

This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article: Cornea, N. L., Véron, R., & Zimmer, A. (2017). Everyday governance and urban environments: Towards a more interdisciplinary urban political ecology. Geography Compass, 11(4), e12310, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12310>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Everyday governance and urban environments: Towards a more interdisciplinary Urban Political Ecology

Natasha Cornea, Institute of Geography and Sustainability, University of Lausanne.
natasha.cornea@gmail.com

René Véron, Institute of Geography and Sustainability, University of Lausanne.
Rene.veron@unil.ch

Anna Zimmer, Institute of Geography and Sustainability, University of Lausanne.
anlouve@gmail.com

Authorship statement: This paper is the product of discussions that have occurred between the three authors. The order of the authors names should not be taken to convey input, each have contributed equally to the end result.

Abstract

Urban Political Ecology (UPE) has mainly evolved within the discipline of geography to examine the power relations that produce uneven urban spaces (infrastructures and natures) and unequal access to resources in cities. Its increasingly poststructuralist orientation demands the questioning of received categories and concepts, including those of (neoliberal) governance, government and of the state. This paper attempts to open this black box by referring to the mostly anthropological literature on everyday governance and the everyday state. We argue that UPE could benefit from ethnographic governance studies to unveil multiple state and non-state actors that influence the local environment, their diverse rationalities, normative registers and interactions across scales. This would also to enrich and nuance geographical UPE accounts of neoliberal environmental governance and potentially render the framework more policy relevant.

Keywords: Urban Political Ecology, political ethnography, governance, norms

Introduction

The field of political ecology, an important framework in human geography to study human-environment relations, has become diversified in the past two decades in at least three dimensions: theoretically, topically and regionally. The classic neo-Marxian formulations of political ecology (PE) in the mid-1980s (Blaikie 1985, Blaikie and Brookfield 1987) have been replaced or complemented by post-structuralist approaches (Peet and Watts 1996, Walker 1998, Peet and Watts 2004); the focus on “land-based resources” (Blaikie and Brookfield 1987) has been broadened to include diverse topics

ranging from water management, protected areas and value chains of particular commodities to ecosystem services (Ernstson 2013, Kull, de Sastre and Castro-Larrañaga 2015), air pollution (Véron 2006, Buzzelli 2008) and climate change (Adger, Benjaminsen and Svarstad 2001); and the attention to rural areas in the global South has been extended to include studies on urban processes both in the global South and the global North.

Particularly the latter has implied the emergence of a rather distinct new field, that of Urban Political Ecology (UPE), since the late 1990s (Swyngedouw 1997, Bakker 2003, Kaika 2003). Inspired by urban geographers in particular (Smith 1990, Harvey 1996) UPE regards cities as a “second nature”, as the dominant and arguably most “natural” form of human living under the present capitalist system. It recognizes that urbanization is always an interconnected social (political-economic) and an environmental (physical-material) process and that cities are socio-environmental hybrids (Swyngedouw 2006). In sync with the normative orientation of political ecology, the general research agenda of UPE has been to uncover the political-economic and power relations that produce current forms of urbanization, uneven urban spaces and differentiated access to resources and services in cities.

While UPE largely developed from within the discipline of geography and within a Marxist framework, the field (like its rural counterpart before) has recently experienced a shift toward poststructuralist, particularly Latourian and Foucauldian, approaches to apprehend urban socio-environmental processes as well as the related politics and power relations (see the review articles of Gabriel 2014 and Heynen 2014, for example). Furthermore, recent (situated) UPE studies have paid more attention to micro-politics

and everyday practices of city-making (Truelove 2011, Loftus 2012, Shillington 2012, Lawhon et al. 2014) instead of structural power and the elites.

This shift towards poststructuralist perspectives on UPE necessitates the opening of black boxes, including that of government or governance, which can no longer be attributed to a monolithic state driven by the interests of a capitalist elite. Gabriel (2014) has therefore rightly identified governance as an issue to be better theorized and to be examined more closely in UPE, and he reviews the potential contributions of the largely geographical literature on urban governance, urban subject formation and self-governance (see also Monstadt 2009).

In this paper, by contrast, we attempt to go beyond this disciplinary focus (which has generally been more prevalent in UPE than its rural counterpart). In particular, we aim to show the usefulness of the mostly social-anthropological and ethnographic approaches of everyday governance and the everyday state for UPE.¹ These point to the plurality of governance actors, their practices, rationales, normative orientations, interests and imaginaries as well as their relative and contextual power that shape local (urban) spaces and environments as well as access to (urban) resources, amenities and services. Paying increased attention to the practices of actors other than elites (as in much of “first-generation” UPE studies) or ordinary city dwellers (as in more recent situated UPE research) may also render UPE more policy-relevant; everyday-governance actors, including street-level bureaucrats, municipal councillors, NGOs or neighbourhood leaders, are often the key implementers of urban environmental policies and partners in urban development projects.

In the following section, we describe the use of governance concepts in existing, mostly geographical, UPE studies. We then provide a more detailed explanation of the concepts of everyday governance and the everyday state and their application in empirical studies, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and in India. In the subsequent section, we assess the potential benefit for UPE to engage with these concepts and to undertake ethnographic governance studies. In the conclusions, we highlight the advantages of an intensified interdisciplinary dialogue in the field of UPE and the use of a politicized governance concept.

The concept of governance in existing UPE studies

(Urban) political ecologists have criticized the governance literature for being largely “apolitical” (if they have not ignored it altogether). The normative approach of “good governance”, for instance, is regarded as a homogenizing techno-managerial project that downplays conflicting interests and deep societal divisions as ostensible consent is created through formalistic forms of participation and accountability (Swyngedouw 2005, Swyngedouw 2009). Furthermore, the idea that new forms of governance that include state and non-state actors in partnerships would be less hierarchical and more inclusive than state-centered government is seen as naïve; decision-making can shift to non-state governance actors that are neither democratically accountable nor popularly seen as having legitimacy. The democratic content of governance thus needs to be questioned (Chandhoke 2003, Mayntz 2003, Swyngedouw 2005, Swyngedouw 2006).

However, governance can also be used as an analytical concept and in a political way to examine how interdependent state and non-state actors negotiate policy goals, ways to

reach them and attempt to steer society (Kooiman 2003, Hust 2005). In rural PE, for instance, conflicting interests and agendas of different actors at different scales have been at the centre of analysis at least since the 1990s, often inspired by actor-oriented approaches to the study of development (Long 1990). In this literature, the politicized environment has been understood as an “arena of contested entitlements” (Bryant & Bailey 1997, 27) or as a proxy for fighting out underlying, often historical, socioeconomic conflicts (Kull 2002, Robbins 2004). Furthermore, the variety of political practices of different actors have been studied in relation to layered institutions, understood as “rules-in-use” (Watts & Peet 2004, 25). Apart from studying household- and community-level conflicts, negotiations and institutions, political ecological studies have early on paid primary attention to the role of the state as both protecting and destroying the rural environment as well as mediating between different environmental interests (Bryant & Bailey 1997, 39, Robbins 2008).

By contrast, UPE has rarely employed an equivalent analytical governance concept that looks at a large range of actors and their political practices shaping the urban socio-environment. Rather, the dominant Marxist-oriented UPE literature forwards macro- and meso-scale political-economic analyses that often present local urban socio-environments to be governed by actor-less, overwhelming top-down processes. For example, Heynen (2006, p. 500) related changes in urban tree cover to deindustrialization and the concomitant change in employment and income in Indianapolis, concluding that “[p]olitical economic processes ... govern the distribution of urban trees within cities” (Heynen 2006, p. 500, emphasis added). If an explicit reference to governance is made, it tends to be understood as a neoliberal system as, for example in the UPE literature on

planning that sees governance as a new “regime” of public-private partnerships (Hagerman 2007, p. 285) or as entrepreneurial “strategies” (Quastel 2009, p. 719).

Another set of UPE studies, by contrast, engages with the role of a variety of (local) actors, yet without drawing explicitly on governance. For example, Njeru (2006) investigates the Nairobi City Council’s efforts in formulating programmes to address the plastic bag waste problem and the influence of business associations on their implementation. Bryne et al. (2007) examine the creation of an inner-city park in Los Angeles and highlight the importance of a local history that weaves together real estate agents and oil companies with a wide coalition of elected officials and municipal institutions in the shaping of the urban environment. Finally Desfor and Vesalon (2008) focus on Toronto Harbour Commission’s role in producing new urban land at Toronto’s waterfront in the early 20th century, but recognize other actors, such as the media, business associations and local politicians, in producing political consensus around the creation of land through the infill of marsh and a shallow bay.

A further strand of UPE literature applies the analytical governance concept more explicitly in the examination of state-led urban service provisioning and environmental policy (Gandy 2004, Véron 2006, Ioris 2012, Kitchen 2013, Gopakumar 2014, Ranganathan 2014). These authors recognize and examine the relationships between the state and other actors, including community based organizations, NGOs and activists, in an era of governance reform and the neoliberalization of nature. For example, Véron (2006) shows how the judiciary and environmentalist NGOs determined state-level air pollution policies in Delhi and contributed to a more rigid demarcation of private and public environments. Gopakumar (2014) examines private-public partnerships and their

provision of networked water in Bangalore that opened political space for a network of local residents, associations and activists. Furthermore, Kitchen (2013) highlights the tensions between neoliberalism, capitalist production and consumption, on the one hand, and the stated ideals of community empowerment, on the other, in the new governance of urban forests in Wales. These studies thus begin to respond to the call that “[t]he role of the state ... needs to be placed more centrally within [urban political ecology and environmental justice] literatures with increased linkages to the expansive and emerging work on neoliberalisations” (Cook and Swynegdouw 2012, p. 1970).

While these are useful attempts toward a more actor-oriented UPE, the concept of governance is rarely problematized. More thoroughgoing actor- and practice-oriented concepts of governance have been developed outside of (U)PE, particularly in the anthropological literatures on everyday governance and the everyday state.

Everyday governance, practice and the state

Since the early 2000s, a wide range of authors have engaged with the everyday practices of governance as the object of their studies (see for example Le Meur & Lund 2001, Blundo & Le Meur 2009, Eggen 2011, Hausermann 2012, Bjerkli 2013, Schindler 2014). Concurrently, other bodies of literature have engaged with contiguous topics, for example the ‘everyday state’ (Fuller & Benei 2000, Corbridge et al. 2005, Coelho 2006, Anjaria 2011). These approaches have in common to see governance as something that occurs within and beyond the state sphere and that needs to be examined through the practices of involved actors. They differ in their analysis of governance processes from Marxist-

oriented UPE (including those that integrate Foucauldian and Latourian elements), which put emphasis on political-economic processes, formal policies, macro-level discourses and structural power, by viewing power as relative, context-specific and dispersed among a wide range of actors.

Everyday governance

A cohesive body of literature on everyday governance has emerged from the writings of anthropologists who study the state in mostly francophone West Africa (Le Meur & Lund 2001, Blundo & Le Meur 2009, Myers 2010, Eggen 2011, Olivier de Sardan 2011, Bierschenk & Olivier de Sardan 2014, Olivier de Sardan 2014). These authors explore the provisioning of public goods and services through a multiplicity of power centres and the related actual governance practices (Le Meur & Lund 2001, Blundo 2002).

Le Meur and Lund (2001, p. 2) in an early writing define everyday governance broadly to be “the actual practices of how interests are pursued and countered, authority exercised and challenged, and power institutionalised and undermined.” In a more extensive exploration of the concept, Blundo and Le Meur (2009, p. 7) offer a definition of everyday governance as “a set of interactions ... resulting in more or less stabilised regulations, producing order and/or disorder ... and defining a social field, the boundaries and participants of which are not predefined.”

These ethnographical studies on everyday governance focus on the “banal” workings of the local state (Bierschenk & Olivier de Sardan 2014, p. 3) and the practices of various state and non-state governance actors, including bureaucrats, politicians, customary

leaders of the chefferie, merchants and development project workers. Through their interactions novel, temporary and context-specific articulations between state and non-state institutions are created that defy simple demarcations of “state”, “civil society” or “private sector” (Blundo 2002). Especially in postcolonial societies, these governing practices must be captured through fieldwork and in their “complexity, variety, ambiguity and modernity” in order to avoid any preconceptions regarding patterns of behaviour and modes of decision-making (Olivier de Sardan 2008, p. 1).

This literature has shown that governance actors are in a position to negotiate, adapt, hybridize or create norms, rules and regulations; these are not externally imposed on them (Olivier de Sardan 2008, Blundo & Le Meur 2009). The question thus arises how “the rules (...) are produced, debated, transformed and controlled” (Blundo and Le Meur 2009, p. 2) and by whom. These processes reproduce a plurality of norms, implying that negotiations between actors are not only about means and ends but also about the imaginaries, set of norms, or normative registers, to apply in a given situation. According to Blundo and Le Meur (2009), the plurality of norms (which is a common feature in postcolonial societies in particular) tends to favour those actors who are endowed with multiple forms of capital and are thus able to set the object and the rules of the game. At the same time a subtle economy of favours creates a “web of indebtedness” (Anders 2009, p. 128) amongst actors who help each other in (or ignore someone's) circumventing formal regulations. Others might be excluded from these networks; inclusion in and exclusion from the arenas of governance are hotly contested (Blundo & Le Meur 2009).

A point of contention may be the definition of the “field” of governance itself; that is, the decision about which subjects, activities or environments should be addressed by (whose) governance efforts. Governing is an activity in which a certain state of affairs, space or conduct is constructed as problematic (Fuchs 2005, Blundo & Le Meur 2009). Everyday governance approaches, therefore, examine which actors and groups try to problematize particular situations or spaces or activities.

In reviews of the literature on everyday governance, Olivier de Sardan (2011; 2014) provides a typology of modes of local governance in West Africa that point to the actor groups that provide public or collective goods and services. He identifies four principal modes: bureaucratic (state); municipal (resulting from decentralization); development project based; and associational (cooperatives, farmers’ groups). Also present are four more disparate, individualized modes: chiefly (traditional chefferie); sponsorship based (sponsors or big men); merchant based (private operators delivering public services); and a religious mode. Despite their distinctiveness, each of these modes of governance operates from a specific source of legitimacy and authority, each is regulated by a particular set of norms and each is accountable to others through particular mechanisms. While Olivier de Sardan’s typology is specific to West Africa, it can usefully inspire research in other regions to explore the multiplicity of groups intervening in local governance drawing upon different normative registers and sources of legitimacy and authority.

Anthropologies of the state

Olivier de Sardan's summary of the modes of governance in West Africa resonates with the literature on the Indian 'everyday state' (Fuller & Benei 2000, Corbridge et al. 2005, Gupta 2012) or the 'anthropology of the state' in India (Sharma & Gupta 2006). This literature has also largely been produced by anthropologists using ethnographic methods and studying the state and governance in a non-normative manner. Research on the everyday state employs a diverse range of thematic entry points, including the delivery of public goods and services or slum clearance (see Fuller and Benei 2000), the implementation of anti-poverty schemes or the provision of primary education (Corbridge et al. 2005), corruption or immigration practices (Sharma & Gupta 2006).

These studies recast the state as a heterogeneous assembly of actors, institutions, practices and representations that is constantly reproduced through power relations as well as through deliberate performance (Fuller & Benei 2000, Hansen & Stepputat 2001, Corbridge et al. 2005). These processes, through which the state asserts its relative authority, are often built on intimate, personal relationships between state and non-state actors (Sharma & Gupta 2006). The examination of state-society relationships thus becomes crucial for an anthropological understanding of the (local) state. Gupta (1995), for example, explores the unclear boundary between state and society through the practices of state actors. Conversely, Corbridge et al. (2005) study the practices of people accessing and using the state, often through political intermediaries. While state activity may appear as a "messy and ever-contingent reality" (Herbert 2000, p. 555), the realm of the state has logics and rules that are, however, not a singular or fixed, but constantly (re-

)negotiated as all concerned actors navigate plurality (Osella & Osella 2000, Berenschot 2010).

Practices and power

These bodies of literature on ‘everyday governance’ and the ‘everyday state’ have aptly shown the value of examining practices in governance studies, and three major insights can be drawn. First, they point to an array of actors with different normative registers and imaginaries that complicate the ‘steering of society’ by a government toward some pre-defined condition. Continuous and contingent negotiations and shifting alliances between state and non-state actors produce complex ground realities of (local) governance that vary in time and space and blur the boundaries between state and society (Gupta 1995). Second, these literatures rightly point to the relative but continued importance of the state and of the practices of state actors for governance. The state as an institution has at least the ambition to steer society, particularly in postcolonial contexts, and the ‘state as an idea’ (Fuller and Benei, 2000) often serves as a reference point for actors, including ordinary people, to which actual governance practices (e.g., corruption) are compared. Thirdly, while paying attention to governance practices by state actors, the ‘informality’ that occurs within formal structures must be recognized. That is to say that even within structures led by written rules, guidelines, regulations and laws, there is often disparity between the official model and actual behaviour on the ground (Tarlo 2000, Roy 2002, Corbridge et al. 2005, Bierschenk & Olivier de Sardan 2014, Olivier de Sardan 2014). However, this informality is not without a normative register of its own (or ‘practical norms’ in the words of Olivier de Sardan (2014)) that underpins the practices of officials.

Furthermore, the reviewed literature explicitly engages with questions of power (unlike many normative governance studies), very often using Foucauldian notions of dispersed power (unlike most Marxist-oriented UPE research). According to Foucault (1982), power is always relational, emergent and enacted, existing only through practices in particular contexts. Adopting this understanding of power displaces the state or government as the sole entity from analysis in governance studies and shifts the attention to dispersed practices and the relationships between state and other actors that result in everyday forms of control (Ekers and Loftus, 2008). Blundo and Le Meur (2009), for example, capture the dispersed nature of power through Foucault's concept of governmentality. They understand governmentality as "the link between government techniques and subject-making" (p. 10) and suggest that "the heuristic strength of governmentality lies in its ability to weave domination and subjectivation into a common framework while paying attention to the knowledgeability and capability ... of all actors involved" (Blundo and Le Meur 2009, p. 11). Corbridge et al. (2005) put the capability of ordinary people in relation to governmentality (defined as the 'conduct of conduct' following Foucault). In particular, they show that participation (as a technology of power and part of the 'good governance' agenda) has created spaces of empowerment, including for the rural poor. By contrast, Olivier de Sardan's work refers to Weberian concepts of power, such as authority and legitimacy. Power is still seen as context-specific and dispersed, between local political, economic and social elites rather than among ordinary people. Inspired by Bourdieu's field theory, power is seen as based not on economic relations alone (as in Marxist approaches) but also on social and symbolic capital (cf. Bourdieu, 1998).

Despite these differences in the conceptualization of power, the literatures on everyday governance and the anthropology of the state concur that “even if power is diffuse, it is still to some extent concentrated in social institutions, it has ‘centres’” and that “relationships of power are mediated by a variety of actors and agencies” (Lindell (2008, p. 1881). Apart from identifying where power lies, the reviewed literature puts emphasis on the necessity to recognize the co-existence of various modes of power and to examine how power is exercised through practices.

Potential benefits of ethnographies of governance for UPE

Approaches of everyday governance have so far been rarely used to study urban environmental issues, with the partial exceptions of some research on water (Alou 2009, Truelove 2011, Ranganathan & Balazs 2015); waste water and sanitation (van der Geest & Obirih-Opareh 2009, Zimmer 2012, Zimmer & Sakdapolrak 2012, Desai et al. 2015); solid waste (Bulkeley et al. 2007, Bjerkli 2013); and land (Nauta 2009). However, we suggest that UPE would benefit from integrating approaches of everyday governance for various reasons.

First, ethnographies of governance and the state facilitate an empirically rich account of interactions and negotiations that have an immediate effect on the local socio-environment. They unveil the local agents of policy implementation, their rationalities and interactions with city dwellers, thus going beyond the analysis of formal policies and policy discourse to examine how these are put into practice on the ground. This implies increased attention to street-level bureaucrats, local councillors, neighbourhood leaders

and other political intermediaries hitherto neglected in UPE analyses. For example, Berenschot (2010) offers a detailed analysis of the daily routine of a city councillor in Ahmedabad in order to explore the institutionalisation of a “mediated state” in Gujarat. These political actors shape the delivery of a wide range of state services, including environmental services such as water and sanitation. Such a detailed ethnography of the state complicates readings of patronage politics to expose the complex flows of information and influence between the state, political actors and citizens in the everyday.

Second, studies informed by the concept of the everyday state would therefore also respond to the general critique of the literature on neoliberal governance and urban change to overlook the local state in its heterogeneity and ostensible disorderliness (Blanco et al. 2014). They would help identifying and explaining the “local distortions” of environmental projects and plans, or more generally the project of environmental governance to steer society and the environment (in one direction). In her study of everyday governance practices and interactions between state and non-state actors in relation to the provisioning of piped water to an informal settlement in Delhi, for example, Truelove (forthcoming) demonstrates how the powers of reach and authority result in a spatially and communally differentiated provision of water that does not correspond to government plans.

Thirdly, everyday governance is highly relevant for an increasingly poststructuralist UPE that aims, among other things, to uncover relationships of micro-power that contribute to the (re-) production of uneven urban spaces and unequal access to urban environmental resources in an often incremental way. In addition to uncovering (innocuous and conflictual) socio-environmental relations between different social classes, ethnic groups,

genders and identities (as situated UPE do), ethnographic governance studies could reveal the complex relationships and networks across scales and sites; that is, how social groups and individuals are 'linking up' to particular state and non-state governance actors to support, reshape or subvert environmental policies and projects. Such an analysis (together with that of the everyday state itself) would go beyond the account of "social resistance" found in the geographical UPE literature on neoliberal governance to allow a more nuanced mapping of uneven spaces of governance (Harriss 2007) and resulting unequal urban infrastructures and natures.

Conclusions

Parallel to its diversification into poststructuralist perspectives, the framework of UPE would benefit from an intensified dialogue across disciplinary boundaries, particularly between geographers and anthropologists. Without wanting to discount sociological or political-science concepts of governance, we focused in this article on the potential benefits for (largely geographical) UPE to engage with (largely anthropological) concepts of everyday governance and the everyday state in order to produce a richer account of the practices of multiple governance actors and their uneven impact on the local environment. However, we do not want to suggest favoring micro-level analyses over the macro-level assessments of political-economic processes usually attempted in (Marxist-oriented) UPE studies. The focus on the local state is in part due to the methodological difficulties to undertake critical ethnographic studies at 'higher' levels of government that have rarely been overcome (for an exception, see (Mosse 2005)). The influence of global discourses and of international and national policies and investments on local

environments is undeniable, though indirect and filtered through a variety of local institutions and actors. Apart from examining such multi-scalar intersections, UPE may do well in exploring the non-hierarchical networks of power extending beyond city and national boundaries (e.g., business networks, international clubs with local chapters, city partnerships, transnational NGOs) that may affect local government and urban socio-natures.

Furthermore, the anthropological literature on everyday governance can also benefit from UPE and geography (and not only the other way around). Research on how everyday practices produce local urban socio-natures (Truelove 2011, Loftus 2012, Shillington 2012, Desai et al. 2015) demonstrates that the entry point of the environment can serve as a lens through which to examine subtle power relationships, including those of class, ethnicity or gender, as well as governance relationships more generally. The political use of environmental discourses, resources and infrastructures remains largely under-examined in ethnographic studies on everyday governance and the everyday state. Geographers have also started to point to the spatiality of practices of everyday governance and issues of scale (Bulkeley et al. 2007, Hausermann 2012, Schindler 2014).

This paper also attempted to show that governance can (and should) be used as an analytical (rather than a normative) concept that recognizes politics and power relations. We have already pointed to the references to the Foucauldian concept of governmentality and to Bourdieu's field theory in the literature on everyday governance and the everyday state. In recent UPE studies, furthermore, scholars indicate that the concept of governance could be theorized through other approaches, including Gramsci's counter-hegemony (Loftus 2012) or feminist theory (Truelove 2011). This implies that governance can be

used as more than just a term to describe a depoliticized form of governing in the current neoliberal era, as it is often done in UPE studies. Indeed, everyday governance points to the divergences between an imaginary (neoliberal) governance project, or steering of society and the environment in a particular direction, and the heterogeneous on-the-ground realities of policy implementation and resource use. Through their attention to a multiplicity of state and non-state governance actors, their practices and often contradicting normative registers, ethnographies of governance somehow even 'radicalize' the view of path-dependent "actually existing neoliberalisms" (Brenner & Theodore 2002) that are believed to be influenced by inherited institutions and geographically contextualized histories of political struggle.

Finally, using the concept of everyday governance may also render UPE, which arguably has so far had little material impact on urban policies or socio-natures, more policy relevant or 'political' in a practical sense (Walker 2007) through its attention to local governance actors, including street-level bureaucrats or NGO leaders, who often play key roles in the implementation of urban projects and policies. Furthermore, the concepts of everyday governance and micro-politics imply "reformist [and] pragmatic" (Corbridge, et al. 2005, p. 272) positions and incremental policy changes (see also Lawhon et al. 2014), which may be more acceptable by policymakers (but also more at risk of cooptation) than the more systemic changes called for by the radical critique of neoliberal governance, often characteristic of UPE studies.

Works Cited

- Adger WN, Benjaminsen TA, and Svarstad H** 2001 Advancing a political ecology of global environmental discourses. *Development and Change* 32(4) 681 - 715
- Alou MT** 2009 Public Goods and the Management of Collective Infrastructure: the case of the Drinking-Water Supply Systems in the Maradi Region of Niger. In: **Blundo G and Le Meur P-Y** eds *The Governance of Daily Life in Africa* Brill, Lieden & Boston 317-340
- Anders G** 2009 Like chameleons: Civil servants and corruption in Malawi. In: **Blundo G and Le Meur P-Y** eds *The governance of daily life in Africa Ethnographic explorations of public and collective services* Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden 119-142
- Anjaria JS** 2011 Ordinary states: Everyday corruption and the politics of space in Mumbai. *American Ethnologist* 38(1) 58 - 72
- Bakker K** 2003 A political ecology of water privatization. *Studies in Political Economy* 70(35 - 48)
- Berenschot W** 2010 Everyday Mediation: The Politics of Public Service Delivery in Gujarat, India. *Development and Change* 41(5) 883-905
- Bierschenk T, and Olivier de Sardan J-P** editors 2014 *States at Work: Dynamics of African Bureaucracies*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Bierschenk T, and Olivier de Sardan J-P** 2014 Studying the Dynamics of African Bureaucracies. An Introduction to States at Work. In: **Bierschenk T and Olivier de Sardan J-P** eds *States at Work: Dynamics of African Bureaucracies* Brill, Lieden & Boston 3-33
- Bjerkli CL** 2013 Governance on the Ground: A Study of Solid Waste Management in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(4) 1273-1287
- Blaikie PM** 1985 *The Political Economy of Soil Erosion in Developing Countries* London, Longman
- Blaikie PM, and Brookfield H** 1987 *Land degradation and society* London, Methuen
- Blanco I, Griggs S, and Sullivan H** 2014 Situating the local in the neoliberalisation and transformation of urban governance. *Urban Stud* 51(15) 3129-3146
- Blundo G** 2002 Editorial. *Bulletin de l'APAD [en ligne]* 23-24
- Blundo G, and Le Meur P-Y** editors 2009 *The Governance of Daily Life in Africa: Ethnographic Explorations of Public and Collective Services*. Lieden & Boston: Brill.
- Blundo G, and Le Meur P-Y** 2009 Introduction: An Anthropology of Everyday Governance: Collective Service Delivery and Subject Making. In: **Blundo G and Le Meur P-Y** eds *The Governance of Daily Life in Africa: Ethnographic Explorations of Public and Collective Services* Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden 1- 38
- Bourdieu P** 1998 *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Brenner N, and Theodore N** 2002 Cities and the Geographies of "Actually Existing Neoliberalism". *Antipode* 34(3) 349-379
- Bryant RL, and Bailey S** 1997 *Third World Political Ecology* London, Routledge
- Bryne J, Kendrick M, and Sroaf D** 2007 The Park Made of Oil: Towards a Historical Political Ecology of the Kennedy Hahn State Recreation Area. *Local Environment* 12(2) 153 - 181
- Bulkeley H, Watson M, and Hudson R** 2007 Modes of governing municipal waste. *Environment and Planning A* 39(11) 2733-2753

- Buzzelli M** 2008 A political ecology of scale in urban air pollution monitoring. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33(4) 502 - 517
- Chandhoke N** 2003 Governance and the Pluralisation of the State. Implications for Democratic Citizenship. *Economic & Political Weekly* 40(11) 1033 - 1039
- Coelha K** 2006 Tapping in. Leaky sovereignties and engineered (dis)order in an urban water system. *Sarai Reader* 6 497 - 509
- Cook I, and Swyngedouw E** 2012 Cities, Social Cohesion and the Environment: Towards a Future Research Agenda. *Urban Stud* 49(9) 1959 - 1979
- Corbridge S, Williams G, Srivastava M, and Véron R** 2005 *Seeing the State: Governance and Governmentality in India* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Desai R, McFarlane C, and Graham S** 2015 The Politics of Open Defecation: Informality, Body, and Infrastructure in Mumbai. *Antipode* 47(1) 98-120
- Desfor G, and Vesalon L** 2008 Urban Expansion and Industrial Nature: A Political Ecology of Toronto's Port Industrial District. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(3) 586-603
- Eggen O** 2011 Chiefs and Everyday Governance: Parallel State Organisations in Malawi. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 37(02) 313-331
- Ekers M, and Loftus A** 2008 The power of water: developing dialogues between Foucault and Gramsci. *Environmnet and Planning D: Society and Space* 26 698 - 718
- Ernstson H** 2013 The social production of ecosystem services: A framework for studying environmental justice and ecological complexity in urbanized landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 109(1) 7-17
- Foucault M** 1982 The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* 8 777 - 795
- Fuchs M** 2005 Slum as Achievement: Governmentality and the Agency of Slum Dwellers. In: **Hust E and Mann M** eds *Urbanization and Governance* Manohar, CSH, South Asia Institute, New Delhi 103-123
- Fuller CJ, and Benei V** editors 2000 *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India*. Social Science Press: New Delhi.
- Gabriel N** 2014 Urban Political Ecology: Environmental Imaginary, Governance, and the Non-Human. *Geography Compass* 8(1) 38-48
- Gandy M** 2004 Rethinking urban metabolism: water, space and the modern city. *City* 8(3) 363-379
- Gopakumar G** 2014 Experiments and Counter-Experiments in the Urban Laboratory of Water- Supply Partnerships in India. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(2) 393-412
- Gupta A** 1995 Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State. *American Ethnologist* 22(2) 375 - 402
- Gupta A** 2012 *Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India* Hyderabad, Orient Blackswan
- Hagerman C** 2007 Shaping neighborhoods and nature: Urban political ecologies of urban waterfront transformations in Portland, Oregon. *Cities* 24(4) 285-297
- Hansen TB, and Stepputat F** editors 2001 *States of imagination: Ethnographic explorations of the postcolonial state*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Harriss J** 2007 Antinomies of Empowerment: Observations of Civil Society, Politics and Urban Governance in India. *Economic & Political Weekly* 42(26) 2716-2724
- Harvey D** 1996 *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference* Cambridge, Blackwell Publishers
- Hausermann H** 2012 From polygons to politics: Everyday practice and environmental governance in Veracruz, Mexico. *Geoforum* 43(5) 1002-1013

- Herbert S** 2000 For ethnography. *Progress in Human Geography* 24(4) 550 - 568
- Heynen N** 2014 Urban political ecology I: The urban century. *Progress in Human Geography* 38(4) 598-604
- Heynen N, Perkins HA, and Roy P** 2006 The Political Ecology of Uneven Urban Green Space: The Impact of Political Economy on Race and Ethnicity in Producing Environmental Inequality in Milwaukee. *Urban Affairs Review* 42(1) 3-25
- Hust E** 2005 Introduction: Problems of urbanization and urban governance in India. In: **Hust E and Mann M** eds *Urbanization and Governance in India* Manohar, CSH, South Asia Institute, New Delhi 1 - 26
- Ioris AAR** 2012 Applying the Strategic-Relational Approach to Urban Political Ecology: The Water Management Problems of the Baixada Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Antipode* 44(1) 122-150
- Kaika M** 2003 Constructing Scarcity and Sensationalising Water Politics: 170 Days That Shook Athens. *Antipode* 35(5) 919-954
- Kitchen L** 2013 Are Trees Always 'Good'? Urban Political Ecology and Environmental Justice in the Valleys of South Wales. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(6) 1968-1983
- Kooiman J** 2003 *Governing as governance* London, Sage
- Kull CA** 2002 Empowering Pyromaniacs in Madagascar: Ideology and Legitimacy in Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Development and Change* 33(1) 57-78
- Kull CA, de Satre XA, and Castro-Larrañaga M** 2015 The political ecology of ecosystems services. *Geoforum* 61 122 - 134
- Lawhon M, Ernstson H, and Silver J** 2014 Provincializing Urban Political Ecology: Towards a Situated UPE Through African urbanism. *Antipode* 46(2) 497-516
- Le Meur P-Y, and Lund C** 2001 Everyday Governance of Land in Africa. *Bulletin de l'APAD [en ligne]* 22 np
- Lindell I** 2008 The Multiple Sites of Urban Governance: Insights from an African City. *Urban Stud* 45(9) 1879-1901
- Loftus A** 2012 *Everyday Environmentalism: creating an urban political ecology* Minneapolis & London, University of Minnesota Press
- Mayntz R** 2003 New challenges in governance theory In: **Bang H** ed *Governance as social and political communication* Manchester University Press, Manchester 27 - 40
- Monstadt J** 2009 Conceptualizing the political ecology of urban infrastructures: insights from technology and urban studies. *Environment and Planning A* 41(8) 1924-1942
- Mosse D** 2005 *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid policy and Practice* London; Ann Arbor, MI, Pluto Press
- Myers G** 2010 Seven Themes in African Urban Dynamics. *Nordiska Afrikanstitutet Discussion Paper* Nordiska Afrikanstitutet, Uppsala
- Nauta W** 2009 The Politics of Transferring and Managing Land in the 'New' South Africa. In: **Blundo G and Le Meur P-Y** eds *The Governance of Daily Life in Africa: Ethnographic Exploration of Public and Collective Services* Brill, Leiden & Boston 241 - 278
- Njeru J** 2006 The urban political ecology of plastic bag waste problem in Nairobi, Kenya. *Geoforum* 37 1046 - 1058
- Olivier de Sardan J-P** 2008 *Researching the practical norms of real governance in Africa* London, Africa Power and Politics Programme
- Olivier de Sardan J-P** 2011 The Eight Modes of Local Governance in West Africa. *IDS Bulletin* 42(2) 22-31

- Olivier de Sardan J-P** 2014 The Delivery State in Africa. Interface Bureaucrats, Professional Cultures and the Bureaucratic Mode of Governance. In: **Bierschenk T and Olivier de Sardan J-P** eds *States at Work: Dynamics of African Bureaucracies* Brill, Leiden & Boston 399 - 429
- Osella F, and Osella C** 2000 The Return of King Mahabali: The Politics of Morality in Kerala. In: **Fuller CJ and Benei V** eds *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India* Social Science Press, New Delhi 137-162
- Peet R, and Watts M** editors 1996 *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Peet R, and Watts M** editors 2004 *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Quastel N** 2009 Political Ecologies of Gentrification. *Urban Geography* 30 694-725
- Ranganathan M** 2014 Paying for Pipes, Claiming Citizenship: Political Agency and Water Reforms at the Urban Periphery. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(2) 590-608
- Ranganathan M, and Balazs C** 2015 Water marginalization at the urban fringe: environmental justice and urban political ecology across the North-South divide. *Urban Geography* 36(3) 403-423
- Robbins P** 2004 *Political ecology: a critical introduction* Malden, MA, Blackwell
- Robbins P** 2008 The State in Political Ecology: A Postcard to Political Geography from the Field. In: **Cox KR, Low M and Robinson J** eds *The Sage Handbook of Political Geography* Sage, London & Thousand Oaks, CA 205 - 218
- Roy A** 2002 *City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender And The Politics Of Poverty*, University Of Minnesota Press
- Schindler S** 2014 A New Delhi every day: multiplicities of governance regimes in a transforming metropolis. *Urban Geography* 35(3) 402-419
- Sharma A, and Gupta A** 2006 Introduction: Rethinking theories of the state in an age of globalisation. In: **Sharma A and Gupta A** eds *The anthropology of the state A reader* Blackwell Publishing, Malden & Oxford 1-41
- Shillington L** 2012 Urban Political Ecology in the Global South: Everyday Environmental Struggles of Home in Managua, Nicaragua. In: **Edensor T and Jayne M** eds *Urban Theory beyond the West A World of Cities* Routledge, London & New York 295-310
- Smith N** 1990 *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space* Oxford, Blackwell Publishers
- Swyngedouw E** 1997 Power, nature, and the city. The conquest of water and the political ecology of urbanization in Guayaquil Ecuador. *Environment and Planning A* 29(2) 311 - 332
- Swyngedouw E** 2005 Governance Innovation and the Citizen: The Janus Face of Governance-beyond-the-State. *Urban Stud* 42(11) 1991 - 2006
- Swyngedouw E** 2006 Circulations and metabolisms: (Hybrid) natures and (cyborg) cities. *Science as Culture* 15(2) 105-121
- Swyngedouw E** 2006 Power, Water and Money: Exploring the Nexus. *Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper* 2006(14)
- Swyngedouw E** 2009 The Antinomies of the Postpolitical City: In Search of a Democratic Politics of Environmental Production. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33 601- 620
- Tarlo E** 2000 Paper Turths: The Emergency and Slum Clearance Through Forgotten Files. In: **Fuller CJ and Benei V** eds *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India* Social Science Press, New Delhi 68 - 90

- Truelove Y** 2011 (Re-)Conceptualizing water inequality in Delhi, India through a feminist political ecology framework. *Geoforum* 42(2) 143-152
- Truelove Y** (forthcoming) Incongruent Waterworlds: Situating the Everyday Practices and Power of Water in Delhi *SAMAJ*
- van der Geest S, and Obirih-Opareh N** 2009 Ligid Waste Management in Urban and Rural Ghana: Privatisation as Governance? In: **Blundo G and Le Meur P-Y** eds *The Governance of Daily Life in Africa: Ethnographic Exlorations of Public and Collective Services* Brill, Leiden & Boston 205 - 222
- Véron R** 2006 Remaking urban environments: the political ecology of air pollution in Delhi. *Environment and Planning A* 38 2093-2109
- Walker PA** 1998 Politics of nature: An overview of political ecology. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 9(1) 131
- Walker PA** 2007 Political ecology: where is the politics? *Progress in Human Geography* 31(3) 363-369
- Watts M, and Peet R** 2004 Liberating political ecology. *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements* Routledge, London 3-47
- Zimmer A** 2012 *Everyday governance of the waste waterscapes: A Foucauldian analysis of Delhi's informal settlements*. Doctor, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University of Bonn
- Zimmer A, and Sakdapolrak P** 2012 The Social Practices of Governing Analysing Waste Water Governance in a Delhi Slum. *Environment and Urbanization Asia* 3(2) 325-341

¹ For a more general discussion of the benefit of integrating UPE and governance see Mondstadt (2009).