Resistance to mining: A review

Marta Conde

Institute of Science and Environmental Technology (ICTA), Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Edifici Z, ICTA-ICP, Campus UAB, 08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Barcelona, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This academic review of more than 200 articles, books and reports sheds light to why and how do communities resist mining and how do their forms of resistance change over time. The literature reveals that local communities react not only to perceived environmental impacts but also to their lack of representation and participation in decisions concerning their development path, lack of monetary compensation and distrust with the mining company and the state. Several authors explore the objectives and discourses of these movements that range from compensation and market embedded demands to the articulation of post-material values and the emergence of socio-ecological alternatives. Cross-scalar alliances have emerged as a crucial factor in the formation of discourses and strategies; local narratives and alternatives are being combined with global discourses on rights (to clean water, to take decisions, indigenous rights) and environmental justice. Cross scalar alliances have also allowed local groups to increase their knowledge about the projects, give them visibility, and comprehend and act against their weak position in the global commodity chain. These alliances have also contributed to the emergence or consolidation of a diverse set of resistance strategies such as legal court cases, activist-scientist collaborations and local referendums or "consultas" at community level to reject mining projects. This review also explores the response of the state and the mining companies to these conflicts, exploring responses such as regulatory changes or Corporate Social Responsibility programs.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Why and how do communities resist mining, and how do their forms of resistance change over time? Answering this question is important for studies of ecological distribution conflicts (EDC) and of the changing nature of commodity frontiers. EDCs are increasing due to the growing metabolism of society that is demanding more energy and material resources (Martinez-Alier, 2003). Even a non-growing economy, if based on current technology, would need "fresh" inputs of fossil fuels and minerals. The commodity frontier in mining has been expanding especially to the global South due to structural adjustment plans and mining law reforms, rising mineral prices from the mid-1990s to the mid-2010s (with a temporary drop in 2008), strong equity markets, and low domestic interest rates in core economies (Bridge, 2004; Campbell, 2009; Gordon and Webber, 2008).

From the year 2000, the emergence of Asian economies and specially China has caused a steady and rising demand for natural resources worldwide (Muradian et al., 2012) pushing further the commodity frontier. India's increase in material consumption has relied so far on internal supplies, causing many resource extraction conflicts nationally (Vagholikar and Dutta, 2003). Also in the last decade speculative trading activities with hedge funds have provoked investment booms pushing

mining exploration projects in many parts of the world (see, for the effect in different countries, Tavasci and Ventimiglia, 2011; Fraser and Larmer, 2010; Conde and Kallis, 2012).

Industry technological advances are making reserves accessible that were previously not economically viable (Mudd, 2007). Companies go deeper and farther, into more ecologically and sometimes socially vulnerable areas to extract the remaining resources. On many occasions these areas are inhabited by (indigenous and non-indigenous) communities who suffer the burdens of pollution and lack of access to basic resources due to the unequal distribution of power and income, and social inequalities of ethnicity, caste, social class and gender (Bury, 2007; Martinez-Alier, 2003; Martínez Alier et al., 2014b) leading to the formation of EDC.

The term EDC was coined by Martinez-Alier and O'Connor (1996) to describe social conflicts born from the unfair access to natural resources and the unjust burdens of pollution. These two authors, trained as economists, were inspired by the term 'economic distribution conflicts' in political economy that describes conflicts between capital and labour. For instance, claims for higher wages from mining unions opposing company owners - that don't always go in hand with environmental compliance (Martinez-Alier, 2003).

'Ecological distribution conflicts' is then a term for collective claims against environmental injustices. For instance, a mine may be polluting a river yet this damage is not valued in the market and those impacted are not compensated (as studied by Bebbington et al., 2008a). Unfair

ecological distribution is inherent to capitalism, defined by Kapp (1950) as a system of cost-shifting. In environmental neoclassical economics, the preferred terms are "market failure" and "externalities", a terminology that implies that such externalities could be valued in monetary terms and internalised into the price system. If we accept economic commensuration and reject incommensurability of values (Martinez-Alier et al., 1998), 'equivalent' eco-compensation mechanisms could be introduced. Instead ecological economics and political ecology advocate the acceptance of different valuation languages to understand such conflicts and the need to take them into account through genuine participatory processes (Agarwal, 2001; Zografos and Howarth, 2010).

There are local as well as global distribution conflicts; whilst many of them occur between the global South and the global North (an Australian or Chinese mining company operating in Namibia), many are local conflicts within a short commodity chain (e.g. on local sand and gravel extraction for nearby cement factory) (Martinez-Alier, 2004). From a social metabolic perspective we can classify EDCs through the stages of a commodity chain; conflicts can take place during the extraction of energy carriers or other materials, transportation and production of goods, or in the final disposal of waste. This review focuses only on the EDCs that emerge at the first stage of the commodity chain; the extraction and processing of minerals and the resistance that emerges in these areas.

There is a lot written on mining conflicts and resistance, but much of it is fragmented among different disciplines and is written with different questions in mind. This literature review attempts to give a "meta" outlook on resistance to mining, from the perspective of a critical researcher interested in the drivers of ecological distribution conflicts and the social forces that might change unsustainable ecological distributions. This review analyses a shift in strategies and discourses used by resistance to mining in the last two decades. It points to alliances with extra-local actors as having played an important role in this shift; not only fostering movements to emerge, but also developing solidarity and political opportunities (Ali, 2009; Bebbington et al., 2010; Conde and Kallis, 2012; Foweraker, 2001; Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Urkidi, 2010).

Resistance also shapes and influences patterns of development. An important finding of many authors is that many movements create, recover or re-affirm a development path that rejects mining, in the process proposing alternative development models, or "alternatives *to* development" (Bebbington, 1996; Escobar, 1995). In other cases communities adapt and accept the offers of the mining companies largely in the form of Corporate Social Responsibility programs and other ameliorations (Horowitz, 2012).

Resistance as a concept may refer to different political aims and forms of opposition and mobilisation. Hollander and Einwohner's (2004) review of the term identifies 'action' whether it be "verbal, cognitive or physical" and 'opposition' to existing power relations as core elements of resistance. The issue of 'recognition' is more contested. Whilst some scholars suggest the term should be reserved for visible and collective acts (Rubin, 1996), a growing scholarship based on Scott's (2008) research draws attention to what he termed "everyday" resistance. Although his research is based on peasant studies, a parallel can be drawn with mineworkers that need to make a living out of the source that is causing their grief, compelling them to covert resistance and calculate their conformity. 'Everyday socio-environmental resistance' in mining is not well documented so most resistances covered by this manuscript are found to be visible and overt, where both the communities and the mining companies are aware of it taking place. The review does include works where communities resist as part of their negotiation strategy with the mining company. Moreover, resistances covered can be sporadic or even anecdotal or they can be sustained over time, based on organised collective actions and backed by a dense social network, turning into a social movement (Tarrow, 1994).

Extensively used in this manuscript is the word 'community'. It has been challenged on many occasions as ignoring the complexity of actors, different interests and the institutions that it entails (Agrawal and Gibson, 1999). In this review, 'community' describes groups of lay people that live in the surrounding area of mining projects. This can represent one or several groups, with different visions and understandings of the project, different ethnicity, gender, class and cast cleavages, and with different degrees of marginalisation. I acknowledge this simplification and try to specify where I can the differences in each case.

After a short explanation of the methods used for the review, Sections 3 and 4 analyse why EDCs emerge and what are the objectives of those resisting a mining project. Section 5 points to the important role of cross-scalar alliances in the diffusion and formation of discourses and strategies used by resistance movements in mining conflicts. Section 6 explores the responses of the state and mining companies to this resistance, especially looking at Corporate Social Responsibility programs. The last section highlights two findings of this review and points to several gaps in the literature.

2. Methodology

I carried out an integrative literature review aiming at summarising all related themes of social resistance to mining (Cooper, 1988). Following Creswell's (1994) methodology I undertook a process "of reading, analysing, evaluating, and summarising scholarly materials about my topic". I embarked on an extensive search using the Web of Knowledge and Google Scholar employing different combinations of relevant keywords in English and Spanish. For example I combined resistance, social movement, conflict, protest, collective action and strikes together with mining, resources, extractive industries, governance, development, CSR, etc. A second search was carried out using snowball methodology from the bibliography obtained in the first search. A literature map helped me organise and decide how to group the articles and structure my work. After a screen of more than 300 works, around 200 peer-reviewed publications and books were summarised starting to feed into the outline of the review and responding to my research question.

The review omits significant literature on oil and gas. Although the patterns of resistance are similar -and in many cases the same movements are involved in both- the dynamics of each industry and the resistance that emerges can vary. Having said this, some of the literature revised analyses aspects of resistance to extractive industries that includes, but is not confined to, mining cases. I have regretfully excluded the extensive and valuable literature produced by grassroots organisations, NGOs and activists that analyse and denounce the impacts of the mining industry as well as that produced by think tanks, mining companies or consultancy firms due to word limit constraints. Moreover there are whole regions of the world that are not covered because of the limitations of looking at English and Spanish literature alone.

3. Why mining conflicts emerge?

Economic growth and the increasing social metabolism of society coupled with neoliberal reforms are some of the reasons behind the advancing resource frontier. What causes a conflict to emerge however are the socio-environmental impacts on land, water and livelihoods coupled with the lack of participation of local communities nearby extraction projects in decision-making processes. Combined with a lack of trust in the companies and the deficient compensation for the grievances suffered, many communities react giving way to EDCs. I describe in more detail below these four broad forces.

Mining conflicts emerge in source regions due to a "clash of metabolisms" between a subsistence and an extractive economy. Illustrating this clash, Silva-Macher and Farrell (2014) use the Yanacocha-Conga conflict in Peru to compare a local form of social metabolism such as milk production as it encounters the industrial social metabolism of gold mining. Through the use of a flow/fund MuSIASEM model, they

show how the magnitude of the impacts of the mining process through land removal and hydrological alterations disrupt local milk producers who consider land as a fund and not as a flow like mining companies do.

These impacts affect the local livelihoods of peasants that react to protect themselves and their livelihoods. They see how the quality and quantity of water decreases, their grazing areas are encroached and socially they confront increasing community conflicts and loss of cultural traditions (Bury, 2007). In Perreault's (2013) excellent account of Bolivia's mining enclosures, he argues that it is not only the dispossession of land that is driving conflict (accumulation by dispossession) but the accumulation of toxic waste, water and water rights (to pollute water) and the accumulation of the spatial land of the mines that is driving livelihood dispossession through a process he names "dispossession by accumulation". Klare (2001) highlight also how environmental burdens can lead to community-level grievances and in turn to larger violent conflicts.

Using Melanesia as a case study, an anthropological debate emerged around this issue. Kirsch (2001) and Hyndman (2001) seem to acknowledge that the impact on local livelihoods and health is the most important reason for the rise in socio-environmental conflicts whilst Banks (2002) argues these movements emerge as a result of their demand on resource and livelihood control (next).

A second factor is the lack of participation or representation of local communities living nearby mining projects and their lack of rights to effectively decide their own development path (see Ballard and Banks, 2003; Dwivedi, 2001; Escobar, 1995, 2006; Kuecker, 2007; Mohanty, 2010; Walter and Martinez-Alier, 2010). Many local communities aspire to determine what happens on their land (Horowitz, 2002), wanting to receive visibility and recognition of their rights (Ali and Grewal, 2006). Anguelovski (2011), based on her analysis of protests in the Tintaya mine in Peru, argues that some communities react in order to start a dialogue with the mine on equal footing and mobilise each time that they need to obtain more legitimacy and recognition in the dialogue. For other authors (Escobar, 2001; Muradian et al., 2003; Urkidi, 2011) participation entails not dialogue with the mine, but the community's right to decide over their own practices such as communitarian access to land or democratic decision making processes. Tschakert (2009) advocates for the recognition of galamsey illegal miners in Ghana through "a practical tool for participatory parity" that allows them "rather than local elites or external experts decide what values and conditions for flourishing should be chosen." Some groups want to have access to and influence institutional spaces where political decisions are taken (Echave et al., 2009) whilst others want to look for alternative institutions where they can express themselves. These groups, crucially, don't want to participate in the political system, they want to participate in the definition of what political system they want (Alvarez et al., 1998).

Third, monetary compensation due to land or resource losses are common claims behind contestation to mining. Arellano-Yanguas (2011) in his quantitative and qualitative analysis of conflicts in Peru, states that most conflicts in Peru originate due to "people's sense of grievance regarding previous [supposedly unfair] land transfer agreements" and the high company profits that incentivise communities "to claim the fulfilment of promises" by the mining company as well as a greater share of these profits and compensation for their lost assets and livelihoods (Barrantes, 2005). Kirsch (2007) in Papua New Guinea or Ali and Grewal (2006) in New Caledonia also point to financial benefits as one of the motives behind opposition to mining in their studies.

Fourth, the distrust many communities have of the mining company and the government can also be a source of increased confrontation (Muradian et al., 2003). According to Echave et al. (2009), the perception of the magnitude of the effects an activity can generate relates to the relations of trust these communities have. Horowitz (2010), studying the decisions of Kanak villagers in New Caledonia, argues that trust wasn't determined by the scientific validity of the information provided by the company but by the affiliation of each villager to either the company or the protest group that "stemmed from expectations of long-term social relationships and economic benefits for themselves and for their community, as well as feelings of empowerment".

A crucial factor that allows for resistance to emerge (and expand) are the extra-local alliances made by communities and local NGOs. It is often through the diffusion of information across networks that communities learn about the impacts mining can cause and react before the operation starts (Bebbington et al., 2008a; Conell and Cohn, 1995). This factor is explored further explored further in Section 5.

Ballard and Banks (2003) also argue that resistance is likely to emerge in remote resource frontiers with a lack of effective presence of the State. As Echave et al. (2009) and Bebbington et al. (2010) point out; when the population lacks institutionalised means to channel their demands or social or political actors to represent them, the main path for those that can get organised is mobilisation and protest.

These four factors appear prominently in the literature as determining the emergence of EDC. However, not all communities resist mining and not all who do, do with the same intensity. My reading of the literature suggests that communities are more likely to resist when they are able to perceive a threat to their health or livelihood. This in turn depends on a number of factors, such as the stage of the mining operation when this threat is perceived, the geography of the area and the commodity type, when and what information they have access to, who they trust (e.g. what the companies tell them or what concerns an NGO raises) and their degree of political marginalisation, meaning the degree of access to information and their capacity to organise.

4. Objectives of resistance movements

The resistance to mining that has occurred during the last two decades of mining has been considered by some authors as part of the New Social Movements (NSM). These emerged to resist and oppose the "destabilisation of the established citizenship" (Stahler-Sholk et al., 2007) imposed partly by neoliberal reforms. NSMs can help describe and understand some of the strategies and discourses used by mining resistance movements, although one might claim that resistance movements to mining have distinct roots that make them different.

NSMs, such as gay and feminist rights movements, emerged as a response to post-industrial preoccupations, the increasing rationalisation of modern life and the everyday colonisation of the state and market economy (Melucci, 1985). Following Habermas (1984) these movements are a rejection of the 'colonisation' and control of people's lifeworlds – their domains of everyday, meaningful practice. Some argue that in Latin America, movements against resource extraction are NSMs because they are driven by the same rejection of neoliberal intervention and the precariousness that emerged from it (Stahler-Sholk et al., 2007; Urkidi, 2010). Echave et al. (2009) also argues that the cultural dimensions of resistance struggles over resources -the dispute over ways of life, the relationship between communities and their environment and traditions- are part of the identitarian process of NSMs. Alvarez et al. (1998), on the other hand, criticise this division between NSM and previous "popular" urban or peasant movements because they consider all movements have a cultural dimension that is used to question dominant (neoliberal or Eurocentric) practices.

Other authors argue that EDCs differ from NSM's post-industrial and middle class post-material values (Martinez-Alier, 2003). Inglehart (1977) argued that only when basic necessities are covered could people be concerned about very material issues like "the environment". Contrary to this argument, environmental movements in the North are and have been very concerned about very material issues like nuclear radiation and dioxins from incinerators with a long tradition of concern for safety and health in factories, mines and urban environments (Hays and Hays, 1989). In the global South communities defend the environment and the land as the space in which they live (Guha and Alier, 1997): they are a 'materialist' movement. Moreover mining conflicts

have a long history in Latin America, South Africa and elsewhere, prior to the arrival of NSMs in the West (Martinez-Alier, 2001).

Against Inglehart's interpretations, these social movements emerge from struggles of the poor and the indigenous for their own survival, as they try to preserve ecological necessities such as energy (including food), water and other materials (Martinez-Alier, 2003). These poor communities react against the disproportionate use of environmental resources by the rich and powerful that threatens their livelihood, health, culture and autonomy. The reaction against this unequal distribution of ecological costs and benefits is what Guha and Alier (1997) named the 'environmentalism of the poor'. Martínez-Alier (1991) argues that these movements value local livelihoods and material and economic needs, not as market opportunities but as basic needs for life.

Alternatively, these movements have also been considered historical, class or ethnic-based- movements that are contesting changes in the management of their land. They might use an environmental issue sometimes only strategically; if local peasants are integrated in the market economy, their demands to preserve nature or land might be more linked to capturing the flow of value coming from exploiting that land -and selling the products of the market- (Robbins, 2004). As Bebbington (1996) points out in his analysis of indigenous and non-indigenous resistance to mining in Ecuador, communities developed alternative agriculture-based economies embedded in the neo-liberal model of profit-making and export that arrived in the country before the mining project. More than trying to preserve their livelihoods, they are fighting against their lands being used by somebody else, against privatisation, against accumulation by dispossession.

Both arguments being correct, it could also be claimed that class, ethnicity, market driven local economies and livelihood and environmental values go together; lower class or marginalised local communities (immersed or not in the market economy) are impacted more by extractive projects because they are closer and depend more on the environment that is being impacted.

A crucial factor that influences the demands and objectives of these resistance movements is the stage of the mining operation in which the community decides to take action. Before the mine is in operation, communities are more likely to confront and oppose the project, but if the mining project has been operating for a long time, the community is more likely to focus on concessions, compensation or mine rehabilitation (Bebbington, 2012). Bebbington et al. (2008a) show in their analysis of peasant and urban protests against Yanacocha mine in Peru, that their objective was not to shut down the mine but to obtain fair compensation for lost land, greater participation in the governance and an increased share of benefits obtained from the mine. Contrary to this view, Machado Araóz (2009) shows in his analysis of the Alumbrera resistance in Argentina that communities' demands shifted from increasing royalties and environmental controls to the utter rejection of the project due to rising environmental impacts and their increasing connections and participation in regional and national assemblies.

Another emerging debate revolves around the political demands of these movements. Are resistance movements against mining NIMBY (Not In My BackYard) or are they demanding broader structural changes in the socio-political-economic structure? As pointed out by Bloodworth et al. (2009), NIMBY resistance might shape the resource extraction frontier and even drive companies to extract resources elsewhere. However their demands are limited to keeping a project away from their lands. Many movements that might start with a NIMBY discourse realise these projects are driven by the neoliberal socio-economic order once they start connecting with other networks and start demanding broader structural changes (Campbell, 2009; Hyndman, 2001). The environmental justice movement embraces this consciousness destroying the NIMBY image of grassroots environmental protests and turning them into NIABY protests (Not In Anyone's BackYard) (Martinez-Alier, 2001).

NIABY, however, might not be enough. Swyngedouw (2014) seems to go a step further criticising "the micropolitics of dispersed resistances and individualised alternative practices". He argues that resistance by itself is playing the neoliberal game, and that we need to enter into 'the political' to create a truly egalitarian society. He describes 'the political' as "the contested public terrain where different imaginings of possible socio-ecological orders compete over the symbolic and material institutionalisation of these visions" (Swyngedouw, 2014). He insists on the importance of equality to take part in "a life-in-common" and the need to achieve this through the "re-organisation, transformation and distribution of socio-ecological things and services" (Swyngedouw, 2014).

Are the resistances analysed in this review individualised and dispersed? Or do they aim for a broader equalitarian transformation and the re-distribution of environmental bads and goods? I would argue that some of them do. Some of the resistance movements to mining have visions of alternative cultural projects that are trying to destabilise the dominant neoliberal order, aligning under the environmental justice paradigm. They don't want inclusion into the present system, but a transformation of the Eurocentric political culture into one they can participate in. They are not frightened of modernity; they want to be modern and different, enter in modernity without losing their identity (Alvarez et al., 1998; Mohanty, 2010). An example of this is the resistance movement against the Rosia Montana project in Romania (Velicu, 2012); they realise that to become "agents of their own destinies, they need to regain a policy space where they can articulate and make visible their own narrative". They link their vision of development to quality of life and to their choice to have a productive and creative life "according to their needs and interests". Merlinsky and Latta (2012) write about the "productivity of environmental conflicts" as they contribute to the construction of environmental rights, in terms of developing economic alternatives or institutional changes.

Some groups create alternatives based on a defence of cultural difference and local knowledge linked to place, to the valorisation of local livelihoods (Escobar, 2001; Martinez-Alier, 2003). Radical alternatives have been endorsed for example by the Diaguita indigenous group in Chile recovering farming traditions with low ecological impact and defending communal property as a land management model (Urkidi, 2010).

These radical socio-ecological alternatives are being developed together with wider visions or post-development ideas shared through resistance movements in Latin America. The philosophy of 'Buen Vivir' based on the Ecuadorian 'sumak kawsay' and Bolivian 'suma qamaña' are indigenous philosophies aimed towards quality of life and the recovery of an ethical relationship with nature (Gudynas, 2011). Linked to this is the 'post-extractivism' model that implies a substantial downscaling of extraction to levels that are genuinely necessary (Escobar, 2012; Gudynas, 2013). Both ideas challenge basic tenets of the neoliberal paradigm such as economic growth and perpetual progress. Similarly, in India, due to so many cases of conflict in the extractive industries or because of land grabbing for infrastructures, a vision of Radical Ecological Democracy has been proposed by Shrivastava and Kothari (2012) in their book Churning the Earth.

But not all resistance movements have this radical impetus of breaking with the neoliberal order. Many have also been successful in shaping territorial development and their own livelihoods with less radical projects that are immersed in national and global markets. Bebbington et al. (2008a) show in their analysis of Intag's resistances in Ecuador how the 'Assembly for Cantonal Unity' (with help from Acción Ecológica and other outside sympathisers), twice pushed the region to reject mining and develop new economic activities such as organic coffee production or community managed eco-tourism. Eco-tourism is criticised by Büscher and Davidov (2014) who argue it reinforces the Eurocentric view of development supplanting traditional forms of rural subsistence. However, as shown by Walter and Urkidi (2015) in their monograph on Intag, eco-tourism (and small hydroelectricity) are locally preferred alternatives to a very large open pit copper mine owned by a foreign company. Other communities such as the 'galamsey' in Prestea, Ghana, want

to carry on with their traditional artisanal gold-mining activities that are also embedded in the global economy (Hilson and Yakovleva, 2007). Another example is the advocacy organised by artisanal and small-scale miners in Zimbabwe after a crackdown operation on illegal mining were more than 25,000 miners were arrested were miners associations created a new political space to pressure authorities for more "livelihood-oriented policy making" highlighting the value of small-scale mining – in addition to farming, the preferred government livelihood strategy (Spiegel, 2014). These communities are in fact being shaped by the "friction" between local and global forces such as trade or power (Tsing, 2005).

5. Strategies, discourses and the role of cross-scalar alliances

This section highlights the role of cross-scalar alliances in resistance movements to mining. The networks created through these alliances are one of the most determining factors in strategy and discourse formation.

This has been explored by scholars like Özen and Özen (2011) who use the term "strategic action fields" to uncover the interactions of two social movements against two gold mines in Turkey. They conclude that both the resistance movements and the mining companies learn from previous resistance movements; what to do but also crucially what not to do. Svampa and Antonelli (2009) analyse the increasing resistance in Argentina against mining projects based on the dissemination of information about two previous mining projects; the "Alumbrera effect" that had important environmental impacts and the "Esquel effect" where communities organised and built local and regional territorial networks of mobilisation and information exchange.

It's important to notice that alliances at local level can also be decisive in the formation of resistance. Bebbington (2007, 2008a) points to the crucial role of everyday and informal networks, what he defines as 'social movement organisations' such as NGOs, churches and student organisations as catalyst in social environmental struggles (see also Holden and Jacobson (2009) for the importance of role of the church in Guatemala).

Below I explore in more detail the importance of these alliance for discourse formation and the diffusion of strategies through these networks.

5.1. Discourses

When activists jump scales liaising with different national and global actors such as NGOs, scientists or lawyers, it allows them to broaden the perception of the scope of the conflict. They realise it's not just a local problem but the result of regional and national regulatory frameworks (Urkidi and Walter, 2011) and their weak position within the market geopolitical dynamics of global capitalism, where the power balance is in favour of mining companies that allows them to impose monetary valuation over the values and needs of the local population (Martinez-Alier, 2003; Watts, 2005). This is sometimes incorporated in their framing and discourse.

Culture, local narratives and the values of the communities are still present in these alliances. Although there is an apparent contradiction between place-based or local discourses and global discourses, they are in fact part of the process to overcome 'militant particularisms' that focus on local loyalties and identity politics (Harvey, 1996). Instead, through these cross-scalar alliances, discourses can shift in scale. As Haarstad and Fløysand (2007) point in their study of the opposition to the Tambogrande project in Peru, local identity with the land was repositioned with national Peruvian identity through the defence of lemons to cook ceviche, a national dish, and more global discourses such as the violation of democratic rights. In the Pascua Lama conflict transnational activists defended the livelihoods of local communities and local resistance movements spoke about climate change, glacier protection and other wider global claims such as democracy and

participation or access to information (Urkidi, 2010). In opposition to coal mining it has been argued (for example in South Africa, Bond, 2008) that leaving the "coal in the hole" is at the same time a good local idea and a good global idea - there is a lot of "unburnable fossil fuels" that must be left underground to prevent carbon dioxide emissions. This slogan has spread through platforms such as the Climate Action Network.

Also adopted through cross-scalar alliances is the ecological pro-conservation discourse. This is one of the discourses adopted by Intag's resistance in Ecuador- even though it didn't represent the communities' own views on it (Buchanan, 2013). It has also been used by local populations in Peru (Arellano-Yanguas, 2011) and Colombia (Grueso et al., 2003).

Linking with place based demands, discourses on rights; to land, territorial rights and water rights is one of the main argumentations of movements resisting the enclosure and privatisation of land and water by mining projects (Bebbington et al., 2008b). Some communities also claim their right to use environmental services such as river sediments for agriculture or the fish in the rivers (Clark, 2002; Martinez-Alier, 2009).

Recognition of indigenous rights is being increasingly demanded with success, but not without controversy, by communities affected by mining who want to maintain control over their land, have access to and participate in social and political life, and decide over their own development (Andolina, 2003; Rumsey and Weiner, 2004; Urkidi, 2011; Yagenova and Garcia, 2009).

Situated often in post-colonial contexts, communities who claim indigenous status are "seeking equal rights through reversing their continuing history of dispossession" (Schippers, 2010). As Bebbington (1996) points out in Ecuador, the recovery and projection of the idea of being Indian is a form of resisting white and mestizo domination and regaining a space for the values of being indigenous. In the study of the Guatemalan struggle against the Marlin mine, Urkidi (2011) explains how communities linked local-based demands such as water depletion and contamination with the defence of their Mayan traditions, culture and "cosmovisión" and claimed "legal participation rights and the democratisation of decision-making processes". This cultural defence was not connected to a specific local place but to the historical grievances suffered by their culture and communities. Although some had lost the connection with the land, they knew they wanted to follow a different development path to that offered by the mine. This discourse was in fact articulated by different actors at different scales at the international level as well as through national coalitions such as the 'Western Peoples Council' that ultimately helped the communities to carry out mining consultas.

Indigenous rights can be invoked as a strategy to stop a project or to obtain something from the company or the State. In the context of a mining conflict this has been very well described by Schippers (2010) who shows how a local organisation promoted the legal establishment of an indigenous region in Bakun, the Philippines, by framing a community that didn't originally identify themselves with the term indigenous. The strategy gave them the power to negotiate access for companies potentially interested in their lands. Similar strategies have been used in India to defend the rights of the Adivasi people who are seeing their land encroached by mining projects and metal factories (Padel and Das, 2010). As in Chhattisgarh, this strategy can be externally articulated; middle-class activists used the idea of 'indigeneity' and attachment to land of the Adivasi to defend their rights in a coal mining conflict (Sharma, 2012). In the Philippines, mining conflicts have strengthened the indigenous discourse of several groups (Holden, 2005).

Some authors warn that groups adopting an indigenous discourse risk being judged as "inauthentic" and their concerns ignored if they don't reach certain traditions or ecological standards (Horowitz, 2011; Conklin and Graham, 1995). It might also create conflicts between indigenous and non-indigenous groups (Horowitz, 2011) as well as

internal conflicts in the communities themselves if there is a need to demonstrate who has 'indigeneity' (Ballard and Banks, 2003).

Another example of strategic global discourses that are increasingly being used by resistance movements due to extra-local alliances is Environmental Justice (Martinez-Alier, 2001; Sikor and Newell, 2014). The language of environmental justice (and against "environmental racism" as used in the US) implies the claim that certain communities or groups in society are disproportionally exposed to environmental impacts and risks than other groups. The concept originated during the late 1980s in the US as a distributional claim against the exposure of racial minorities to environmental hazards (Bullard, 1990). Martinez-Alier (2003) that is not about "minorities", but about poor people of various colours in all continents who suffer environmental injustices, and complain accordingly. The discourse has since then been adopted by numerous resistance movements all over the globe (Carruthers, 2008; Martinez Alier et al., 2014a; Timmons, 2007; Walker, 2009). Whilst some activists and communities don't identify themselves explicitly with the words "environmental justice", others (more in the US and Brazil than elsewhere) use explicitly the words "environmental justice" in their own names or the descriptions of their work. For instance, in Mozambique, 'Movement of Environmental Justice' is the name of the local member of Friends of the Earth. Whilst in Colombia, the local member of Friends of the Earth is CENSAT (S from Salud, Health, T for Trabajo, Labour), and in Nigeria ERA (Environmental Rights Action). All these are environmental justice organizations (EJOs) as hundreds and indeed thousand of other small environmental justice organisations supporting communities around the world.

Through the analysis of this global expansion Schlosberg (2007) uncovered and incorporated other important aspects such as the recognition of the groups' collective identities and rights and their participation in decision-making processes. Urkidi and Walter (2011) identify all three dimensions in the Chilean and Argentinean mining struggles in Pascua Lama and Esquel. Whilst both resistance movements demanded participation initially, recognition and procedural claims increased specially in the Huasco (Pascua Lama) movement. Distributional claims only appeared at the onset of the conflicts. They also show how Environmental Justice was not part of their initial discourse; it was used as a strategy to gain more visibility after networking and exchanges with other communities had broadened the perception of their struggle.

5.2. Strategies of resistance

The repertoire of strategies traditionally used by resistance groups to mining include among others, diffusion activities, protests, blockades and occasionally violence. Peluso (1992) shows how the repertoire of actions depends on "specific historical and environmental circumstances", the nature of the complaint and the tools (including social and political) at their disposal. More recently the EJAtlas analysis of 1500 cases carried out by Martinez Alier et al. (forthcoming) identify 27 strategies of mobilisation with complaint letters, public campaigns, street protest and the development of networks for collective action as the most commonly reported strategies by activists. Networking and cross-scalar alliances have increased the tools, strategies and discourses at the disposal of activist organisations, achieving in some cases a high degree of complexity with different strategies and discourses being operationalised at the same time.

Adding to traditional repertoires used by resistance movements, I explore below three strategies and institutional avenues that have been allowed to expand due to extra-local alliances.

Already mentioned, consultas or referendums emerged in the 2000s as a strategy used increasingly by communities in Latin America (Echave et al., 2009; Urkidi, 2011; Walter and Martinez-Alier, 2010). Starting with the Tambogrande, Peru, consulta in 2002 (Haarstad and Fløysand, 2007; Muradian et al., 2003) as many as 68 consultas have been carried out up to 2012 in five different countries, and more are on-going with all mining projects being rejected by the communities.

Activists in these consultas network through cross-scalar alliances questioning and legitimating the scale of participation and decision-making that should be in place to decide over mining activities (Walter and Urkidi, 2015).

Although not new, taking a mining company to court is becoming a more realistic possibility for poor and marginalised communities through the alliances created with national and international NGOs and lawyers. Since the Rio summit in 1992 new legislative frameworks and judicial systems for the protection of the environment have appeared allowing for more legal avenues (Hirsch and Warren, 1998). Legal actions can start in the country where the mining company is operating. This was the case of a landmark judgement by the Supreme Court in India that recommended the closure of almost all limestone mines in the Doon Valley (Bandyopadhyay and Shiva, 1985; Gadgil and Guha, 1995). A more recent case is the demands put forward by the Dongria Kondh tribe against the UK based mining company Vedanta. The mining approval was rejected before the Supreme Court of India in 2013 (Temper and Martinez-Alier, 2013).

A second option is the use of legal avenues in the company's home state; this is possible in countries such as Australia, Canada, in domestic courts of several European countries (Pigrau et al., 2012). This was the case of two ex-workers from Rössing, Rio Tinto's uranium mine in Namibia, that claimed compensation for health damages due to their work in the mine. Their claims finally 'prescribed' as too much time had elapsed. BHP was taken to court in Australia by local communities in Papua New Guinea for the environmental impacts caused by the tailings of the Ok Tedi mine. It was also found that they had been involved in drafting Papua New Guinea's legislation trying to prevent court action in foreign countries (Connell and Howitt, 1991). In 1995 the local authorities of Ilo, Peru, presented a class-suit action in the US denouncing the impacts from a copper mine and the associated smelter. It was however dismissed on the grounds of forum non conveniens (Martinez-Alier, 2003). With similar results, the Amungme tribe filed several class-suit actions in regional US courts against Freeport McMoran for the impacts of its Grasberg mine in West Papua. Also in the US, the Alien Tort Claims Act (ATCA) has received several extractive industries related claims. It is however now a closed avenue since a demand placed by Nigerian citizens against Shell. The Supreme Court decided ATCA couldn't be applied if the case didn't occur in the US or with US companies. International Courts are a third avenue and these include the International Court of Justice or regional systems for human rights protection such as the Inter-American court of Human Rights (Pigrau et al., 2012). These courts however have limited capacity. An example is the case against Southern Peru Copper Corporation in Ilo, Peru at the International Water Tribunal in the Netherlands where local groups only obtained moral support (Martinez-Alier, 2003).

Legal cases where communities have been successful such as the Vedanta case in India or the Chevron-Texaco case in Ecuador, do exist. However, as North and Young (2013) state, legal routes can take a great deal of time, money and effort, needing a well organised community and alliances with professional lawyers making it "cumbersome and sometimes effectively impossible for communities to pursue" (Fulmer et al., 2008). A court case may also diminish the number of options offered to local communities who, like in the Yonggom (Ok Tedi mine) case, had to choose between protecting the environment, compensation or the job and economic benefits of keeping the mine open (Kirsch, 2007).

Obtaining compensation through legal cases often entails the monetary valuation of losses to the community where a fair price has to be established for lost land, water, biodiversity and in many cases livelihoods. In the field of ecological economics it is argued that "human rights, collective territorial rights, sacredness, ecological, and aesthetic values" (Martinez-Alier, 2009) cannot be monetised. Temper and Martinez-Alier (2013) also add, based on the bauxite mining conflict against Vedanta in the Niyamgiri hills in India, that setting prices deepens inequalities, excludes local participation and encourages economistic decisions.

A third phenomenon and evolving strategy concerns the role and mobilisation of science in resistance that has been increasing also through extra-local alliances. Initially, the only providers of scientific knowledge were the mining companies, creating issues of distrust within the communities (Horowitz, 2010). Due to the local-national-global nexus, scientific knowledge can be introduced at early stages before the mining project has started that can drive the local population to reject the project outright as happened with the Esquel case in Argentina with the participation of hydrogeologist expert, Robert Moran (Walter and Martinez-Alier, 2010). Once the mining operations are underway activists can create alliances with sympathetic scientists to challenge the information produced by the mining companies who on many occasions deny the impacts they cause on the environment or on the health of their workers (Bebbington and Bury, 2009). Conde (2014) explains, in her account of Niger and Namibia, how local activists engaged with scientists because they wanted to understand how they could protect themselves from radiation emanating from uranium mines as well as gain visibility and legitimacy by denouncing the impacts with scientific data. Since all knowledge, including scientific knowledge are partly socially constructed, the 'co-production' of new knowledge combining local and scientific knowledge can be used to challenge the knowledge produced and "manufactured" by the mining companies.

Activists have also developed concepts that have later been adopted by academia such as 'ecological debt', 'land grabbing' or 'climate justice' (Martinez Alier et al., 2014a). Conversely, activist organisations are increasingly using concepts developed in academia such as 'peak oil' or 'ecological footprint' (Martinez-Alier et al., 2011).

6. Effects of the mobilisations

6.1. The state and resistance

Governments can react in different ways to resistance depending on how dependent is the country on mining, the national economic situation at the time and the strength and tactics of the social resistance (Bebbington et al., 2008a). Regulation and legislative changes are a common response to the pressure from social movements. As Khoday and Natarajan (2012) argue based on their analysis in India, several laws on indigenous rights and environmental legislation have been changed, limiting the instances where communities can be evicted from their land and creating better resettlement plans. Also in India, the Green Tribunals created in 2010 will supposedly help expedite environmental claims, involve experts in environmental law and increase citizen participation. The Peruvian government has improved the environmental control of mines and implemented a new ministry for the environment, even though it has no power to fine or sanction mining companies (Bebbington and Bury, 2009; Echave et al., 2009). Governments like El Salvador, have created a moratoria on extraction due to social pressure (Bebbington and Bebbington, 2011) and the Ecuadorian government started (and later thwarted) an innovative proposal to leave oil untapped in the protected Yasuní-ITT park in exchange for financial compensation (Rival, 2010).

Also flourishing is the interest in progressive governments like Bolivia, Ecuador, Brazil or Uruguay that promote an extractivist model based on resource nationalism (specially oil and gas, but also iron ore in Brazil and Uruguay) with promises of redistribution of revenues and economic diversification. Several authors are looking at the apparent contradiction between the progressive-based-extractive-model and the social unrest and resistance it sparks (Bridge, 2013; Kohl, 2006; Perreault, 2006; Perreault et al., 2011). Also paradoxical is that this extractivist development discourse is shared with conservative governments like Colombia, Mexico and Peru. Authors point to deeply neo-liberalised structural path-dependent economies as main constraints for change (Kohl and Farthing, 2012; Kaup, 2010) and the focus on demands from social movements on nationalisation and redistribution of revenues (Perreault and Valdivia, 2010).

Common with both progressive and conservative governments is a growing intolerance to social resistance to extractive projects. This is resulting in the increasing use of repressive measures, the criminalisation of protest through new legislation and the prosecution of leaders in resistance movements. Although it appears transversally in the literature this reaction by governments is yet to be examined in detail (Bebbington and Bebbington, 2011; Martinez Alier et al., 2014a; Özen and Özen, 2009; Walter and Urkidi, 2015). Global Witness (2014) is currently the best source reporting the number of activists being killed in environment and land conflicts highlighting that "three times as many people were killed in 2012 (147) than 10 years before (57 in 2002)". But the use of violence is not new. A well-studied case is the role played by the authoritarian regime of Suharto in Indonesia from the mid 1960s to the end of 1990s where the rich Grasberg mine and a movement for independence justified a heavy military presence. On top of major environmental damage, many human rights abuses took place such as displacements and killings perpetrated by the Indonesian military and police, in cooperation with Freeport's own security service (Leith, 2003; Martinez-Alier, 2003). The Indian government also had a decisive role in the violent handling of the Maoist movement that in several areas opposed the privatisation of their lands for mining extraction projects (Guha, 2007). The recent deaths of 44 mine workers protesting in Marikana, South Africa is another example (Bond and Mottiar, 2013).

6.2. Corporations and resistance

Corporations are aware of the increasing reaction they experience to their activities. For them, increasing resistance means rising costs in terms of delays to mining projects. A recent article by Franks et al. (2014) shows that many mining companies fail to account for the full cost of potential conflicts by not adopting appropriate measures to avoid them. In response to this realisation, there is an increasing body of literature that aims at achieving sustainable development through mining extraction, providing advice and recommendations to both mining companies and communities to reach agreements and achieve common objectives (Ali, 2009; Veiga et al., 2001; Solomon et al., 2008; Kemp et al., 2011).

O'Faircheallaigh and Gibson (2012) have worked on which mineral taxation design would be more appropriate for indigenous communities whilst Ali and Grewal (2006) advise mining companies to improve transparency and have "willingness to change" if they want to reach amicable relations with indigenous communities. Hilson (2002) points to community consultations and appropriate compensation packages as good strategies over land disputes.

It has been observed across the mining industry but especially with the big players that corporate strategies of community engagement have changed radically, from little or no information channels to highly developed communication and development strategies that are increasingly known as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Since the 1990s partnerships between multilateral organisations, governments and the industry entailed the creation of a plethora of codes of conduct and reporting guidelines such as the 'United Nations Global Compact' (Bennett, 2002). Targeting the mining industry are the Global Mining Initiative (GMI) or the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). Most large mining companies now disclose through their annual reports CSR information such as social and environmental performance, health and safety issues and ethics (Jenkins and Yakovleva, 2006).

The aims of these corporate practices is to build greater trust, minimise risks of conflicts and win community support for their projects (Himley, 2013; Jenkins, 2004). Early participation of communities in the design of these programs and negotiation techniques are some of the recommendations emerging from an extensive literature on community-company relations (Kapelus, 2002; Kemp, 2010; Kemp et al., 2011; O'Faircheallaigh and Corbett, 2005; O'Faircheallaigh, 2007; O'Faircheallaigh et al., 2008; Esteves, 2008; Lockie et al., 2008). CSR

programs emerged as a result of the widespread opposition towards controversial environmental and social practices of the industry (Yakovleva, 2005; O'Faircheallaigh and Ali, 2008), pressure from multilateral organisations like the World Bank who wanted to see a response to the criticisms and the rising organisational capacity and cooperation between different resistance networks at different scales (Kapelus, 2002; Szablowski, 2002, 2007).

A central critique to these programs is their voluntary and non-enforceable nature (Fulmer et al., 2008; Watts, 2005). As Szablowski (2002) indicates based on his analysis of the World Bank Involuntary Resettlement directive, the ideas in principle are good but the way they are implemented fail to fulfil the objectives set up. Based on studies of CSR programs related to mining projects in Ghana and Ecuador, Hilson and Yakovleva (2007) and Warnaars (2012) conclude these programs are in many occasions not well designed and, coupled with communities' displacements, increase rather than alleviate the communities' hardship. Another common critique is the issue of participation of local communities; unlike the state, companies differentiate between recipients of benefits, prioritising those closer to their project or local elites, causing in some occasions inter and intra-community conflicts (Warnaars, 2012; Jenkins and Yakovleva, 2006; Newell, 2005). The context in which these programmes are developed is also of crucial importance; weak governance (Yakovleva, 2005) or post-confrontational events where the company has already lost its legitimacy don't provide good grounds for CSR programmes (Warnaars, 2012).

The demand pattern and market structure of each mine commodity also determines the industry behaviour and responsiveness to social resistance. Consumer markets, NGOs and mining companies can be influential in the development of initiatives like the Kimberley process that attempts to stop the illicit trade of diamonds (Le Billon, 2006, Grant and Taylor, 2004; Haufler, 2010). Spiegel (2015) highlights in his study of diamond certification in Zimbabwe how "multi-national corporate power, 'fair trade' commoditization, and technocratic development ideology" associated artisanal mining with illicitness further marginalising these poor communities. In the analysis of the fair trade gold certification Childs (2014) shows how bigger emphasis has been placed on the recognition of the artisanal mining sector however the scheme does not challenge the existing marginalisation of these miners.

7. Conclusions

The review explores academic peer reviewed publications around resistance to mining. It reveals there has been a shift in the strategies and discourses used by resistance to mining movements in the last two decades. It points to alliances with extra-local actors as having played an important role in this shift; not only fostering movements to emerge, but also developing solidarity and political opportunities, facilitating the acquisition or co-production of technical knowledge and allowing for the emergence of alternative imaginaries of development. Strategic contacts with NGOs, lawyers and scientists are contributing to legal court cases, activist-scientist collaborations and the spread of consultas to formally reject mining projects at community level. Is difficult to assert the decisive role of these alliances due to a lack of comparison with "successful" mining resistances that have not experienced these alliances. Also, not sufficiently explored in the literature is how these alliances are formed and get organised. An initial exploration shows that some are organised against specific minerals such as the "African Uranium Alliance" or "WISE" for uranium, specific companies such as "International Articulation of those affected by Vale", "PARTI-ZANS" against Rio Tinto, "Foil Vedanta", per country or region such as "JATAM" for Indonesia, "No a la mina" in Argentina, and by communities or indigenous groups such as "CONACAMI" in Peru. Further research such as that carried out by EU funded EJOLT project (Özkaynak et al., 2015) will uncover routes, similarities, conditionings and limitations of these alliances.

These cross-scalar alliances have also contributed to another shift that has been taking place in resistance movements to mining; local conflicts with local demands articulated around working conditions and salaries (Godoy, 1985; Moodie, 2002) as well as local environmental and livelihood concerns (Bebbington et al., 2008a; Bury, 2007) have been changing to pro-positive resistance movements.

These movements link local based demands with the rejection of the overall 'development' model that supports these mining projects. The Intag and Sipakapa communities in Ecuador and Guatemala or the Rosieni in Romania have realised their weak position within the commodity chain and the capitalist complex that is ultimately destroying their way of life. Local groups are innovatively combining local narratives and alternatives with global discourses on rights and climate, social and environmental justice, thus becoming the first agents for change. This review uncovers an emerging anti-capitalist and non-Eurocentric discourse articulated with local place-based demands. It has however been only identified in some communities and peripheral analyses. Further research on new cases and with the specific objective of identifying this trend would be welcomed.

In retrospect, the academic literature could be divided by the authors' general outlook on the relation between the economy and the environment. There is predominance in the literature of "ecological modernisers" or supporters of "weak sustainability" that might support mining projects, provided better environmental protection and compensation is offered. Whilst there are several exceptions, there is a lack in much of this literature of "strong sustainability" views that explore the possibilities of an economy less based on extractive industries, and the global environmental justice movement in pushing the economy towards sustainability (let alone the idea of an equitable reduction of energy and material consumption encapsulated in degrowth).

Other gaps and weaknesses identified in the literature have been already identified in the manuscript. Literature on the state's response and role in shaping mining expansion and resistance is sporadic and unstructured and would welcome a cross-cutting comparative analysis of states' role and response in mining conflicts. Despite recent efforts by organisations like Global Witness (2014) a big gap in the literature is the role of violence in mining conflicts. There is a need to compare and understand current upsurges in Philippines, Latin America and South Africa. Gender studies on resistance to mining is another gap. Despite Jenkins' (2014) excellent review on the role of women as mineworkers and in communities affected by mining, their role in resistance is less explored; why and how do they engage in resistance?

This review has identified a new space of contestation where power balances are being swung between globally connected resistance movements – participating in local and wider debates around post-neoliberal socio-ecological alternatives- and mining companies (and the state on most occasions) with Eurocentric and growth based development programs. The territorial dynamics and the geographical expansion of the mining frontiers can be determined by the interaction between these two forces.

References

Agarwal, B., 2001. Participatory exclusions, community forestry, and gender: an analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework. World Dev. 29, 1623–1648.

Agrawal, A., Gibson, C.C., 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation. World Dev. 27, 629–649.

Ali, S.H., 2009. Mining, the Environment, and Indigenous Development Conflicts. University of Arizona Press.

Ali, S.H., Grewal, A.S., 2006. The ecology and economy of indigenous resistance: divergent perspectives on mining in New Caledonia. Contemp. Pac. 18, 361–392.

Alvarez, S.E., Dagnino, E., Escobar, A., 1998. Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures. Revisioning Latin American Social Movement Revisited. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.

Andolina, R., 2003. The sovereign and its shadow: constituent assembly and indigenous movement in Ecuador. J. Lat. Am. Stud. 35, 721–750.

Anguelovski, I., 2011. Understanding the dynamics of community engagement of corporations in communities: the iterative relationship between dialogue processes and local protest at the Tintaya copper mine in Peru. Soc. Nat. Resour. 24, 384–399.

Arellano-Yanguas, J., 2011. Aggravating the resource curse: decentralisation, mining and conflict in Peru. J. Dev. Stud. 47, 617–638.

Ballard, C., Banks, G., 2003. Resource wars: the anthropology of mining. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 287–313.

Bandyopadhyay, J., Shiva, V., 1985. The conflict over limestone quarrying in Doon Valley, Dehradun, India. Environ. Conserv. 12, 131–139.

Banks, G., 2002. Mining and the environment in Melanesia: contemporary debates reviewed. Contemp. Pac. 14, 39–67.

Barrantes, R., 2005. Minería, desarrollo y pobreza en el Perú : o de cómo todo depende del cristal con que se mire. In: Barrantes, R., Záratey, P., Durand, A. (Eds.), Te quiero pero no: minería, desarrollo y poblaciones locales. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Lima, pp. 17–79.

Bebbington, A., 1996. Movements, modernizations, and markets. In: Peet, P.R., Watts, M. (Eds.), Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements. Routledge, pp. 86–109.

Bebbington, A., 2007. Social movements and the politicization of chronic poverty. Dev. Chang. 38, 793–818.

Bebbington, A., 2012. Underground political ecologies: the second annual lecture of the Cultural and Political Ecology Specialty Group of the Association of American Geographers. Geoforum 43, 1152–1162.

Bebbington, A., Bebbington, D.H., 2011. An Andean avatar: post-neoliberal and neoliberal strategies for securing the unobtainable. New Polit. Econ. 16, 131–145.

Bebbington, A.J., Bury, J.T., 2009. Institutional challenges for mining and sustainability in Peru. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 106, 17296–17301.

Bebbington, A., Bebbington, D.H., Bury, J., Lingan, J., Muñoz, J.P., Scurrah, M., 2008a. Mining and social movements: struggles over livelihood and rural territorial development in the Andes. World Dev. 36, 2888–2905.

Bebbington, A., Abramovay, R., Chiriboga, M., 2008b. Social movements and the dynamics of rural territorial development in Latin America. World Dev. 36, 2874–2887.

Bebbington, A., Bebbington, D.H., Bury, J., 2010. Federating and defending: water, territory and extraction in the Andes. In: Boelens, R., Getches, D.H., Gil, J.A.G. (Eds.), Out of the Mainstream: Water Rights, Politics and Identity. Earthscan, pp. 307–327.

Bennett, J., 2002. Multinational corporations, social responsibility and conflict. J. Int. Aff. Columbia Univ. 55, 393–414.

Bloodworth, A.J., Scott, P.W., McEvoy, F.M., 2009. Digging the backyard: mining and quarrying in the UK and their impact on future land use. Land Use Policy 26, S317–S325.

Bond, P., 2008. Social movements and corporate social responsibility in South Africa. Dev. Chang. 39, 1037–1052.

Bond, P., Mottiar, S., 2013. Movements, protests and a massacre in South Africa. J. Contemp. Afr. Stud. 31 (2), 283–302.

Bridge, G., 2004. Mapping the bonanza: geographies of mining investment in an era of neoliberal reform. Prof. Geogr. 56, 406–421.

Bridge, G., 2013. Resource geographies II: the resource-state nexus. Prog. Hum. Geogr.

Buchanan, K.S., 2013. Contested discourses, knowledge, and socio-environmental conflict in Ecuador. Environ. Sci. Pol. 30, 19–25.

Bullard, R.D., 1990. Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality (Vol. 3). Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Bury, J.T., 2007. Livelihoods, mining and peasant protests in the Peruvian Andes. J. Lat. Am. Geogr. 1 (1), 1–19.

Büscher, B., Davidov, V. (Eds.), 2014. The Ecotourism-Extraction Nexus: Political Economies and Rural Realities of (un) Comfortable Bedfellows. Routledge.

Campbell, B. (Ed.), 2009. Mining in Africa: Regulation and Development. IDRC.

Carruthers, D.V. (Ed.), 2008. Environmental Justice in Latin America: Problems, Promise, and Practice. MIT Press.

Childs, J., 2014. From 'criminals of the earth' to 'stewards of the environment': the social and environmental justice of Fair Trade gold. Geoforum 57, 129–137.

Clark, B., 2002. The indigenous environmental movement in the United States transcending borders in struggles against mining, manufacturing, and the capitalist state. Org. Environ. 15, 410–442.

Conde, M., 2014. Activism mobilising science. Ecol. Econ. b105, 67–77.

Conde, M., Kallis, G., 2012. The global uranium rush and its Africa frontier. Effects, reactions and social movements in Namibia. Glob. Environ. Chang. 22, 596–610.

Conell, C., Cohn, S., 1995. Learning from other people's actions: environmental variation and diffusion in French coal mining strikes, 1890–1935. Am. J. Sociol. 366–403.

Conklin, B.A., Graham, L.R., 1995. The shifting middle ground: Amazonian Indians and eco-politics. Am. Anthropol. 97, 695–710.

Connell, J., Howitt, R. (Eds.), 1991. Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia. Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Cooper, H.M., 1988. Organizing knowledge syntheses: a taxonomy of literature reviews. Knowledge Soc. 1, 104–126.

Creswell, J.W., 1994. Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Sage Publications.

Dwivedi, R., 2001. Environmental movements in the Global South issues of livelihood and beyond. Int. Sociol. 16, 11–31.

Echave, D., José, Á.D., Huber, L., Revesz, B., Ricard, X., Tanaka, M., 2009. Minería y conflicto social. IEP, CIPCA, CBC CIES. Lima.

Escobar, A., 1995. Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the third world. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Escobar, A., 2001. Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. Polit. Geogr. 20, 139–174.

Escobar, A., 2006. Difference and conflict in the struggle over natural resources: a political ecology framework. Development 49, 6–13.

Escobar, A., 2012. Una minga para el posdesarrollo. Signo y Pensamiento 30, 278–284.

Esteves, A.M., 2008. Mining and social development: refocusing community investment using multi-criteria decision analysis. Res. Policy 33 (1), 39–47.

Foweraker, J., 2001. Grassroots movements and political activism in Latin America: a critical comparison of Chile and Brazil. J. Lat. Am. Stud. 33, 839–865.

Fraser, A., Larmer, M. (Eds.), 2010. Zambia, Mining, and Neoliberalism: Boom and Bust on the Globalized Copperbelt. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fulmer, A.M., Godoy, A.S., Neff, P., 2008. Indigenous rights, resistance, and the law: lessons from a Guatemalan mine. Latin Am. Polit. Soc. 50, 91–121.

Gadgil, M., Guha, R., 1995. Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India. Psychology Press.

Global Witness, 2014. Deadly Environment.

Godoy, R., 1985. Mining: anthropological perspectives. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 199–217.

Gordon, T., Webber, J.R., 2008. Imperialism and resistance: Canadian mining companies in Latin America. Third World Q. 29, 63–87.

Grant, J.A., Taylor, I., 2004. Global governance and conflict diamonds: the Kimberley Process and the quest for clean gems. Round Table 93 (375), 385–401.

Grueso, L., Rosero, C., Escobar, A., 2003. The process of Black community organizing in the Southern Pacific Coast Region of Colombia. Perspectives on Las Américas: A Reader in Culture, History, & Representation. John Wiley & Sons.

Gudynas, E., 2011. Desarrollo, postextractivismo y "buen vivir". Revista Pueblos 49.

Gudynas, E., 2013. Transitions to post-extractivism: directions, options, areas of action. Beyond Development.

Guha, R., 2007. Adivasis, naxalites and Indian democracy. Econ. Polit. Wkly. 3305–3312.

Guha, R., Alier, J.M., 1997. Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South. Routledge.

Haarstad, H., Fløysand, A., 2007. Globalization and the power of rescaled narratives: a case of opposition to mining in Tambogrande, Peru. Polit. Geogr. 26, 289–308.

Habermas, J., 1984. The theory of communicative action. Vol. I. Beacon, Boston.

Harvey, D., 1996. Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference.

Hays, S.P., Hays, B.D., 1989. Beauty, health, and permanence: Environmental politics in the United States, 1955-1985. Cambridge University Press.

Hilson, G., 2002. An overview of land use conflicts in mining communities. Land Use Policy 19, 65–73.

Hilson, G., Yakovleva, N., 2007. Strained relations: a critical analysis of the mining conflict in Prestea, Ghana. Polit. Geogr. 26, 98–119.

Himley, M., 2013. Regularizing extraction in Andean Peru: mining and social mobilization in an age of corporate social responsibility. Antipode 45, 394–416.

Hirsch, P., Warren, C. (Eds.), 1998. The Politics of Environment in Southeast Asia: Resources and Resistance. Psychology Press.

Holden, W.N., 2005. Indigenous peoples and non-ferrous metals mining in the Philippines. Pac. Rev. 18, 417–438.

Holden, W.N., Jacobson, R.D., 2009. Ecclesial opposition to nonferrous mining in Guatemala: neoliberalism meets the church of the poor in a shattered society. Can. Geogr. 53, 145–164.

Hollander, J.A., Einwohner, R.L., 2004. Conceptualizing resistance. Sociol. Forum 19, 533–554.

Horowitz, L., 2002. Daily, immediate conflicts: an analysis of villagers' arguments about a multinational nickel mining project in New Caledonia. Oceania 35–55.

Horowitz, L.S., 2010. "Twenty years is yesterday": science, multinational mining, and the political ecology of trust in New Caledonia. Geoforum 41, 617–626.

Horowitz, L.S., 2011. Interpreting industry's impacts: micropolitical ecologies of divergent community responses. Dev. Chang. 42, 1379–1391.

Horowitz, L.S., 2012. Translation alignment: actor-network theory, resistance, and the power dynamics of alliance in New Caledonia. Antipode 44, 806–827.

Hyndman, D., 2001. Academic responsibilities and representation of the Ok Tedi Crisis in postcolonial Papua New Guinea. Contemp. Pac. 13, 33–54.

Inglehart, R.F., 1977. The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics.

Jenkins, H., 2004. Corporate social responsibility and the mining industry: conflicts and constructs. Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag. 11, 23–34.

Jenkins, H., Yakovleva, N., 2006. Corporate social responsibility in the mining industry: exploring trends in social and environmental disclosure. J. Clean. Prod. 14, 271–284.

Jenkins, K., 2014. Women, mining and development: an emerging research agenda. Extract. Ind. Soc. 1, 329–339.

Kapelus, P., 2002. Mining, corporate social responsibility and the "community": the case of Rio Tinto, Richards Bay minerals and the Mbonambi. J. Bus. Ethics 39, 275–296.

Kapp, K.W., 1950. Social Costs of Private Enterprise.

Kaup, B.Z., 2010. A neoliberal nationalization? The constraints on natural-gas-led development in Bolivia. Lat. Am. Perspect. 37, 123–138.

Keck, M., Sikkink, K., 1998. Activists beyond borders. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Kemp, D., 2010. Mining and community development: problems and possibilities of local-level practice. Commun. Develop. J. 45 (2), 198–218.

Kemp, D., Owen, J.R., Gotzmann, N., Bond, C.J., 2011. Just relations and company–community conflict in mining. J. Bus. Ethics 101, 93–109.

Khoday, K., Natarajan, U., 2012. Fairness and international environmental law from below: social movements and legal transformation in India. Leiden J. Int. Law 25, 415–441.

Kirsch, S., 2001. Changing views of place and time along the Ok Tedi. In: Weiner, J., Rumsey, A. (Eds.), From Myth to Minerals: Mining and Indigenous Lifeworlds in Australia and Papua New Guinea. Crawford Press, Bathurst.

Kirsch, S., 2007. Indigenous movements and the risks of counterglobalization: tracking the campaign against Papua New Guinea's Ok Tedi mine. Am. Ethnol. 34, 303–321.

Klare, M.T., 2001. Resource Wars. Metropolitan, New York.

Kohl, B., 2006. Challenges to neoliberal hegemony in Bolivia. Antipode 38 (2), 304–326.

Kohl, B., Farthing, L., 2012. Material constraints to popular imaginaries: the extractive economy and resource nationalism in Bolivia. Polit. Geogr. 31, 225–235.

Kuecker, G.D., 2007. Fighting for the forests grassroots resistance to mining in northern Ecuador. Lat. Am. Perspect. 34, 94–107.

Le Billon, P., 2006. Fatal transactions: conflict diamonds and the (anti) terrorist consumer. Antipode 38 (4), 778–801.

Leith, D., 2003. The Politics of Power: Freeport in Suharto's Indonesia. University of Hawaii Press.

Lockie, S., Franetovich, M., Sharma, S., Rolfe, J., 2008. Democratisation versus engagement? Social and economic impact assessment and community participation in the coal mining industry of the Bowen Basin, Australia. Impact Assess. Proj. Apprais. 26 (3), 177–187.

Machado Aráoz, H., 2009. Minería transnacional, conflictos socioterritoriales y nuevas dinámicas expropiatorias. El caso de Minera Alumbrera. Minería transnacional, narrativas del desarrollo y resistencias sociales, pp. 205–228.

Martinez Alier, J., Anguelovski, I., Bond, P., Del Bene, D., Demaria, F., Gerber, J.-F., Greyl, L., Haas, W., Healy, H., Marín-Burgos, V., Ojo, G., Firpo Porto, M., Rijnhout, L., Rodríguez-Labajos, B., Spangenberg, J., Temper, L., Warlenius, R., Yánez, I., 2014a. Between activism and science: grassroots concepts for sustainability coined by Environmental Justice Organizations. J. Polit. Econ. 21, 19–60.

Martínez Alier, J., Demaria, F., Temper, L., 2014b. Social metabolism and environmental conflicts in India. Indialogs: Spanish Journal of India Studies Vol. 1, pp. 0051–0083.

Martinez Alier, J., Temper, L, Del Bene, D., Scheidel, A., 2016. Is there a global environmental justice movement? Geoforum. Bandyopadhyay, J., Shiva, V., 1985. The conflict over limestone quarrying in Doon Valley, Dehradun, India. Environ. Conserv. 12, 131–139 (forthcoming).

Martínez-Alier, J., 1991. Ecology and the poor: a neglected dimension of Latin American history. J. Lat. Am. Stud. 23, 621–639.

Martinez-Alier, J., 2001. Mining conflicts, environmental justice, and valuation. J. Hazard. Mater. 86, 153–170.

Martinez-Alier, J., 2003. The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Martinez-Alier, J., 2004. Los conflictos ecológicos-distributivos y los indicadores de sustentabilidad. Revista Iberoamericana de Economía Ecológica (REVIBEC) 1, 21–30.

Martinez-Alier, J., 2009. Social metabolism, ecological distribution conflicts, and languages of valuation. Capital. Nat. Social. 20, 58–87.

Martinez-Alier, J., O'Connor, M., 1996. Ecological and economic distribution conflicts. In: Costanza, R., Martinez-Alier, J., Segura, O. (Eds.), Getting down to Earth: Practical Applications of Ecological Economics. Island Press/ISEE, Washington, DC.

Martinez-Alier, J., Munda, G., O'Neill, J., 1998. Weak comparability of values as a foundation for ecological economics. Ecol. Econ. 26 (3), 277–286.

Martinez-Alier, J., Healy, H., Temper, L., Walter, M., Rodriguez-Labajos, B., Gerber, J.F., Conde, M., 2011. Between science and activism: learning and teaching ecological economics with environmental justice organisations. Local Environ. 16, 17–36.

Melucci, A., 1985. The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements. Soc. Res. 789–816.

Merlinsky, M.G., Latta, A., 2012. Environmental collective action, justice and institutional change in Argentina. In: Latta, A., Wittman, H. (Eds.), Environment and citizenship in Latin America: natures, subjects and struggles. Berghahn Books.

Mohanty, R., 2010. Contesting development, reinventing democracy: grassroots social movements in India. In: Thompson, L., Tapscott, C. (Eds.), Citizenship and Social Movements: Perspectives from the Global South. Zed, London.

Moodie, T.D., 2002. Mobilization on the South African gold mines. In: Meyer, D.S., Whittier, N., Robnett, B. (Eds.), Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State. Oxford University Press.

Mudd, G.M., 2007. Global trends in gold mining: towards quantifying environmental and resource sustainability. Res. Policy 32, 42–56.

Muradian, R., Martinez-Alier, J., Correa, H., 2003. International capital versus local population: the environmental conflict of the Tambogrande mining project, Peru. Soc. Nat. Resour. 16, 775–792.

Muradian, R., Walter, M., Martinez-Alier, J., 2012. Hegemonic transitions and global shifts in social metabolism: implications for resource-rich countries. Glob. Environ. Chang. 22, 559–567.

Newell, P., 2005. Citizenship, accountability and community: the limits of the CSR agenda. Int. Aff. 81, 541–557.

North, L.L., Young, L., 2013. Generating rights for communities harmed by mining: legal and other action. Can. J. Dev. Stud. 34, 96–110.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., Ali, S. (Eds.), 2008. Earth Matters: Indigenous Peoples, Extractive Industries and Corporate Social Responsibility. Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., Gibson, G., 2012. Economic risk and mineral taxation on indigenous lands. Res. Policy 37, 10–18.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., 2007. Environmental agreements, EIA follow-up and aboriginal participation in environmental management: the Canadian experience. Environ. Impact Assess. Rev. 27 (4), 319–342.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., Corbett, T., 2005. Indigenous participation in environmental management of mining projects: the role of negotiated agreements. Environ. Polit. 14 (5), 629–647.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., Trebeck, K., Haley, S., Magdanz, J., Coumans, C., Howitt, R., ... Yakovleva, N., 2008. Earth Matters: Indigenous Peoples, The Extractive Industries and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Özen, H., Özen, Ş., 2011. Interactions in and between strategic action fields: a comparative analysis of two environmental conflicts in gold-mining fields in Turkey. Org. Environ. 24 (4), 343–363.

Özen, Ş., Özen, H., 2009. Peasants against MNCs and the state: the role of the Bergama struggle in the institutional construction of the gold-mining field in Turkey. Organization 16, 547–573.

Özkaynak, B., Rodriguez-Labajos, B., Aydın, C.İ., Yanez, I., Garibay, C., 2015. Towards environmental justice success in mining conflicts: an empirical investigation. EJOLT Report No. 14.

Padel, F., Das, S., 2010. Cultural genocide and the rhetoric of sustainable mining in east India. Contemp. South Asia 18, 333–341.

Peluso, N.L., 1992. Rich forests, poor people: resource control and resistance in Java. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Perreault, T., 2006. From the Guerra Del Agua to the Guerra Del Gas: resource governance, neoliberalism and popular protest in Bolivia. Antipode 38, 150–172.

Perreault, T., 2013. Dispossession by accumulation? Mining, water and the nature of enclosure on the Bolivian Altiplano. Antipode 45, 1050–1069.

Perreault, T., Valdivia, G., 2010. Hydrocarbons, popular protest and national imaginaries: Ecuador and Bolivia in comparative context. Geoforum 4, 689–699.

Pigrau, A., Borràs, S., JariaiManzano, J., Cardesa-Salzmann, A., 2012. Legal avenues for EJOs to claim environmental liability. EJOLT Report No. 4 (98 pp.).

Rival, L., 2010. Ecuador's Yasuní-ITT initiative: the old and new values of petroleum. Ecol. Econ. 70, 358–365.

Robbins, P., 2004. Political Ecology. Blackwell, Oxford.

Rubin, J.W., 1996. Defining resistance: contested interpretations of everyday acts. Stud. Law Polit. Soc. 15, 237–260.

Rumsey, A., Weiner, J.F., 2004. Mining and Indigenous Lifeworlds in Australia and Papua New Guinea. Sean Kingston Pub.

Schippers, T., 2010. Securing land rights through indigenousness: a case from the Philippine Cordillera Highlands. Asian J. Soc. Sci. 38, 220–238.

Schlosberg, D., 2007. Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature.

Scott, J.C., 2008. Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance. Yale university Press.

Sharma, S., 2012. Adivasi predicament in Chhattisgarh. Econ. Polit. Wkly. 47, 19.

Shrivastava, A., Kothari, A., 2012. Churning the Earth: The Making of Global India. Penguin, Delhi.

Sikor, T., Newell, P., 2014. Globalizing environmental justice? Geoforum 54, 151–157.

Silva-Macher, J.C., Farrell, K.N., 2014. The Flow/Fund Model of Conga: Exploring the Anatomy of Environmental Conflicts at the Andes–Amazon Commodity Frontier. Environment, Development and Sustainability, pp. 1–22.

Solomon, F., Katz, E., Lovel, R., 2008. Social dimensions of mining: research, policy and practice challenges for the minerals industry in Australia. Res. Policy 33, 142–149.

Spiegel, S.J., 2014. Legacies of a nationwide crackdown in Zimbabwe: operation Chikorokoza Chapera in gold mining communities. J. Mod. Afr. Stud. 52 (04), 541–570.

Spiegel, S.J., 2015. Contested diamond certification: reconfiguring global and national interests in Zimbabwe's Marange fields. Geoforum 59, 258–267.

Stahler-Sholk, R., Vanden, H.E., Kuecker, G.D., 2007. Introduction: globalizing resistance: the new politics of social movements in Latin America. Lat. Am. Perspect. 5–16.

Svampa, M., Antonelli, M. (Eds.), 2009. Minería transnacional, narrativas del desarrollo y resistencias sociales Editorial Biblos.

Swyngedouw, E., 2014. De-Politicization and Re-Politicization. In: G., D.'.A., Demaria, D., Kallis, G. (Eds.), Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era. Routledge.

Szablowski, D., 2002. Mining, displacement and the World Bank: a case analysis of companiamineraantamina's operations in Peru. J. Bus. Ethics 39, 247–273.

Szablowski, D., 2007. Transnational Law and Local Struggles: Mining, Communities and the World Bank. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Tarrow, S., 1994. Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Tavasci, D., Ventimiglia, L., 2011. Financialisation in the primary commodity dependent developing countries: the case of Chile. Int. J. Manag. Concepts Philo. 5, 171–189.

Temper, L., Martinez-Alier, J., 2013. The god of the mountain and Godavarman: net present value, indigenous territorial rights and sacredness in a bauxite mining conflict in India. Ecol. Econ. 96, 79–87.

Timmons, J.R., 2007. Globalizing environmental justice. In: Sandler, R.D., Pezzullo, P.C. (Eds.), Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement. MIT press.

Tschakert, P., 2009. Digging deep for justice: a radical re-imagination of the artisanal gold mining sector in Ghana. Antipode 41 (4), 706–740.

Tsing, A.L., 2005. Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton University Press.

Urkidi, L., 2010. A glocal environmental movement against gold mining: Pascua–Lama in Chile. Ecol. Econ. 70, 219–227.

Urkidi, L., 2011. The defence of community in the anti-mining movement of Guatemala. J. Agrar. Chang. 11, 556–580.

Urkidi, L., Walter, M., 2011. Dimensions of environmental justice in anti-gold mining movements in Latin America. Geoforum 42, 683–695.

Vagholikar, N., Dutta, R., 2003. Undermining India: Impacts of Mining on Ecologically Sensitive Areas. Kalpavriksh, Pune.

Veiga, M.M., Scoble, M., McAllister, M.L., 2001. Mining with communities. Natural Resources Forum. 25. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Velicu, I., 2012. The aesthetic post-communist subject and the differend of Rosia Montana. Stud. Soc. Justice 6, 125–141.

Walker, G., 2009. Globalizing environmental justice: the geography and politics of frame contextualization and evolution. Glob. Soc. Policy 9, 355–382.

Walter, M., Martinez-Alier, J., 2010. How to be heard when nobody wants to listen: community action against mining in Argentina. Can. J. Dev. Stud. 30, 281–301.

Walter, M., Urkidi, L., 2015. Community mining consultations in Latin America (2002–2012): The contested emergence of a hybrid institution for participation. Geoforum (In press).

Warnaars, X.S., 2012. Why be poor when we can be rich? Constructing responsible mining in El Pangui, Ecuador. Resour. Policy 37, 223–232.

Watts, M.J., 2005. Righteous oil? Human rights, the oil complex, and corporate social responsibility. Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 30, 373–407.

Yagenova, S.V., Garcia, R., 2009. Indigenous people's struggles against transnational mining companies in Guatemala: the Sipakapa people vs Goldcorp Mining Company. Social. Democr. 23 (3), 157–166.

Yakovleva, N., 2005. Corporate Social Responsibility in the Mining Industries. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Zografos, C., Howarth, R.B., 2010. Deliberative Ecological Economics.