

CONCLUSION

Marlies Glasius and Jan Aart Scholte

This eighth edition of the Yearbook has put the spotlight on poverty and, more particularly, citizen action in world politics around this question. The topic is not new to the Yearbook, since questions of impoverishment and activism to resist it have figured at least secondarily in a number of contributions to earlier volumes. However, given the prominence of poverty concerns in so much contemporary global civil society mobilisation – for example, around the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the debts of low-income countries, humanitarian relief actions, Education for All campaigns, etc. – the editors determined that the subject warranted full treatment across an entire edition. This Yearbook is the result.

The preceding chapters have ranged widely across global civil society involvements in the politics of poverty. The essays have interrogated discourses as well as statistics. Contributors have examined local groups that engage global issues as well as global organisations that intersect with local contexts. Chapters have travelled through theory and practice, the secular and the religious, the visual and the verbal. Closing questions remain: what has been learned; what adjustments to global civil society activism on poverty could be recommended; and what further studies might be prompted by the work done between these covers? The following pages address these summing-up issues in relation to conceptions of poverty, statistics of poverty, geographies of poverty, social structures and poverty, exits from poverty, and empowering the poor.

Conceptions of Poverty

Repeatedly, chapters in this volume have attested that poverty is not a straightforward concept. Blunt universal measures such as the dollar-a-day threshold give a sense of the immensity of the challenges, but little of the texture and diversity of poor people's lives. As chapters here have indicated, poverty for tribals in India, for peasants in Mali, and for the marginalised in London is far from the same thing: culturally, ecologically, economically, politically or psychologically. By implication, global civil society campaigns against

poverty would do well to cater their tactics to context more than has often happened to date. Future research might examine cases where global civil society mobilisation on poverty has maintained high degrees of sensitivity to local particularities.

Several authors in this volume have taken critique still further and expressed dissatisfaction with the word poverty itself. Smitu Kothari prefers the term 'impoverishment', as a way to denote that destitution is not a preordained and fixed condition, but a result of processes with active implementers as well as victims. In a similar vein, Harsh Mander emphasises that destitution is a socially generated condition that results from processes of exclusion. Kumi Naidoo does not object to the term poverty *per se*, but also insists that 'we see poverty as being defined by social and political relations and being produced through social systems'. Each of these perspectives implies that poverty is not a state of being, but a dynamic. Impoverishment or social exclusion entails acts of casting people out, or at least perpetuating their marginalised status. To this extent the causes of poverty lie with persons in positions of power who perform the acts of exclusion.

What is the role of global civil society in relation to processes of impoverishment? Does global civil society involve a dynamic of exclusion or a means of resistance? Different theories suggest opposing answers to this question. If, following Karl Marx, civil society is defined as 'bourgeois society', then global civil society would be a culprit in creating and perpetuating poverty. Yet if, following Antonio Gramsci, civil society involves 'proletarian counterhegemony', then global civil society would lay bare social exclusion and mobilise struggles for inclusion (Cohen and Arato 1992: 151; Rupert Taylor 2004).

Rather than indulge in purely theoretical disputes, the present Yearbook has opted for a more open definition of global civil society and devoted attention to empirical mapping of actual practices. Global civil society has been understood here as a 'sphere of ideas, values, institutions, organisations, networks, and individuals located between the family, the state,

and the market and operating beyond the confines of national societies, polities, and economies'. With this looser notion it is possible to explore the implications of global civil society for poverty and impoverishment without strong preconceptions regarding the nature of the relationship.

In fact the evidence accumulated in this Yearbook points in different directions. For example, some of the global civil society discourses discussed in Chapter 1 contribute to the social production of poverty, while others empower resistance to exclusion. Likewise, as indicated in Chapters 4 and 10, global civil society organisations can promote a wide variety of strategies, from maintenance of the status quo to pursuit of radical transformation. Thus neither 'global' nor 'civil society' carries with it a particular theory of poverty or a particular prescription for its elimination.

The lesson from this Yearbook, then, would be to avoid unqualified celebrations as well as blanket condemnations of global civil society in relation to poverty. Some activism within this realm parallels and reinforces the work of official agencies. Other initiatives challenge established policies and chart innovative courses. In a word, each instance of poverty activism in global civil society needs to be assessed without prejudice as to its motivations and consequences.

Arguing the Figures

Much as authors in this Yearbook (reflecting the research community at large) have not agreed on a conception of poverty, they have also contested the statistics around the subject. For example, Meghnad Desai affirms that the 'poverty head count' in India declined during the 1990s from 38 per cent to 27 per cent of the population. Yet two chapters later Smitu Kothari asserts that inequality in India increased between 1993 and 2000 in both rural and urban areas. Contrasting conceptions of poverty lead the respective authors to different sets of figures and different assessments of trends.

This disagreement vividly illustrates the argument elaborated by Sally Stares in Chapter 2: namely, that statistics are neither true nor false. Any quantification is by its nature a snapshot that conceals certain aspects of poverty at the same time that it reveals others. Desai and Kothari (like other authors) have each chosen from the mass of data such snippets as conform to – and confirm – their perspective on poverty and impoverishment.

Of course it is no great discovery that statistics,

and poverty statistics in particular, are political in their construction and use. Yet should activists and researchers on poverty conclude from this truism that all data is suspect and worthless? Clearly that inference would be mistaken. Empirical evidence is vital for the formulation and implementation of coherent policy, including effective measures of poverty eradication. The challenge for global civil society is not to suppress all statistics, but to nurture modes of data gathering, calculation, interpretation and circulation that will best serve the poor.

As Stares demonstrates, global civil society networks such as Social Watch have had considerable impact in promoting alternative and more multifaceted conceptions of poverty. Policy makers no longer contest the validity of including indicators such as maternal mortality or access to clean water in a poverty measure, even if such additions can be somewhat arbitrary. In local settings, too, numerous initiatives have encouraged poor people themselves to define the forms of deprivation that they suffer. However, activists have struggled to scale up these experiments and integrate this community-based thinking into the frames of public policy. Meanwhile the simplistic dollar-a-day metric has not lost its currency either. Even a big development NGO such as Oxfam continues to headline this crude measure.

Geographies of poverty

Collectively, the chapters in this Yearbook should also prompt theorists and practitioners of global civil society to reconsider the geography of poverty in the world today. Old-style dependency models produced in the 1960s and 1970s have passed their historical sell-by date. Activists need to map poverty less in terms of countries and continents and more in relation to locales within and across these spaces.

Dependency and world-system theories have tended to present poverty and wealth in a one-to-one correspondence with macro-regions. In such a conception North America and Western Europe constitute a rich centre of the world system, Eastern Europe and Latin America are an aspiring semi-periphery, and other regions form a destitute periphery. To be sure, even some early proponents of the theory recognised that this depiction oversimplified matters: that there was also a 'South' in the 'North', and vice versa. Nonetheless, to this day it remains common for researchers and practitioners alike to assign



labels of 'developed' and 'underdeveloped' (or, more euphemistically, 'developing') to countries and continents as though they were uniform units, thereby concealing processes of impoverishment that also occur within these spheres.

As chapters in this Yearbook indicate, these neat geographical binaries do not adequately reflect actual circumstances. The so-called 'Third World' contains pockets of conspicuous wealth with marble hotels, opulent houses, designer outlets, and bloated offshore bank accounts. As Kothari notes in his chapter, this 'North' in the 'South' carves its own space of wealth with 'an explosion of gated communities manned by private guards, private security agencies, private hospitals and clinics and private schools serving their needs'. Vinay Lal in his chapter likewise distinguishes wealthy and poor strands in contemporary migration from the 'periphery' to the 'core': some migrants move as doctors and engineers, whereas others move as domestics and sex workers. Meanwhile child poverty is rampant in large swathes of the would-be 'developed' countries, and beggars occupy the pavements outside five-star hotels in Paris and Washington as readily as Kampala and Mumbai. As Jane Wills stresses, a living wage is an urgent concern for some Londoners. Rather than persist with untenable notions of 'rich' and 'poor' countries and continents, anti-poverty campaigners might instead do better to highlight the glaring inequalities that have become more tangible everywhere in the world.

Indeed, the old maps of 'North' and 'South' could be positively detrimental to the poor. On the one hand, this conception encourages advantaged circles in the so-called 'developed' countries to regard poverty as something belonging in faraway lands of which they know little. Poverty alleviation is then 'addressed' with relatively paltry sums of 'foreign aid' (which moreover as often as not enhances market opportunities for well-off citizens of the donor countries). By locating poverty in the distant 'South' comfortable classes in the 'North' are more able to turn a blind eye to poverty and exclusion on their own doorstep. As and when the disadvantaged of the 'First World' raise their voices, elites subtly or not so subtly tell their poor neighbours to be happy that they do not live in the 'Third World', as though that settled the question.

Meanwhile, elites in the 'South' can invoke grossly over-aggregated statistics concerning inequalities between countries and continents in order to divert

attention from social inequalities of caste, class, ethnicity, gender, etc. within their own national and local contexts. The advantaged of the 'periphery' thereby externalise causes of poverty, when the forces do not in fact neatly align along an inside-outside divide. Also, crude notions of 'poor countries' can allow much 'aid' from the 'core' to sustain privileged circles in the 'periphery', rather than benefiting the poor in their midst.

The proximity of the poor – at whatever point on earth – is uncomfortable, also for well-intentioned activists of global civil society. This Yearbook has described various policies in different parts of the world that segregate the poor from the rich and hide them from view. As inequality continues to increase, as well as being spatially compressed, policies to make the poor invisible have intensified. For instance, as Amita Bhide sketches, the ostensible solution of redevelopment in Mumbai beautifies the city at the expense of slum dwellers. It is therefore important for researchers and activists of global civil society to insist on keeping poverty visible, especially that poverty which is close to home.

Social structures and poverty

In pursuing such critical knowledge and practice it is well to map poverty not only in relation to territorial geography, but also in terms of social categories (such as age, caste, class, disability, ethnicity, faith, gender, race, and sexuality). Indeed, as the chapters in this Yearbook have repeatedly shown, poverty can result as much (if not more) from social position than from geographical location. For example, members of a diaspora are prone to suffer impoverishment through racism wherever on earth their migration has taken them. Likewise, indigenous peoples tend to experience disproportionate poverty anywhere on the planet as a result of cultural subordination. Several chapters have also noted the structural feminisation of poverty owing to gender hierarchies on a global scale.

Optimistically, one might observe that discrimination on the basis of gender, caste or race has become less absolute in contemporary history. For instance, certain individuals from structurally disadvantaged backgrounds have reached the highest offices of state. As early as 1969, Golda Meir of Israel became the world's first non-dynastic female head of government. Former presidents and prime ministers, Corazón Aquino, Violeta Chamorro, Gro Harlem Brundtland, Margaret Thatcher, Angela Merkel and Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf have followed. In the early 1990s Nelson



Mandela moved from being a prisoner of apartheid to being president of an interracial regime in South Africa. In 1997 a Dalit became President of India in the person of Kocheril Raman Narayanan. In 2007, a child of immigrants became President of France in the person of Nicolas Sarkozy. As this Yearbook was being completed in 2009, Barack Obama became the first African-American President of the United States.

Yet these success stories can mask remaining structures of social inequality in the global political economy of poverty. Indeed, breakthroughs by individuals can in principle transpire at the same time that overall hierarchies in society become more entrenched. Several accounts in this Yearbook suggest that such paradoxical developments may be unfolding today. While Obama moves into the White House, many slum dwellers have never been more trapped in poverty. At the time of writing, the full knock-on effects of the global financial crisis are not yet apparent; however, it is predictable that the resultant expansion of the ranks of the poor will disproportionately involve children, the elderly, people of colour, underclasses and women.

Indeed, the rise of people like Meir, Mandela, Narayanan and Sarkozy may act as a double-edged sword in struggles of the structurally disadvantaged. On the one hand, such figureheads can lift the horizons of some who identify with them. On the other hand, successes of the exceptional few can complicate efforts to mobilise against continuing social exclusion for the many. The politics of post-apartheid South Africa are a case in point.

In some ways, then, this Yearbook can be read as an unsolved 'whodunit.' After the ten preceding chapters, the contours of the crime (i.e., poverty) have come into sharper focus. In addition, the character of the inspecting detective (i.e., global civil society) has been developed in much of its complexity. However, the identity of the perpetrator remains elusive. There are multiple suspects – including 'global capitalism', 'modernity', 'neo-liberalism', 'patriarchy' and 'racism' – but the evidence is not sufficiently conclusive for global civil society to solve the crime. Research and associated political debates will continue.

Exits from poverty

So, probably unsurprisingly, this Yearbook has not produced 'the answer' by which global civil society could eliminate poverty. To be sure, different chapters have suggested a variety of strategies. Indeed, given the diversity of contexts emphasised earlier, it might actually be unhelpful and unviable to promote a single formula for all global anti-poverty activism. Rather, this conclusion does better to draw together some of the proffered options.

Migration

One common response by poor people themselves is, and has long been, to leave the places where they live precariously and to seek better prospects elsewhere in the world economy. Some such migrations have been massive, and sometimes they have been extraordinarily successful, as in the case of the large-scale movement of poor people from Europe to the Americas in the nineteenth century. That said, economic success of migrants can be accompanied by cultural and political difficulties, as Vinay Lal has shown in his studies of the Indian diaspora in Fiji and Trinidad.

Migration of the poor in contemporary history has tended to bring mixed results, whether the movement takes place from rural to urban areas or from the global South to the global North. This labour mobility can provide employment and income – if often uncertain – but many of these migrants live in conditions of semi- or non-recognition by the host polity. Such predicaments afflict internal migrants such as the slum-dwellers of India described by Bhide as well as transborder migrants such as Asian labourers in the Gulf states described by Irudaya Rajan, and undocumented workers in Australia described by Berg and Samson.

Reactions in civil society to these mobile poor are ambivalent. 'Uncivil' ethno-populist opposition to economic migrants has surfaced in every main world region. As Berg and Samson observe, even human rights groups tend to have difficulty advocating for the equal rights of irregular economic migrants. Instead they work primarily on cases of more vivid repression such as human trafficking and slavery. No campaign of any significance in global civil society has promoted the creation of a systematic and just global migration regime to stand alongside global governance of finance, trade and communications. Thus contemporary activists have largely ignored one of the historically most prevalent and successful 'poverty reduction





strategies'. Poor people who pursue this course can currently expect little support from global civil society.

Religious Philanthropy

A more common response from (global) civil society to poverty is charity, with voluntary transfers of private resources to spare poor people the worst indignities of destitution. Some philanthropy moreover extends beyond immediate humanitarian relief to programmes of long-term poverty alleviation and eradication. Much though not all philanthropy follows exhortations from the world religions to look after the poor, as illustrated in this Yearbook with the chapter by Khaled Mansour and Heba Raouf Ezzat.

Historically, and to this day, most anti-poverty work in civil society has transpired through faith-based organisations. However, such initiatives have in the past tended to promote giving exclusively within the religious community. Today many religious associations are beginning to address the ethical and practical implications of cross-faith support. However, others such as Vishva Hindu Parishad continue to pursue an unabashedly sectarian agenda.

Mansour and Raouf Ezzat describe the recent trajectory of Islamic humanitarian organisations. Many of these associations originally drew a tight link between humanitarian relief, proselytisation and struggles against the enemies of the faith. Today the approach is one of a universalistic ethos that emphasizes relief for all who require it. Islam is important in such work as the inspiration for humanitarianism rather than as a mission for winning souls. At the same time, agencies such as Islamic Relief Worldwide are shifting their emphasis from immediate succour alone to long-term development as well.

Meanwhile other NGOs in global civil society are directing the resources obtained through philanthropy more towards advocacy work. These charities have recognised that poverty is combated not only through on-the-ground relief and development projects, but also through changes in the policies, rules and institutions that govern the world economy. Islamic organisations too may find that their new-found 'neutral' role as relief and development service providers is not a sufficient response to the deeper roots of poverty, prompting them to revert to more overtly political advocacy work.

Participatory Development

Also ostensibly politically neutral in their approach

to poverty reduction are the countless development projects pursued by globally operating secular NGOs. Much traditional work by the likes of Oxfam and Save the Children has concentrated on building schools, running clinics, digging wells, and so on in order to supply basic needs for the poor. Similarly, other global civil society initiatives covered in this Yearbook – for example, by the Grameen Foundation, Women's World Banking, and the World Economic Forum – have proffered technical fixes for poverty through, say, immunisation efforts and micro-credit schemes. In the early twenty-first century much of this project-based poverty alleviation work is framed around the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of the United Nations.

However, critics wonder at the effectiveness of these would-be practical solutions. They observe that decades of such 'development' work have not brought the world any closer to the end of poverty. Likewise, with five years to go it appears unlikely that the MDGs will be achieved. For the critics this mode of global civil society activism is too Northern-led, too micro-oriented, too much an 'aid industry' that has come to seek its self-perpetuation rather than its redundancy. In addition, development workers have often discovered to their frustration that advances which are painstakingly achieved through micro-level projects can rapidly unravel in the wake of macro-level developments around armed conflict, economic shocks or poor governance.

In response to such dissatisfaction, some global development NGOs such as ActionAid and Oxfam have shifted to anti-poverty strategies that emphasise advocacy and recipient participation. In regard to advocacy, the organisations have acquired substantial research and policy teams that explore the social, economic and regulatory conditions that shape impoverishment. The presumption is that effective lobbying of local, national, regional and global centres of governance can generate far greater advances against poverty than project work alone. As for participation, the organisations have drawn intended beneficiaries into their decision-taking processes regarding programme and project formulation and review.

In another step to root poverty reduction efforts more deeply in the target communities, the likes of ActionAid and Oxfam now leave much project execution to locally based 'partner' associations. The presumption is that work for the poor can be more effective when it is co-designed with the poor themselves. In addition,



these global NGOs have increasingly hired local staff into their country offices, including at senior levels. ActionAid has moreover relocated its head office from London to Johannesburg and appointed a number of its global policy officers from the South.

It remains to be seen how far these more overtly political approaches to poverty reduction will deliver better results on the ground. Certainly Oxfam tends still to concentrate its advocacy work with offices and staff in the global North. Likewise, most Oxfam funding decisions remain centralised at headquarters. The jury is also still out on whether localised staff will prove to be less paternalistic on caste and class lines vis-à-vis the poor. As other research has documented, discourses of 'participation' can all too easily gloss over inequalities rather than challenge them (Cooke and Kothari 2002).

Capitalism: maintained, reformed or transcended?

Still deeper than debates over participation in global civil society activism on poverty is the question of capitalism. Is capitalism – i.e., the modern and increasingly globalised political economy centred on surplus accumulation – the problem or the solution in respect of poverty? Contributors to this Yearbook fall on different points of the spectrum in relation to this core question of poverty politics.

Towards the 'solution' end of the spectrum, some contributions have suggested that capitalism in general – and global capitalism more particularly – provides a long-term sustainable exit from poverty for all. Thus, for example, most attendees at the World Economic Forum hold that capitalism has brought humanity unprecedented prosperity and will, if permitted to develop, reduce poverty to a minimum, if not eliminate it altogether. This 'Henry Ford' approach to the end of poverty argues that every Ford worker must be able to afford a Ford car. In this way the alleviation of poverty would simultaneously create an expanded consumer base for capitalist production. It is a win-win proposition where elites and underclasses have a shared interest in poverty reduction. All it needs is time, the resolution of certain technical hitches (such as inadequate financing mechanisms and information deficits), and the elimination of corruption. At that point capitalism will reveal its full potentials to defeat poverty.

Reliance on capitalist answers to poverty is not limited in global civil society to associations of big business. For example, the Grameen Foundation described

in Chapter 4 and Box 1.4 also looks to capitalism (in the form of microcredits) as an answer to poverty. Even StreetNet International, although it vigorously opposes exploitation of underclasses within capitalism, nevertheless seeks betterment for its constituents through legal recognition and increased bargaining power in the marketplace.

However, StreetNet and most other global civil society associations described in this Yearbook are sceptical about taking capitalism on its present terms as the route out of poverty. Indeed, a decade into the twenty-first century there appears to be a widespread consensus in global civil society that so-called 'neo-liberalist' policies of unfettered privatisation, liberalisation and deregulation have not provided the answer to poverty and indeed have often worked detrimentally in respect of poor people. The latest crisis in global finance has reinforced this scepticism and accentuated calls for change in the capitalist order.

Yet little consensus prevails regarding the nature of the required change to capitalism. Some such as Harsh Mander in this volume advocate a statist approach. As he puts it, we need 'the State to act ... pro-actively before people slip into destitution'. Many traditional socialist voices at the World Social Forum take a similar line.

Other reformists are more doubtful that the state-socialist formula that held sway across much of the world in the mid-twentieth century is appropriate today. After all, as Smitu Kothari notes in relation to India, in recent history the state has been a major agent of neo-liberalism, often contributing to the impoverishment of disadvantaged groups. Given this record, many in global civil society are today suspicious of returning all responsibility for anti-poverty policies to the state, even if this were possible.

Instead, much reformist attention (including from several editors of this Yearbook) currently goes in the direction of more hybrid forms of governance, where different kinds of actors work within a common regulatory framework to address a major public policy issue such as poverty. In a so-called 'multi-stakeholder' construction, national governments work together with supra-state agencies, corporate players and civil society associations. 'Global action networks' (to give the phenomenon another name) can, it is claimed, ensure that all affected constituencies participate and that power is democratically controlled. Examples of hybrid constructions with immediate relevance to poverty





reduction include the Global Water Partnership and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

Whether one opts for a statist or a multi-stakeholder approach, however, there remains an unanswered question of what ethical concept should inform a post-neoliberal strategy against poverty. Although indignation against glaring global inequalities remains acute, a vision of complete income equality is rarely touted nowadays. This reticence has come partly because income is no longer seen as the full or determining issue of poverty. In addition, many apparently fear that pursuit of this kind of equality can generate the dehumanising pursuit of homogeneity that characterized some communist experiments of the twentieth century.

So the search is on for an alternative ethics of global justice. One option, promoted particularly through UNDP around the turn of the millennium, is global public goods. This conception maintains that, while the market can be expected to produce most commodities most of the time, some core needs such as potable water, clean air and health care need to be guaranteed through public channels. In today's more global world these public goods must be provided at least in part through global regulatory arrangements.

A second and more demanding ethical frame for poverty eradication in the contemporary global political economy is that of economic and social human rights. To date rights discourses have tended to look too exclusively to the state as the bearer of obligations. However, it would be possible invest other actors such as multi-stakeholder regimes with these duties (Glasius 2006). Already the UN-sponsored Global Compact articulates a set of corporate responsibilities to promote social and economic rights, although adherence to this code of conduct is voluntary, and it lacks any enforcement mechanism. A more ambitious option would be to subordinate all global governance to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as a binding umbrella framework.

Other ethical frameworks for global justice inherently challenge the logics of capitalism. Such a critique readily emerges when anti-poverty struggles are coupled with ecological concerns. In this vein Kothari in this volume advocates a 'simple life with dignity'. Some indigenous peoples' resistance to modern destruction of their habitats follows a similar anti-capitalist line. From another angle, feminist notions of a 'gift economy' also suggest that poverty is better alleviated by rejecting

dynamics of accumulation (Vaughan 2007).

In the end, then, this Yearbook does not have an answer to the problem of capitalism and poverty. The broad options are clear enough: (a) rely on market-centred capitalism to eliminate poverty; (b) manipulate capitalism to work against poverty with proactive public policy; or (c) transcend capitalism so that poverty is eradicated through a political economy that is based on something other than surplus accumulation. This is another debate that this edition of the Global Civil Society Yearbook can only aim to sharpen and propel forward, not conclude.

Empowering the poor

Although perspectives on capitalism and world poverty often diverge, also in this Yearbook, broad agreement appears to reign between these covers that it is both morally right and practically effective when poor people themselves have a major say in the policy decisions that affect them. This message has surfaced continually across the various chapters of the Yearbook and has also run through these concluding pages. Poverty is largely a matter of social power, or lack of it. Any meaningful response to impoverishment must therefore also change the political dynamics involved.

On this subject Smitu Kothari has emphasized the importance of self-help movements of the poor. Celine Tan has explored the potentials of participatory budgets as a strategy for effective poverty reduction. Scholte and Timms have noted in Chapter 4 that global organisations in civil society do not *ipso facto* become elite preserves and can, when suitably constructed, give poor people themselves a political platform. That said, most of the global civil society forums discussed in Chapter 10 have struggled to offer substantial voice and initiative to impoverished circles.

Thus it appears far easier to pronounce the rhetoric of participation and empowerment than to realise these practices in actual global civil society activism on poverty. This very Yearbook, although articulating the need for self-determination by the poor, has in the end gathered spokespersons for the poor without passing the microphone to the poor themselves. The dynamics of impoverishment will be the weaker when the dispossessed publish their own narratives.



REFERENCES

Cohen, J L and Arato, A (1992) *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Glasius, Marlies (2007) 'Pipedream or Panacea? Global Civil Society and Economic and Social Rights', in Mary Kaldor, Martin Albrow, Helmut Anheier and Marlies Glasius (eds) *Global Civil Society 2006/7*. London: Sage.

Taylor, Rupert (ed) (2004) *Creating a Better World: Interpreting Global Civil Society*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.

Vaughan, Genevieve (ed) (2007) *Women and the Gift Economy: A Radically Different Worldview Is Possible*. Toronto: Inanna Publications and Education.