municipality. The contemporary power of urban hierarchies depends on formalizations – by both social-systemic and specific-local institutions – that conceal the production of political subject positions.

In order to highlight the ways that institutional mechanisms shape political subjects, I describe three marginal neighborhoods' modes of interacting with state-directed institutions. Distinguishing three distinct collective forms helps to examine the ways that urban and state mechanisms shape and are shaped by social practices and relationships within differently positioned collectives in civil society. In a common analytic move, the study explores the influence of institutional mechanisms in shaping local practices. Its more novel contribution to the analysis of local and global inequalities, however, consists in exploring the ways that dominant social structures also depend on local practices to sustain them. My approach to these dynamics is summarized in the concept of the “city effect.”

The concept of the “city effect” is developed through an examination of the interaction between social structures, urban and state institutions, and periurban residents. The chapters below show that the state-enforced and globally influenced social institutions of private property, resource management and political participation encourage particular practices in periurban areas over others. Peripheral practices, thus, tend to reproduce dominant logics, subjectivities and social relations. Such dominant logics depend on the distinction between formality and informality, valuing formality over informality, materially, symbolically and practically. These processes likewise create the distinction between the center and the periphery, granting the center the objective and subjective structuring power to shape center-periphery hierarchies. The “city effect” is an attempt to describe the entrenched power of unequal social structures, while at the same time examining these structures as an effect, rather than solely a cause, of everyday practices and actions.

The comparison of the three neighborhoods introduced above facilitates the study of the dynamic links between institutional and development paradigms, on the one hand, and collective practices and subjectivities, on the other. Studying these dynamics in the peripheries of Bolivia's urban areas allows for a focus on local collectives where subjectivities and practices are profoundly influenced both by politically powerful national social movements and by alternative logics to dominant neoliberal paradigms. The study highlights the institutional work necessary for the consolidation of neoliberal subjectivities, practices and logics. It, thus, argues against the inevitability of these, and explores possibilities for alternative collective subjectivities and logics.

In Nueva Vera Cruz, the most established of the three neighborhoods of study, a neoliberal logic prevails. The neoliberal framework of Nueva Vera Cruz's shared practices increases residents' opportunities to access formal employment, higher education, and urbanized infrastructure, including basic and social services. The chapters below will specify characteristics of Nueva Vera Cruz's neoliberal subjects through descriptions of their practices and perspectives regarding private property, their supplier-consumer model of resource management and their representative forms of participation.
Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara are far newer settlements, with less infrastructural development and greater incidence of informal employment and education. The logics that prevail in these neighborhoods are identified as counter-hegemonic and divergent. These terms point to the alternative subjectivities and social relations implicit in Mineros and Lomas neighbors' property, resource management and political practices. Yet because these alternative practices are forged in the interaction between unequally positioned logics, they are marginalized and discouraged by state institutions. As a result, residents of new settlements may modify their practices in accordance with formal, municipal frameworks. Over the course of time, Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents may indeed come to resemble the more urbanized neighbors of Nueva Vera Cruz. Their property may be individualized and titled, their access to basic services may be efficiently organized in supplier-consumer management models, and they may find that their political influence is most effective in the form of representative participation. But identifying the characteristics of Mineros' and Lomas' actually existing collective logics and practices points to possibilities of other configurations of development and socio-political relations.

In order to specify these alternative configurations, I analyze the ways that local practices and socio-economic structures shape each other via their interaction through state institutions. On the one hand, I look at how global hierarchies of inequality establish themselves locally through institutionally-encouraged neoliberal subjectivities. On the other hand, I look at how the structuring power of contemporary urban structures and paradigms is also an effect of local practices and perspectives. These practices and perspectives are shaped by the institutionalized neoliberal logics of present-day private property regimes, models of efficient resource management and representative forms of political participation. Yet as the cases of Mineros and Lomas show, periurban practices are not completely predetermined by such dominant logics and state institutions. I, thus, question the view that the city is the constant that will eventually incorporate the periphery into its logics, a view that assumes the eventual victory of urbane liberal and neoliberal logics over others. The utility of the concept of the city effect - by which the dominant structures of the city are produced through institutionally shaped practices and distinctions - lies in recognizing both its entrenched power and its intrinsic contingency. It could be otherwise. As collective political subjects, periurban residents, thus, call into question urban and state structures and challenge modern notions of citizenship and property.

In the first chapter, I explore these dynamics by looking at the theoretical context of these themes and briefly reviewing the relevant literature. I, then, introduce contemporary peripheral development in the city of Cochabamba, identifying the distinct, collective logics and political subjects found in the three neighborhoods of study: neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent forms of shared practices, development paradigms and social relations. In each of the subsequent chapters, I look at different state institutions as they interact with these collective forms. I examine the way that institutional mechanisms shape everyday practices as they formalize residents’ relationships to land, to water and within local
collectives. Comparing the dynamics in the three different study sites, I examine both dominant neoliberal and alternative understandings and practices, particularly regarding land and territory, basic services and natural resources and public accountability and collective legitimacy. Buoyed by national and regional indigenous movements, alternative understandings and practices are actually reshaping the configuration of Bolivian cities and its state. The counter-hegemonic characteristics described in Mineros and the divergent logics described in Lomas point to elements that have defined the political struggles over Bolivian cities and its state over the last decade.

Chapter Two describes how the institution of private property in urban land depends on the construction of a border between the formal and the informal spheres, which homogenizes varied local practices regarding territory and land. Yet different ways of understanding property imply distinct collective valuations, authorities and legitimacies. As such, the border between the formal and the informal does not actually describe two separate spheres, but rather an attempt to favor those valuations, authorities and legitimacies that uphold the conditions necessary for capitalist accumulation. The ways that municipal mechanisms foster these conditions is further explored in the two chapters that follow.

In Chapter Three, I focus on the local administration of basic services. I look at the ways that certain collective approaches to accessing water are encouraged or discouraged by urban institutions and dominant development frameworks. These institutions and frameworks also promote particular configurations of community, of social relations and of civil society. Chapter Four explores the socio-political implications of these dynamics, by extending the examination of marginal political subjectivities into the context of the currently debated state mechanism of citizen control. The chapter looks at how practices of social and political participation are constructed in the interaction between local, state and global forces, once again exploring the differential configurations within neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent collective forms. The political subjectivities thus produced determine particular positions in social and economic hierarchies, at the same time reinforcing or, more rarely, transforming those very hierarchies.

Finally, the conclusion reviews how these three separate institutions shape what is understood as the city. While the institutions of landed property, resource management and administrative accountability are not found only in urban areas, their role in shaping periurban logics and subjects reproduces the city center as the distinct site to which migrants and periurban residents seek access. Thus, the effect of these institutions is a city that then takes on both the appearance and the power of a structure that shapes possibilities of inclusion and exclusion. The conclusion explores these dynamics in the context of the social and political transformations currently taking place in Bolivia. As periurban logics and subjects reproduce, challenge and transform the city effect, so do contemporary Bolivian social movements reshape the state effect, that is, the institutionalized effect of a state that both appears to be and has the power of a structure that directs civil society. The concluding section suggests links between the borders that produce the city and the borders that produce
the state as separate from society. Populist calls for participation can be understood as a challenge to these distinctions, and to the political and economic order maintained by them. Such populist calls have been institutionalized in Bolivia’s popularly elaborated new constitution, ratified in 2008 and enacted in 2009. The refounding document renames the nation the Plurinational State of Bolivia, and proposes new and recombinant forms of citizenship and democracy.
### TABLE SUMMARIZING MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective logics and political subjects</th>
<th>NEOLIBERAL</th>
<th>COUNTER-HEGEMONIC</th>
<th>DIVERGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Vera Cruz</td>
<td>Mineros San Juan</td>
<td>Lomas de Santa Bárbara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction of community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized neighborhood</td>
<td>Unified territory</td>
<td>Intimate associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The search to be a legitimate part of the city prevails</td>
<td>With strong leadership that defines the unity of the collective in contrast to dominant urban ideologies</td>
<td>The nexus of participation is not the neighborhood as a whole, but rather smaller groups and other networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property regimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and formal ownership</td>
<td>Collectively legitimized possession</td>
<td>Dependent occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abides by dominant legitimacy of legalized private property</td>
<td>Challenges limitations of land conceived as property and its implicit socio-political relations</td>
<td>Falls prey to the marginalization of divergent logics by dominant property institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of administering water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer management</td>
<td>Collaborative organization</td>
<td>Shared access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water as private good, administered through supplier-consumer model reproducing unequal access</td>
<td>Water understood as a public good, administered collaboratively and equitably but subject to hegemonic exclusions</td>
<td>Water as a communal good, accessed through reciprocal organizational forms but unable to make broader impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive development</td>
<td>Incorporative development</td>
<td>Pluriactive development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship represents the main possibilities of development</td>
<td>Inclusive of the majority of neighbors, demands their constant active presence</td>
<td>Various familial socioeconomic strategies as well as personal and labor links are combined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective vision of development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-political patterns and organizational forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative membership</td>
<td>Counter-hegemonic participation</td>
<td>Communal associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen control of public entities is high, relations with external institutions are strategic, but local participation is low and unequal</td>
<td>Notable legitimacy and collective control of local authorities as articulation of collective, incorporation into community high but depends on hegemonic in- and out-group categories</td>
<td>Normative social control and participation in communal associations is high, but at the cost of low collective control of neighborhood and public authorities and poor coordination with external institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic forms laid out in constitution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative democracy</td>
<td>Participatory democracy</td>
<td>Communal democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“By way of the election of representatives by universal, direct and secret vote.”</td>
<td>“By way of the referendum, citizens’ legislative initiatives, mandate revocation, assemblies, town meetings, and previous consultations.”</td>
<td>“By way of the election, designation or nomination of authorities &amp; representatives by norms and procedures of indigenous, originary, rural nations and people, among others.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implication for dominant hierarchies &amp; inequalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduces</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Peripheral to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But best positions individuals in capitalist society and economy</td>
<td>But also discourages diversity, producing its own exclusions</td>
<td>Most equitable forms within collective but marginalizes within dominant hierarchies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
AT THE MARGINS OF THE CITY AND THE STATE

Residents of the periurban area of Cochabamba known as the Zona Sur began arriving in significant numbers to the city's vacant peripheries over twenty years ago. They are still arriving. Settlers to Lomas de Santa Bárbara, for example, began to put up tents among scattered shrubs on a high rocky hill in the Zona Sur a little more than ten years ago. To assert their tenuous claim to that difficult terrain, these settlers battled off other groups who sought the land. They used dynamite and rocks to repel them, patrolling the area all night and sleeping in their clothes to thwart surprise attacks. In their long and difficult establishment of homes and communities, and their claims to the right to the city, residents of Lomas and Cochabamba's Zona Sur take part in the demographic and socio-political transformations taking place across Latin America. The production of the periurban areas they live in has paralleled the steady rise of urban poverty in the past decades (Fay 2005:20), as national and international economic policies have generated rural-urban migration and the growth of tertiary service and informal sectors (UNFPA 2007).

In this dissertation, I examine the construction of local civil society organization in the growing periurban areas of Cochabamba, Bolivia. Periurban socio-political organization emerges from syndicalist and rural traditions and indigenous movements, yet it has also been shaped by the historical development of cities, polities and citizenships. The modernizing policies of decentralization and territorial regulation examined in Chapter Two, for example, have been central to the rise of urban popular movements in the country. These policies have resulted in the paradoxical empowering of local authorities and weakening of citizen impacts within institutionalized politics. This context, along with the exacerbated inequalities of the urban landscape, has encouraged the urban poor to participate in the mass movements that have galvanized political transformations in the country. The force of Cochabamba's periurban mobilizations was demonstrated in the 2000 Water War that prevented privatization of its municipal water system (further described in Chapter Three). These dynamics make the city a remarkable and instructive place to study these themes.

In the chapters that follow, I examine the ways that the political forms and collective practices of Cochabamba's periurban residents are shaped by, and seek to transform, inequalities institutionalized in the liberal and neoliberal state and economic system. To explore these dynamics, I focus on the interaction of the institutions of urban land, resource management and public accountability, with local collective logics and practices. I am particularly interested in the ways that these institutions promote certain forms of social and political relations, while discouraging others. Exclusions within Bolivian cities function in conjunction with the formalization of territory into land, natural resources into basic services, and public legitimacy into administrative accountability. Sectors of the urban poor, however, are not unilaterally shaped by these exclusions and institutions. In coordination with national and regional movements, and through their daily practices that result from and respond to
urban and state institutions, periurban residents establish themselves as collective political subjects. In so doing, they transform urban and state structures through their re-creation of modern forms of property and citizenship.

To analyze these processes, I identify three ideal-typical collective logics and subjects formed at the margins of Bolivian cities: neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent logics, subjectivities and practices. I employ these ideal-types to describe three distinct configurations between urban institutions, marginalized populations and their socio-political relations to the city and the state. These three configurations are introduced below and will be developed throughout the dissertation. To set out the theoretical and background context of the dissertation argument and study, I begin this chapter with a statement of the problem in the context of relevant literature, then describe the research methods and sites of the study.

A. URBAN EXCLUSIONS AND PARTICIPATION: THEORETICAL CONTEXTS

Mobilizations in Bolivia over the last decade have propelled a populist leader to the head of its state and indigenous social movements into the international limelight. The accompanying academic and popular literature on Bolivia has portrayed the country as a place of permanent mobilization, in which mass politics emerges from the very sinews of its indigenous traditions and history (Stroble-Gregor et al. 1994, Thomson 2002), and picks up, once more, on the promises of its uncompleted social revolution (Malloy 1970, Rivera Cusicanqui 2004). In addition to other sweeping reforms, Bolivia’s 1952 Revolution led to universal suffrage with the abolishment of literacy and property requirements. In the elections that followed in 1956, the population of eligible voters increased from 200,000 to over 1 million (Santiesteban and Oeffner 2002:np). In its more recent iterations, popular political participation in Bolivia has taken place through widespread protests and strikes. While president for only two years before escalating street demonstrations led to his resignation in June 2005, Carlos Mesa faced an astonishing average of 40 protests per day (Reel 2005:A18).

In this dissertation, I explore the relationship of quotidian activities and collective identifications to such broad political participation. I focus on the role of the city – both its institutional mechanisms and the consequent conception of what the city is and does – in constituting political relations and participation. I argue that the social systems of property, resource management and public accountability, among others, constitute the city and its social relations through shaping varied collective practices regarding these institutions. Poor residents of the city’s peripheries engage in everyday politics as they reproduce, challenge or are peripheral to the dominant logics of the city that define their marginality.

This chapter provides the theoretical and research contexts of this exploration. It begins with an overview of the background and literature related to the dissertation’s argument. I first look at discussions regarding the roles of marginal populations in civil society activity, particularly mass political participation in the Bolivian case. The second subsection
examines the role of state institutions in shaping the city and its relations. Urban and
development studies show that formalizing institutions and the concept of the city create
peripheral subject positions through the reinforcement of a center-periphery paradigm that
produces differential access to resources of power. In examining the literature on these
economics, I define the concept and the relevance of the periurban. This chapter section on
theoretical contexts of the dissertation argument ends with a brief review of work that
informs my study of the production of political subjects and collective logics. I introduce the
three configurations of these subjects and logics that structure the dissertation analysis –
neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent. Each of these defines a set of shared paradigms
and practices that produces particular collective political subjects in interaction with the
institutions that make the city.

Civil society and political participation

The political engagement of excluded sectors has been an abiding concern of theorists
of democracy, particularly in Latin America. While wide-ranging in their insights, works that
focus on the topic evolve from three basic perspectives. Political-economic approaches
(Kaufman and Stallings 1991, O’Donnell 1993) have provided critical explorations of the role of
state and economic structures in determining forms and levels of mass popular political
participation. Post-structural approaches (Evers 1985, Laclau 2005), in contrast, have turned
our attention to the importance of the discursive construction of collective identities. Bringing
elements of these approaches together is a growing literature on the historical and political
context of collective identities. In Latin America, this perspective has most recently focused on
indigenous mobilization across the region (Cammack 2000, Eckstein 2002, Andolina 1999,
Yashar 2005).

This literature that highlights the historical, political contexts of contemporary social
movements is especially insightful as it contextualizes discourse and identity in
institutionalized state and economic structures. The historical-institutional approach that
characterizes this literature, however, has been generally applied to analyses of social
movements, and has, thus, focused on the organizational elements of popular politics. Thus,
contrasting perspectives on Bolivian contemporary society and politics stress either its robust
civil society built progressively from the 1952 reforms onwards (Dunkerley 1984, Grindle and
Domingo 2003), or the more precarious populist politics aimed at uniting the heterogeneous
society that is the legacy of racialized colonization (Demmers et al. 2001, Oxhorn 1998). The
present study seeks to contribute to this line of research by adding to it a bottom-up approach
that takes everyday practices, rather than organizational dynamics, as its focus. It looks at the
ways that collective identities are constructed by identifying logics of their shared practices,
produced in interaction with urban and state institutions.

Bolivia provides an extraordinarily apt place to explore the dynamic and controversial
constitution of overlapping collectives. The consolidation of a national public is a proclaimed
state goal, yet the political rise of the party in power was premised on the mobilization of syndicalist and indigenous groups. Contesting allegiances – particularly in the resource-rich and ethnically distinct eastern lowlands – have been most strikingly articulated in calls for autonomy by the oppositional Nación Camba movement. Further, Bolivia has come to play an important symbolic role in transnational social imaginaries. These include worldwide virtual communities, such as the International Indigenous Movement, and more immediately, Latin American integrative efforts, including political and economic alliances such as the South American Community of Nations trade bloc and cultural and ideological projects like Telesur, a pan-Latin American challenge to CNN and BBC in the Americas. Grasping the contours and conjunctions of these types of shifting socio-political organization is a broad task for social scientists in the era of globalization (Appadurai 1996).

Political sociologist and now Vice President of Bolivia Alvaro García-Linera (2005) considers that the social organization underlying recent Bolivian mobilizations is based on the new forms of association that followed the fragmentation of corporate collectives by neoliberal restructuring of labor organization. In a review of this analysis, however, Nancy Postero (2005) writes, “What remains is more serious ethnographic research to see how this compelling argument plays out. This would be the next step to seeing what this ‘multitude’ is made of and how multiple factors might interact with it” (132). This research project seeks to provide an empirical exploration in that vein, with a particular focus on the ways that collectivities are grounded in everyday practices produced as a result and in response to urban and state institutions.

This study builds on the growing Latin American literature on the rise of indigenous movements and on recent changes in the region's racialized political landscape (Yashar 2005, Albro 2005, Postero 2007). I draw on these analyses' theoretical concerns with the tension between democracy’s provision of universal citizenship rights and its ability to recognize and respect differences in social organization that challenge the individualism implicit in such rights. The framing of these questions in terms of collective identities highlights the multiplicity of collectivities that overlap and interact to form civil and political society. This, in turn, points to the limitations of the Habermasian formulation of the problem, that is, how can the public sphere be strengthened where matters of common concern can be rationally discussed (1991)? The question, rather, must be extended and refined, as Habermas’ followers and critics have suggested (Fraser 1990, Eley 1992), to explore how it is that ‘common’ and ‘public’ come to be defined and experienced, and to analyze the exclusions and omissions that such definitions enact.

The social collectives explored in this study are “field[s] of discursive connections” (Calhoun 1992:37) established through associative practices (Dewey 1954, Arendt 1998, Warner 2002). Examining formations of collectives rather than a culture or a society highlights

“interaction and continuing self-formation rather than a given or self-sufficient body of practices distinguishing one group from another...

[A collective] evokes ‘identity,’ but does so with more emphasis on
actions and their consequences than on the nature of the characteristics of the actors.” (Robbins 1993:xvii)

In other words, the notion of collectives allows for a focus on social organization as it is practically and discursively enacted, thus allowing for an examination of their production through interactions with institutional mechanisms. By studying social relations of power informed by an approach that explores the co-production of urban institutions and collective logics and subjects, this project stresses the importance of everyday practices in popular political participation.

The formation and political import of such collective dynamics has been most prolifically explored in the revitalized study of civil society. This renewed interest in civil society in the last few decades is due to – depending on one’s point of view – democratic openings after the fall of Communism in Europe and the collapse of dictatorships in Latin America, the alienation inherent in liberal economic models, a yearning for the stability of collectives in an increasingly insecure world, or the tremendous rise of non-governmental associations throughout the world (Edwards 2004:2). Robert Cox (1999) usefully connects the emergence of civil society discourse to the neoliberal hegemony in the contemporary global economy:

“As the state retreats from service and social protection to the public, the public loses confidence in the integrity and competency of the political class... At the end of this century, there is a world-wide problem of repairing or building political societies, of constructing a sense of identity between people and political authorities. There is a wide political space between the constituted authority and the practical life of people... Civil society would be the base upon which a new or reconstructed political authority would have to rest.” (13)

Thus, civil society describes the social and everyday space “upon which a new or reconstructed political authority would have to rest” (ibid.). In this sense, however, what exactly is this social and everyday space termed civil society? And how can it be understood in relation to the public collective whose confidence the state has purportedly lost?

In Jean Cohen and Andrew Arato’s (1992) terms, civil society represents a “particular angle of looking at this world from the point of view of conscious association building and associational life” (x). They write that, “Accordingly, civil society refers to the structures of socialization, association and organized forms of communication... to the extent that these are institutionalized or in the process of being institutionalized” (ibid.). Thus, while this study's close focus is on collective identities and logics, its aim is to help us understand civil society – which includes voluntary associations and forms of communication – as the deliberate association and institutionalization that both emerges from and creates these collectives (Calhoun 1993). Social theorists from Gramsci (1971) to Bourdieu (1990), however, have pointed to the indelible links between civic institutions and associations, on the one hand, and
political and economic power and structures, on the other. These distinctions between civil society, local subjectivities and unequal structures are useful for approaching contemporary social mobilization in Bolivia. Such conceptual distinctions help discern the concrete institutional bases and historical inequalities that form patterns of organized civil society from the collective logics produced by organized civil society. Historical-institutional analyses of indigenous mobilization, for example, highlight the institutional bases and structural conditions from which collective identities emerge. Such approaches to popular civil society activity, thus, bring together political-economic and discursive perspectives on Bolivian mobilization.

Political-economic approaches to popular civil society activity grow out of analyses of the classical populism that was widespread throughout Latin America from the 1930s to 1970s (whose most paradigmatic representative is Juan Perón of Argentina), and see populism as a particular stage in the maturation of liberal economies and democracies. These perspectives highlight either fiscal indiscipline or redistributive economic policies, as is evident in the work of Kauffman and Stallings (1991), or stress the multiclass, socio-political coalitions that typically arise during the early stages of Latin American industrialization, as seen in O'Donnell’s (1973) work on democratic transitions and in the Colliers’ (2002) book on the political incorporation of labor forces. These variants of the political-economic approach have been most useful in helping to explain shifts in economic and sociopolitical configurations of mid-20th century Latin American countries, as we see in their application to the Bolivian case after the Bolivian Revolution in 1952.

In contrast to the political-economic approach to popular civil society activity, discursive approaches are not limited to particular spatio-temporal locations. Instead, they focus on more symbolic processes of political legitimation and mobilization. Post-structuralist approaches in this vein, for example, claim that populism represents a challenge to the entrenched status-quo in the interest of the subaltern sectors through the promotion of an identity of the ‘people.’ This perspective is represented in the work of Ernesto Laclau (1985) on new social movements and more explicitly, in his later work on hegemony and populist reason (2005). As we will see in the brief historical review below, discursive approaches are more useful for understanding more recent iterations of Bolivian popular politics, such as the rise of indigenous parties in the 1990s and Evo Morales’ stunning victory in the 2005 elections. Yet post-structural approaches are limited by their inability to incorporate historically grounded institution building that has been central to the rise of contemporary social movements in Bolivia. At the end of the historical review, I examine the ways that historical-institutional approaches to popular politics draw from both political-economic and discursive perspectives. They incorporate diverse analyses of labor organization, populist bonds and alliances, decentralization and ‘new’ social movements, all of which constitute the historical context of contemporary Bolivian civil society forms.

Ruth and David Collier (2002), and others, argue that the growth of Latin American countries’ labor forces was the premise for their populist incorporation. That is, as the
economic growth stimulated by Latin American countries’ export-oriented policies of the late 19th to early 20th century fostered industrialization and urbanization, the urban working and middle class sectors and national industrial bourgeoisie burgeoned. The demographic and economic strength of the new labor and middle class sectors was harnessed into popular support of the nationalist import substitution industrialization policies that were the hallmark of the classical populist governments. Indeed, in the 1930s and ‘40s, when Bolivia’s traditional oligarchic politics – based on the wealth of its mining exports – were questioned after the devastation of the Chaco War¹, novel discussions regarding land, labor and economic dependency on private investments ensued (Klein 2003). Labor organization, which up to that point had consisted mainly of miner unions, was expanded and institutionalized into state structures through the Ministry of Labor. The Ministry declared the compulsory unionization of factory workers, craft workers and miners (Alexander 2005).

Despite the post-Chaco War government’s attempt to build coalitions with labor, the political scene was complicated by the emergence of multiple political forces battling to fill in the political vacuum left by the withdrawal of traditional parties. The National Revolutionary Movement (MNR for its initials in Spanish) was the party that was best able to bring together the fragmented political field (C. Mitchell 1977). The party’s forces were assembled through cross-class alliances; in 1952, with the support of a segment of the armed forces, the MNR distributed arms to their working and middle-class supporters and, unexpectedly, easily took La Paz. The period that followed – from 1952-64 when the MNR held state power – was Bolivia’s most influential populist period by far. Responding to their sudden popular mandate and in an attempt to incorporate the mobilized peasantry and labor forces, the MNR’s policies were more radical than they had originally planned. Aside from universal suffrage, these included a comprehensive agrarian reform program, nationalization of large strategic mining sectors, and an ambitious universal education policy (Arze and Kruse 2004:23).

Through these policies – as well as by granting the Bolivian Workers’ Central (COB) labor federation important influence in regime policies – the MNR enjoyed widespread popular support. A more inclusive civil society was developed with the Revolutionary period’s establishment of a citizenship regime that included the conversion of indios (natives) into campesinos (peasants), the admission of illiterates as citizens and the attainment of women’s legal equality with men. Politicians within MNR, however, struggled over the support of this broadened political base. Those opposed to the power of the COB sought an alternative base to labor; the MNR administration that governed between 1960 and 1964 hoped to weaken the importance of the central union by reconstituting and rearming the military, which since the National Revolution had been mostly engaged in public works. This move away from labor interests split the MNR into opposing factions. Thus weakened, the MNR was overthrown in 1964 by a military junta, and until 1982, Bolivia was ruled by a series of short-lived military

¹ The Chaco War was a territorial war fought against Paraguay between 1932 to 1935, in which Bolivia lost not only a large part of its territory, but over 65,000 of its young men’s lives out of a total population of only about two million persons.
dictatorships. These various governments sought to bring civil society, especially the unions, under tighter control. To combat their lack of labor support, the military regimes tried to forge a strategic relationship with other popular sectors, notably the peasantry. The military-campesino pact was a ‘top-down’ attempt to create a clientelistic system in rural areas through which the peasantry would be rewarded for its support for the country’s military rulers (Crabtree 2001:3).

In 1982, a democratically-elected government was instated in the midst of fiscal crisis. A combination of hyperinflation from 1982 through 1985, the concurrent collapse of world prices of tin, Bolivia’s key export, and the implementation of the 1985 structural adjustment policies changed the political panorama of civil society. Labor organizations were effectively subdued through the early 1980s, then thoroughly undermined by the New Economic Policy of 1985, under which state mining centers were closed, leaving 23,000 of its 30,000 workers unemployed (Medeiros 2001:408). The rapidly growing urban migrant populations resulted from the severe dislocations in mining and from a similarly ruinous agricultural situation, with the value of agricultural production dropping 11% between 1980 and 1984, and a severe drought in 1983 (Klein:240). Two important populist parties that formed before the 1989 elections marked the complex political divisions and preferences that were pervasive in urban areas by the late 1980s. Conciencia de la Patria (literally translated as Conscience of the Homeland), led by Andean media personality Carlos Palenque, and Unión Cívica Solidaria (Union of Civic Solidarity), created by Santa Cruz based beer industrialist Max Fernández, both garnered significant support and placed well in the elections (Molina 2005). Though both parties were dismantled following the deaths of their leaders in the late 1990s, their popularity forced other parties to take seriously the indigenous base no longer tied clientelistically to the MNR (Albro 2005).

In the 1990s, the indigenous parties of Movimiento al Socialismo (Movement Towards Socialism, MAS) and Movimiento Indigenista Pachakuti (Pachakuti Indigenous Movement) – represented by Evo Morales and Felipe Quispe respectively – expanded, partly as a result of the 1994 Law of Popular Participation that opened up political spaces for municipal elections (Domingo 2005). The Law decentralized government resources and responsibilities, and had far-reaching effects in the transformation of local and urban relationships, both empowering diverse and indigenous authorities and, as we will see in the chapters that follow, enabling clientelism and exploitation. The Law of Popular Participation recognized traditional indigenous forms of social organization and self-government and doubled the share of the national budget going to local municipalities from 10% to 20%. Neighborhood and indigenous organizations were officially recognized as Territorial Base Organizations, which were to be vehicles for participatory planning at the municipal level, and the representatives of these OTBs formed committees with veto power over municipal budgets (Stephenson 2000). While the consequences of the Popular Participation Law are still being analyzed and debated (Goudsmit and Blackburn 2001, Kohl 2002), it is clear that local political spaces established with the implementation of the law has further enabled what Deborah Yashar calls a “scaling
up” of indigenous collectivities, that is, their expansion and reinforcement through transcommunity networks (2005:99-100). Its effect on cities and their peripheries will be explored throughout the dissertation.

Yashar’s distinctive contribution to the literature on the institutionalization of indigenous social movements is her comparative and historical examination of their networks. Indigenous communities were first mobilized in Bolivia through the extension of citizenship rights by the MNR during its dominant post-revolution period. For example, central to the mobilization of the largely indigenous rural population was the new revolutionary government’s extension of education that led to an increase of the rural student body by 564% between 1952-1974 (Yashar 156). Yashar argues that a corporatist citizenship regime was implemented through the institutionalization of peasant unions as part of the land reform policy. Thus indigenous peasants were mobilized and created networks that were consolidated through schools and unions. The indigenous activists, calling themselves Kataristas after Tupac Katari, leader of the 1781 indigenous rebellion against the Spaniards, effectively utilized those networks beginning in the 1960s. These activists became an important political force through their leadership in the Sole Confederated Union of Peasant Workers in Bolivia (CSUTCB), established in 1979. CSUTCB leaders' political strategies were sharpened through the intermittent openings of political associational space during the military period (Andolina 1999, Albó 2000).

Both Evo Morales and Felipe Quispe cut their political teeth with the Aymara-led CSUTCB, which sought to bring together the ethno-national and class concerns of indigenous highland peasants. As the importance of the CSUTCB diminished in the mid 1980s, as noted above, due to the drastic shifts in labor patterns, the coca growers' unions increased in importance to challenge the U.S. pressure for coca eradication (VanCott 2003:755). The Cochabamba coca-growers trade union movement from which Morales emerged was part of the second-generation indigenous movement that learned from the La Paz-based Kataristas’ experience. MAS did not emerge, as did the Kataristas, from efforts to defend local autonomy. Yet its leaders learned the value of networking and focusing on ethnicity and locally-based community forms as part of their populist political program.

In the context of this history, in which the Law of Popular Participation has institutionalized political engagement at the local level and populism has discursively articulated mass politics, what is the role of participation in the transformation of social hierarchies? Chapter Four will argue that the technical institutionalization of participation has actually de-politicized and reinscribed exclusions. Nevertheless, the persistence of socio-economic inequalities combined with the liberal ideal of formal political inclusion has intensified popular calls for participation in Bolivia. National social movements have sought to destabilize the modern divisions that partition the state off from society, hoping to thus challenge hierarchies and inequalities. This is apparent in the populist character of their demands.

It is, therefore, a complex interaction between labor, populist, municipal and
indigenous collective organizations and identities that has brought about the intense civil society activity apparent in Bolivia today. Political-economic approaches (Malloy 1970, Colliers 1991) are necessary in helping understand the structural forces at work in the emergence of popular politics. Yet such analyses of ‘old’ social movements, populism and decentralization cannot encompass the intersection of politics and collective identity that has been critical to the rise of indigenous movements in Bolivia. Post-structural approaches, in contrast, insist on the always incomplete nature of the social. Laclau (2005), for example, considers that any construction of collective identity takes place in the wide openness and indeterminacy of society, in which “the social only exists... as an effort to construct that impossible object” (Laclau and Mouffe 1985:112). According to this perspective, a collectivity is an ever-receding horizon defined by the transitory stability in a system of signification, and by the crystallization of a logic of equivalences that unites particular demands. It requires constant and interminable political work (Laclau 2005). This approach links everyday and mundane social practices – through which we make meaning and thus signify – to the political constitution of social forms. Yet while such discursive approaches to ‘new’ social movements can help shed light on the widespread appeal of MAS in contemporary politics, it cannot help us to comprehend the complex dynamics of its emergence.

The historical-institutional approach to collective identities is best able to bring elements from the political-economic and post-structuralist perspectives together. Such an approach stresses the institutional implications of discourse within the context of political and economic structures. Paul Cammack (2000), for example, writes that rather than contrast the structural and discursive aspects of populism, he seeks to “retain Laclau’s emphasis on the particular significance of ‘appeals to the people’ in the context of capitalist society and institutions, through an integrated analysis of discourse, institutions, and political economy, in a specified historical conjuncture.... Just as much attention should be paid to the institutional implications of populism as to its structural and discursive content: a full analysis will operate simultaneously at the three levels of structure, institutions, and discourse, and the relationship between these three elements will reflect the character of the historical conjuncture.” (152)

A similar emphasis on the contextualized institutionalization of identity is apparent in Marc Edelman’s work (1998), in which he argues that contemporary Central American transnationally-networking peasant activities can only be understood in terms of both its class-based and policy-oriented analytic components (central to “old social movements” studies) and its focus on identity and cultural specificity (the theoretical meat and potatoes of “new social movements” studies).

Such an approach is most useful in understanding the development of indigenous social movements and parties in contemporary Bolivia. Susan Eckstein’s (2002) comments on the
historical institutional approach to social movements apply to my analysis of popular political participation. She writes that these types of analysis

“help account for generalizable as well as particularistic features of the movements grounded, directly and indirectly, in neoliberalism.

Accordingly, an institutional analysis highlights localized responses that neoclassical economics and modernization-based societal analyses overlook, both analytically and empirically, overlook, and trans-local features about which local-centric postmodern analyses do not theorize.

(363)

Although the institutional approach highlights the importance of culture and group-based beliefs, “it grounds the study analytically in global institutional dynamics and mediating structures, as well as [in] local group life” (ibid.). The work of Yashar, Edelman and Eckstein focuses on civil society mobilization and its institutionalization in indigenous parties. These parties’ populist insistence on their difference from traditional parties has made a social movements perspective relevant to their analysis.

Social movements approaches have importantly extended academic analyses of civil society that establish the importance of non-state forms of political engagement (Gramsci 1971, Fung 2003). Yet those approaches have also encouraged analyses that function at an organizational level, as they seek to understand how the movements have developed and expanded. My own study seeks to extend the discussion on popular political activity beyond party and movement politics. It engages historical-institutional approaches with the insights of theorists from various literatures: political culture scholars who have examined the production of collective subjectivities (Anderson 1991, Eliasoph 1998); urban analysts who have made important connections between the construction of exclusive publics to property and class relations (Lefebvre 1991, Blomley 2003); and anthropologists and sociologists who have stressed the importance of practical and embodied knowledge in the enactment of social collective and hierarchies (Foucault 1977, Bourdieu 1990). Bringing these literatures into constructive conversation, this study seeks to contribute to a better understanding of the ways that interactions between institutions and daily practices create particular forms of social and political relations.

Production of the periphery and the city effect

Beginning with and drawing on the work of Timothy Mitchell, this second subsection briefly examines the relevant literature on the city’s role in social and political relations. It looks at studies that focus on the ways that the city reinforces a center-periphery paradigm that creates differential access to resources of power through the production of peripheral and marginal subjects. Mitchell (2002) discusses early modern theorization of the city as critical to the establishment of the economy as a unified and discrete sphere. He writes that:
“Prior to the making of the economy in its mid-twentieth century meaning, the idea of the metropolis could be used in this way to imagine the density and tangibility of economic relations. In the formative decades of the professional social sciences, sociologists were preoccupied with the question of the city. It held a place later to be filled by the idea of economy.” (96)

In terms quoted from Georg Simmel’s influential essay “The Metropolis and Mental Life,” the city served to separate “objective culture” from ideas and values. The city provided a built environment that embodied subjective ideas in objective form. By the mid-twentieth century, according to Mitchell, the economy came to be understood as the objective form, then the driver, of social change.

Mitchell’s point about the economy is that its power derives not from its internal logic and coherence, but rather, from its construction as an internally logical and coherent field. He writes:

“The power of what we call capitalism rests increasingly on its ability to portray itself as a unique and universal form, on reproducing a view of history and of economics in which the market is the universal system, constituted and propelled forward by the power of its own internal logic. The displacements and reformulations of the capitalist project show its dependence on arrangements and forces that this logic needs to portray as non-capitalist.” (271)

Mitchell shows that an understanding of the economy as the driving engine of social change depends on the widening gap between what are understood as objective forces and structures (such as progress, capitalism, development) and the subjective practices they supposedly direct. He shows, nevertheless how this objective structure, is itself an assembly of political practices that depends on the subjective concealment of the violences it effects.

These concealments take place through the subject positions that institutional mechanisms produce. Mitchell makes a similar argument in an article on “Society, Economy and the State Effect” (1998). In it, he argues that the state “needs to be analyzed as... a structural effect” (93).

“That is to say, it should be examined not as an actual structure, but as the powerful, metaphysical effect of practices that make such structures appear to exist... In fact, the nation state is arguably the paramount structural effect of the modern social world. It includes within itself many... particular institutions, such as armies, schools, and bureaucracies. Beyond these, the larger presence of the state in several ways takes the form of a framework that appears to stand apart from the social world and provide an external structure.” (93-4)
For Mitchell, however, this does not mean that the understanding of the state as separate from society is an illusory distinction. He argues that the boundary of what is understood as the state is in fact drawn within, instead of beyond, the network of institutional state mechanisms: “Producing and maintaining the distinction between state and society is itself a mechanism that generates resources of power... The appearance that state and society or economy are separate things is part of the way a given financial and economic order is maintained” (83-4).

In a similar way, the distinction between the city and the non-city – what I call the city effect – is a result of the institutions that make it take the form of a framework apart from the social world that is continuously re-created. The city is, literally and symbolically, at the core of spatialized center-periphery paradigms. That is, the city, in institutionalized practices and in social imaginaries, is constructed as the center to which access is limited. As in other cities worldwide, Cochabamba’s periurban residents are essential parts of the city’s economy and urban public. Yet they are generally recognized, even by themselves, as the peripheral and negative outliers against which the urban is defined.

Periurban and urban-popular sectors in Latin America, in fact, have been defined by their lack since cities in the region began to burgeon. Rapid urban growth began during their most intense period of industrialization, from the 1950s onwards (Portes 1989). The average urban population in Latin American countries quadrupled between 1950-1980, whereas their total populations only doubled (Barcena 2001:52). The huge numbers of new city dwellers were an integral part of the industrializing and urbanizing economy, yet neither the terms of that economy nor the services municipalities provided kept up with migrants’ housing and consumption needs. Squatter settlements proliferated throughout and at the edges of cities. Developmental models explained the deprivation of economically and spatially peripheral urban sectors by endogenous causes.

In contrast to these views, dependency-influenced urbanists applied theories of unequal relations to more local geographies of capitalism. Like political-economic analysts of mass politics noted above, dependency theorists explained marginality structurally. International level dependency theorists, such as Andre Gunder Frank (1969) and Cardoso and Faletto (1979) argued that Latin American countries would not follow the path of development forged by European and North American countries. They showed, rather, how the very international structures of capitalist accumulation at the basis of this model of development actively produced and reproduced underdevelopment in the region. Urbanists such as Janice Perlman (2003) and Manuel Castells (1983) applied the dependency model to challenge the concept of marginality that explained economic poverty by the poor's social disorganization, cultural backwardness and political apathy (Lewis 1976).

As Gunder Frank argued for dependent nations, so did Perlman for Brazil's urban poor: their poverty was not dictated by their dissimilarities from other sectors, but rather, by their very integration into unequal social structures. Perlman argued that the myth of marginality is not simply invalid, but further served political functions of isolation and deprivation of participation. David Collier (1976) took this line of argument further by showing that one of
the most important stimulants to squatter settlements has been populist mobilizations. Such political and often covert machinations of the elite and the state demonstrate that informality is closely linked to formal political and social institutions, and is even actively produced by those institutions and relations.

Theorists who followed this approach to urban marginality specified links between urban and international relationships of dependency. Manuel Castells placed the question of squatters and the state within a broad historical survey of urban social movements. In The City and the Grassroots, Castells (1983) argues that marginal actors and the struggles they articulate are critical to the very definition – symbolic and practical, political and economic – of the organization of the city. Through extraordinary empirical detail and across centuries of Western sites, Castells shows that urban meaning and functions are shaped by conflicts over the role of cities in collective consumption, community and citizenship. While Castells’ focus on urban social movements highlights the centrality of “marginal” actors in these definitions, his chapter on squatters in the dependent city lays bare the limits of such participation. Although not wholly determined by them, neither can social movements or their participants function outside international and institutionalized structures of dominance.

The 1980s neoliberal economic policies that followed the 1950s to 1980s period of industrialization and intense urban growth have reshaped cities worldwide and further dispossessed their poorest inhabitants. Prompted by the international debt crisis, the World Bank and IMF began to promote debt management through highly conditioned loans. The conditions of their structural adjustment loans and programs demanded a fiscally austere restructuring of national economic policies. These led, throughout the region, to the elimination of social welfare and labor protection, the freezing of salaries and the increase in prices of basic goods. The structural violences thus produced were social, political and symbolic. Urbanists such as Javier Auyero (2007) explore how this violence is structural (producing mass unemployment), personal and corporeal (as the daily dangers of living in slums are amplified by unemployment), political (with intermittent state repression) and, significantly, symbolic (since social isolation leads to further decreases in social and other types of capital). The situation of the residents of the Zona Sur must be understood in this context. As Bourdieu (1998) writes:

“You cannot cheat the law of the conservation of violence: all violence is paid for, and for example, the structural violence exerted by the financial markets, in the form of layoffs, loss of security, etc., is matched sooner or later in the form of suicides, crime and delinquency, drug addiction, alcoholism, a whole host of minor and major everyday acts of violence.” (40)

Such analyses of “advanced marginality” emphasize the structural and political-economic forces that produce it.

Nevertheless, these ways of understanding inequalities by examining the processes by
which marginality is imposed, fail to note the radical shifts in modes of organization and urban life that emerge from popular sectors’ responses to these impositions and marginalizations. Structural approaches to inequality are thus, on their own, inadequate for understanding increasingly influential popular sectors in periurban areas throughout Latin America. Like the post-structuralist approaches to mass politics noted above, urban studies of informality have also benefited from analyses that pay close attention to the construction of new forms of sociality. As such, work by theorists such as Asaf Bayat (1997), Nezar AlSayyad and Ananya Roy (2003) and Goankar (2001) are innovative in their approach to the informalization that has increased dramatically worldwide. Rather than define informality – whether in employment, housing or political action – in opposition to the formal sphere, these works analyze informality on its own terms. That is, they seek to understand the alternative social, economic or political configurations that are generated by varied forms of informality.

Such forms are theorized into altogether new analytics for understanding informality and cities in AbdouMaliq Simone’s (2004) powerful analysis of African cities. Central to his work is the recognition that structural adjustment means more than the restructuring of national economic policies. It constitutes, in fact, a restructuring of the very experiences of city life – of the most basic dimensions of time and space and sociality – that ground African lives. Thus the responses to these new regimes grow out of those shifted definitions. Simone’s compelling contribution to urban studies is his focus on the very experimentation rooted in the heterogeneity of African urban actors' and in the evanescence and mobility of African social formations and identity. He writes:

“Far from being marginal to contemporary processes of scalar recomposition and the reimagination of political communities, African cities can be seen as a frontier for a wide range of diffuse experimentation with the reconfiguration of bodies, territories and social arrangements necessary to recalibrate technologies of social control... Here, what we may know conventionally as legality and illegality, war and peace, the corporeal and the spiritual, the formal and the informal, and movement and home are brought into a proximity that produces a highly ambiguous sense of place. These ambiguities... amplify the historical capacity of many African societies to configure highly mobile social formations. These formations emphasize the construction of multiple spaces of operation embodying a broad range of tactical abilities aimed at maximizing economic opportunities through transversal engagements across territories and disparate arrangements of power.” (2)

Simone explores the reconfigurative creativity of Africans’ urban activity while critiquing the crushing conditions that compel such creativity. Simone’s work is the clearest articulation of attempts in urban studies to move beyond the dichotomies of agency and structure, resistance and negotiation, towards an emphasis on the new horizons of possibility, the regimes of
subjectivity and the systems of intelligibility created by the “lived hegemony” of contemporary international conditions.

These kinds of analyses that focus on the creativity of the marginal are reflected in current literature – both technical-urban and socio-political – on the periurban. Isabel Arteaga (2005), for example, writes that precisely because of its peripheral position and the instability of its land use, the urban periphery leads to "new contours, new ways of occupying territory, new ways of acting, of planning, new typologies, new social conflicts, in short, the contemporary urban world” (103). She continues:

“...It is from this space that we must construct (and reconstruct) today's cities. The large open spaces, the inestimacies between consolidated networks, the transformative capacity of constructed space, the identification of a particular logic and of a spatial diversity have converted themselves into opportunities for the periphery, to rethink it and transform it... From being a space without meaning in which the absence of history has driven the construction of a space without identity, it has become a space with a unique meaning where spontaneity is converted into identity.” (107)

Despite the idealized character of this image of the periurban, we can usefully draw from these recent analyses an emphasis on the centrality of peripheries to urban logics. The term periurban, as opposed to the categories of informality or the “urban poor” defines not only a state or a structural location, but also a subjective position. As such, the periurban as it has been developed in Latin American literature (Castronovo 1998, Castellano and Perez 2003) and as it is employed in this study, is a both an identity and a process that actively partakes in the construction of the city.

A critique of the celebratory mode of post-structuralist approaches to informality parallels the appraisal of post-structuralist perspectives to mass politics: each of these perspectives tends to de-contextualize the objects of study from their historical and structural production. The previous sub-section showed how my study seeks to bring together elements of political-economic and post-structuralist perspectives on the politics of the poor. Likewise, I seek to draw on findings from both structural and post-structuralist approaches to urban marginality and informality. To do so, I employ theoretical insights from a more recent anthropology of development literature, which I will describe in the subsection that follows. While not specifically applied to cities, these studies help us to understand that the dynamics of informality and marginality depend fundamentally on a discursive and symbolic separation of the formal from the informal and the developed from the underdeveloped. Further, these analyses examine the ways that the definitions of such oppositions maintain particular social and economic structures. My own work contributes to this approach by exploring the ways that state and development institutions create peripheral subjects of the city.
Urban institutions and periurban logics and subjects

This subsection explores literatures that may shed light on the ways that urban institutions produce periurban subjectivities. This will provide a basis for examining in the following chapters how collective logics and political subjects are formed in Cochabamba's peripheries. Recent migrants to these peripheral areas consistently conceive of their move to the city as a search for inclusion in national and global markets and societies. This inclusion, however, is channeled through particular social institutions, institutions which then change the ways that periurban residents understand their relationships to their surroundings. The section will end by describing the use of the heuristic device of ideal-types, and refer to relevant literature to preliminarily define three forms of collective logics and political subjects – neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent – that are produced in interaction with urban and state institutions in Bolivia.

State institutions as social systems, and the municipal institutions that materialize these systems, formalize practices in order to stabilize them. At the same time, however, they also frame particular social relations of legitimacy and authority and promote certain ways of understanding and evaluating one’s context and position. This is because formalization does not decrease the complexity of social, political or economic relationships. An early and emblematic historical example of this was the Spanish strategy of “reductions,” in which indigenous populations were resettled into towns designed by the Spanish. In the name of the native's spiritual conversion to Christianity, however, their economic, social and political relations with each other and to the Spanish were also transformed. That is, the formalization of one element – in the colonial case, the spatial residence of natives – impelled, justified and to an extent, concealed a series of other social and political reconfigurations. Another example of this is formal land titling, carried out with the aim of increasing the efficiency and security of private property systems. Yet the formalization of ownership in titles is made at the cost of the diminished legitimacy and binding character of other social and political arrangements regarding land.

Examining international development from a similar perspective, James Ferguson (1990) shows how the limiting of development initiatives to the technical formulation of problems and solutions reinscribes and conceals international power relations. It is in this sense that he describes development as an “anti-politics machine.” Tanya Murray Li (2007), extending Ferguson’s analysis writes that: “The practice of ‘rendering technical’ confirms expertise and constitutes the boundary between those who are positioned as trustees, with the capacity to diagnose deficiencies in others, and those who are subject to expert direction. It is a boundary that has to be maintained” (7). In order for improvement efforts to be legitimate, a boundary of “lack” needs to produced and controlled. In a similar vein, Timothy Mitchell (2004) describes the separation between the formal and informal spheres as a “frontier,” in which the distinction between formal and informal property is actually a “terrain of warfare” over which configurations of capitalism are battled.
Such recent literature examining the construction of boundaries between the formal and the informal, the developed and the underdeveloped, and trustees and their charges goes beyond the post-structural deconstruction of these categories. Rather, it argues for the analysis of the political processes by which these boundaries are established and maintained. It is not incidental that this line of analysis is furthered by Anglo-European trained anthropologists studying the developing world. It combines Western deconstructive analytical moves with the need to take seriously the persistence of the deconstructed categories (like development) as more than false consciousness.

North American anthropologist Mark Goodale (2008) notes a key dilemma at the heart of his research on the law and liberalism in rural Bolivia: “how to mediate the empirical and conceptual gap between the critiques of modernity and its discontents on the one hand, and, on the other, what is... a positivist and essentially optimistic engagement with the project of modernity by a range of social actors and institutions” (16). In other words, how can one analytically critique paradigms of development while neither denying its importance to social actors nor proclaiming their desire for development a sham? In his analysis of the law, that extreme field of formalization of social norms, Goodale notes that, on the one hand, one must recognize that it is indeed a separate and internally coherent formal sphere, while incorporating the insights of sociolegal approaches that insist on “an expansive and essentially social understanding of law in order to decenter it” (35).

In his careful analysis, Goodale notes that “it is precisely its supposed isolation and nonrelevance that invests law in Bolivia with such power, not as a closed system of rules, but as a kind of pervasive frame of reference through which people understand and challenge identity itself” (164-65). He, thus, concludes that liberal law in Bolivia is not a field completely separate from informal spheres of everyday life, but rather the frame through which informal life has been played out. It is the subjective separation of law as a formal sphere – which depends on and produces its supposed coherence and neutrality – that marginalized Bolivians rely on as they seek fulfillment of the liberal promise of universal inclusion. Thus, instead of seeing the 1952 and current political upheavals in Bolivia as revolutions, Goodale highlights their implicit attempts to deepen and extend the promises of liberalism. In a similar way, Nancy Postero (2007) examines the forms of multicultural citizenship that have emerged in Bolivia not against, but through, neoliberal institutions. In these literatures that look at the intersection of institutions and identities, there is a finer attention to the ambivalent nature of both domination and resistance, with a more careful analysis of the ways that practices and subjectivities are formed in the intersection of the two.

That is, formalizing urban mechanisms are not simply “oppressive institutions” through which periurban residents are dominated into devaluing their traditional practices and forms. Instead, these institutions shift the ways that urban residents relate to each other and the city. There is indeed a reinscription of social inequalities that takes place with the separation of formal from informal spheres. But is not only a result of the technical effects of formalizing institutions, but also of the ways that these institutions creates different
More specifically, the practices framed by the formalizing institutional mechanisms create the subjective paradigm of center and periphery that reinforces material inequalities. That is, these practices create peripheral positions that seem to be driven by central structures, positions that entail differential access to basic infrastructural resources and economic opportunities. For those on the margins who experience the material inequalities their position entails, the subjective paradigm of center-periphery motivates their drive to access that center. Furthermore, as explored above, the lack of legitimacy of periurban areas depends on the modernizing values of development. In this model, the periurban is scorned for its closeness to the country and its distance from progress. Thus the exclusion of the periurban depends on a division of the city and the country that devalorizes the non-city.

Goodale analyzes a similar dismissal of the peripheral in his discussion of the concentric circle approach to how law works in Bolivia:

“The concentric circle approach to understanding (in this case) legal relations [and in other cases, development, progress, etc.] would seem to explain the effects of distance: The patterns of formal “law” in Bolivia radiate out from the urban centers and, like radar signals, weaken with each successive kilometer, until “law” merges and then is subsumed within “custom”, which then gives way to the idiosyncratic normative practices of single clusters of hamlets, then individual hamlets, then finally, at the far reaches, perhaps groups of families.” (73)

“However” he adds, “all this intuition... is wrong.” Goodale’s work shows that liberal law both frames and is established through rural practices and subjectivities by illiterate indigenous peasants as much by the courts and lawyers in Bolivia’s capital city of La Paz.

The marginalization of the indigenous and the periurban in national institutions such as law and the city identifies these not only as Other, but as less. The distance measured between an “urbanite” and an Other cannot be measured in kilometers, but in differential possibilities and power to determine one’s own perspectives and valuations. Marquez (2005) notes that “if the forests of the Middle Ages fulfilled the role of ‘interior frontier,’ we could say the same of the favelas in the context of today’s Brazilian cities,” or in the context of the city of Cochabamba, the periurban neighborhoods of the Zona Sur and the rural areas they resemble. Marquez continues in his analysis:

“To construct the normative, that which it is not is also needed, because the work of defining an order supposes discriminating (and therefore marginalizing) among elements that form social reality... All symbolic order is constructed, and not everybody participates equally in this construction. Material power is proportional to symbolic power.” (np)

Thus, not only are rural areas classified as a “shameful trace of the past” that must be overcome (Hernández García 2007), but so are the elements of indigenous cultures that rural
migrants bring with them, such that Camus (1999) writes of the “specificity of the indigenous as urban poor” (171).

The hierarchizing power of the center-periphery paradigm is not only derived from the ways that urban and state institutions shape unequal access to material resources. Unequal access is also subjectively experienced. Disadvantaged periurban residents seek access to urban opportunities and resources by incorporating the very valuations that define their neighborhoods and livelihoods almost completely by their lack. It is precisely in this coupling of material inequalities objectively spatialized in the city and subjective categories of identity that the center-periphery paradigm is reproduced and exclusive urban structures are maintained.

Arun Agrawal (2005) notes that “It is in adopting certain actions, gestures, and desires over time that [people’s] practices produce the effects of their subjecthood” (221). Subjectivities “act as grids for the perception and evaluation of things” (98). Developing the connection between institutions and the formation of subjects, Agrawal writes:

“Rearrangements and transformations of institutions have important effects in framing people’s interests, the way they act in relation to their interests, their involvement in the enactment of regulation, and the manner of their engagement with processes of government.... [These transformations] shape subjects, their interests and their agency [and produce] the reconfigurations of subjectivities.” (ibid.)

Following Foucault, other theorists of governmentality similarly link institutionally channeled practices to the production of particular subjects. Nikolas Rose (1999), for example, notes that “There is a history to be written of the subjects of governments. It is a little, variegated, multiple history of the objectifications of human being within the discourses that would govern them, and their subjectification in diverse practices and techniques” (41).

This dissertation looks at three different institutions that contribute to shaping the city, its peripheries and its exclusions. These are the urban and state institutions that: (1) regulate formal ownership of urban land; (2) encourage supplier-consumer models of resource management; and (3) establish public legitimacy through technical accountability. This comparative strategy is aimed at helping us understand the particular kinds of socio-political subjects that are created in the overlap of institutionalized governance. As Patton (1989) writes, “New techniques for examining, training, or controlling individuals, along with new forms of knowledge to which they give rise, bring into existence new kinds of people” (264). The study aims to examine the institutionally shaped practices that bring “new kinds of people” into existence and the transformed social and political relations which this implies. The comparative examination of three different collective logics based on empirical observations in periurban neighborhoods will help to shed light on the relationships between institutions, practices and new subjects.

To this end, the dissertation is framed around the comparison of three forms of
collective logics and political subjects – neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent – that are produced in interaction with urban and state institutions in Bolivia. While each of these socio-political forms is developed as a description of a particular neighborhood of study, this does not mean that it is the only logic that exists among neighbors in that site. Nevertheless, the terms are used to describe prevailing practices and subjectivities that are collectively constructed in order to more clearly examine shared results of, and responses to, dominant institutional mechanisms. The three logics described may be seen as ideal-types. Jessop (2002) writes:

“Ideal types are so called because they involve thought experiments, not because they represent some normative ideal or other. They are theoretical constructs formed by the one-sided accentuation of empirically observable features of social reality to produce logically coherent and objectively feasible configurations of social relations. These configurations are never found in pure form, but their conceptual construction may still be useful for heuristic, descriptive, and explanatory purposes.” (458)

In this sense, neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent logics, subjectivities and practices do not exist in any pure form, but are ways of describing three distinct configurations between institutions, people and their social and political relations. Rather than providing answers, however, these three ideal-types help me to ask particular types of questions regarding contesting paradigms of representation and authority in the framework of historically entrenched urban, national and international inequalities. Each of these three collective logics and subjects will be developed throughout the chapters that follow. In the following few paragraphs, however, I establish preliminary definitions of each.

To begin to describe neoliberal logics, it is useful to recall the distinctions Wendy Larner (2000) draws between analytic frames of neoliberalism that understand it as policy, ideology and governmentality. According to Larner, policy analyses of neoliberalism have described political and institutional shifts that accompanied the retrenchment of the welfare state, yet this analytic lens does not shed light on the link between changing programmatic policies and individual identities and subjectivities. For Larner, neo-Gramscian studies of neoliberalism as ideology overcome that shortcoming by describing how power relations are constructed in and through political discourse. But it is the governmentality approach to neoliberalism that Larner sees as most helpful in elucidating the ways that institutionalized apparatuses recreate inequalities by establishing “‘regimes of truth’ concerning the conduct of conduct... ways of speaking truth, persons authorized to speak truth” (Rose 1999:19). Neoliberalism in this sense can be understood as a “system of meaning that constitutes institutions, practices and identities [although] in contradictory and disjunctive ways” (Larner 2000:12).

Theorists of neoliberal governmentality have extended Foucault's analysis of the
production of the individual, self-disciplined subject within liberalism to the changing contemporary organization of society and individuals. Rose and Miller (2008), for example, characterize the shift from liberal to neoliberal governmentality as distinguished by three features: (1) a transformed relationship between expertise and politics, such that political authorities are evaluated through expert calculative techniques like accountability and audits; (2) the displacement of centralized regulatory techniques to “a form of government through shaping the powers and wills of autonomous entities: enterprises, organizations, communities, professionals, individuals” (213); and (3) subjects that are ruled through their acts of choice. As such, neoliberal governmentality implies that “political reason must now justify and organize itself by arguing over the arrangements that are adequate to the existence of persons as, in their new essence, creatures of freedom, liberty and autonomy” (214). The concept of neoliberal subjects helps to clarify the ways that dominant logics of municipal and state institutions shape neighborhood collective practices and subjectivities.

The second configuration of collective logics and political subjects that will be developed throughout the dissertation is identified as counter-hegemonic. The term describes social and political forms that seek to collectively counter dominant logics and is best understood in the context of the Gramscian literature on hegemonies. Following Gramsci, Laclau and Mouffe (1985) define hegemony as the contingent articulation “by which a certain particularity assumes the representation of a universality” (xii). In this sense, hegemony is the political relationship by which a collectivity of wills – a cluster of particular demands and identities – is transformed into a common and collective will. For Laclau and Mouffe, the unification of distinct demands and identities – that takes place most significantly through the populist definition of an antagonistic frontier – is at the root of all political activity.

Such a post-structuralist perspective of mass politics is useful for understanding the rise of indigenous social movements and political parties in Bolivia and Latin America more generally. As this approach highlights the construction of malleable identities, the construction of collective, indigenous identities can be understood as political, rather than purely social or cultural acts. The populism and popularity of Evo Morales, for example, does not depend only on indigenous significations. Rather, he “swiftly moves from identifying himself specifically with the ‘Quechuas and Aymaras’, then more broadly with ‘indigenous people’ and finally with the Bolivian people more generally... Morales’ indigeneity here is a strategic position against which to challenge global capitalism.” (Canessa 2006:252). His antagonistic frontier against global capitalism provides for a more wide-ranging set of equivalent linkages and a broader base of support. In Gramscian terms, it is an organic cohesion between leaders and led that may provide the equivalences necessary for a counter-hegemonic reconstruction of a ‘people’ into a popular collective will.

Finally, the third type of social and political logic that is identified and developed in the next chapters is labeled a divergent logic. The purpose of using the term divergent is to suggest collective forms and practices that are defined neither in terms of the dominant logics materialized in urban and state institutions, nor in opposition to them. Neoliberal
subjectivities are produced through institutional practices and techniques. Counter-hegemonic subjectivities are framed by their discursive opposition to these. Divergent subjectivities, in contrast, are predominantly defined by practices and techniques that are tangential rather than antagonistic to dominant logics. Instead of being defined by or against state institutions, they channeled through their subaltern forms of non-state organization. Divergent logics are, to be sure, historically produced in interaction with the city and state's institutions, yet they are not currently or fundamentally defined by, or oppositional, to them.

The particular study site whose collective logics are identified as divergent, for example, has its own communal, associational and networked organizational characteristics. Its shared norms are established and enforced in order to sustain these characteristics through its members' practices and identities. Its description as “divergent” seeks to stress the point that the prevailing characteristics of neighborhoods such as this one are peripheral to dominant urban and state institutional logics – that is, they are both an alternative to them and marginalized by them. There are certainly countless other collective logics that are produced as a result and in response to contemporary institutional, state and development frameworks. The point in describing these three collective logics and periurban subjectivities is not that these are most representative of local responses to dominant structures, but more simply that identifying and exploring these can help identify elements of the interaction between global, state, institutional and local forms.

B. Research in the peripheries: Methods and study sites

This second part of this chapter turns to the research methods and study sites of the dissertation research. It begins with a subsection describing the rationale behind the ethnographic research design and participatory methodologies. Details of the methods employed in the research are further described in the methodological appendix. The second subsection describes the study sites and their contexts, introducing the periurban area of Cochabamba known as the Zona Sur. This will provide the grounded elements and the concrete background for the consequent examination of the ways that the periphery is produced and structured in interaction with urban and state institutions.

Research methods to articulate participation

This study of everyday political participation in periurban neighborhoods of Cochabamba takes local practices as its starting point, while also arguing that everyday practices are central to the constitution of wider social structures. This subsection begins with theoretical approaches to the relationship between the local and the global, and between individual subjects and objective structures, in order to argue for the methodological utility of a local and participatory focus on collective practices and subjectivities. Positing local
collectives as a critical empirical starting point for the study of the relationship between local and global processes, I also suggest that participatory methods are particularly apt for understanding how these collectives are dynamically constructed.

In line with analyses on borders and frontiers described above, James Ferguson (2006) argues that the opposition between the local and the global is a socially constructed opposition that creates particular hierarchies of power. For Ferguson, this opposition mirrors the equally political construction of the opposition between the state and civil society. Discourse and analyses that assume these oppositions naturalize the authority of the state. They do this by merging “three analytically distinct ideas – superior spatial scope; supremacy in a hierarchy of power; and superior generality of interest, knowledge, and moral purpose – into a single fig, the 'up there' state that encompasses the local and exists on a 'higher level’” (92). Ferguson maintains that theoretical and political clarifications are thus in order, not only for the clarity of analyses, but also to sharpen the strategies of subaltern social movements. He writes:

“What is called for, in other words, is an approach to the state that would treat its verticality and encompassment not as a taken-for-granted fact, but as a precarious achievement – and as an ethnographic problem... The central effect of the new forms of transnational governmentality... is not so much to make states weak (or strong) as to reconfigure the way that states are able to spatialize their authority and stake claims to superior generality and universality.” (112)

In line with Timothy Mitchell’s “state effect,” Ferguson urges scholars to analyze the ways the different scales of what he calls the “vertical topography of power” interact.

Researching the relationships between local practices, state institutions and global development logics, however, requires a methodology that can recognize the complexity of the relationship between individual subjects and objectified structures. It requires methodological tools that recognize global logics as an ensemble of processes-in-construction, of emergent and self-organized systems, of complex and contingent causality, whose interrelated and interdependent actors are adaptive and co-evolve together with the systems (Urry 2005). Above all, it requires a methodology that can identify systemic and structural patterns in the sites where these materialize, in local, collectively-defined practices.

Positivist methodologies have contributed important findings through their reduction of variables and their identification of general laws. Nevertheless, the applicability of these laws are limited when applied to complex and dynamic social realities. There are a great deal of multiple and contingent causalities in local contexts that cannot be explained using these methods. This is apparent, for example, in development planning based on positive methodologies that has not been successful in mitigating generalized global inequalities. In contrast to positivist methodologies, the interpretive paradigm of social constructivism helps to identify important mechanisms that function to create subjectivities. But it is difficult for this perspective to comprehend the intransigence of structures of power and thus the
possibilities for their transformation.

One approach that may be useful in trying to understand the mutually constitutive and dynamic relationships between objective and subjective processes is the recently refined complexity approach in the social sciences. David Byrne describes this approach as “the interdisciplinary understanding of reality as composed of complex open systems with emergent properties and transformational potential” (2005:97). It is an inherently dynamic understanding that does not describe or explain change using linear causality or universal patterns, but rather through the exploration of multiple and interrelated movements. Instead of a universal coordination or a global structure, this approach identifies interactions between local units, be these actors, communities, nations or other subsystems. Complexity approaches maintain that the impossibility of identifying global rules is due to the fact that:

> “From the interaction of the individual components ... emerges some kind of property ... something you couldn’t have predicted from what you know of the component parts ... And the global property, emergent behavior, feeds back to influence the behaviors of the individuals that produced it.” (Langton, quoted in Ramalingam and Jones 2008:19)

This mutual production of both the individual and social structures takes place through localized conformation of the collective. Pedro Sotolongo and Carlos Delgado (2006) observe that the two dimensions of society – the micro of subjective actors and the macro of social structures – are constituted in a “parallel, simultaneous and concomitant” manner. According to them:

> “Both dimensions of the social, the 'micro' and the 'macro' proceed from a same 'source': the interpersonal quotidian praxis – that is at once both social and historical – of real men and women... This quotidian praxis always concretizes itself through the taking place of some pattern of social interaction, that is of some regime of characteristic and recurrent collective practices (be they communitarian, familial, class, educational, labor, religious, gender, race, ethnic, etc.) of that quotidian life.” (133)

It is for this reason that the focus on local collectives and the shared creation of social practices and discourses is a focal point for this study of the relationships between structural systems and the subjectivities of individuals.

The construction of objective structures and individual interpersonal subjectivities implies the centrality of contextualized social practices and the primacy of the local collective. A focus on the local construction of these practices would allow for an examination of the links between daily contextualized interactions, collectively patterned, and the ways that social relations are objectively structured and constituted subjectively (Sotolongo and Delgado 134). Bourdieu (1990) also links the spheres of social and material structures with the subjectivity of actors through daily practices. His concept of *habitus*, however, which unifies and generates practices, is the internalized form of objective conditions and the unequal
relations of power that these imply. As such, Bourdieu's structures are less dynamic and interactive than those proposed by Sotolongo and Delgado. A research focus on the local context allows for an examination of these theoretical propositions. Such a focus provides a concrete site in which to examine the ways that the regimes of quotidian and recurrent collective practices both establish and are produced by objective structures.

Yet despite such an acknowledgment of the local and contingent nature of socially constructed structures, these structures are insistently not relative. Byrne writes that a complex approach “necessarily confronts the subjective relativism of postmodernism with an assertion that explanation is possible, but only explanation that is local in time and place” (2005:97). Causation can be addressed, but only if it is considered to be a complex and contextual causation. Neither does this emphasis on the quotidian, on the local, imply a limited or merely exemplary focus. Urry (2005) writes:

“The linear metaphor of scales, stretching from the local to the global, or from the micro level to the macro level, does not seem plausible and should be replaced by analyses of multiple systems of mobile connections. There is no top or bottom of the global, but many systems of connections or circulations that effect relationality at multiple and varied materialities and distances.” (245)

Latour concurs when he says: “There is no zoom going from macro structure to micro interactions . . . [since] both micro and macro are local effects of hooking up” (1999:19) to varied elements of multiple systems.

The methodological question then remains: How do we begin empirically with local processes in order to understand the establishment, re-creation and potential transformation of contemporary social structures? Byrne's answer is that social scientists are particularly able to approach this problem through their ability to compare. He explains:

“We as social scientists can deal with – to use the terminology – ensembles of systems. We can deal with lots of cases and see how the configurations they represent can help us to understand the various ways in which things have come to be as they are, the various ways in which they might be different, and – with luck and the wind in the right quarter – how social action might produce one possible future rather than another.” (101)

Similarly, Richard Biernacki writes that by focusing on “an overarching pattern of techniques rather than a simple outcome,” configurational analyses can point to the “systematicity of differences” (1995:12-13) in distinct cultural logics. It is in this sense that the methods of my dissertation research employed the comparison of three complex cases of local collectives and the political subjects they produce.

I hope that such a comparative approach may help us understand the ways that structural inequalities are produced as both the objectivization and institutionalization of
particular realities and as the experience of these realities. Such experiences are, on the one hand, the subjectification of structures, and on the other, creative and collective elaborations of them. By examining the dynamic relationships between structural inequalities, urban institutions, subjective experiences and collective responses in the three cases, I aim to better understand the difficulty of transforming structures of power, without closing off that possibility. Analyses that posit a horizon of social transformation also require a methodological design that allows for the problematization of situations, relations and processes, that is, which can perceive their problematic character and break with the “fiction of naturalization” (Montero 2003). Such analytic processes, however, are indissociable from social relations of power.

Action research is the general term for research that recognizes the role that the research process plays in these social relations of power and, to a greater or lesser extent, seeks to directly act on those relations. As such, this approach works most effectively when it incorporates an analysis of the configuration of systems. Norbert Elias notes that what is needed in order to understand social transformations is to “investigate the nature of this range of possible transformations and the configuration of factors responsible for the fact that, of all of the possibilities, only this one is materialized” (1970 cited in Bastardas 2002:5).

Incorporating configurational comparisons, action research can recognize the importance of the interrelationships between actors and researchers’ own position in the world of historically and socially constructed and reconstructed practices. Parallel to its attempt to specify relationships between the global and the local, action research can thus also shed light on the relationship between theoretical analyses and research and everyday practices.

Participatory research is a form of action research that incorporates some part of the study population into the research process itself. It particularly befits the theoretical focus of this study since by incorporating the research subjects into the process, participatory research can elucidate their perspectives on everyday politics and civil society participation. The research for this study was conducted parallel to work with a local non-governmental organization, the Centro Vicente Cañas based in the Zona Sur. Within the Centro Vicente Cañas, I worked with the Poder Local (Local Power) team, an initiative established as part of a national Poder Local Program with teams in periurban neighborhoods of seven cities of Bolivia. The aim of both the national and the local programs was to strengthen grassroots social organizations of the urban poor and their political incidence in public policy and priorities. Local power was defined by the program as “civil society's capacity to influence decisions based on collective interests in the face of constituted powers. From the municipal level, it transcends to other spaces and is constructed as a participatory, democratic and critical project” (PPL 2010:2).

The Poder Local team of the Centro Vicente Cañas worked in three interrelated areas: a popular education area, an alternative communication area and a more recently established research component. I began work with the research area of the Poder Local team by collaborating on a research proposal that incorporated their organizational and my own
theoretical interests. The objective of the research project was to understand local forms of organization and participation, in order to better understand periurban residents’ limited impact on public policies and decisions, despite their significant participation in meetings, protests and collective activity. The research project incorporated traditional research methods such as interviews, oral histories and surveys, as well as collaborations with the education and communication components of the program to produce printed material, radio and video.

A "popular communicator" trained by the Poder Local team films a Zona Sur-wide open assembly. The signs in the forefront says "New Municipality for the [Zona] Sur."

Credit: Centro Vicente Cañas archives 2006

The participatory component of the research, in conjunction with much of the other work of the Poder Local Program, sought to support dialogic and communicative spaces that would enable residents to rearticulate their identification with both local and larger collectives, and thus reshape the terms of who belongs to what groups. It did this in the context of already existing dynamics within the Zona Sur, the city of Cochabamba and at the national level. The articulation of collectives with which residents identified and acted took place to different degrees at these varied scales. For example, while locally coordinated projects such as a Zona Sur newspaper worked to articulate common issues among Cochabamba’s periurban population, the national Poder Local Program brought together representatives and neighbors for an annual “Encounter of Urban Popular Organizations” to meet with their counterparts from other periurban areas across the country.

Two other examples of the study’s research methods that sought to incorporate subjects’ identifications within different collectives included the participatory use of quantitative data and oral and visual histories. In terms of the quantitative data, surveys were developed in conjunction with neighborhood representatives in order to address their issues of neighborhood concern. The collection of data brought university students and community
members together to collect the data. And finally, survey results were presented to residents and representatives of each neighborhood. This allowed for a contextualization of the neighborhood's profile within other local, urban and national data. Further details on these surveys are found in the Methodological Appendices. In terms of the oral and visual histories, residents and leaders of Lomas requested that a history of the neighborhood be published in an accessible format. After expanding on the oral history elements of interviews in Lomas, I worked with a local artist to develop and publish a comic book of the neighborhood history. The visual history sought to contextualize Lomas residents' experience within periurban dynamics in the city and nation more generally. Sample pages from this and other Poder Local communicational products and publications are found in Appendix C.

Both my own research and the Poder Local project were, thus, focused on periurban residents' reconfigurations of their participation in distinct collectives. As such, the research methods were also able to provide perspectives on three theoretical conversations regarding the constitution of civil society and the role of academics in it. The first of these is the reflexivity of one's incidence in the social world as a researcher, the second is the dynamic and interminable political constitution of the social and the final is the question of what is meant by civic engagement and participation itself. Firstly, as research is reintegrated into its social context through participatory methods, the question of our own role as academics in social processes is highlighted. Participatory methods facilitate an examination of the role of the scholarly reflection in the political formation of collectives, particularly in terms of the intellectual that Gramsci (1971) describes. For Gramsci, the critical figure of the intellectual is not limited to the academic nor is the intellectual defined by the nature of his or her work. Instead, this central figure for Gramsci is defined by the function he or she perform in social relations. Gramsci’s intellectuals emerge in different social groups as the strata of actors that give the group “homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields” (5). Through participatory methods, we can explore the role of these important articulators of collective identities by examining the parts that that different actors – including ourselves – play in these dynamics.

The second theoretical conversation to which participatory methods can contribute regards the articulation of collectives. One of the theoretical aims of this dissertation is to examine the constitution of periurban collectives as it is experienced in everyday practices, particularly as these interact with urban institutions and social structures. By providing a vantage point of the the dynamic processes from local and shifting perspectives, participatory research allows for an examination of multiple dimensions of the shaping of collective political subjects. It allows, then, for an examination of Laclau's claims to the political logic of the social, of the subjective and of the symbolic – as well as, inversely, the social, the subjective and the symbolic logic of the political.
Finally, participatory projects, by making explicit our engagement in the dynamic processes of the rearticulation of collectives, highlight the need to pay closer attention in our discussions of participation and civic engagement to the question: Participation or engagement in what groups, by what means and to what ends? The kind of insights that a participatory research project such as this one produces help us to analyze civil society beyond its Putnamesque liberal conception as voluntary associational activity that cultivates civic traits needed to support a liberal individualist democracy (Putnam 2000). It also helps to move beyond the republican conception of civil society as the mediation between the individual and the state, a conception evident in the 1960s revival of literature on civil society as the legitimate authority of society over illegitimate state institutions. Both of those approaches pay little attention to the inequalities and antagonisms that might problematize such constructions of collectives. As Foley and Edwards write, such perspectives “presuppose precisely the sort of political peace that [they] imagine civil society providing” (1996:7). Instead, in participatory research projects, the very question of what constitutes civic engagement is in flux and shifts as the project itself proceeds, and the dynamics of participation and engagement change participants’ identification with different civic and political collectives and in the politics of power.

**Cochabamba and the Zona Sur**

This final subsection describes the study site of the research project, beginning with a description of the relevance of the city of Cochabamba to the research problem, then honing in on the periurban area of the city, the Zona Sur. Even in the pre-colonial period, the area that Cochabamba now occupies played an important role in the Andean region. The ecologically diverse valleys that presently nestle the city provided grains and beans in exchange for tubers.
grown in the high plains of the Andes and coca and fruits grown in lowland areas. Anthropologist John Murra (1972) influentially theorized such Andean social arrangements as the “vertical control of ecological levels,” by which “islands of resources” in different ecological environments were collectively accessed through complementary communal relationships.

During the colonial and republican period, grains grown in the valleys were critical in provisioning the mining communities that worked in the silver and tin mines in the barren highlands of the Andes. The national dependence on mineral resources decreased only in the second half of the 20th century, with the depletion of silver repositories and the fall of the tin prices. This latter period in Bolivia witnessed not only the debilitation of the state economic model based on mining but also the implementation of structural reforms and the establishment of a free market economy. National and international support of agro-industry produced an “economic march towards the east” (Dunia Sandoval et al. 2003). Most recently, the exploitation of gas has driven further development and the growing economic and political power of the eastern lowland areas.

Thus, the socio-economic changes in the country and the state have transformed the spatial configuration of the nation.

Fig 1. Bolivia: cities of more than 20,000 inhabitants, by size. 1950 and 1992.
Source: DEPUALC (CELADE 1999)
While the highland mining areas in the western part of the country were once the unrivaled center of national power, the growing importance of the eastern lowlands has consolidated the city of Santa Cruz as the focal point for economic and political opposition to the La Paz based indigenous government. Currently, the cities of La Paz (and El Alto\textsuperscript{2}), Santa Cruz and Cochabamba – also the four largest cities in the country – enjoy an unparalleled economic, cultural and political predominance in Bolivia. At the geographic center of these is Cochabamba. The map on the previous page shows the locations of the largest Bolivian cities, by the size of their populations. It represents cities that had more than 20,000 inhabitants in 1950 with a triangle. These include La Paz in the western Andean highlands, Santa Cruz in the eastern lowlands, and Cochabamba in the valleys between them. The three other Bolivian cities with more than 20,000 inhabitants in 1950 were Oruro, Sucre and Potosi. Yet the populations of three cities of La Paz, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz between 1950 and 1992 increased far more than the populations of other Bolivian cities. Note the growth, particularly, of what Carmen Ledo (2002) calls the National Economic Corridor – extending from La Paz in the west to Santa Cruz in the East, with Cochabamba as the central node in the corridor – along which economic activity and population has concentrated.\textsuperscript{3}

Ledo summarizes the functions of Cochabamba in this national spatial growth, noting the city's double role,

“which integrates its regional context and also links the cities of La Paz and Santa Cruz, which gives it an important role in the national urban system. It is for this reason that Cochabamba has become an intermediate space, of integration, coordination and meeting of the nation, while it is also a middle space that sums up the contrasts of the country. In many ways Cochabamba is a synthesis of Bolivia.” (2002: 59)

Others have also noted the unique characteristics of the city:

“Between La Paz and Santa Cruz, with their great productive and cultural differences, Cochabamba is the region destined to take on the most important responsibilities of national integration. This is especially the case considering that the spaces controlled by Santa Cruz and La Paz are centers subject to powerful extra-national influence.” (Laserna 1984:47)

Cochabamba, then, plays an important role in the national imaginary as a “place of encounter” (from a sign posted by the Cochambamba municipality, field notes 09.10.08).

Yet this image clearly depends on a separation of what is admitted as part of the city

\textsuperscript{2} El Alto is the working class and rural migrants’ city adjoining La Paz. It is currently the third largest and fastest growing city in Bolivia. Though the city is still often considered La Paz’s bedroom community, its local authorities have dubbed the city “Bolivia’s Economic Capital” due to recent growth of commerce and industry.

\textsuperscript{3} The departmental – equivalent to state level – territorial region of Cochabamba shares the same name as its capital city.
and what is not, which in the past took the form of the opposition between urban modernity and indigenous backwardness. From the 16th century onward, the city was founded on “frontiers that would permit delimiting, classifying and hierarchizing limits with the 'other'... distinguishing between our use of time and space and theirs. Through a combination of notions from the Enlightenment, economic liberalism and social Darwinism, these frontiers sustained our task of breaking any ties with the past, conceived as a irrational defect, so we might advance eagerly towards the presumably rational future.” (Rodríguez and Solares 1997:2)

These frontiers still characterize the city. During conflicts that took place in Cochabamba in January 2007, the mostly indigenous residents from the poorer urban sectors and their rural counterparts marched into the central part of the city and occupied the main plaza. The protests were supported by Evo Morales' governing party (MAS, Movement Towards Socialism) and demanded the resignation of the departmental governor, Manfred Reyes Villa. Reyes Villa aligned himself with the Santa Cruz-based opposition to MAS. Middle-class mestizos from the residential northern and eastern parts of the city organized a counter-march to defend Reyes Villa, their notions of democracy and their city.

They shouted as they approached the center of the city, “Today they take the plaza, tomorrow they'll take your house!” (in Alem 2007:np). Three people were killed and dozens were injured in the conflicts that followed. Jobbe-Duval and Rocha (2008) comment that in Cochabamba during those days, “the neighbors from the North and the East showed that one of the foundations of their identity is the social and physical distance that separates them from the rural and periurban worlds, from the popular sectors in general” (1).

These conflicts highlighted the unresolved tensions implicit in the idealized construction of Cochabamba's mestizo identity and its supposed spaces of integration. They
evidenced urban middle class sectors’ confusion of periurban and rural populations and their violent attempts to situate both groups beyond the frontiers of the city, a fusion that depends on the sacrosanct division between the city and the country. Yet the conflicts that ensued were as much about political power as they were about defining and policing spatialized racial identities. The role of institutionalized political power in shaping these identities became apparent in later investigations of the events. These included evidence of the MAS Ministeer of Justice joining in popular sectors’ burning of the deparmental government building in the days leading up to the violent conflicts (UnoAmerica 2009), as well as declaractions that juvenile offenders were ordered by the departmental government to to fabricate baseball bats that were handed out to middle-class Reyes Villa supporters (Los Tiempos 2008). This section seeks to thus ground the theoretical discussions outlined above, on the institutional production of peripheral subjectivities, in the concrete case of Cochabamba.

In the city of Cochabamba, the Zona Sur marks the space of periurban exclusion.

**Fig 2. Quality of Basic Household Services by census zones**
*From the 2001 National Population and Household Census. Metropolitan Area of Cochabamba.*

The map above show the city of Cochabamba, and the quality of basic household services of different census zones. The red areas on the map show census zones with poor basic services, dark red areas represent census zones critical basic services. The Zona Sur covers approximately the bottom third of the metropolitan area of Cochabamba. Note also the Zona Sur’s distance from the foothills north of the city, where traditional organized access to water
(for example, in communal and irrigation organizations) is widespread, due to that area's proximity to water sources. The inequities Zona Sur residents experience in comparison with the rest of the city reflect the increase in inequalities seen in all Latin American urban areas in the last decades. The accelerated industrialization of the second part of the twentieth century, combined with the structural adjustments of national economic policies resulted in an increase of the population that lives in Latin American cities, and – for the first time in the history of the region – a predominance of urban poverty compared to rural poverty (Psacharopoulos et al. 1995:252). But the particular characteristics of inequality and poverty in different cities grow out of specific historical and institutional conditions.

In Cochabamba, periurban areas are deficient in infrastructure for basic utilities and health services. It is, thus, difficult for residents of the Zona Sur to exit from the vicious circle of poverty, in part because they pay more to access basic and social services that their wealthier neighbors in the northern and central part of the city. For example, the average cost of a cubic meter of water in the Zona Sur is ten times more than its cost in the northern sector of the city, where most neighbors access their water through the municipal water system (CGIAB 2006:np). Other figures regarding the differential conditions and access to services in the Zona Sur are equally shameful. According to data from the National Institute of Statistics of Bolivia (INE 2001), only 49% of the housing stock of the municipality has acceptable access to potable water. These dwellings are found almost entirely in the central and northern districts of the city. In the peripheral districts of the city, 74% of dwellings have no access to water systems (Ledo 2004:28). There are almost no potable water systems in the Zona Sur. Residents of those areas obtain their water from water trucks in dubious hygienic conditions.

Residents of the Zona Sur also have less access to educational and health establishments. Schools are concentrated in the center and in the north of the city. There are fewer schools in the Zona Sur than in other areas, despite the fact that the area has a higher percentage of youth than any other area of the city. In District 14 of the Zona Sur, for example, seven of every ten residents is less than 25 years old (PPL-CVC 2006:8). There are also great disparities in terms of health services, with health centers concentrated in the center of the city. In 2001, the Zona Sur housed almost half (43%) of the city's population, yet less than 8% of health service establishments were located in the area (PPL-CVC:24). In 2007, only 2% of the city's budget was invested in infrastructure for this area that is the fastest growing area in the municipality (Ledo 2004:5).

Such disparities are ever-present for the neighbors of the Zona Sur. One neighbor noted:

“You know that the north of the city has everything, we’re always excluded. For example, water. The northern zone has water 24 hours a

---

4 The rapid urbanization of the second part of the 20th century, along with the structural adjustments and recessions throughout Latin America in the 1980s, has produced a situation in which the percentage of urban population living in conditions of poverty rose from 44% in 1959 to 78% in 2000 (Barcena 2001).
day, we don’t, we have to buy water at 4 or 5 bolivianos per barrel. But all the help goes to that area, the north, I don’t know why.” (interview 10.08.07)

The exclusion of Zona Sur residents is not only expressed in their lack of access to basic services, but also in their social marginalization. Another neighbor expressed:

“There from the north, they hate us, always, I always hear it. This morning I heard it on Channel 4, too. On Channel 4, they only let people with money talk. Whenever there’s someone there from the Zona Sur, they only let him talk a little bit. But if he’s from the northern area, they let him talk a lot. Poor people only get about five seconds, then they cut him off, that’s how the journalists from the center of the city are.” (interview 30.09.07)

This active disdain converts the Zona Sur into a negation of that which the city seeks to be. Not surprisingly, the garbage dump of the city is in the middle of the Zona Sur. In their desire to satisfy their families’ basic needs, residents of this marginalized area construct their homes and their dreams incorporating the spatialized objective inequalities into subjective perspectives. These perspectives deny the area’s proper characteristics, stressing instead its mere lack.

The idea of ‘belonging’ to the city is foundational in the neighborhoods of the Zona Sur. Residents of these peripheral neighborhoods seek to show themselves to be part of the city, even mobilizing in 2007 to be included in the urban territory of the municipality instead of the

---

5 Although many Zona Sur neighborhoods did not yet exist when the garbage dump was established in 1987, a number of farming communities did exist in the area, and the dumpsite was established in an area between several of them, less than a mile away from a school. Area residents began to report effects of contamination in 1994 and have protested for its immediate closure since that time (Lara 2009). The most recent ruling allows for the dump to operate at its site for another three years (La Razon 2010).
neighboring rural municipality of Arbieto. Neighbors of Mineros San Juan took to the streets, as they had in the past along with other neighborhoods, to try to have their urbanization included in the city of Cochabamba. While the practical reasons for this include the ability to partake in Cochabamba city politics, it is also a symbolic gesture, which would move the neighborhood away from the rural past of much of its residents. It could then enter into the logic of urbanization both in the collective imaginary of the residents and in the neighborhood’s visible features.

Another example of this attempt to gain legitimacy as an urban area and as part of the city was seen clearly in one of the monthly neighborhood-wide assemblies that takes place throughout the Zona Sur. Through unanimous consent, the dirigentes and neighbors agreed to prohibit loose animals in the neighborhood. Dogs would not be permitted to stroll the streets anymore. Nor would pigs with little respect for private property and urban propriety be tolerated any longer as part of the neighborhood's landscape. As he reiterated the restrictions and warning against animals on streets, the neighborhood leader repeated once more that animals had no place in their neighborhood's public spaces since, “We are an urban area!” (field notes 11.11.07).

With a similar longing to be part of the city, the dirigente of another neighborhood in the Zona Sur said:

“That’s the idea that people want to, and can say, I’m from this neighborhood. Because many people say, at least it happened before, instead of saying, I’m from here, they’d say, I’m from Valle Hermoso [a nearby neighborhood], because of the bad image we have. That is, Valle Hermoso is more developed. It would be great for them to say, we’re from here, and we’re staying here.” (interview 06.12.07)

This dirigente would like his neighbors to feel like their area is a legitimate part of the city, as are some neighborhoods with more infrastructure that are thus, according to this perspective, “more developed.”

Periurban residents are constantly reminded that their neighborhoods are not quite legitimate parts of the city, especially given the exclusions and conditions that define their environments. One neighbor said that “between the city and the peripheries, there’s lots of differences. Because the city has all the services... here we don’t have anything” (interview 03.11.07). Another neighbor similarly noted that “The difference is that they, for example, benefit from everything and we from almost nothing” (interview 30.08.07). The lack of legitimacy in periurban areas is understood through the classical lens of development, which links the civilized and advanced to the city and the primitive and stagnant to the country. Even the question of animals is part of this discourse, with one neighbor commenting that, “In the city, the streets need to be clean. That’s not true in rural communities, there can be pigs, cows, llamas there” (interview 20.10.07).

As noted above, the exclusion of the periurban depends on a division of the city and the
non-city and a deprecation of the latter. Such a perspective can be seen when residents of the Zona Sur, most of whom are migrants from rural communities, speak of rural areas in terms of total lack, “There’s nothing there, no plants, no nothing” (interview 03.08.07). More than anything else, there are economic deficiencies: “In the country, there in the country, there’s no yield in our crops, it’s not enough for our families, because, you know, our production isn’t valued” (interview 20.10.07). Deficiencies of the rural in comparison to the urban are extended to all spheres:

“It’s not possible in the country, there’s nowhere to study... In the country, we’re happy for only a moment, because there’s neither electricity, nor water.” (interview 04.11.07)

“It’s far, roads don’t reach there much, there’s no electricity and it’s a forgotten place... it’s rain and rain there, and there, you can only grow peppers and potatoes, nothing else. People there live on only peppers, and they’re not even very spicy.” (interview 03.08.07)

These judgments are also applied to the periurban areas before their settlement, before the first homesteaders invested their suffering and labor into the development of the neighborhood. Many descriptions of the area at the moment of settling begin by naming natural elements of the terrain, then quickly confine these elements to insignificance. Neighbors say that “there were spiny bushes here, there wasn’t anything” (interview 29.07.07) or “stones, rocks, there was nothing when I first got here” (interview 20.08.07).

But the tenacity of the exclusion of periurban residents resides in the fact that it is not only their living spaces that are marginalized, but also their identities and realities.
As in peripheral urban areas throughout Latin America, the Zona Sur is the first point of anchorage for migrants arriving to the city. According to the most recent census, the districts of the Zona Sur have higher percentages of recent migration that the northern areas of the city. The inhabitants in the Zona Sur also self-identify as indigenous more than in any other part of the city: three fourths of Zona Sur residents identify with an ethnic group, while in the northern and central parts of the city, less than half of the residents identify with an indigenous group (INE 2001:np). In the urban aspiration to surpass oneself – a characteristic feature of both capitalist and Marxist modernity – the presence of the indigenous in the city is made invisible, disdained or criminalized for falling outside the formal sphere that is central to the construction of the modern project. Thus, the spatialized opposition of rural deficiencies versus the modern city is racialized in the indigenous Bolivian versus his or her westernized counterpart.

It is for this reason that the relations of domination in the city are not limited to the production of marginal periurban neighborhoods, but extend to the production of racialized marginal populations, no matter where they might happen to be. Periurban residents, particularly those who identify themselves as indigenous, are reminded daily of this:

“If they see that we’re from the Zona Sur, they think that we’re dirty. If you go in the trufi [public transportation], I’ve seen it happen many times, a woman in a pollera [indigenous skirt] sits next to a woman with a purse, upper class, she’ll move to the side. She thinks that she’s covered with dirt and will pollute her somehow. They always look down on us because they think they’re of a higher class, but there shouldn’t be that.” (interview 25.11.07)

Such discrimination is not individual but systemic, rooted in a long history of attempts to define the spaces of the city in opposition to indigeneity. Jorge Komadina (2005) cites the historian D’Orbigny, who looks at the restriction of traditional culture in the city of Cochabamba. Before 1880, locales in which the native alcoholic corn-based drink of chicha was brewed and served were found throughout the city of Cochabamba. The indigenous language of Quechua was also heard throughout the city. But

“little by little, especially during the liberal period at the beginning of the twentieth century, the chichería [locale where chicha is served] was stigmatized as the urban prolongation of the Andean world, a factor of backwardness, filth and moral archaism. The chichería was dangerous and plebeian. But it could not disappear because it fed the municipal coffers; it was thus relegated to the peripheries, far from the central plaza.” (D’Orgbigny quoted in Komadina:8).

Similar processes took place in all of Latin America. In Colombia, for example, chicha was even further decried by hygienists, until “its sale and consumption were absolutely prohibited. This decision was extended to the whole of the national territory thus formalizing the
disappearance of any indigenous imprint in Colombian cities” (Calvo quoted in Molina 2007:3). With the distancing of chicha and the indigenous to the peripheries of the city, the main, central plaza was converted to a privileged place for the socialization and identification of the creole elite.

The modernizing Bolivian devalorization of the indigenous is not simple. In the Carnaval of Oruro and in school and tourist presentations, the indigenous remains a symbol of national pride and the folklorization of its identity. This is only possible, however, once the indigenous is emptied of all elements that question the liberal progressive paradigm. Indigenous elements such as a holistic and spiritual vision of development and the valorization of the collective over the individual oppose the rationalization and liberalization implied by modernization. Empty symbols – the cultural emptied of its political import – are nevertheless necessary to promote identification with the Bolivian nation as opposed to other modern nations. Manfred Reyes Villa, the westernized leader of the opposition against Evo Morales and indigenous social movements whose leadership sparked the racialized conflicts in Cochabamba in 2007 (described above), nevertheless used a similar strategy with chicha in his campaign for governor: “I like chicha, yes I do, I’m from Cochabamba, yes siree” (field notes 11.02.07).

With the distancing of chicha and the indigenous to the peripheries of the city, the main plaza, the very center and heart of the city, became a privileged place for the socialization and identification of the elite creoles. But in 1952, with the National Revolution and visions of modernization, the symbolic, social and political uses of the central plaza once more changed. New groups “appropriated the place to stage their distinctions and exhibit their force: middle classes, migrant peasants, workers and the unemployed” (Komadina 2005:np). The Federation of Factory Workers established itself in one of the buildings overlooking the plaza. And in the Water Wars of 2000, social movements occupied the plaza in their physical and political occupation of the city.

The “symbolic taking” of the plaza is thus strongly rooted in the Cochabamba imaginary, as it is throughout Latin America. The occupation of the plaza is a mobilizational resource for the different, excluded social groups of the city. The plaza constitutes the theater and the agora, the space where social actors represent themselves, constituting themselves as political subjects. These types of struggles over spaces are seen in everyday experiences as much as in moments of collective and violent confrontation. A Zona Sur neighbor recounted:

“I’ve confronted many times those of white skin. When I was crossing the street with my grandfather, a taxi passed by. ‘Get out of the way,’ he yelled, ‘shit peasant.’ I got very angry… I told him ‘What’s that you say?!’ I kicked it hard. He really made me angry and I kicked his door hard and I dented it. ‘Get out!’ I yelled at him, I answered him with rough words. He couldn’t get out, he was too scared. ‘Being a peasant I can show you lots!’ I told him, because a peasant thinks, just like he does, just because he has money, he thinks not.” (interview 25.11.07)
The events in Cochabamba in January 2007 described above are an example of the most violent and visible points of exclusive realities that are constructed in the quotidian. Urban public spaces, on an everyday basis and at culminating moments, are sites of struggle among actors creating the city. These actors seek to shape the city – and the social relations that constitute it – from their differentiated structural and institutional positions. Attempts to define the urban constitute the context within which periurban residents emphasize their alternative valuations, at the same time that they reclaim their self-defined right to the city.

CONCLUSIONS AND OPENINGS

Given urban popular movements' discursive and strategic links to national social movements, periurban areas offer dynamics sites for examining the making of the city and the new nation in Bolivia. Cochabamba's heterogeneous migrant population, and its intermediate political and economic position in the country, provides an apt setting for the comparison of diverse collective subjects with varied interactions to the institutions that make the city. This comparison allows an examination of the ways that institutionally channeled practices shape periurban subjects and logics, and the consequent consolidation of the city and its hierarchies of power. In what follows, we will look at the ways that institutions shape the periurban residents' practices and relations with regards to land and water and within local collectives.

Modern urban mechanisms formalize social relationships with land and water into private property and supplier-consumer systems, and collective relations of public legitimacy into systems of administrative accountability. As such, it will be no surprise that Nueva Vera Cruz, the neighborhood that has been established the longest among the three study sites, is the most infrastructurally urbanized and “developed.” It is also the neighborhood characterized by neoliberal collective logics, daily practices and political subjects. The chapters that follow describe Nueva Vera Cruz's valuations of titled property, their efficient management of water and their representative forms of participation and accountability.

Residents of Nueva Vera Cruz continue to identify with the peripheral status of the Zona Sur, yet their logics and practices contrast starkly with those in Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara. The study shows that in Mineros and Lomas, property, resource management and participatory practices are driven by logics quite distinct from the institutionally dominant neoliberal paradigm. But the research on these neighborhoods took place over a bounded period of time. In such relatively suspended animation, it is difficult to see the movement of the social over time. Won't the collective logics and subjectivities in Mineros and Lomas more closely resemble those in Nueva Vera Cruz when residents obtain stable services and adequate infrastructure? Are alternative legitimacies – such as the symbolic and practical primacy of the collective in Mineros, or the communal convergence of the private and public in Lomas – bound to weaken as individuals obtain functional security?

The supposition that collective logics in periurban areas is due only to the privations
that its inhabitants experience is evident in the popular imaginary as well as in analytic discourse. Many Zona Sur residents interviewed considered that the forms of participation in their neighborhoods would change as access to services increased. One said:

“I think that there will be less participation, because [neighbors’] needs will be satisfied. Like in the city, there are hardly any organization. People might be part of some group or party, but it’s independently. I think when basic needs are satisfied, people won’t organize.” (interview 16.11.07)

Likewise, other neighbors commented that once their land was titled, there would be little need for participatory or communal forms of organization.

In 1990, the urbanist Jesús Galindo wrote that the phases of emergent cultures in popular urban settlements consisted of (1) the struggle for life conditions, in which popular movement (in the restricted sense of local organizing) is strong and mediates between the state and the settlers; (2) the transition phase, in which inhabitants seek to reproduce their material conditions of life and popular movement (in both the restricted sense and in the wider sense of social movements) practically disappears; and (3) the phase of expectations of mobility, where a small part of residents succeeds in securing their needs, and in doing so raises their class status, while the rest remain frustrated (352-53). Giancarla de Quiroga, writing on Cochabamba, concurs, summarizing that “the higher the incidence of poverty, the greater the organizational capacities” (1999:171).

Far more recently, Nelson Antequera (2007) analyzed the processes of the growth of periurban areas in Bolivia, identifying the stages of “expansion, consolidation, and densification, that are all part of a single process of growth” (133). Antequera characterizes the areas in the stage of expansion by their new neighborhoods, informally settled, with precarious constructions and few to no services. In such areas of expansion, “organization serves the function of the processes of settlement and of acquiring basic services.” In areas in the stage of consolidation, with self-managed services, “organization is strong, since it is revolves around the securing of services, public works, etc.” Finally, neighborhoods reach the stage of densification, characterized by vertical growth and the security of access to basic and social services. In this stage, according to Antequera, “organization is weak or non-existent,” since there no longer exist collective needs (133-134).

Such analyses accurately identify the inverse correlation evident in Latin American and Bolivian cities, between infrastructural development and socio-political organizational forms. I argue, however, that this correlation is not a result of an inexorable process of development. Instead, it is a result of the city effect. The effect of the city is to shape neoliberal subjectivities in the peripheries by re-inscribing the distinctions between the center and periphery. In this process, formal neoliberal practices that enable access to the material, social and symbolic resources of the center are encouraged, and alternative practices classified as informal are devalued and discouraged. The concept of the city effect emphasizes that the structuring
power of the city is not inherent to urban areas or agglomerations, but, instead, lies in institutionally-channeled practices that naturalize the frontiers between the city and the non-city. The city that shapes subjects, then, is also an effect itself of local subjectivities and practices. The contingency of the city effect highlights the fact that the dominance of particular urban logics over other is neither necessary nor inevitable. Instead, this dominance is the result of a profoundly political struggle, a struggle whose politics, are nevertheless, concealed by the formalization of institutional mechanisms.

The present-day characteristics in neighborhoods such as Mineros and Lomas will not last forever. The counter-hegemonic and divergent subjectivities of residents in those neighborhoods will no doubt experience transformations. Their daily practices will certainly be unequally influenced by social institutions that shape neoliberal subjects. But those institutions are also subject to transformation. Specifying the alternative logics of neighborhoods such as Mineros and Lomas can help us to extend the horizon of possibilities we can discern for urban processes. Practices in these two neighborhoods show us other ways of understanding and enacting territories and territorializations, property and belonging, citizenships and publics. The assumption that infrastructural development and urban inclusion will necessarily be linked to a decline in non-liberal logics implies the acceptance of the modernizing and individualizing model of development that popular sectors in Bolivia have decisively rejected. Despite the structuring power of the city effect, and of the social institutions of private property, resource management and political participation that sustain it, other logics are possible. Each of the chapters below explores the ways that Zona Sur collectives engage with these institutions, reinforcing or seeking to transform dominant social logics and political relations.
CHAPTER TWO
LAND AND TERRITORY: COMPETING PROPERTY REGIMES

Land, as Karl Polanyi noted over 60 years ago, “is an element of nature inextricably interwoven with man’s institutions. To isolate it and form a market out of it was perhaps the weirdest of all undertakings of our ancestors”(1944:178). In this chapter, I seek to understand the effects of that weirdest of undertakings, the establishment of the formal land market. More specifically, I focus on the ways that the institution of urban land as property influences peripheral logics and practices, and in doing so, promotes particular social and political relationships over others. Thus, I examine the ways that the formalization of urban land ownership in the institution of titled property shapes social relations and collective logics by encouraging particular property practices and discouraging and exploiting others.

Poor migrants to the city of Cochabamba often have little choice but to occupy the most accessible land, given their scarce resources and the dearth of other affordable housing or credit options. Like their counterparts in periurban neighborhoods throughout Latin America, they settle in these areas through dubious purchases from lot-traffickers¹ or through surreptitious or violent occupations. “They just take the land,” said a new neighbor of Lomas de Santa Bárbara who had paid for her lot with savings and loans from other family members (interview 12.08.07). A more established resident of Mineros San Juan expressed the needs behind these takings:

“I said to [my husband], I’m going to go and grab some [land], it doesn’t matter where. All I want is to be able to have a house I can live in with my children. I don’t want to keep going from one rental to another... Maybe if we had just 200 square meters to live on, my husband said. When a friend told me about [the settlement of this area], it made me so happy. It was on a Wednesday that she told me. We have to go on Sunday, she said. So I went on Sunday.” (interview 26.07.07)

Throughout Bolivia, and Latin America more generally, periurban neighborhoods have followed similar patterns of informal settlement. The massive internal migration to Latin American cities, combined with the lack of documentation (both land registration and titling) in the urban peripheries, prepared the way for lot-trafficking and informal settlements in the entire region. A recent report on periurban growth conducted by the UN Population Division estimates that close to half of the total urban population in Latin America occupies informally or illegally settled land (da Gama 2008:5).

Despite the different ways of occupying land explored below, the three study sites demonstrate that residents’ forms of appropriating periurban spaces is not only a product of

¹ The Bolivian word for lot-trafficker (loteador) is a term used derisively for someone who profits by subdividing apparently unclaimed land and selling lots with no legal titles at very low prices. Since the lot-trafficker often has no legal or legitimate claim to the land, he seeks to quickly attract enough settlers to fight off or discourage other claimants to the land.
existing institutions and social relations but also represents an attempt to forge particular relations and collective identities. These identities are not fixed; they are a constant recreation of the collective through shared discourses, practices and valuations, materialized in the distinct organizational and territorial forms of each neighborhood. As Dematteis (2006) writes:

“Territorial urban systems are essentially a mental construction that correspond, more than to an existing reality, to a projected reality. That is, they are mental images of social networks to a great extent yet to be constructed, with a basis in the principles of local territory, in terms of people’s possible relationships with the milieu.” (60)

The forms of belonging to, challenging and participating in perirurban and urban publics are a projection and a wager for how the social can and should be constructed.

Following a brief overview of the municipal approach to the city of Cochabamba’s growth, each of the following three sections focuses on a different perirurban approach to understanding land as property, and explores the collective logics that these imply. Section one examines the importance of formality and the regularization of land titling, both for government institutions and for marginal citizens. Through descriptions of these dynamics at the municipal level in Cochabamba and at the neighborhood and individual level in the urbanized neighborhood of Nueva Vera Cruz, the importance of private and formal ownership is emphasized, as is the related separation of the formal and informal for neoliberal collective logics. Given poor migrants’ difficulty in accessing formal land, however, many periurban areas have been settled with no legal titles. As the unified collective of Mineros San Juan demonstrates in the second chapter section, such a lack of legality has been compensated by a collectively constructed legitimacy. Examining such collectively vindicated possession in the context of national indigenous claims for collective territories highlights the alternative economic, social and political relations implied by counter-hegemonic collective logics.

Finally, the third section of the chapter turns to very different dynamics of informal settlement in the communal associations of Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Without the unified force of a counter-hegemonic collective logic, the de facto and dependent occupation of land in Lomas has been prey to the most negative impacts of the separation of the formal and the informal. These negative impacts show how divergent collective logics are marginalized and discouraged by municipal and state institutional mechanisms. Such institutional channelling of particular social logics and relations will be further explored in the following chapter on state, municipal and local forms of water administration.

Regulating the peripheries in Cochabamba and Bolivia

The spatial segregation of the area in the southern part of Cochabamba known as the Zona Sur has existed since the city’s limits first began to spread. The Argentinean engineer Miguel Rodríguez wrote in 1937 that:
“The southeast part of the city requires much attention from the municipal government... it is now a true gypsy encampment, requiring the diligent attention of the authorities, to produce a better well-being physical and moral hygiene for those wretches, crammed into narrow and dirty rooms, with no other models than degeneration and vice.” (quoted in Goldstein 2004:63)

Through such municipal perspectives and mechanisms, periurban areas have been defined most often by their lack, in terms of the informality, irregularity and illegality of their residents' occupations, land and even lives.

Vacaflores writes that Bolivian migratory flows after Spanish colonialism were the product of two central political-historical moments: the 1952 National Revolution and the implementation of the neoliberal economic model in 1985. In 1952, agrarian reform and the abolition of large, landed estates, “originated a process of the liberation of the labor force, which [eventually] precipitated migratory currents” (quoted in Siles 2007:5). Migration to Cochabamba throughout the second half of the 20th century was extraordinary. The city's rapid growth is evident in the map below showing Cochabamba’s urban expansion between 1962 and 2000. The vast difference in land covered between the inner black and outer green contours represents land included in the municipality of Cochabamba between 1962 and 1983.

**Fig 3. Urban Growth in Cochabamba from 1962 to 2000, showing city limits in 1962, 1983, 1996 and 2000.**

*Source: Prado and Van der Straaten based on DGEy and CLAS images taken in 2002*
Municipal responses to this intense urban growth have been characterized by repeated attempts to submit the area to its governability. Since peripheral urban areas were to be remade in the image of the city, this constituted a form of marginalization through inclusion. In 1961, for example, the municipality implemented a Regulatory Plan with the purpose of directing the urban fabric of the entire city. Urquidi (1995) writes that the city’s Regulating Plan of 1961 sought the “rational, aesthetic and technical growth of constructions in the urban orbit” (59). Bolivian urban planning in the 1960s and '70s was based on modernizing ideas of European urbanists of the 19th century, which in turn were founded on a liberal faith in the linear vector of progress, in the possibilities of scientific and technical planning as tools for improving human societies by promoting their advancement along this vector of development.

The modernization of the city as evident in municipal projects before the 1980s in many ways paralleled the developmentalist project of “First World” countries. These international and municipal projects sought to develop and incorporate the periphery – peripheral countries at the international level and peripheral areas at the urban level – to put them on the same paths and patterns expected of development in the center. As non-regularized land occupations continued apace in Cochabamba (Solares Serrano 1989:*), as in many other Latin American cities (da Gama 2008:*), the periphery was conceived as the negative expression of urban modernity (Dematteis 1998). Such a modernizing perspective considered that periurban areas were dominated socially, economically and culturally by the city center. They were understood to be undefined, anomalous areas, with no identity (Arteaga 2005). From the perspective of municipal governments and urbanized citizens, these areas were seen primarily as problems to be solved.

Urban planning policies in Cochabamba in the 1960s followed the patterns of then-prevalent European ideas, typified in the Garden City of Ebenezer Howard (Fishman 1984). A central aspect of this planning model was city zoning, in which certain areas were destined to particular functions, such as residence, recreation, administration and economic activity. Cochabamba’s 1961 Regulating Plan required that 39% of inhabited areas be ceded to “green areas” for public use in parks, schools, hospitals or byways. In addition, it required a garden strip of 3.5 meters in front of any new construction (Achi and Delgado 2007:82). This led to the creation of the demand for independent lots, from the working class to the more wealthy areas of the city. This requirement also “continues to influence the development of a municipal normative and appears to be a central symbol of Cochabamba’s identity, as it is one of the ordinances most enforced and sanctioned by the municipality” (Achi and Delgado:83). These normatives have discouraged urban densification and, as will be explored below, provided fertile ground for the speculation of vacant land and the rise of lot-traffickers in peripheral parts of the city.

The modernizing perspective found in the municipal planning and policies of Cochabamba in the third quarter of the 20th century was also reflected in the broader socio-economic transformations of the country. Both the widespread social reforms of the
populist government that led the country after its 1952 revolution, as well as the military
dictatorships that followed from 1964 through 1982, justified their regimes as responding to
country's need for modernization. James Holston’s (1989) study of the development of the city
of Brasilia in the late 1950s describes the extraordinary – and ultimately failed – modernist
attempt to engineer democratic social relations through city planning. Modernist attempts to
manage social relations through technical planning were evidenced at the international scale
in the post-war drive for development, which privileged economic development as a means to
work towards more egalitarian social relations. Philip McMichael (1996) writes that the
“linking of human development to national economic growth was a key historical event,”
particularly as a “political and intellectual response to the state of the world at the historical
moment of decolonization” (31). He notes that with the massive emergence of post-colonial
states after World War II, international powers could encourage economic growth in the new
nations while revitalizing faltering international trade.

This focus on economic growth, so central to the liberal modernizing paradigm of
development, later found its maximum expression in the neoliberal structural adjustments
policies of the 1980s. The transformations in the national political economies precipitated the
fastest growth of peripheral urban areas in Bolivia's history. The implementation of the 1985
New Economic Policy – among other orthodox economic shock measures – meant the dismissal
of over 90,000 state employees, including over 30,000 miners. Noting that the number of
unemployed workers due to the New Economic Policy had climbed to 150,000 by 1996,
Vacaflores writes that “with an average of five members per family, this meant that 750,000
people were forsaken, abandoned to their own prospects, which threw open the doors of
[domestic and international] migration” (quote in Siles:7). More than one hundred thousand
Bolivians migrated from mining communities to cities in the valleys and highlands between
arrived in Cochabamba in the year 1986 alone.
Just as this massive surge in migration was beginning, the city of Cochabamba remained at a loss as to what to do with the southern area of the city, which could not be controlled by its urban development plans nor incorporated into the city's formal economy. In the mid 1980s, the city of Cochabamba began to implement policies of deliberate exclusion of the Zona Sur. The municipal government admitted in its 1985 Directing Plan for the Urban Region that “45% of the city's urbanizations and subdivisions evade municipal control” (cited in Goldstein 2004:77). A large part of the Zona Sur was declared a “red zone” whose status was “frozen” by the municipality. The areas included in the “red zone” were precluded from any possibility of becoming legalized (Goldstein 76-78).

The consequent rapid growth of informal settlements and excluded populations through the 1990s was paralleled at the national level. The high socio-economic costs of the New Economic Policy had weakened the legitimacy of the neoliberal Bolivian state. The state's response was the construction of a national project based on an inclusive citizenship to encourage Bolivians to identify with the state. Between 1994 and 1995, the Law of Popular Participation, the Law of Administrative Decentralization and the multi-cultural Educational Reform were all passed. This legislation was developed, paradoxically, through a top-down process with little input from popular and local sectors. Moreno (1999) characterizes this period as a constitutive moment in Bolivia's history, “through which the State establish[ed] an active presence in rural areas and grant[ed] a universal citizenship to all Bolivians. Enabling participation in state decisions at the local level guarantee[d] the State's own legitimacy” (5).

Attempts to regularize the peripheral neighborhoods of Cochabamba in this period were implemented as part of national decentralization policies. Legislation on municipal territorial ordering, based on the 1994 Laws of Administrative Decentralization and Popular Participation, mandated that each municipality formulate its Municipal Development Plan and its Urban and Territorial Ordering Plan. These would regularize urban lands and assign land use zones to determine settlement, construction, urbanization and subdivision norms. Nationally dictated regularization policies were influenced by the wave of international property titling programs, which had become part of development initiatives since the 1980s, promoting the privatization and legal formalization of land rights. According to these programs,

“governments and donating agencies promote the privatization of public and traditional lands, and the legal formalization of rights to land throughout developing countries. This has engendered an unprecedented effort to elaborate legal documents and plans for every parcel of land.” (Lastarria 2007:3)

The drive to regularize land ownership has thus been an effort implemented at the international, state and local levels.

In the 1990s, the municipal government of Cochabamba employed a parallel attempt to incorporate peripheral neighborhoods, as it had attempted in the 1960s and '70s. Following
international and national trends, however, the 1990s such municipal incorporation took place through the decentralization of municipal administration and efforts to title of unregularized land. In his 1993 campaign for city mayor (before his later bid for governor), Manfred Reyes Villa promised that his administration would find ways to manage the growing periurban areas. During Reyes Villa’s period as mayor, from 1993 to 2000, a city official stated that “The Municipality must intervene in these neighborhoods to regularize them. It must incorporate them and integrate them into the city” (cited in Goldstein 2004: 81). Decentralization to sub-municipalities and the incorporation of neighborhood associations into municipal mechanisms established a state authority in peripheral neighborhoods. Yet while Cochabamba’s urban land policies in the 1990s indeed functioned to incorporate the Zona Sur into municipal dynamics, we will see below that these policies have had varied effects in different neighborhoods.

A. NEOLIBERAL SUBJECTS OF REGULARIZED URBAN LAND

State and international development programs are not the only actors who seek to title lands and order territories. The residents of informal neighborhoods do too. One neighbor of Lomas said, “We need to get our documents to feel secure on our property. Because right now we’re not, people aren’t secure” (interview 11.02.08). Another neighbor desired the security that she felt that titles would provide in economically unstable conditions:

“That's what most worries me, the land titles, so I can go to work without worries. Because now there's no security. Sometimes at any moment the dirigentes say that we have to go here or there, and if I go to work, I get fined. And if I don't go to work, I don't get paid. What can I do?” (interview 08.12.07)

Informally settled neighbors throughout the Zona Sur, despite their insistence on the legitimacy of their non-legalized occupation of land, are still emphatically preoccupied with obtaining titles for their land.

In his study of a neighborhood in the Zona Sur, Daniel Goldstein (2004) interprets these anxieties for land titling as a desire for inclusion in the national liberal community, a desire to be Bolivian citizens. As noted in the discussion above, such national inclusion also served the state’s extension of its authority. Goldstein writes, “By securing land titles, [periurban residents] hope to overcome their marginalization, removing the obstacle to recognition as legitimate and deserving citizens...” He quotes a neighbor from the Zona Sur who says, “Right now we are – how can I put it? Like a natural son that is not recognized by his father as natural, you see? When he is recognized, then he is the legitimate son. So our documents are sort of like that, no? They make us legitimate.” (130)

Goldstein writes that such perspectives show periurban residents' acceptance of the
terms of membership that the state has dictated. He explains:

“By accepting the state’s terms for citizenship, barrio residents have thereby accepted the alcaldia’s claim to legitimate authority over and regulation of Villa Pagador… now it is the municipality to whom barrio residents must pledge loyalty in exchange for needed attention and services.” (131)

These dynamics are certainly evident in the urbanized neighborhood of Nueva Vera Cruz.

This section explores the tensions and implications of a relationship to land and property that has primarily been defined by formal and private ownership as legitimized in titles. In the two sections following this one, the cases of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara will show alternative relationships to the dominant property regime, in neighborhoods where a more ambivalent relationship to state and urban institutions has prevailed.

**Private and formal ownership in Nueva Vera Cruz**

The neighborhood narrative that relates the establishment of Nueva Vera Cruz insists on its legality. Asked about the titling of land in the neighborhood, one early dirigente proudly stated, “Everything legal as it should be.” Speaking of neighborhoods where lots were still untitled, such as Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, another neighbor noted that, “They want to be like us, more legal” (interview 04.12.07). Nevertheless, the original settlement of the area was not so simple. Over 30 years ago, the first neighbors of Nueva Vera
Cruz arrived in the area. This small group of twelve people formed a group to purchase the lots, through which they took care of the paperwork, the distribution of land and sales to incoming neighbors. Long-term residents interviewed about the history of the neighborhood all spoke of this group of original settlers as a “cooperative” whose purpose was to establish their occupation of the area.

When asked who made up the original cooperative, one of the long-time residents remembered, “It was the community.” Yet at that time, there was hardly a community to speak of, as the area was empty before the settlement. Another neighbor responded that the cooperative was made up of “the original dirigentes, the community leaders.” Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, as we will see below, were also settled by groups of people and their leaders. Yet in neither of those neighborhoods were those groups ever called “cooperatives.” Why, then, have Nueva Vera Cruz residents understood their neighborhood's establishment to have taken place through a cooperative?

The use of the term “cooperative” has particular connotations and legitimacies in Bolivia. The activities of cooperatives have been legislated in Bolivia since 1958, when the General Law of Cooperative Societies was passed. Telecommunications cooperatives brought widespread telephone access to Bolivian cities, and are still the major telecommunications service providers in the country. Cooperatives also provide public utilities to a vast number of Bolivians, with the Rural Electrification Cooperative and the Santa Cruz Potable Water and Sewage Service Cooperative counted among the most important electricity and water providers in the country (Zárate and Sanabria 2009, Yavarí 2006). After dismantling the national mining company, the neoliberal state encouraged the growth of small mining cooperatives, which have now organized into the powerful National Federation of Mining Cooperatives in Bolivia. Finally, Bolivian savings and credit cooperatives manage close to a third of the country’s savings (La Razon 2002, Alliende 2008). There is a national Day of the Cooperatives and an official Hymn to Cooperativism (CONCOBOL nd).

Of particular note is that cooperatives, despite their grassroots connotations, are state-recognized collective actors who play an important role in formal economic, productive and service sectors. In fact, cooperatives in Bolivia have been questioned for partaking in strategic maneuvering within party politics. For example, mining cooperatives emerged in the late 1980s, after the neoliberal dismantling of state mining corporations and massive dismissal

---

2 The first settlers arrived in Nueva Vera Cruz in the 1970s. They did not obtain titles to this land, however, until the late 1980s, when the regularization of their land also granted the neighborhood official municipal recognition as an urbanization. After the implementation of the Law of Popular Participation in the mid-1990s, the neighborhood association of Nueva Vera Cruz became a state-recognized Territorial Base Organization (OTB). To get a sense of the comparative time frames of settlement of the three neighborhoods, most Mineros settlers arrived to the area in 1993-4, although the area was already sparsely inhabited at the time. Despite the fact that their land remained untitled through the end of the study period in 2009, Mineros San Juan became an OTB in the mid 2000s. Lomas was first settled in 1998. Until the end of the study period, land in Lomas remained untitled and the neighborhood association was not yet recognized as an OTB.

3 The same applies to some extent at the international level as well. The International Cooperative Alliance claims to be the largest non-governmental organization in the world, and was one of the first three NGOs to be recognized and accorded consultative status by the United Nations.
of Bolivia’s miners. Many of these new mining cooperatives were criticized for benefiting from government support in exchange for withholding criticism of government policies and quietly paying rent for concessionary use of the mines. A progressive radio station that publicized such a critique was dynamited shortly thereafter (Torrez Miranda 2009:8). More generally, Gregorio Iriarte (1979) developed a “criticism of cooperativism from an Aymaran [indigenous Bolivian] perspective,” which distinguished integrative indigenous communal forms from uni-directed and instrumentally-driven cooperatives. By using the term “cooperative” for the group of original settlers – despite the fact that the group was in no way a formally recognized cooperative like the ones mentioned above – Nueva Vera Cruz residents implied their adherence to what they considered modern values and institutions. This served to distinguish their legal occupation of land from the informal settlements nearby.

In addition to perceiving the original group of settlers as a “cooperative,” Nueva Vera Cruz residents also used the term “intermediary” to describe the middle-men with whom they negotiated for the land. Most interesting was their general avoidance of the term “lot-trafficker,” as these middle-men were repeatedly referred to in Mineros San Juan, in Lomas de Santa Bárbara and in Bolivian popular media. Like lot-traffickers, intermediaries did not guarantee a legal transfer of land, nor did they necessarily work on behalf of the legal owners. One of the original dirigentes remembered, “I bought from one of the intermediaries, because in the end, there was no real owner that was selling, but rather there was this intermediary” (interview 09.11.07). The intermediaries were paid a nominal amount by the settlers, but the cooperative had to find and pay the owners for the land and legalize their purchases on their own.

The same dirigente then described how the cooperative searched for the owners:

“For the urbanization, we focused on the radio, even in Oruro [a city 4-5 hours away], so that they would know. I publicized it on Radio Bolívar. Then we gave the previous owners 90 days to come forth [and claim themselves] as owners, so that they could come and claim their properties. We wanted to urbanize and buy legally and negotiate with the true owners.” (interview 09.11.07)

So preoccupied was this early community leader in ensuring the legality of the land purchases from the real owners that he sought advice from an institutionally-positioned acquaintance: “And so that I wouldn’t get confused, I got advice from an ex-mayor” of a nearby city.

A smaller group of neighbors also found their lots through an intermediary who, nevertheless, had no official paperwork for the land. They also had to seek out the legal owners. One of the leaders of that group described the process as follows:

“To legalize my block, to find the owner, I walked from the Plaza Cala-Cala [in the center of the city] to the Cruce Taquiña [at the northwestern-most edge]... back and forth, up and down the city. It took me years, and when I found the owner, she was on her deathbed, just about to die. So I talked to
her, we are the ones interested in your lot... and this is our situation. In the end, she sold it to me, and so I legalized it.” (interview 25.11.07)

Even with the intermediaries, then, there was still some measure of insecurity regarding the eventual titling of their land.

Only two of more than twenty Nueva Vera Cruz residents interviewed used the term “lot-trafficker” when referring to the establishment of their neighborhood. In both cases, the term was used interchangeably with “intermediary.” One long time neighbor said, “I met up with the lot-trafficker and he gave me a lot up here. But then... the lot-trafficker, the intermediary, died, and after a year his wife also died” (interview 12.11.07). Referring to the non-titled purchase of land, another neighbor highlighted the similarities between lot-traffickers and intermediaries:

“It's always a problem, it's the primary problem... Most of [this land] has been divided into lots by lot-traffickers, by intermediaries. Then the intermediaries don't bother to worry about the legality of the papers... That's why we've had problems. Most of them are lot-traffickers that don't worry about regularizing, once they've gotten their money.” (interview 07.11.07)

As in other neighborhoods where settlers arrived through lot-traffickers, Nueva Vera Cruz residents lived without legal titles to their land for many years.

Yet Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors used the term “intermediaries” in a similar way that they used the term “cooperatives,” in order to position themselves in a hierarchical discursive universe over and above those who had to resort to “lot-traffickers.” In its generally accepted use, a lot-trafficker's work is viewed as both illegitimate and illegal, seeking profit at the expense of others at the margins of the law. But the urban poor desperately need the lot-trafficker as much as they disdain him. At one point, a group of Zona Sur neighbors laughed as they told of a well-known lot-trafficker listing his profession on official papers as “buyer and seller of lots” (field notes 02.01.08). The humor lay in the juxtaposition of his illegal activities with such a legitimate title.

It was precisely this tension between illegality and legitimacy that most Nueva Vera Cruz residents avoided in their collective remembering of their cooperative having worked through intermediaries. Their ability to label the sellers of their lots “intermediaries” rather than “lot-traffickers” was based on the lack of pressing conflicting claims to the land. We will see below that in Mineritos San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara conflicting claims to land derived from rival valuations and legitimacies. In Nueva Vera Cruz, in contrast, settlers, intermediaries and owners more or less agreed on the legitimacy of land markets, and of the individualized and legalized buying and selling of land. Even though the cooperative worked to buy and regularize various lots, the basic aim of the cooperative was to provide a group means for buying individual lots. At no point in the narratives of the establishment of Nueva Vera Cruz – except in references to municipally-mandated public spaces – was there any mention or
a sense of collective possession, ownership or property. Despite the lack of holding legal titles for over a decade after their neighborhood's establishment, Nueva Vera Cruz settlers never sought to contest the legitimacy of the liberal legality of individualized private property. Their settlement can be better understood as a protracted purchase over many years. In contrast, Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents literally battled to claim legitimacy for non-market and extra-legal occupations of land.

In a comment that highlighted the importance of their alignment with official institutions, an early Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente spoke of the importance of state orientation as neighbors sought to ensure the legality of their land. He recalled, “So I went to La Paz, and in La Paz I went into the Congress. In the Congress, I look for people I know. In the Congress, they orient me: 'This is what you have to do.' Thanks to them [we were able to begin the process of land titling], while here in Cochabamba you get neither information nor support” (interview 09.11.07). La Paz, in this regard, symbolized the formality of state institutions. This was further reflected in a comment regarding the only type of collective property discussed in Nueva Vera Cruz, the official public spaces that urbanizations are legally required to maintain. The neighborhood's first vice-president described the importance of formal planning:

“We had a map of the area drawn, and that was a problem. [The neighbors said] 'What do these llamas know? What are they here to do?'

Whether they wanted to or not, the map was going to be drawn. For example, in the rural areas of La Paz, they make well-planned streets. The map was carefully developed with engineers. According to that, lots are divided. They said, 'What do you want to do here? Go on to La Paz.' That's how they were. And now what do they say. They've had to stay quiet, and some have even said thank you for having these things done.” (interview 25.11.07)

Some of the neighbors' early resistance to the regularizations required by state institutions finally gave way to an embrace it.

In the context of a neighborhood such as Nueva Vera Cruz, where property was basically understood as formalized, private ownership, public spaces had to be strictly controlled. In Nueva Vera Cruz, as in many other areas in the Zona Sur, “green areas” – as neighborhood public spaces are called – were often still empty lots (with very little green in them). Nevertheless, according to municipal norms, planned spaces for green areas were to be held by the urbanization until it could use them for community spaces such as a park, market or plaza. As the only collective spaces in the Nueva Vera Cruz, these areas were highly regulated to prevent private appropriation. The neighborhood's dirigentes, who paid strict attention to formalities in dealing with these public areas, were lauded by a resident:

“They are responsible, they tell us everything. Sometimes they show us documents to do any little thing. For example, we need to [deal with] a green area... they say lot-traffickers are coming. [But] we have a map,
they’ve already got it. There has to be a map, or a photocopy, to know its extent. They show it to us, they don’t just do whatever.” (interview 28.10.07)

The legitimacy of legality in Nueva Vera Cruz was, thus, supported by the professionalism of its dirigentes.

Leaders’ professionalism and networks – their social capital – increased their ability to work with state and external actors. Two central characteristics of the urbanized neighborhood of Nueva Vera Cruz over the period of study were the professionalism and experience of its leaders and their strategic coordination with external and formal institutions. These will be further examined in the chapters that follow.

Early Nueva Vera Cruz residents not only had leaders with more social capital than those of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, but they also arrived in the area with more economic capital than their Zona Sur counterparts. The first settlers to Nueva Vera Cruz clearly had some measure of savings or credit that helped them to establish themselves. A member of the original cooperative recalled:

"There was nothing here when we arrived, we had to bring it in... then everyone else came in. Not a cent was returned to us. At that time we spent 2800 [bolivianos, equivalent to about US$400] to bring electricity in. That 2800, we paid for among just eight families." (interview 09.11.07)
institutional frameworks had to do with their greater access to capital valued within that framework, both in social and in economic terms.

Nueva Vera Cruz residents were also able to accumulate social and economic capital over the longer period of their residence in the area, compared to Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents. But the accumulation of particular types of capital was not the result of an predetermined process of development that would inexorably lead to urbanization, legalization and professionalization. In a similar manner, the process that led to the representative – rather than participatory or communal – forms of organization evident in Nueva Vera Cruz was not directly the result of the satisfaction of basic needs. Rather, as I will argue throughout the chapters that follow, these processes were shaped by the power of dominant property and socio-cultural regimes to impose the legitimacy and value of particular forms of capital over others. Principal among these was economic capital in the form of private property. Urban institutional frameworks legitimated such forms of capital and ownership, thus shaping the neoliberal logics of the Nueva Vera Cruz collective.

At the same time, the practices and discourses which promoted formal and private ownership in Nueva Vera Cruz also reinforced the liberal terms of propertied citizenship and its valuations. In this sense, the legitimation of property through titling is not a simple recognition of the authenticity of ownership. Instead, as Jaroslava Zapotocka (2007) notes in her study of Zona Sur residents' attempt to obtain titles for the lots they occupy, “The recognition of the settlers as owners is not the only legitimation produced. A legitimation of power and the juridical order is also generated” (249). This is especially evident in the moral preference for legality over potential profits that a Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente expressed:

“Look, I could have become owner of this whole block, that's eight lots, easily. No one had receipts, but... one has to be conscientious in life. So I looked for who it was that was on the list and I distributed the records I had... Everything legal as it should be.” (interview 25.11.07)

Thus the act of titling for Zapotocka, as for Goldstein, is “also an act of authority, an act of power, and thus a political act” (Zapotocka 248). In conscientiously sticking to the formalities of record-keeping and titling, the dirigente who chose to remain legal “as it should be” accepted the authority of and legitimacy of dominant urban socio-economic configurations.

**The formal-informal frontier and neoliberal logics**

Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ search to be a legal part of the city, however, reproduces existing valorizations and definitions of the city, and the relations of power that these imply. The hierarchical power relations that the liberal and neoliberal logics of private and formal ownership entail are particularly evident in the social relations shaped by neighborhood property forms. Despite the importance of the cooperative in the early years of the neighborhood, its utility diminished once the functional goal of securing titles was achieved.
In contrast to dynamics in Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, land ownership in Nueva Vera Cruz has generally served individual rather than collective functions. A long-time Nueva Vera Cruz resident described the different stages of land transfers he observed in his neighborhood:

“First they bought the houses, just like that... Then it seems that others came in with a little more money. Now, let's say, I buy this and turn it into a business - this is the third owner now. That's why the houses were unattractive... Then I think people came from the Chapare4, or from wherever, with more money. They bought, there's no longer the older owners, these are all new owners. Where do you think those other owners went? Maybe back to their hometowns. I don't know, they've disappeared... There are other owners now.” (interview 11.03.08)

By the time of the study, the buying and selling of lots in Nueva Vera Cruz was completely individualized. The legality of land tenure in this case had led to the dissociation of land as private property from its potential collective function of social integration.

Land as private property in Nueva Vera Cruz, in fact, reinforced social exclusions. A current dirigente observed, "One of the things that's happening is that a neighbor comes and marks out his lot and puts up a ten foot wall and doesn't want to know about anybody else" (interview 13.04.08).

4 The Chapare is the tropical area of the department of Cochabamba, where many miners migrated when they lost their jobs in mines in the 1980s. As coca fields were increasingly eradicated under US influence in the 1990s, many coca growers from the Chapare moved to Cochabamba.
In a study on the impact of international migration on community development in the Zona Sur, Roncken et al. (2009) note:

"Numerous testimonies from neighbors remark on the construction of new houses due to international remittances. Around those houses, high and exclusive walls are almost always built. This privatization of homes goes hand in hand with the privatization of their inhabitants' lives, evident in observations on the lack of participation [in neighborhood activities] by new neighbors and migrants' families who have recently built large houses. These constructions reinforce the individualized power of privacy, that is, the power to deprive others of what one owns." (83)

Thus, individual and family ownership of property in Nueva Vera Cruz was further consolidated by migrant remittances that fortified the border between residents' privatized worlds.

In a similar vein, Teresa Caldeira (2000) theorizes the connections between the closing of physical spaces and the possibilities for democratic political participation. Her book City of Walls argues that the fragmented public sphere created by privatization and enclosure is one “in which equality, openness, and accessibility are not organizing values... The new urban environment enforces inequalities and separations. It is an undemocratic and unmodern public space” (331). In fact, in Nueva Vera Cruz, participation in decision-making spaces was literally contingent on private and formal ownership. Renters, who at the time of the study represented 20% of the neighborhood's population, were excluded from membership in the neighborhood association. One renter who had been living in Nueva Vera Cruz for two years explained,

“The renter has neither voice nor vote... I haven’t gone to any meetings or assemblies, I haven’t participated. I don’t have a lot here, nor a house, so it’s not required. I haven’t gone... if I do have land or a little house here one day, I could participate, but right now I don’t.” (interview 22.11.07)

In contrast, renters in the other two study sites were actually required to participate in neighborhood activities. The exclusion of renters from the Nueva Vera Cruz neighborhood association points to property practices shaped by liberal and neoliberal logics. These depend on the strict and legalized distinction between formal private ownership and informal or de facto possession.

A champion of the distinction between formal and informal property is the highly influential Peruvian businessman-turned-economist Hernando de Soto (2000). “Formal property,” he exalts, “is this extraordinary thing, much bigger than simple ownership” (202). De Soto uses a vivid description of a bell jar to describe capitalism, placing those without formal titles outside the protective glass rim of capitalism, clamoring to enter: “The bell
jar’ makes capitalism a private club, open only to a privileged few, and enrages the billions standing outside looking in.” He describes “informals” as “outside the global economy, [they] are in fact outside the market economy, are certainly outside the capitalist economy” (67). De Soto’s work has been central in the formulation and justification of international programs for the regularization of informal, urban land. From this perspective, Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ insistently legal regularization of their land is part of their wager to participate in the market economy.

Katherine Verdery (2004) notes that de Soto’s central argument throughout his body of work depends on his differentiation between legality and illegality as two totally separate spheres. De Soto’s individualizing proposal for the reduction of economic inequalities consists in the inclusion of the heroic and entrepreneurial poor in the capitalist system of formal private property. His basic argument is that policy-makers and other central actors of the legal system can help the urban poor convert their “dead capital” (his term for informal property) into “live capital” by facilitating regularization. This process will allow the “informals” to enter the bell jar of capitalism. However, as Peter Ward (2003) writes:

“A potential problem with this approach is that concepts of ‘good citizen’ and the societal ‘mainstream’ are social constructions that are often highly value laden and may derive from within a particular class and dominant power group. Regularization to achieve integration into the wider set of social opportunities such as public education and health care is one thing; regularization for social convergence and conformity is another.” (10)

Nueva Vera Cruz exemplifies a case in which regularization has indeed constructed “good citizens,” as its neighbors have generally accepted dominant values, despite the exclusions that these imply.

Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors’ acceptance of the state-defined separation between formal and informal property has helped to shape the neoliberal collective logics of the neighborhood and their individualized subjects. The border between the formal and the informal, the market and the non-market, is a cornerstone of liberal capitalism. Yet it is within the shift from liberal to neoliberal subjects that the individual and local civil society are thrust into the role of patrolling that border. As noted in the previous chapter, governmentality theorists argue that neoliberalism is characterized by government rule through the shaping of subjects’ autonomy and will, as neoliberal subjects “accord to their life a meaning and value to the extent that it can be rationalized as the outcome of choices made or choices to be made” (Rose and Miller 2008: 214). Nueva Vera Cruz residents have become not only eager (if late-coming) parties to de Soto’s bell jar of capitalism. In their enterprising and individualizing autonomy, they are

5 The French historian Fernand Braudel used the image of a bell jar to describe the exclusion that has existed since the establishment of Western capitalism. Braudel writes, “The key problem is to find out why that sector of society [that is] capitalist... should have lived as if in a bell jar, cut off from the rest” (quoted in de Soto 2000:66).
also active producers of its protective rim, through the distinctions they uphold between their formally legitimate cooperative and intermediaries, on the one hand, and illegal squatters and lot-traffickers, on the other. These discursive distinctions eclipse functional similarities and overlaps.

The utility of identifying the collective logic at work in Nueva Vera Cruz’s neighborhood approach to land as private property is that this begins to shed light on the centrality of state and municipal mechanisms of land regularization in the interaction between the globalized policy framework of neoliberalism and its lived experience by residents of a marginal urban neighborhood in a peripheral country. Rincón (2006) writes that “The normative rationalities in the appropriation of urban territory can be understood as practices produced and transformed socially through time, that circulate in society, exert a control over social action within a territory and aspire to have a monopoly in regularization” (673). Neoliberalism as materialized in the urban landscape can thus be understood as a normative rationality that seeks to impose itself, in part, through the formalization of land.

Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ investment in the formality of private property and in the professional and accountable leaders who buttress this truth provides insight into the “regulation of populations through multiple institutions and technologies in society” (K. Mitchell 2006:389). Yet these institutions and technologies are by no means all-encompassing or over-determinant. Thus, while the institution of private property is dominant in contemporary capitalist societies, responses to it include enablement, resistance, evasion, even transformation. As we have seen in this section, Nueva Vera Cruz residents have largely reproduced the institutionalized distinctions between the formal and informal, the private and the public. They have, thus, recreated a neoliberal logic at both the local, collective level and individual, subjective level. This logic makes private property and market value the markers of legitimacy. Further characteristic features and the implications of this logic will be explored in the following chapters. But Bolivia's peripheries are particularly important as key sites in which national challenges to these dominant forms of society and economy are played out. The sections below explore two very different forms in which the constructed border that legitimates formal, legal ownership and delegitimates other property and social forms is recognized and challenged.

**B. COUNTER-HEGEMONIC FORMS OF VINDICATING PROPERTY**

It is precisely in the liminal space that residents of the Zona Sur occupy between the formal and the informal that the validity of non-legal possession and occupation of land and alternative conceptions of property can be established. In contrast to the ways that property is enacted in Nueva Vera Cruz, the property practices explored below do not rest on state legality for their legitimacy. Residents in both Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara justify their untitled occupation of the land with the hardships they endured to settle it.
Describing the arduous work of opening up streets, laying the cobblestones of their main street by hand, obtaining the basic services of electricity and water, a Lomas neighbor said, “It has cost us suffering, work. We opened up streets. It was nothing but dirt and thorns, now look how nice it is. Now there's transportation, streets, a playing field. We did it all ourselves. That's why I wouldn't sell. It's cost me so much” (interview 22.10.07). This emphasis on the high costs that they paid for their lots – above all in terms of suffering and labor – was often repeated in the discourse of Lomas and Mineros residents.

Their efforts were contrasted to the experiences of the “new buyers” who substituted easy money for the difficult struggles of early settlers. One of these early residents of Mineros San Juan was worried that the legal owners of the land would require yet another payment for her land.

“Because all our suffering, what will become of it? Everything that we have suffered, sleeping with our shoes on, that's what we had to do. It would rain, and the ground we slept on was wet. And they called lists...
Now people come in with money. They have no idea what we've suffered. Money can be found, but life, life just can't be found.”

(interview 28.10.07)

This neighbor felt that she had already paid an exceptionally high price for her lot, with her labor and her very life.

In this sense, the experiences of early residents of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara were quite similar. The settlers of each of these neighborhoods consistently remarked on the “suffering” they endured in those early years. The hardships of carving a habitable residential area out of difficult and disputed terrain is shared by settlers to periurban areas throughout Latin America. Emphasizing their suffering, informal settlers highlight the value of their efforts in contrast to their neighbors’ purchases of their lots (Varley 2002, Achi 2010). In doing so, these residents lay claim to a normative order in which their struggles to establish their non-legal possession of land is valued on par with economic capital and the formal legal order.

In Mineros San Juan, such an audacious claim and its implicit alternative normative has been developed in the context of the territorial resistances of Bolivian – particularly rural – indigenous groups. I argue below that claims to the legitimacy of informal land occupation in the peripheries of Bolivian cities are the most recent iterations of rural indigenous groups' demands for territory and autonomy. Worldwide, in fact, indigenous peoples' emphasis on territory has highlighted the integral relation between land, collective identities and socio-cultural and productive survival, particularly as this conception of territory confronts capitalist commodification of land. This section focuses on the enactment of such a counter-hegemonic territorialization in the periurban neighborhood of Mineros San Juan. In the first subsection below, I explore the ways that Mineros neighbors established legitimacy for their non-legal occupation of land. I, then, turn to the interaction between Mineros'
collectively vindicated possession and the counter-hegemonic logics of national and regional indigenous social movements.

An everyday scene in Mineros San Juan during the period of study.
Credit: Author 2007

*Mineros San Juan's collectively legitimized possessions*

The settlement of the area that has become Mineros San Juan took place through violent struggles over the land. These conflicts bonded the newly formed collective through a proud and bellicose identification with the miner. In particular, early Mineros settlers battled against members of an agrarian community called Llave Mayu, who claimed to be the legitimate owners of the very area to which Mineros lot-traffickers and settlers arrived. Thus, the unity of Mineros settlers was fortified from their very conformation against a clearly identified “enemy”. One Mineros resident recalled their adversaries' strategic attacks on his fledgling neighborhood: “It was those people who said they owned the land, our enemies... They put an explosive in the house of our ex-president... They burned down houses, used dynamite” (interview 12.11.07).

A member of the Llave Mayu community had an equally antagonistic description of Mineros settlers. He related:

“They lived in tents then. We tried to get rid of them, but then they called on their hoodlum friends from the Cancha.\(^6\) They came in something like five trucks to the place, with their hired goons, with their bats – that’s what they called them, with their axe handles. They came with all those things, and with dynamite. And that’s how they moved us

---

\(^6\) The Cancha is the main market in Cochabamba, widely regarded as a breeding ground of petty criminals and drug addicts.
[out of the area]. We couldn’t defend ourselves against so many of them. That time they came with a mauser [rifle], saying that they’re miners. And we don’t have anything like those arms.” (interview by Amonah Achi 12.11.06).

Such a censorious perspective of Mineros settlers was even shared by children in other neighborhoods. Mothers in Mineros recalled that when their children attended a school in a nearby neighborhood, they were treated badly by both other students and teachers because they were from Mineros San Juan: “They told them they were bad, they wouldn’t play with them” (field notes 13.10.07). Since settling in the area, then, Mineros neighbors have been united in their shared and combative marginalization. One neighbor noted proudly, “They call us Talibans. We’re famously known as the Talibans” (interview 28.10.07).

With its strong group solidarity and its identification with the historically revolutionary miners, Mineros San Juan is an apt place to examine the attempt to construct a counter-hegemony that legitimates an alternative to liberal legal frameworks and neoliberal governmental logics. This attempt, in fact, ran up against a juridical resolution ruling that the community members of Llave Mayu were the rightful owners of part of Mineros San Juan. In 2005, after over a decade of conflict between the two groups, the National Institute of Agrarian Reform granted certificates of titles to community members of Llave Mayu as the native inhabitants of the area (Los Tiempos 2005). These titles covered about one fourth of the land of Mineros San Juan. Yet even as it lauded the decision for giving “the native occupants and the settlers... a legal basis for the distribution of the land,” the city newspaper recognized the contingent force of that legality, adding that: “The outcome over the struggle for land [in that area] is still uncertain” (np).

Mineros settlers recognized that the Llave Mayu community members were there generations before them, yet they still claimed a greater legitimate right to the land. According to Mineros neighbors, it was their labor that converted the fallow land into their neighborhood, into their productive territory. One neighbor said, “There were so many owners appearing saying they were farmers. How could they possibly have been farming the area... It was all tag’o [a small dry bush native to the area] and spiny shrubs. We are the ones who cleared the area, who cleaned it up” (interview 28.10.07). Another neighbor recounted, “We dug, we pulled out rocks. Every night we had to dig” (interview 11.10.07). With these efforts, the settlers sought to territorialize their land, armed essentially with the legitimacy that they felt their labor and suffering granted them.

Mineros residents justified their possession of the land by pointing out that the Llave Mayu community members did not actually use the land as they were legally beholden to do. According to the National Institute of Agrarian Reform, native inhabitants may only be granted titles if they have made social productive use of the land in dispute. Claiming that the Llave Mayu community members sold off parts of the land instead of cultivating it, the Treasurer of Mineros alleged: “Those are land grants that the government gave to them to work, to cultivate. But they have only used it for business” (interview 09.11.07). Another
neighbor even called them “the lot-traffickers of Llave Mayu” (interview 21.10.07). As was apparent in these comments, Mineros neighbors disdained the profit-making buying and selling of property that is the driving force behind the formal land market.

Mineros neighbors marked a clear distinction between those who used land productively and those who only profited from its exchange. Speaking derisively of those who only purchase lots “to do business,” one Mineros resident said, “That's not for their benefit anymore, for the benefit of their families. That's to do business, to sell” (interview 21.10.07). Another contrasted the easy money made in lot-trafficking to the more committed relationships that agriculture creates between farmers and land:

“Like I tell you, if you plant, you harvest every six months, then it's another six months, seven months from the harvest to the money. But here, in one month, they may have taken the land and sold it, making 500 dollars... They've sold it and they've gone to look to other areas where there's more land. They've gone there, and sold there as well, and in other places they're hoarding land. They've seen that it's an easy business. It's a bad habit that people have gotten into.” (interview 10.03.08)

The Mineros collective looked down on and actively discouraged such rent-seeking. Neighbors took action if they concluded from an owners' absence that the land was only being used for investment. A neighbor recounted such an incident:

“It's because he didn't even live here... We couldn't have empty areas, belonging to who knows who. And when we have problems, nobody will help us out. And so this gentleman never built anything [on the lot]. Until the people got angry, and they took over his lot. Now they don't want to give it back, because they say he didn't live here. As they say here, the one who lives on the lot is the owner. Whether or not he's paid for it, if he lives on the lot, he is the owner.” (interview 07.10.07)

Partaking in the neighborhood collective by simply being there, then, was given more value in determining ownership in Mineros than the occupant's legal status vis-a-vis the land. Don Felipe, the charismatic president of the neighborhood, explicitly proclaimed this logic of collectively vindicated possession of the land: “The right of ownership has been declared. No one can remove us from here, no matter what they do. This [land] will have to be titled” (field notes 12.08.07). Formal titling, according to this view, should follow upon legitimate possession, not the other way around.

Similar dynamics can be seen in Varley’s (2002) study of poor urban neighborhoods in Mexico. In her case studies, the urban poor who seek titles to their land did not only do so in hopes of becoming part of the liberal citizenship system, as Goldstein interprets. Varley argues – as I do for Mineros residents – that a title also represents legitimation of periurban residents' alternative values. Among the urban poor she studies, a title is important insofar as it is a
public recognition of the private achievements of caring for their families and constructing a home. In making this argument, Varley critiques the liberal division between the public and the private in which the public is held to be the site in which political and social relations of power are enacted. She notes that this is a variation of the dualism that opposes the legal and the illegal, the inside and outside of capitalism, and the valorization of the public sphere, the liberal legality and the inside of capitalism. While the liberal paradigm insists that economic and political inclusion may only take place within the legal and formal inside of capitalism, both her study and Mineros show us that legality may sometimes be valuable insofar as it legitimates private, non-legal and informal practices.

That titling can mean opposing things – an adherence to institutionalized formality and neoliberal logics in the case of Nueva Vera Cruz residents, and a defense of alternative values and counter-hegemonic logics in the case of Mineros – highlights not only the importance of particular contexts in determining contingent meanings, but also the heuristic rather than definitive purpose of analytic categories. Many Nueva Vera Cruz residents surely saw titling, to some extent, as a recognition of their personal achievements, and Mineros residents may very well have been driven by the legitimacy that titling grants them within dominant urban frameworks. The point in highlighting distinct uses of titling within ideal-typically defined communities is to identify tendencies rather than fixed categories.

Mineros residents’ tendency to consider titling a recognition of their informal justifications of ownership, rather than titling as a justification of ownership, must be understood in the context of these residents’ limited access to formal property. Titling is only one way that Mineros neighbors seek to legitimate their alternative property claims. The treasurer of Mineros said:

“Titling isn't necessary anymore, what's important is that it's in our possession. And with that, we have the green light because they already asked the municipality to certify if we're really part of the Cochabamba municipality, if we're an urbanization. So the city certified, and the deputy mayor even came to a general assembly, and he authorized so that we could begin to get electricity in Mineros San Juan.” (interview 12.10.07)

Neighbors of Mineros San Juan sought to increase the legitimacy of their possession of the land through the infrastructural public works that established their permanence.

Despite the fact that none of the residents had regularized the titles to the land they occupied, the very fact of building a water tank or a school, or installing individual electricity meters, supported their de facto possession of the space. Thus, while continued struggles with other claimants to the land may have suggested that residents' only tentatively possessed the land, their infrastructural works affirmed otherwise. Even without official land titles, then, Mineros residents claimed their legitimate right to the land due to its transformation through their labor, and by the material constructions that granted their presence some measure of
permanence. Given their collectively legitimized possession of land, the president of Mineros San Juan, Don Felipe, proclaimed, “We are no longer settlers, we are residents” (field notes 12.08.07)

Don Felipe expressed his conviction that “to live with dignity means that we all should have some small share” of land to live on. Yet he also recognized that “unfortunately, in Bolivia, regulations require lawful ownership... Tenancy of land and territory has been the most important issue for us. In 14 years [since their establishment], we have not yet been able to support our legitimacy with legality. This is our greatest task” (interview 15.02.08). Given these circumstances, neighborhood leaders have sought to regularize their land as a group over the last few years. Nevertheless, their form of approaching formalization was quite distinct from the process we saw in Nueva Vera Cruz. Rather than following the legal process to gain individual titles, the residents of Mineros sought to obtain community ownership of the neighborhood land area.

Most importantly, at each point in this process, the neighborhood's collective identity and claims were highlighted and reinforced. In one neighborhood assembly, for example, the president proclaimed: “It’s up to all of you. In assembly, we decided that the owner should come before us. He should come before us all [in a public assembly]” (field notes 12.08.07). Negotiations with landowners were complicated by multiple and overlapping claims to the land, by allegations of forged titles and by divided loyalties to the original lot-trafficker on the one hand and to the bellicose miner identity on the other. But these difficulties did not fragment the collective approach to working towards regularizing their land possession, as we will see was the case in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. One of the largest hurdles, the cost of land after the delivery of a clear title, exemplifies the collective approach to land regularization in

---

7 The word used in Bolivia for this process is *sanear*, which is also the term used to describe the process of recovering health
Mineros.

In Bolivia, a legal requirement for the official transfer of real property is that it be free and clear of any encumbrances, such as liens, counterclaims or property taxes. But the cost of clearing the title of such encumbrances and the consequent legal sales of individual lots would increase the prices of the lots. Legalizing their ownership of the land that they occupied would, thus, cost more than the majority of Mineros neighbors could afford. At a seeming impasse, Don Felipe sought counsel at a Latin America-wide gathering of rural and urban grassroots leaders. He came back from the meeting inspired by other leaders' advice to collectively buy the land from the different owners as is. The suggestion was based on rural indigenous communities' parallel attempts to obtain official state designation of Indigenous Community Territory to protect their collective claim to their communal lands. Applying this logic to the periurban area, Don Felipe said, “The strategy was to buy the entire territory, as a neighborhood” (interview 15.02.08). He proposed that the neighborhood offer owners a certain price for their land as a whole in whatever legal state that it was, regardless of the taxes still owed on it or counterclaims from other owners. The neighborhood would then manage internally the distribution and clearing of titles.

While Mineros dirigentes turned to pro-bono university lawyers to help them evaluate owners' legal claims to the land, they also requested that the declared owners present themselves and their cases in front of the assemblies as a whole. At one Sunday assembly, the president announced that an owner of part of the neighborhood's land would be arriving to speak to the neighbors.

The assembly began with other agenda items, and soon, a white SUV pulled up near the meeting area. A man in an ironed and buttoned-up shirt stepped out tentatively. He was after an illness.
accompanied by a well-dressed woman, who was introduced as his wife and another gentleman, his lawyer. They spoke quietly to the dirigentes on the high promontory as the neighbors looked on and murmured below. The president introduced them, thanking them for their courage in coming to speak before the assembly. It was apparent from the first words of the owner that there was some anxiety in how he might be received by this famously combative group.

He began addressing the crowd below by seeking common ground. Just as the Mineros settlers were hard-workers, so were he and his wife. They had just come from spending a number of years toiling abroad, working to make ends meet. They, too, knew how difficult it was in Bolivia to earn a decent salary. After a few minutes of speaking in Spanish, the man began to speak in Quechua. Only after he felt that he had established a connection with the Mineros residents, did the owner then go on to talk about costs. He detailed before the entire gathering exactly how much the back-taxes would cost in order to deliver clear titles. Property taxes had not been paid in the over ten years, the period of time during which the attending neighbors had built their homes, cobbled their main street and installed electricity. When prices began to be discussed, comments rippled through the assembly of over 250 residents, many of them yelling their opinions out to the crowd as a whole.

Over and over, neighbors hollered out that they would only pay “the price of a dead chicken!”, a Bolivian phrase meaning a low price in which the buyer benefits more from the exchange than the seller. The constant use of the phrase throughout the negotiations with the owner pointed to an attempt to reverse the tendency of the capitalist to profit at the expense of other parties to the exchange. The phrase “the price of a dead chicken” has commonly been used in national media in reference to questions of state ownership of public enterprises and their complicated relationship to profit. According to the president of the newly re-nationalized state electricity company, for example, the company was “dismembered and sold to neoliberal capital at the price of a dead chicken” in the 1990s (La Nación 2010), when it was privatized to raise state funds. In using this phrase, the president of the state electricity company implied that a low price paid for concessions of the utility benefited the buyers - “neoliberal capital” - at the expense of the Bolivian people. The phrase was also used in critiques of Evo Morales' government when it sold mining or oil concessions to transnational firms “at the price of a dead chicken.” At stake in the dead chicken’s price is the question: Who is to profit from particular frameworks within which buying and selling takes place? Within capitalist accumulation, the answer is clear: the capitalist. But social movements worldwide and the current Bolivian government have insisted on the need to rethink the capitalist frames of property and exchange.

In their practices, Mineros residents reclaimed the centrality of the collective in property exchange. Their point was not that property needed to be owned communally, but that its economic utility should remain subordinate to its role in shaping social relations. One informally institutionalized mechanism that reinforced the power of the collective in Mineros was called the derecho de piso. Literally translated as the “right to the ground,” the derecho de piso was a sort of move-in fee for new neighbors used in different ways throughout
Cochabamba's periurban areas. During the initial establishment of both Mineros and Lomas, the *derecho de piso* was paid to lot-traffickers as payment to join the settlement. This was not necessarily payment for the lot itself, as there were no titles involved. Instead, it was the right to be part of the settling group\(^8\). Just as with formal land market prices, however, the cost of the informally regulated *derecho de piso* rose as demand for the land rose. A Lomas resident who was among the second wave of settlers recalled, “There was a first group, they were the ones who really fought... [I paid] 250 bolivianos for the *derecho de piso*...before it was only 20” (interview 22.08.07). The legitimacy of tenure was not confirmed by official titles, but by the leaders who had been paid the *derecho de piso*.

During the period of study, the *derecho de piso* in Mineros was paid to the block group, in addition to the price the incoming resident paid to the previous (informal since untitled) owner for a lot and/or house. The *derecho de piso* was paid for any transfer of property by block group members to their more localized group, rather than to the neighborhood association. This charge assured the group's legitimation of a new neighbor's tenure and their incorporation into the group. A group leader explained:

> “We don't have papers, so we just call them transfers. Buying and selling would be with written documents, all those things. These are simply transfers, without any papers. It's simply guaranteed by the group, by the people and the chief of the group. That is, it guarantees that you're coming and you're putting down your *derecho de piso* and that you abide by all the consequences.” (interview 18.11.07)

Despite their apparent similarities, then, the *derecho de piso* serves different functions from a move-in or collective housing fee. These latter fees are generally paid in exchange for services provided by the association; formal ownership is a separate, if related, aspect of one's residence. In the context of informality, however, the *derecho de piso* provisionally replaces the title. Paid to the group that validates ownership, it signals both one's commitment to the group and the group's inclusion of its new member. In the way that the *derecho de piso* worked in Mineros, economic inclusion was inseparable from social integration.

Given these dynamics, the value of territory goes beyond the use-value ascribed to it within the Marxist perspective; the establishment of territory is the establishment of the collective itself. The *derecho de piso* explicitly recognizes the role that land plays in constructing the social, as it seeks to reinforce the authority of the local collective, and maintain the legitimacy of its non-legal occupation of land. As many theorists have noted (i.e. Hardin 1968, Boyle 2003), the separation of the economic and social functions of land provided the foundation for the capitalist markets that today structure and move populations and their relations. Some of the most influential recent challenges to dominant capitalist and neoliberal socio-economic structures in the Latin American region have been by indigenous social

---

8 The term is also used in work situations where one “pays one's dues” or “earns one's place” when beginning a new job. In Bolivia, new teachers must work in rural areas in order to pay their *derecho de piso* before obtaining work in urban areas.
movements. Strategically and discursively, Mineros and other periurban collectives draw from these social movements' powerful attempts to reintegrate the economic into the social.

**Territorializations through counter-hegemonic logics**

Mineros San Juan residents' informal practices regarding their non-legal occupation of land seek to establish legitimacy for an alternative normative order that values their labor and social forms. Both these periurban property practices and the indigenous rural forms of territorialization that they draw on can be seen as attempts to construct spatialized social systems that validate particular social valuations and marginal capital. As noted above, analysts have argued that urban territorial systems are projective models of “social networks yet to be constructed” (Dematteis 2006:60). In other words, the ways that land is occupied and property is regulated, formally or informally, is tantamount to a proposition of how social relations might be structured. This subsection will further explore the collectively vindicated possession of land in peripheral urban settlements in the context of the indigenous, largely rural-based social movements that have sought recognition of their own alternative social and territorial forms. These national and regional movements have provided marginal urban communities such as Mineros San Juan with important discursive strategies and political resources with which to make claims to the city.

Although the background, experiences and political organization of indigenous people in Bolivia’s highlands and lowlands have historically had quite distinct trajectories, their articulation around the issue of land has contributed to the construction of a broader indigenous political identity in recent decades (Herrera et al. 2004). Assies (2003) writes that the notion of territory

“has enjoyed a sort of ‘voracious appropriation’ by indigenous movements throughout Latin America, in coordination with other claims such as the recognition of indigenous forms of authority and jurisdiction. Together, these elements constitute the foundation of the autonomy that has become a central demand of indigenous movements.” (1)

The demands of the growing periurban populations have given a new meaning to the theme of land and territory in Bolivia, taking up and reconfiguring the emphasis of indigenous rural people on their vital and legitimate occupation of space.

Yet the territorial legitimacy of periurban communities is not based on an ancient connection to their land, as indigenous rural communities have claimed, but is instead based on their suffering and hard work. Mineros residents’ intense and difficult settlement period violently constructed their collective memories of the land, and linked their effective possession of the area with their demands to be included in the city. Even without property titles, the inhabitants of Mineros claimed a right to live on the land due to their toiling to establish their neighborhood and by their effective occupation of it. Such informal settlement
discourses have extended indigenous claims to legitimacy from rural to periurban areas, traversing the popular interpretation of agrarian reforms, “the land is of those who work it.”

Political claims of indigenous territoriality in Bolivia are rooted in long resistances to spatial impositions of power, from the colonial period through to the foundation of the republic and the consequent liberal and neoliberal state formations. The central strategic element of Spanish colonization in the Andean region was the organization and management of territory. With the importance of the region in the colonial productive economy of the southern Americas,

“A brutal pact of reciprocity was maintained between the colonial state and the Andean ayllu, where to possess land required payment of a tax or tribute as well as obligatory work in the mines of Potosi. In the 19th century, during the Republic, the criollo-mestizo elites implemented the Disentailment Law in 1874. Its objective was to destroy the ayllu or the communities in the valleys and high plains in order to appropriate communal lands, arguing that the communities hampered economic progress.” (Plata 2007:36)

The Disentailment Law of 1874 was part of a process of land privatization, in which bureaucrats were assigned to determine limits of land and its productivity. While apparently respecting indigenous communities' rights to their land, it also declared unproductive or unclaimed land – which included communal rotating plots – property of the state. As Laura Gotkowitz (2007) writes:

“All told, the 1874 law paved the way for the most devastating assault against communal property since the seventeenth century, when the Potosi mining boom triggered a rapid expansion of the hacienda. In 1880, Indian communities held approximately half of Bolivia's farmland; by 1930, the communities' holdings had been diminished to less than a third.” (30-31)

While the territorial violations against lowlands indigenous people beginning in the colonial period took on quite different forms, each resulted in the destabilization of indigenous people's socio-cultural, political and economic arrangements.

Political coordination between disparate Bolivian lowland and highland groups around their shared, long history of the dispossession – particularly of land – led to the rise of the national indigenous-led MAS (Movement Towards Socialism) political party. In 1990, following the lead of indigenous movements in Ecuador, and supported by the increased interest of international non-governmental organizations in indigenous rights, indigenous communities across the country came together in the March for Dignity and Territory. Groups of indigenous

---

9 This motto is attributed to Emiliano Zapata as part of his struggles for the Mexican Revolution.
10 The ayllu is an indigenous communal form of social, political, economic and religious organization.
people marched 34 days from the Amazonian capital of Trinidad to the highland capital of La Paz to demand the recognition of their legitimate claims to their land and autonomy. They sought “legal protection of the geographical areas vital to the subsistence of indigenous communities; and in second place, the recognition of their collective rights” (Plata 2007:36).

Not only did the March place the indigenous claims for land at the forefront of national politics, but it also linked the issue of land to that of territories, countering the economic-productive utility of land with its territorial importance in the continued collective survival of indigenous peoples. This emphasis has been the central node in the political union of Andean and Amazonian indigenous groups, which, in turn, brought the MAS leader, Evo Morales, to power in the country in 2005. This emphasis on territory highlights integral and systemic relationships between land, shared identities established on and through that land, and the constitutive memories of their spatialized collectivity.

Plata (2007) notes the emergence of the notion of territory in indigenous discourse: “In the two contemporary documents elaborated by leaders, authorities and intellectuals of Aymara organizations – the Declaration of Tiwanaku (1974) and the Fundamental Agrarian Law (1984), the concept of territory is not mentioned” (37). The Declaration of Tiwanaku consolidated the idea of the “indigenous people” in Bolivia by reinforcing the issues of the right to land and rural indigenous people’s work. The Fundamental Agrarian Law extended the perspective of indigenous rights, highlighting communal and socio-economic elements and specifying two types of rights over land: “the original dominion that corresponds to native and reconstituted communities and the [right] to property for familial productive units and their associated work” (Fundamental Agrarian Law, cited in Houghton and Paz 2005:34). The concept of territory was the axis that brought together social and land rights. Assies (2003b) writes that the idea of territory as a “vital space” was able to function as this axis in contrast to the concept of land, which “refers to an object of work and often an object of market exchange.” He notes that the concept of territory emerges with “clearly defensive connotations against the development projects of Latin American states,” including the

“impulse to 'conquer' the 'last frontier': the Amazonian basin. Geopolitical motives, summed up in the Brazilian motto 'integrate so as not to lose', the search for new natural resources and the fostering of colonization in the framework of agrarian reforms brought about the occupation of the Amazonian space.” (1)

In this context, throughout Latin America, the theme of territory links up with other indigenous claims such as the recognition of autonomous authorities and jurisdiction.

After the March, then Bolivian president Jaime Paz Zamora immediately signed eight decrees that created new territories of indigenous peoples. In 1990, Paz Zamora’s government also ratified the International Labor Organization’s Convention 169 “On Indigenous and Tribal People.” Its article 13-2 declares that “the term lands... shall include the concept of territories, which covers the total environment of the areas which the peoples concerned occupy or
otherwise use” (1989). The 1996 Law of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform in Bolivia created the official designation of Indigenous Community Territory. These lands were defined as the habitat of native people and their communities, where they lived in accordance with their own social, cultural and economic organization. Indigenous rural groups could thus legalize their land as collective property.

The conception of territory as integral to the relationship between environment and people is expressed in the work of Bolivian sociologist Raul Prada (1996). He writes: “Territory is the environment made concrete. Beyond habitat, territory is the condition of a mode of being in space. In this sense, territory is historic density” (25). Prada further connects sociality, spatialized history and power, noting that, “The function of power is to create and possess a memory; this function is carried out on a raw material of power that is marked: on land” (27). Because social relations and their subjective experiences mutually and continuously recreate each other in inhabited spaces, the ways that land is conceived is central to hierarchies of power. The concept of territory seeks to articulate these complex dynamics of land, and express its importance beyond its economic and even social utility. As we have seen, marginal urban residents have challenged exclusionary structures through their discursive identification with this indigenous notion of territory, and its implicit valuations and legitimacies.

Yet recall that Mineros settlers did not recognize the Llave Mayu community’s rights to the land. This highlights important features of alternative claims legitimated by collective identifications with indigenous groups. The first is that such claims are complicated – whether in rural, urban, national or transnational spaces – by the shifting and strategic meanings of indigeneity in contemporary contexts. In rural as in periurban areas, indigenous people conform dynamic and constantly transforming collectives. In a study of such transformations, Herrera et al. (2004) examine the ways that indigenous groups' collective practices in the rural lowlands of Bolivia changed after the 1996 land reform's specifications for claimants to Indigenous Community Territories. It is in this sense that Sarela Paz (2005) writes that the indigenous political subject must be understood as a group that “in the process of the political articulation of ethnic claims... constitutes itself as a collectivity that seeks to politically manifest its difference” (40). As such, Paz emphasizes the strategic use of ethnicity for political articulation, “in the framework of the struggle over [collective] interests.”

Indigenous claims to land are, thus, essentially demands concerning relationships of power.

Unified by their discourse of shared marginality, Mineros settlers positioned

11 It is significant that Paz wrote these lines in documents prepared for the Center for Andean Development and Communication (CENDA), an NGO whose action research has supported indigenous social movements since the 1980s. CENDA's research helped to orient indigenous groups' proposals developed for the Constituent Assembly that elaborated a new state constitution between 2006 and 2007. The question of autonomies is an abiding issue in Bolivia, where it has been used by both marginalized and economically powerful groups to seek self-determination and control of resources. Paul Regaltsky, quoted lines below, is also a CENDA founder. These views show that for Bolivian indigenous social movements and their collaborators, political, strategic issues regarding production and reproduction are held above cultural issues of identification. Regaltsky (2008), in fact, writes that “The process of identification is subordinate to the task of constructing and ethnic territorialized space for community (re)production” (39).
themselves as the deserving dispossessed. They justified their occupation by their arduous struggles to overcome their disempowered positions. Despite Mineros leaders' use of indigenous discourse, this discourse was employed most importantly in the strategic service of the unity of the counter-hegemonic collective. The fact that the Llave Mayu community's claim to land may have been more legitimate, in terms of indigenous occupation of land over time, did not deter Mineros settlers from making political claims backed by what they posited as a stronger legitimacy. In fact, although Mineros leaders also depended on popularized anti-imperialist discourse, their justification for their occupation of land through the exertion of their labor was an eminently Lockean, liberal one. Thus, the ideal-type of a counter-hegemonic collective needs also to admit its contradictions.

This leads to another point about Mineros' appropriation of alternative claims to legitimate their alternative property regime. This concerns the violences enacted by a counter-hegemonic collective. While counter-hegemonic collectives – both the Mineros collective and the allied MAS national-political project – are, by definition, alternatives to dominant orders, this does not mean that their own logics are necessarily more equitable or less exclusive. Rather than seek the end of inequalities, counter-hegemonic collectives more simply seek to abolish the particular dominant hierarchies that marginalize them. Paul Regalsky's (2008) comments on the consolidation of ethnicity apply to that of counter-hegemonies:

"It is a process of collective identification at the same time that it is an exercise of legitimate violence by a non-State authority. It is a political process very much interconnected to the productive dynamics of a community's forms of appropriation (and exchange) of resources, especially land and family labor." (39)

The particular exclusions that Mineros' participatory organizational forms imply suggest a critical approach to the widespread calls for more participatory democracies. In the counter-hegemonic logics of Mineros, high participation in community events and contribution to communal work coexisted with decreased possibilities of diverse perspectives and dissenting opinions.

The repression of dissent within the collective was due, in part, to the importance of discourse in consolidating the Mineros counter-hegemony. Likewise, the importance of symbolic resources in the group enabled Mineros leaders to appropriate and deploy the seemingly contradictory elements noted above: indigenous discourse, anti-imperialist rhetoric and foundational liberal principles. According to Sousa Santos (in Assies 2001), there are three dimensions that constitute a response to the instability implied by a meeting between normative orders, in this case between the dominant institutionalized order of the city and the alternative order of Mineros. These dimensions are: rhetoric, bureaucracy and violence. Of these three dimensions, rhetorical resources are the most accessible for populations at the margins of the city, law and society. This helps to explain the centrality of discourse in
Mineros’ counter-hegemonic logics, which require the articulation of an antagonistic frontier (Laclau 2005). In the Mineros case, that frontier was rhetorically drawn between the dominant liberal and neoliberal socio-economic system, on the one hand, and claims to alternative property regimes, on the other.

Such a unifying frontier is particularly important given the heterogeneity and recent constitution of periurban collectives. About 60% of Cochabamba’s residents identify with an indigenous group, the same proportion as in all of Bolivia (INE 2001). As noted above, two-thirds of Mineros’ inhabitants reported rural places of origin, almost 20% were from other urban areas and 12% came from mining communities. The particularity of periurban collective subjectivities is highlighted in Xavier Albó’s 2003 study of urban-popular neighborhoods populated by indigenous migrants in two Bolivian highland cities. Albó shows that despite the fact that “the criteria and mechanisms of customary rights persist” to some extent in these neighborhoods, the context of urban heterogeneity “hampers the prospect of personal contact, which is fundamental for the development of customary mechanisms” (101). One of the major challenges to establishing periurban legitimacies at the margins of the city and the law is thus the lack of a shared normative universe. In these marginalized spaces, one response to this challenge is the construction of an oppositional and counter-hegemonic discourse and subjectivity.

The establishment of an alternative normative order requires the construction of a hegemonic collective subjectivity. Indeed, the discourse of Mineros residents stressed its unification in the face of shared challenges and enemies. That unity was materialized in organizational and daily practices which required the active presence and participation of neighbors, and was symbolized in the leader whose indigenous and anti-imperialist discourse constructed a discursively hegemonic collective.

The president of Mineros San Juan speaking at a neighborhood event.
Credit: Rosario Veliz 2008, courtesy of Centro Vicente Cañas
This discursive elaboration was, at the same time, the very constitution of the collective. As Laclau (2005) notes, a collective is simply the hegemonic effort to express a shared will. This shared will and the always incomplete and unstable constitution of the collective depends on the articulation of particular demands that are made equivalent by an antagonistic common frontier. In periurban neighborhoods such as Mineros San Juan, it was not difficult for local leaders to identify the antagonistic frontier. Mineros dirigentes established this frontier between the dominant law and the unified community, signified in the hegemonic discourse of marginality.

Yet it was not only dirigentes’ discourse that continually recreated the opposition between the delegitimated legal order and the legitimate alternative order, so as to constitute the counter-hegemonic collective. Rather, the symbolic frontier between the two was also stabilized in shared periurban practices in Mineros. One of these practices, as explored above, was the insistently legitimate occupation of land, despite its non-legality. The insistence in their collectively legitimized possession was as strategic as it was symbolic for these periurban settlers. The articulation of territorial sovereign rights and rights to self-determination – together with the claims to natural resources – have become the axes that articulate indigenous social movements in Bolivia and in the Latin American region as a whole. The following chapter looks at the shared practices to administer water in Mineros, which similarly depended on and produced the border between dominant transnational models of water management and local customary forms of organization. We will see that not only was the Mineros counter-hegemonic collective produced by this frontier, but so were the social movements whose counter-hegemonic logics have complicated the task of administering state power. Finally, in the fourth chapter, we will look at local forms of community justice, often more effective than state justice, which have likewise drawn on and contributed to the establishment of an counter-hegemonic normative order. It is through their practices of informal occupation, of self-management of natural resources and basic services and of local social control that periurban residents identify with and participate in contemporary, national social transformations.

For Bolivian social movements – and the MAS government brought to power by them – customary law expresses the alternative normative order that unifies these central themes of indigenous sovereignty. The definition of customary rights establishes a unified frontier in opposition to the positive law that is fundamental to the globally dominant liberal socio-economic paradigm and system. This frontier is expressed regionally and internationally, as Sergio Tamayo (2006) describes in the context of Mexico, “the dilemma between liberalism and communitarianism, the contradiction between customary and positive rights, the contradiction between collective uses and customs and individual rights” (24). Yet despite the seeming clarity of these dichotomies, recent studies (De Vos, Boelens and Bustamante 2006, Herrera, Cardenas and Terceros 2004) have explored the mutual interpenetrations of customary and universal rights.

Still, Bolivian social movements have based their discourses on these constructed
oppositions. The Pact of Unity, the coalition of grassroots, indigenous organizations in the county, declared in its proposal for the Constituent Assembly:

“Bolivia, like the rest of the Latin American states, has constructed a liberal model characterized by the imposition of occidental culture that has marginalized and debilitated our originary cultures and political and juridical systems... A uniform juridical system and foreign models of government and the administration of justice have been imposed, which favor market interests and deprives the people of their means of sustenance.” (quoted in Flores et al. 2006:83)

While identifying such an antagonistic frontier may be analytically imprecise, it is evident that it is strategically central to the consolidation of a counter-hegemonic collective.

Yet contestatory practices, both by Mineros residents and by Bolivian national social movements, are neither fully separate nor wholly different from dominant legal practices. The international search for the legitimation of customary norms, for example, has been extended and enforced by the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, promulgated in 2007. The Declaration has the same juridical and political values as the UN’s 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which makes it incumbent for independent states to respect the declarations in their internal and external relations. One of the most important characteristics of each Declaration is its definition and protection of indigenous collective rights. As such, organizations seeking to defend their norms and practices that deviate from the dominant liberal order have done so through the very strategies of positive rights.

Likewise, periurban residents’ practices are not limited to the discursive universe that so clearly opposes the dominant state normative order with local alternative legitimacies. For example, residents of Mineros pragmatically turned to the police and formal justice system, despite their deprecatory comments of these. They sought to secure titles at the same time that they continued to insist that their informal possession of the land was more legitimate than formal titling. In a similar manner, various neighborhood groups in the area subscribed to a document denouncing before state law another group’s informal taking of land. Despite the fact that non-legal settlement was the norm for the establishment of their own neighborhoods years earlier, the denouncing parties now sought judicial consequences for what they considered to be illegitimate usurpation of land. The document that over a dozen informally-established neighborhood associations signed declared that this particular violent and forceful takeover of land represented “completely reproachable conduct [which] constitutes crimes that have been committed and that should be investigated and sanctioned with the full rigor of the law by the relevant institutions” (Los Tiempos 2004).

Yet practical appropriations of elements from the dominant juridical system are not simply marginal actors’ attempts to participate in the dominant order. Both the informal practices of periurban residents and the political strategies of international indigenous movements are also aimed at changing the terms of that order, which they seek to employ to
legitimate their own positions and alternative norms. That is, the strategic appropriations of state law from marginal positions not only seek to validate private interests, but also function to support marginal legitimacies. Such contradictory dynamics are succinctly expressed in Don Felipe’s rhetoric and practices related to the neighborhood’s quest to obtain legal titling of their land. The Mineros president consolidated the discursive hegemony of the neighborhood by repudiating the injustice of the law as represented in the work of lawyers: “I’m going to tell you very clearly, the truth is that the lawyers are the ones who swallow up our money, it’s that simple” (field notes 12.08.07). Nevertheless, later and in a private meeting, Don Felipe described the hybrid strategies he and his fellow dirigentes employed in seeking legal titling for their neighborhood: “Not only do we have support from a lawyer, but also from [the municipal department of] human rights” (interview 24.10.07). As such, Mineros residents contribute to the legitimation and constant recreation of an alternative normative order through mechanisms that are both legal and illegal, formal and informal. Despite their hybrid and strategic appropriation of both dominant and subaltern practices, Mineros residents’ collective force is based on a counter-hegemonic discourse, that draws on a consolidated national indigenous identity and its political power.

C. MARGINALIZATION OF DIVERGENT LOGICS BY DOMINANT INSTITUTIONS

Beginning in 1998, inhabitants of Cochabamba and nearby rural areas began to hear that there were free vacant lots on a far-flung high hill in an undeveloped area south of the city. One neighbor recalled:

“There was a large flag right there, flying from a post. Once people saw that, they came; the flag could be seen from faraway. It wasn’t a national flag… This has always been the work of the lot-traffickers. As people arrived, they showed them the land... They took me high up the hill [and said], ‘Don’t move from here, otherwise others will try to take over, and that’s your problem then.’ When I went down the hill to eat, I got back and there was nothing there, not even my bed.” (interview 03.08.07)

The lot-traffickers began giving land that did not belong to them away, requiring that grateful recipients remain rooted to their lots, in order to establish the growing group’s domination over the area. Once their authority over the area was firmly established, as we will see below, the lot-traffickers could then begin to profit handsomely from it.

As more and more settlers arrived, they remained indebted to the lot-traffickers and dependent on their leadership, as the group fought off others that competed for the land. Eventually, the main lot-trafficker – who became the first dirigente of Lomas – came to wield inordinate and extensive local power. The Lomas dirigente’s position was not an idiosyncratic case. Rather, it was produced by contradictory effects of national economic and
decentralization measures implemented in the 1990s. The massive migration to urban areas of Latin America, combined with the lack of land ownership documentation of apparently uninhabited parts of urban peripheries, paved the way for the rise of the informal land settlements and lot-traffickers throughout the region. These and other conditions that will be explored below created the backdrop for the corrupt, clientelistic relationships which have shaped the dependent position of the neighbors of Lomas de Santa Bárbara.

This section will examine the marginalizing effects of powerful dominant frameworks when local authorities and collective logics do not wield the social or political force to legitimate alternative property regimes. That is, despite the fact that the settlements of land in Lomas de Santa Bárbara and in Mineros San Juan shared many similarities, the residents of Mineros have been far more successful in laying claim to their collectively legitimized possessions. We saw above that Mineros' alternative claims to land have actually served to strengthen the local collective and the position of its residents within wider social and economic structures. The forms of dependent occupation in Lomas, in contrast, disadvantage its residents, since they neither abide by, nor challenge, the formal institution of land titling. Instead, they are simply peripheral to and marginalized by these dominant logics of regularization. Property practices in Nueva Vera Cruz provided an example of the advantages of private property, and Mineros San Juan showed the legitimacy of alternative territorializations. Because of their collective logics that diverge from dominant urban property regimes, Lomas residents suffer from the most detrimental effects of regularization.

This is not simply because their lack of titling makes them vulnerable to insecurities, which de Soto argues, would be resolved by formalization. Instead, the case of Lomas shows that the informal land is in fact incorporated into the formal land market to the advantage of those better positioned within its system.
Dependent occupation in Lomas de Santa Bárbara

As in Mineros, multiple lot-traffickers sought to profit from claiming land in the area. The initial settlement of the neighborhood was likewise a military-like encampment where rival groups could attack at any point. One neighbor remembered: “We would go out at night with machetes to, letneo’s say, protect ourselves from those who were coming. They would come at us as if we were at war” (interview 28.07.07). Another recalled the actual battles:

“The people from over there, by Villa San Andres, wanted to take over this land, and then there were other people from Ushpa Ushpa also trying to take over. They wanted to dislodge us... It was terrible that day, fighting them off with dynamite and rocks. From nine in the morning until eleven [at night] we fought. We, then, rested a short while. They were exhausted, too, but then they got together again, and came after us again.” (interview 29.07.07)

Because of these ever-imminent attacks, Lomas settlers were required to be present at any time the lot-trafficker called the roll, including in the middle of the night, and to patrol the area twenty-four hours a day. One neighbor described the incessant roll calls, which took place “at six in the evening, then at ten at night, then at midnight, then at three in the morning, then at five...” (interview 12.08.07). And there was neither compassion nor mercy: “There was no respect for the pregnant woman, nor for the sick. It didn't matter... No one was excused here in Lomas” (interview 21.08.07). Another neighbor related: “They often came at night, so... it was impossible to sleep. The roll was called at one in the morning. There was burning all around, and we patrolled all night long” (interview 28.07.07).

For the first year or so, most settlers lived in tents. A Lomas resident described:

“We had our tents, and every lot had a tent where you had to sleep, because they came to check on us. At any moment they came, and if they didn’t find you sleeping there, it didn’t matter what you had done, how much you’d worked to clean up the area, immediately they took away your lot, with new people there the next day. Some people suffered to keep their lot. They chose to leave their work, good and stable work, because we always had to be here. If you weren’t there sleeping, it didn’t matter how much you’d worked [for the settlement], they simply took away your lot. Someone else would be there the next day.” (interview 09.08.07)

The threat of expulsion was ever-present and the authority of the lot-trafficker unquestionable. Another neighbor explained that when he first got a lot, he was unable to attend the first three required meetings. “And [the dirigentes] came to warn me, told me I had
to pay 500 bolivianos\textsuperscript{12}. And because I complained, he said it would be 600 bolivianos... But they weren’t just like that to me, it was to everyone, that’s how they were” (interview 19.08.07).

Yet, despite the threat of expulsion, settlers looked to the lot-trafficker for leadership in the conflicts. Furthermore, given his provision of lots to an increasing number of families, this authoritarian leader initially enjoyed a grateful submission to his authority. Within a few months, however, he became increasingly abusive and despotic. One neighbor recalled:

“You couldn’t say a single thing against him. When he was hitting the little old man who lived in front of me, I started to yell, ‘How can you hit him that way, you brute!’ And my husband’s cousin grabbed me and said, ‘Don’t say anything; they’ll evict you too.’” (interview 26.08.07)

Others remembered the gun that he carried, how he entered unmarried women’s houses and left them sobbing, the time that he humiliated an old woman, making her crawl and beg to him on her knees. Until the time of the study in 2007, a few neighbors confided that they still feared being evicted by the current dirigentes. One elderly woman in Lomas who lived only with her grandchildren, and had poor relations with her neighbors, feared for the seizure of her lot: “That dirigente, I think he is, said to me, ‘We’re going to take [your lot away] from you,’ because I’m not here sometimes... ‘We’re going to take it.’ That’s what he said to me... I don’t know. I’m angry sometimes, I cry sometimes. I don’t know” (interview 12.08.07). It had not been uncommon in Lomas’ past for dirigentes to use their inordinate local power to evict vulnerable residents and resell their lots.

Although both Lomas’ and Mineros San Juan’s first residents were part of highly conflictive settlements, an important difference in their violent establishment has shaped present social and organizational dynamics. Settlers in both neighborhoods experienced violence collectively, as a group, but Lomas residents also emphasized the lot-trafficker’s more personal and individual brutality. The threats that the settlers felt from the first dirigentes were still palpable almost ten years later. One early settler in Lomas described the experiences of a neighbor who began to speak up against the lot-trafficking dirigentes: “It was terrible, they wanted to kill him... because he looked out for the rest of us. You shouldn’t be taking their money. ’You shut up,’ they told him. It was terrible. They took him back there and beat him up” (interview 19.08.07).

The sense of identification between Lomas neighbors based on their intense shared history was eventually fragmented into smaller units grouped by blocks, the sites at which the neighbors meet. This division into smaller block groups took place when the original lot-trafficker was still the community authority and was done quite clearly to prevent the groups from becoming too united and powerful. One neighbor explained:

“In my block group, there were more than 100 people then, and what

\textsuperscript{12}This is equivalent to about $70 USD, an extraordinary amount to pay as the average income across the three sites of study is equivalent to $90 per month. Some of the first settlers paid just 20 bolivianos, or $3 USD for their derecho de piso in Lomas.
happened was that [the dirigente] heard that we were going to stop his car. That’s why he came to divide us up into three groups, to undermine us. We held meetings. We were all organized, there were so many of us, and we didn’t like what he was doing. But someone told him, and the next day he came. ‘Now we’re going to divide this area in three block groups’ [he told us], ‘from here to there is one group, from here to there another.’ That’s how he divided us up” (focus group 19.08.07).

This history helps to explain the fragmentation of the neighborhood in block groups and the lack of representation that Lomas residents have more recently felt at the neighborhood level.

Given the similar difficulties in the settlement of Mineros and Lomas, early settlers in both neighborhoods valorized their payments in “suffering” rather than in monetary currency. Among these early residents, there was a sense of greater legitimacy in their hard-won occupation of the land than in the transfers newer residents pay for with money. One Lomas neighbor spoke of her experiences settling the neighborhood, “It has cost me, but not so much because of money. It's the sacrifice more than anything else, I have suffered more in my own flesh and sweat than in money” (interview 16.08.07). Another resident said: “It's as if we were already paying... We've given everything. We've paid more than the land is worth already” (interview 26.07.07). These forms of payment stood in stark contrast to those of the “new buyers.” A Lomas neighbor described what she saw as the excessively business-like approach of these “new buyers”:

“They don't really care about the neighborhood or the lot. It's like they buy a black bag, they use it, and then they can just throw it away and forget about it. They don't care about the lot, and the rest of us, we do. We're worried, we care for the neighborhood.” (interview 29.07.07)

The issue at hand, however, is not who has more capital of one type or another, but rather how the form of capital that is valued is determined.

The longer-established residents in both Lomas de Santa Bárbara and Mineros San Juan insisted that their suffering constituted a more legitimate capital than the economic capital of their newer neighbors. The case of Mineros showed us its hegemonic ability to legitimate non-legal possession of land, to validate its claims to alternative values and forms of capital. In Lomas de Santa Bárbara, in contrast, there was a far weaker collective will and discourse to support alternative valuations. Compared to the sense of rightful entitlement to regularization and its eventual inevitability that was pervasive in Mineros, Lomas neighbors seemed almost passively desperate for titling. One Lomas resident lamented, “There aren't titles, there just aren't... If we could just have titles, who wouldn't be happy? That very moment, we'd do anything” (interview 13.04.08). Another neighbor explained:

“The majority of us are poor, we’re from the country and we don't have money to pay. That's why we're scared now, why we need to get the documents. Our dirigentes aren't producing results... so there's no
security regarding the documents. How long will it be that we have to live like this, without knowing about our documents?” (interview 16.03.07)

Finally, one Lomas resident’s desperation for titles was plaintive: “All we can do is ask God that we might obtain titles... we ask for that help, but we haven't gotten it” (interview 26.07.07).

In his interpretation of periurban residents' desire for land titles noted at the beginning of the chapter, Goldstein writes that in titling their land, residents are submitting to the state's authority: “The state as a rational, legal system of domination can offer barrio residents a modicum of protection from the unregulated and arbitrary authority of the lot-traffickers” (130-31). But the passivity of such a submission to the dominant system does not adequately describe distinct periurban realities, where a more ambivalent and varied relationship to state law and justice prevails. For residents of urban peripheries, the authority of the lot-traffickers is not, necessarily, arbitrary. Instead, the authoritarianism of the lot-trafficker during the first phases of a settlement violently imposes the hegemony necessary for the alternative legitimacy of the non-legal settlement of the area. Only with the construction of a shared identity can this hegemony begin to take a discursive form, as it has in Mineros San Juan.

We saw above that the unifying rhetoric of Mineros' counter-hegemonic logic has consolidated and legitimated the local collective. But Lomas residents' divergent logics has created very different collective and property practices. The personalized violence of its settlement fragmented the neighborhood unity, which in turn, has impeded the success of collective claims. So, although Goldstein's insight into the reasons that periurban residents seek titles may not be applicable in the case of the counter-hegemonic logics of Mineros, it does hold true for the neoliberal logics of Nueva Vera Cruz and for divergent collective logics like that of Lomas, which have been so marginalized that they are unable to make claims for their validity.

Lomas' inability to make collective claims was evidenced when its residents proposed to seek regularization of land through usufruct. In Bolivian law, legal ownership may be granted to the possessor of a piece of land, provided that the possessor has physically occupied the property for at least five years. During this time, the legal owner should have neither reclaimed his or her property nor been impeded in making such a claim (Farfan 2004:226). Usufruct is, thus, the juridical recognition of the legitimacy of one's occupation on a piece of land. Nevertheless, it is very difficult in peripheral areas such as Lomas de Santa Bárbara to obtain legal proprietorship through usufruct, given that it is usually still zoned as rural land. Rulings on usufruct in rural lands are decided directly through the national government under the Law of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Many Lomas neighbors thought the plan to approach the national government was a waste of time. Discussions in the Thursday night delegates' meetings began to revolve increasingly around this issue. A number of block groups began to prepare a letter to President Evo Morales, to be delivered as part of a march in the capital city of La Paz. Other block group
leaders said they would not join the march. One delegate dead set against the plan to approach the President explained that there were “thirteen block groups [against the plan] and only four on the other side... it’s just four block groups colluding and convincing, exactly four block groups” (interview 23.03.08). What stood out most in the conflict was the clear division in neighbors’ opinions according to block groups. So clear was this division that neighbors even personalized the aggregation of block groups pushing for the regularization of land through usufruct. They were referred to as “the Jaimes,” owing their name to an ex-dirigente involved in the planning. Because of the organizational fragmentation in the neighborhood of Lomas, attempts to appropriate rural strategies of territorialization were especially problematic.

Below, I examine the role of the formal land market in creating the dynamics within which Lomas' informal property practices make such weak claims. Nueva Vera Cruz residents have some social and economic capital that positions them relatively well within the dominant neoliberal logics of the city. Mineros residents have been able to access the discursive and rhetorical resources of historical and contemporary social movements in order to give force to their counter-hegemonic logic. As will be explored in the next chapters, Lomas' organizational forms have established more equitable social relations within the neighborhood than are found in the other two sites. Yet these and other qualities of Lomas' divergent collective logic are dismissed even by Lomas residents, given the neighborhood’s weak ability to legitimize and value its own practices and forms. This lack of legitimacy is, in part, a result of the clientelist and dependent relations that emerge from speculation in the formal land market and the authoritarian and violent lot-traffickers that the market empowers. These dynamics are the city effect at work: an informal periphery is defined by its lack; the role of the formal center in producing material inequalities and violence in the periphery is overlooked; and marginal populations' subjective capacities for self-valuation and self-determination are weakened.

The discouragement of divergent social forms

What is most surprising about the dramatic neighborhood history of Lomas de Santa Bárbara is that the authoritarian rule of the lot-trafficker lasted for over two years, with the lot-trafficker even voted by a majority to be the neighborhood’s first dirigente, the official community leader and representative of the settlement. What processes made such extended and intensive local power possible? Urbanists decry the lack of urban policies and planning in Cochabamba that have accorded such sovereignty to locally-based leaders, but I argue that it is precisely the combination of national and municipal policies currently in place that has given dirigentes such unrestrained authority.

To begin with, the inability of the 1980s urban labor markets to integrate the migrants who arrived in the city, combined with the privatization of mining and public services and
the liberalization of import policies, resulted in an increased tertialization and informalization of the Bolivian economy (Castedo and Mansilla 1993: 28). These dynamics inordinately affected Cochabamba and its informal sector. As discussed in the previous chapter, Cochabamba’s establishment and growth depended on its ability to serve the other regions of the country. It is little surprise, then, that the tertiary sector became more predominant in Cochabamba than in any other part of Bolivia (Castedo and Mansilla 1973). Further, the demographic profile of migrants to Cochabamba shifted in the late 1990s. For the first time, migrants arriving from rural areas were outnumbered by migrants arriving from other urban centers (Ledo 2004). The service sector was the sector that could most readily absorb these urban-to-urban migrants, as it included self-employed workers and informal laborers.
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policies in Bolivia dramatically cut social spending and dismantled the Bolivian Development Corporation, the principal state development bank.
Close to two thirds of Bolivian workers were part of the urban informal sector at the time of the last census (INE 2001). Given their labor insecurity, workers in the urban informal sector are the most vulnerable to the vagaries of economic conditions. These workers also constitute the dominant portion of the inhabitants of the informal neighborhoods of the Zona Sur. The map on the previous page was based on the 2001 census; the number of informal settlements in the Zona Sur has grown since that period. The shaded areas of the map represent higher proportions of residents who are self-employed. This category includes informal workers. Zona Sur has the highest percentages of such workers. The darkest shade represents areas where over half of the workers are self-employed. Informal, insecure and low incomes, in turn, heighten Zona Sur residents’ dependence on the informal land market.

In addition, national policies have increased the dependency of urban poor sectors on the informal land market. Decentralization measures enacted throughout Latin America in the 1990s, for example, have paradoxically weakened periurban organization, as will be shown below. This has made its populations more dependent on informal mechanisms for accessing land and on the lot-traffickers who profit from their need. The 1989 Organic Law of Municipalities had, for the first time, established municipal elections. The possibility of presenting candidates to these posts, however, was limited to nationally recognized political parties. This first legislation of decentralization, then, did little to transform political relations of power, although it did shift the site of their materialization (Blanes 2006). The 1994 Law of Popular Participation (LPP) further decentralized national resources and functions, most importantly designating Territorial Base Organizations (OTBs) that covered far smaller territorial areas than municipalities and decided locally on the use of 20% of municipal resources.

Yet despite the LPP’s explicit purpose of “facilitating citizen participation” (LPP, Art.1), the development, approval and implementation of the law took place with little to no civil society input. Torrico (2004) writes: “Months before the law was presented, very few people were aware of the proposal and its implications. It was a state-led initiative and action. There is no record of social organizations making these kinds of claims [for participation] at the municipal level” (85). The Law defined particular procedures for participation, including the legally recognized subjects of participation, their functions and moments of participation, as well as the forms of presenting demands, solving conflicts and exerting social control. Recognizing OTBs as the “principal subjects of Popular Participation” (LPP, Art.x), the OTB became the neighborhood’s officially-recognized authority, designated to represent and channel resources to the local territory, to the exclusion of other organizations that often existed in the neighborhood or area. Unions that worked across local territorial boundaries, for example, were disempowered. Esposito and Arteaga (2007) note that one of the results of the law and its implementation, thus, has been the fragmentation of social organization that existed previous to the law.

Analysts of the Law of Popular Participation generally agree that while the law opened up spaces for indigenous authorities and helped to consolidate rural organization (Bazoberry
et al. 2006), its effects in periurban areas have been detrimental to urban popular organization (Ayo 2003). With mechanisms confined to local level politics and decisions, the LPP disarticulated national issues from locally focused action, and fragmented collective action among OTBs, pitting neighborhoods against each other to compete for municipal resources (CEDIB and CVC 2004). At the end of 2008, there were over 300 OTBs, or neighborhood groups in the process of becoming OTBs, in the municipality of Cochabamba alone (HMC 2008). These OTBs shared in the fiscal and legal authority of the municipalities by determining the use of “co-participation” funds, municipal funds that each OTB received for infrastructural development. The amount that each OTB received in co-participation funds, however, was determined by the number of inhabitants counted in the 2001 census, rather than in terms of neighborhood needs. Therefore, the greater needs of the recently populated areas of the Zona Sur were granted proportionally less municipal resources than other areas of the city. Lomas de Santa Bárbara, for example, was clearly the neighborhood of the three study sites with the most infrastructural needs. Yet because it was not included in the 2001 census, as of 2010, it had yet to receive any co-participation funds. Furthermore, the annual dispensation of these funds made their strategic, long-term use more difficult; paving a street or establishing a playing field could be contemplated by OTBs, but larger infrastructural works were still decided within the municipal machinery.

Moreover, only a small percentage of the city’s budget was actually determined by these participatory mechanisms. A non-governmental organization working in the Zona Sur analyzed the 2007 Annual Operational Plan of the Municipality of Cochabamba, and found that of the more than 771 million bolivianos (equivalent to about US$110 million) that the city receives from the national government, only 155 million bolivianos were earmarked for the Popular Participation funds (PPL/CVC 2007a:17). Of these funds, 10% were set aside for a universal maternity and infant insurance program, 25% was for the operating costs of the municipal Supervising Committee, 25% was allocated to municipal Operational Expenses and 3% was for the Promotion of Sports. Therefore, only 64 million bolivianos were left to be divided between the over 300 OTBs in the city (ibid.). This amount constitutes a mere 8% of municipal funds over which citizens have some input. OTBs could propose to use the amount designated to their neighborhood, yet not even are all their proposals approved, “and of those that are approved, not all are executed. Of those that are executed... many are overpriced” (22).

In Cochabamba’s periurban context, these conditions created the backdrop for the corrupt, clientelistic relationships which are now endemic in those neighborhoods. A neighbor from Nueva Vera Cruz noted that, with the conformation of OTBs,

“municipal authorities such as [the, then, mayor] Manfred Reyes Villa began to corrupt dirigentes. Since it was the president of the OTB that signed, stamped and approved everything, they only sought out the presidents. So the presidents could surreptitiously approve and disapprove things.” (interview 04.12.07)
The inability of residents to hold their dirigentes accountable was a result of the dependent relationships that the formal land policies implied for informal settlers like those in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. According to municipal regulations, for example, a developer’s only obligation was to open access routes, with no specification regarding the quality of these routes (Achi 2010). Therefore, a lot-trafficker need only lay claim to land, with no concern for a development’s basic services. That lack of basic services forced local leaders to develop dependent relationships with public institutions to obtain resources for these much-needed public services, thereby weakening their capacity for independent or critical political action.

Clientelism was also encouraged by the ambiguous legality of granting an official designation of OTBs to neighborhoods lacking legal land titles. That is, a neighborhood did not need to possess titles to their land in order to obtain the designation of an OTB. This contradictory status made it possible for these neighborhoods and public institutions to negotiate at the margins of legality (Achi and Delgado 2007). For example, the regional electrical company required legal land titling in the areas in which it provided services. Nonetheless, as a publicly recognized collective, Lomas de Santa Bárbara was able to bargain with departmental authorities for a project to bring electricity to the community in exchange for their support in upcoming elections. Thus, the untitled status and unserviced condition of lands in the area heightened the vulnerability of already marginalized settlers, and their dependence on the local leader. This local leader, in turn, forged dependent relations with municipal leaders to access basic public services that were lacking in the area.

An uninhabited area of the Zona Sur that a lot-trafficker is starting to stake out, giving out or selling lots on which settlers have begun to set up tents.

Credit: Centro Vicente Cañas archives 2006
Given the nature of lot acquisition in informal neighborhoods established by lot-traffickers, these areas were heterogeneously populated. As such, there was little initial collective agreement as to structures of local authority and organization. In contrast to the discursive unity that consolidated the Mineros collective, Lomas residents' lacked shared understandings and practices in terms of local organization and authority. This heterogeneity, combined with the insecurities of land tenure in informal settlements, made Lomas residents exceptionally dependent on, and vulnerable, to the whims of lot-traffickers. Further, as noted above, these lot-traffickers were empowered by the Law of Popular Participation and their particular relationships with public institutions. These dynamics will be further explored in Chapter Four.

At the same time that the Law of Popular Participation increased local authorities' corruptible power within the specific context of periurban settlements, municipal regularization policies further encouraged the growth of the informal land market. Achi and Delgado (2007) write that the elaboration of the district level Development Plans described above actually served to encourage speculation in the informal land market, since they forecasted eventual regularization:

“Regarding urban regularization policies, we observed that the informal land market prospers in the shadows of municipal technocratic norms. These norms are often inconsistent with the lived experiences of the majority of its population, and are more focused on the modernization of the city that favors the moneyed electorate. The informal market and its lot-traffickers prosper, above all, based on their unofficial relationships with local state employees and authorities (in the forms of corruption and clientelism), which allows them to access key information and benefit from impunity and benevolence.” (112)

That is, the development plans both excluded relevant planning of areas such as the Zona Sur and projected their eventual regularization. They, therefore, encouraged speculation, the informal land market and the dependent social relations that these created.

This mutually parasitic relationship between the formal and informal exists beyond the arena of land regularization. It is part of the modern impulse of ordering spaces and societies. James Scott (1998) examines the historical antecedents of this impulse, in examples ranging from scientific forestry in the late 18th century through to the planned cities and villages of the 20th century. His book *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* highlights the self-defeating character of the rationalizing impulse to improve society through state techniques of legibility. His argument, explored through numerous examples (including the Leninist design of Russian society, revolution and economy and the collectivization of rural peasants in Tanzania in the 1970s), is that formal schemes developed by planners are “parasitic on informal processes that, alone, [they could not] create or maintain. To the degree that the formal scheme made no allowance for these processes or
actually suppressed them, it failed both its intended beneficiaries and ultimately its designers as well” (6).

In this vein, analysts of titling programs have concluded that regularization as implemented in Latin America has not served to control informality. On the contrary, regularization has encouraged informality, by promoting the speculation of land prices and causing more evasion of rules for its excessive bureaucracy. Ward’s (2003) review of land regularization approaches in the region, as well as Lungo and Ramos’ (2003) comparison of Latin American cases, both show that the integrative results of land titling have depended on the particular instruments implemented. For example, regularization programs that include the defense of property lots of fewer than 10,000 square meters has encouraged the retention of land for those owners without pressures to offer it on the market. This, in turn, has promoted land speculation (Smolka 2003). In addition, “the existence of excessive and burdensome regularization standards paves the way for the proliferation of informal housing and the evasion of construction regulations” (Instituto Libertad y Democracia 2006:26).

The combination of formal land speculation and excessive regularization is aggravated by prevalent policies of tolerance and the expectations of amnesty, informal land regularization and the eventual basic services standardization. As in any market, these expectations raise the prices of informal land:

“The mere expectation of regularization leads to increases in the prices of land that is expected to be improved, which significantly impacts the prices in the informal market. The higher the expectation of regularization in a specific area, the higher the overpricing of the land in question.” (Fernandes and Smolka 2004:np)

Given these institutional conditions, informal land market prices are relatively high in comparison to formal serviced land market prices. In its survey of ten large, Latin American cities, the Lincoln Land Institute found that the price per square meter of formal land cost between US$32 and US$172 (Smolka 2003). To give a sense of the relative cost of this land, Smolka writes, “Even a family above the poverty line saving up to 20 percent of its monthly wages (US$200) would need 12 to 15 years to save enough to acquire an urbanized plot of 150 m2” (np). After purchasing the lot, they would still need to build their house on it.

Informal and unserviced land prices were found to be lower than the prices of titled and formal land, but informal land was still expensive. The same Lincoln Land Institute survey estimated, conservatively, that informal land in the same ten cities averaged $27 per m2. And the marginally lower prices of informal land rarely benefit the lower-income buyers, who must eventually service the land themselves. Instead, the higher profitability of urban informal land as compared to the formal land accrues to the lot-traffickers and informal developers. In these contexts, “formality begets informality” (Smolka:*), since regulation of formal land makes the production of informal land more profitable.
Table 2. Prices and Profitability of Informal and Formal Land Markets (per m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informal market</th>
<th>Formal market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Rural land designated for urban use</td>
<td>USD $4</td>
<td>USD $4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Cost of urbanization</td>
<td>minimal = $5</td>
<td>full = $25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Final price in the market</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Profit over advanced capital=(3-1-2)/(1+2)</td>
<td>200.00%</td>
<td>141.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Smolka 2003

Further, Smolka adds that the relative profitability of informal land markets is underestimated since these figures do not include the costs and risks – such as financial, security and marketing costs – borne by formal developers and avoided by informal developers. According to these analyses, regularization programs in Latin America have actually advanced informality through encouraging land speculation and clientelist networks.

A family heads up into the unoccupied areas above Lomas, to find out about an informal settlement they heard was being established there.

Credit: Author 2009

Achi and Delgado (2007) demonstrate that these dynamics apply to the reality in Cochabamba. They show that municipal mechanisms resulted in the increase of prices of land and the strengthening of clientelistic logics in the Zona Sur of Cochabamba. The dynamics that we explored in Lomas de Santa Bárbara’s de facto and dependent occupation of land above, are
thus more broadly evident throughout the city and the region. Insofar as regularization policies neglect existing relationships between formal and informal land markets and their municipal and national contexts, they may in fact deepen material inequalities.

It is in this sense that theorists such as Timothy Mitchell (2004) note that it is more instructive to think of the border between the informal and formal spheres as a “frontier,” in which informal property cannot be described as a world “outside” the market. Mitchell writes:

“It would be more instructive to think of the outcome [of the distinction between the formal and informal] as a frontier... The frontier has been a battleground. It is not a thin line marking the barrier between market and non-market, or formal and informal. It is a terrain of warfare spread across the entire space of the market, the entire length of what is called the history of capitalism. If it is an outside, then it is an outside found everywhere, a scene of battle that seems to define every point at which the formal or the capitalist can be identified.” (11)

In this terrain of warfare where different forms of legitimacy are disputed and deployed, formal property arrangements are sometimes evaded and sometimes employed to different advantages.

**Chapter Conclusions**

The property practices within neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent logics explored above suggest some ways that social relations and territory are mutually constructed. Prada writes, “Territory is not property, but... the place in which we recognize each other” (1996:33). Territory is not property, because its functions extend further, even, than the use value of the Marxist perspective. As shown above, the materialization of territory is also the materialization of the collective. Individualized and formal land titling conceals that relationship.

In this context, formal property can be best understood as the public, social and state recognition of the legitimacy of possession. In *Periurban Interpellations*, Jaroslava Zapotocka (2007) contrasts the de facto power of possession to the juridical power of property. She, thus, emphasizes regularization’s transformation from possession to property as an act of legitimizing the order of which juridical power is part. The recognition of the power relations implicit in property relations is even more evident in regimes of indigenous property. A neighbor of Lomas de Santa Bárbara described these dynamics in the distant rural community he still considers his home: “We do have property titles, but we also have our obligations to fulfill: our dues, our work, all of it. Here, for example, people really still don't want to do their duty. There, it's something very different” (interview 05.08.07). In their study of uses and tenancy of land in indigenous and ex-hacienda communities of the Bolivian department of
Oruro, Eliseo Quispe et al. (2002) insist on the impossibility of disaggregating property regimes from ways of being in community.

This chapter has shown that regularization as the state response to the informal occupation of periurban land can actually work against the interests of the urban poor by granting inordinate power to informal developers, increasing settlers' dependence on them and encouraging clientelist networks. At the same time, formalization of property seeks to replace the alternative legitimacies that justify, from informal settlers' perspectives, their occupation of periurban land.

In a similar way, the 1996 Law of the National Agrarian Reform Institute (INRA) was the response to growing demands for the recognition of the right to indigenous lands and territories. The INRA Law created the official designation of Indigenous Community Territory. This designation of collective property was defined as the habitat of indigenous tribes, where they live according to their own socio-cultural, political and economic organization. Despite the symbolic importance of the Indigenous Community Territory, their implementation has been limited by the extremely slow institutional bureaucracy of land regularization. In the first 10 years of the INRA Law, the state projected that 109 million hectares of land would be regularized. Despite spending more than 100 million dollars in the regularization process during this time, INRA had regularized barely 10% of the proposed surface area (Flores et al. 2007). Furthermore, the designation of collective property – following in the conceptual footsteps of the Agrarian Reform implemented after the 1952 National Revolution – “placed work as the central element in the legitimation of ownership of land” (Sanjines 2009:7). Thus it maintains the priority of the efficient and rational exploitation of land, as opposed to a wider concept of indigenous and periurban land identified evident in both Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara.

The new State Political Constitution, further analyzed in the chapters that follow, seeks to valorize the different functions of space through the Social or Economic-Social Function required for continual ownership of land (Art. 397). In this way, it attempts to limit the possibility of exclusive and private, profit-driven ownership rights of land. Nevertheless, as Sanjines (2009) has pointed out, the question of the enforcement of this function has yet to be determined. The legitimacy of alternative, communitarian norms regarding land and territory will only be supported if local forms of verifying the Social Function are respected, that is, if customary obligations (such as fulfilling rotational posts of authority, community work, etc.) are validated in this function. The difficulty of institutionalizing customary rights will be touched on in each of the following chapters, and finally explored more fully in the conclusions of the dissertation.

The cases examined show that while urban land regularization practices insist on the distinction between the formal and the informal, that distinction does not serve the urban poor. Regularization does not decrease the complexity of social, political or economic relationships. Instead, the formalization of one element – in this case the legitimacy of occupation of land through titling – impels, justifies and to an extent, conceals a series of other
social and political reconfigurations. The increase in efficiency of property systems that purportedly accompanies formal land titling is made at the cost of the diminished legitimacy and binding character of other social and political arrangements regarding land.

De Soto’s most influential claim was that capital can be created by formalizing informal land. Mitchell agrees that moving assets from the ‘outside’ to the ‘inside’ of capitalism will indeed create capital, but not in the way that de Soto describes. Mitchell writes, “The process of property titling and the use of property as collateral offer up opportunities for speculation, for the concentrating of wealth, and for the accumulation of rents. The assets of the poor are... the means through which this reorganization and accumulation of wealth is carried out” (27). According to this interpretation, the frontier between the formal and the informal does not actually describe two separate spheres, but rather a constructed border necessary for upholding the conditions necessary for capitalist accumulation. As shown above, these conditions are established and upheld through the very institution of land as private property. This institution encourages neoliberal logics and subjects, is challenged by counter-hegemonic logics and subjects and marginalizes logics and subjects that diverge from dominant institutional frameworks. In doing so, it creates the effect of the city and its borders, which further reinforces and exploits particular forms of social and political relations. The characteristics of these relations will be further developed in the chapters that follow.
CHAPTER THREE
BASIC SERVICES AND NATURAL RESOURCES:
FORMS OF ADMINISTERING WATER

The city of Cochabamba exploded onto the international media scene in the year 2000 with the heady days of protest that came to be known as the Water War. Newspaper headlines reported that “Violence Erupts in Bolivia” (BBC 2000), then “Multinational Company Thwarted by Local Bolivian Community” (Reynolds 2000). Leftist websites condemned “Bechtel’s Bloody Hands in Bolivia” (Shultz 2000) and finally proclaimed the Water War a “ground-breaking victory against the life-sapping effect of globalization in Latin America” (Joseph 2005). As is apparent in these media sound-bites, two sides of the growing international debate on water management defined themselves in opposition to one another, pitting effective administration through privatization against the legitimacy of the people. Or, as Willem Assies termed the opposition, “commodification versus communitarianism” (2003:16).

The former side was represented by the state's granting of the Cochabamba water administration concession to the transnational conglomerate Aguas del Tunari, and by the consequent national law passed to substantiate water privatization in Bolivia. This side emphasized the need to administer this finite good effectively, posing corporate management as a viable answer to the municipal water company’s lack of capital and efficiency. International Water Limited, the international consortium that negotiated the Cochabamba water concession, declared that its aim was to help “develop long-term solutions to provide
safe and affordable water and wastewater services” and support strategies “that allow the water delivery system to be expanded and improved” (IWL 2000:5). Against this position, a coalition of social organizations, unions and other civil society groups emerged, claiming water as a public good that could not be privatized. The social movement coalesced around the organizational body of the “Coordinadora” (or Coalition) in Defense of Water and of Life. The Coordinadora emphasized that water was “the fountain of human life” and linked its administration to traditional “customs and usages.”¹ The social movement against privatization boldly declared: “The water is ours, damnit!”

Through international networks and media, Cochabamba’s struggle against privatization quickly became an iconic victory for the anti-globalization movement. With little more resources than the discursive ability to articulate demands and the organizational capacity to mobilize civil society, the Coordinadora succeeded in establishing cross-class and inter-sectoral alliances. These alliances brought irrigation organization affiliates, union members, homeless youth, middle class clients of the municipal water system and Zona Sur residents into the streets for days of increasingly chaotic protests. After a young protester was killed and Cochabamba residents showed no signs of relenting, the government agreed to rescind the contract with Aguas de Tunari and revise the Law of Water in question.

1 Black’s Law Dictionary defines “customs and usages as” the “general rules and practices that have become generally adopted through unvarying habit and common use.”
The David-beats-Goliath elements of Cochabamba's Water War has, for many, fit perfectly into “the story of water [that] is all too often a story of conflict and struggle between the forces of self-interest and opportunities associated with 'progress', and the community-based values and the needs of traditional ways of life” (Johnston and Donahue 1998:3).

As this chapter will show, however, institutionalized relations of power are more complex and entrenched than such a people-vs-corporation narrative suggests. The clarity of that opposition may very well – and actually did, in the case of the Cochabamba Water War – play an important discursive role in mobilizing citizens to struggle against unequal and unjust power structures. Yet that mythologized opposition,

"fueled by the violence of the widely-circulated photographs, of protesting groups of hooded youth confronting the forces of order armed only with sticks and rocks, constitute in this case an obstacle for the sociological comprehension of the real conditions... in poor neighborhoods.” (Poupeau 2007:196)

In other words, we need to better understand the continued marginalization of residents of these poor neighborhoods, subsequent to and despite the success of the Water War in preventing the privatization of water, as well as within the context of the cycle of social protests that followed and led to the rise of social movement and indigenous leaders to power. To this end, I will look at the ways that “community-based values and the needs of traditional ways of life” are neither separate from, nor opposed to, “the forces of self-interest and opportunities associated with 'progress'.”

In particular, this chapter focuses on the local organization of water management in the sites of study in the Zona Sur of Cochabamba. It examines how communities' widely lauded “self-management” of water access and distribution is distinctly shaped not only by endogenous organizational forms, but also by municipal and state institutions, as well as by global conceptions of progress and development. The chapter begins with a brief description of the dynamics of local, municipal and state water management approaches that led to the Water War. It then turns to the ways that these dynamics of water management affect how water and collectivities are understood and lived in periurban neighborhoods, and how they create particular social practices that transform or reinforce existing unequal relations.

After that brief overview, I describe the development of neoliberal collective logics in Nueva Vera Cruz, through the neighborhood's strategic relationships with external actors, its consumer models of water management and its prospects for productive development. This is contrasted with Mineros San Juan's counter-hegemonic collective logic. As part of this counter-hegemonic logic, the Mineros collective maintains a wary relationship with external actors. Instead, neighbors in Mineros emphasize internal and participatory unity, as evidenced in its collaborative organization of water and its incorporative approach to development. Finally,

---

2 From media articles to NGO reports to academic analyses, the Water War has continued to be described using the very phrase “David versus Goliath” (Langman 2002, Assies 2003, Goodman 2010).
in the last chapter section, I explore Lomas de Santa Bárbara's more equivocal relationship with external actors as part of its divergent collective organizational forms. Rather than being driven by dominant models of resource management and development, or by a reaction against such externally imposed frameworks, the divergent logic in Lomas enables shared water access in the context of pluriactive development.

**Positioning the Local against the Global**

The privatization of state enterprises that the Bolivian government began with its New Economic Policies in the mid-1980s was acutely intensified a decade later. Within the two years of 1995 and 1996, Bolivia's five largest state enterprises were privatized. These included the oil company, the phone and electric companies and the national airline and train system (Kohl 2004). As scholars have increasingly shown, making developing countries attractive to international investors does not depend on a “hollowing-out” of the state that would allow for unregulated free market trade. Instead, international financial organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank have increasingly dedicated resources to supporting state reforms to make institutional arrangements more efficient and effective for transnational corporations (Perreault 2006).

Since the 1980s, World Bank loans to Bolivia included funds to improve the state's administration of justice and its economic management, to promote decentralization, to strengthen the financial sector, for state development of private enterprises and for “technical assistance for regulatory reform and privatization” (Kruse 2005:131). In 1996, the World Bank granted a loan of US$14 million to Cochabamba's beleaguered Municipal Water and Sewage Service (SEMAPA, for its initials in Spanish) on the condition of its privatization. In 1997, the World Bank, the IMF and the IDB offered $600 million in international debt relief to the Bolivian government conditioned, among other things, on SEMAPA's privatization (Shultz 2003).

Two years later, in 1999, Bolivian officials signed a 40-year concession for SEMAPA over to Aguas del Tunari, an international conglomerate whose lead shareholder was the Bechtel subsidiary International Water Limited. Negotiations between the Bolivian government and Aguas del Tunari took place secretly and were safeguarded by confidentiality clauses that made it illegal for any participant to divulge certain information regarding the contract. The concession endorsed Aguas del Tunari's raising water fees for SEMAPA users. In some cases, fees were raised by over 200% (Shultz 2003). More controversially, it also granted the company the right to take over all local water systems, including wells and water networks built by periurban neighborhoods, irrigation systems with a long history of being managed by peasant organizations and even locally shared or individual cisterns used by homes or groups of homes.

To protect the contract with a legal framework, the Bolivian government hastily passed modifications to Law 2029 on Potable Water and Sewage, a law that had been blocked for
several years by rural organizations' resistance. The modifications effectively provided the legal normative necessary to protect such privatizations of Bolivia's water management systems. Article 29 of the concession of potable water and sewage systems declared:

“No natural or juridical person of public or private character, for- or non-profit civil association, municipal or any other cooperative, may provide Potable Water Services or Sanitation and Sewage Services in the concessionable areas, without the proper concession issued by the Basic Sanitation Superintendence.” (Art.29)

Concession areas included any areas of more than 10,000 people, where service would be profitable. Non-concessionable areas included non-profitable areas of less than 10,000 people.

Within these concession areas, corollary clauses specified: the obligatory character of connection for all water and sewage users; a 40-year monopoly on concessions; service providers right to request state expropriation of areas and resources that they required in order to function; and the prohibition of new collection of water without the express approval of the Superintendence (Crespo and Fernandez 2001:87-93). As Crespo and Fernandez write, the specifications of the 1999 modifications to Law 2029 are “a product of the incomprehension that in Bolivia, in the areas considered concessionable, there exist numerous alternative systems of service distribution” (88).

Bolivian water systems had long been created and managed by local and community organizations. This is especially the case in the Cochabamba valleys, areas with historically reliable access to water sources from the surrounding mountain ranges. Organizing irrigation and water distribution continues to be a function of the area's peasant associations to this day (Holben 2004). The coordination of water collection and distribution, along with other collective activities, is traditionally established or locally agreed upon. In an attempt to protect the integrity of these variegated local agreements and procedures as state regulations and globalized market pressures increased, they were grouped together under the category of “customs and usages”. This was part of a worldwide trend to formalize and thus protect indigenous rights, practices and perspectives, articulated in the 1989 International Labor Organization's Indigenous and Tribal People's Convention 169 (discussed in the the previous chapter).

The many organizations that coordinated water access in the rural areas of the state of Cochabamba joined together in 1997, constituting the Cochabamba Departmental Federation of Irrigators' Organizations (FEDECOR). According to its statutes, FEDECOR is “the umbrella organization of all irrigation systems and organizations of the Cochabamba valley, whose principal characteristic is the integral management of water resources through customs and usages” (FEDECOR cited in Crespo and Fernandez 2001:65). Tom Kruse, a U.S.-born researcher who later served as adviser to the MAS government, wrote:

“As a banner of resistance, this complex world of history, culture, organizations, concepts and practices would be summed up under the
banner of defense of 'customs and usages.' We are faced with a situation in which the access to water is mediated by multiple and thick social, cultural and historical mechanisms, and is extremely far from a 'market' in which water is simply an 'economic good.'” (2005:136)

In 1998, critiquing the government's proposal for the Water Law 2029 amendments (which were approved in late 1999), peasant organizations, indigenous people and NGOs developed a national technical water board. This board developed a counter-proposal that took its inspiration from ILO Convention 169 and the article in Bolivia's constitution that likewise recognized the social, economic and cultural rights of indigenous people (Assies 2003).

The FEDECOR organizations were not the only local groups whose very existence was threatened by the new government approach to water management codified in Law 2029. Especially in Bolivian rural and periurban areas, locally-managed water supply systems are widespread. Data from 2004 showed that over three-quarters (79%) of water supply systems in Bolivia were managed by committees and cooperatives with local coverage, while only about 11% of these systems were operated by municipalities (Bustamante et al. 2007). In the city of Cochabamba alone, there were over 250 water committees in 2006, more than in any other Bolivian city (Quiroz et al. 2006). The nearby smaller city of Quillacollo, part of the metropolitan area of Cochabamba, registered 192 different water systems (ibid). All of these water committees, cooperatives and potable water systems ran the risk of being considered illegal organizations under the 1999 modified Water Law 2029.

During the period of study, most Zona Sur neighbors organized their access to water collectively, as shown in the examination below of the periurban water systems in the three neighborhoods. Even with, or as part of, these neighborhood water systems, Zona Sur neighbors received their water from private water vendors whose trucks made the rounds of the neighborhoods and filled residents' water barrels, which sustained them until the next time the water vendors came by.
In 2010, a decade after the Water War ensured SEMAPA remained a public company, water pipe networks still almost exclusively serviced the northern and central parts of the city. SEMAPA users in those parts of the city paid less than one boliviano (about US$ 0.15) per cubic meter of potable water (CGIAB 2006). Residents who received their water through the water vendors' trucks were paying up to five times that. According to the World Health Organization, an adequate supply of water for daily consumption is at least 50 liters of water a day. Water committees in the Zona Sur reported a consumption rate of 19 liters a day, which is a lower rate of water consumption than that of refugees in situations of war or natural disaster (Cooper 2009). The self-constructed and self-managed water supply systems of Zona Sur neighborhoods have sought to collectively confront the difficulties that this costly and unreliable water supply system implies.

The sheer number and social vitality and legitimacy of these locally-managed systems, both periurban and rural, helps us understand why Cochabamba's citizens took to the streets to block the privatization of SEMAPA and the modifications to Law 2029. The emphasis on the self-management of these local systems and their alternative logics based on “customs and usages” was central to the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of non-SEMAPA users for the 2000 Water War. Indeed, this event not only helped expel the transnational company, but also led to protests known as the Gas War in 2003, against the government's gas export plan. These protests, in turn, led to the ousting of Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, then Bolivian president, who had long been the architect of neoliberal restructuring in the country. The Water War has also become a significant international symbol in the movement to stem the tide of neoliberal privatization of public utilities and natural resources.

Despite its importance in many regards, the opposition that the Water War rested on – between neoliberal, transnational privatization, on the one hand, and locally, self-managed systems, on the other – has made it more difficult to critically analyze the ways that different water systems and logics transform or reinforce social and economic inequalities. Post Water-War, authors still celebrate the self-management of local water systems that residents creatively construct in the context of unequal access to the basic resource. Hoffman et al. (2003), for example, write:

“The public spaces in Cochabamba... are fundamentally defined by the nonexistence or the inefficiency of the State in the resolution of basic needs and services. From this perspective, it is in the absence of the state that a complex of non-state public spaces has formed in Cochabamba under its own self-managing logic.” (9)

In contrast to these views, I argue in this chapter that such “self-management” is not shaped

---

3 Sanchez de Lozada was Planning Minister under Victor Paz Estenssoro in 1985-1988 and is considered a central author of the “shock therapy” restructuring that dictated the government’s New Economic Policy. He was president of Bolivia from 1993-1997, when he implemented decentralization and capitalization, the selling off of state enterprises to private transnational companies. He was elected president once again in 2002, and expelled in 2003.
by an absence of external actors and institutions, but rather by the very interactions between local systems and state and development institutions.

In this chapter, I shall look at the how a different logic reigns in the collective water organization in each neighborhood of study. Each logic is shaped by the particular relationships that the collective has forged with municipal and external actors, resulting in water management practices in each site that constitute a shared understanding of water as a type of private, public or communal good. These different conceptions of water are part of distinct visions of development that inscribe particular forms of community and social relations.

A. CONSUMER MODELS OF WATER MANAGEMENT IN NUEVA VERACLARZ

In an example of popular praise of Cochabamba water committees’ “self-management” of water access, a 2007 news article in the city newspaper Los Tiempos commended the neighborhood association of Nueva Vera Cruz. Its headline read: “Initiative: They were not taken into account by SEMAPA, so they organized” (2007b). The news article went on to describe how Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors found out that their area was beyond the scope of SEMAPA’s Expansion Plan into the Zona Sur. As an alternative, residents have “sought their own solutions” and “organized themselves to access water... from other sources.”

The news article briefly described the activities of the “Agua Cruz” water committee, a coordinated effort of residents from Nueva Vera Cruz and the adjacent neighborhood of Santa Vera Cruz. Established in 1996, the committee organized to drill a well to provide water for the area's residents. Prior to that time, they obtained their water from vendors who filled each households' barrels with hoses from their water trucks. As the area was still sparsely populated, water vendors did not come regularly. One neighbor remembered that period: “There were some days that we just didn’t have any water left, so we’d sometimes go down to the highway and try to flag down and convince the water vendor to come up” (interview 16.11.07).

The well would be pumped into an underground water network with pipes to bring water into residents' homes. But registering neighbors to participate in the committee and the water system was not easy. A neighbor recalled:

“When they started to register for the water, and there were comments that there was going to be water, nobody believed it. They said, 'Where will they bring it in from? It's impossible.' Those of us that put down a registration fee of $30 were taking a risk. We weren't sure if there was going to be water or not. So people didn't trust it. They said, 'Why would I give my money away?'” (interview 09.11.07)

Yet the well did provide water for those who were part of the system, and more residents were
encouraged to join the water committee.

After about two years, however, the well began to dry up. The Agua Cruz water committee dug another well, which provided water for about another two years. By the year 2000, however, the two wells together could not provide enough water for Agua Cruz members' needs. Philip Terhost writes that most water committees supplied by wells in the Zona Sur shared similar problems:

“Wells usually only deliver up to 2.5 liters per second due to low porosity values, less than 9 m3 a day... In September 2003, five committees in the south-east [part of the Zona Sur] had serious water shortages because their wells were drying up, which is a long-term phenomena and worsened during the dry season.” (2003:103)

Members of the Agua Cruz water committee said the water shortages from their own wells were caused by adverse soil conditions, the lack of regulation chambers in the wells and water loss from increasing pipe leaks and clandestine installations.

By 2006, only about a third of water committee members were supplied with water from the wells. Water committee members preferred to find other sources of water, as they also feared the underground water wells' contamination by the nearby garbage dump. An Agua Cruz member who no longer used the water network lamented:

“There's been no analysis made of that water. Sometimes poor people had to go looking for water because the water vendor doesn't come very often, he doesn't come every day. So they... drank that water. That water is contaminated from the K'ara K'ara garbage dump.” (interview 13.11.07)

Most of the water committee members, thus, joined their neighbors who continued to buy water from water vendors' trucks.

Since that time, the Agua Cruz water committee has persisted in seeking solutions to overcome the area's limited and unreliable access to water, as will be shown below. Agua Cruz's local approach to water management, however, is not simply an endogenously created form of self-management and organization. Rather, it is critically shaped by the neighborhood's insertion into municipal dynamics and its interactions with external actors. These interactions are conducive to a particular neighborhood vision and collective processes of community development. In this first chapter section, I look at the ways that Nueva Vera Cruz's model of water management has been shaped by more widely prevalent supplier-consumer logics of resource distribution that, in fact, further reproduce unequal access to water.
Strategic relationships with external actors

The neighborhood actions in the news article cited above portrayed Nueva Vera Cruz as a particularly effective local organization. The article highlighted the ability of the neighborhood’s leaders not only to find solutions, but to negotiate with external actors and authorities to do so. In what follows, I will show how the Nueva Vera Cruz set-up of its working system of local water management was made possible through the neighborhood's favorable relationships with municipal and non-governmental actors and institutions, which stood the neighborhood association in good stead from outside perspectives.

Nueva Vera Cruz had benefited from strategic relations with external actors for many years. The neighborhood school, for example, was built with foreign donations channeled through a Spanish priest working at a nearby church. In another case, a local NGO helped train youth to begin a local, community radio. External actors were encouraged to work with Nueva Vera Cruz in large part because of the dependability of its neighborhood association. In a popular pamphlet based on interviews with community leaders and neighbors, the history of the neighborhood is described: “Since the beginning, we have always been well organized. In our first few years... we obtained legal approval of the General Plan, which mapped out the streets, lots and public spaces of our new neighborhood” (quoted in CVC 2007).

The establishment of the Agua Cruz water committee in the neighborhood was also a coordinated effort with several external organizations. In 1996, Nueva Vera Cruz and Santa Vera Cruz decided to work together, in conjunction with the priest from the local church, to establish collective access to water. Residents could pay US$30 to become members of the Agua Cruz water committee and, thus, have access to the water network. These $30, however, only covered part of the actual costs of the deep well perforation and the construction of the water pipe network. The registration fee that was originally considered of US$130 would have been too prohibitive, however, so the Spanish priest helped to find donations to subsidize the initial project costs. Even then, as a neighbor related, “there were only about five of us who risked our $30. In the end, if they weren’t going to install the network, we would have maybe lost $30” (interview 25.11.07).

With the proven success of the first well, however, Agua Cruz’s membership and water network expanded, and a second well was drilled. Another neighbor who joined the water committee a few years after its establishment said: “We were the second group that gave US$200. It was risky to pay that, but we needed water. The water vendor was undependable, or there wasn’t water, or the water was salty” (interview 18.11.07). The higher registration fee was, once more, too large an amount for most neighbors to pay. So Agua Cruz and neighborhood dirigentes coordinated with a local NGO to establish a program of micro-credit loans to residents who wanted to join the water committee.

By the time of the Water War in 2000, the idea that another group – particularly a private corporation backed largely by foreign investors – would take over and benefit from their own hard work and risky investments was intolerable to Agua Cruz and other Zona Sur
water committees. Water committees, influenced by the traditional irrigators' organization, had long been established throughout Cochabamba. Zona Sur water committees proliferated throughout the 1990s, as many groups of residents worked as determinedly as Agua Cruz members to establish reliable systems of water access. Mobilizations for the Water War helped to consolidate these disparate water committees under a common political cause. A Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente said:

“The idea is... to understand that the problem of all these neighborhoods is structural... it is not only particular to Nueva Vera Cruz... the idea is that we coordinate our demands. And one of our needs is precisely the water committee, because we're united and joined by the issue of water.”

(interview 13.11.07)

In 2004, representatives of water committees throughout the Zona Sur joined together to form the Association of Water Committees of the Zona Sur (ASICA-SUR).
As a locally established association, ASICA-SUR enjoyed a grassroots legitimacy in the Zona Sur. Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes cultivated a collaborative relationship with ASICA-SUR protagonists. The president of the Agua Cruz said: “We have more confidence in ASICA-SUR [than in SEMAPA] because we've been been working with [their leaders] since the Water War, when we worked together to expel Aguas del Tunari” (interview 20.11.07). In 2006, benefiting from this local legitimacy and from the international attention Cochabamba received during and after the water war, ASICA-SUR received funding for the Zona Sur water project from a French foundation. The project was an Emergency Plan that would supplement SEMAPA’s limited Expansion Plan into the Zona Sur. Part of the Emergency Plan included the acquisition of water trucks that would be used to purchase water directly from SEMAPA. This would allow residents in the Zona Sur to buy water at more economical prices and of more controlled quality than was available through water vendors.

ASICA-SUR – which at the time of study made its decisions in assembly with representatives from water committees throughout the Zona Sur – chose two neighborhoods in the Zona Sur in which to use these water trucks, based on confidence in their water committees and neighborhood associations. The Agua Cruz water committee was one of the committees chosen. This decision was a testament to the reputation of integrity and efficacy of the Agua Cruz organization. It was also influenced by the confidence engendered by the Agua Cruz water committee president, who, as an architect, had a technical understanding of water system needs.

ASICA-SUR's selection of Nueva Vera Cruz to receive the water truck deliveries required further negotiations by Agua Cruz with municipal authorities. The water truck would deliver water to a community water tank of 50,000 cubic meters, which would allow for the neighborhood to buy large amounts of water at discounted prices. Through the same water pipe network that connected their homes to the wells, Agua Cruz water committee members would have continual access to water from the community tank. The tank would also provide water to more households than were currently connected to the neighborhood water system. In 2007, a Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente said, “We have 150 families waiting to enter into the water committee, as soon as we have our water tank built” (interview 20.11.07). Agua Cruz representatives negotiated with municipal authorities.

The city agreed to carry out the construction of the water tank, using both Nueva Vera Cruz and Santa Vera Cruz's co-participation funds, funds distributed to each officially recognized neighborhood organization to use for locally-designated and municipally-approved projects. By November 2007, ASICA-SUR's Emergency Plan was ready to be inaugurated. The water trucks were purchased, the ASICA-SUR logo was painted on them, and they were prepared to deliver water. An opening ceremony was scheduled to be held in Nueva Vera Cruz. The construction of the Agua Cruz water tank had been completed. Only one thing was missing from the tank, the water pump that municipal offices had agreed to contribute. One week before the ceremony, the municipality had still not delivered the water pump. Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes ran from office to office trying to secure a commitment from authorities that
the pump would be installed before the inauguration day, yet they were met with vague excuses and unreliable assurances.

In an emergency neighborhood assembly with 40-50 people in attendance, residents clamored that the municipality had to be held to its promise. There was a vote and general agreement that neighbors should mobilize and protest before the city offices to exert pressure on the municipality. A neighbor recalled:

“We had to hurry, though, in order to receive the water. We were desperate, totally desperate for there to be water... ASICA-SUR said that if [the infrastructure to receive water] wasn't finished by this day, then the water was going elsewhere. We would have lost the system and it wouldn't come back.” (interview 10.12.07)

The dirigentes held a meeting the following evening. One of the dirigentes worried that, “We'll make a bad impression on the municipal offices if we go out and protest” (field notes 03.12..07). He reminded the others that they would have to coordinate with the municipality in the future. But the vice-president Doña Marina – the only woman on the board of directors and the only one with neither previous professional nor leadership experience – insisted, “The neighborhood assembly is to be respected and we need to respect its decisions.” The school council president countered with their need to act strategically. He told his fellow dirigentes, “You're not just anybody, you're professionals” (field notes 03.12..07).

Finally, after much deliberation, and despite the agreement reached in the neighborhood assembly, the dirigentes decided that avoiding conflict with the municipality was preferable to mobilizing. Since they risked losing access to ASICA-SUR's water trucks, however, Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes needed to make sure that the water tank and its pump were ready to receive water. They decided that the water committee could use its saved funds to pay for the water pump instead of waiting for the city to carry out its obligations. Because of
the lack of time, Agua Cruz members were not consulted on the decision. The water committee's funds were used for the water pump, and the water system was ready in time for the inauguration of the water trucks and ASICA-SUR's Emergency Plan.

**Productive development and consumer management models**

Despite the fact that Agua Cruz has indeed established its own local water system, it is clear that this system has been shaped by its representatives' relationships and coordination with other actors and institutions. More influential than external actors' direct effect on the forms that local systems take, however, is the paradigm of development that these imply. In this section, I examine how the dominant model of productive development has been fundamental to the organizational logics of the Nueva Vera Cruz neighborhood association. This has carried over to the neighborhood's model of water management, which has produced an effective, though unequal, system of access to water.

Previous chapters described Nueva Vera Cruz as the most urbanized neighborhood of the three study sites, with its residents and their organizational forms sharing the most in common with the more established and better serviced city center residents. We have also seen that the neighborhood's relationships with municipal and external actors tends to be one of adjustments, collaborations and mutual benefit. These characteristics of concurrence and accommodation to dominant perspectives is also apparent in its approach to community development.

Over the course of the study period, an important objective of the Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes was to organize neighborhood activities that helped to establish an economically productive community. Apart from attending to the water management system, for example, dirigentes also established ties with NGOs and municipal actors who might support residents' small businesses or provide workshops to orient their concerns. State and other institutions did more than simply provide the capital – economic, cultural and other – necessary for Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes to work towards improving the economic productivity of the community. More importantly, these institutions framed the socio-economic structure within which the neighborhood aimed to position itself. That is, Nueva Vera Cruz leaders sought to establish local channels to help their residents integrate into the productive urban system. An ex-dirigente of the neighborhood said:

“I would like to emphasize this, that a neighborhood does not only live from potable water, from the sewer system, but the authorities have forgotten that part. In each sector, they should look at the possibilities of providing support, like industrializing a particular sector... The authorities don't think that in this area there could be an industrial zone, so they don't give it a chance. They don't support it. All they talk about is potable water, sewage systems, pavements. It's all about basic services [for them].” (interview 13.11.07)
In a collective workshop in which neighborhood development was discussed, residents similarly emphasized the productive-economic aspect of development. One Nueva Vera Cruz neighbor opined:

“Maybe the answer is to create more micro-enterprises, small business, where people can sew, and then they can export. That way there would be income... For example in [a nearby neighborhood] there are many people that work in weaving. There are centers where they teach them how to work as tailors, seamstresses. And there are small businesses [there]. And they sell [their products], and that's how many families are surviving together.” (transcripts from workshop 26.10.08)

Another neighbor noted: “We have carpenters here, tailors, craftsmen and women who embroider costumes for festivals... There are many craftspeople here. We need to support these sources of work and help them grow” (transcripts from workshop 26.10.08). In fact, the neighborhood association of Nueva Vera Cruz was unique in the Zona Sur in hosting an annual Productive Fair, in which goods produced by residents were displayed and sold.

Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes also helped create a proposal for a “Micro-Enterprises Incubator Project,” which would take small family businesses and help them grow through facilitating financial and training resources. Taking advantage of a nearby area owned by the departmental government but currently in disuse, the proposal sought to provide a place and technical support for Zona Sur micro-enterprises. One of the project’s authors explained the idea behind the proposal that had already been submitted for government funding:

“The idea is that through coordination... [that area could] be converted into a micro-enterprises incubator. In many parts of the Zona Sur there are micro-entrepreneurs who work in terrible work conditions. There are leather workers, food producers. The idea is that these micro-entrepreneurs have a space in which their work conditions can be guaranteed, that they have an adequate space in which to work and that the government assist them with infrastructure.” (interview 14.04.08)

The Micro-Enterprises Incubator Project proposal was developed by the Steering Committee for the Development of the Zona Sur, founded in 2005 by Nueva Vera Cruz leaders, in coordination with other Zona Sur dirigentes. The Steering Committee was established with the objective of institutionalizing a Center for Development that would be a resource to leaders throughout the Zona Sur, and its Nueva Vera Cruz founders sought dirigentes who they considered to share their professional experiences and values. The Center for Development was envisioned as a place where neighborhood leaders could improve and advance their projects through experts’ orientation. It would consist of three departments,

“One for legal support, another for the projects support, and another one for communication. The department for the support of projects would
have the capacity to develop projects, paving, constructions. There would have to be an architect at the head of that department... Then the legal support would help neighborhood associations solve legal problems that many of them have in common, land tenure, urbanization. And communication would cover training, public information.” (interview 13.11.07)

At the time of the study, the Steering Committee was also seeking financial resources to establish the Center.

Nueva Vera Cruz’s vision of community development was, thus, geared towards supporting its members’ improved inclusion in existing economic markets and social structures. As was evident in the ideas and projects described above, collective “self-management” in Nueva Vera Cruz aimed to recover the community’s agency from interested private parties and inadequate public entities. The Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente who described the Center for Development said that it could “compete with the municipality...[and] demonstrate the inefficiency of the municipality” (interview 13.11.07). The Center for Development did not, however, propose different aims or strategies than those of the municipality; it simply proposed to reach these aims and employ these strategies more effectively.

In this context, Nueva Vera Cruz’s form of self management emerges from a “logic of utility,” in which collective action is better understood as a series of individuals acting in conjunction to defend interests they hold in common, rather than as shared practices that define individuals and their interests. Roncken et al. (2009) write that,

“In this logic, a collective social actor is nothing more than the organization of individuals who are capable of instrumentalizing their actions, seeking to promote their interests as a group and fulfill the satisfaction of the needs of the groups' members. (55)

Nueva Vera Cruz self-management, then, is aimed at effectively meeting members' individual needs, through making the most productive use of the available resources. Critical resources in this sense include, as shown above, relationships with external actors and institutions.

It is with this background that the model of water management that has emerged in Nueva Vera Cruz can be better understood. While there is clearly no attempt to make a profit from neighbors' access to water, the Agua Cruz Water Committee has chosen operative functionality over guaranteed equality in water access. Bakker et al. (2007) examine the relationships between privatization and commercialization. They write that while privatization implies a transfer of ownership of the resource, commercialization “defines the application of a culture and of the very institutions of capitalism – such as markets, measures of efficiency and free competition – to the management of the resource” (52). Nueva Vera Cruz’s “self-management” model of water administration, organized by its professional representatives, is very much influenced by these contemporary cultural practices. This is
evident in the way that a new member of the Agua Cruz water committee talked about its difficulties: “From the beginning, since I became a member, I've said to the committee, that as new members, we are investing in a company that is about to die. If we knew they were broke, we shouldn't have entered as investors” (interview 09.12.07).

In addition, the registration fee to enter into the water committee and system was determined by the need to recuperate costs, preventing most residents from joining the committee. The newest members of Agua Cruz paid over US$350 to enter into the committee. In a neighborhood where most household incomes are under US$150 per month\(^4\), the registration fee has made it impossible for many to join the committee. At the end of 2007, only about 60 households – or about a quarter of the residents of the water committee's catchment area – were members of Agua Cruz. One adolescent neighbor said, “My dad thinks it's too much. And since we don't have the money, we're not going to put it in yet.” She also admitted, “What they're saying is that it's so much money that they're asking for for the water... they're saying it's a rip-off” (interview 09.12.07). Since less than a third of Agua Cruz Water Committee members received their water from the local system, only about 8% of Nueva Vera Cruz's total households benefited from the neighborhood water system.

Since its initial establishment, the Agua Cruz water committee has granted only some of Nueva Vera Cruz's residents access to water. Because the first water tubes were, thus, installed selectively, it has since been more difficult – and more expensive – for residents of certain parts of the neighborhood to join the water system network. A neighbor explained:

> “Not everyone can [join the water system.] The network is not extended through all the streets; it's only on the main streets. Before, the area wasn't built up, now there are homes there. Now, for example in that sector, on the other side of the school, there are no tubes over there. On this street, the network does go through, but not on that one... and over on that street where there are empty lots there are tubes. Other people are desperate to be part of the committee but there are no tubes [near them].” (interview 11.11.07)

If one's house was not near the underground water system, it cost more to connect to it. Another neighbor complained:

> “There is nothing here yet... and it's costing me a lot. With my own money, I have to put in [tubes] from way over there. Imagine that! And the others don't want to help. I am buying the polycarbonate tubes. And how much is the digging going to cost me? I've already paid the water committee registration fees. I've already paid that, I'm already a member. But I don't have water yet.” (interview 09.12.07)

\(^4\) From survey data. 56% of Nueva Vera Cruz residents surveyed earned less than 1000 bolivianos (the equivalent of USD $142) per month. 77% of residents earned less than 1500 bolivianos (the equivalent of USD $214) per month.
Water access therefore continued to be awkwardly selective in Nueva Vera Cruz. Further, uneven access to water was made worse for households not connected to the system, once several of their neighbors joined the committee and water network. A resident explained that the water vendor came by his area rarely now that some of his neighbors had joined the neighborhood water network, “You have to understand, from the slope over there everybody bought water [from the water vendors], everybody. But now that [some] have water, few of us buy water. So that's why” (interview 11.11.07). Such selective access to water in Nueva Vera Cruz defined, literally, the haves from the have-nots. The vice-president of the neighborhood Doña Marina, who did not have access to the water system, said, “The truth is, it's so terrible, to see neighbors with water. It's humiliating. The other day, a man came and told me, 'Now I have plenty of water.' 'Good for you,' I said to him. And another neighbor was there and I said to her later, 'When will I ever get water? Those people are getting it. But others, because of [lack of] money aren't included’” (interview 07.11.07).

To represent the needs of the majority of neighbors who are not part of the water committee, a Committee of those Without Water was formed. Over the period of study, this committee represented those neighbors Nueva Vera Cruz who were either unable or unwilling to pay for membership in the Agua Cruz water committee. Nevertheless, the members of the Committee of those Without Water did not meet. One neighbor explained that decisions were made by the president of the Committee of those Without Water in the dirigente meetings, in the context of discussions of more general neighborhood issues. Outside of those meetings – which, as noted, brought together less than a dozen dirigentes to make representative decisions – there was little collective discussion for those who were not members of the Agua Cruz water committee and water supply network. In other words, the exclusive features of the Agua Cruz water committee, combined with the representative forms of decision-making in the neighborhood, resulted in a neighborhood approach to water management that neither responded to the majority's needs nor represented their voices. The constitution of such representative forms of organization will be explored in the following chapter; the point here is that these organizational forms both strategically positioned this urbanized neighborhoods' access to public and external resources, and reinforced unequal access to those resources within its collective.

That access to the water system was a social marker of inequality in the neighborhood was evident in Doña Marina's reluctance to join the water system. As vice-president, Doña Marina was the odd woman out in the male-dominated board of directors. She was also the only community leader who argued against the board of directors' invalidating the neighborhood assembly's decision to mobilize against the municipality, described above. Her actions and opinions were often at odds with the rest of the dirigentes, and she seemed unwilling to participate in the markers of inequality that differential access to water implied. Doña Marina explained:

“I've thought that I won't have the installation done... I'll remain part of those who don't have water. Because it wouldn't be good... because
they'll say, 'She became a dirigente and she's benefitted.' They'll think that I got something for free or something like that. That's why I want to be part of those who don't have water. Until it comes [to everybody], I can also make claims. Because if I have water, I won't have the right to make claims for those who don't have water, whether or not I'm on the neighborhood board of directors.” (interview 07.11.07)

In contrast to the other dirigentes in the neighborhood, Doña Marina considered that she could best represent her neighbors if she identified personally with their circumstances. For her, it was more important that a leader share in the experiences of the collective rather than be able to professionally or strategically perform expert roles. The examination of organizational forms in the next chapter will show that Doña Marina's form of understanding and legitimating authority is more prevalent in the counter-hegemonic and divergent logics of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara than in the neoliberal logics of Nueva Vera Cruz. Further, Doña Marina's comments made clear that unequal access to water highlighted socio-economic differentiations and divisions between Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors.

The lack of a wholly collective approach to water management exacerbated inequalities between neighbors. Like their neighbors who joined the water committee, those residents who continued to obtain their water from water trucks depended on private resources to secure their water access. This underscored economic differences between neighbors. Those who could afford to, for example, built tanks to store water, in order to lessen their dependence on the unreliable water vendors. According to the survey conducted in 2007, those Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors who relied on water vendors, the majority – 82% – used barrels to hold their water and dipped into the barrels for daily water usage. The 18% who were able to build household cisterns often had more newly built houses with interior plumbing.

A neighbor whose husband had migrated to Spain used the remittances sent by her husband to both be a part of the neighborhood system and build a household water tank. She said:
"We made a cistern up there, we always wanted a cistern. We have our water apart, see? And sometimes we buy from the water truck, and they fill up our whole tank. Other times we get it from up there [from the neighborhood tank, through the pipes], but that's not really very reliable, see? It's irregular, sometimes there's water, sometimes there isn't. But when you have your own cistern, then you have water every day." (interview 12.05.08).

Thus, the wealthier neighbors of Nueva Vera Cruz are more likely to have the most reliable access to water. This is precisely the kind of social dynamics that a supplier-consumer model of water management promotes.

Such an approach to collective "self-management" of water is a far cry from the idealized community-values based approach that is held up in opposition and as a condemnation of the capital-driven privatization of water. Despite being a locally-created system of water management, the Nueva Vera Cruz model of water access is fundamentally shaped by its strategic relationships with external actors and its related approach to development that emphasizes improving its members' individual positioning within the dominant society and economy. This is, indeed, a necessary development emphasis in any neighborhood of the Zona Sur. Yet the Nueva Vera Cruz case show us that when economic considerations drive local models of water management to the detriment of equality of access, the commercialization of water deepens inequalities, regardless of whether the model is nominally private, public or shared ownership. As Bakker et al. (2007) write on the mercantilization of water, "the principle objective of water management passes from being social equality and the guarantee of its provision, to being efficiency in the use of the resource, that is already perceived, mediated and managed as a scarce good" (66). While Nueva Vera Cruz residents did not seek to efficiently manage water to profit from its, supplier-consumer model of water did follow the logic described by Bakker et al. to effectively manage water to secure its regular access. As will be highlighted by the comparisons with Mineros San Juan's and Lomas de Santa Bárbara's organization of water access, social relations of equality are not antithetical to the adequate administration of shared resources. Such social relations are, however, discouraged by the neoliberal logics of Nueva Vera Cruz.

Such logics were widespread throughout the Zona Sur during the period of study. Philip Terhorst (2003), who studied the emergence of ASICA-SUR, writes that throughout the self-managed water committees of the Zona Sur, “There are important issues of how many households within the areas of a committee are actually connected and what price they had to pay for that. Often, connection charges are very high (up to US$300 has been reported) and lack of investment prevents the expansion of distribution systems” (103). Such supplier-consumer models of water are based on an emphasis on the scarcity of water. Yet Franck Poupeau (2007) writes that the scarcity of water

“is not an inexorable process linked to the disproportionate increase of
the population in relation to limited natural resource, but the result of politics that point to the production of scarcity, that is, the constitution of water as an economic good, susceptible to being bought and sold, in a market of natural resources whose existence is justified by that very scarcity.” (184)

A model of water management, thus, does more than distribute water. It also shapes a particular understanding of what water is, and our consequent administration of it, in turn, shapes our relationships to each other.

The following trenchant story related by a neighbor in Nueva Vera Cruz shows how the supplier-consumer model of water management influences social relations:

"I'm part of the water system. And the other day, my neighbor asked me, 'Could you give me some water?' At that moment I was cursing my dog – my dog had eaten up three boliviano's worth of bread, who wouldn't be cursing? – And my neighbor asked me, 'Could you give me some water?' I told her, 'I don't have water, the water is expensive. Our bill is very expensive!' I spoke to her very harshly.

"And my husband said to me, 'How are you going to talk that way to our neighbor, when she's helped you out? Remember when I got electrocuted, and you yelled? The electrical current was terrible, my finger almost shrunk up. You yelled and Doña Juvencia practically jumped over the wall. And you talk to her that way,' … I should have given her a bucket of water.” (interview 15.11.07)

This example demonstrates the ways that the commercialization of water in the supplier-consumer model and its concomitant production of scarcity are actually lived.

Thus, the community-run water committees that are often seen as the antithesis to corporation-driven, privatized water systems can, in some cases, intensify rather than assuage the inequalities experienced by already marginalized citizens. This is because the logics of administration that underlie the local water management system are not shaped separately from market logics. Instead of emerging endogenously from the local collective, the model of water management in Nueva Vera Cruz is shaped by the neighborhood collective's insertion in institutional frameworks and development paradigms.

The organization of water supply in Nueva Vera Cruz is an administrative question, with access to water apportioned according to market constraints. The professionalism of Agua Cruz's and Nueva Vera Cruz's representatives has facilitated their coordination with other organizations and actors and the establishment of a functioning local water management system. Yet those very relationships with external actors are part of the neighborhood's drive toward inclusion in existing social and economic municipal and development structures. We have seen, however, that the consequent supplier-consumer model of water management is extremely restricted and exclusionary within the
neighborhood. Water access through Nueva Vera Cruz’s widely lauded “self-management” model is clearly unequal. In terms of the potential of resource management to promote more just social relations, then, the logics underlying water management models are as important as who owns or manages the water system. A comparison with the dynamics of water management in Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara will exemplify alternative logics of administration shaped by different relations to institutional contexts and development paradigms.

**B. Collaborative Organization of Water in Mineros San Juan**

In previous chapters, I emphasized the hegemonic unity of the local collective in Mineros San Juan, which requires its neighbors’ participation in a regularly re-legitimized consensus of solidarity personified in the charismatic and dominant dirigente. The strong unity that characterizes Mineros San Juan’s neighborhood organization is also evident in its local form of water management. As I will describe in this section, the neighborhood-level and collaborative organization of water in Mineros reinforces its residents’ sense of belonging to the unified collective. As with other aspects of its organizational dynamics, the organization of water in Mineros includes most of the residents of the neighborhood, and both requires and depends on their active presence and participation. Such a unity rests on a vision and approach to development that incorporates the group’s members, that brings them together to work towards collective advancement. As described above, however, part of what consolidates that hegemonic ideal is the identification of both common challenges as well as common enemies.

The conflict-ridden and bellicose settlement of the neighborhood created an intimidating image of its residents. So threatening was the Mineros collective considered to be that not even the local authorities dared to enter the area:

“We fought terribly, with sticks... even the police were scared to come. The police never came. If somebody called, [about a problem in the area, the police would respond,] 'Over there, where the Talibanes are from? No way, they kill people there.' That’s how they treated us.” (quoted in Widemann 2008:24)

Such violence did not escape the attention of the local media. Articles on the area, then called Ushpa Ushpa, brandished headlines such as, “A fight over land leaves many injured in Ushpa Ushpa” (*Los Tiempos* 2001) and “Land or death: the slogan of Ushpa Ushpa” (*Los Tiempos* 2002).

With its infamy came attention from international philanthropists as well. As we shall see below, very little international assistance has been offered to the less developed, but also less noticeable, neighborhood of Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Mineros, in contrast, aided by their leaders’ negotiating experiences in unions, has coordinated with several non-governmental
associations for development support and assistance. Nevertheless, Mineros' relationships with actors and institutions is quite different from Nueva Vera Cruz's strategic relationships with them. Mineros' more wary relationship with external actors is connected to its particular approach to neighborhood development and its internal social dynamics.

In 2005, Mineros San Juan leaders signed an inter-institutional agreement that included financial support from a Dutch institution, the Hulp Aan Straatkinderen Foundation, and technical support from the municipal utility company SEMAPA for the building of a neighborhood potable water system. Two tanks were to be built which would be filled by water trucks regularly, and an underground water pipe network would carry water from the tanks to all Mineros residents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The two water tanks were completed in 2007, and the water pipe network was under construction from 2007 through the end of 2009.

![Building the water tank in Mineros San Juan. Credit: Sixto Icuña 2007, courtesy of Centro Vicente Cañas](image)

The Dutch foundation paid for the materials and for the water trucks to facilitate the direct purchase of water from SEMAPA once the water network was completed, so that neighbors would not have to rely on private water vendors. Neighbors in turn, contributed by digging the trenches for the water pipes and by paying US$20 for their individual meters.

In keeping with the contentious conditions in Mineros, however, there were threats to this neighborhood public work. While the tanks were being built in the first months of 2007, Mineros “enemies” tried to dynamite the tanks. The city newspaper described the events:

“Residents of [Mineros San Juan], a neighborhood 12 kilometers from the city in the area of Uspha Uspha, were alarmed yesterday by an explosion
in a water tank under construction. The explosion was caused by half a cartridge of dynamite that was set off through an electrical system... It detonated at about 7:00 am, when many residents were still in their homes, and caused damages to the primary pipes of the tank, which has a capacity of 100,000 liters.” (Los Tiempos 2007c)

A neighbor related her experiences that morning:

“My daughter and I were coming back from buying early for our store, and suddenly we heard it. It terrified me. We went running and there was a young guy running away, the son of Molle [one of the original lot-traffickers expelled from the neighborhood]. They grabbed him and tied him up, and took him to the police.” (interview 24.10.07 DE ARRIBA)

The Dutch foundation financing the construction of the tanks and water network threatened to cut off funding of their investment if such threats continued, so neighbors organized themselves in groups to protect the tanks, taking shifts to guard them twenty-four hours a day. As much as Mineros leaders were also eager to protect the tanks they had contributed in building, they spoke warily of the representative of the Dutch foundation who placed conditions on the neighborhood. One group delegate explained, “The gringa [foreigner] obligated us to guard the tanks. If we didn't do it, we'd lose the water... That gringa is so difficult” (interview 12.10.07). Such an apprehensive perception of actors external to the neighborhood, despite their financial or technical support, was widespread in Mineros. This wariness is not surprising in this neighborhood unified by its discursive identification of its enemies and proud of its aggressive independence.

Wary relationships with external actors

As described in previous chapters, the Mineros dirigentes during the period of study were the first of the neighborhood's leaders without miners' union backgrounds. Nevertheless, the same tough unity of the miners' discourse and organization carried into the administration of the new dirigentes. During their administration, however, the collective identity of Mineros residents could no longer be defined against enemy groups that attacked the neighborhood. Instead, this new group of leaders channeled the contentious unity of the collective against other external forces. That is, anything considered exogenous was initially met with a certain degree of mistrust, and was challenged to prove its value to the community and within the community's set of priorities.

The rhetoric used by the dirigentes, and particularly the neighborhood's president, Don Felipe, was a contentious anti-imperialist discourse influenced by the Andean discourse that Evo Morales and his Movement Towards Socialism (Movimiento al Socialismo, MAS) party has advanced. In his interviews and speeches, Don Felipe often contrasted what he called the “occidental... neoliberal, privatizing vision” with indigenous Andean perspectives. Implicit in
this perspective, which will be further explored, is the idea that Western models of society, economy and development are invasive forces to the Bolivian and Andean ways of life. In this context, the occidental approach to development is a threat not only to indigenous forms of development, but to the planet as a whole. Don Felipe maintained that “It's the occidental development model versus the communitarian development model. Occidental development is based on a fictive science, which can sometimes be useful. But it has also invented the atomic bomb, caused the proliferation of cancer, the perforation of the ozone layer” (interview 06.01.08). As we saw in the previous chapter, however, this function of this discourse in uniting the collective was as important as its content. As such, even the MAS-controlled municipality could be seen as an external threat to the neighborhood collective.

A sense of the foreign as an invasive threat to neighborhood unity was also clear in the attitude that not only Don Felipe, but also other dirigentes and neighbors had, regarding families with relatives abroad or the returning migrants themselves. According to Don Felipe, these neighbors brought the foreign occidental model of development into the neighborhood and country. He said that international migration was a “response to the horizon of neoliberalism,” but that the “negative effects... [were] in the mental models” that they irreversibly shaped. “Now the migrant families respond to the competitive and individualized economic model,” lamented Don Felipe (interview 06.01.08). As a result, within the neighborhood, returning migrants aroused envy for their conspicuous gains made apparent in their home improvements, and were no longer seen as part of its collective. One neighbor, for example, felt:

“Most of the people who migrate abroad come back to their home here, but they now think they are a wonder, they're more arrogant... Before they said to you, 'How are you? How are you doing?' Now they get here and they don't even greet you, they see you like any old thing, like an insignificant object. That's how the people are who come back from abroad. They become racist. They see us as if we're worthless.” (interview 09.03.08)

Although international migration caused some tension in all the neighborhoods of study, this was especially apparent in Mineros San Juan. Mineros dirigentes' and residents' circumspect approach to migrants bearing influences from abroad was shaped by the hegemonic unity of the neighborhood.

External threats to the collectively-imagined Mineros way of life came from changing Bolivian values as well. Another example of the suspicion of the external was the enduring distinction that neighbors made between “old” and “new” residents. As mentioned in the previous chapter, there was a clear differentiation between the older residents who suffered through the difficult first years of the settlement, and the new neighbors who counted on enough financial resources to pay for land in the neighborhood and to construct their homes. New neighbors' reliance on the value of their money threatened the value of longer-time
residents’ hard work and suffering to establish the settlement. In discussing her new neighbors, a Mineros resident who had lived there since its settlement defined them quite distinctly from “all of us who live here.”

At least from the point of view of the dirigentes, however, a more insidious alien aggression than new residents was the entry of social assistance organizations into the neighborhoods. Aside from the Dutch foundation and several evangelical churches, the local non-governmental organization, Centro Vicente Cañas, also worked in Mineros San Juan, as did another German-funded NGO. A new Cañas staff member assigned to coordinate with Mineros dirigentes joked about having to “court” the neighborhood president, as he would a girl he was trying to impress. That staff member, in fact, never quite earned the trust of the Mineros leaders. In contrast to other neighborhoods that the organization worked with, whose dirigentes were often in touch with Cañas staff, Mineros leaders rarely sought out Centro Vicente Cañas organization members to coordinate with, or for assistance.

Mineros dirigentes were even more wary of the German organization, Project Prospects (a pseudonym), which had offices located on the neighborhood’s main avenue, only blocks away from the neighborhood association office. Project Prospects made enormous infrastructural and service contributions to the neighborhood. In 2004, the NGO established the neighborhood’s first health center and nursery school, fully funded by external sources. In 2008, Project Prospect completed the building of an elementary school with international funding. It planned to build a high school and vocational school in the neighborhood as well. Nevertheless, relations between the neighborhood association and the NGO were strained, mostly due to a lack of coordination between the organizations. Speaking of the work of non-governmental organizations more generally, Mineros president Don Felipe said:

“NGOs and foundations still don’t understand, they still need to listen much better. But to be fair, I should also say that the inhabitants... also need to learn to express their will. They need to be able to say 'I believe' and 'I am confident' when faced with that humiliation, when faced with that culture that traumatizes them, [that says] pity the poor peasants.”

(interview 20.01.08).

Don Felipe readily warned his fellow dirigentes and neighbors against those sorts of social assistance perspectives that distanced and diminished the populations with which non-governmental organizations were supposed to work.

That very perspective was readily apparent in the Project Prospects work in the neighborhood from its very establishment. This insistently nonrural neighborhood – recall, for example, the ban on loose pigs and dogs at a neighborhood assembly – was described on the original Project Prospects website as “a small village on the outskirts of Cochabamba, Bolivia. It is a typical settlement of very poor people who lack almost every basic service.”

These quotes are from the original website (www.uspau-ushpa.com), last accessed in March 2009. The website has since changed its text, although similar ideas can be found on the website available in November 2010, particularly on the pages
quoted the project’s German founder, describing how he “found” Mineros: “With the help of interested and active people, I found this place and I am happy to be contributing to the improvement of the quality of life.” The entire website of Project Prospects lacked any description of the actions of these very active neighbors. Instead, the founder writes, “I invite you to join my efforts” (emphasis added), implying that together we can help pull up the poor peasants from their pitiable circumstances.

The dirigentes of Mineros San Juan recognize the potential inherent in foundations’ and non-governmental organizations’ contributions. Nevertheless, Don Felipe added a critical note in discussing them:

“In many NGOs there are people from abroad as well. But just because they have money doesn't mean they can manipulate us. It's not that we are poor, simply that we haven't been given opportunities. That's what I think, and that's not only me, but all of Mineros San Juan, all of the Andean area thinks that way. So I think that there is not yet enough understanding of that.” (interview 20.01.08)

The lack of understanding between this European NGO and the Mineros neighbors was reinforced by the approach of the Project Prospects’ director to decisions regarding the school they were building in the neighborhood. During a period of some tension between the NGO and the neighborhood dirigentes, the project director asked, “Why should we coordinate with them, if it’s our school?” Don Felipe, in turn, spoke of Project Prospects reproachfully:

“As long as they don't listen to us, nothing will be accomplished. Instead of supporting us, they are detrimental to us. I told them before, 'Let's coordinate.' This is my territory and no foreigner is going to dictate over me... They should include me [in the planning of projects].” (18.04.08)

Don Felipe went so far as to warn, “If in one month, [Project Prospects] does not inform me of its activities, it will be expelled from here” (ibid). These quotes express Don Felipe's wariness of this foreign organization. Insisting on his own importance (“my territory... should include me”), these phrases also conveys Don Felipe's self-conception as the embodied representation of the neighborhood, a characteristic further explored in the next chapter.

The almost total absence of coordination between Project Prospects and the neighborhood association was also evident in the unnecessary doubling of health personnel. At the same time that the Project Prospects health center attended to Mineros residents, Cuban doctors who had coordinated their office hours with the neighborhood association held consultancies in the association office. On the many occasions I visited each of the two medical consultancies, doctors could be found waiting for patients. According to the NGO director, a blond, German woman whose very distinctness marked the foreignness of the organization, Project Prospects sought to work separately from the neighborhood dirigentes group. The

director commented to me informally that she thought it best to work directly with Mineros residents. She thought it preferable to have neighbors represent themselves in such spaces as the women's group that Project Prospects hosted, without the mediating presence of the dirigentes (field notes 22.11.07). Yet this independent form of working in the neighborhood, combined with the dirigentes' wariness of external actors, made for difficult coordination and wasteful activity. In fact, both the NGO's autonomous approach to working in the neighborhood and the dirigentes' initial prejudice against external actors confirmed and exacerbated their unfavorable views of each other. By the end of the period of study, the Project Prospects NGO was still alienated from the neighborhood dirigentes. Given the lack of coordination between the two organizations, the NGO's growing importance to the residents – due to the opening of the elementary school – threatened to challenge the local authority of the dirigentes.

The strong sense of a collective besieged by external threats that is central to the neighborhood's identity is also related to the participatory form of development that has emerged in Mineros San Juan. This participatory model of development both grows out of a collectively constructed and legitimated vision of the neighborhood's future and is actually driven by the neighbors' active participation in community work. The model of water management in Mineros has been shaped by this participatory approach to development. In the following subsection, I shall explore the characteristics of Mineros' collaborative organization of water, as well as its implications for the neighborhood's social relations.

**Incorporative development and collaborative organization**

As shown above, the Mineros president's ways of discussing development were both well-practiced and well-defined, based on a counter-hegemonic and post-colonial political discourse that opposed indigenous, communal to individualized, occidental development. Elaborating on his perspective on indigenous development on different occasions, Don Felipe emphasized its contrasts to the Western forms of progress that “don't even see the human being for what he or she is.” Within indigenous Bolivian forms, on the other hand, “harmony is sought, respect of interrelations. It's a different model of development.” He explained that traditional Andean approaches involve

“a great respect towards not only other human beings, but also towards the plants, the stone for us is also life. Nothing is dead, nor is it static. It's in constant movement. So it's a very distinct vision, very different. I believe science is potent... but not to kill ourselves, not for wars, but to understand each other... From such different visions we need respect. What you know needs to be complemented, what I know also. We need to work all for one and one for all.” (interview 06.01.08)

The Mineros dirigente's approach was, thus, not to eschew outright all external agents, but
rather to seek to incorporate them into the unified group. Problems arose, as seen with Project Prospects, when those external agents could not or would not be incorporated and so threatened the unity of the group.

Although their discourse was less erudite than that of Don Felipe, other Mineros dirigentes and neighbors approached the incorporation of outside agents in a similar way. At a meeting with representatives from the very group with whom Mineros had long-standing conflicts, another Mineros dirigente spoke of the need to work with their former enemies, though cautiously:

“If it’s the moment to give someone a glass of water, we’ll give it to them.... Giving that glass of water can help solve things. You invite the drunkard who wants to hit you to another drink... Talking, we can understand each other, but they had better not mess with us.” (field notes 09.12.07)

Likewise, more than in the other study sites, residents in Mineros emphasized that only by integrating all neighbors in the community's work would they obtain what they needed. One resident of the neighborhood, for example, said that, “If all of us are united, we can do anything.... if everyone's working, we'll get water and we'll make a sewer system, then we'll go to the prefecture [state government] so that they cement our streets” (interview 02.12.07).

Like other Zona Sur neighbors, Mineros residents sought to secure basic services and economic stability. But their approach was quite different from the strategies employed in Nueva Vera Cruz, which sought to insert residents in existing municipal and economic structures. Mineros residents, in contrast, had as their principal framework their own neighborhood's development, into which they were literally incorporated through their physical work and presence. From their regular attendance in group meetings and neighborhood assemblies in which decisions were made by acclamation, to their required participation in mobilizations and community work, the collective of Mineros neighbors was the effective driver of community development. By participating in neighborhood activities, Mineros neighbors created their distinctive community.

The water management model in the neighborhood followed these characteristics. Unlike the Agua Cruz water committee, the Mineros water committee was considered an integral part of the neighborhood association. Thus, all Mineros residents were automatically members of the water committee. All the major decisions concerning the water network project took place – as did decisions for most community issues – in large neighborhood assemblies on Sundays. In this way, the administration of water in Mineros incorporated the active participation of most neighbors in the construction of the local water system. Each household of Mineros was not, however, automatically included in the water pipe network. In order to be included, each household paid $20 for their individual meters and worked to dig the trenches on their street and to their house for the water pipe installation. Hacking at the layers of rock beneath the Mineros ground, armed only with shovels and sweat, was a difficult
task. A neighbor described, “The terrain is arid, it's rock. I need to dig from here, six meters. My neighbor there, another six meters” (field notes 09.03.08). Another neighbor complained, “It's almost impossible to dig here... To dig that, I really suffered. I dug as deep as I am tall. I had to get in deep, into the trench, to dig” (interview 16.03.08). It is work that easily took each household over 100 hours to complete.

During the close to two-year period that neighbors dug the trenches, groups of residents could be seen borrowing shovels and other tools from the neighborhood association office. Posted on the outside of the office was a schedule of which neighborhood groups needed to be working on specific streets during any given week. Delegates and their groups' members would organize working times for their members, and it was a common sight to see a group of men or women carrying tools back to their streets or using them to dig. One woman noticed, “It's always more of us women working here than men. The men are working [outside of the neighborhood]” (field notes 12.05.08). The group of women with whom she was digging laughed, and they all took a break from their hard physical work to talk about differences in men’s and women’s work. Sitting on piles of dirt, between jokes about their husbands, the women reaffirmed their solidarity, as they agreed that “the woman always works more... because women have more will” (field notes 12.05.08).

This sort of face-to-face community work not only made the installation of the water system a collective effort, but also created a particular type of collective that depended on the majority of its members' participation.
Whether or not particular neighbors decided to dig together and at the same time, the collective nature of the work required coordination and increased dependence between neighbors. For the pipes to be laid down each street, the trench needed to be dug up the entire street. One neighbor explained:

“So if the owner isn't there and hasn't dug, or hasn't paid the amount he owes, then that area is left out. The [main] tube passes it by, and this is terrible for the rest of the people who have dug. So that's why there needs to be agreements between owners regarding digging.” (interview 08.06.08)

Residents were even dependent on whether their neighbors complete the work correctly. The engineer from SEMAPA, which supported the technical aspects of the water system installation, warned neighbors at a meeting that some sectors needed to fix their trenches. If a neighbor's faulty digging was not corrected, pipes on that street would not be able to be laid down.

The mutual dependence engendered in the building of the water system in Mineros was part of the collective's general approach to their neighborhood's development. This was also clear in the use of mobilizations to advance the progress of their infrastructure, as will be described in the following chapter. A Mineros group delegate went so far as to say, “The only way we obtain things is by marching... little by little we're getting far. I would never have
imagined it, the last, most marginalized neighborhood will now have potable water. That's thanks to the mobilizations" (interview 15.12.07). Like the physical community work to dig the trenches, these mobilizations were only as strong as the numbers of neighbors who joined in with their presence and participation.

This is an example of Cristina Barajas' (2000) argument that water systems create particular types of collectives in Colombia. She writes that, “The process of organization around water has produced coalitions... that, thus, allow for the production of a particular sense of community. This form of community emerges as a valid actor in actual processes” (1).

Likewise, as noted above, analysts of the uses and tenancy of indigenous communal lands insist on the impossibility of disaggregating human relations with natural resources such as water and land from social relations in collectives.

In keeping with such an emphasis on the integrity of social and material relations, Don Felipe expressed hope that his neighbors’ quest for economic stability might also be approached collectively. Within the framework of the Andean form of development, he explained, there was an alternative approach to the economy. He called it an “associative economy”, which could recognize people's and communities' potentials and incorporate their initiatives. Despite the difficulty he noted in working towards it, Don Felipe said that the Pachakuti already showed signs of its approach. The Pachakuti literally means “the turning over of the world” and is spoken of as a paradigmatic transformation of the nature of history and society. “It will take 20-50 years,” he said, but Don Felipe looked forward to a period in which,

“Projects and investments will work within a communitarian economy. Everyone will be its bearers, everyone will be the managers. Everyone needs to be, everyone for everyone, and all earning the same... We need to pose these questions now... We have to explore new paradigms now, new examples of modes of production.” (interview 06.01.08)

In an attempt to explore these new modes of production, Mineros dirigentes introduced the idea of collaborative work in a general neighborhood assembly. Groups of electricians, shoemakers, carpenters and pork-rind-fryers each elected representatives who would organize the workers in their trade as a collective response to the individualization of work and economic risks.

Although this is ostensibly a similar endeavor to the support for micro-enterprises proposed in Nueva Vera Cruz, there were important differences in the ways these plans were
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6 Javier Medina writes, in the introduction to the philosopher and MAS founder Filomen Escobar's book De la Revolución al Pachakuti (2008): “The prefix pa means par, dual, double, two, bis. Cha means energy. Pacha, therefore, means the contradictory encounter of two antagonistic energies that in complementing each other produce space-time... Periodically, this space-time is overturned qualitatively, as when the magnetic parallels of the earth change their axis relative to the geographic poles. This turn is called in the indigenous languages [of Aymara and Quechua] kuti. Therefore Pachakuti is the concept homeomorphic to the Revolution... The Pachakuti affirms the principle of the complementarity of opposites... in place of the principle of identity, non-contradiction and exclusion, with which the Revolution operates... In one case, collaboration, in the other confrontation.” (11-12)
discussed that point to fundamental divergences in neighborhood strategies and outcomes. Three main differences stood out. The first was the language used to discuss the micro-enterprises in Nueva Vera Cruz versus the collaborative groups in Mineros. In Nueva Vera Cruz, the language used when both neighbors and dirigentes spoke about collaborative economic approaches was insistently professional: “micro-entrepreneurs” instead of “workers,” “food producers” instead of “pork-rind-fryers.” This had to do with the second basic difference in the two approaches, which was the public that each plan sought to convince. In Mineros San Juan, the basic idea behind discussing the collaboratives was to encourage neighbors who shared a trade to begin working together. In Nueva Vera Cruz, on the other hand, the professional language was geared towards developing proposals that might find financing to start up a micro-enterprise project.

Another clear difference between the two neighborhood approaches to coordinated labor followed on the differences described above. Each form of working collectively presupposed a very different degree of dependence on working with external actors and within given social and economic frameworks. Nueva Vera Cruz residents emphasized the importance of external actors, funders for their projects, government authorities and supporting professionals. They sought to improve their positions within the urban institutional context. Although most Mineros residents did not share the express revolutionary convictions of their president, their daily neighborhood activities encouraged a different sort of approach than that of Nueva Vera Cruz. In the Mineros practical approach to community development, dependence among neighbors was fostered and the most important resources for their development were to be found within the neighborhood. In discussions after the collaborative worker groups were formed, Mineros neighbors did express concern over the shared need for capital or investment, which could only come from external public or private entities. Nevertheless, this was a secondary concern, in contrast with Nueva Vera Cruz's primary focus on obtaining start-up resources. Through the end of the study period, neither micro-enterprises nor work collaboratives had finally provided residents in either neighborhood with a viable alternative to the vagaries of the individualized job market. Yet those proposals and processes were integral parts of how each of these neighborhoods inserted itself into its urban and national economic contexts and structured its residents' social relations.

The varied outcomes of these two development approaches, in terms of neighbors' social relations, is evident in a comparison of the results of the Mineros collaborative organization of water to Nueva Vera Cruz's consumer model of water management. As shown above, Nueva Vera Cruz's water management model was efficiently set up: the tank was built, set to work with the existing water pipe system and began to receive water from the ASICA-SUR water trucks within about six months. After the new water tank and system were in place, Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes sought to expand the limited range of the water system's beneficiaries. By the end of the study period, however, that expansion had yet to take place, and differential water access between neighbors continued to exacerbate their socio-economic
differences.

In Mineros, in contrast, more than two years after the work on the water system began, there were still trenches being dug by neighbors and Mineros residents still received their water from private water vendors. As was the case during the creation of the water committee and system in Nueva Vera Cruz, there were residents in Mineros who were unwilling or unable to pay the initial US$20 fee for their individual meters. As the Mineros treasurer said, “Always, in every neighborhood, there are people who are skeptical... the people who were skeptical did not deposit [the $20 fee]” (interview 12.05.08). Nevertheless, in comparison with the handful of people who initially signed up to be part of the Agua Cruz water committee, the number of Mineros residents who chose to be part of the water system was emphatically higher. Out of 1067 lots in the neighborhood, 940 households initially paid their registration fee and began to contribute in the community work of guarding the tanks and digging the trenches. This reflected Mineros' neighbors higher willingness to invest in the neighborhood. As noted above, only a quarter of Nueva Vera Cruz residents were part of the water committee and system in 2008, and less than a tenth of neighbors actually received their water from the potable water system. In comparison, almost 90% of Mineros residents were included in the water system. And, in principle, once the water system began to work, all those residents would receive water at the same time.

Given the extent of the inclusion in the Mineros San Juan water system, as well as the work required to be part of it, it is not surprising that there was a greater sense of ownership of the water system by Mineros residents and dirigentes than by their Nueva Vera Cruz counterparts. This was apparent in the way that Mineros neighbors talked of the water project, despite its external funding. One neighbor said, “It's ours, even though it was given to us [by the Dutch foundation]. They are helping us with the water that's for us, and it's our twenty dollars and our labor. We our sacrificing ourselves, that's why they're giving us the money” (interview 16.04.08). As a project that is considered theirs, Mineros leaders made decisions regarding inclusion in the water system. The Mineros treasurer explained:

“We have an inter-institutional agreement, between the foundation, the [neighborhood organization], the water committee and SEMAPA. In one of its clauses it says that we have to endorse each neighbor who is to have their meter. Because we're working with an internal statute that we have [by which] all of us have to comply with our duties as settlers... If we don't endorse [a household], they won't have water. If they've complied with 60, 70% [of the community work and/or fees], we'll endorse them. We'll certify who will have and who won't have water.”

(interview 12.05.08)

This reinforced residents' participation in the neighborhood collective, and also buttressed the importance and authority of the neighborhood and its leaders.

In this scheme, Mineros dirigentes also had more flexibility in making decisions
regarding who could be part of the water network. Nueva Vera Cruz residents applied individually to a local NGO for micro-credits to borrow money to pay the water committee registration fee. The decisions regarding these applications were made by the NGO's technicians based on the likelihood that the loan would be repaid. Most of Nueva Vera Cruz residents who applied in 2007 for micro-credits of around US$300 to join the Agua Cruz water committee were turned down. In Mineros, in contrast, decisions regarding who could join the water network was based on other factors. The treasurer said that “There are people who don't have [money], but have worked. Some haven't been able to make the deposit, but they've worked” (interview 12.05.08). Mineros dirigentes convinced the Dutch foundation that there should be special dispensations made for these neighbors, and the Dutch foundation donated individual meters to the neighborhood association. As a result, Mineros and water committee leaders decided who deserved these meters based on their contributions to and participation in the community work.

This approach does indeed work towards the kind of re-integration of the social and economic spheres about which the Mineros president so eloquently declaims. In doing so, it creates a different order of priority for access to natural resources than is found in the consumer model of water management. In Mineros, residents who contribute to the constitution of the collective are incorporated into the water system. As a result, water is distributed more inclusively, with the process of establishing the water supply network manifesting the collaboration of the majority of neighbors. At the same time, however, it also makes admission into the water system less regulated and more dependent on particular dirigentes' ability to distinguish between “deserving” and “undeserving” neighbors.

A related danger in such a hegemonic neighborhood is that it constructs its unified collective in opposition to common adversaries. In doing so, it marginalizes particular residents. Mineros' newer residents, as well as its returning migrants, encounter the antipathy of more established neighbors. These neighbors are generally defined by their greater economic resources rather than any other of their characteristics. A migrant who had worked abroad recounted his experiences once he returned to his neighborhood:

“When they see you, they think you have money. And when they see you on the street, they always say to you, 'Go on, buy from me, you've got money.' Even your own relatives, they think that you always have money. They say to you, 'Go on, lend me some money, you've got.'... And if you say you don't have any, it's worse. They think you're keeping it for yourself.” (interview 16.04.08)

This neighbor also reported that he did not now participate in neighborhood activities as much as he had before he had left to work abroad. These dynamics point to the tendency of a hegemonically unified neighborhood to collectively stereotype the “Other.”

Does a more inclusively-constructed collective than that of Nueva Vera Cruz necessarily imply the sort of combative attitude towards groups considered different that is
apparent in Mineros San Juan? In the communal organization versus transnational privatization opposition, neighborhoods like Mineros San Juan explicitly place themselves on the side of the local and indigenous confronting imperialist, international forces. The case of the Nueva Vera Cruz water management model, which was locally constructed yet exacerbated existing socio-economic inequalities, shows us that this opposition is not an entirely useful analytic lens. Yet Mineros San Juan's collective organization of water, which ensures most residents will have access to water, problematically relies on the discursive and unifying force of that opposition.

As different as the organization of access to water may be in Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, however, both water systems rely on the strength of the neighborhood-level leadership, either to represent residents or to discursively unify them. The professional and experienced leaders of Nueva Vera Cruz organize their water system following consumer models of management and economic-productive approaches to development. In this sense, despite its community self-management, water in Nueva Vera Cruz is administered as a private good that must be efficiently administered. The Mineros San Juan dirigentes, influenced by both miner and indigenous political discourse, have led the collective construction of an inclusive model of water organization within a participatory framework of local development. In Mineros, there is a very strong sense that water is a public good, but that public is shaped by both the active contributions of those who partake in it as well as by an oppositional discourse that defines who is not included. The third study site shows a very different model of collective collaboration to access water, one that depends on a shared understanding of water. Lomas de Santa Bárbara's model of shared access to water is part of the neighborhood's organizational dynamics that drive more equitable social relations within the neighborhood. Yet those dynamics also reinforce Lomas residents' collective, marginal position within the context of contemporary urban and development structures.

C. SHARED ACCESS TO WATER IN LOMAS DE SANTA BÁRBARA

In this last section, I focus on the ways that Lomas de Santa Bárbara's peripheral position and its organizational emphasis on intimate associations leads to a diversified neighborhood collective and a pluriactive approach to development. In this context, I will describe the shared organization of water access that Lomas neighbors have established, as well as the effects this has their on social relations. By looking at the neighborhood's difficult relationship with external actors, I will explore the ways that these alternative forms of communities and development are marginalized within current urban and state frameworks.

Lomas de Santa Bárbara shows, by many counts and certainly by municipal and standard development measures, a failed system of neighborhood water management and an unsuccessful model of local development. Nevertheless, it is also the neighborhood where individual or group exclusions are the least sustained. The case of Lomas de Santa Bárbara
suggests that we pay attention to how social relations are shaped within particular forms of local collectives and development approaches. It also calls for us to reflect on the ways that municipal policies and institutions encourage some forms of local collectives and development approaches and discourage others, and in so doing shape particular social relations.

When Lomas de Santa Bárbara was being settled, the lack of a reliable supply of water experienced in most peripheral settlements was exacerbated by the difficulty of reaching the far-flung neighborhood. The lack of roads leading to Lomas meant that no water truck could come to the neighborhood to supply water. So settlers carried cans of water from the river, a three and a half mile walk away. One neighbor recalled, “We brought water from the river to build, from the river down there by the highway. We would take large cans and carry them full back up to here. There was no bus or transportation to get up here. And when we ate, we drank cola with bread. There was no water to drink. There was no clean water” (interview 19.08.07). Not only did new settlers need water to satisfy their family's personal needs, but also to fulfill the lot-traffickers' stringent orders to construct their homes quickly or be expelled from the neighborhood. Another neighbor described how she constructed her home: “You had to go to the river to get [water]... My husband brought cans of water, we made 10 adobe bricks today, ten tomorrow and that's how we made our little home. In one year we had enough adobe for a room [while we] suffered living in the tents” (interview 29.07.07).

Within about a year of its settlement, Lomas de Santa Bárbara neighbors had begun to make their neighborhood accessible by carving out a series of uneven roads out of the hillside, hiring heavy equipment, including from the municipal public works' department. The main road that connected Lomas to the highway and city below, however, passed through the planned urbanization of Calicanto, with its identical streets and brick houses.

Scattering the far hill behind these Calicanto houses are the more humble adobe homes of Lomas de Santa Bárbara.
Credit: Author 2007
Coordination between the neighborhood organizations of Calicanto and Lomas was never easy. During the early period of the establishment of Lomas, its settlers were seen as illegitimate squatters by the Calicanto residents, who had established themselves through the legal channels of the government’s National Fund for Social Housing program. Although Calicanto residents never partook in violent conflicts over the land being settled up the hill from their homes, neither did they seek to make life any easier for their new neighbors. They would not, for example, allow water vendors' trucks to pass through their neighborhood into Lomas. A Lomas neighbor described, “They blocked the passage of the water truck. They told us, 'We've improved our own roads. We don't want you to use them!'” (interview 29.07.07).

United in their pioneering conditions, neighbors from Lomas gathered to face Calicanto residents' indifference to their needs:

“We had meetings, set off explosive signal flares. And we went to their meeting. There were maybe a hundred of us, twenty from each area of Lomas. And we caught them at their meeting. We went down with belts to show them, and they all ran away. That time, the police came up. We were throwing rocks at their houses when the police arrived. So we made an agreement: nobody can block the roads. It was at that moment that we made the water vendor go up the road. It was obligatory, if he didn't sell us water, he wouldn't leave the area.” (interview 18.08.07)

This initial mobilization in Lomas de Santa Bárbara to secure access to water was successful in helping its residents meet their shared needs. In terms of equality of access to water, all neighbors benefited equally from the new arrangement; all Lomas households could buy their water from the water trucks that now entered into the neighborhood.

After this successful organization for water, the neighborhood as a whole and the block groups established regulations – and even prices – for the distribution of water. A block group delegate explained:

“The dirigentes, and the people too, all worked together, because without water, there's no life. There were three water vendors that came here, and we named the price that we'd pay. The entire neighborhood decided: 'This is how much we'll pay. This is the water vendor that can come and he'd better not disappoint us. This is how much we'll pay, and if he doesn't like it, he doesn't need to come.' There was one water vendor that we forced to leave the neighborhood three times.”

(interview 18.08.07)

Those first few years, the residents of Lomas were able to enforce their collective will on the water vendors by virtue of their consolidated unity.

But with the passage of time, as noted in previous chapters, Lomas block groups began to become more important than the neighborhood-level collective. This exacerbated Lomas dirigentes equivocal relationship with external actors and their consequent lack of success in
finding municipal responses to neighbors' demands. I will explore below Lomas leaders' ineffectiveness in strategically positioning their neighborhood in municipal dynamics, illustrated by their problematic solution to water access. I will, then, argue that the neighborhood's continued marginalization is linked to the incoherence between the neighborhood's development approach, on the one hand, and municipal frameworks and expectations, on the other.

**Equivocal relationships with external actors**

Bolivian decentralization structures institutionally recognize OTBs and neighborhood associations as unique, locally legitimate representative bodies. The strengthening of the intimate block groups in Lomas, however, has made coordinated work more difficult for the neighborhood as a whole. In this final chapter section, I look at how Lomas dirigentes' consequently difficult relationships with external actors has hampered its residents' ability to benefit from municipally-organized structures and resources. For example, unlike most neighborhoods in Cochabamba, Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents have never had a water committee to channel their shared concerns and demands to district, municipal or national levels.

Over 120 Zona Sur water committees have leveraged their joint political influence through the Association of Water Committees of the Zona Sur (Driessen 2008). Since the Water War, there have been hundreds of workshops and seminars in Bolivia and the Andean region aimed at dialogue over water management experiences. And a project inaugurated in 2010, Yaku al Sur (Yaku is Quechua for water) has funds from an Italian foundation to strengthen water committees in the Zona Sur of Cochambamba over the next five years. With no water committee, Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents have neither been represented nor participants in these efforts.

The lack of a water committee also limited Lomas neighbors' ability to impact the distribution of water beyond their close-knit block groups. Lomas neighbors felt that their preoccupation with obtaining water was not reflected in the dirigentes' meetings. One neighbor said of her dirigentes and neighborhood association: “They just don't worry about water... As long as there's water, whether it's clean or dirty, water is water, they say. And nobody has said anything at a neighborhood assembly or at the delegates' [meeting], the problem just hasn't been brought up” (interview 22.08.07). This lack of neighborhood-level spaces for discussion decreased residents' ability to take joint action regarding water access. This weakened the pressure that neighbors once had over water vendors' prices and activities. One neighbor complained, “The water vendor has not come for a week. One week we've had to endure with just one barrel of water. And we're sold the water for five [bolivianos] a barrel” (interview 05.08.07). Another neighbor lamented:

“Now we're paying five, and that's a lot, because the water vendors raise or don't raise their prices at any moment. So people are without water.
And we lend each other buckets, among neighbors we lend each other water, and then later return it to each other. But five is a lot, three and a half would be about right. Those water vendors sell at whatever price they like. And the water is dirty, nobody can control that.” (interview 22.08.07)

The fragmentation of the neighborhood in Lomas made it very difficult to enforce control over the quality of water that is distributed through the private water vendors.

The problem of contaminated water was a problem that Lomas residents shared more generally with other Zona Sur residents. As noted in the first chapter, the lack of coordination between Zona Sur organizations was a paradoxical result of the Law of Popular Participation and the particular context and characteristics of Bolivian decentralization. At the time of the study, there was no district or municipal level coordination to control the quality of the water that water vendors sell. A systematic study had yet to be conducted measuring the levels of contamination in water supplied by water trucks, but neighbors' testimonies provided many examples of water that was murky or otherwise contaminated. A Lomas neighbor explained:

“There are neighbors who complain that the water trucks are bringing greenish water. That's why I only buy from the one water vendor I know. Because sometimes, when it's a different water vendor, one you don't know, you don't know anything about the water. And nobody – at least no authority – bothers to enforce any kind of control over the water that's distributed. But sometimes you do have to get water from whoever is selling. What else can we do? Because we need it, we don't have a choice sometimes.” (interview 31.08.07)

In Lomas at the neighborhood level, then, and at the Zona Sur and municipal level, the extensive number of associations that managed water locally was one of obstacles to ensuring residents had access to a supply of safe water.

If there was some sort of quality control over water contamination, this was limited to an individual and fragmented control, a control that would be difficult to institutionalize more extensively. A young Lomas resident explained:

“The same water trucks also go over there to the neighborhood down there And they were bringing water in from the Rocha River. And the neighbors there had the water analyzed, and they threatened those water vendors. So instead of selling there, they came here. There are only two water trucks that go to that neighborhood now, that's what they're saying. I know because one of my teachers lives over there and got some of the water into a bottle and took it to be analyzed, to see if the water was okay or if it was contaminated. And that's what they told
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7 Rio Rocha is Cochabamba's main river, which is extremely polluted and unsafe.
him, that the water is from the Rocha River and from the lake. They say that they put something into it so it doesn't smell so bad, and they sell it as if nothing.” (interview 07.10.07)

It is clear that this type of quality control could in no way cope with the extensive problem of safe water for Cochabamba residents.

This weak collective control – both in Lomas and at the Zona Sur level – placed residents at the mercy of the water vendors. Another neighbor said: “We don't know where the water is from... You can see it's bad because of its color, its smell too. But people buy it. If there's no water, what else can we do?” (interview 20.08.07). Not only did residents, thus, have very little influence over the price of water and its quality, but even their daily rhythms were susceptible to the erratic arrivals of the water vendors. One neighbor complained that the water vendor “comes from time to time, sometimes at four in the morning. If we don't wake up, then we're left without water” (interview 09.08.07). Residents stayed home when they needed to wait for the water vendor, rather than risk missing him. Interviews, meetings and other events in the Zona Sur could be interrupted at any moment by the water vendors' call.

This dependent relationship that Lomas had developed with water providers was representative of the neighborhood's relationship with external actors more generally. To counter their weak internal authority, neighborhood delegates and dirigentes sought to strengthen their positions by relying on public and non-profit organizations. Recall, for example, delegates' direct appeal to the national government to resolve the neighborhood's land titling problems, or dirigentes' agreement to secure electricity for the neighborhood through promising support for the controversial governor. Both efforts failed due to the neighborhood's internal fragmentation and even generated further controversy within the neighborhood.

The neighborhood maintained similar equivocal relationships with non-governmental organizations. While Lomas leaders sought technical and financial support from NGOs, their weak neighborhood legitimacy problematized any support they did secure. During the time that I worked with the Centro Vicente Cañas, Lomas dirigentes dropped by the organization's offices more regularly than leaders from any other neighborhood. Often, they sought administrative support for paperwork they were processing, or came by to comment on recent or upcoming events in the neighborhood. Yet on several occasions, the very support of the NGO became a bone of contention between disputing neighborhood factions.

One of the Centro Vicente Cañas projects included training popular communicators and establishing neighborhood centers to encourage youth to engage in producing radio shows, new stories and short videos. At one point in 2007, there arose the possibility of establishing such a center in Lomas. Cañas personnel would help to train youth to use the equipment at the center, as long as the neighborhood association provided premises for the center and named a neighborhood resident responsible for it. Cañas personnel waited for months while delegates debated over the center's placement and who would be in charge. Before the decision was made, however, the Lomas leadership changed and the question of the
youth communications center took back stage to the internal conflicts in the neighborhood. The center was later established in another Zona Sur neighborhood.

About a month before these conflicts flared up and the Lomas dirigentes were expelled, a young Zona Sur resident working with the Cañas popular communicators project decided to write a story on the school being built in Lomas. The article quoted the neighborhood president saying: “This year we've worked on two projects, the school and electricity in Lomas... Others wanted to solve the problem of land titling first, but it isn't easy while working on the other two projects” (García 2008). Based on the interview with the Lomas president and the president of the school association, the article went on to say that the dirigentes' decision to work on the school was based on resident support for the construction of the school. While a seemingly benign story written by a high school student, the article ignited heated debate in the neighborhood. In the context of increasing tension in the neighborhood, the article was seen by some as a sign of the dirigentes' dismissal of the issue of land titling and its proponents, as well as the dirigentes' manipulation of the NGO to their own benefit. The neighborhood dirigentes used the article to boast of their affiliation with the external organization.

On a particularly tense Sunday just after the dirigentes were expelled in a Thursday night delegates' meeting, there were two neighborhood assemblies led by opposing factions taking place at the same time, just down the street from one another. Leaders from each side sought out the attending Cañas personnel to explain the reasons for their positions, in hopes of gaining the organization's support. This sort of dependence on outside organizations to boost their internal legitimacy was consistently part of different Lomas leaders' strategies. They sought to consolidate support of their leadership through an external institution's acknowledgment of their authority.

These types of ambivalent and finally ineffective relationships with external actors hampered Lomas' ability to take advantage of municipal and non-governmental resources. Another circumstance in which this became evident was in Lomas' limited dealings with Cochabamba's municipal water company, SEMAPA.
In 2005, as part of its Expansion Plan, SEMAPA constructed a large tank in the middle of Lomas, to supply not only Lomas, but also adjacent neighborhoods with water. Nevertheless, the only time that the water tank was ever used was when it was first filled. A neighbor recalled, “It was badly made. It leaked all over and everyone came out to get whatever water they could and in a flash it was all gone” (field notes 23.08.07). The women in the neighborhood did their heaviest wash as quickly as they could, in the water spilling out of the huge tank. Throughout the neighborhood, clean blankets hung out to dry for the next few days. The tank was never repaired, nor was it used again. While Lomas dirigentes had succeeded in having the tank built in their neighborhood, they were unable to sustain collective neighborhood pressure to hold SEMAPA responsible for the poor tank construction. As described above, during the period of study, the question of water access was not a neighborhood-level issue. Discussions regarding access to water only came up in frustrated conversations with individual Lomas residents, and often.

**Shared access in the context of pluriactive development**

Such an inability to exert neighborhood-level control over external actors was also clear in Lomas residents’ relationships with water vendors. With the decreasing importance of the neighborhood-level collective, the group mechanisms for collective control over their shared water supply began to lose their validity. When dirigentes and residents had initially mobilized together to bring water vendors to the neighborhood, they were also able to demand fair conditions for their water supply from the vendors. Once the neighborhood’s ability to make unified demands weakened, however, the issue of access to water became a domestic or block-level issue. Other shared problems emerged as collective neighborhood concerns in Lomas, namely property titling and the school. Water, in contrast, became a private rather than a local public issue.

Nevertheless, as noted in previous chapters, given the constancy of neighbors’ intimate and face-to-face associations and interactions, private domestic issues were not dissociated from shared concerns at the block group level. The difficulty of accessing water was something that each resident of Lomas had always shared with his and her closest neighbors. One neighbor recalled how the water obtained from the river below was shared in his block group:

“We brought water in those large cans, and the people from this block group, we all put in some money for coffee, for bread. One of us boiled the water... I didn't have money then to make tea, nor for anything else. They put together their money, though, and I boiled up our breakfast.”

(interview 19.08.07)

Organizing to access water was still considered the responsibility of one's closely united circle of neighbors, formalized in the block group. One Lomas resident explained that each neighbor “borrows or lends a bucket of water, we give to them, or they give to us” (interview 05.08.07).
In this context, water was seen as a communal good. It was precisely the intimate space of the block group that allowed neighbors to understand the problem of access to a water supply as a common problem. The communal management of water in Lomas among close neighbors, however, is quite distinct from its neighborhood-level administration in Mineros. In Mineros, water was understood as a public good to be distributed equally within the broader collective, and the water system itself was collectively constructed by the majority of neighbors. In Lomas, the close sharing of access to water consolidated, instead, personalized reciprocal relationships of solidarity between neighbors who overcame daily water shortages together. One neighbor described:

“In my block group, for example, let’s say the water runs out, and I have water. My neighbor says to me, 'Lend me some water' and I lend it to her. So there’s no lack there... My mother lives nearby, too. I go get water from there. Or from the neighbor over there I borrow. I get along fine with my neighbors. If my neighbors in front there don't have, they say, 'Lend us water.' And if I have, I have to give to them, what else can we do?” (interview 29.07.07)

Thus, Lomas residents worked with their closest neighbors to secure their supply of water. Some block groups organized their water more formally. Another neighbor related how his block group gathered money to collectively access water when the water trucks could not reach their area during the rainy season.

“From those electricity posts, the rain water came down like a river. There was no way to get here, no cars, nothing made it through... So we got the water between us, the Gavilanes [the name of her block group, 'The Sparrowhawks']... Because down there they were getting water, so
our block lowered hoses down.” (interview 10.08.07)

This shared approach to water management in Lomas grew out of, and reinforced, the importance of relationships of solidarity and exchange in the neighborhood.

The centrality of these networks and links was evident in the ways that Lomas residents understood “progress” and “development”, that is, in the ways that they sought to transform their individual and collective futures. Lomas residents' relationships to each other and to external actors shaped their pluriactive approach to development, which is further described below. It is difficult, in Lomas, to identify local community development at the neighborhood level. The community's most important collectives were the block groups, which served as nodes from which their members were linked to other social and economic networks. Thus instead of the community and its future development revolving around the neighborhood or the city center – as was apparent in Mineros San Juan and in Nueva Vera Cruz respectively – the collectivity of Lomas, as such, was made up of numerous foci of further associations.

Labor and economic links between periurban and rural areas were especially strong in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Data from the census carried out in the neighborhood showed that, despite being urban residents, 14% of Lomas residents work as agricultural or livestock farmers, a far higher number than in any of the other neighborhoods studied. Many neighbors traveled back and forth to work in their rural communities of origin, or their families were divided up to take advantage of different opportunities available in urban and rural areas.

One family, for example, built a house on their lot in Lomas in which the mother and a nephew lived. The mother of the family sold produce in the main city market while the nephew studied in a local high school. The family's three young children lived in the small town of Tacachi, some three hours from Cochabamba, where their grandmother and aunt took care of them. These two women, along with a few other family members who lived in the house, oversaw the potatoes and other crops the family produced for the market and for their own consumption. The father of the family, an elementary school teacher, worked in another rural area, but returned often to his hometown and was almost always present in Lomas for Sunday block group meetings and neighborhood assemblies. Another neighbor explained, similarly, that her son worked on their land in the country, but also stayed with her every week: “He comes with his products to the wholesale farmers' market [here in the city] to sell them” (interview 14.02.08).

According to the surveys conducted, almost a third of Lomas' residents owned or rented property outside of the neighborhood. This was double the number of Mineros or Nueva Vera Cruz residents who owned or rented property outside their own neighborhoods.8

8 These percentages in all three neighborhoods likely underestimated the multiple residences of neighbors, for two reasons: (1) In newer neighborhoods, there was a prejudice against neighbors who “don’t live here,” due to the importance of property as possession and use discussed in the previous chapter. Thus it is likely that there were neighbors who did have residences outside of the neighborhood who nevertheless responded to the question negatively; and (2) The survey question asked “Do you own or rent property in another part of the city?” Given the qualitative data collected through observations and interviews,
As individuals and families extended their labor networks to rural areas, so did small businesses. A Lomas resident who worked in a hair salon near the city market, for example, also traveled weekly to work in a nearby town. The owner of the small salon said, “He's not here today, because he had to go to Punata. We have a salon there too, we do well there on Tuesdays. Since it’s a market day there, it’s a very big market there on Tuesdays, well, it’s very quiet here” (field notes 06.11.07). In this context, Lomas neighbors did not direct their energies to the collective development of their neighborhood. Rather, their investments were spread out over their varied networks. Lomas residents did not invest their time, efforts and money, toward the construction of large private homes nor neighborhood public works, as was the case with Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, respectively.

An example of this was the investment of migrants’ remittances. In all three neighborhoods of study, about one-fifth of households had a family member working abroad. In both Mineros and Nueva Vera Cruz, the construction of new houses was readily evident. These houses were often built with money sent home from migrants. One Nueva Vera Cruz neighbor, for example, said that with the help of her husband's remittances, “I'm building my house now, see? It's coming along, [the remittances] have helped us a lot” (interview 03.03.08). Other residents from Nueva Vera Cruz spoke of those houses built by families with migrants abroad: “They make their huge houses. They make their beautiful homes. Uy! They build their homes here in the styles from over there... And they also buy lots of things. They buy the latest model of everything, see? They buy cars like that, too” (interview 15.05.08). Mineros neighbors likewise noted home improvements as the effects of migration abroad:

“You see the effects [of migration] in the construction of houses, there are many that have been improved. This was a poor neighborhood, very poor. Before there were very few well-off homes. But now I’ve seen that houses have been improved. They're well-built, they have plaster finishings. They're in better shape. And that's thanks to migration.” (interview 13.04.08)

In contrast to widespread construction in these two neighborhoods, there was little conspicuous spending on homes in Lomas de Santa Bárbara, despite the fact that it was established only four to five years after Mineros San Juan. When asked if he thought migrant families were investing remittances in constructions or home improvements, the president of the Lomas neighborhood association responded: “Maybe they're investing elsewhere, not here. The houses here are pretty much maintained just as they were” (interview 24.04.08).

Instead of spending their time and money on their homes or within the neighborhood, Lomas neighbors were apparently investing where their networks led them, that is, in other spaces and spheres. One Lomas neighbor, for example, explained that his wife had taken a long time to establish their home in the neighborhood because he had been away for an entire year...
as the communal authority in his community of origin:

“...It was my turn to be the authority. I'm from Potosi. [My wife] said, 'We have to build a house.' But I had to be the authority... It's for native community members and it's rotational. You have to be the authority for one year. Then, when the year is over, you pass it on to another community member.” (interview 04.08.07)

Other neighbors spoke of buying or maintaining their property in nearby rural areas.

Even the dirigentes' efforts towards infrastructural development seemed to be more driven by leaders' attempts to harness the neighbors' divergent interests rather than by the shared goals of the neighbors. In early 2008, before electricity was established and the school was opened in the neighborhood, the president of the Lomas explained:

“This year we want to pave the main street... Paving is the most important because that's the reason public transportation doesn't get here. We only have one transport line that reaches Lomas. Some people don't live here because there's no electricity, that's why, they just have their houses here. Their children are in other schools... and that's why they don't live here, also because of the schools.” (interview 24.04.08)

In other words, the neighborhood infrastructure itself was seen as a way of binding residents whose attention and investments were directed towards multiple spaces and spheres. Infrastructure in the other two neighborhoods of study, in contrast, was more clearly directed by collective and shared needs rather than by an attempt to consolidate the collective.

One way to understand Lomas' dispersed and pluriactive development is by learning from current understandings of rural development. Attempts to describe new forms of rurality in the context of reduced agricultural incomes have focused on rural families' diversification of activities and the spaces in which they conduct them. Giarraca, Aparicio and Gras (2001) write:

“Many authors posit pluriactivity as a structural characteristic of agriculture... We might consider, therefore, that the characteristics of the different kinds of subjects present in contemporary agriculture not only need to be further extended to include their connections with activities outside of their land, but that those subjects are conditioned, even made possible, by such connections.” (306)

Cristóbal Kay (2007) spatializes the diversification of rural household incomes: “In the search for their own maintenance, a growing number of rural residents make temporary or longer-term migrations to other rural areas or to urban areas. Migrations to other countries... are also more and more frequent” (34). According to Kay, these migrants work either in informal labor such as handicrafts, or in commerce and trade, or become wage earners in small businesses. Recall from the previous chapters that migrants from rural areas constituted close
to three quarters of the resident population of Lomas. Insofar as these residents were still tied personally and productively to spaces beyond their urban neighborhood, the ways that they understood progress did not revolve solely around the neighborhood's social or economic development.

In this context, shared forms of accessing water allowed neighbors to depend on their intimate associations without major investments of time and money in public infrastructural development. Thus, the shared form of accessing water in Lomas emerged from and reinforced pluriactive strategies of subsistence and development. As such, Lomas residents benefited from their close associations and ties within their block groups to meet their immediate and localized needs. Access to water is an example of Lomas residents' ability to work with their close neighbors to resolve their shared problems. According to survey data, Lomas residents were more willing to work together to provide themselves with water than were residents from Mineros San Juan or Nueva Vera Cruz. Lomas neighbors organized almost four times more often than Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors to obtain water.

Such a shared approach granted Lomas residents a sense of security in terms of being able to rely on their close knit groups to access water. Despite the antagonisms evident with neighborhood-level leadership, tensions between neighbors were less apparent in Lomas than in the other sites of study. One Lomas neighbor said, “We only have problems of the roads, of water. Those are our problems. Between neighbors, we're fine. In other neighborhoods it’s different, there are people who get angry, who judge each other. But not here” (interview 26.08.07). The following chapter will show that Lomas collectives were not without their strains or hostilities. These, however, had to do with collectively defined norms and quotidian sanctioning to uphold these within the intimately associated groups. They were not based on hegemonic definitions of collective identity, such as were identified in Mineros, or the differential access to resources that was described in Nueva Vera Cruz. That is, as Lomas residents' pluriactive approach to development encouraged their identification with various other networks, the conformation of their collectives accepted a diversity of identities. Their relations to their block groups and neighbors, then, emerged from shared immediate needs rather than shared collective identities.

Not only were identities diversified by the varied spaces within which Lomas neighbors moved and worked, but so were their investments. As such, differential resource accumulation within the neighborhood did not create the same exclusions that are apparent in other neighborhoods. The very construction of a neighborhood shaped around intimate associations whose commitments network outwards, thus resulted in more equitable social forms within the collective. Hierarchical differences between neighbors in Lomas were neither as palpable nor as factious as they were in Nueva Vera Cruz (at the individualized level) and in Mineros San Juan (at the group level). Nevertheless, organizational forms in Lomas hampered residents' ability to access municipal and development resources. In part, this was due to the ways that institutional frameworks encourage and discourage certain forms of collective organization, their associated approaches to development and their consequent social relations.
Chapter conclusions

The introduction to this chapter described the ways that the discursive opposition between powerful transnationals and legitimate popular interest served to mobilize Cochabambinos and international support. The collective action that spread from syndicate meetings to city streets to virtual networks of transnational solidarity effectively pressured the Bolivian government to revise its public policy approach in ways that responded to citizens’ concerns. In the case of Cochabamba, it was clear that the privatization concession was antithetical to the interests and logics of local organizations that had built their own water supply systems and established collective procedures for water access.  

Nevertheless, I have also argued that the opposition between private global capital and public local self-management does little to help identify the ways that unequal access to water has continued to persist in the peripheries. The contemporary context of Bolivia requires analytic approaches that, instead, identify ways that the public, the local, or the community interact with external relationships, dynamics and logics. The challenge is to specify the ways that resulting organizational forms contribute to, or work counter to, more equitable social relations. As shown in the cases above, organization for access to water is part of how a collective constructs itself and the social relations between its members. The “self-managed” systems for collective access to water were, thus, shaped by how the different neighborhoods’ residents worked towards their shared futures and the related ways that they associated with public and development institutions.

It is precisely the construction of collectives through their shared social practices and discourses that can help show how local logics and globally structured inequalities constitute each other. Sotolongo and Delgado observe that those two dimensions in society – the micro of subjective actors and the macro of objective structures – constitute themselves in a “parallel, simultaneous and concomitant” manner. It is in the local context that patterns of social practices are produced and reproduced, that “regimes of quotidian and recurrent collective practices” (133) are established. The local organization of accessing water provides a formal or informal institutionalization of these collective practices.

Yet these “self-managed” local systems of water administration cannot be understood apart from municipal and development frameworks and the hierarchies of social relations that these establish. That is, Nueva Vera Cruz is clearly the neighborhood that is best integrated and coordinates most effectively with external actors, despite its limitations. Its water system was efficiently built based on these relationships and a consumer model of water management that emphasizes economic utility. Yet this very integration into urban institutional contexts also reproduces those contexts’ socio-economic differences, with unequal access to water in the neighborhood reinforcing those differences.

The collaborative organization of water in Mineros San Juan, on the other hand, is an

---

9 In fact, then president of Bechtel Enterprises, Steven Bechtel, Jr. told his executives: “Remember: We are not in the business of construction and engineering; we are in the business of making money” (quoted in Kruse 2005:128).
important part of the neighborhood's participatory approach to development. The characteristic unity of Mineros, that incorporates residents into its collective is also, however, dependent on the potentially dangerous identification of that which is external to itself. While this allows for a skeptical attitude towards dominant development frameworks, it also hinders dialogue and exchange between diverse perspectives and has the potential of creating divisive social relations. Finally, Lomas de Santa Bárbara's organizational forms seem less conducive to the hierarchical or divisive social relations apparent in Nueva Vera Cruz and in Mineros. The shared organization to access water in Lomas neither increases socio-economic inequalities nor does it marginalize particular groups. The dynamics of organization around water and its role in the constitution of social relations in Lomas' collective stand in stark contrast to the role that water management plays in Mineros San Juan and in Nueva Vera Cruz, where water is central to neighborhood-level consolidation and inequalities, respectively. Yet it is also clear in this chapter that both the intimate associations and the dispersed engagements of Lomas' pluriactive development have reinforced the neighborhood's marginal position.

Dominant municipal institutions and frameworks thus encourage particular collective logics and practices over others. These organizational forms and collective practices, in turn, produce certain kinds of social relationships. The ways that each of the three neighborhoods organized to access water are shaped by the collectives' insertion into these urban frameworks, and in turn, shapes social relations within their neighborhoods. The Lomas collective's unsuccessful integration into urban frameworks is related to the neighborhood's inability to reproduce municipal and dominant expectations of social relations and progress, while also avoiding the reproduction of the divisive social relations that these imply.
CHAPTER FOUR
ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEGITIMACY:
THE SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF CITIZEN CONTROL

Control social, or “collective control” over public entities and authorities and their
decisions and actions¹, has become a central issue for Latin America’s progressive and populist
governments. While the U.S. and European literature on democratizing governments has
emphasized the public accountability of state mechanisms, Latin American analysts and actors
underscore the public’s ability to demand and pronounce on such an accounting. The focus of
this chapter is the local forms of collective control in the three sites of study. Examining these
in the context of the institutionalization of public accountability will illuminate the ways that
state institutions interact with everyday practices and shape social and political relationships.

We have seen above that the formalization central to the urban institutionalization of
land ownership and water administration encourages particular practices over others.
Specifically, these institutions promote neoliberal collective practices, logics and subjectivities
that reproduce the inequalities and exclusions implicit in contemporary capitalist societies. As
a response to these inequalities and exclusions, Bolivian social movements have sought to
establish an alternative set of collective practices, logics and subjectivities. In their need to
produce a collective legitimacy at the margins of formal state institutions, however,
counter-hegemonic logics depend on alternative unifying discourses that produce their own
exclusions. Finally, divergent practices logics seem to provide the most equitable social
relations within local collectives. These logics, however, marginalize their subjects within
municipal and state hierarchies.

The processes by which this promotion and marginalization of particular forms of
social relations take place are further explored in this chapter. This chapter focuses on the
more explicitly political practices of participation and collective control within each of these
logics, that is, by these three different subject positions. Neoliberal subjects in Nueva Vera
Cruz constitute their collective through representative membership. This organizational form
best enables citizen control of the state through accountability. Counter-hegemonic subjects in
Mineros San Juan produce their unified collective through counter-hegemonic participation, an
organizational form that is particularly conducive to collective control over local authorities
through legitimacy. Finally, divergent logics establish the framework for the collective in
Lomas de Santa Bárbara, which is articulated in communal associations. This final

¹ I have chosen to translate the term control social as “collective control” in order to give it a similar range of meanings that
the Spanish term encompasses. The literal translation “social control” in English generally refers to normative control over
members of society, while the English term “citizen control” implies a state institutionalization of democratic control that also
narrows the term too much. My use of the term “collective control” seeks to incorporate both these meanings, as does the
Spanish term control social. I will, however, sometimes use the phrase “social control” when specifically discussing the
normative control over members of society, and the phrase “citizen control” when specifically discussing institutionalized
forms of democratic collective control.
organizational form most readily allows for normative control of the social through its inclusiveness and shared norms. Following a brief overview of collective control in Bolivia, I examine these organizational forms and their relationship to different forms of collective control.

The aim of this chapter is to examine the possibilities of institutionalizing an inclusive and effective collective and citizen control in the context of entrenched inequalities. In previous chapters, I explored the ways that the state's institutionalization of private property and resource management promotes certain forms of social relations over others. This is effected through the definition and reinforcement of the border between institutionalized and informal practices, a border that is subjectively spatialized in the center-periphery paradigm that produces periurban collective subjects. The case of Lomas demonstrated most clearly the marginalization of alternative spatial and subjective logics in which the city is not held to be the central, determinant force of social and economic relations. The legality, rationalized efficiency and productive development sought by these institutions thus impels, justifies and to an extent, conceals a series of other reconfigurations in social relations of power. In this sense, a focus on the institutionalization of collective control will further our understanding of these dynamics, since the very justification for the existence of citizen control is the explicitly political democratization of authorities and state institutions. Nevertheless, we will see below that the institutionalization of participation – like that of property and resource management – partakes in the urban dynamics that marginalize peripheral logics.

I begin this exploration of participation and collective control with a short historical overview of Bolivia’s experiences with collective control, from communal to union to citizen control. Then, in section one, I look at the production of neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent forms of participation that emerge from residents' experiences and other resources, as these are deployed from differing positions in municipal hierarchies. In the second section of the chapter, I explore the ways that different collective logics affect the role that citizens can play in the control of their representative institutions and authorities and in normative social relations. These different aspects of collective control need to be analyzed in conjunction in order to avoid the sterile institutionalization that has dogged the powerful notion of collective control in Bolivia’s recent past.

**Bolivia’s experiences with collective control**

Civil society’s authority over its public institutions was first officially mandated in Bolivia with the 1994 Law of Popular Participation. This law established municipal-level Supervising Committees, institutionalized citizen groups that would oversee municipal plans and activities and exercise a formalized “citizen control.” Later government decrees established regional and national Mechanisms of Citizen Control to provide similar functions at the departmental and national levels. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the Supervising Committees and the Mechanisms of Citizen Control – as well as of other instruments
established to provide public accountability, such as the Citizen Directors of the municipal water company in Cochabamba – has been roundly criticized by socio-political analysts and actors (Driessen 2008, Spronk 2010). For example, despite the fact that public control over water administration is a flagship issue for Cochabamba’s social movements, analyst Carlos Crespo unequivocally declared in 2007 that “The ‘experiment’ of collective control over water management has failed” (PIEB 2007:1).

Still, the continued importance of citizen control over public entities was reflected in a proposal made by the social movement-led Pacto de Unidad to the country’s 2007 Constituent Assembly. This proposal sought to institute collective control as the fourth power of the state, invested with the authority to oversee the executive, legislative and juridical powers. The “Plurinational Social Power,” as it was called, was proposed as “an independent and autonomous entity authorized to control the other powers” (from Art. 114 of that project, cited in Komadina 2009a). Assemblyman Carlos Romero, who headed the technical team to develop the proposal, noted that the decision was finally made “not to institutionalize this mechanism nor integrate it into the state structure, since this would mean bureaucratizing it and establishing its political dependence” (La Razón 2007).

Another perspective on the vicissitudes of the concept of collective control in the elaboration of the constitution is presented by Bolivian political analyst Jorge Komadina. He writes, “While the more radical sectors conceived of Social Power as the institutional alternative to representative democracy, the more pragmatic sectors emphasized the institutional impracticality of this proposal” (2). The diverging points of view of these sectors is evident in a comparison of the text of the constitution approved in 2007 by the Constituent Assembly and the final version sanctioned by national referendum in 2009 (Constituent Assembly 2007 and 2009). The same passage which in the earlier version read: “Organized civil society will establish its own norms and mechanisms to fulfill the functions of participation in decision-making and citizen control” was replaced in the final version by three more precise and limiting clauses: “The Law will establish the general framework for the exercise of citizen control”; “Civil society will organize itself to define the structure and composition of participation and citizen control”; and “State entities will generate spaces of participation and citizen control for society” (Art. 241)

At stake is precisely the complex question of how to institutionalize the final authority of an inclusive society over state authorities and actions, where state structures are also mutually constitutive of social relations. These difficult theoretical dilemmas were at the heart of the growing debates over the development of the Law of Citizen Control in 2008-2009. The government’s Ministry of Transparency and Fight against Corruption organized workshops in all the country’s departments to discuss the issue and to elaborate a proposal for the law. As of August 2009, the Ministry had conducted a workshop in La Paz with representatives from 30 national and departmental social organizations (Aguilar 2009). The National Confederation of Intercultural Communities of Bolivia gathered in February 2009 to discuss their proposal for Participation and Citizen Control; social movement organizations brought together through
the National Coalition for Change are currently developing similar proposals (Lovera 2009). More locally, during that same period, non-governmental organizations in Cochabamba were seeking ways to promote dialogue among marginal urban populations about these proposals.

This profuse interest in the institutionalization of collective control must be understood in the context of what collective control has historically meant in Bolivia, before and beyond the Supervising Committees and official Mechanisms of Citizen Control. A brief review of this history will help us consider, empirically and theoretically, the role of collective control in the changing relations between the Bolivian state and civil society. Raúl España et al. (2003) identify “workers’ control” established in the wake of the 1952 Revolution as a founding moment for formalized collective control in modern Bolivian history. Workers’ control sought to ensure the right of workers to participate in the production and management decisions of the recently nationalized mines.

By co-managing the state-run Mining Corporation of Bolivia, miners’ unions sought to transform national socio-economic conditions. They sought to accomplish this through changing the laws regarding the mining system and its administration, aiming to achieve full workers’ management of the companies with the right to veto. The government, however, restricted workers’ control to a limited co-participation in management. Workers’ control thus fell prey to “the government’s appropriation, manipulation and instrumentalization of the concept and its practice, on the one hand, and the influence of party politics, on the other” (España et al.:17). Similar themes reappear in the national experience with Popular Participation.

España et al. then identify three periods in Bolivia’s economic and socio-political history that have determined different forms of collective control since the 1990s. The first two periods are associated with the legal recognition of civil society to exercise citizen control over the state. In the years between 1994 and 1997, the legal framework for citizen control was
introduced, with the promulgation of the Law of Popular Participation, the Law of
Administrative Decentralization and the Law of Municipalities. Between 1997 and 2000, the
mechanisms and resources for the exercise of this citizen control at the departmental and
state level. The third period of collective control began in the year 2000, as social movements
mobilized nationwide to challenge the civil society-state relations instituted in the inadequate
mechanisms of citizen control. As Jorge Komadina notes, this period constitutes “a profound
questioning of power and can also be seen as a mode of collective control, though it does not
operate institutionally (2009b:12). For Roger Córtez (2007:115), it is at this point that the notion
of collective control experiences a qualitative leap, insofar as, in a very brief period, it was
transformed from a mechanism of cooptation into a tool to confront and delegitimize the
State.

Nevertheless, the precipitous rise of social movements in the country does not
constitute the unexpected rise of a new form of collective control. Instead, society’s recent
ability to influence state action must be understood in the context of the two most significant
forms of control by and of the social in Bolivia’s history: community control through shared
norms; and collective control understood as social control or domination. Both of these forms
of collective control – despite their very different processes and objectives – are based on
practices of collective legitimation. For Pablo Quintero (2005), whose work explores “the
dimension of interethnic power relations” found in post-colonial societies like Bolivia, one of
the distinct characteristics of collective control is its naturalization. This “legitimizes it in the
logical order of society. In this way, social rules and norms are almost unchallengeable, from
kinship forms through the modes of production of material goods. Collective control is thus a
sort of naturalized equilibrium” (6).

In this sense, collective control is the application of social norms in both daily life as
well as in the political sphere. One of its fundamental functions is the equilibrium of social
relations, whether this stability serves interests constructed as collective interests or
particular or external interests. The establishment and enforcement of social norms is at the
basis of any society’s control over its political institutions. Bringing together these multiple
aspects of collective control – the constitution and enforcement of socially legitimized norms,
as well as the collective authority over public actors, goods and decisions – will help shed light
on its mechanisms and potential institutionalization. Such a synthetic perspective on
collective control is almost completely absent in critical analyses of the Law of Popular
Participation and the state-institutionalized mechanisms of citizen control in Bolivia
(Dominguez 2006, Bazoberry 2006). This is, in part, due to the complexity of the country’s
contemporary society and its unequal and dynamic relations with its state.

A clearer articulation of perspectives that incorporate varied aspects of collective
control exists in the literature on social relations in indigenous communities. With its more
geographically and socially limited focus, studies of community collective control can more
readily identify the relationship between the production of shared norms and their
enforcement in private, public and political spheres. Collective control in indigenous communities is exercised through community justice, with forms of control linked to individuals as well as to the collective as a whole. The function of community authorities and justice is to “re-establish the harmony in intra-communal relations” (Gutiérrez 2003:5).

In a similar vein, Elva Terceros writes that in indigenous Amazonian communities, “The control that is exercised through social censure is how the collective enforces norms and demands that its authorities adopt the most adequate decisions in order to prevent the weakening of values and norms” (2003:139).

Shared norms and values are agreed upon in these micro-societies through the daily contact and face-to-face meetings that are made possible by the small size of the communities. But how can we think of the ways that public accountability can be enforced from Bolivian civil society as a whole? How are norms agreed upon that must found an entire society’s control of state activities? The new Bolivian constitution repeatedly names “organized civil society” as the main actor in issues of citizen control and public accountability. But how does this civil society organize itself, both incorporating and moving beyond syndicate and community organization? In the introduction to the volume of essays The Non-State Public in the Reform of the State, its editors Luis Bresser-Pereira and Nuria Cunill Grau maintain that “enriched public debate in the heart of civil society can exercise a critical and controlling function over the State” (1998:37). España et al. (2003) similarly write that “the principal peculiarity of citizen control is its locus in the public sphere” (48).

Edgardo Lando (1998), however, notes that the principal peculiarity of both contemporary civil societies and public spheres are their complex and unequal dynamics. He writes:
“If we do not begin from the most significant aspects of civil society and the public sphere – their profound inequalities and heterogeneities – the concept of the public sphere loses its analytic value and runs the risk of replicating the Manicheanism present in much of the literature on civil society, that attributes authoritarianism, inefficiency, corruption and clientelism to the State, while holding up civil society as the bearer of creativity, efficiency and liberty.” (16)

Examining the dynamics of collective control in a sector of civil society that is largely defined by its disparities and diversities, can help identify how collective control is constructed in Bolivia’s contemporary and complex society. Section one below describes social and organizational dynamics in three marginal urban neighborhoods of Cochabamba, Bolivia. This will allow for a subsequent examination of varied forms of collective control and the relationships between civil society, the public sphere and collective and citizen control in Bolivia’s growing cities.

A. CONSTRUCTING DIFFERENT FORMS OF THE COLLECTIVE

In this section, I look at the ways that neighbors in the Zona Sur constitute their collectives through varied forms of participation, and how those collectives, in turn, mediate their subjectivities, both within the group and within the wider context of the city and nation. In the first subsection, I focus on the ways that neoliberal logics and subjectivities shape the parameters of Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ participation through representative membership in their neighborhood organization. In the second subsection, I turn to the counter-hegemonic logics of participation in Mineros San Juan, and finally look at the communal associations that are enabled by Lomas de Santa Bárbara’s divergent logics in the third subsection.

Representative membership for neoliberal subjects

It’s Monday evening in Nueva Vera Cruz, and the collective taxis and buses are full of residents coming home from their workday in the city. In a few hours, the weekly neighborhood board of directors’ meeting will take place. The community loudspeaker is already coming on sporadically, and with static, inviting all neighbors to attend. Very few of them will. These neighborhood meetings are scheduled to take place every Monday night at 8p.m. But by 8:30 that evening, only two or three of the dirigentes have usually arrived. These men begin to settle into a snug room, only about eight feet by eight feet. It is the front room of an abandoned locale. The paint on the walls is a peeling, pale green, and the room is lined with chairs, benches and a desk scattered with stray papers. Those who have arrived exchange friendly conversation and trade stories of their days. As the time gets close to 9p.m., they agree to call the other board of director members again on the speakers. They also welcome all
neighbors to the meeting once more, but it is almost always the same few community leaders who arrive and debate local issues until late into the night. The vice-president Doña Marina is the only woman among the six to eight dirigentes that meet in this room each week.

As the meeting begins, the agenda and the minutes from the previous meeting are read. There are informal interruptions, suggestions and disagreements throughout the meeting. In contrast to the dynamics described below in the other two neighborhoods of study, however, discrepancies in opinion among Nueva Vera Cruz leaders rarely cause tension or conflict. In fact, throughout the meeting, the dirigentes accuse each other of being “oligarchs” or “loafers.” They are only half-joking. But though these jests point to varied perspectives and significant differences between the neighborhood leaders, they function more like the familiar banter that brings together a group, as in a family reunion, where there is common amusement with the idiosyncrasies of a talkative uncle or a mischievous niece.

Each regular member of the board of directors seems to have his or her role and sticks to it. The president of Nueva Vera Cruz during the period of study, for example, rarely spoke. He was even chided frequently for his passivity. During one contentious discussion about whether or not to mobilize the neighbors because of a breach of contract by the municipal water company, another community leader said, referring to the neighborhood president, “What’s he going to say; he doesn’t even know what’s happening” (field notes 12.11.07). Yet this same group of dirigentes encouraged and convinced neighbors to re-elect the same president for another term. Most vocally critical of the neighborhood president, and of everyone else, was the president of the School Council. This ex-miner with important connections to the MAS national governing party, often discoursed at length about what the neighborhood should do. His comments were generally taken into account. The president of the Water Committee was an architect who arrived to the meetings on a sleek black motorcycle, hurrying from work or from other engagements. The secretary, a teacher in the neighborhood school, was called the Professor by everyone, though other board members
often spoke over, or cut off, his opinions.

As a group, however, the Nueva Vera Cruz board of directors was well respected by neighbors. In the survey of the neighborhood conducted in 2007, only one in ten respondents rated the performance of the dirigentes negatively, qualifying their performance as “poor” or “very poor.” The remaining respondents felt that the work of their leaders was “satisfactory,” “good” or “very good.” Nueva Vera Cruz residents also turned more often to their dirigentes with their neighborhood concerns than did Lomas or Mineros residents. While 63% of Nueva Vera Cruz residents turned to their dirigentes with their neighborhood concerns, less than half of the residents in the two other neighborhoods of study did so. In Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, neighbors were more likely to turn to group leaders, their neighbors or their family and friends to talk over or resolve their neighborhood concerns.

Given the community confidence in its leadership, Nueva Vera Cruz dirigentes made executive decisions in their weekly meetings in ways that would be unacceptable in the other two neighborhoods, where collective decisions were made by consensus of either delegates of block groups or all participants of a neighborhood-wide assembly. As mentioned above, in one Monday night board of directors’ meeting, Nueva Vera Cruz leaders agreed that the neighborhood should protest before the mayor for the delay in the construction of their water tank. They presented the plan at the next neighborhood general assembly, in which only 30-40 neighbors were present. The assembly participants assented to the plan, and agreed to help spread the word. Nevertheless, one day before the protest, the dirigentes decided that the strategy of protesting was misguided. Instead, a few of them should work out an agreement with the municipality’s representatives. Using the community loudspeaker in the Prado, one of the dirigentes announced that the protest was called off. Both the decision to mobilize and the contradicting decision to negotiate were made by the small group of neighborhood leaders. Neighbors had little room for discussion of the decision to negotiate with the municipality; the decision was never brought up in an assembly, only announced on the loudspeaker.

Thus, the general resident support of the Nueva Vera Cruz leaders was accompanied by little personal and direct involvement in neighborhood activities. This is characteristic of representative forms of organization, in which direct forms of participation are replaced by confidence in elected representatives. One neighbor commented, “I don’t really participate. The only meetings I go to are the Water Committee meetings. I just go there to pay” (interview 15.11.07). Another neighbor said, “I prefer to be here inside my home. If something happens, I’ll sometimes go, or sometimes I won’t. I don’t like to get involved in problems” (interview 22.11.07). In fact, Nueva Vera Cruz residents reported, by far, the lowest levels of strong participation in the neighborhood, and the greatest levels of non-participation.

There were many explanations given by the residents for the low levels of participation; the most common among these reasons was that neighbors already had access to basic services. Residents throughout the Zona Sur readily pointed out that people only participated in neighborhood organizations because they needed the basic services – such as water and electricity – that could only be accessed by publicly or collectively. Asked if she
would continue to participate in neighborhood meetings once she had access to all basic services, however, one faithful Zona Sur neighbor answered, “Yes, until I die. Well, once I die I won't go [to meetings] anymore.” Yet she recognized that times were changing: “Maybe my children will go, or probably not. Maybe they'll just pay taxes” (interview 16.11.07). Participation in the formal sphere of tax-paying, this neighbor seemed to suggest, would replace her own more direct forms of participation. Once residents could rely on public or private entities for their needs, they would no longer depend on local organization. Nueva Vera Cruz vice-president Doña Marina made a similar comment regarding residents whose land had already been legally titled: “There are also a group of people, of course not in the sense of a group, but individuals – who don’t participate. They... bought their lots, and they don’t regard the neighborhood association as they should” (interview 21.11.07).

Complementing these explanations of the lower levels of participation was Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ greater inclusion in the urban public. As noted in the introduction, Nueva Vera Cruz was both the most urbanized and the most diverse of the three neighborhoods, with more residents hailing from urban areas than the other two sites of study. The urbanity of Nueva Vera Cruz was also reflected in its residents’ characteristics, which included more formal education and employment than in the other two neighborhoods of study. Almost half of Nueva Vera Cruz residents had some formal middle or high school education, while in the other two neighborhoods, less than a third of the residents had reached this level of formal education. Many Nueva Vera Cruz residents (71%) also held official papers to their land, whereas no lots in either Mineros or Lomas were regularized. Their sense of belonging to wider and more formal public spaces decreased Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors’ participation in more local issues.

Less than 10% of residents attended neighborhood meetings, which tended to be spaces for the dissemination of information rather than for collective discussion and decision-making.
Given that Nueva Vera Cruz residents were more incorporated into the wider urban spheres, they had less need to turn to the local authority of their neighborhood leaders. Nueva Vera Cruz residents tended to turn to local neighborhood authorities with their problems less often than did residents of the other two neighborhoods. While about half of Nueva Vera Cruz residents responded that they turned to neighborhood leaders when problems arose between neighbors, 68% and 79% of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents, respectively, turned to neighborhood leaders in those cases. In general, across the three neighborhoods, urbanites (as opposed to residents from rural or mining areas) were more likely to try to resolve problems between neighbors amongst themselves, or to not resolve them, rather than turning for help to a collective authority. Likewise, in a nationwide survey, only 20% of urban Bolivians said they had they had participated in the collective resolution of a local problem, whereas twice the number of rural Bolivians had done so² (Rojas Orstute and Verdesoto Custode 1997).

Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ closer identification with the city was also apparent in neighbors’ repeated mention of their hopes to move to another neighborhood, preferably in the north of the city. While more than 80% of Lomas and Mineros residents thought they would be in the neighborhood in ten years, only about 65% of Nueva Vera Cruz residents surveyed imagined they would still live in the neighborhood at that time. One Nueva Vera Cruz neighbor confided:

“I do hope I can [move from here], because my sons have told me that this area is too dry. ‘I want to go where there’s more life and activity, where there’s water,’ they tell me. I tell them that there’s some good deals on land near here. We can buy lots for my older son, for the two eldest. But they don’t want to hear about that. ‘No, no,’ they say, ‘we’re going somewhere else.’” (interview 10.11.07)

In addition, as a more urbanized, serviced and accessible neighborhood than the other two areas, there were more renters in Nueva Vera Cruz – 16% of neighbors were renters – than in Mineros San Juan or in Lomas de Santa Bárbara, where less than 3% of residents were renting the house they lived in. As noted above, Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors generally agreed that renters had no need to participate in the neighborhood organization.

Nueva Vera Cruz residents’ low levels of participation were thus related to their greater satisfaction of basic needs, their higher levels of professionalism and ability to access urban public spheres and institutions, and their lower commitment to the neighborhood (as either renters whose residence was temporary or owners who were hoping to leave). Yet these low levels of participation did not reflect a lack of confidence in the neighborhood leaders. In fact, in representative social and political systems, there is a clear relationship between the two: one needn’t involve oneself directly in particular activities if there are capable representatives

---

² The survey did not separate out Bolivians from mining sectors.
to do so. Walter Lippman’s 1920s argument that the state should be driven by the attempt “not to burden every citizen with expert opinions on all questions, but to push that burden away from him towards the responsible administrator” (1961:250) still holds practical sway.

In Nueva Vera Cruz, there was a sense that the dirigentes were elected precisely because they were the most capable of working towards neighborhood development. One neighbor commented, “There should be someone [in the leadership] who knows about projects, that has the capacity to develop projects, constructions... who can propose development projects” (interview 16.11.07). When asked about the neighborhood leaders, another Nueva Vera Cruz resident said: “They’re doing well. It’s as if there’s more people now who understand. There are more professionals, with open minds. They’re students, professionals, other types of people now... That’s how we’ve put them in, they’re doing well” (interview 02.12.07). In fact, Nueva Vera Cruz was the only one of the three neighborhoods of study where a higher education was correlated with higher levels of participation in the organization. While the majority (over 60% in each case) of Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents with high levels of participation had completed no more than primary education, more than two thirds of Nueva Vera Cruz residents with high levels of participation had finished their high school education. There was, thus, a sense among the less formally educated Nueva Vera Cruz residents – who made up about half of the neighborhood population – that their more professional neighbors were more fit to lead their community’s development: lower levels of formal education in Nueva Vera Cruz were correlated with higher qualifications of the performance of the dirigentes. More than 40% of residents with only a primary education judged that their leaders were performing well, while less than a quarter of residents with higher education thought that their leaders were performing well. As such, the importance that neighbors granted the professionalism of neighborhood authorities and the formal accountability they expected from them was more marked in Nueva Vera Cruz than in any other neighborhood of study.

But community leaders’ authoritative legitimacy, based on their professional knowledge and experience, also had negative social effects. Nueva Vera Cruz residents' dependence on capable representatives conditioned who felt capable of impacting neighborhood issues. This dynamic was reinforced by the importance that neighbors and their leaders granted to “projects,” a term that referred to technically developed project proposals. A Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente said:

“Without a project, what's going to get done? Nothing. So we told that neighbor [who wanted neighborhood improvements] that we have to have a project. Without a project, what improvement can you talk about? You have to have an open file to look for financing at any moment.” (interview 19.04.08)

Thus, those neighbors without the capacities to articulate ideas in the language of service organizations had a more difficult time influencing neighborhood development.
A full third of Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors surveyed felt they had no impact on neighborhood decisions, while only 13% of Mineros residents and 11% of Lomas residents felt they had no impact on neighborhood decisions. Further, fewer Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors from vulnerable groups – those with low levels of formal education, from low socio-economic strata and from younger age groups – reporting having a significant impact in organizational decisions, than did neighbors from those vulnerable groups in Mineros San Juan and in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Only 4% of Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors with primary or no education felt that they had a high impact on neighborhood decisions, whereas that number was above 13% in both Mineros and Lomas. 9% of Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors from the lowest income groups felt that they had a high impact on neighborhood decisions, whereas that number was above 16% in both Mineros and Lomas. Finally, only 3% of Nueva Vera Cruz members 30 years old or less felt that they had a high impact on neighborhood decisions, compared to more than double that in both Mineros and Lomas. In other words, in valuing the professionalism and experience of their representatives, Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors without those qualities reported having less effect in local decisions than those in neighborhoods with more direct forms of participation. In the second section of the chapter, I will describe the ways that Nueva Vera Cruz’s representative forms of membership enabled the most effective citizen control over public entities of the three neighborhoods of study. Nevertheless, such a representative participation also implied lower levels of perceived integration for vulnerable groups within the neighborhood, and thus a less inclusive shared control of the social.

**Counter-hegemonic participation**

In contrast to the representative membership in the Nueva Vera Cruz collective, the Mineros San Juan neighborhood association demands and depends on the far wider participation of residents. While dirigentes also hold powerful positions in Mineros, their authority derives from its constant legitimation in neighbors’ common and daily interactions: in conversations at the local corner stores, during a break during a group’s community work, in chicherías (the illicit locales for drinking the local, alcoholic brew called *chica*). In this subsection, I examine the ways that a participatory collective is formed in Mineros San Juan. The counter-hegemonic discourse of the neighborhood described above legitimates the leaders and the collective in the face of their informal settlement and marginalized position in the city.

The neighborhood-wide assemblies in Mineros San Juan are staged in a large dirt field, lined on one side with a ledge from which dirigentes declaim. In the summertime, it is a shared space in which children take advantage of the assembly to play in the small pools formed by the seasonal rains. Women dressed in traditional skirts glance over at their children as they chat, knitting a blanket as they listen to the words of their president. Don Felipe, the maximum dirigente of the neighborhood, stands characteristically above the crowd, among a group of his fellow dirigentes, wearing an indigenous shawl and carrying a traditional, small bag for his...
coca. As he speaks, forcefully and convincingly, he sounds like the very President of the Republic, Evo Morales, condemning imperialism. Despite the fact that the Mineros president's critiques are more directly aimed against municipal rather than global forces, the call to mobilization is the same. He urges his fellow neighbors to protest the costs of installation of the public lighting in the neighborhood: “Comrades, if we have to keep harassing the authorities we will!” He uses a version of the local indigenous word for harassing, k’allay, which means to break open something particularly unyielding. “We will make our demands, and if they don't listen to us, then a k'allaypiadita!” (field notes 15.06.08). His motion receives general applause.

Not only at its Sunday assemblies, but also walking through its streets on any given day, Mineros San Juan's spirit of unity was readily apparent. Residents greeted passers by, and there were often small groups of neighbors working in the streets to dig trenches for the neighborhood water system. Stopping to chat with these neighbors about changes in Mineros since its establishment a decade ago more often than not revealed a tone of combative pride, whether because of the difficulties overcome in establishing the neighborhood, or in relation to the infrastructural development achieved in it. In comparison with the other sites of study, more neighbors (15%) in Mineros considered that their opinions had a high impact in neighborhood decisions (in contrast to 5% of Nueva Vera Cruz residents and 9% of Lomas residents). Vivid memories of struggles against their shared marginalization persisted in the Mineros collective memory. The mining identity constructed in the 1990s in Mineros emphasized an association with the revolutionary mining unions of the country that had toppled dictatorships. We see in the second section of this chapter that the construction of
Mineros' counter-hegemonic collective was premised on the discursive unity of the group and its embodiment in its local leader, since Mineros residents' ability to assert a marginal legitimacy depended on this unity. Each new assembly, as the paramount decision-making space, was the participatory and sometimes contentious site in which this unity was, nevertheless, re-legitimated. This dynamic both expressed and reinforced the counter-hegemonic character of the Mineros collective.

In interviews, a number of Mineros neighbors expressed exhaustion with the constant meetings and community work required to be a legitimate part of the local collective. But most residents surveyed and interviewed felt that it was important to remain unified in the face of their shared needs and challenges. One neighbor stated, “It’s good that they call these assemblies, that way we’re united,” and another said, “Now we’re one, all together, all of us” (interview 14.10.07). Of the three neighborhoods, residents of Mineros had the highest levels of participation and lowest levels of non-participation in local activities. Only 6% of Mineros residents said that they did not participate in neighborhood activities; in contrast in Nueva Vera Cruz, that number reached 25%.

During the period of study, the general assembly of Mineros was a critical space for the construction of the neighborhood collective. It was not simply an informational space, as were neighborhood assemblies in Nueva Vera Cruz. In Mineros, instead, the assembly was a fundamentally participatory space, where consensus was created and strategies for action were approved. Commentaries were constantly made among participants of the assembly. More importantly, they were also called out to the general assembly before decisions were made and the issue was voted on by general acclaim. The assembly was a space that, thus,
established cohesion among those present, who were most of the residents of the neighborhood.

The assembly was also a space in which those who endangered the local hegemonic unity were sanctioned. At one meeting, a neighbor publicly criticized the dirigentes for their approach to working with the municipal water company. He was roundly dismissed through immediate and aggressive counter-arguments. “Were you present at the last water meeting where this was discussed?” (field notes 07.10.07). Don Felipe demanded angrily. Thus, the assembly not only brought together the collective, but also rejected elements that endangered the implicit agreements fundamental to the group’s unity.

The organizational characteristics of the group meetings in Mineros San Juan supported its neighbors' cohesive alliance. Mineros residents participated in smaller group meetings as well, but these were not organized by blocks as they were in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. The groups in Mineros were far larger than the block groups in Lomas. Mineros group meetings of up to 100 participants therefore lacked the intimacy and familiarity of the small block meetings in Lomas. Even the different names of Mineros groups denoted a lack of personal involvement in the group. Many Mineros groups were annotatively named Sunday 1, Tuesday 3, etc., depending on the day that they were established, as groups of settlers were incorporated into the neighborhood. But in contrast to the way that Lomas was settled, people arriving in Mineros on the same day were not necessarily assigned contiguous lots. Thus, Mineros group members did not always live in the same part of the neighborhood. Mineros small groups also met less often than those in Lomas; some met every two weeks, some only met once a month, or more rarely. As a result, the closeness that existed in Lomas block groups, where personal concerns and daily interactions were shared among members, was not a central characteristic of Mineros groups.

Yet this distance also allowed the representatives of these groups to play more well-defined organizational roles. Since the Mineros groups tended to be more administrative than personal, so do Mineros group leaders play more administrative roles than block group leaders in Lomas. Mineros group officers acted as go-betweens or middle-men between the neighborhood leaders and the residents. This more hierarchically-defined position was evident in their group leaders titles; they were not called delegates, but “group officers.” In previous years, they were even called “group commanders.” One group officer emphasized his intermediary role in the organizations: “Why are we group officers? I understand that it’s our job to build bridges, to make some things viable [for the neighbors]. The group officer fulfills important functions: we control and we inform” (interview 22.10.07). Thus, Mineros group leaders acted in the service of the integration of neighbors and the neighborhood-level leadership.

The importance of the neighborhood-level collective in Mineros San Juan was grounded in its conflictive settlement, as described in Chapter Two above. Central to the shared identity of residents has been the collective, reconstructed memory of the miner, as was proudly described by one neighbor: “The miners are fearless, they instill fear. Because
once they grab some dynamite, like a rocket they’ll set it off. The miners’ bravery is impressive” (interview 18.08.07). Organized miners have a long history of mobilization and political activity in Bolivia. The force of their trade union was only dismantled with the 1985 New Economic Policy, which privatized the state mining companies and put more than 30,000 miners out of work. The period that ensued is known as the “relocalization”, as miners and their families relocated to cities and agricultural areas, like the coca-growing Chapare, with profound impacts on the social and political landscape of the country.

The number of ex-miners who settled in Mineros peaked in the early 1990s. Close to 40% of residents who arrived in 1994 named their place of origin as a mining community. A neighbor who was already established in the area before this high point of miner settlement recalled their arrival: They came with sticks and machetes, everyone else had to escape. The daughter of the owner is still fighting them, until now, they almost killed her” (interview 19.10.07). Another Mineros resident originally from a nearby rural area described the first group of miners that arrived: “They were well organized. There were so many of them, 120, 150 of them in that group. They told us that we would be called Mineros San Juan” (interview 18.08.07). Asked if those who had been there longer minded this imposition by the miners, this neighbor responded: “No, when they helped them keep their lots, they stayed silent.”

Among the miners, many of them came to the area through contacts. An ex-miner remembered the lot-trafficker with gratitude:

“I give him my thanks, because neither my father, nor my mother, gave me a place to live, but he did... He’s also from the mining area Llallagua. I’m a miner from there, my husband is a miner, all my family have been
miners. Because of the relocalization, that’s when we came looking for a new life, for work. This area was called Uspha Uspha. We gave it the name Mineros San Juan... I am with people from Llallagua. I’m fine here, there’s nothing I miss. It’s almost like Llallagua here.” (07.10.07)

At the time of the study, the symbol of the miner continued to coalesce the neighborhood identity. During the 2007 neighborhood anniversary, for example, youth from the area put on an outdoor theater performance. They chose to perform a piece that retold the story of the 1967 San Juan massacre, in which dozens of miners and their families were mercilessly killed by the military government.

Despite the discursive importance of the miner identity, however, the census conducted in 2007 showed that less than a quarter of current Mineros residents were ex-miners. And in fact, in self-reported levels of neighborhood participation, those ex-miners did not participate in neighborhood activities as much as neighbors from rural and urban sectors. While over 20% of neighbors from urban areas and close to 15% of neighbors from rural areas rated their levels of participation in neighborhood activities as high, only 12% of Mineros residents from mining areas reported they participated at that level. With the group of dirigentes who entered in 2007 – the first group of neighborhood leaders who were not ex-miners – the rhetoric shifted slightly, influenced by the changing national political discourse. Don Felipe, elected president of Mineros in that period, hailed from a rural area and stressed the indigenous elements of miners’ collective practices. He maintained a forceful and unifying discourse by incorporating the anti-imperialist discourse of Bolivia’s president Evo Morales. At the end of every large assembly, Don Felipe led the neighbors in the resounding call and response:

“Long live Mineros San Juan!!”
“LONG LIVE!!!”
“Long live Mineros San Juan!!”
“LONG LIVE!!!”
“Death to the Yankees!!”
“DEATH TO THEM!!” (field notes 12.08.07)

In leading this collective performance that repeatedly produced the group's unity, the Mineros president also reasserted his own legitimacy.

The legitimacy and authority of group leaders, as a whole, was also reflected in the fact that Mineros residents felt quite strongly that the neighborhood association reflected their concerns. Among the three neighborhoods, Mineros residents were the ones who felt most represented by neighborhood priorities: the percentage of neighbors who reported that their opinion had a high impact on neighborhood decisions was close to three times that percentage in Nueva Vera Cruz and one and a half times that percentage in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Nevertheless, as suggested above, the importance of symbolic unity in Mineros required the public dismissal of anyone who challenged the local hegemony. There was little tolerance for
discrepant opinions regarding visions and strategies of neighborhood development. The local hegemony that unified the group and legitimated its leaders thus also entailed particular risks.

**Communal associations within divergent logics**

Criss-crossing roads are etched into the steep dirt slope of Lomas de Santa Bárbara. On approaching the high hill on which Lomas sits, on an early Sunday morning, pockets of people can be seen dotting the roads. They are slowly gathering for their weekly block group meetings.

![Group meetings about to begin in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Credit: Centro Vicente Cañas archives 2006](image)

Women look for a jutting spot of the hillside or a large rock to sit on, while the men tend to remain standing. The meeting begins with a roll call. Sometimes, teenagers are sent as their families’ representatives, and there are also, inevitably, a number of small, sleepy children with their mothers. In the rainy season, these neighbors meet in one of their one-room homes.

An intimacy and closeness between block group members can be observed at these meetings, one based on sharing the same space and concerns. Everyone knows about the neighbor who asked to be excused from attending the meeting to care for his sick mother in his hometown. Or they look around for the representative of the family that is once again missing. One neighbor noted how unified the block groups are:

“In my block group, we’ve really helped each other out. We haven’t just
sat by and watched. We’ve helped each other out in making adobe blocks, among all of us. Also in the evictions, when they wanted to evict, if we hadn’t all helped out, my neighbor would have lost his house and lot. From the very beginning we’ve stuck together, and we still do.”
(interview 29.07.07)

About a third of current Lomas residents arrived after the initial conflict-ridden stage of the neighborhood settlement. Yet due to organizational forms within the neighborhood, they have been quickly integrated into the block groups. Over the period of study, groups of one to two dozen neighbors met in their block groups at least once a week, early in the morning. These small meetings were Lomas residents’ nexus of neighborhood participation. It was in these intimate gatherings that collectives were constructed with which residents most readily identified. It was also in these spaces that the parameters of participation were most decidedly drawn.

Despite the inordinate power of the lot-trafficker described in Chapter Two, the unity of the early block groups allowed neighbors to defend each other to some extent against unscrupulous evictions by their authoritarian leader. When surveyed in 2007, Lomas neighbors still looked to their block group leaders most often when seeking information about neighborhood decisions. When asked, “How do you find out about neighborhood decisions, if you were unable to attend a meeting?” over half of Lomas residents responded that they turned to their block group leaders. In contrast, in Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, most residents found out about community decisions through their neighbors or family members. Don Gavino, a Lomas delegate, explained:

“They all come if there’s a problem on the block. I blow the whistle and they all come. I blow the whistle if we have to pay the [shared] electricity bill, or the monthly neighborhood fee. What’s happening in other parts of the neighborhood? What are the dirigentes doing? The people need to be informed of these kinds of things.” (interview 18.07.07)

Thus, Don Gavino, like his fellow delegates, called the block group together if there was some extra-ordinary information or event and, more generally, informed the group of the discussions at the delegates’ meetings. Presiding over the early morning block group meetings that took place at his home, Don Gavino gathered his neighbors’ concerns, which he would then try to channel to the neighborhood association at the next Thursday night delegates’ meeting.

The proximity in Lomas to block group leaders, and neighbors’ distance from the neighborhood-level leaders, was also noted in residents’ comments. One neighbor commented that “people don’t pay attention to the dirigentes… Today they called everyone to work to clean up the cemetery, but hardly anyone has gone” (interview 25.07.07). In fact, another Lomas resident spoke about his block group delegate as his dirigente, a term in every other case used only to refer to organization-level leaders:
“In this block group our delegate sometimes tells us what we need to do, or that we need to clean up the road, because the water truck can’t enter... So we have to clean up the road so that it can come in. We talk amongst ourselves, then our dirigente – our delegate – tells us what we have to do. So every block group is in charge of a part of the road. Lists are checked, that way every one comes.” (interview 05.08.07)

The importance of the block group delegates was reflected in the fact that Lomas residents also dealt with problems between neighbors with delegates’ help more often than in the other two neighborhoods of study. In Lomas, 36% of residents surveyed said that problems between neighbors were resolved with the help of the block group delegate. In Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, only 4% and 15%, respectively, counted on their delegate’s help to resolve problems between neighbors. Mineros “group officers” had organizational roles and titles that were more authoritative than Lomas delegates, yet as we saw above, “group officers’” authority was founded precisely on their positions in the organizational hierarchy. The authority of Lomas delegates, in contrast, was more integral to the functioning of the block groups.

The centrality of the delegate was supported by the essential and daily importance of the block group itself. A neighbor in Don Gavino’s block group explained: “Especially as we’re all from somewhere else, we’ve shared everything. For example, we lend each other whatever we need. If I need something, my neighbors will lend it to me” (interview 05.08.07). Even neighborhood sports were organized by block groups. One delegate explained that “every block group is obligated to have a [soccer] team to play in the league of Lomas de Santa Bárbara. So each block group has to participate. On Sundays [the fields and surrounding areas are] full of people. There’s a women’s league and a boys’ league” (interview 15.08.07). The distinctive naming of the block groups in Lomas also indicated residents’ personal identification with these collectives. Don Gavino’s group was called the Sparrowhawks, and was one of the first block groups to be established. A Lomas resident from one of the other early block groups remembered: “First we were the Falcons, the Lions and the Sparrowhawks, we were made up of those three. Then came the Stars, and many others.” (focus group 12.08.07). Another group called themselves the Tigers; another, the Anacondas; then, there were the Wheelbarrowers, and even the Forgotten.

The close social relations in Lomas led to a greater legitimacy of personal concerns in the collective than was found in the other two sites of study and in public discourse more generally. That is, the organizational and social dynamics in Lomas did not assume the modern equation of the individual and familiar with the private sphere. Problems that individuals and their families experienced in Lomas, such as how children or spouses were treated, or whether one should use an appliance that consumed large amounts of electricity, became matters of collective concern in the block group spaces. Thus, the participation of Lomas residents was channeled through the intimate associations and shared daily concerns of these small groups.

The possibility of speaking of domestic issues in the block groups explains, in part, the
higher participation of women in Lomas than that of women in the other two neighborhood, as the space of the block group meetings took into account their concerns. A clear gender difference in participation was observed in the three neighborhoods of study, where in all three sites the percentages of men who reported their high levels of participation was always higher than the percentages of women with high participation. Yet more women in Lomas (15%) reported high levels of participation than in the other two neighborhoods (11% in Mineros and 7% in Nueva Vera Cruz).

Although in surveys women report that their participation is lower than that of men, they are nevertheless very present at general meetings and assemblies.

Credit: Author 2007

The Lomas delegate Don Gavino commented: “Participation is fine, it's coming along. For example, our delegate in my block group was a woman before, and before that a man. There's no restrictions” (interview 23.08.07).

In fact, individual integration into the collective was more equitable in Lomas than in the other two neighborhoods of study, not only by gender, but also by levels of education and age. Greater proportions of Lomas residents with low levels of formal education and in lower age groups had high levels of participation (see graphs on following page). The smaller spaces of the block groups facilitated a commonplace recognition of the validity of prosaic contributions of the neighbors, with less emphasis on categorical formal differences between people.
This gave a fundamental legitimacy to the block group delegates from populations normally marginalized within the public sphere. Across the three neighborhoods, not only did women turn to group representatives with their neighborhood concerns more often than men did, but so did younger neighbors.

Nevertheless, this importance of the block groups in Lomas and neighbors' dependence on the block group delegates hindered the representation of residents at the neighborhood level. That is, as the block group meetings often concerned more domestic and personal issues, it was difficult to translate the perceptions and preoccupations of these spaces to the more decidedly “public,” neighborhood-level issues discussed in the delegates’ and dirigentes’ meetings. Neighbors’ concerns, therefore, rarely reached representation within the neighborhood association and so remain unaddressed at that broader level. This effectively relegated particular issues – such as access to water, as we saw in the previous chapter – from neighborhood discussion.

That Lomas residents' personal concerns often failed to become neighborhood issues was also apparent in a separate study in which I took part, on the effects of international migration on community development in the Zona Sur (Roncken et al. 2009). Almost 15% of Lomas neighbors had a family member abroad, and many neighbors interviewed expressed concerns over the way that this affected both family and social relations. One Lomas resident, for example, complained that:

“Almost all of the people who go abroad come back, but then they think they're so important... Before, they would say 'Hello, how are you? How have things been with you?' Now they arrive and they don't even
greet you. They see you as something of little value, to be disdained. That's how people come back from abroad. They've become racist. They think very little of us.” (interview 01.06.08)

Yet despite such strong and widespread opinions on the effect of migration on his neighborhood's social relations, the president of Lomas had little sense of any relationship between migration and the neighborhood:

[Interviewer] “Do you think that international migration affects the neighborhood?”
[Lomas president] “No.”
“Not in any way?”
“No, it really doesn't affect us.”
“It doesn't affect the neighborhood at all?”
“No, it doesn't affect us.” (interview 10.01.08)

Thus, the organizational dynamics of the neighborhood marked personally experienced issues as private concerns and distanced these from those issues constituted as public, neighborhood concerns.

The inability of delegates to represent their block group’s concerns was reinforced by the hierarchical relationships between block group delegates and the dirigente, a legacy of the neighborhood’s history in the context of municipal development policies. One delegate complained that, “Sometimes when we speak up, we’re marked. ‘Why do you have to talk so much?’ [the dirigentes] ask us, even if what you’re saying is true” (interview 16.08.07). The fact that block group concerns did not reach neighborhood representation was also reflected in the fact that Lomas residents who reported high levels of participation did not necessarily perceive that their opinions had a high impact on neighborhood decisions. In Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, in contrast, high levels of participation were correlated with high perceived impact of one’s opinions in neighborhood priorities. Lomas de Santa Bárbara was the one neighborhood where this correlation did not hold. Lomas residents participated actively in their block groups, but did not necessarily identify with neighborhood-level authorities or priorities. A neighbor in Don Gavino’s block group stated that she did not go to the general neighborhood assemblies, but was always present at meeting called by Don Gavino: “I just go to those. I don’t go to anything else” (interview 11.08.07).

These dynamics of organizational fragmentation and weak neighborhood authority were also apparent in a candle parade held in August 2007 to celebrate the anniversary of the neighborhood. Neighbors, delegates and dirigentes were to progress in unison along the main street of the neighborhood. Because of poor coordination between the dirigentes and delegates, however, the dirigentes began at one end of the street, followed by a small group of neighbors, while most of the delegates with their block group members began at the other end of the
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3 Candle, or torch parades, are a civic ritual to commemorate allegiance to autonomous unity. They are held in homage to a Bolivian revolutionary patriot proclamations in 1809 against the Spanish colonists.
street. There ensued a confused commotion, with children running between one group and another and with a number of onlookers making amused comments. Some delegates and neighbors, however, were livid. Arguments arose and accusations flew across the groups. Many neighbors commented that the president of the neighborhood was not fit to lead them, some even demanding his immediate resignation.

These calls for resignation, however, did not arise only from the muddle made of the candle parade. They were, rather, a symptom of the poor coordination at the neighborhood level in Lomas de Santa Bárbara, and the weak authority of the president of the neighborhood. At the next delegates’ meeting, there were long discussions about the group of dirigentes leading the neighborhood. A few delegates hopefully suggested that, “We need to work together... we need unity, humility” (field notes 09.08.07). But far more were those who agreed with the delegate who declared, “The ruptures [in the organization] are clear” (field notes 09.08.07). Such ruptures, in fact, were clear before the failed parade, and became more so after the event. Since the neighborhood’s establishment, two different sectors of Lomas seceded from the neighborhood association. At one point in 2008, the neighborhood was split into four separate factions, but returned to a fragile unity in 2009. In what follows, I examine the implications of such a weak neighborhood collective for Lomas residents’ participation in civil society and the public sphere.

**B. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONSTITUTION OF CIVIL SOCIETY**

In this section, I examine the ways that collective control – both normative social control and citizen control of public authorities and institutions – is experienced in daily life in each of the study sites. Comparisons between the three collective logics described above will help to further clarify the institutional effects on daily social practices that construct civil society in the context of profound inequalities. I begin this examination with a focus on the normative social control exerted by and over residents of the three neighborhoods, in order to identify the regulative social practices that constitute the collective. I will, then, link the production of shared norms to the control of local authorities and public institutions, emphasizing the vital link between normative social control and collective control over public authorities and actions. In the final subsection, I will identify elements from these concrete experiences that can help us to better understand the possibilities and limits of collective control organized in the public sphere of a diverse and unequal civil society.

Different local, organizational characteristics imply distinct possibilities of exerting collective control over public institutions and activity. That is, different constructions of the public imply distinct mechanisms of citizen control. But again, as with the institutions of property and resource administration, current state institutions of participation and citizen control encourage neoliberal collective logics over others, thus reinforcing its inequalities. Counter-hegemonic logics replace neoliberal exclusions with others. And divergent logics are
simply marginalized despite the fact that they provide the most inclusive and equitable social relations.

**Shared norms and inclusive control of the social**

René Orellana (2003) writes that in indigenous communities, “Intimate conflicts of a familial order, as well as others related to the honor or the morality of persons, are attended to by community authorities” (25). At the beginning of the chapter, the social control enacted in indigenous communities was described. Social control in these contexts serves to enforce and, if necessary, reestablish the equilibrium of the community. The indigenous Aymaran leader Kurak Mallku, of the ayllus of North Potosí, described how community justice functions: “For example, if some member of the community errs, he or she is punished with the chicote [traditional whip] and it could also be with a fine. Or if it is not a monetary fine, it could be a product, something that benefits the community itself” (quoted in España et al. 2003:19).

Although many of the residents of Nueva Vera Cruz, Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara were, indeed, from mining or rural communities, periurban forms of social control were quite different from those found in syndicate or communal contexts.

Albó’s (2003) analysis of the different applications of customary law in rural and periurban areas, in which he points to the effects of the heterogeneity and size of periurban communities, is especially relevant for the neighborhoods of study. According to a 2004 study, migrants arriving to Cochabamba were more diverse than migrants to Bolivia’s other state capitals (Ledo 2004).4 This diversity was reflected in both Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan, in which neither residents from rural, nor mining, nor urban sectors constituted more than two thirds of the neighborhood's residents. These two neighborhoods had a particularly difficult time enforcing effective normative social control of their residents, as will be shown below. Of the three study sites, Lomas de Santa Bárbara had the most homogenous population, with almost 80% of its neighbors originating in rural areas. As a result of both this homogeneity, and the organizational structures in Lomas that were based on more intimate forms of participation, normative social control was stronger in this neighborhood than in the other two.

In Lomas' more communal spaces, there was more frequent daily contact among neighbors, for whom the border between the public and the private was less definitive than in the other sites of study. These more intimate social and organizational dynamics shaped Lomas' forms of normative social control, which were similar to the rural communal control based on shared values. One Lomas neighbor commented that, “When we have problems here in the group, here's where we try to solve them” (interview 18.08.07). One of the block group
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4 Ledo (2004) shows that the majority of immigrants to La Paz and El Alto are from the high plains region and the flows of migration to those cities are mostly from rural areas, while migrants to the city of Santa Cruz generally arrive from some part of the Amazon lowlands. In contrast, about half of the migrants to Cochabamba arrive from the high plains region, while the other half are from the valleys or the lowlands.
delegates recounted his group’s reaction to a case of domestic violence:

“All of us from the group went into his house, and we gave him a *chicotazo* [a whipping that is traditional punishment in community justice]. Since then we haven’t heard from him... Because we couldn’t just sit by and watch it happen. It’s like I’m back in my community, that’s how it makes me feel.” (interview 26.08.07)

The communal, collective control over group members was reflected in the fact that block groups were the spaces in which problems between neighbors were resolved.

The collective social control of group members can be understood as a way of maintaining the stability of the social group. In Lomas, this function was even institutionalized at the neighborhood-level in its Secretary of Conflicts position, a position rarely found in urban organizations. The Secretary of Conflicts, who was part of the neighborhood council, was charged with maintaining neighborhood harmony and was recognized and respected by leaders and neighbors. During an NGO-led workshop to professionalize the neighborhood council, the workshop facilitator sought descriptions for responsibilities and functions of the neighborhood officers, including the President, Vice-president, Secretary and the like. The participants duly provided him with these descriptions, supplemented by additional itemizing by the workshop leader. Once discussion turned to the Secretary of Conflicts, however, there was far more interest, commentary and laughter from the workshop participants. They spoke over one another to describe the Secretary of Conflict’s multiple roles: “Ensuring that there is respect, helping to solve problems”; “Theft, violations, quarrels, fights;” “There are lots of problems with animals, pigs, goats;” “It’s no joke. The Secretary of Conflicts is the one with the most work.” (field notes 14.02.08). Because Lomas' Secretary of Conflicts had to help solve conflicts between neighbors and assist in sustaining social relations in a context with residents from different areas of the country, only a resident who spoke Quechua, Aymara and Spanish was chosen.

Lomas' mechanisms and functions for controlling the social were also apparent in events narrated by a young Lomas resident, recounting her step-father's drunken hitting and killing of a neighbor. The neighbors duly carted the guilty party off to the Judicial Technical Police and to the District Attorney. But they also sought to make the young woman pay the community for her step-father's crime, through fees and community work. According to the neighbor, the fees requested were extraordinary. With time, however, the neighbors saw that, unlike her step-father, the young woman sought to support the community's stability. She worked conscientiously to pay her neighborhood fees and never shirked her community responsibilities. She noted, “It's because they saw that I worked hard on my own. I made my own house, they saw that... And since I lived, I fulfilled all my obligations, the neighbors supported me” (interview 26.11.07). In this case, the residents used both state law and the force of the collective to harmonize social relations. The punishment of the step-father was through legal means, and he never came back to live in Lomas. The re-integration of the young
woman into the community, however, was through customary means of fulfilling community responsibilities.

Given that the block groups were the intimate sites of control over group members, the perception residents had some control over irregular or undesirable activity was stronger in Lomas de Santa Bárbara than in the other two neighborhoods. Crime, for example, was a frequently mentioned as a primary concern by Mineros and Nueva Vera Cruz residents. In contrast, on being asked about house break-ins, one Lomas resident responded, “Thank goodness nothing like that has happened in our group” (interview 18.08.07). Another Lomas neighbor related what would happen if strangers were seen in their area:

“We know each other among neighbors. 'Who are those people,' [we'll say,] 'their relatives?' A thief is one kind of person, those of us who live here are another kind. We know the neighbor, so we know that. So we’ll ask [the neighbor about the stranger]. We’ll introduce them: 'This is my relative.' They also have my cell phone number, so they can call me.” (interview 31.07.07)

The intimacy among Lomas neighbors made public safety a personal and manageable issue.

Social norms were enforced very differently in Mineros San Juan and Nueva Vera Cruz. In both those neighborhoods, it was clear that social control over the residents was weaker, with individuals less integrated and regulated by the local collectives. In both Mineros and Nueva Vera Cruz, neighbors were very worried about thieves. The sense of insecurity and of the lack of social control was evident in comments from neighbors in both sites. One resident from Nueva Vera Cruz commented, “That house that’s being constructed there across the street, they’re also hoodlums, we all know it. But what can we say? All we can do is watch them” (interview 18.11.07). Many female neighbors from Mineros worried most about “personal safety, because there’s a lot of violence here, a lot of violence in the family, a lot of physical attacks” (interview 22.11.07). Another Mineros neighbor complained,

“There are times that guys come around in gangs, they walk around drinking, it’s terrible. One day I was going to work down there, to wash clothes, and they broke into my house, they robbed me. They’re really bad guys who come around, it’s really awful. A woman came by and told us that [residents of a nearby neighborhood] were lynching one of [those guys].” (interview 07.10.07)

But while crime was mentioned frequently in both Nueva Vera Cruz and in Mineros, the latter neighborhood’s more intense collective participation and identity allowed Mineros residents to develop shared notions and discourses regarding collective control over the social. When the physical attack of a young teenager by her boyfriend led to her death, an old-time Mineros neighbor commented that:

“We always have to stick together... As for [the mother of that girl], it
was also her fault since she didn’t sound the signal with the petards, or at least go from house to house notifying us... We could have done something... The young man was also in his house, we could have taken hold of him.” (interview 21.10.07).

Other neighbors likewise spoke of the need for neighborhood responses to such events. Indeed, the leadership of Mineros discursively encouraged their neighborhood’s collective imaginary of social control, despite the fact that there was, in fact, little collective action against crimes. Throughout the period of study, Mineros neighbors continued to complain of delinquency and theft. After her house was robbed, one Mineros neighbor decided to transfer her bread stand from the main city market to the corner near her house, in order to keep watch over it, even though she now earns far less. Social control in Mineros, thus, played a more important discursive role than it did an effective role.

The belligerent, discursive unity of Mineros San Juan was also apparent in the neighborhood’s reactions to increasing crime in the area. An extreme consequence of this “you’re-one-of-us-or-against-us” tendency was the attitude that neighbors took towards groups of the neighborhood’s own residents, blaming them for the heightened insecurity. As burglaries increased, security became a theme of discussion in more neighborhood assemblies. At a general assembly, the Mineros president declaimed:

“We all know that every few days there’s a burglary. Why? Because there are *chicherías*, where some people drink and others are watching. You leave your home for half an hour and when you get back, you have no television, your gas tanks are gone, you've been robbed. But, we should take care of each other among neighbors! If we see a burglary, we must stop them. What will they do, then, rob us? They won't, comrades, if we stop them. We must stop them, the thieves are from our very own neighborhood!” (field notes 15.06.08).

Those thieves, moreover, were assumed to be young men from the neighborhood. The self-defensive and combative disposition that helped to conform the collective identity of Mineros residents found its scapegoat in the youth who residents feared were behind the robberies.

According to Bauman (2005), fear in contemporary urban life drives its residents to construct communities as “safe environments.” This means making public spaces into enclaves that can be defended and only selectively accessed; “separation instead of negotiation in common life; the criminalization of residual difference” (136-7). This affirms a collective identity through the exclusion – even a violent exclusion – of a feared Other. At the same Mineros assembly where the question of crime was raised, a neighbor responded: “We can make dummies and hang them on posts,” referring to the practice of using these dummies as warning signs of the fate that would befall criminals in the area. “And if it's possible,” continued the neighbor, “put their names on there too. That way we know who it is among us
who's doing this!” It would not be difficult to imagine such collective actions intensifying and becoming unruly enough to seek release in the kinds of lynchings that have been reported in other periurban areas of Cochabamba.

The unified collective of Mineros depended, as has been shown, on the counter-hegemonic definition of a shared enemy. In this case, that enemy was internal to the community, with several Mineros residents interviewed blaming crime on their young male neighbors.

One resident, for example, said the problem was “youth who get together in gangs... whose parents don't control them” (interview 12.05.08). In a recent study of perceptions of crime in periurban areas of Cochabamba, Hinojosa et al. (2006) explain how the youth of these areas tend to be targets of both concern and distrust:

“The perception that associates youth with offenses tends to criminalize the youth, even more so if the youth in question are poor. In this way, the criminalization of youth is fused with the criminalization of poverty. The combination of both phenomena makes it even less possible for youth of urban poor neighborhoods to feel safe, regardless of their own personal actions. In this sense, it is not by chance that many victims of recent hangings in Cochabamba are young.” (17)
Criminalization here is understood as a specific form of stigmatizing or “embodying malevolence in subjects selected for that purpose” (Niño 2002:202).

Thus, in Mineros San Juan, just as the “new neighbors” were marginalized within the neighborhood in order to legitimate alternative collective values, so were young men suspected for their potential disruption of neighborhood norms. This points to an important difference between the normative social control exercised in Lomas and in Mineros. While Lomas residents directed their control over individuals who transgressed shared norms, the counter-hegemonic logic of Mineros discursively defined categories of people to be excluded. Such an attitude reproduced the marginalization that Mineros residents experienced as a group more generally. Recall, for example, the ways that Mineros children were teased in school for hailing from the neighborhood considered the violent home of “Talibans.” Counter-hegemonic unity, and participatory forms of organization, more generally, are not without their complexities.

Nueva Vera Cruz’s neoliberal logic of representative membership helps to clarify differing dynamics in the enforcement of norms in that neighborhood. We saw above that Nueva Vera Cruz residents tended to participate in local issues through their representatives rather than directly. By belonging to a collective defined more by formal and representative inclusion, rather than presence in neighborhood meetings and collective actions, the neighbors of Nueva Vera Cruz lacked a direct organizational mechanism of social control over fellow neighbors. One neighbor described the time her own house was broken into, and the reaction of her neighbors:

“[My neighbors] were standing there, two months ago, and I was going to church, and they said that thieves had gone in and were carrying things out of my house! And then I saw a man coming right out of my house. I had to yell, ‘What are you doing! Thieves! Get out!’ And the neighbors looked at me as if to say, ‘This woman is crazy.’ They didn’t even come over to tell me about the other one!... My neighbors never said anything, they didn’t make any noise, there’s not that kind of unity here. That’s what makes me despair.” (interview 21.11.07)

Neighbors in Nueva Vera Cruz did not seem to have a way to participate in a normative control over the circumstances and behaviors in their collective. The neighborhood’s dirigentes proposed a plan by which neighbors sounded a whistle to warn that there was some problem. However, given the low attendance in neighborhood meetings and residents’ high participation in arenas beyond the neighborhood, the proposed plan never took off. One neighbor described, “We were supposed to use a whistle when there was a robbery or something. It's never been used” (interview 05.07.07). As a result of these dynamics, relatively few Nueva Vera Cruz residents worked with their neighbors to prevent undesirable activity. 82% of Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents surveyed responded that they collaborated with their neighbors to prevent irregular activity, while 67% of Mineros residents responded likewise. In
Nueva Vera Cruz, in contrast, only about a third of residents said that they organized among themselves to prevent undesirable activity.

The way that the neighborhood association levied fines in Nueva Vera Cruz also displayed a general lack of control over fellow neighbors' activities. There was simply no way to enforce fines for those who did not participate anyway in neighborhood activities. One neighbor lamented:

“Those people [who never attend meetings] are content. Those of us who do come to the meetings and duly pay our fees and everything, we’re still fined if we miss once or twice... I believe it’s going to keep being the same, a few of us are going to keep getting together to talk about a few things.” (interview 16.11.07)

In contrast, in Lomas and Mineros, fines for missing meetings were more enforceable by the closer daily contact between neighbors, their delegates and dirigente. Extending this criticism to normative social control more generally, the Nueva Vera Cruz vice-president Doña Marina noted that residents had little influence over the activities of their fellow neighbors, “since the majority of people don’t participate” (interview 21.11.07).

There was, however, one organizational characteristic that supported collective control over Nueva Vera Cruz residents. Nueva Vera Cruz groups that provided a specific, collective service often took the form of supplier-consumer relations through which particular resident activity could be directed. If a member of the water network, for example, failed to attend the protest march called for by the neighborhood association, his or her access to the water system could be turned off. Or a resident could also be rewarded for his or her support, as one neighbor described:

“So, I always went, I went along with that [a march called for by the neighborhood association]. They told me that they were going to give me [access to water network]. 'Because you’re always at the meetings, you can be part of the water network,' they told me.” (interview 17.08.07)

In that case, to be part of a collective constructed through supplier-consumer relations was to be linked to that group by that very service.

Collective and social relations based largely on shared services, however, limit the issues to which the group may respond. As Albó (2003) writes about organizations in periurban areas:

“Many statutes of neighborhood associations include attributes that were common in the immigrants’ places of origin. But, in fact, the cases in which these intervene are more and more centered on the provision and maintenance of basic services and in boundary conflicts between lots.” (102)
The kind of participation implicit in supplier-consumer relations and neoliberal logics individualizes and channels it to technical aspects, separating its functioning from fundamental social and normative questions. For example, Doña Marina noted that people did sometimes organize around specific needs, “Like in '99, when Petrolera Avenue was constructed, there was no public consultation. So neighbors did start to go to meetings. They demanded that there be a roundabout, and walkovers as well” (interview 05.07.07).

Roundabouts and walkovers all along the avenue were indeed built. And neighbors stopped going to meetings. The instrumental and limited nature of the residents' demands did not produce a more enduring identification with the neighborhood collective nor participation in the sustained task of consolidating its shared norms. The form that social organization took in Nueva Vera Cruz helped to shape and extend dominant neoliberal logics that conceive of collective interests as an aggregation of individual interests. In social forms in which collective interests articulate—both express and bring together—individual interests, in contrast, a transformative relationship more clearly exists between the individual and collective. Mineros president Don Felipe described such a logic in his neighborhood:

“Andean conceptions of freedom are not individual. Freedom is collective. People who think individually say, they can't prohibit me. But you – by not participating – can't prohibit others who have rights, rights to basic services, for example. So we begin with the communal logic. We say that we have all have to participate. The one that doesn't participate prejudices the group.” (interview 13.11.07)

This implies dynamics in which both the collective constitution of the individual is made explicit, and in which the individual partakes in the shaping of group norms.

The importance of the concept of collective control—and the reason it has held such force and hope in Bolivia in the last decade—is precisely due to its potential to restore normative questions of social justice to the shared administration of public goods. If a collective’s members are to be able to intervene in or influence group norms, their participation must be based on more than shared services. The expression, legitimation and joint construction of shared values takes place through daily practices of social control over other group members. And such commonly constructed values are the foundation for the collective control over public authorities and issues. Otherwise, that control can only be directed by particular or external interests.

**Legitimacy and collective control over local authorities**

As in the case of normative social control, collective control of local authorities in periurban neighborhoods is influenced by—yet distinct from—collective control of authorities in indigenous and mining communities. Elba Flores writes that in rural areas, collective control is the legitimacy that authorities are granted, “backed by the assembly, in order to carry out
collective decisions” (2003:130). In the rural areas that Flores studied, the inherent link between authorities and the assembly was based on the legitimacy of community decisions in representing shared values. In this subsection, I explore the ways that the social control of group members helped to establish shared values in periurban areas. These shared values implied particular social relations that were materialized in the representative figure and functions of the local authorities. That is, if the normative social control of neighbors was understood as the personal and individual contribution to the stability of a set of social relations, then the collective control of authorities was the public manifestation and discursive sustenance of this stability.

The issue of the legitimacy of authority requires linking questions of normative social control to issues of collective control over public authorities and goods. Across the three neighborhoods, there was a very strong correlation between the opinion that neighbors could prevent irregular activities (normative social control) and the opinion that neighbors could ensure that their neighborhood leaders acted in the interest of all (collective control over authorities).

In other words, normative social control is indeed related to the collective control over local authorities. If normative social control provides mechanisms for the construction of a community around implicit agreements regarding what is valid or not for the group, the dirigentes or delegates and the neighborhood or group decisions are representations of these implicit community agreements. A review of how local leaders are controlled will help to more clearly identify the links between shared norms and legitimate representation.

In Mineros San Juan, for example, the dirigentes’ authority was particularly important to sustain the unity and stability of the collective. It was, thus, important that the leaders’ authority remain largely unquestioned. All members of the neighborhood leadership followed programmatic line set out by their president, Don Felipe. At meetings and in interviews with groups of dirigentes, Don Felipe tended to speak; if others contributed, it was almost exclusively to support his argument. If hegemony is understood to be consent to domination, then the organizational dynamics in Mineros were clearly hegemonic. Generally, dirigentes, delegates and neighbors did not feel coerced or oppressed by their president’s domineering style, but instead, felt represented by his powerful speech and actions.

During Don Felipe's two-year term as neighborhood president, only one of the dirigentes seemed to challenge his authority. Beginning about three months into their shared term, the vice-president of the neighborhood began to note Don Felipe's excessive self-importance, although only in private interviews and conversations. The tension between the two neighborhood leaders grew over the next months, as the vice-president grew increasingly vocal in his criticisms of Don Felipe. Without mentioning the vice-president by name, Don Felipe began to speak – both privately and publicly – about dirigentes who did not truly have the interests of the neighbors at heart. The other dirigentes said little about the
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5 The statistical correlation for the two questions: "Can neighbors organize among themselves to prevent some irregular activity?" and "Can neighbors exercise collective control over the local leaders so that these act in the public interest of the neighborhood residents?" (n=875) is 0.000.
animosity between the two. Finally, in a general assembly and before hundreds of neighbors, Don Felipe accused the vice-president of engaging in negotiations for land titling separately from the neighborhood association. As land-titling was easily the most charged neighborhood issue at the time, outraged neighbors began to shout criticisms and questions at the vice-president. He was only awkwardly able to begin defending himself, before he was publicly and immediately dismissed from his position before the noisy general assembly, charged as an enemy to the collective interest. Such a dramatic public judgment and expulsion supported the type of collective that has been constituted in Mineros since its inception, one in which the single figure of the maximum dirigente discursively unified the group.

In such a context, it was clearly difficult for overt criticisms of authorities to emerge. Instead, community control of Mineros leaders more often emerged in informal spaces.

It was through rumors circulating among neighbors – in stores, street encounters and in smaller group meetings – that criticism and control over the leadership was established. This was evident in the way that the previous group of dirigentes was unseated. Through rumors and small talk, perceptions that members of the board were taking over neighborhood public spaces began to circulate. Casual as these commentaries were, their circulation and growing confirmation was finally amplified at a general assembly. With close to 300 residents gathered in the sunken field, the aggregate commentaries gathered strength and a force of their own and became explicit.

Neighbors began to talk amongst themselves, discussing whether or not their leaders were looking out for their collective interests. One neighbor later noted that, “Everyone had been commenting. Comments aren’t made in vain. They don’t appear out of nowhere” (interview 18.10.07). A group officer asked the first public question about the illegitimate land
use. Soon, overlapping demands and challenges began to be yelled out, and a general call for
the expulsion of the entire group of *dirigentes* spread like wildfire. While collective control was
exerted publicly in this assembly, and did have the intense institutional effects of ousting an
entire group of community leaders, this collective control over authorities was only possible
given the previous deliberation in informal spheres. We saw above that overt criticisms of the
leadership were summarily dismissed. The dismissal of authorities was only possible because
there was already a massive concurrence of opinion that finally found expression at the public
assembly. As the group officer who sparked the challenge to the leaders actions related, “from
the moment I first asked, it exploded. Another person asked, then another followed directly, then
everyone was demanding an explanation” (interview 18.10.07).

Given the importance of the Mineros leadership in materializing the symbolic,
communal unity of the neighborhood, however, the dissolution of the *dirigentes*’ legitimacy
required an immediate substitution. In the same assembly in which the *dirigentes* were all
ousted, a new group of neighborhood leaders was quickly elected, headed by Don Felipe. One of
Don Felipe’s first actions, during the same assembly, was to create a Transparency Committee.
This committee was charged with overseeing the *dirigentes*’ activities and processes, to ensure
their legitimacy before the neighbors. It is notable that the Transparency Committee was
never functional, nor, perhaps was it ever seriously meant to be. Far more important at that
first assembly was the symbolic gesture of the Transparency Committee: the reinstatement of
the legitimacy of the neighborhood’s authorities.

The processes that led to the expulsion of the Mineros leaders reflected the importance
of daily social activities in the collective control over authorities. As in the indigenous
communities that Flores studied, “control is exercised through non-institutional practices that
are part of cultural life, through gossip, through social censure” (130). Because of the symbolic,
unifying importance of Mineros leaders, residents’ collective control over their actions could
only be dramatically and publicly expressed once such informal mechanisms of control
gathered force. These same patterns of collective action were apparent in the way that
collective decisions were often made in Mineros. Although neighborhood decisions were only
made after public discussions in general assemblies, the parameters of those discussions and
neighbors’ positions on them were always previously established through less formal
combinations. In both group meetings and in informal chats with their neighbors, Mineros
residents explored positions regarding issues that would be discussed at the next assembly.
During the time that negotiating prices for their land was a pressing neighborhood issue, for
example, groups of Mineros residents could be found debating the pros and cons of different
prices and approaches to land titling.

In Lomas, the dynamics of collective control over local authorities were very different.
Because organizational forms in Lomas were based on more intimate forms of participation,
the border between public and private spheres was less definitive. As we saw above, this made
normative social control stronger than in either Mineros or Nueva Vera Cruz. The very
micro-spaces that allowed for these participatory characteristics, however, also reduced the
sense of unity at the neighborhood level. Thus, Lomas residents were far more concerned with
the collective control of their block group leaders than of their neighborhood-level leaders.
One Lomas resident stated: “If the [block level] delegate is irregular, or lies to the group, or
doesn’t fulfill his or her obligations, then we simply have to replace him or her with another
delegate, one that can work for the group” (interview 18.10.07). Another commented on her
delegate:

“Yes, he has to render accounts, at least once a year. Just a while ago he
rendered accounts and everything was fine. Everyone was happy, now
we’re doing fine. The previous delegate was corrupt and until now he
still owes us. We’ve determined that in two meetings.” (interview
11.11.07)

This attention to the collective control over block group delegates made delegates more
legitimate representatives of Lomas residents than their neighborhood leaders.

Within this context, however, delegates focused their attention on their limited group
and its needs, and did not necessarily work to improve the neighborhood as a whole. In one
case, a delegate proposed a project for municipal financing whose benefits would be limited to
his block group’s small sector. Delegates who saw that particular neighborhood leaders’
actions harmed their block group members would denounce these dirigentes in
neighborhood-wide meetings. But in their commitment to their block groups, and in the
absence of a practical or discursive unity at the neighborhood level, delegates remained
uncoordinated. They did not function as a bridge between the block group and neighborhood
level since there was no clearly articulated shared vision that defined a neighborhood
collective, as there was in Mineros. While the Mineros collective was manifested in and
reinforced by the figure of a legitimate community leader, there was no antagonistic frontier
against which Lomas defined itself as a group or neighborhood-level representative who might
embody its unity.

The expulsion of an entire group of dirigentes in Lomas de Santa Bárbara exemplified
these dynamics. Over the course of several months in 2007-2008, disagreements regarding how
to deal with the issue of land titling arose and intensified in the neighborhood. Some delegates
and neighbors felt that they should write to the President of the Republic, who had already
made dispensations in favor of the usufruct law. In these cases, after seven years of occupation
without claims made to the land, the possessors became the legal owners of the land. Others
said it was important to keep negotiating with the owners with municipally-registered
property titles. Yet another faction said that would be a waste of time, as there were other
owners who claimed the property was theirs, and the alleged owners might have false papers.
The neighborhood-level leaders did not take a firm position on the matter and tensions grew.
In one Thursday night delegates' meeting, admonitions and accusations were hurled back and
forth among delegates and dirigentes. Some delegates said they were preparing a march with
their neighbors, and dirigentes were cowardly not to support it. The Secretary resigned, and
the Treasurer threatened to quit, as well. The delegates’ meeting continued late into the night, but the matter was not resolved. Throughout the next week, there were heated discussions in block group meetings and negotiations between delegates. A general assembly was called, and in it the remaining dirigentes were expelled.

Yet in contrast to Mineros’ immediate election of representatives to replace their overthrown dirigentes, Lomas residents took longer than six months to agree on a new group of leaders. As argued above, Lomas neighborhood-level leaders were not as central to residents’ daily lives as were block group leaders, nor did they serve as important a symbolic function as they did in Mineros. We saw that fulfillment of shared needs, such as access to water, functioned at the block group level. Thus, the absence of neighborhood-level dirigentes did not change the daily lives of Lomas residents. Further, the factionalism among block groups described above implied a greater commitment to these groups than to the neighborhood as a whole. This hampered the ability of the neighborhood collective to agree on a set of new dirigentes. Several elections were held, but due to different neighborhood factions’ objections, these were subsequently annulled as illegitimate. One of the expelled dirigentes explained how the neighborhood had split off into several contingents: “They’ve divided up into four groups… They reject all of us. They don’t want any part.” (field notes 12.05.08). Don Gavino, a delegate who headed a group opposing the previous neighborhood leaders said, “We’re going to establish another group of dirigentes here... and this group is going to be solid and is going to do it right” (field notes 12.05.08). At one point during the interim six months, there were two self-proclaimed groups of leaders working in parallel. Finally, the dirigentes who had been originally ousted were brought back to head the neighborhood. While the hegemonic unity of Mineros required the immediate restoration of dirigentes to personify their unity, it was difficult for Lomas de Santa Bárbara’s fragmented neighborhood to agree on their group of leaders. Implicit agreements about what was valid or not for the group were very strong in Lomas block groups. Articulated concurrently, these were strong enough to censure the dirigentes. Yet these localized agreements were, finally, too diverse to concur on a leader or group of leaders to represent them.

Finally, in Nueva Vera Cruz, the less directly participatory dynamics of the neighborhood organization suggested a weaker collective control over authorities than was found in Lomas and Mineros. This could be explained by the very same characteristics that defined Nueva Vera Cruz’s lower levels of participation in neighborhood issues: the greater proportion of residents with urban backgrounds, the lower levels of commitment to stay in the neighborhood and the higher numbers of renters. Across all three neighborhoods, each of these factors was indeed correlated with a lower perception of the ability to exercise collective control over their leaders and local organization.  

---

6 61% of urbanites compared to 72% of non-urbanites responded that neighbors could exert collective control over local authorities, while the statistical correlation for the two questions: “Do you think you will remain in the neighborhood the next 10 years?” and “Can neighbors exercise collective control over the local leaders so that these act in the public interest of the neighborhood residents?” (n=875) was 0.000.
It is important to note, however, that participation did not simply disappear in more urbanized neighborhoods of Cochabamba. Instead, it took on different forms, such as the representative participation described in Nueva Vera Cruz. The same was the case for collective control over local authorities. Nueva Vera Cruz residents did not lack collective control over their leaders, but rather, took on particular characteristics. In interviews, Nueva Vera Cruz residents had far more practical suggestions for the neighborhood leaders than residents in Mineros and in Lomas. One Nueva Vera Cruz neighbor recommended that, “They should go to the Sub-Municipality and find out what is going on there. They can tell them there what’s happening. They should be aware of those things” (interview 17.11.07).

That is, while Lomas and Mineros residents often judged the personal characteristics of their leaders, Nueva Vera Cruz residents were more likely to make assessments based on particular and concrete activities: “The neighborhood leaders need to communicate constantly that there are meetings, that’s how we can all improve, through the neighborhood leaders” (interview 18.11.07). Another Nueva Vera Cruz neighbor explained his support of his dirigentes:

“They showed us papers. Yesterday they explained [the water project] to us, explaining it to us on posters. ‘Now,’ [they say,] ‘if you want to know anything about the project, if you think we’re cheating you or taking too much money, come and look. There are papers, you can make photocopies, read them, even if you just want to hold onto them. No one here is tricking you.’ They’re transparent, they’re not cheating us.” (interview 17.11.07)

Thus, in Nueva Vera Cruz, there was no massive concurrence of collective control over neighborhood leaders as was apparent in Mineros assemblies. Instead, there existed a more formalized and technical control of Nueva Vera Cruz leaders. Despite the small number turnout at neighborhood meetings, at each one there was a public review of financial accounts.
that confirmed the transparency of the leaders’ work. As discussed in the previous chapters, Nueva Vera Cruz leaders were legitimized by their professional actions and experiences, and the possibility that this expertise afforded them to engage in coordinated actions.

Even the last change of the dirigentes in Nueva Vera Cruz was channeled through formal documentation and strategic planning, instead of by general impassioned acclamation, as in Mineros and Lomas. Dirigentes and neighbors had agreed at an assembly that the nearby garbage dump should be closed, and that Nueva Vera Cruz as a group would stand by that decision. One neighbor participated in a small group of residents who sought to have the dirigentes replaced. He recounted that despite the assembly agreement,

“There were negotiations with the mayor, and our president went and signed his approval that the dump should stay. Well, we had the documents and we went to the assembly and showed them, 'Here it is, in another assembly we had decided just the opposite.'” (interview 09.11.07)

The group of Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors spearheading the recall employed formal mechanisms, proving through documentation that the neighborhood president had failed to fulfill his duties. Not only did the tone of the revocation process of Nueva Vera Cruz leaders differ from the replacement of leaders in Mineros and Lomas, but its very logic differed. In Nueva Vera Cruz, rationalized accountability by a representative group of neighbors was central to the recall, in contrast to Mineros' and Lomas' collective demand by the force that rested on the group's unity.

The importance of documents in Nueva Vera Cruz was palpable not only in this case, but in all the dirigentes’ work. It reflected the professionalism of the neighborhood leaders and the organization’s valuing of representation and rationality. Yet with the weaker shared norms of the neighborhood, and the calculable accountability rather than shared identification that neighbors used to scrutinize the authority of their local leaders, such citizen control was not experienced as collective control by the neighbors of Nueva Vera Cruz. After some residents went to the city center to join the protest that had been agreed upon collectively, but then later cancelled by the dirigentes, one of them said angrily, “We’re not going next time they call us, let them protest” (field notes 09.12.07). Nueva Vera Cruz residents entrusted their leaders to represent their concerns in the public sphere, but they did not necessarily identify with them.

A Zona Sur resident noted the difference between the way that leaders were selected in the city, and in his rural community of origin. In the city, he maintained, residents chose “the most confident ones... the one who knows how to read. He will be the best, he’ll be able to get things done” (interview 16.11.07). Particularly in urbanized neighborhoods such as Nueva Vera Cruz, the municipal frameworks within which a dirigente has to “get things done” determines how authority is locally legitimated. In contrast, in the rural system of authorities, “Everyone has to have their turn, because we all eat the same from the land” (interview 27.08.07). He
explained:

“Everyone has to do one year. One year, and the next year, it's someone else. And everyone has to do it. But [the authorities] are not chosen from everyone, only the lower dirigentes are chosen. There is a head [dirigente] that has to get them ready. So that those that follow, those that are lower, have to start there. So that following the stronger ones, they can learn. The next post will then be filled by the one who's learned. Then in another term, he'll go to the head. That's how they choose there.”
(interview 27.08.07)

Similarly, some block group leaders in Lomas and Mineros were selected on a rotational basis rather than by election.

More generally as well, residents in those other two neighborhoods used standards quite different from professional accountability to evaluate their leaders. In both Lomas de Santa Bárbara and Mineros San Juan, neighbors stressed their leaders' ability to relate to their situation, and conversely, the importance of their own identification with him. In Lomas, the leaders with whom neighbors most closely related were their block group delegates. As these delegates were their own close neighbors, there was a ready identification with them, and their legitimacy as representatives was reinforced in daily observation and contact. Nevertheless, the strength of these very localized block groups and the weak formal organization at Lomas' neighborhood level led to a lack of legitimate neighborhood-level authorities. In Mineros San Juan, neighbors did identify quite closely with their neighborhood leader: One Mineros resident judged that: “This president is doing well... he’s in favor of the poor people” (interview 14.10.07). Another said, similarly, “The most important thing for a dirigente is that he can work with the people, that he can talk with them and work with them” (interview 21.10.07). Nevertheless, as we have seen above, the oppositional unity that the maximum dirigente represented in Mineros was framed in hegemonic dynamics that brooked little dissent.

**Accountability and citizen control over the state**

In this final subsection, I turn to the close links between the internal neighborhood forms of participation and collective control explored above, and the forms of collective control over public institutions beyond the neighborhood. Different local, organizational characteristics imply distinct possibilities for exerting collective control over public institutions and activity. For residents of the Zona Sur, inclusion within the urban public and in the city's political and economic structures depends to a significant extent on their ability to exert such citizen control. We will see below that the collective logics examined in the three study sites each implies a distinct set of mechanisms for citizen control over state – particularly municipal – institutions, and therefore, a distinct set of possibilities for
socio-political relations and positions.

Previous chapters described how the Law of Popular Participation led, among other results, to fragmentation and increased competition between local neighborhood organizations. As we saw in Chapter Two, the Law of Popular Participation contributed to clientelistic dynamics and reinforced representative participation to the detriment of participatory and communal forms of organization. A Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente lamented:

“Since the Law of Popular Participation in 1994, neighborhood associations get titles... So they [the state as represented in the municipality] tell us, 'You have corporate legal recognition, you're legal. Now you have money that we'll give to you.' So you have your birth certificate as an organization. This has meant that the dirigentes are the ones who can decide on anything. Before, that wasn't the case. The community had to decide in assembly. There was a logic of neighborhood associations that had grown over many years, but that was broken by the Law of Popular Participation.” (interview 13.11.07)

As organizational forms and collective logics of a neighborhood became more representative, their dirigentes were better able to work and be effective within the municipal framework, as we saw above with the case of Nueva Vera Cruz. Yet paradoxically, we also saw that in this form of collectivity, members were less likely to share implicit norms, and the organization was less likely to represent its most vulnerable members.

It was in this context that clientelist municipal dynamics fostered, which influenced even the way that the Supervising Committees – groups of elected citizens charged to oversee municipal accountability – functioned. As such, Zona Sur residents found little possibility of satisfying their demands through these formal institutionalized channels. Instead, they generally strove to exert collective control over state or public entities in the form of protests, demonstrations or unofficial negotiations. Lomas de Santa Bárbara and Mineros San Juan residents commonly sought to pressure municipal or state authorities through mobilizations. And although Nueva Vera Cruz residents did mobilize as well, their collective control over public institutions took on a more strategic character, as their dirigentes collaborated with other organizations to reach common goals.

Throughout the period of study, Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents organized frequently to protest against the municipality’s unfulfilled promises and obligations. In 2007, President Evo Morales attended a ceremony in Lomas to personally hand over a check (underwritten by the Venezuelan government) to the city mayor for the construction of a public school in the neighborhood. Months after the President’s visit, there was no sign of any construction. The President himself condemned this inactivity, with the city newspaper reporting that “the Chief of State denounced that the city mayor has had more than three months to begin construction of the school” (Los Tiempos 2007b). In a general assembly, neighbors and dirigentes agreed to participate in a march to the main municipal building.
But when the protesters reached the city’s central plaza, they were met with a sit-down strike of Public Works Department employees. The mayor took advantage of the presence of Lomas residents to criticize the Public Works strike, blaming the employees for the delay in the schools’ construction. Belligerent and chaotic pronouncements ensued, and Lomas residents’ demands were lost in the confusion. Despite the community agreement on collective demands in this case, the generally weak unity of the neighborhood’s discourse and leaders was unable to hold its own in this situation that other actors sought to manipulate.

Another prominent aspect of this protest was the symbolic presence of the national state. The President of the Republic indirectly summoned the protest, insofar as his support and legitimacy marshaled Lomas residents to protest. One Lomas neighbor said:

“We organize, and we support Evo, [because] he helps us. Today they're also going to support Evo. Last night there was a meeting... My husband went, and listened for a while. 'We have to go on the march tomorrow to support him.' That's all he heard, and then he came back. He just went to hear the most important part.” (interview 09.08.07)

There was far less neighborhood loyalty to their local dirigentes, as became evident in an incident that took place around the same time. When Lomas residents discovered that a public area was being occupied in the outskirts of their neighborhood, an emergency meeting was called and neighbors agreed to march over to that area and oust the occupants of the public land. A group of nearly a hundred Lomas residents marched over to the area, which was located
down the hill from Lomas, on the banks of a dry riverbed. A few dirigentes and a number of neighbors walked down to the area, while the rest watched from a ledge above. At that point, someone in the onlooking group yelled, “They’re hitting our dirigente!” Another responded, “Let ‘em kill him then, what’s he going down there for!” (field notes 14.08.07). Support for neighborhood-level dirigentes in Lomas was rarely unified or particularly strong.

This disarticulation between neighbors and their leaders was also apparent in conflicts which shook the city of Cochabamba in January 2007. The conflicts revolved around the departmental governor’s attempts to weaken Evo Morales’ MAS party administration by siding with oppositional leaders. The mostly MAS-supportive neighbors organized themselves, rather than waiting for coordination from their dirigente, to join the massive protests against the departmental governor’s most recent actions. Trucks of rural MAS supporters began to arrive daily to gather in Cochabamba’s main plaza. Tensions in the city and department (state) rose as the media reported that the more middle-class and urban supporters of the governor were also preparing themselves, in order to challenge the MAS protests.

In those same days, representatives from the governor’s administration met with the Lomas dirigentes to promise that electricity would be brought to the neighborhood, as long as residents showed their support for the governor. The dirigentes agreed, and told Lomas residents not to join the protests. Nevertheless, amongst themselves, the neighbors agreed, “We said we had to go down [to protest], those that wanted to could go down. The people didn’t like Manfred [the governor]. ‘Even if he puts in electricity, we’re still going to go,’ we said, ‘We’re going to go protest’” (interview 09.08.07). A large number of neighbors from Lomas participated in the protests, which did eventually lead to the expulsion of the governor. The departmental administration took its revenge, suspending all work on the electrical system in Lomas. The few light posts already installed remained as mute witnesses to the departmental reproach of neighbors’ “disobedience” and the lack of coordination between dirigentes and community members.

In Lomas, then, collective control over public entities was weakened, due to negotiations made by the dirigentes in order to obtain public services and infrastructure. Despite their lower levels of legitimacy than the delegates, neighborhood leaders still represent Lomas in all its negotiations with the municipality. The delegate Don Gavino described the situation as follows:

“The neighborhood was supposed to go, three needed to go from Lomas, to coordinate with the Supervising Committee... That’s what the representative from there told us, ‘Send someone from the neighborhood, to oversee that’... But it didn’t come up. It should have come up in a delegates meeting: this and that person will coordinate together. But unfortunately, [the president] just wants to do everything, himself.” (interview 04.11.07)

Thus, for Lomas residents, the difficulty of exerting collective control over public entities was
linked to the lack of coordination within the organization and the fragile authority that its leaders hold. In this sense, even ample neighbor participation concerning shared demands can still fail to exert collective control over public institutions.

In contrast, in Nueva Vera Cruz, collective control over public entities was more effective, partly due to the professionalism and experience of its leaders and the representative character of participation in the organization.

**Nueva Vera Cruz**

*Dirigentes* with Cochabamba’s mayor and other city officials.

Credit: Centro Vicente Cañas archives 2006

As asked how community leaders could help their neighbors oversee and engage in public works, a Nueva Vera Cruz *dirigente* reflected: “For example, for the school... the control of the planning was done by [the architect] and [the school council president] has added his skills in supervising” (interview 25.11.07). Over the period of study, a high school was added onto the elementary school that had been built with donations channelled through a Spanish Jesuit mission in the area. *Dirigentes* used their technical capacities to oversee the school’s construction. With a clear sense of the materials needed, for example, the architect (who was actually the president of the Water Committee) was able to gauge the quality and fair prices for building materials proposed by the construction company. It is notable that the Nueva Vera Cruz leader who was asked about neighbors’ involvement in citizen control did not discuss how residents might engage in supervision of public works. Rather, he recognized that the *dirigentes* were vested with the authority to conduct this supervision in the name of the residents. Such citizen control over neighborhood infrastructure was quite different from the Lomas residents’ mobilizations for the construction of their own school described above.

Nueva Vera Cruz’s relative advantage over the other two study sites in terms of working with external actors and institutions was noted in the previous chapter. A distinct advantage of Nueva Vera Cruz’s representative form of collective organization was that the group’s relationship to state and other institutions could be more strategic and more clearly defined. With Nueva Vera Cruz’s well-organized representative form of participation, it was
clear to external actors who the neighborhood experts and leaders were. The professionalism and legitimacy of Nueva Vera Cruz’s representatives emerged from a combination of their education and leadership experiences, their diligent efforts to cultivate mutually beneficial relationships with external actors and institutions, and the mandate their constituents granted them as representatives. This professionalism and legitimacy facilitated collaboration with such actors as the Zona Sur-wide association of water committees (ASICA-SUR), as shown in the previous chapter, the media and municipal authorities. Not long after they were chosen by ASICA-SUR to begin to receive water with donated water trucks, a Nueva Vera Cruz dirigente proudly proclaimed at a board of directors' meeting, "We're being recognized... even by the media. Whenever anything [in the Zona Sur] happens, Bolivisión [a local TV channel] comes to the neighborhood... Now the authorities don't tell us anymore 'Yes, we'll come.' Instead, they even seek us out" (interview 25.11.07).

Representative organizational forms made it easier for external actors more generally to know how to work with legitimate organization representatives. For example, personnel from the non-governmental organization Centro Vicente Cañas, found it somewhat difficult to work with the unstable neighborhood association of Lomas de Santa Bárbara. While working with the the block-group leaders was the best way to coordinate with small groups of neighbors, the neighborhood-level leadership of Lomas was never wholly legitimate nor long-lasting. Working with the dirigentes of Mineros San Juan, on the other hand, was an excellent way to collaborate with the neighborhood as a whole. Such work, nevertheless, implied a long period of overcoming the dirigentes’ suspicions; one needed to be constantly present in their many and unscheduled meetings in order to gain their trust. The board of directors of Nueva Vera Cruz, however, easily integrated professional personnel into their predictable Monday night meetings. The Cañas staff member who regularly attended these meetings eventually became an important member of the group, supporting the dirigentes on various organizational and technical issues.

Another incident exemplified the representative and strategic characteristics of Nueva Vera Cruz's organizational forms. In order to demand the closing of the nearby garbage dump, neighborhood dirigentes coordinated with leaders of the bordering neighborhood of Santa Vera Cruz to blockade the main highway that leads into the city from the south. The dirigentes decided on the blockade in their Monday night meeting and then discussed the best ways to obtain wide neighbor participation. They agreed that one member of each household would be required to be present at the blockade. In the following general neighborhood assembly, neighbors were informed of the decision. Santa Vera Cruz’s president went from house to house in his neighborhood to inform residents of the blockade and their required participation. Given their more immediate and basic needs, it was unlikely that neighbors of Nueva Vera Cruz and Santa Vera Cruz would have organized themselves to protest the garbage dump. The leaders acknowledged this at their meetings and understood that their role was to “raise neighbors’ consciousness” regarding the health and environmental impacts of the poorly managed garbage dump.
After that mobilization, Nueva Vera Cruz and other neighborhood leaders coordinated with other organizations to exert political, media and juridical pressure on the municipality and department. These leaders were co-founders of the Committee for the Closing of the Garbage Dump, which attracted widespread support from environmental institutions, both non-profit organizations and academic and research centers. Those institutions, in turn, founded the Committee for Citizen Control of Adequate and Transparent Waste Management, composed of neighbors and leaders of the Zona Sur, environmental professionals, academics and more than a dozen non-profit organizations. In this case, collective control over public activity emerged as a consequence of the knowledge and experience of dirigentes, in issues that they considered significant for the collective. It is important to note that Nueva Vera Cruz leaders did not assume themselves to be the neighborhood’s unique protagonists; they indeed sought to encourage their neighbors’ participation in all local affairs. Yet it was partly through the focus of activity in a small group of leaders that Nueva Vera Cruz achieved the strategic capacity to coordinate with other groups and exert citizen control over public issues and actions.

In contrast to both Lomas de Santa Bárbara and Nueva Vera Cruz, the neighbors of Mineros San Juan exerted a collective control over public entities with widespread support from the neighborhood as a whole. In the case of Mineros, this collective control was driven by the well-attended, neighborhood-wide assemblies, both general and emergency meetings. In these large, open and vibrant spaces, collective actions were agreed upon, with the aim of protesting or altering municipal activity. In one case, for example, Mineros leaders called an emergency neighborhood meeting to discuss the failure of the city government to complete the excavations needed for the installation of water pipes. In their shared frustration, neighbors and leaders agreed at that heated moment to stage a protest in the city to pressure the municipality and other institutions to take responsibility for their unfulfilled promises to the neighborhood.

On the morning of the protest, dirigentes, members of the neighborhood’s Transparency Committee, group representatives and Mineros neighbors made visits to several public institutions, beginning with the electric utility company. With petards and dynamite announcing their arrival and presence, they reminded these institutions of their delinquent pledges. Once they marched into the main plaza, Mineros neighbors crowded before the front doors of the municipal and departmental government seats. With shouts, blasts, signs and banners, they demanded that the corresponding authorities begin with the agreed-upon tasks. After many hours of protests, they obtained some further pledges from authorities. These pledges, however, were neither written up nor were they followed up by the kind of strategic negotiations employed by Nueva Vera Cruz leaders. Further protests by Mineros residents held the municipal authorities to these new pledges, in a performative push-and-pull between protesting citizens and reluctantly agreeing municipality. Thus, the forms of citizen control exerted by Mineros residents had more dramatic and immediate effects than those of Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors, although they were not necessarily as effective in the long term.
At another point, Mineros residents mobilized around the issue of municipal limits, as they had in previous years. A city newspaper described the incident:

“With a chain of blockades on the highway leaving the city to the Valle Alto, the inhabitants of some of the city’s poorest neighborhoods... yesterday expressed their desire to be part of the city of Cochabamba, refusing to be part of the neighboring municipality. The residents of the youngest neighborhoods of the city, which emerged as illegal settlements a decade ago, now lay claim to their right to be part of the Annual Operational Plan of the city of Cochabamba.” (Vásquez 2006)

Protesting neighbors endured the heat of the sun and the irritation of the obstructed drivers, while their president declaimed from a high ledge on one side of the highway.

Finally, municipal representatives arrived. With the attentive crowd watching them, they had little choice but to respond, “What happened is not our fault, but we are negotiating with the corresponding authorities to resolve the neighborhood’s request. It is in the interest of both municipal and departmental governments that Mineros San Juan be included within the territorial limits of the city” (fieldnotes 23.09.07). The Mineros collective was able to extract yet another promise from the municipality, but, again, it took further work and pressure to have the final ruling made.

In Mineros, the social construction of the collective required neighbors’ direct participation and presence. Because of this direct participation, neighbors readily identified
with the collective control over public entities that the group exerted. Yet because it was mostly exercised in the form of mobilizations and oppositional pressure on the municipality, it had to be constantly relegitimized, as its effect was less enduring than the strategic negotiations and institution-building of Nueva Vera Cruz. Part of the reason that Mineros citizen’s control over public entities was weaker than that of Nueva Vera Cruz was because the counter-hegemonic logics of the Mineros collective actually devalued public and external institutions as a way of reinforcing the legitimacy of the collective and its local authorities.

With regards to working with the police to increase public safety in the neighborhood, the Mineros president proclaimed: “We have sought to negotiate, because there are established state institutions that should enforce public safety. Who are they? The National Police, obviously a monster within it, cosmically made over, but all of us know about the corruption” (field notes 28.10.08). Instead of relying on municipal authorities to address their concerns, in this case regarding crime, the dirigente of Mineros proposed a strict neighborhood control over people entering their territory. In a neighborhood-wide meeting, Don Felipe declared:

“We will begin to take measures to ensure our neighbors’ safety... We will begin to take measures once more. Cars enter into our neighborhood; they do whatever they like... Declared this 28th of October, each and every car that enters the neighborhood will be registered... The warrior soldiers of Mineros San Juan will be established once more! There will be a toll gate as there was before! We will seek support from the municipality for the warrior soldiers of Mineros San Juan, all the neighbors will contribute, and tolls to the cars that enter!” (field notes 28.10.08)

Even though there were no concrete efforts to subsequently implement the plan of registering all cars that entered into the neighborhood, the very fact of declaring the plan was due to – and continued to reinvigorate – the strong legitimacy that the local leadership of Mineros San Juan enjoyed.

Yet the apparently more effective forms of citizen control over public entities in Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan also suffered from their disadvantages. In Nueva Vera Cruz, the representational forms of participation and inclusion led to unequal capabilities to influence group decisions, with more professional representatives taking over the expert positions of decision-making. The inadequacy of a top-down approach in shaping collective interests was apparent in one neighbor’s misinterpretation of the reasons for the mobilization described above, against continued contamination by the garbage dump. She thought that, “Now we’re asking that SEMAPA bring us water, since they do that with other neighborhoods around the dump. That’s why we’re here blockading” (field notes 09.12.07). This dynamic of uneven and unequal participation in collective decisions will become more apparent below. Given its neoliberal logics, greater access to the “center” in Nueva Vera Cruz reproduced the
center-periphery patterns within the borders of the neighborhood. In Mineros San Juan, there was collective support for neighborhood decisions and an important sense of belonging to the group. Yet collective control over public institutions had to be constantly exerted, as neighborhood leaders were only legitimate insofar as they held a public presence and obtained public results.

Finally, in terms of their ability to influence municipal and public activities, Lomas residents fared the worst, given their leaders' weak command of both public and neighborhood legitimacy. In order for Lomas residents to be able to exert more citizen control in the public sphere, its organizational form would need to change. It was in this way that municipal and state institutions discouraged divergent forms of local organization such as that of Lomas. Yet the logic that shaped the Lomas collective, precisely because it diverged from the dominant and oppositional logics, also mitigated both the inequalities inherent in neoliberal social structures and the exclusions of counter-hegemonic hegemonies.

Citizen control over public entities, then, must not only be understood as the possibility of making a group’s demands heard and needs met by municipal and state institutions. Citizen control goes beyond the ability to ensure access to public resources, though this is clearly also part of it. Particularly in a place such as Bolivia, where there exist other types of collective control, citizen control can move beyond institutionalized accountability to an inclusive normative and social legitimacy. This entails participation in the construction of those values that define the relations and positions of people, resources and discourses within the public. Understanding the central characteristic of collective control in Bolivia as legitimation helps to bring together the different facets of the concept. Each time a member of a collective accepts a neighbor’s everyday act, or the public proceedings of a local or state authority, he or she is also recognizing and validating the activity's implicit structure of social relations.

**CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS**

The previous chapters examined the institutions of urban land and basic services as they encouraged and discouraged particular social forms and logics. Chapter Two looked at the urban land market's promotion of private and formal ownership, as opposed to collectively legitimated possession or de facto occupation. Chapter Three focused on the ways that urban utilities and institutions encourage supplier-consumer models of water management and productive forms of collective development. Through fostering particular practices, these institutions shape neoliberal subject formation and its concomitant inequalities. In response to their marginalization by these inequalities, counter-hegemonic subjects seek to establish an alternative, oppositional order. This counter-hegemonic logic, nevertheless, creates its own exclusions. A logic that diverges from both dominant and oppositional social dynamics may indeed be more equitable and inclusive. That logic, however, is deterred by the urban and state
institutions whose power derives from formalization and the concomitant city effect that creates a “center” and limits peripheral access to it. This chapter has shed light on the construction of collectives and collective control over public issues in these contexts, providing ways to think about citizen control and its imminent institutionalization in Bolivia. Above all, this chapter has sought to emphasize the difficulties of exerting collective control over public activity and authorities when this collective control is separated from the public constitution of normative social control.

In Lomas, social dynamics that emerged from intimate and face-to-face spaces drove a strong normative social control within the collective. But that same organization and the lack of unifying symbols or discourses beyond the small groups hampered the collective construction of a shared vision towards the future. This concrete case demonstrated the difficulties of divergent collective logics based on fragmented public spheres. More coordinated public deliberations between different civil society groups and actors would more effectively orient the collective control of public authorities and activities. Without these public constructions, public accountability is bound to remain ineffective or in the service of particular interests. Bresser-Pereira and Cunill Grau (1998) write:

“Public interest exists... in relative form, through the consensus that is formed based on that which constitutes a common morality... As such, the reinforcement of the sphere of citizen control requires the deployment of mechanisms that facilitate the public exposition of particular interests – instead of their spurious concealment in the form of public interest – and, above all, the creation of spaces for public deliberation processes, by which social subjects can arrive at a definition of common themes and problems.” (35)

Both at the neighborhood level in Lomas de Santa Bárbara and at the level of national civil society, improving public deliberation mechanisms would mean further coordinating and democratizing channels of communication.

In the neoliberal logics of Nueva Vera Cruz, there was a clearer and more legitimate transparency between neighbors and their representatives. Dynamics in this neighborhood demonstrated the advantages and the challenges of citizen control with more representative and official forms. The professionalism and experience of the Nueva Vera Cruz representatives allowed for ample coordination and negotiation with other key actors and groups. This coordination encouraged relatively effective citizen control over public activities in the neighborhood’s interest. Nevertheless, the social dynamics in this neighborhood also showed us the dangers of a sole dependence on representative forms. On the one hand, possibilities for public deliberation were reduced. Decisions tended to be taken by representatives rather than group members more generally, and meetings became spaces to disseminate information rather than discuss collective concerns. On the other hand, the related valuation of the “expert knowledge” of the representatives implied the exclusion of those group members without the
indicated forms of knowledge.

A criticism that has been commonly leveled at institutional mechanisms of institutionalized citizen control in Bolivia is of their “predominantly technical-instrumental vision that fits with the vision established by the Law of Popular Participation” (España et al. 2003:98). A study by Urioste and Baldomar notes that “to fulfill the competencies needed for the Supervising Committee, a certain degree of technical knowledge is necessary, for example, in order to judge the elaboration or execution of a budget” (in Cunill Grau 2000:21). This has made it difficult for the committee to be representative of the diverse population of civil society, particularly its most marginalized members. Cunill Grau continues: “Therefore, the evidence... confirms that the technical content of the attributions assigned to public accountability mechanisms is itself an inhibitor of the exercise of that accountability” (22).

Finally, Mineros San Juan demonstrated a counter-hegemonic unity and the apparent integration of normative social control and citizen control over public entities and authorities. Paradoxically, this brings us back to the question of the possibility for normative constructions of collective control within the complexity, diversity and inequalities of contemporary civil society. In Mineros, the spaces of the public assembly represented an almost ideal, republican collective: community issues were debated openly, decisions were made in the group, and local representatives acted based on collective decisions. Mineros amply possesses what Liszt Vieira (1998) says is necessary for the construction of full citizenship: “the previous presence of a bonding element, a sense of community, of collective identity that would be, in ancient times, belonging to a city, and in modern times, belonging to a nation” (3).

The concept of citizen and collective control as it has been developed in Latin America is fundamentally based on this republican conception, which understands the public sphere as the political community that legitimates the State. The republican response to inequalities created by the rise of private interests is precisely this public sphere, which is characterized by collective discussions, decision-making and action. In contrast to the liberal public, which provides mechanisms to protect aggregate individual interests, the republican public sphere is recognized as the privileged site for true political activity. This public sphere serves to limit and direct the power of the State and the market.

From this perspective, the public sphere is the space of not only the political understood as governmental, but also of our very human development as social – and therefore political – beings. For Jurgen Habermas, this public sphere is where reason triumphs through deliberation (1962). Hannah Arendt, another republican theorist, insists that this sphere constitutes our very reality: “Only where things can be seen by many in a variety of aspects without changing their identity, so that those who are gathered around them know they see sameness in utter diversity, can worldly reality truly and reliably appear” (1958:57). This perspective underwrites current hopes worldwide that civil society may counteract the abuses of the state and the market. As such, this is the foundation of the institutionalized notion of citizen control. In Bolivia, the recent inclusion of marginalized populations in collective deliberation and political decision-making through social movement
pressures has renovated faith in the possibilities of this public sphere. In this sense, it is the collective – the people – that legitimates the State and where true authority lies.

The republican conception of the public gives a useful framework to understand the formation of legitimacy and authority. Still, it pays little attention to the inequalities of differential access to the public sphere. That is, while this perspective recognizes the diversity and conflict necessary to collective deliberation, it presupposes the neutrality of the parameters of that deliberation. Foley and Edwards write that the republican perspective, as well as the liberal perspective, “presuppose precisely the sort of political peace that [they] imagine civil society providing” (1996:7).

Theories that may help to work through this analytic quandary, in contrast, understand all social collectivity as a fabrication created through the establishment of a “common sense”, a sense that is not common by nature but by hegemony. According to analysts such as Antonio Gramsci and Pierre Bourdieu, the collective will is the contingent articulation by which a private particularity becomes a public universality. This perspective of the domination inherent in the construction of publics that are supposed to be protective (from liberal perspectives) or participatory (from republican perspectives) helps to explain the persistence of exclusions despite the recognition of universal citizenship in all of Latin America. Andrés Guerrero (1997), for example, notes that universal citizenship in Ecuador – while it included historically marginalized indigenous populations – also privatized cultural hierarchies, depriving them of their public and political character. He writes that “domination was thus no longer a public and political fact; it was transformed into a private issue, a matter of free will of personal conduct between citizens” (5).

Likewise, the experiences of collective control in Mineros San Juan require us to think of the construction of such a hegemony in daily cultural practices. Lander (1998) emphasizes the importance of

"recognizing the significance of symbolic/interpretive processes or of the construction of meaning in the constitution and reproduction of social life. From the point of view of the ideals of justice and equality, this has profound implications. The access to, and participation in, interpretative processes and the creation of meaning by different social and cultural sectors, in societies so profoundly heterogeneous and hierarchical as those in Latin America, constitutes a fundamental requirement for the very idea of democracy.” (21)

The examination of the hegemonic unity in Mineros also serves as a reminder that institutionalized mechanisms stabilize social relations of power. It is for this reason that the foundations and consequences of our institutions must be persistently examined, while their importance is nevertheless acknowledged. Katherine McKinnon notes that a productive conception of “hegemony understands that politics, broadly defined, is an endless process through which competing ideologies struggle always against each other” (2007:777). Collective
control, then, cannot be an end or a universal demand in itself, but rather a political element in the perpetual struggles over the configurations of our social relations.

This discussion has particular implications for how we think of institutionalizing collective control and public accountability. Based on an analysis of the link between normative social control and institutionalized citizen control, I have argued that the establishment of citizen control mechanisms must consider: the fragmentation of public space; the importance of channels of communication and spaces of collective deliberation; the exclusionary tendencies of an administrative focus of citizen control; and the importance of social and cultural practices in the exercise of collective control. In addition, there is the vital need to persistently identify the hegemonies that establish and result from institutionalized mechanisms.

Studies that analyze forms of participatory governance make similar points. Giles Mohan and Sam Hickey (2005), for example, identify the characteristics of experiences of citizen control that have helped to transform entrenched structures of inequality. Their concrete recommendations to ensure that participation “is rooted in a normative and theoretical approach to development” (238) also serve to extend the findings from this chapter. Mohan and Hickey write that mechanisms of participatory governance are able to serve the most excluded citizens:

“(1) when they are pursued as part of a wider radical political project;

“(2) where they are aimed specifically at securing citizenship rights and participation for marginal and subordinate groups; and

“(3) when they seek to engage with development as an underlying process of social change rather than in the form of discrete technocratic interventions.” (237)

It is in this sense that I understand and concur with Jorge Komadina’s (2009) point when he urges us to “think of collective control as a category of the political instead of as a technical instrument... As such, it is linked not just to institutions, to administrative mechanisms, but to the political field, to correlations of force, to hegemonic projects” (10). A new and transformative institutionalization of citizen control cannot dispense with these perspectives.
Like many millions in the developing world, Bolivians migrate to cities hoping for inclusion into national and global markets and societies. But the terms of that inclusion are selective and limited. Thus, marginalized citizens not only mobilize in order to be included in the city. They also challenge the urban structures that marginalize them. This study focused on the state-directed, social institutions of private property, resource management and political participation, in order to better understand the mechanisms by which the city and its structures, its logics and its subjects, are produced. As cities become points of reference for an increasing number of people worldwide, confronting their inequalities becomes a more daunting and urgent task. It is not enough, as experience and history have shown, to appeal for a broader scope of inclusion in the coveted spaces of the core, in the bell jar of capitalism. The specific ways that the core and the periphery, the city and the non-city, are conceived and materialized, determine the very structures of those inequalities.

This study has sought to shed light on those structures, as they are produced in our daily practices and in the social institutions that organize our practices and social relations. The three different institutions examined, and the municipal mechanisms that actualize them in the city, encourage neoliberal practices and hierarchies. They do this, in part, by defining periurban logics and subjects in terms of a structurally and socially peripheral status. Institutionalized municipal mechanisms symbolically, socially and materially benefit and promote the formal over the informal, the rational-universal over the customary and the center over the periphery. As such, neoliberal logics that likewise depend on and reinforce these distinctions most advantageously position periurban residents within the urban market and society. These processes take place through, and function to generate, what I have called the city effect.

The city effect makes the city appear to be a structure and a place external to the myriad practices, actors, spaces and processes that constitute it, across different localities and scales. As such, the city is not recognized as a product of those interactions, but as a structuring force that shapes them. Identifying the city effect helps to emphasize that periurban populations are not simply marginalized by the structures of the city. These marginalized sectors are, in fact, defined as peripheral through the institutionalized distinctions between formality and informality that generate resources of symbolic and material power. These processes produce the city. The state-directed institutions examined throughout this study formalize practices in order to stabilize them and maintain the dominant socio-political order of the city.

In what follows, I review these dynamics, as we have seen them play out in the Zona Sur of Cochabamba. Then, I explore the implications of the city effect for understanding current transformations of the Bolivian state. As periurban actors challenge the
core-periphery paradigm, through their collective and discursive practices, so do marginalized citizens challenge the notion of the state as separate from society. I will end the dissertation with a brief exploration of the forms of democracy being essayed in Bolivia today.

**Making the city through peripheral logics and subjects**

I characterized the collective subjects in the three study sites by the logics and subjectivities that framed their everyday shared practices: neoliberal, counter-hegemonic and divergent. Each community exemplifies distinct *peripheral* logics and subjectivities, formed at the margins of the city of Cochabamba and Bolivian society. That is, peripheral subjects are not only shaped by periurban residents' unequal material positions vis-a-vis dominant hierarchies and inequalities. They are also, importantly, shaped by the subjective framework of the center-periphery. Within this framework, “the forces of change are more or less synonymous with a central power... which imposes itself on a resistant periphery” (Mitchell 167). When the city and the state are produced as central, distinct and determinant structures that unilaterally shape the lives of residents on the peripheries, unequal access to resources of power is reinforced.

We examined above the ways these different types of peripheral subjects are produced through the institutions of urban land, basic services and public accountability. The institutions themselves depend on the borders between the formal and rational-universal, and the informal and customary. Chapters Two and Three showed how the institutions of the urban land market and the management of basic services create and reproduce these borders, discouraging alternative, informal and customary practices, as well as the social relations these practices imply. With a focus on forms of social organization, participation and collective control in the Zona Sur, Chapter Four further developed the implications of distinct periurban logics on social and political relations and possibilities.

In the case of land and territory, the formalization of land as private property was incorporated into the neoliberal logics of the urbanized neighborhood of Nueva Vera Cruz. Residents of this neighborhood by and large sought to become legitimate and legal participants in the city. Residents of the unified territory of Mineros San Juan, in contrast, challenged dominant socio-economic and political relations by claiming the legitimacy of collectively legitimized possession. Their strategy depended on the ability of the counter-hegemonic collective to draw on, and participate in, national, indigenous social movements’ practices and discourse. The dependence on such strategic and appropriated discourse demanded violence of its own, particularly towards people – such as the Llave Mayu community, and even Mineros’ own neighbors – who in some way challenged the unity of the collective.

The small, intimate groups in the neighborhood of Lomas de Santa Bárbara showed how the border between the formal and the informal – on which the urban land market depends – functions to exploit the poorest sectors of the city. Lomas residents paid many times
over for the informality of their land tenure, since conditions set by formal municipal mechanisms disadvantaged them. Their informality determined their minimal access to reliable infrastructure, services and employment, as well as to participatory mechanisms to influence policy decisions that affect them. Institutional and municipal mechanisms thus disadvantaged the divergent and informal practices of Lomas residents, and discouraged their logics and social relations. Chapter Two explored the concepts of property and territory as projections for how the social can and should be constructed. The institution of private property seeks to impose one such proposition over others.

Chapter Three further explored the relationship between urban municipal mechanisms, peripheral practices and socio-political subjects, by focusing on basic services and natural resources. Different forms of administering water are shaped by distinct, collective visions of development. Chapter Three, thus, highlighted the ways that the local management of water was powerfully shaped by and inserted into broader logics and development paradigms, along with the socio-political relations these implied. Nueva Vera Cruz’s efficient management of water conceived of water as a private good, administering it through a supplier-consumer model that reproduced unequal access. This was a component of the neighborhood’s neoliberal logic of productive development, in which entrepreneurship represented the main possibility for development.

The collaborative organization of water in Mineros San Juan, in contrast, conceived of that resource as a public good, administering it collaboratively and equitably, but subject to hegemonic exclusions. The Mineros water system – and the counter-hegemonic logic of incorporative development that framed it – included a majority of neighbors, and demanded their constant and active presence. Finally, through their shared access to the vital resource, Lomas de Santa Bárbara neighbors conceived of water as a communal good. Water was accessed in Lomas through reciprocal social forms, which helped to consolidate the importance of interpersonal spaces. Simultaneously, however, this also weakened Lomas residents’ ability to make broader impacts on water management at the neighborhood level and beyond. The communal form of administering water was part of Lomas’ divergent logic of pluriactive development, in which investments were made in networked and dispersed spaces. This form of water management and development, and its implicit social relations, were the most marginalized within urban and state structures.

Chapter Four turned to political relations more directly, focusing on the ways that neighborhood organizational forms and practices interacted with formal state mechanisms of participation and citizen control. Representative membership constituted the neoliberal collective of Nueva Vera Cruz. Within this organizational form, the neighborhood association related strategically with external actors, and, as a result, exerted relatively significant citizen control over public entities. Local participation in the neighborhood association, however, was low and unequal. In contrast, within the counter-hegemonic participatory model of Mineros San Juan, local authorities benefited from notable legitimacy, and residents exerted some degree of collective control over them. These leaders were viewed as important articulators of
the community, as they linked its members and expressed the unity of the collective. The Mineros neighborhood association, thus, significantly incorporated residents into its collective. Nevertheless, the counter-hegemonic logic in Mineros also depended on hegemonic in- and out-group categories, thus enacting its own exclusions. The divergent logics of Lomas de Santa Bárbara, manifested in communal associations, most equitably incorporated vulnerable groups within the collective. As such, Lomas neighbors exerted strong normative social control over each other, and participated readily in their block-level groups. Yet the divergent logics of Lomas also implied poor coordination with external actors, as well as little collective control over neighborhood and public authorities.

In this study, I explored the ways in which the mechanisms of formal, state-directed social institutions encourage particular types of social and political relations over others. This not only affects the ways that Zona Sur residents relate to each other and with other urban residents, but also shapes periurban populations’ relationships with central, public authorities and entities. The center-periphery paradigm is the main oppositional distinction that the social institutions of private property, resource management and political participation presume and promote. Within these dynamics, the city is understood to be the core that the poor must access in order to be included in wider society and markets. The stability of urban hierarchies depends on the city's separation from the extended spaces that produce it. Yet this study has shown that the city is, instead, made up of the interactions between the core and peripheral logics and subjects. This is the city effect, the effect of institutionalized practices that take on the appearance of a structure with the power to incorporate marginal citizens.

Understanding the city effect as the spatialization and consolidation of the distinction between the core and periphery helps elucidate the processes by which dominant frameworks are reproduced and inequalities are entrenched. This reinscription of inequalities takes place as the city effect and its implicit borders shift sites of calculation and decision-making. Just as development models identify and spatialize deficiencies in order to define who it is that needs to be developed, so does the core define its peripheries by their lack. Private property regimes, consumer water management systems and administrative public accountability may indeed make for more quantifiably efficient systems than other regimes of property, resource management and collective legitimacy. They do not, however, necessarily describe or respond to social realities more clearly, effectively or justly. As Timothy Mitchell (2002) writes:

“The 20th century’s new regime of calculation did not produce, necessarily, a more accurate knowledge of the world, despite its claims, nor even any overall increase in the quantity of knowledge. Its achievement was to redistribute forms of knowledge, increasing it in some places and decreasing it in others.” (92)

Thus, the production of these distinctions – between the core and the periphery, the formal and informal, and the rational-universal and the customary – is a profoundly political act.

Rather than simply describing a reality, these distinctions also create it, materializing
particular rationalities, valuations and legitimacies in concrete spaces and places. These distinctions, for example, encourage the type of neoliberal practices and logics that we see in Nueva Vera Cruz. As neoliberal political subjects, Nueva Vera Cruz residents accept the distinctions between the formal and the informal and the core and the periphery. Their objective is to access that center, not to question the structure that determines their peripheral position. Neoliberal subjectivities, thus, presume and reproduce the city effect. That is, they depend on the reinforcement of the borders between center and periphery, formal and informal, and on an acceptance of the consequent unequal access to resources.

This acceptance of dominant inequalities is a fundamental feature of the neoliberal collective practices in Nueva Vera Cruz. Such practices, simultaneously, reinforce the distinctions and legitimacies that such inequalities imply. Land as formal, private property legitimizes the juridical order necessary to uphold the capitalist economic order. Supplier-consumer models of resource management and entrepreneurial frameworks of development legitimize economic efficiency and productivity over equity of access. And representative models of participation, with their stress on administrative accountability, legitimize hierarchical models of specialization and organization. Both supplier-consumer models of management and representative models of participation value expertise and efficiency over equity of access to decision-making processes. This obscures political struggles as technical problems to be solved.

The collective logics and political subjects described in Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara provide cautious hope for alternative legitimacies and socio-political relations. Mineros and Lomas are far newer settlements than Nueva Vera Cruz. Thus, to an extent, the dynamics evident in those two neighborhoods are a result of the length of time that they have existed. The counter-hegemonic logics in Mineros and the divergent collective logics of Lomas may very well eventually resemble the neoliberal logics of the more urbanized and established neighborhood of Nueva Vera Cruz. My point in bringing these three cases together, however, is not to place them on an inexorable developmental timeline. My purpose throughout this study has been to critically identify actually existing alternatives to neoliberal logics and political subjects. This has helped me to describe the mechanisms by which contemporary state-directed social institutions deter alternative practices and logics, and consequently, inhibit alternatives to dominant social and economic relations of power.

For example, counter-hegemonic political subjects stress the primacy of the group's unity over individual difference. In the Mineros San Juan case of a counter-hegemonic collective, only its leader stood out prominently, and then, only as the symbolic embodiment of the community. This centrality of group unity was also apparent in Mineros' collective transactions over land titles, and the importance of the group in legitimizing possession of land. Such dynamics not only locally challenge the legitimacy of economic capital that new neighbors or migrant families possess, but in fact challenge conceptions of land as a market good. Such a confrontation of dominant developmental and global logics was also apparent in Mineros' collaborative organization of water. A collaborative model of water management and
participatory forms of organization are more apparently inclusive than neoliberal, representative participation. Yet diversity and dissent within such organizational forms is also circumscribed.

The exclusions at work in Mineros are due, in part, to the acceptance of the oppositional distinctions that are at the basis of neoliberal logics. That is, the force of the unity of this counter-hegemonic collective is the discursive valuation of the informal, the indigenous and the peripheral. Counter-hegemonic political subjects do not question hierarchical distinctions made between the core and the periphery. They question, rather, the relative positions of each. In their bellicose and oppositional stance, Mineros residents not only accept their outsider status, but in fact insist on its value. Recall their proud identification as fearless, dynamiting miners, or even as Talibans. Such an inversion of hierarchies replaces currently excluded populations with others. In this sense, the struggle of the counter-hegemonic subject is not to challenge the core-periphery structure but rather to relocate its center.

The divergent logics and collective practices of Lomas de Santa Bárbara, in contrast, are based on an entirely different model than the center and periphery. The daily practices of their networked subjects are not driven by attempts to access the center, as are neoliberal practices, nor to reposition the periphery as the new center, as are counter-hegemonic practices. Recall Lomas residents' apparent ambivalence regarding securing either titles or a more reliable supply of water. Lomas neighbors longed for titles, yet neither actively sought nor discursively challenged them. Likewise, there were no attempts to organize a water committee to establish a neighborhood water system.

This ambivalence can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Divergent collective subjects might be seen as so marginalized, with such weak communal organization and knowledge of urban mechanisms, that they cannot even begin to attempt to secure titles or a water system. Yet the focus on the particularities of Lomas' organizational forms showed that residents there did not feel any more marginalized, weak, or misrepresented, than did residents of the other study sites. In fact, the communal associations of block groups allowed for a less hierarchical border between private and public issues, between formal neighborhood concerns and the informal opinions of Lomas' most vulnerable neighbors. Shared access to water empowered more Lomas neighbors (four times more than Nueva Vera Cruz neighbors!) to feel that they were pro-actively organizing to obtain water. These observations lead to another way of interpreting divergent subjects' ambivalence towards institutionalized forms such as titles, neighborhood water systems and external entities that might serve as resources. Perhaps, simply, these are not critical to their everyday practices, despite the fact that they are part of Lomas neighbors' discourse. Institutionalized formalities, so fundamental to neoliberal logics, are not the most important forces shaping divergent practices or subjects.

These two interpretations of the structural and subjective positions of Lomas, however, are certainly not exclusive. In fact, I argue that they are mutually constitutive. Throughout this study, I have described the ways that the collective logics and practices of Lomas residents diverge from dominant models, yet do not challenge them directly. Because the distinctions
that drive neoliberal and counter-hegemonic logics are not central to divergent subjects, the
social institutions of private property, resource management and political participation
exploit, marginalize and discourage their peripheral practices. The city effect is at play in
Lomas insofar as dominant logics make alternative, collective practices difficult to sustain.
Through these processes, the institutions that make the city encourage particular social
relations and subjectivities over others. These institutions, thus, reward neoliberal logics and
practices that reproduce their inequalities, coexist uneasily with the challenges posed by
counter-hegemonic logics and marginalize divergent logics and subjects and their implicit
socio-political relations.

Yet the ways that social and state-directed institutions shape local subjectivities is only
one part of the social processes examined. This study has also emphasized that marginal
practices shape social and municipal institutions, to a greater or lesser extent, depending on
the historical and political context. For example, the municipal mechanisms that materialize
the social institution of private property (such as departments of territorial ordering and land
regulation) are inconceivable without practices that reinforce the presumed separation
between formal and informal property. It is only through daily practices and their implicit
categorizations and distinctions that particular social and concrete institutions make any
sense. Thus, neoliberal subjects reinforce the social institution of private property and the
municipal mechanisms that uphold them, counter-hegemonic subjects challenge these
institutions, and divergent subjects are peripheral to and marginalized by them. While the
divergent case of Lomas seems to be completely conditioned by the municipal mechanisms and
dominant institution of private property, it is important to remember that the transformation
of categorizations and distinctions is neither linear nor progressive. The very divergence of
Lomas' logics, as suggested below, point to ways we might cautiously rethink dominant
paradigms.

In a similar way, the urban and local institutions that ground the social institutions of
resource management and political participation both shape and are shaped by local practices.
The forms that the municipal administration of water or its citizens may take are determined
by the ways that the city's residents organize themselves locally, in the everyday. This was
demonstrated most dramatically in the case of the Water War. The state's concession of
Cochabamba's public water company to a private, transnational firm was successfully blocked
by mobilizations to defend local practices.

Likewise, the ability of legislated transparency and public accountability mechanisms
in Cochabamba and in Bolivia to ensure further collective control of public processes depends
on their taking into account actually existing practices of participation and citizen control. An
example of this is the actual (as opposed to the legislated) functions of municipal mechanisms
such as the city's Supervising Committees. The existence of alternative practices of social and
collective control has changed the work that these Supervising Committees, and other
municipal mechanisms of accountability, do. The study sites' three distinct forms of
organization and citizen control take on particular relevance in Bolivia's current political
moment, as they correspond to the forms of democracy recognized in the new national constitution: “The Republic of Bolivia adopts for its government the participatory, representative and communal democratic forms” (Constituent Assembly 2009, Art.11). The implications of this will be further explored in the next section.

Bolivian cities are particularly generative sites to explore different ways that the city might be produced. The city as a set of urban processes made up of practices, relationships and logics that traverse multiple spaces and localities (Antequera and Cielo 2010) is foregrounded in urban Bolivia. Andean societies have long been fundamentally characterized by the multiplicity and physical extensions of their productive spaces, as described in Murra's (1972) concept of the “vertical archipelago.” Currently, Bolivians who migrate to cities often remain tied to their communities of origin (Antequera 2007). Rather than definitive relocations, such moves are a kind of tentative investment in different spheres and spaces. Most apparent in the case of Lomas de Santa Bárbara, where pluriactivity and multilocality went hand in hand, these strategies constitute the maintenance of some measure of “capital” in several fields, within which one’s positions are utterly unstable (Stark 1996). It is no coincidence, then, that the neighborhood that most significantly incorporates this spatial mode – that most diverges from the dominant and institutionalized center-periphery framework of the city – is the most marginalized within its structures.

Cities are also central to the global distinctions made between the developing and developed world, as well as to the techniques by which these distinctions are imposed. On the one hand, cities provide convenient examples of the purported duality between the formal and modern core and the informal and traditional periphery. On the other hand, cities are also important sites where the very ability to imagine that kind of order is inculcated, through such rationalities as the neoliberal logics of Nueva Vera Cruz. Thus, this study also sheds some light on the role that urban institutions play in the interactions between local perspectives and practices and global processes. It helps us to problematize the oppositional dichotomy between global macro-economic forces and locally-situated resistance.

Aihwa Ong (1999), for example, argues that views opposing global forces to local resistance are unable to examine “the horizontal and relational nature of the contemporary economic, social, and cultural processes that stream across spaces. Nor do they express the embeddedness in differently configured regimes of power” (4). Likewise, Michael Smith (2001), critiques globalization theorists such as David Harvey (1990) and Manuel Castells (1996) for their counterpositioning of the “local as globalism’s Other” (Smith:180). Smith contends that methodological approaches that focus on social practices will allow us to better understand the way that local, national and global processes help shape each other rather than stand in opposition. He promotes a social constructionist urban theory “in which globalization is treated as an unfinished product of politically and culturally constructed social practices, rather than a structural force operating behind people’s backs and inexorably determining their futures” (184). This research project began with a focus on such practices, and extended its scope to the institutions that mediate those practices.
Examining these social and localized practices, and the ways that these partake in and produce broader processes, is, thus, also part of a political project that seeks to identify possibilities for shifting structures and shaping change. As James Ferguson (2006) writes:

“Rethinking the taken-for-granted spatial mapping that is invoked not only in such terms as “the state” and “civil society” but also in the opposition of “local” to “global” (and in all those familiar invocations of “grassroots,” “community,” etc.), in these times becomes an elementary act of theoretical and political clarification, as well as a way to strategically sharpen – and not, as is sometimes suggested, to undermine – the struggles of subaltern social movements around the world.” (109)

I have sought, in this dissertation, to contribute to this rethinking. To do so, I examined configurations created by the dynamic interactions between people and meaning, city forms and institutions, and relations of collaboration and power. I hope to contribute to theoretical conversations that try to make sense of the shifting implications of contemporary urban and international processes. As such, I focused on identifying the ways that these processes, and the inequalities they imply, are stabilized through institutions and practices that produce the city and its peripheral populations.

From populist to plurinational state

The constitution of collective subjectivities through particular institutions not only sustains particular understandings of the city, but also of the state. Timothy Mitchell’s (1998) conception of the “state effect” - on which my own understanding of the city effect is based - is that state institutions are not a consequence of the state’s power. The state, rather, is an effect of these institutions and the processes and practices they shape. This is not a claim that the state does not exist, nor a suggestion that it cannot be distinguished from other social processes and practices. But it proposes an extremely careful approach to understanding the ways that the state seems both to be separate from our social world and to structure it. Mitchell’s approach highlights the peculiarly modern separation between state and society, in which the former is understood as a decision-making and policing apparatus apart from – yet legitimized by – the latter. Central to the fabrication of such a state is the corresponding construction of cities as primary nodes of government administration and national and global economies.

Technical state and urban institutions depoliticize and reinscribe exclusions through the processes examined throughout this study. Yet as we see in Bolivia, the persistence of socio-economic inequalities, combined with the liberal ideal of political inclusion, has intensified popular calls for participation in governmental administration. These calls for participation challenge the boundaries established by the formalizing mechanisms described
above. This is evident in the populist character of social movement demands, which challenge the modern divisions that partition the state off from society and underpin socio-political hierarchies and inequalities.

Bolivian populism, however, has moved beyond the discursive realm, seeking to incorporate the alternative practices and logics described throughout this study. The establishment of a “plurinational state” is an attempt to recognize the multiple authorities and territories that have always existed within Bolivia's national territory. This plurinationality is posited as an alternative to the nation-state as it emerged in Europe and was incorporated into post-colonial republics. The contemporary emphasis on participation throughout Latin America can be understood as a challenge to the separation of the administrative public from the participatory public, a necessary separation in the nation state's establishment of territorial authority.

The authority of the European state has been defined territorially since its emergence at the beginning of the modern period, concurrent with the emergence of the economy as a distinct sphere of society. The separation of religious from political authority, beginning with the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia\(^1\), consolidated territorial domination, incorporating semi-feudal and separate domains under a unique framework of public authority. Caporaso (2000) specifies three dimensions of authority that were transformed within these changes: partialized and personalized domination in the medieval period became consolidated and rationalized; and authority based on a social, non-spatial ontology was transformed into an authority based on territorialization of the social. It was this consolidation, rationalization and territorialization that came to require the representation of the public in administrative posts of the new nation-states.

Given the extended territorial reach of the governmental apparatus, its functions became differentiated. Its officials were vested with a public authority that depersonalized domination, emphasizing their mandate as agents of a central sovereignty (Elias 1994[1939]). The public authority of these new states “assumed objective existence in this permanent administration” (Habermas 1991[1962]:18). In his remarkable book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Jürgen Habermas traces the development of the notion of the public from its feudal conception, where it was a characteristic of the king, to its modern conception, where it identifies participation in the government by people who are appropriately representative and public. It is in the context of these transformations that liberal civil society became the regulator or vigilante of the state and market.

We have seen throughout this study that Bolivian alternative practices challenge such modern separations of both the political and the economic from the social. Discursive attempts to establish a sense of belonging to the nation – and to reintegrate state and society – are also

---

\(^1\) In the Treaty of Westphalia, European powers agreed to respect, in principle, the sovereignty of political authorities over their established territories, supposedly initiating a new European order in which it would be no longer possible to impose an authority based on religion - or any other supranational authority - over states. The Treaty is widely recognized as a foundational event in the consolidation of the nation-state.
apparent in contemporary identifications with the national leader. Periurban residents consistently and personally identified with President Evo Morales. Simply called "Evo" by Bolivian popular sectors, Zona Sur residents spoke of him both familiarly and devotedly. With a government bonus given regularly to students of public schools to encourage attendance and studies, even children felt close to Evo. A Lomas resident related:

"Now there's the Juancito Pinto bonus, which there never was before. That's thanks to what Evo is doing. Kids say, 'Evo gives me money every month. If I do well in class, Evo will give me lots of money.' My daughter says, 'I have to study, I have to be the best student. I'm going to get paid by him.'" (interview 15.08.07)

Children's identification of Evo as a kind relative paralleled adults' conviction that Evo could identify with their own difficult situations. The same Lomas resident said: “Evo knows how it is. He's suffered, he's been a peasant. Maybe he hasn't studied, but he's doing good things. Evo went abroad to ask for help, and now he's giving to everyone in the country” (interview 15.08.07). With this identification, neighbors established a sense of belonging to the new nation, within which they are important actors. Zona Sur residents, and popular sectors more generally (as well as leftist activists), frequently declared their allegiance to the “process of change.” The phrase was constantly used to describe, imagine, participate in, and thus materialize, the nation's promised social and political transformations. A sense of belonging to the national collective thus emerged, directly linked to the President of the Republic and the changes his government was implementing.

This discursive positioning vis-a-vis the national State is the construction of a collectivity around what Ernesto Laclau (2005) calls an “empty signifier,” in his book On Populist Reason. In this case, the representation of Evo and the “process of change” permitted periurban residents to fill that signifier with their own identifications, in order to mark their belonging to the nation. Referring to this “process of change,” one Zona Sur neighbor said that, “it depends on the neighbors and dirigentes, it depends on all of us” (interview 18.08.07). Another neighbor concurred: "The power to organize ourselves is in the people. Neither the state, nor the municipalities govern. This time, the people are governing" (interview 12.10.07).

In this form of constructing the state, in which peripheral neighbors feel an integral part of it, civil society, as the national political community, is no longer separate from administrative government. Citizens participate in the state as their unity as a people is articulated through the signifier of Evo. As Laclau (2005) argues, “some type of equivalence (some production of a 'people') is necessary so that a discourse may be considered political” (154). For Laclau, the political forms within which representatives are differentiated and separated from those they represent are part of the institutionalized hierarchies of formal democracies. Such representative politics “simply involve the death of politics and their re-absorption by sedimneted forms of the social” (155). But the participatory belonging of periurban residents in the Bolivian national public does not remain at the discursive level that
Laclau analyzes. The Bolivian state has sought to incorporate their popular practices into the state systems.

Central to the participatory elaboration of the new State Political Constitution, enacted in 2009, were attempts to provide juridical and institutional support for practices considered informal within previous state systems. The reformulation of the national constitution was a central demand of the social movements' mobilizations that brought the current government to power. The Constitutional Assembly took place with ample participation of constituent representatives, most of whom were not career politicians, and represented their communities at the national level for the first time. The new constitution was approved at the end of 2007, and in 2009, the Plurinational Legislative Assembly was founded with the objective of substantiating the new constitutional norms in law. The ambitious first article of the Constitution proclaims:

“Bolivia establishes itself as a Social Unitary State of Plurinational Communitarian Law, free, independent, sovereign, democratic, intercultural, decentralized and with autonomies. Bolivia is founded on plurality and on political, economic, legal, cultural and linguistic pluralism, within the integrative process of the country.” (Constituent Assembly 2009, Art.1)

Such legislated pluralism is, nevertheless, particularly difficult to concretize in a political context where counter-hegemonic logics and discourse have mobilized and given force to the government. Many Bolivian analysts (i.e. Rivera Cusicanqui 2004, Gutierrez 2001), as noted in Chapter Three, position liberal-representative and communal-indigenous forms of organization as directly oppositional. Sociologist and current Vice-President Alvaro Garcia Linera (2004a) writes of indigenous “political cultures that are different from those that are partisan, liberal and representative, profoundly anchored in” Bolivian specificity. These socio-political forms are characterized by “the superimposing of collective identity over individuality, deliberative over elective practices, normative coercion as a mode of compelling behavior over and above free choice” (2).

But as we have seen in previous chapters, the defense of customary practices at the national and international levels has been established above all through the vital struggle for their legal recognition. These legal battles have been central for indigenous and grassroots organizations in the Andean region in recent decades. Still, “the efforts to obtain legal recognition do not replace, but rather complement, local struggles 'in the field'. At both levels, there are political-strategic actions to defend [and] define rights, ... legitimate local authorities and confront powerful discourses” (De Vos, Boelens and Bustamante, 2006:45). Within the challenging project of plurinationality, formal recognition is granted to customary rights. This means formally recognizing collectively legitimized possession as property, natural resources as public goods that are collaboratively organized, and unified communities in which the authority is an articulation of active participation.
The attempt to fix customary practices and rights more generally, however, to universalize them in order to enforce them, is based on the rational impulse of the liberal socio-political system that has oriented the nation since its foundation. Mark Goodale (2009) uses the term “hyperuniversalist” to describe the legal epistemology of Bolivian state law. He points out that the liberal legality that founded the nation was based on the Enlightenment utopian assumptions, such as the perfectibility of humanity through reason and linear progress. Based on these same ideas, the 1952 National Revolution extended the formal equality of citizenship to historically marginalized Bolivians. But it also extended the homogenization of that equality. Salazar (2006) notes that “the notion of equality as a factor of cohesion was supported, in turn, but the equality of human work, objectivized as market goods” (4). Thus, liberal universality of citizenship went hand in hand with the capitalist market that created and maintained hierarchical inequalities.

In contrast to this homogenization, what characterizes customary law is its contextual, contingent and dynamic particularity. Customary law describes practices and norms that are locally and collectively established according to historically and geographically specific conditions. The local and differentiated norms that govern the use of water throughout Bolivia, for example, respond to the relative scarcity of water (PRONAR 2000). Furthermore, customary norms are constantly being transformed, since they must respond to new needs in changing contexts. The bureaucratization of these norms is directed at rationalizing and systematizing them. For example, despite the fact that a universal customary law would be an oxymoron, a Bolivian government report on the administration of water recommended that “the logic and systematicity of the universal doctrine of Customary Law and its existing relevant practices” be incorporated in public policies regarding water management (National Irrigation and Drainage Program, cited in Bustamante and Vega 2000:48). Such a contradictory understanding of customary norms both discredits them and diminishes them.

At the same time, as Leff (2001) shows, the effective translation of marginal political claims in defense of collective rights is impeded by the very forms of state and legal ordering and the tempo of legal procedures. Latin American struggles for collective self-determination and for the recognition of customary norms continue to be articulated in spheres dominated by positivist, legal discourse, both at national and at international levels. “The need to reaffirm their demands in ways that are compatible with this legal discourse has resulted in the essentialization, reification and idealization of the indigenous customary rights practices” (Van Cott 2000:212). Thus, Bolivian subaltern claims expressed in the language of human rights are paradoxically equivalent to an attempt to codify particular rights through universal rights.

Writing on the March for Territory and Dignity, Goodale (2009) notes that, with each kilometer that the indigenous protesters advanced, they reconstituted themselves “as rights-bearing modern subjects in the way liberal Bolivia had always envisioned.” In this sense, he describes the march as “a metaphor for getting into, not out of, modernity” (19). The paradox has serious consequences:

“The poor and marginalized Bolivians who eagerly take up the banner of
human rights have ironically less discursive space now to complain about the deprivation and increasing alienation that result when a nation’s citizens redefine social relations in terms of contract rights, private property, and the liberal pursuit of enlightened self-interest.”

(19)

In fact, one analytic approach to positive rights (cf. Weil, 2003[1949]; Olivera and Gómez, 2006) criticizes narrow conceptions of rights defined as universal access to particular goods, whether this be the right to health, the right to water or another human right understood as access to a good. These types of analyses make explicit “the profound links between narrow conceptions of human rights and market-based development models” (Yamin 2008:52). According to these analyses, attempts to guarantee rights for marginalized citizens in the name of social justice may in fact support the very structures that marginalize them.

In the context of these difficult questions, the declared plurality of the Bolivian state seeks to find ways for representative, participatory and communal democracy to coexist. These are defined in the constitution by the ways in which each form is exercised:

“1. Direct and participatory, by way of referenda, citizens' legislative initiatives, mandate recalls, assemblies, town meetings, and previous consultations. Assemblies and town meetings will have a deliberative character, according to the Law.

“2. Representative democracy, by way of the election of representatives by universal, direct and secret vote, according to the Law.

“3. Communal democracy, by way of the election, designation or nomination of authorities and representatives by norms and procedures of indigenous originary rural nations and people, among others, according to the Law.” (Art.11.II)

Yet a focus on such technical mechanisms conceals pressing political questions regarding the underlying logics of these mechanisms, and the possibilities of their coexistence. It directs our attention away from seeing how such logics may interact with local social relations and broader political processes.

The institutionalization of new forms of relating in political communities, as I have argued throughout this study, must be approached quite critically. I have focused on the borders and distinctions that state institutions presume and produce, and the role of the city in these dynamics, in an attempt to contribute to this task. My point, however, has not been to critique the existence of conceptual borders and distinctions. To point to the multi-locality of cities is not to say that cities and their frontiers do not exist. Perhaps, in fact, attempts to make and institutionalize distinctions and separations are unavoidable. After all, we need conceptual borders. It is our ability to distinguish differences, to define patterns and categories, that help us make sense of and act upon our world. My point, rather, has been to try to understand the
work that these borders – and the institutions and cities that depend on them – do.

Institutions and legislation not only produce results, but also people with unexpected ways of seeing and experiencing and connecting to the world. Likewise, particular ways of effecting the city produce different kinds of citizens and relations between them. Given the features of technical institutionalization that we have examined, then, a significant shift in state and civil society relations must do more than merely incorporate marginalized practices into state frameworks or legitimate popular demands. These practices and demands, instead, will need to be translated into institutions and cities that are oriented by a recognition of the collective logics and political subjects that they produce.
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APPENDIX A. METHODOLOGY

This methodological appendix is divided into three sections, each describing research methods employed in the study. The first section describes the participatory research methods I used, the second section details my ethnographic research methods and the third section discusses the research methods used to collect quantitative data. Although the research process incorporated all three methodological approaches in a more integral manner, they are separated here to facilitate their descriptions.

1. PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH METHODS

In November 2006, I approached a local organization that works in the Zona Sur, the Centro Vicente Cañas, to see if there might be a way to work on my dissertation research and questions in coordination with their own work. I was particularly interested in the work of their Poder Local team, a department of Centro Vicente Cañas that works to strengthen civil society action in periurban areas. This organizational aim dovetailed well with my own research themes. After meetings and discussion with Poder Local team members, we agreed to collaborate on a research project on local forms of participation and citizen control. Such a project would facilitate data collection for my dissertation research, and at the same time, provide the Poder local team and the Centro Vicente Cañas organization with data and analyses that could help them to improve their own work.

On the research project with the local organization. The Poder Local team agreed to provide the institutional backing and incorporated the research project in progress into the team’s multi-disciplinary work. The study began in February 2007, when a research team to conduct the project was formalized. The team consisted of the research staff member of the Poder Local team, the director of Centro Vicente Cañas, who served in an advisory role throughout the project, and myself. Research was coordinated with the entire Poder Local team, which consisted of four members: a coordinator, the research staff member with whom I would be working, another staff member working in the area of alternative communication and another in the area of popular education. The research staff member was assigned to the research project as part of his staff duties, and I trained him in research methods and worked with him on this and a related research project (also described below) throughout the next two-and-a-half years.

Through coordination with the other staff members and areas of the Poder Local team, the research project was linked to educational and communicational components. The project thus included, for example, classes, workshops and collective analyses of data with neighborhood representatives and residents. As a team, we produced communicational products such as pamphlets, news articles, radio shows, and a short documentary on the
research theme. Working in these different arenas allowed for further opportunities for participant observation and data collection.

As I began work with the organization in February 2007, I also began to conduct participant observation and interviews within the organization. In the context of the Poder Local educational area, I taught a social research methods class to residents of the Zona Sur in April 2007, which facilitated further observations, informal interviews, and contacts. It also oriented my preparation for the study. By the time I began working with the Poder Local team that same month of April 2007, they had already begun to prepare diagnostic analyses of each of the three neighborhoods of study.

**Participatory research with neighborhood groups.** Diagnostic analyses of each of the three study sites were based on discussions and interviews with leaders and key actors in each neighborhood. Each of these community analyses was conducted by a Poder Local staff member, who I had advised on conducting and analyzing interviews (Poder Local staff also sat in on the research methods class I taught). Each staff member wrote up a report based on their interviews and observations. These three diagnostic analyses identified some of the neighborhoods' distinct characteristics, their history and needs and their development aims for the next years. This information was aimed at orienting the Poder Local team in improving their coordination and interventions within each neighborhood and its organization.

I worked with the Poder Local team member assigned to each neighborhood to create and publish accessible and informative pamphlets based on these initial diagnostic analyses. These pamphlets used very basic text and plenty of visual material to briefly describe the neighborhood, its history, its organizations and resources, and its projects and future plans. The pamphlet was aimed at encouraging discussion regarding these issues. Its format invited readers to engage with the information presented and enter into dialogue with its content from their own perspectives and experiences. Readers might answer the questions presented, discuss them with their family and friends, or raise the issues within more formal neighborhood groups. Thus, the pamphlets were developed as a concrete point of departure for further collaborations and discussions with residents and leaders of the neighborhood. For example, before the pamphlets were published, they were presented to neighborhood leaders who debated over and contributed to their content. (See Appendix C1 for sample content from these presentations). This provided initial moments of collective reflection regarding neighborhood characteristics and issues.

Once the pamphlets were published, they were disseminated in small, selected group spaces. We sought to make these spaces conducive to dialogue regarding the pamphlets' content and the dynamics of each neighborhood within urban and social structural contexts. In Lomas de Santa Bárbara, for example, the pamphlets were distributed in over a dozen block groups, as well as in the schools' parent organization. In Mineros San Juan, we likewise met with block groups as well as organized womens' groups in the neighborhood. In Nueva Vera Cruz, we met with school groups. These meetings were the starting point for the qualitative data collection for the study, which I turn to in the following section.
These meetings also helped us coordinate the research project and Poder Local organizational goals with those of the representatives and residents of the neighborhoods. For example, Lomas de Santa Bárbara delegates had two main ideas regarding ways that the research project could respond to their own needs. When we presented them with the idea of conducting a survey in the neighborhood, they requested that a full census be conducted, as no data had yet been established on neighborhood demographics. Lomas delegates were also concerned with establishing and articulating the collective history of the neighborhood. As part of Poder Local team's work, a visual history, in the form of a comic book, was developed and published to reflect both collective neighborhood experiences, as well as the neighborhood's experiences in the context of urban development and national socio-demographic contexts more generally. (Pages from this visual history of Lomas are included in Appendix C2.)

In the other two neighborhoods, we worked with the neighborhood associations to develop collaborative goals for the research project as well. Mineros sought support in developing audio/visual and communicational products on the neighborhood. The Poder Local communications staff member trained and worked with Mineros neighbors and youth to produce a theater piece on the Massacre of San Juan for the annual neighborhood anniversary celebrations, as well as radio shows, news articles and short videos on local issues. In Nueva Vera Cruz, the board of directors asked for a formal presentation and report of the research project, which were presented to them at the conclusion of the project. They also added further questions to the survey that would assist them in their own neighborhood decisions.

**Dissemination and dialogue regarding research findings.** Once the data collection and analysis of the Poder Local research project were completed, an internal report was written up and submitted to the Centro Vicente Cañas. I then worked with the Poder Local team to disseminate findings of the project. To this end, I presented the data from the research in workshops and in meetings in the three study sites. I also participated in other seminars and spaces to discuss the research themes and findings, including a Zona Sur-wide forum on participation and citizen control and in seminars with other groups and organizations. (See Appendices C3 and C4 for samples products from this stage of the research.) The consequent conversations and observations provided opportunity for continued engagement with the study sites and further primary data collection for my dissertation research.

**Research study on the effects of international migration on periurban communities.** As the research project on local forms of participation and citizen control was being completed, the Centro Vicente Cañas director asked me to participate in another research project. This aim of this second project was to establish baseline data and analyses for the Cañas department that worked with international migrants and their families in the Zona Sur. I worked on the project from its very beginning development phases, so although the research focus on migration was new to me, the over-arching research themes and design reflected my own research interests and concerns. The project became a collaborative project
between the migration department and the Poder Local program of the organization. The original eight-month-long research project was extended when the research team secured funding from the Program for Strategic Research in Bolivia to further collect data on the research questions, deepen the analysis and develop the research report into a book.

For this project, which spanned from the beginning of 2008 to the middle of 2009, I worked on an interdisciplinary research team of five people. This second research project studied the same three neighborhoods of Nueva Vera Cruz, Mineros San Juan and Lomas de Santa Bárbara, and included two other Zona Sur neighborhoods. The study looked at the ways that international migration interacted with the different configurations of communities and visions of development of each neighborhood. Thus, much of the data collection for this second project informed my dissertation research. I include brief descriptions of the relevant data collection from this project in the following section.

2. ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH METHODS

The initial diagnostic analyses of the three neighborhoods that were developed in conjunction with the Poder Local team were shared with residents and local leaders through the meetings described above. These meetings provided a point of departure for discussions, as well as contacts to begin conducting in-depth, semi-structured interviews. They were also sites in which focus groups and other data collection was planned.

*Interviews.* Formal, recorded interviews for the research project – focused on neighborhood histories and concerns, and on local forms of participation and citizen control – were conducted between June 2007 and December 2007. Interviews were conducted in each of the three study sites, with another 8 formal interviews conducted with municipal authorities and experts in the themes of urban development and political participation. Interviews were based on an interview guide, and were conducted by myself and by the Poder Local research staff member. During the first month of interviews, we conducted interviews together, as I was training the staff member in research and interview methods. After that, we mostly conducted interviews individually.

31 interviews and oral histories were conducted with Lomas de Santa Bárbara residents and leaders, 21 interviews with Mineros San Juan residents and 18 interviews with Nueva Vera Cruz residents and leaders. The higher number of interviews conducted in Lomas was due to the collection of additional material for the neighborhood visual history. Aside from these formal interviews, my close work in the area benefited from countless informal interactions, conversations and opportunities for observation and data collection.

During the period of study with the migration research team, a total of 76 further interviews were conducted, also using interview guides. All five research team members for this project conducted the interviews, sometimes in pairs, sometimes individually. At least some part of each of these interviews contained relevant information for my dissertation
research themes. These interviews do not include another 23 interviews conducted by the migration research team outside of the Zona Sur (such as with migration experts or organizational actors).

**Focus groups and group interviews.** Aside from the numerous meetings, group discussions and organizational events held with neighborhood leaders and residents, six directed focus groups with specific data collection objectives were held over the course of research project on participation and citizen controls. In Lomas, two group oral histories were held. In Mineros San Juan and Nueva Vera Cruz, two focus groups were held in each neighborhood. I prepared, directed and participated in all of these focus groups. For the migration research project, likewise, the research team participated in numerous meetings, discussions and organizational events. Aside from these, 18 formal, directed group interviews were held. As with the interviews, part of the data collected focused on migration. Other parts of the data collection in these group interviews, however, focused on the construction of community and development visions in each of the neighborhoods, themes that are central to my research concerns.

**Participant observation and other research methods.** Participant observation took place over the course of over two and a half years of interactions in and with the neighborhoods, from February 2007 through the end of 2009. These interactions were of different intensities and had different purposes throughout that time period. Participant observation took place in organizational meetings, in general and emergency assemblies, in block or group meetings, in meetings with municipal and other institutions, in mobilizations outside of the neighborhood and in the daily life of the residents. At the same time that my work with the Centro Vicente Cañas was the frame within which I collected data for my dissertation research, it was also a site for participant observation and informal conversations. I learned a great deal about the Zona Sur and Bolivian social and political dynamics through my exchanges with Centro Vicente Cañas staff. Field notes were taken throughout the entire period of participant observation.

Working with the Centro Vicente Cañas also provided me with access to the organization’s data, textual archives and audio/visual material, collected over a period of their work in the area since 1996. More generally, work with the organization provided me with exceptional entry into my research sites and a framework for collaboration with residents of the neighborhoods of study. Finally, envisioned as part of – rather than an appendage to – the work of the organization, the research projects I conducted with Cañas contributed to the longer-lasting, continued collaboration between Cañas and the residents of the Zona Sur.

### 3. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

Unless otherwise noted, the quantitative data on neighborhood demographics and
levels of participation included in the dissertation is drawn from sample surveys and censuses conducted in each of the three sites. I coordinated two of the surveys and one census, in collaboration with the Cañas Poder Local team, leaders and residents in the three neighborhoods of study, and an economics professor and his students from the local public university of Cochabamba. The study also draws on data from censuses conducted by the neighborhood association of Nueva Vera Cruz and by a non-profit organization in Mineros San Juan, in their respective neighborhoods. These two censuses are described below, and analyses that draw from their data are noted throughout the dissertation. Such primary data collection to establish basic socio-demographic information was necessary given that the 2001 census did not cover the two recently and informally settled neighborhoods of Lomas de Santa Bárbara and Mineros San Juan, and the census data for Nueva Vera Cruz was outdated.

**Survey organization and coordination.** For the surveys conducted by the Poder Local research team, we coordinated with a university professor in the Faculty of Economics of the Universidad Mayor de San Simón. I worked with two of his thesis students to design the survey. The two students were experienced in quantitative data collection and analysis, and we jointly planned and held workshops to train about 50 other economics students to assist in conducting the census in Lomas de Santa Bárbara and the surveys in Mineros San Juan and Nueva Vera Cruz. We also jointly led the survey design and implementation under the supervision of their professor. The university professor incorporated participation in the survey as part of students' evaluation in his class, and the workshops were incorporated into the educational program of the Centro Vicente Cañas. As such, students received certificates of participation from the Centro Vicente Cañas. They were also paid a minimal stipend for conducting the surveys.

**Methodological design for data collection.** The main data collection instrument was a survey, which allowed for the interpersonal recollection of oral answers. A sample questionnaire is included in Appendix B. Survey interviewers were Cochabamba university students, who attended a workshop on conducting the survey before going into the field. Interviewers asked residents the questions and marked the answers down themselves. The structure of the questionnaire was directed at obtaining socio-demographic information including general data of family members, their levels of education, economic activities, basic services, household characteristics, participation in neighborhood and public activities, health and international migration.

A full census was conducted in Lomas de Santa Bárbara. Since the neighborhood was organized in 80 different block groups, the research team coordinated with block groups, assigning students to work with block group leaders to survey the households in their areas. To orient the block group leaders, a pilot survey was initially conducted with only these neighborhood leaders. We used these pilot surveys to obtain feedback and revised the survey accordingly. The census was conducted in Lomas de Santa Bárbara in mid-November 2007, then representative surveys were conducted in Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan in the
last week of November and the first week of December 2007.

A random sample, by households, was applied in the Nueva Vera Cruz and Mineros San Juan surveys. The thesis students leading the survey design and their professor recommended the application of a “survey by conglomeration,” given that no reliable list of the households existed. Using this method a listing of the conglomerations (or groups) of households was needed. Thus, the analysis of sample choice began with an analysis of maps in each of the study sites. These maps divided the neighborhoods into block units, convenient units for the survey's conglomeration grouping. To make a selection of the households to be surveyed, block groups of households were listed, numbered and every third or fourth group of households was chosen to be surveyed. Within this group, each household completed a survey questionnaire. Survey interviewers returned to the area over the course of two weeks to ensure that all households in the chosen conglomerations were surveyed.

The sample size for the surveys was determined based on the population of each neighborhood. These population size and numbers of households of the neighborhoods were determined from censuses conducted in each of the two neighborhoods by other organizations in 2006-2007, further described below. In Nueva Vera Cruz, the census conducted by the neighborhood association in 2006 registered 363 households. In Mineros San Juan, the census conducted by Fundación San Vicente de Paul identified 869 households.

**Data collection and codification.** The census and surveys were all conducted in November and December 2007. The census in Lomas de Santa Bárbara registered a total of 834 households with a total of 3,177 inhabitants.

The surveys were aimed at heads of household. 193 households were surveyed in Nueva Vera Cruz, and 239 households were surveyed in Mineros San Juan. Given that the previous Nueva Vera Cruz census identified 363 households, our survey of 193 households included 63% of the population. The survey in that neighborhood had a margin of error of 4.9 points, at a confidence level of 95%. In Mineros San Juan, a previous census had identified 869 households, so our survey of 239 households represented 28% of the population. The survey in that neighborhood thus had a margin of error of 5.4 points, at a confidence level of 95%.

The two university thesis students in charge of the surveys codified the data, using SPSS. They presented preliminary analysis of the data (such as frequencies and cross-tabulations), and then we worked on further analysis of the data (such as correlations and regressions) together.

In addition to the surveys conducted by the research team, we were also given access to the raw data of censuses that the neighborhood association in Nueva Vera Cruz and a non-profit organization working in Mineros San Juan had conducted in their respective neighborhoods. In Nueva Vera Cruz, the neighborhood association had conducted a full census of neighbors in 2006, led by a high school teacher whose students went house-to-house with questionnaires containing questions regarding basic demographic data and access to public services. Almost a year after the survey was conducted, however, only basic numbers had been
tallied by hand. Most of the data had not been codified and the questionnaires remained unused. The research team codified the data and was granted access to the information to use in our own research.

San Vicente de Paul is a non-profit organization working in Mineros San Juan. The organization sought to establish baseline health data and worked with university health sciences students to conduct a full census of neighborhood residents in the early part of 2007. The census contained questions regarding basic demographic and health data. The data had been codified by San Vicente de Paul staff members and frequencies had been tabulated and percentages determined for particular questions. An undergraduate student from the United States who volunteered with the Poder Local research team had experience in quantitative data analysis, and conducted further quantitative analyses of the data for San Vicente de Paul. In exchange, we were granted access to their raw data.

After codification and analysis of the data, the data was organized and presented to neighborhood leaders who planned to use the information for planning and advocacy purposes (see sample publication in Appendix C3). The research team provided reports with very basic data to the neighbors at general meetings and workshops. Printed and computer files with the data were provided to the neighborhood association leaders, and they were encouraged to work with Poder Local team members to further analyze and use the data.
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ESTUDIO SOCIO-DEMOGRÁFICO
PARA VECINDARIOS DE RECIENTE CREACIÓN CASO ZONA SUD

CENSO DE LOMAS DE SANTA BÁRBARA

Presentación:
*El Centro Vicente Cañas, en coordinación con la Junta Vecinal Lomas de Santa Bárbara y estudiantes de la Universidad Mayor de San Simón, está realizando un censo que tiene el propósito de proporcionar datos vigentes sobre la población del barrio y las características de sus viviendas y servicios básicos. Esto le servirá a la Junta Vecinal en su planeación y para fines de demandar atención pública e institucional para sus pobladores, frente a instituciones de servicios básicos, educación, salud y otros servicios sociales.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre del Encuestador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre del Jefe de Grupo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre del Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre del Codificador</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIRECCIÓN DE LA VIVIENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipio</th>
<th>OTB o Junta Vecinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cercado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lomas de Santa Bárbara</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nombre de Grupo</td>
<td>Manzano No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. POBLACIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(marcar respondiente con X)</th>
<th>Jefe de Hogar</th>
<th>Persona 2</th>
<th>Persona 3</th>
<th>Persona 4</th>
<th>Persona 5</th>
<th>Persona 6</th>
<th>Persona 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATOS GENERALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.1 ¿Qué relación de parentesco con el jefe de hogar?</td>
<td>Jefe(a)</td>
<td>Padre/suegro</td>
<td>Hijo(a)</td>
<td>Abuelo(a)</td>
<td>Hermano(a)</td>
<td>Nieto(a)</td>
<td>Yerno/nuera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2 ¿Es hombre o mujer?</td>
<td>Hombre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3 ¿Cuántos años cumplidos tiene?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.4 ¿Donde vive habitualmente?</td>
<td>Aquí en la ciudad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.5 ¿Cuál es su estado civil?</td>
<td>Casado(a)</td>
<td>Divorciado(a)</td>
<td>Conviviente</td>
<td>Separado(a)</td>
<td>Viudo(a)</td>
<td>Soltero(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.6 ¿Donde nació? Departamento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ciudad o localidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.7 ¿Donde vivía hace 5 años? Departamento</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ciudad o localidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIVEL DE INSTRUCCIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.8 ¿Sabe leer y escribir?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.9 ¿Ha asistido al programa de alfabetización en el barrio?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.10 ¿Asiste o asistió a algún centro educativo?</td>
<td>Asiste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.11 ¿Cuál fue el nivel y curso más alto de instrucción que aprobó?</td>
<td>Ninguno</td>
<td>Primaria</td>
<td>Secundaria</td>
<td>Técnico</td>
<td>Licenciatura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.12 ¿En qué idioma aprendió hablar?</td>
<td>Quechua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aymara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVIDAD ECONÓMICA</td>
<td>SOLO PARA PERSONAS DE 7 AÑOS O MÁS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.13 ¿Durante la semana pasada, trabajó?</td>
<td>1 Sí  2 No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.14 ¿Cuál es su ocupación principal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P.15 Durante la semana pasada, | 1 Buscó trabajo habiendo trabajado antes  
| 2 Buscó trabajo por primera vez  
| 3 Es estudiante  
| 4 Realizó labores de casa  
| 5 Es jubilado/ rentista  
| 6 Otro |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLO PARA MUJERES DE QUINCE AÑOS O MÁS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.17 ¿En total cuántas hijas e hijos nacidos vivos a tenido? (incluyendo fallecidos o ausentes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.18 ¿De sus hijos nacidos vivos cuántos viven actualmente?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P.19 ¿Donde tuvo lugar su último parto? | 1 En establecimiento de salud  
| 2 En su domicilio  
| 3 En otro lugar |
| P.20 ¿Quién atendió su parto? | 1 Médico  
| 2 Enfermera  
| 3 Otra persona  
| 4 Usted misma  
| 5 Partera |
### HOGAR

#### CARACTERÍSTICAS DE LA VIVIENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.1 Tipo de vivienda</th>
<th>H.2 ¿Cuántos cuartos tiene su vivienda, sin contar el baño?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Propia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Alquilada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Antíctico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cuidada por servicio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Otros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.3 Cuántos cuartos usa exclusivamente para:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormitorio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.4 ¿Cuál es el material de construcción más utilizado en las paredes de esta vivienda?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ladrillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tabique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Otro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.5 ¿Las paredes interiores de esta vivienda tienen revoque?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.6 ¿Cuál es material más utilizado en los techos?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Calamina o plancha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Teja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Loza de hormigón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Paja, caña, palma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Otro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.7 ¿Cuál es el material de construcción más utilizado en los pisos?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cemento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cerámico o mosaico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Otro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SERVICIOS BÁSICOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.8 ¿De dónde obtiene el agua para beber y cocinar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cañería de red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agua lera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pozo sin bomba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lago, laguna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.9 ¿Tenie baño o letrina?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.10 El baño es:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Usado por solo un hogar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Compartido por otros hogares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.11 El baño tiene desagüe:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Al alcantarillado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A una cámara séptica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A un pozo ciego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A la superficie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.12 ¿Donde bota sus basuras?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Carro basurero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Campo libre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Incinerador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enterrado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.13 ¿Qué tipo de combustible utiliza para cocinar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Guano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kerosén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Electricidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Otro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 No utiliza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.14 ¿Usa energía eléctrica para alumbrar su vivienda?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.15 ¿Con qué tipo o uso de consumo eléctrico cuenta?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Colectivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.16 ¿Cómo es la calidad del servicio de electricidad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Es bueno (casi siempre hay suficiente luz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Es regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Es malo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Es muy malo (casi nunca hay suficiente luz)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SALUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.17 ¿Es usted asegurado a algún servicio médico u otro?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.18 ¿Donde acude en caso de enfermedad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hospital público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hospital privado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Posta sanitaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yatiri / curandero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Otro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.19 ¿Si no acude a servicio médico cuando alguien en su familia está enfermo, cual es la mayor razón? (respuestas múltiples posibles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No sabía donde ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No podía pagar el costo del transporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No podía pagar el costo de la consulta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 No podía salir del trabajo, tenía que hacer otras cosas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 El cuidado es inadecuado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 No me tratan bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Fui pero me negaron el cuidado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 No pensaba que estaba muy enferno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Otro (específica)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. PARTICIPACIÓN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.1 ¿Desde qué año vive usted o tiene su lote en el barrio?</th>
<th>R.3 ¿Habitualmente se encuentra alguien en su casa durante la semana?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1. Alguien de mi familia siempre está por aquí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Estamos en casa para dormir y fines de semana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Venimos los domingos solamente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Estamos unos ................ días por semana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.2 ¿También alquila o tiene otra casa o lote en otra parte de la ciudad?</th>
<th>R.4 ¿Qué ha tenido que hacer para quedarse en el barrio?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1. Pagar derecho de piso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pasar lista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Construir casa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Transferencia o compra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Otro ......................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.5 ¿Planta permanecer en el barrio los próximos diez años?</th>
<th>R.6 ¿A quién dirige sus preocupaciones sobre asuntos barriales?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1. Dirigente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jefes de grupo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Vecinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Familia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Otros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.7 ¿Si no asiste a las reuniones del barrio como se entera de las decisiones que se toman?</th>
<th>R.8 ¿Cómo se entera de los acontecimientos del barrio?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jefe de grupo</td>
<td>1. Reuniones de grupo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vecinos</td>
<td>2. Vecinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Familia</td>
<td>3. Familia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. En la tienda</td>
<td>5. En la tienda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Otros</td>
<td>6. Otros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.9 ¿Qué tipo de medios de comunicación usa regularmente para enterarse de las noticias?</th>
<th>R.10 ¿Qué es su nivel de participación en la Junta vecinal u OTB?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Radio</td>
<td>1. Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Televisión</td>
<td>2. Medio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Periódico</td>
<td>3. Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Otro</td>
<td>6. Otros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.11 ¿En qué forma se involucra en los asuntos de la Junta vecinal u OTB?</th>
<th>R.12 ¿Qué tipo de impacto generan sus opiniones en las decisiones del barrio?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Está presente</td>
<td>1. Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opina</td>
<td>2. Medio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incide</td>
<td>3. Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Líder</td>
<td>4. Ninguno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.13 ¿Aparte de la Junta vecinal u OTB, participa en otras organizaciones o grupos?</th>
<th>R.14 ¿En qué forma se involucra en los asuntos de estos grupos?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sindicato</td>
<td>1. Esta presente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Iglesias</td>
<td>2. Opina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liga deportiva</td>
<td>3. Incide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Club de madres</td>
<td>4. Líder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junta escolar</td>
<td>6. Otros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.16 ¿A partir de cuántas instancias se resuelven los problemas o conflictos que surgen entre vecinos?</th>
<th>R.17 ¿En el barrio los vecinos se organizan entre ellos para que los carreros sistemas le provean de agua potable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Justicia o policía municipal</td>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Los dirigentes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Delegados de municiq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Entre los vecinos involucrados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Con la ayuda de otros vecinos o familiares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No se resuelven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.18 ¿Los vecinos pueden ejercer algún control sobre la OTB?</th>
<th>R.19 ¿Han tenido la presencia de autoridades municipales o gubernamentales en el barrio para hablar sobre temas del barrio?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.20 ¿Ha habido algún resultado sobre el tema que han hablado con esas autoridades?</th>
<th>R.21 ¿Con que frecuencia regularmente participa en reuniones en el barrio?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1. Más de una vez por semana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Una vez por semana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Una vez por mes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Una vez cada ............... meses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. No participo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.22 ¿Ha participado en alguna movilización de la OTB?</th>
<th>R.23 ¿Cómo califica la dirigencia actual?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sí 2 No</td>
<td>1. Muy bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Malo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Muy malo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. SAMPLE PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH TOOLS AND PRODUCTS

1. Slides from visual products to encourage dialogue over initial analyses (2007)

Based on interviews with community leaders and available data, the Poder Local Program team members developed initial analyses of each neighborhood. These were presented to residents in meetings and as printed pamphlets to foster discussion regarding neighborhood issues.
2. Pages from visual history of Lomas de Santa Bárbara (2007)

Lomas leaders wanted a product to reflect research findings in an accessible format, particularly on the neighborhood history. The pages below are from a comic book based on in-depth interviews and group oral histories. Boxes throughout link local history with urban trends. The grey boxes below, for example, contain blurbs on migration to cities and on the context of informal lots.

Migrando a Cochabamba
Sebastián y Fica son unos de los tantos migrantes que llegaron a Cochabamba, que viene tanto de comunidades rurales y mineras como de otras ciudades del país. Según el Censo 2001, 78.474 personas (14.6% de la población de la ciudad) son migrantes, recientemente el 60% de la población (respectivamente) ha nacido fuera de Cochabamba.
La vigilia permanente no era en vano, ya que una noche, como tantas otras, sonaron las peladas...

Acostumbrado a dormirse vestido, el Sebastián se desperta abruptamente, a luchar por su terreno.

Huellas, piedras o por último no falta un minero que cuenta con cachorros de dinamita.

La necesidad de lotes

En todas las ciudades de Bolivia y hasta de Latinoamérica pasa lo mismo. Las clases populares, muchos quienes trabajan en el sector informal, ganan al día pequeños montos muy variables. No tienen los recursos suficientes como para pagar en una sola vez un terreno con un título de propiedad, en regla, una casa, y los servicios básicos y sociales. Estas circunstancias socio-económicas – combina con la falta de políticas urbanas satisfactorias – hacen que tantas personas cengan lotes en condiciones inéditas y se tengan que someter a manipulaciones de gente como los letrados.
3. *Poster for popular forum on research findings* (2008)

A Zona Sur-wide forum was held, with discussants from the different neighborhoods as well as municipal authorities, to discuss the findings of the Poder Local study on citizen control.
4. Pages from pamphlets for workshops on neighborhood data (2008)

Once the surveys were developed in collaboration with neighborhood leaders, and data was collected and analyzed, workshops were held to discuss findings with residents and leaders.
APPENDIX D. CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSE

This is the text of Creative Commons’ Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, version 3.0. ¹

THE WORK (AS DEFINED BELOW) IS PROVIDED UNDER THE TERMS OF THIS CREATIVE COMMONS PUBLIC LICENSE (“CCPL” OR “LICENSE”). THE WORK IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAW. ANY USE OF THE WORK OTHER THAN AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS LICENSE OR COPYRIGHT LAW IS PROHIBITED.

BY EXERCISING ANY RIGHTS TO THE WORK PROVIDED HERE, YOU ACCEPT AND AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS LICENSE. TO THE EXTENT THIS LICENSE MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE A CONTRACT, THE LICENSOR GRANTS YOU THE RIGHTS CONTAINED HERE IN CONSIDERATION OF YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

1. Definitions

a. "Collective Work" means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Work in its entirety in unmodified form, along with one or more other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole. A work that constitutes a Collective Work will not be considered a Derivative Work (as defined below) for the purposes of this License.

b. "Derivative Work" means a work based upon the Work or upon the Work and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Work may be recast, transformed, or adapted, except that a work that constitutes a Collective Work will not be considered a Derivative Work for the purpose of this License. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Work is a musical composition or sound recording, the synchronization of the Work in timed-relation with a moving image ("synching") will be considered a Derivative Work for the purpose of this License.

c. "Licensor" means the individual, individuals, entity or entities that offers the Work under the terms of this License.

d. "Original Author" means the individual, individuals, entity or entities who created the Work.

e. "Work" means the copyrightable work of authorship offered under the terms of this License.

f. "You" means an individual or entity exercising rights under this License who has not previously violated the terms of this License with respect to the Work, or who has received express permission from the Licensor to exercise rights under this License.

¹ See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/
Despite a previous violation.

2. Fair Use Rights

Nothing in this license is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any rights arising from fair use, first sale or other limitations on the exclusive rights of the copyright owner under copyright law or other applicable laws.

3. License Grant

Subject to the terms and conditions of this License, Licensor hereby grants You a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright) license to exercise the rights in the Work as stated below:

   a. to reproduce the Work, to incorporate the Work into one or more Collective Works, and to reproduce the Work as incorporated in the Collective Works; and,

   b. to distribute copies or phonorecords of, display publicly, perform publicly, and perform publicly by means of a digital audio transmission the Work including as incorporated in Collective Works.

The above rights may be exercised in all media and formats whether now known or hereafter devised. The above rights include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats, but otherwise you have no rights to make Derivative Works. All rights not expressly granted by Licensor are hereby reserved, including but not limited to the rights set forth in Sections 4(d) and 4(e).

4. Restrictions

The license granted in Section 3 above is expressly made subject to and limited by the following restrictions:

   a. You may distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work only under the terms of this License, and You must include a copy of, or the Uniform Resource Identifier for, this License with every copy or phonorecord of the Work You distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform. You may not offer or impose any terms on the Work that restrict the terms of this License or the ability of a recipient of the Work to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the License. You may not sublicense the Work. You must keep intact all notices that refer to this License and to the disclaimer of warranties. When You distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work, You may not impose any technological measures on the Work that restrict the ability of a recipient of the Work from You to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the License. This Section 4(a) applies to the Work as incorporated in a Collective Work, but this does not require the Collective Work apart from the Work itself to be made subject to the terms of this License. If You create a Collective Work, upon notice from any Licensor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Collective Work any credit as required by Section 4(c), as requested.
b. You may not exercise any of the rights granted to You in Section 3 above in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation. The exchange of the Work for other copyrighted works by means of digital file-sharing or otherwise shall not be considered to be intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation, provided there is no payment of any monetary compensation in connection with the exchange of copyrighted works.

c. If You distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work (as defined in Section 1 above) or Collective Works (as defined in Section 1 above), You must, unless a request has been made pursuant to Section 4(a), keep intact all copyright notices for the Work and provide, reasonable to the medium or means You are utilizing: (i) the name of the Original Author (or pseudonym, if applicable) if supplied, and/or (ii) if the Original Author and/or Licensor designate another party or parties (e.g. a sponsor institute, publishing entity, journal) for attribution ("Attribution Parties") in Licensor’s copyright notice, terms of service or by other reasonable means, the name of such party or parties; the title of the Work if supplied; to the extent reasonably practicable, the Uniform Resource Identifier, if any, that Licensor specifies to be associated with the Work, unless such URI does not refer to the copyright notice or licensing information for the Work. The credit required by this Section 4(c) may be implemented in any reasonable manner; provided, however, that in the case of a Collective Work, at a minimum such credit will appear, if a credit for all contributing authors of the Collective Work appears, then as part of these credits and in a manner at least as prominent as the credits for the other contributing authors. For the avoidance of doubt, You may only use the credit required by this clause for the purpose of attribution in the manner set out above and, by exercising Your rights under this License, You may not implicitly or explicitly assert or imply any connection with, sponsorship or endorsement by the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties, as appropriate, of You or Your use of the Work, without the separate, express prior written permission of the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties.

d. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Work is a musical composition:

i. **Performance Royalties Under Blanket Licenses.** Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect whether individually or, in the event that Licensor is a member of a performance rights society (e.g. ASCAP, BMI, SESAC), via that society, royalties for the public performance or public digital performance (e.g. webcast) of the Work if that performance is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation.

ii. **Mechanical Rights and Statutory Royalties.** Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect, whether individually or via a music rights agency or designated agent (e.g. Harry Fox Agency), royalties for any phonorecord You create from the Work ("cover version") and distribute, subject to the compulsory license created by 17 USC Section 115 of the US Copyright Act (or the equivalent in other jurisdictions), if Your distribution of such cover version is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation.
e. **Webcasting Rights and Statutory Royalties.** For the avoidance of doubt, where the Work is a sound recording, Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect, whether individually or via a performance-rights society (e.g. SoundExchange), royalties for the public digital performance (e.g. webcast) of the Work, subject to the compulsory license created by 17 USC Section 114 of the US Copyright Act (or the equivalent in other jurisdictions), if Your public digital performance is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation.

5. **Representations, Warranties and Disclaimer**

UNLESS OTHERWISE MUTUALLY AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES IN WRITING, LICensor OFFERS THE WORK AS-IS AND ONLY TO THE EXTENT OF ANY RIGHTS HELD IN THE LICENSED WORK BY THE LICENSOR. THE LICENSOR MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND CONCERNING THE WORK, EXPRESS, IMPLIED, STATUTORY OR OTHERWISE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, WARRANTIES OF TITLE, MARKETABILITY, MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, NONINFRINGEMENT, OR THE ABSENCE OF LATENT OR OTHER DEFECTS, ACCURACY, OR THE PRESENCE OF ABSENCE OF ERRORS, WHETHER OR NOT DISCOVERABLE. SOME JURISDICTIONS DO NOT ALLOW THE EXCLUSION OF IMPLIED WARRANTIES, SO SUCH EXCLUSION MAY NOT APPLY TO YOU.

6. **Limitation on Liability**

EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY APPLICABLE LAW, IN NO EVENT WILL LICensor BE LIABLE TO YOU ON ANY LEGAL THEORY FOR ANY SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, PUNITIVE OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF THIS LICENSE OR THE USE OF THE WORK, EVEN IF LICensor HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

7. **Termination**

   a. This License and the rights granted hereunder will terminate automatically upon any breach by You of the terms of this License. Individuals or entities who have received Collective Works (as defined in Section 1 above) from You under this License, however, will not have their licenses terminated provided such individuals or entities remain in full compliance with those licenses. Sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will survive any termination of this License.

   b. Subject to the above terms and conditions, the license granted here is perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright in the Work). Notwithstanding the above, Licensor reserves the right to release the Work under different license terms or to stop distributing the Work at any time; provided, however that any such election will not serve to withdraw this License (or any other license that has been, or is required to be, granted under the terms of this License), and this License will continue in full force and effect unless terminated as stated above.

8. **Miscellaneous**

   a. Each time You distribute or publicly digitally perform the Work (as defined in Section 1
above) or a Collective Work (as defined in Section 1 above), the Licensor offers to the recipient a license to the Work on the same terms and conditions as the license granted to You under this License.

b. If any provision of this License is invalid or unenforceable under applicable law, it shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the terms of this License, and without further action by the parties to this agreement, such provision shall be reformed to the minimum extent necessary to make such provision valid and enforceable.

c. No term or provision of this License shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to unless such waiver or consent shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged with such waiver or consent.

d. This License constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the Work licensed here. There are no understandings, agreements or representations with respect to the Work not specified here. Licensor shall not be bound by any additional provisions that may appear in any communication from You. This License may not be modified without the mutual written agreement of the Licensor and You.

Creative Commons Notice

Creative Commons is not a party to this License, and makes no warranty whatsoever in connection with the Work. Creative Commons will not be liable to You or any party on any legal theory for any damages whatsoever, including without limitation any general, special, incidental or consequential damages arising in connection to this license. Notwithstanding the foregoing two (2) sentences, if Creative Commons has expressly identified itself as the Licensor hereunder, it shall have all rights and obligations of Licensor.

Except for the limited purpose of indicating to the public that the Work is licensed under the CCPL, Creative Commons does not authorize the use by either party of the trademark "Creative Commons" or any related trademark or logo of Creative Commons without the prior written consent of Creative Commons. Any permitted use will be in compliance with Creative Commons' then-current trademark usage guidelines, as may be published on its website or otherwise made available upon request from time to time. For the avoidance of doubt, this trademark restriction does not form part of this License.

Creative Commons may be contacted at http://creativecommons.org/.