



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Strategic governance for inclusive development

Pouw, N.R.M.; de Bruijne, A.

DOI

[10.1057/ejdr.2015.53](https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2015.53)

Publication date

2015

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

European Journal of Development Research

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Pouw, N. R. M., & de Bruijne, A. (2015). Strategic governance for inclusive development. *European Journal of Development Research*, 27(4), 481-487. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2015.53>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Introduction

Strategic Governance *for* Inclusive Development

Nicky R.M. Pouw* and Ad de Bruijne

University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

*E-mail: n.r.m.pouw@uva.nl

Abstract The global academic and policy debate on inclusive development is rising. Conceptual and theoretical contributions are made from multiple disciplinary angles. A driving force behind this is the disheartening trend of growing inequality, which juxtaposes economic success stories in countries that were previously low-income. How to strategically govern societies towards more inclusive development within an interactive governance constellation, for positive or normative reasons, is a major challenge. This special issue brings together the latest empirical and theoretical studies that consider strategic governance and inclusive development in inter-relationship. Most of these contributions stem from research undertaken under the guidance of Professor Baud at the Governance and Inclusive Development group at the University of Amsterdam. The strategic governance for inclusive development research agenda pursues interdisciplinarity, transdisciplinarity and plurality of knowledge in the field of international development studies.

Le débat académique et politique mondial sur le développement inclusif devient de plus en plus fréquent. Des contributions conceptuelles et théoriques venant de diverses disciplines sont apportées. Une force motrice à l'origine de cela est la tendance décourageante vers une inégalité croissante, qui juxtapose les histoires de réussites économiques dans des pays qui étaient auparavant à faible revenu. La question de comment gouverner de façon stratégique des sociétés pour un développement plus inclusif, au sein d'une constellation de gouvernance interactive, est un défi majeur, pour des raisons positives ou normatives. Ce numéro spécial rassemble les dernières études empiriques et théoriques qui considèrent les liens entre la gouvernance stratégique et le développement inclusif. La plupart de ces contributions proviennent de recherches menées sous la direction du professeur Isa Baud du groupe Gouvernance et Développement Inclusif de l'Université d'Amsterdam. La gouvernance stratégique pour le programme de recherche du développement inclusif poursuit l'interdisciplinarité, la transdisciplinarité et la pluralité des connaissances dans le domaine des études du développement international.

European Journal of Development Research (2015) 27, 481–487. doi:10.1057/ejdr.2015.53

Keywords: strategic governance; inclusive development; inequality; interdisciplinarity; transdisciplinarity; plurality

Introduction

Pessimism over increasing global inequality ruled the debates at the recent 2015 World Economic Forum in Davos. The general perception was that governments do not do enough to make economic growth inclusive. Fear of the growing geopolitical and religious tensions and of the new (national and international) cultural contradictions and conflicts was widely expressed.¹ These perceptions are made substantive by an increasing body of research on the topic of inequality; how it has been increasing since the early 1970s in 'developed' economies (for example see OECD, 2011; UNICEF, 2011; Piketty, 2014); and on the relationship between (rising) inequality and conflict (see Cramer, 2005; Collier *et al.*, 2008; Holmqvist, 2012; OECD, 2012). Political proponents of 'economic growth first – redistribution after', argue that inequality

reduction hampers growth; yet, they fail to present convincing empirical evidence (Krugman, 2014).² Moreover, if people are constrained or excluded from opportunities to realize their full potential, inequality can also be considered a social-political process that carries social justice weight (for example, Sen, 2010; Lintelo, 2011). The current debate around African and Middle Eastern refugees coming into Europe in precarious conditions is telling at this point.

Steering the economy towards achieving economic growth while governing a plurality of social and political actors with different interests and powers for poverty/inequality reduction and sustainability is a daunting task. A question that has been studied in depth and from multiple disciplinary angles is: How to govern to enable inclusive development, by a multitude of stakeholders (state and non-state) and at multiple levels within a context of inequality of voice and representation? Baud has addressed this question since the beginning of her academic career in the 1970s and in the process has incorporated perspectives from the 'Global South'³ and acknowledged a plurality of knowledges (for example see Baud, *et al*, 1997; Baud, 2004; Baud and Nainan, 2008; Hordijk and Baud, 2011; Pouw and Baud, 2012; Baud, 2015). Much has been achieved in collaborative effort with the research teams that she has led over the past three decades – most recently with the *Chance2Sustain* project, 2010–2014.⁴ Some of the intellectual insights gained from these research projects, and other research carried out under the umbrella of the Governance and Inclusive Development (GID) programme that she has led since 2004, are collected in the tribute book *Geographies of Urban Governance. Advanced Theories, Methods, Practices* by Gupta *et al* (2015).

This special issue is likewise dedicated to the farewell of Baud as Professor in International Development Studies (IDS) from the University of Amsterdam (UvA) on 11 September 2015.⁵ It is first aimed at commemorating her academic achievements in the IDS field of knowledge, particularly her ideas and insights on topics related to 'strategic governance' in urban environments and 'inclusive development' in the Global South. Second, it provides an overview of the different ways in which these ideas and insights have been taken forward by people she has collaborated with in relation to the theory of inclusive development, inclusive urban policy reform, the strategic governance of big data, gender and inclusive development in education, inclusive growth, and rural governance of natural resources. Third, it is aimed at extrapolating conceptual and theoretical lessons from her work that could serve to guide future research on strategic governance for inclusive development. Fourth, and finally, this special issue portrays a body of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research and the policy and strategic lessons that can be drawn from it.

The Challenges of Building Strategic Governance for Inclusive Development

Global developments in the form of geo-political shifts in power, climate change, emerging economies, financial crises and social transformations call for new forms of global governance. Robert Faulkner, of the London School of Economics, in a report for the European Environment Agency (EEA, 2011) describes the changes in global governance as a 'mega-trend' that began in the 1980s and accelerated in recent years while at the same time taking on new forms:

[H]owever, global governance has become increasingly transnationalised, meaning that it involves a growing number of non-state actors operating at different levels, from the local to the regional and global. (p. 4)

Baud and de Wit (2009) observe a similar trend taking place at the level of Indian mega-cities, whereby urban governments strategically adopt new forms of urban governance to deal with

rapidly growing urban populations and with the diversified effects of globalization in different cities and towns. For example, they identify new forms of urban governance that may accommodate more participation and negotiation (for example, at the ward level), involve new actors and constitutions, and interact with socio-economic and political changes across multiple levels. In a global context of (rapidly) expanding urban populations, the realigning of different actors and stakeholders at multiple levels of governance stands out as a paramount problem (Baud and Post, 2003). In the literature on global and urban governance, the term ‘glocalization’ is used to signify universal trends concurring with locally specific outcomes and responses (Robertson, 1997). An example of this is the role of migrants abroad, as well of returned migrants in cities in poorer countries.

Glocalization creates new problems and challenges for global and urban governance that require strategic alliances with a multitude of actors and at multiple levels of governance. Torfing *et al* (2012) advance this new urban governance paradigm by stressing the need for ‘interactive governance’, which aims to provide the room for manoeuvre for devolved decision making by a multitude of different actors and institutions (2012, p. 7).⁶ Strategic governance is then about the effective realignment of predefined strategies with performances and outcomes within a context of interactive governance. In this way, urban governance can respond and adapt effectively to the complex challenges it faces. For example, binding urban governance is needed in situations where inequality has led to conflict and violence between different population sub-groups in the city. However, the existing governance is often linked with specific sub-groups. Here, the outcome of Verrest and Jaffe’s (2012) analysis of Caribbean cities, which identified both ‘bipolar antagonism’ and ‘multipolar existence’, is useful. Concerted efforts – by policy makers, urban planners, the media and citizens in their everyday interactions – are be critical in promoting and safeguarding an urban climate of multipolar coexistence to avoid a geography of fear.⁷

The general lack of reliable data, knowledge and capacities in cities of the Global South adds to this complexity, as Karin Pfeffer *et al* (2015, this volume) point out in their analysis of the use of ‘Big Data’ to control water-related risks and insecurities in two Caribbean cities. Yet, these are critical ingredients to enable timely, responsive and adaptive urban governance (Hordijk and Baud, 2011; Baud *et al*, 2013). Concentrating the access and ownership of Big Data in the hands of a few can lead to knowledge contestations. Big Data, if not shared freely, may lead to the further marginalization of vulnerable sub-groups in the population through a process of discounting and devaluing their (alternative) ways of knowing and collecting information, which are not supported by Big Data.

Political constraints, in the form of lack of political will, historical ties and co-opted politicians, also weigh significantly into the equation of strategic urban governance and into its spatial manifestations, as Catherine Sutherland *et al* (2015, this volume) illustrate in the case of urban water provision in Durban, South Africa. The authors argue that historically grounded inequalities, for example in urban water provisioning, are not always easy to resolve because of their spatial manifestations and infrastructures. However, success can be achieved if there is the political will for incremental transformation, based on adaptive learning and openness of policies towards incorporating local perceptions and marginalized views.

That incremental learning and including the experiences and viewpoints of marginalized groups is key to achieve more social justice in development is also acknowledged by Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen *et al* (2015, this volume) in the context of smallholder farmer value chain inclusion in Southern Africa. They argue that strategic governance in agriculture should not unambiguously favour private–public partnerships over other cooperative arrangements, because of the substantial power inequities between different actors in the chain. Landscape approaches to doing action research, and learning platforms that create a level playing field between the

different players and their different knowledge systems, could function as local innovation platforms to foster more inclusive practices in agriculture.

In another rural context, and in an environment where small-scale fishers are dependent on a common pool resource for their livelihood, Maarten Bavinck *et al* (2015, this volume) point to the risks of ‘over-inclusion’. These risks range from social-cultural conflict and political-economic strife to unsustainable fishing practices, environmental damage and the depletion of natural resources. In their in-depth case study of trawl fishers in Chennai, the authors weave together social justice and fairness principles with culturally appropriate institutions and governance-coordinating mechanisms in a context of legal pluralism. They draw on the Rawlsian difference principle, put forward in his *Theory of Justice* (Rawls, 1971), that the institutional arrangements enabling small-scale fishers to access scarce resources work to the advantage of the least well-off, thus avoiding elite capture. In practice, this can only work if those who are better-off or more powerful accept the institutional arrangements made and their underlying principles, as well as the governance structures and instruments put in place.

Inter-cultural differences not only find their expression in different legal systems and formal and informal institutions, but also in the way school systems function. Mieke T.A. Lopes-Cardozo *et al* (2015, this volume) show how in the case of the Bolivian schooling system, the inter-cultural inequalities between indigenous and non-indigenous groups are augmented by deeply rooted gender inequalities. Recent educational reforms, rooted in neo-liberalism, put most emphasis on addressing intercultural inequalities, by offering bilingual and intercultural education. The observed gender imbalances in educational process and outcome indicators are only addressed in theory, but not concretized in any kind of strategic or practical educational reforms. This provides little support or space for resistance in the classroom to gender imbalances by the (pre-dominantly) female teachers as they themselves are ‘subalterns’ within a patriarchal education system and society where norms of machismo prevail. The degree of marginalization faced by women and men, girls and boys, varies across culture, time and place, and interacts with ethnicity, class, religion and race, but it is important to recognize this heterogeneity because it explains differential development outcomes, as Baud (1992) argued in relation to the industrialization process that took place in the 1980s in India and Mexico.⁸

Public policy and action also come with real limitations, as pointed out by Elisabeth Peyroux (2015, this volume) in the context of Johannesburg, South Africa, where the city – in its quest for economic proliferation and sustained growth – creates ample opportunity for businesses and private actors to take over the public agenda. Inclusive growth, green-growth or pro-poor policies have limited effect in an internationally competitive environment, where international businesses easily overrule redistributive norms and practices. Building the resilience of marginalized and excluded groups (for example, the urban unemployed youth) to counter such powerful forces should therefore be high on the strategic agenda of urban governance, according to Peyroux.

Enhancing marginalized people’s voice and power in South Africa and elsewhere therefore forms part and parcel of inclusive development, as advocated by Joyeeta Gupta *et al* (2015, this volume). Pro-poor policies remain an empty promise if poor people themselves are not made agents of their own transformative. This was one of the main conclusions of the Participatory Development Evaluation research project led by Dietz, a former colleague of Baud, derived after extended field-testing of the methodology in rural communities in Ghana and Burkina Faso (Dietz *et al*, 2013). In their contribution, Gupta *et al* (2015, this volume) define inclusive development as:

[D]evelopment that includes marginalized people, sectors and countries in social, political and economic processes for increased human wellbeing, social and environmental sustainability, and empowerment (*pp.*).

Interactive and strategic governance at global and local levels is a prerequisite for the design and implementation of inclusive development. It operates by developing relevant epistemic communities, enabling empowerment and adopting appropriate governance instruments (Gupta *et al*, 2015, this volume, p. x). The inclusive development agenda can be advanced through more interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research; it can build innovative insights into complex, multi-layered and emergent processes, and organize key stakeholders and experts to validate and drive new knowledge on inclusive development. The future of international development studies lies in embracing the plurality of knowledge systems on inclusive development (from personal communications with Baud, November 2014).

The above notion of inclusive development pre-supposes a more encompassing approach to 'development' than the inclusive growth approach described by Arjan de Haan (2015, *this volume*). His historical tracing of the economic debate on inclusion in development illustrates how the pre-occupation of national governments (for example, India, China) and multi-lateral institutions with growth first, redistribution second (or later) has gradually shifted from an emphasis put on safety nets for the poor, to 'pro-poor' policies, to social protection programmes, to economy-wide inclusive growth strategies. According to de Haan, inclusive growth, meaning that the poor benefit from economic growth, should aim for the *ex-ante* incorporation of more redistributive mechanisms in the economic system, regardless of whether or not economic growth has been achieved. In this way, growth and inclusion can be pursued simultaneously, but can also reinforce each other by creating more stability and equality, and less contestation and conflict.

Over the past decade, there has been an over-reliance on neo-liberal economic systems (for example, financial systems) to resolve various forms of malaise or unsustainable practices (Gupta *et al*, 2015 *this volume*). However, it is not the system itself, but the people within a system, that have or lack the power and the means to craft, negotiate, defend and deliver the desired outcomes. Therefore, apart from the political-economic architecture of systems, the contributions in this special issue ask for more focus to be dedicated to the people *within* a system, to their capacities, and to the instruments needed to enforce a more socially just and sustainable development.

Notes

1. *The Guardian*, 25 January 2015.
2. Hebe Verrest, one of Isa Baud's PhD graduates, included as a proposition in her thesis 'Home-Based economic activities and Caribbean Urban Livelihoods': 'While low-income groups from the economic growth and benefit the least, conversely they are hit the hardest by economic crisis' (Verrest, 2007).
3. The 'Global South' is a term used for developing countries to contrast them as a group with the 'Global North', the so-called developed countries. The 'Global South' refers to those countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia that are in the lower range of the human development index (after the first 57 countries). However, with the newly emerging economies, notably the BRICs countries, the 'Global South' and 'Global North' categories have been shifting, and the labels are becoming less useful nowadays.
4. Projects of Isa Baud include Chance2Sustain (2010–2014); Spatial information infrastructure and urban governance for multi-dimensional poverty reduction: comparing middle-size Indian cities (2007–2012); New Forms of Urban Governance (2003–2006); Poverty and development between state, market and civil society. *Re-aligning actors in an urbanizing world* (2004); Sustainability in practice: exploring innovations in urban domestic SWM in secondary cities in India (1999–2002); Human Resource Development, labour markets and industrial growth (1999); Urban Environmental Management (1998–2002); and Solid Waste Management: Linkages between formal and informal sector waste collection, separation and recycling' (1994).
5. Professor Baud delivers her farewell speech on 11 September 2015 in the Aula of the University of Amsterdam. A video recording of the event will be available.

6. Interactive governance is defined as ‘the complex process through which a plurality of social and political with divergent interests interact in order to formulate, promote and achieve common objectives by means of mobilizing, exchanging and deploying a range of ideas, rules and resources’ (Torfing *et al.*, 2012, pp. 2–3).
7. Rivke Jaffe, as member of the GID programme, studies the intersection between political and cultural processes to understand how urban social problems and inequalities are reproduced, negotiated and transformed; see Koster *et al.* (2015). She is currently involved in three projects. The first is *SECURCIT* (2013–2019), funded by an ERC Starting Grant and NWO VIDI, a research programme on public-private assemblages in Kingston, Jerusalem, Miami, Nairobi and Recife. The second project, *The Popular Culture of Illegality* (2013–2018) NWO Humanities Open Competition Grant, studies the Popular Culture of Illegality in urban Jamaica, Mexico and Brazil. The third project, *Slum Tourism in the Americas* (2014–2017), a trilateral project with LSE and LMU, funded through an ORA Plus Grant from NWO, DFG and ESRC, investigates tourism in low-income urban areas in Kingston, Los Angeles, Mexico City and Rio de Janeiro.
8. From the beginning of her Professorship in International Development Studies at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in 2004, Baud has always promoted a gender-aware perspective within the research being done at GID, UvA. It is a continuous research theme throughout the work of the GID members. Closely in line with this, Baud has also fostered research on the heterogeneity of development processes and outcomes.

References

- Bavinck, M., Karupiah, S. and Jentoft, S. (2015) Contesting inclusiveness: The anxieties of mechanised fishers over social boundaries in Chennai, South India. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 589–605.
- Baud, I.S.A. (1992) Gender and forms of production. Labour intensive industries in India and Mexico. *Economic and Political Weekly* 27(34): 1811–1818.
- Baud, I.S.A., de Bruijne, G.A. and Raju, S. (1997) Human resource development, gender and labour market segmentation. In: V. Benei and L. Kennedy (eds.) *Industrial Decentralization and Urban Development*, Pondy Papers in Social Sciences, No. 23. Pondicherry, India: Institut Francais de Pondicherry, pp. 123–129.
- Baud, I.S.A. (2004) *Learning from the South; Placing Governance in International Development Studies*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Inaugural address University of Amsterdam.
- Baud, I.S.A. and Nainan, N. (2008) Negotiated spaces for representation in Mumbai: Ward committees, advanced locality management and the politics of middle-class activism. *Environment and Urbanization* 20(October): 483–499.
- Baud, I.S.A. and Post, J. (2003) *Realigning Actors in an Urbanized World. Governance and Institutions from a Development Perspective*. London: Ashgate.
- Baud, I.S.A. and de Wit, J. (2009) *New Forms of Urban Governance in India Shifts, Models, Networks and Contestations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Baud, I. *et al.* (2013) The Development of Kalyan Dombivili: Fringe City in a Metropolitan Region. City Report. Bonn: EADI – chance2sustain.
- Baud, I.S.A. (2015) The emerging middle classes in India: Mobilizing for inclusive development? *European Journal of Development Research* 27(2): 230–237.
- Collier, P., Hoeffler, A. and Rohner, D. (2008) Beyond greed and grievance: A. Feasibility of civil war. *Oxford Economic Papers* 61(1): 1–27.
- Cramer, C. (2005) Inequality and conflict. A review of an age-old concern. Identities, conflict and cohesion programme paper 11. Geneva: UNRISD.
- De Haan, A. (2015) Inclusive Growth: Beyond safety nets? *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 606–622.
- Dietz, T. *et al.* (2013) *PADev Guidebook. Participatory Assessment of Development*. Amsterdam and Leiden, The Netherlands: University of Amsterdam: AISSR.
- EEA (2011) *Global Governance – The Rise of Non-State Actors. A Background Report for the SOER 2010 Assessment of Global Megatrends*, EEA Technical Report No. 4/2011. Copenhagen, Denmark: European Environment Agency.

- Gupta, J., Pfeffer, K., Verrest, H. and Ros-Tonen, M.A.F. (2015) *Geographies of Urban Governance: Advanced Theories, Methods and Practices*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer (in press).
- Gupta, J., Pouw, N.R.M. and Ros-Tonen, M.A.F. (2015) Towards an elaborated theory of inclusive development. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 541–559.
- Holmqvist, G. (2012) Inequality and identity: Causes of war? Discussion Paper 72, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala.
- Hordijk, M.A. and Baud, I.S.A. (2011) Inclusive adaptation: Linking participatory learning and knowledge management to urban resilience. In: K.O. Zimmermann (ed.) *Resilient Cities, Cities and Adaptation to Climate Change*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Verlag.
- Koster, M., Jaffe, R. and de Koning, A. (eds.) (2015) Special Issue: Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state. *Citizenship Studies* 19(2).
- Krugman, P. (2014) Inequality and economic performance. *New York Times* 12 February, http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/12/02/inequality-and-economic-performance/?_r=0.
- Lintelo, te.D. (2011) Inequality and Social Justice. Roundtable Consultation Summary. MDG Achievement Fund, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK.
- Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A., Sawyer, J. and Simoni, M.L.T. (2015) *Machismo and Mamitas* at school: Exploring the agency of teachers for social and gender justice in Bolivian education. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 574–588.
- OECD (2011) *Divided we Stand. Why Inequality Keeps Rising*. Paris, France: OECD.
- OECD (2012) *Perspectives on Global Development 2012: Social Cohesion in a Shifting World*. Paris, France: OECD.
- Peyroux, E. (2015) Discourse of urban resilience and 'Inclusive Development' in the johannesburg growth and development strategy 2040. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 560–573.
- Pfeffer, K., Verrest, H. and Poorthuis, A. (2015) Big Data for better urban life? — An exploratory study of critical urban issues in two Caribbean cities: Paramaribo (Suriname) and Port of Spain (Trinidad and Tobago). *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 505–522.
- Piketty, T. (2014) *Capital in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pouw, N.R.M. and Baud, I.S.A. (eds.) (2012) *Local Governance and Poverty in Developing Nations*. (Routledge studies in development and society) New York: Routledge.
- Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Robertson, R. (1997) What is glocalization? Presentation at the 'conference on globalization and indigenous culture', Institute for Japanese Culture and Classics, Kokugakuin University, Japan.
- Ros-Tonen, M.A.F., Van Leynseele, Y.-P.B., Laven, A. and Sunderland, T. (2015) Landscapes of social inclusion: Inclusive value-chain collaboration through the lenses of food sovereignty and landscape governance. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 523–540.
- Sen, A. (2010) *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sutherland, C., Scott, D. and Hordijk, M. (2015) Urban water governance for more inclusive development: A reflection on the 'waterscapes' of Durban, South Africa. *European Journal of Development Research* 27(4): 488–504.
- Torring, J., Peters, B.G., Pierre, J. and Sørensen, E. (eds.) (2012) *Interactive Governance. Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNICEF (2011) *Global Inequality: Beyond the Bottom Billion – A Rapid Review of Income Distribution in 141 Countries*. New York: United Nations.
- Verrest, H. (2007) *Home-Based Economic Activities and Caribbean Urban Livelihoods: Vulnerability, Ambition and Impact in Paramaribo and Port of Spain*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Verrest, H. and Jaffe, R.K. (2012) Bipolar antagonism and multipolar coexistence: Framing difference and shaping fear in two Caribbean cities. *Social and Cultural Geography* 13(6): 625–644.