

The Politics of the Evicted: Redevelopment, Subjectivity, and Difference in Mumbai's Slum Frontier

Sapana Doshi

*School of Geography and Development, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA;
sdoshi@email.arizona.edu*

Abstract: In recent years cities around the world have undergone mass slum clearances for redevelopment. This study of Mumbai offers an alternative interpretation of urban capital accumulation by investigating the differentiated political subjectivities of displaced slum residents. I argue that Mumbai's redevelopment entails not uniform class-based disposessions but a process of *accumulation by differentiated displacement* whereby uneven displacement politics are central to the social production of land markets. Two ethnographic cases reveal that groups negotiate redevelopment in contradictory ways, supporting or contesting projects in varying moments. Redevelopmental subjectivities are influenced at key junctures by market-oriented resettlement, ideologies of belonging, desires for improved housing, and participation in non-governmental groups. This articulated assemblage of power-laden practices reflects and reworks class, gender, and ethno-religious relations, profoundly shaping evictees' experience and political engagement. The paper concludes that focusing on differentiated subjectivities may usefully guide both analysis and social justice practice aimed at countering dispossession.

Keywords: Mumbai, redevelopment, slum evictions, urban social movements, subaltern subjectivity, difference

Introduction

In recent years cities around the world have experienced intensified efforts to clear informal slum settlements¹ for infrastructure and real estate redevelopment. Critical urban scholarship has theorized such interventions along two principle registers. Some see slum redevelopment in primarily political economic terms—as instances of “accumulation by dispossession” (Bannerjee-Guha 2010; Harvey 2003, 2008; Mahmud 2010), “Haussmanization” (Davis 2006), and a “global urban strategy” (Smith 2002), whereby states advance the material interests of upper and middle classes, developers, corporations, and transnational finance by rechanneling public resources and evicting the urban poor. Others conceive of world-class city remaking projects as a manifestation of the subjective spatial desires and discursive practices of elite and middle classes—a form of “bourgeois environmentalism” (Baviskar 2003) that aims to clean and remake cities for elite consumption through the removal of the poor from central public spaces (Fernandes 2006). While both perspectives emphasize important material and symbolic trends, their focus on the agency, desire, and interests of upper classes and bulldozing states underplays the experience

and political influence of those most intensely affected by redevelopment: displaced slum residents. This study of Mumbai offers an alternative interpretation of urban capital accumulation that focuses on the politics of the evicted as constituted through differentiated processes of displacement and subject formation.

Attention to the politics of the evicted and differentiated displacement reveals that redevelopment projects rarely unfold in a simple top-down fashion. In Mumbai, a city with a history of strong social movements and NGOs and with more than 55% of its citizens living in slums, diverse groups have actively negotiated urban transformations in varied and unpredictable ways. Mumbai's redevelopment entails not a uniform onslaught of class-based dispossessions but rather a process that I call *accumulation by differentiated displacement* where uneven displacement practices are central to the social production of land markets. Here, urban capital accumulation advances through political processes that differentiate slum residents in relation to regimes of redevelopment, including market-based resettlement policies, discourses of belonging, aspirations for improvement (Anand and Rademacher 2011), and institutionalized channels of participation in non-governmental groups. This "articulated assemblage" (Moore 2005) of power-laden discursive and material practices in turn shape and are shaped by fractured subjective experiences of displacement and engagement with redevelopment—reworking, supporting, or contesting elite projects in varying moments. This focus on differentiated displacement allows for a robust reading of "actually existing" urban neoliberalisms (Brenner and Theodore 2002), examining the social processes involved in capital accumulation and the negotiations and conflicts they entail (Leitner, Peck and Sheppard 2007). Accordingly, this paper investigates the contradictory subjectivities of redevelopment through a comparative ethnographic analysis of two trajectories of displacement and mobilization on the urban periphery.

In its focus on slum-based movements and subjectivity, this work engages with recent scholarship on the "politics of the governed" (Chatterjee 2004) and the ways that the urban poor are transforming cities and the meaning of democratic citizenship and participation (Appadurai 2002; Holston 2008). This paper departs from these works, however, by emphasizing the politicizations of difference and differentiated experiences of displacement among the urban poor as the key factors influencing subject formation processes. Rather than a singular notion of subaltern urban subjectivity—based on class, housing legality, or some other moral collectivity—the Mumbai case shows how the politics of the evicted is shaped by what Ong (2007) calls "graduated citizenship". Here, dynamic articulations of class, ethno-religious, and gender inequalities and differences fundamentally shape political subjectivities. This analysis complicates homogenized categorizations of slum dwellers and forces a reconsideration of the emancipatory potential of popular movements.

Accumulation by differentiated displacement exemplifies what Vasudevan, McFarlane, and Jeffrey call "spaces of enclosure", shifting focus from systemic over-accumulation, crisis, and dispossession to "the multiple ways in which 'enclosure' has been and continues to be implemented and resisted". This attention to the relationship between dispossession and subjectification makes visible the "differential consequences of enclosure for different social groups" as well as new

relationships between redevelopment governance, territoriality, and subjectivity (2008:1642–3). Furthermore, the dialectic of enclosure and differentiated urban subjectivities presented in this paper seeks not only to highlight diverse political agencies and practices of subaltern classes against elite narratives and dispossessions (Gidwani 2006; Guha 1982); it also exposes the limits of these political agencies and the ways that gendered, romanticized, and singular representations of subaltern subjects may become complicit in deepening inequalities and dispossessions (Roy 2011; Spivak 1999). Finally, the production of urban subjectivities is also intimately tied to the production of space whereby slum clearance and resettlement politics in Mumbai's fringe areas constitute the core political processes enabling capital accumulation through redevelopment. The idea of accumulation by differentiated displacement illuminates how regimes of redevelopment rule rely on simultaneously inclusive and exclusionary technologies of subjection through eviction and market-oriented resettlement as well as classed, gendered, and ethnicized subjectivities that shape and remake these regimes and urban space itself. In other words, accumulation by differentiated displacement is both a spatial process and a framework for understanding redevelopment that emphasizes the uneven political processes and differentiated subjectivities that enable, rework, and thwart the release of urban land for capital accumulation. In my view this framework is not only analytically useful but also crucial for understanding the possibilities and opportunities for social justice practice.

My reading of the politics of the evicted in Mumbai is informed by three facets of slum redevelopment: the uneven practices of displacement advanced by neoliberal slum redevelopment policy and ethnic politics; the micro-political economy of resettlement spaces; and differentiated subject formation processes linked to diverse displacement experiences and discursive practices of social mobilization. Unpacking the first of these facets, I show how land markets, redevelopment, and resettlement policy have all come to reflect histories of both ethnic exclusion and neoliberal partnerships among NGOs, states, slum residents, and developers. Slum redevelopment policy engages market mechanisms and public–private partnerships—among state bureaucracies, developers, NGOs, community groups, and financiers—to offer ostensibly cost-free formalized resettlement to eligible evictees. Neoliberal redevelopment policies politically enable the freeing of land for accumulation by offering the displaced the promise of improved living through resettlement. These policies resulted in part from arduous negotiations and pressures from neighborhood collectives and NGOs, often with women's groups figuring prominently. However, market-based design features have restricted governmental capacity to provide housing and higher-value plots to all displaced slum residents equally. Only a fraction of the displaced are re-housed on site; many others (affected by infrastructure and environmental improvements) are moved to low-value fringe areas distant from their original neighborhood and sources of income. This practice, as I show below, compounds class and gender inequalities. Furthermore, thousands of households and entire neighborhoods deemed “illegal” and therefore ineligible have been excluded from resettlement. As ethnic chauvinist party politics has infiltrated redevelopment practice, state agencies have disproportionately targeted ethno-religious minority neighborhoods (Chatterji and Mehta 2007). Here violent

ethno-geographic imaginaries and discourses distinguish residents deemed to belong in the city and deserve resettlement from those conceived of as illegal invaders. These uneven experiences of dispossession and resettlement constitute the political core of accumulation by differentiated displacement.

Differentiated displacement is also deeply connected with uneven urban development. This paper thus examines the micro-politics and political economy of resettlement spaces with a focus on the Northeastern suburb of Mankhurd, a rapidly growing resettlement ghetto. Through two ethnographic case studies, I show how Mankhurd has constituted a curious and contradictory “frontier” site for both capital accumulation and social mobilization. One case examines an NGO-mediated infrastructure project that harnessed evictees’ desires for formal housing and gendered modes of participation enabling cooperation (with some limitations) with off-site resettlement. In the second case, an “illegal” settlement was demolished to resettle evictees from other parts of the city, ironically. In this case, compounded forms of ethnic and class marginalization sparked protest, alliance with a radical anti-displacement movement, and claims to urban space made in the idiom of citizenship rights. These cases demonstrate how the embodied politics of eviction and resettlement and modes of mediation and representation shape and reflect diverse experiences, subjectivities, problem framings, and positionings. Resettlement and discourses of legitimate belonging in the city emerged as sites of struggle during significant transformations of the 1990s. The following overview of the political economy of redevelopment, resettlement negotiations, and identity politics during this period situates current slum politics.

Neoliberal Redevelopment, Resettlement, and the Politics of Belonging

Neoliberalizing the City, Producing Land Markets

The decade of the 1990s represents a key historical conjuncture in which multiple political and economic forces converged to produce particular redevelopment practices in the 2000s. During this period, I argue, state interventions in slums shifted from welfare accommodations distributed through patronage to neoliberal resettlement practices aiding the proliferation of new land markets and lucrative redevelopment opportunities. In the process power-laden property relations articulated with other inequalities to create the scenario of accumulation by differentiated displacement introduced above. Among the political economic forces at play were economic liberalization reforms in India starting in 1991 that caused volatilities in urban land markets (Patel and Thorner 1995). In cities across India, newly enriched elites and upper middle classes began demanding new spaces of consumption and residence (Fernandes 2006) while local and foreign corporations, developers, and finance capital eyed office space and investment opportunities in infrastructure and real estate projects. Mumbai’s real estate volatility was exceptionally severe compared with that of other Indian cities; land prices in its central business districts surged to among the highest in the world for a short period in 1996. Liberalization was not the only factor. A number of supply constraints also

exacerbated price hikes, and the state has played an immensely important role in governing the “casino capitalism” of real estate by regulating and channeling the release of land supplies (Nijman 2000). Indeed, several scholars and activists point to the historically sedimented biases of state agents towards powerful developers, large land holders, and financiers, including the post-industrial rezoning of defunct textile mill sites and protected coastal areas favoring developers and land owners over workers and slum residents (Adarkar and Menon 2004; D’Monte 2005); the systematic undermining of the Urban Land Ceiling and Rent Control Act, which aimed to protect tenants and control skewed land ownership and development (Narayanan 2003); corrupt dealings with vested organized crime groups (Weinstein 2008); and stalled efforts to decentralize business districts (Banerjee-Guha 1995).

Land markets clearly have not emerged from an abstract “neoliberal globalization” but have been actively and unevenly produced through multi-scalar, interconnected social and political processes. Furthermore, while state agents have advanced urban development in ways that reveal class biases, it would be a mistake to argue that state interventions have bowed to elite interests alone. The political pressures of volatile land markets in the 1990s demanded balancing the release of land for infrastructure and real estate redevelopment with the rising expectations of working classes who were experiencing a housing squeeze and very few benefits of economic growth. New policies and partnerships for redevelopment and resettlement have purported to address some of these concerns by enrolling the participation and interests of slum residents and NGOs as well as developers and finance capital. The market design and partial inclusivity of the new slum policies have unleashed lucrative redevelopment opportunities along with limited resettlement offers, but they have also created large geographies of dispossession affecting slum residents in different ways. Thus, slum redevelopment has privileged local and transnational elites through a combination of negotiated consent to displacement and forced eviction. In the process, urban desires, subjectivities, partnerships, and accommodations have all played a role. Thus slum policies emerging in the 1990s must be understood not as simple welfare-oriented interventions but as a central technology in the social production of both land markets and urban citizenship in the redeveloping city. Understanding this history requires a cultural-political contextualization of the establishment of the slum redevelopment policy, its neoliberal design features, and its embedded exclusions.

The Emergence of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme

Slum redevelopment policy in Mumbai is rooted in the 1995 Maharashtra state elections. The Shiv Sena, a Mumbai-based political party and populist movement known for promoting xenophobic violence against Muslims, migrants, and other perceived outsiders, won the election on an ambitious set of campaign promises. Appealing to the urban poor and elite alike, the party pledged to beautify the city, expand transportation infrastructure, eradicate slums, and provide formalized housing to 4 million slum dwellers. Subsequently, the Shiv Sena-led state government launched the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme (SRS), a neoliberal policy that aimed to remove slums and promote real estate and infrastructure redevelopment on a massive scale. In contrast to previous policies marked by

periodic slum demolitions or upgrading (Mukhija 2003; O'Hare, Abbot and Barke 1998) and patronage-oriented municipal distribution of resources and "*de facto* tenure" through slum regularization (Benjamin 2008), the SRS propelled slum policy into a new arena of land market governance. It facilitated slum clearance and leveraged market incentives and developer participation to resettle slum dwellers. The approach appealed to elite and middle classes who resisted spending public revenue on "free" flats and thereby rewarding so-called "encroachers". The market-based policy promised an attractive "win-win" solution, offering housing for the legitimate poor, land tax revenues for the state, beautification for upper classes, and redevelopment profits for developers.

The SRS not only increased the role of the private sector in low-income housing construction, it also dramatically expanded the space available for market-rate redevelopment. It did so through a cross-subsidy model whereby developers would gain coveted "transferable development rights" (TDRs) to build taller buildings throughout the city in exchange for providing compensation housing units to slum dwellers. TDRs allowed builders to construct market rate housing on the slum site or in a suburb of the city located to the north of the development (in the effort to decongest the southern business districts). Besides unleashed slum land, the SRS created lucrative new opportunities in a vigorous market for TDRs, which were particularly valuable under booming real estate markets (Mukhija 2003). Slum redevelopment policies gained popularity among slum residents who expected resettlement in newly constructed buildings on the same plot of land or nearby.

Not all slums, however, would be resettled in their former neighborhoods. The SRS stipulated that the thousands of residents affected by infrastructure and environmental improvement projects—including river basin clearances, rail expansions, airport modernization, and roads and overpasses—would be relocated off-site. Builders and landowners would receive TDRs for off-site resettlements as well, a policy feature that has created incentives to resettle displaced residents on the cheapest possible lands on the fringes of the city. Thus under SRS, both off-site and in situ resettlement compensation would be financed almost entirely by the market. To date, most of the studies documenting the contours and limitations of SRS (see Mukhija 2003; Nijman 2008) have addressed on-site projects rather than off-site resettlements. Yet off-site resettlements have encompassed a greater percentage of completed SRS projects than in situ rehabilitation and have generated an enormous number of TDRs used to build market rate housing in some of the most expensive areas of the city.² Transnational capital including World Bank funds often finance such projects, relying on NGOs to facilitate neighborhood processes, as one case study in this paper illustrates.

These SRS neoliberal design features were born out of multi-stakeholder negotiations, including a world-renowned NGO (SPARC), developers, bureaucrats, and Shiv Sena-aligned politicians controlling state and municipal governments. NGO involvement in the SRS negotiations helped to ensure certain social inclusions in resettlement policy: the addition of women to titles and the extension of eligibility to formerly excluded groups known as pavement dwellers. However, the policy also entailed significant exclusions. For instance, the SRS guaranteed resettlement only to evicted slum dwellers who could prove residency in Mumbai prior to 1 January

1995. Those who could not furnish documentary proof of residence prior to this “cutoff” date would be completely excluded from compensation upon demolition of their homes. Upper floor unit renters and residents would also be ineligible for compensation. As this market-oriented model has phased out and replaced other public housing and slum improvement schemes, it has advanced large-scale slum clearance with limited resettlement as well as significant new prospects for investment and speculation. In these ways, neoliberal slum rehabilitation created a novel land market policy that fused the political imperatives of displacement compensation with redevelopment interests.

Redevelopment through Ethnic Violence

The exclusions in the SRS policy and in urban neoliberalization more broadly were also deeply entwined with ethno-religious violence erupting across the city in the 1990s. As Shiv Sena politics fueled anti-Muslim, regionalist, and xenophobic sentiments, the housing crisis became linked to ethnicized battles over space. Arjun Appadurai has cogently argued that the Shiv Sena “sutured a specific form of regional chauvinism with a national message about Hindu power through the deployment of the figure of the Muslim as the archetype of the invader, the stranger, and the traitor” (2000:646). Shiv Sena leaders played a central role in the infamous communal riots of 1993 that led to the loss of thousands of lives and untold economic damage in poor and Muslim neighborhoods (Chatterji and Mehta 2007; Hansen 2001). Through incendiary media campaigns and neighborhood-based organizing, discourses deployed by leaders like Bal Thackeray promised a Hinduized yet global Indian city by eliminating outsiders. Thackeray famously proclaimed, “we don’t want to add to our problems by allowing more immigrants into the city. We have to clean the system in a dictatorial manner—it is the only way” (as quoted in Hansen 2001:208). Through their campaigns the Shiv Sena systematically conflated and attacked Muslims, North Indians, and slum dwellers as predatory invaders.

Hindu Nationalist and xenophobic regionalist imaginaries became concretely embedded in resettlement policy through the exclusionary cutoff-date eligibility criterion for resettlement, which invoked a symbolic barrier to an imagined tide of invading migratory outsiders. For instance, early in the launching of the SRS, Thackeray announced that “municipal officers have been instructed to not recognize any new *zopadpattis* [shanties]” while the Minister of Housing, Chandrakant Khaire, assured that the scheme was meant to benefit Maharashtrians (a primarily Hindu ethno-linguistic group from the state of Maharashtra of which Mumbai is the capital) and not “aliens” of Pakistani or Bangladeshi descent (Hansen 2001:208). Legacies of ethno-nationalist chauvinism in slum policy discourse and practice has endured well beyond the governing term of the Shiv Sena. In a subsequent administration, one bureaucrat affiliated with the ostensibly more moderate Congress Party expressed to me in a 2007 interview: “We cannot keep allowing Mumbai to turn into a ‘Mumbaiabad’”, referring to an imagined Islamicized North Indian colonization of the city. Discourses also continue to conflate migrants from the North Indian states of UP and Bihar with allegedly “anti-national” and even “terrorist” elements. As the politician Raj Thackeray recently stated, “Mumbai, Thane, and other parts of the

state are teeming with migrants from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and illegal Bangladeshis. Unless the government checks the influx of migrants, such acts of terror will not stop" (Tripathi 2011). By vilifying non-Maharashtrians and slum dwellers politicians justified the curtailment of public benefits like resettlement.

Displacement and Graduated Slum Citizenship

Slum clearance and uneven resettlement compensation have thus been undergirded by both powerful real estate interests and violently exclusionary discursive practices regarding who rightfully belongs to the space of the city. The contradictions of differentiated spatial politics of resettlement eligibility and public imaginaries of legitimacy were brought into sharp relief in the revanchist demolition sweeps of the next decade, and as I discuss in the second of my two case studies, it is significant that many of these neighborhoods contain a majority of marginalized North Indian and Muslim residents. Even in smaller scale in situ redevelopment projects undertaken ostensibly with the consent of eligible slum dwellers, however, less visible, ongoing exclusion of residents deemed ineligible for compensation has been taking place. Thus, simultaneously inclusive and exclusionary eviction and resettlement practices constitute the boundaries of urban citizenship in the city. It is in this manner that Mumbai's slum redevelopment has advanced accumulation by differentiated displacement—experienced through graduated citizenship formations. Processes of differentiation in the moment of dispossession and displacement have fractured and rearticulated the socio-spatial category of slum dweller through notions of legitimacy and belonging shaping residents' access to urban space and claims-making practices. Graduated citizenship embedded in slum policy discourse and practice has also produced uneven geographies of redevelopment and resettlement. In particular, development of low-value land on the urban fringe emerged as the principal state and NGO strategy for off-site resettlement. Mankhurd, one such area simultaneously undergoing slum evictions, mass resettlement colony construction, and vigorous grassroots movements offers a revealing lens into the politics of neoliberal redevelopment, accumulation by differentiated displacement, and subaltern subject formations.

The Redevelopment Frontier of Mankhurd

Marginality

Among Mumbai's peripheral areas, Mankhurd, a neighborhood located in the marshy farthest eastern portion of the M East Ward, has seen large-scale proliferations of both resettlement projects and evictions. Until recently, marginal location, environmental regulations, and non-residential zoning have restricted formal real estate development in Mankhurd and other coastal areas. Instead the coastal fringe of the area has been incrementally settled into informal neighborhoods.³ Over the last 10 years, however, city planners, boosters, and some NGOs have promoted the release and rezoning of areas like Mankhurd for development as a solution to Mumbai's housing shortages. The urban periphery has emerged in planning and development imaginaries as the ideal location to resettle

displaced slum dwellers. For instance, the Vision Mumbai Report—a planning document prepared through a partnership between a civic group of corporate leaders, real estate developers, and a transnational consulting firm—strongly recommended the development of marsh lands on the city’s northern fringes to meet the need for affordable resettlement housing (McKinsey and Company 2003). At the same time, these ambitious redevelopment initiatives have relied on severe state violence and demolitions affecting many northern periphery residents deemed illegal and ineligible for resettlement.

Containing a mix of low-income housing, abandoned industrial plots, coastal swamps, and garbage dumps, M East ward, where Mankhurd is located, is among the most underserved of Mumbai’s neighborhoods, with the lowest number of schools and hospitals per capita, inadequate sanitation, high levels of pollution, and acute water shortages amounting to one of the lowest human development indexes in the city (Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai 2009). Though many of Mankhurd’s slums were originally settled by communities of Maharashtrian Dalits, North Indians and Muslim communities have undertaken more recent settlement expansions in the northeastern fringes of the neighborhood since the 1990s. The combined influence of ethno-religious and class-based marginalization has meant that slum residents of many of these areas remain among Mumbai’s most underserved and vulnerable. Several of the neighborhoods are unrecognized by state authorities as legal or regularized settlements. Due to this illegal status, Mankhurd’s slums have been systematically targeted for demolition and eviction without resettlement.

Double Frontiering

At the same time, resettlement colonies housing over 15,000 displaced families have been established in the area since 2005. These colonies were primarily constructed for slum residents and businesses affected by the World Bank-funded Mumbai Urban Transport Project and other environmental and infrastructure projects. Resettlement concentration in Mankhurd may be attributed to the ample availability of cheap land as well as vulnerable populations that have been easy to evict. But there is another important factor related to market-based slum redevelopment policy design. The SRS stipulates that developers and land owners who offer to build resettlement housing for project-affected people be awarded with TDRs for high-density construction in any location to the north of the resettlement plot. Because Mankhurd is located far east but still south of many of Mumbai’s ultra-elite western suburbs, resettlement TDRs generated here offered lucrative prospects for builders and land owners interested in building upscale developments.

Accordingly, Mankhurd represents an “urban frontier” (Smith 1996) in two contradictory ways: as a site of redevelopment accumulation by dispossession and as a means of addressing the social fallout of redevelopment in other higher market value areas of the city. Whitehead and More (2007) have recently applied Smith’s frontier framework to Mumbai to argue that devalued lands occupied by slums and defunct factories have been flooded with redevelopment interest due to gaps between actual and potential ground rents. These gaps have been expanding

since the 1980s under the combined influence of economic liberalization, foreign capital flows, and oligopsonistic land markets prompting deindustrialization and gentrification (Whitehead and More 2007). But rent gaps alone cannot explain the political processes of redevelopment. Revanchist gentrification is fundamentally shaped by the fact that that slum residents are positioned in highly differentiated ways. Because of policy and planning frameworks, slum residents are both displaced and become (willingly or not) complicit in the dispossession of others. Thus understanding accumulation politics in Mumbai requires an analysis of these differentiated positionings in relation to eviction and resettlement. The following two case studies of social mobilization reveal the political contours of this remaking of Mankhurd in the service of redevelopment.

Embodied Evictions: Gendered Domesticity through Participatory Resettlement

This ethnographic case examines gendered subject formation processes among displaced slum residents and the educative role of an influential intermediary NGO in the political trajectory of resettlement projects. A world-renowned urban development organization, the SPARC Alliance, has been actively involved in resettling displaced slum dwellers all over the city but particularly in the Mankhurd area. In this case, subaltern subject formation turned on ideals of gendered domesticity in two interconnected arenas: aspirations for improved housing status and conditions centered on the social reproductive dimensions of resettlement; and non-confrontational participation and cooperation with off-site market-based resettlement. Understanding these gendered processes requires a brief overview of SPARC's mobilization history.

The SPARC Way of Feminized Non-confrontational Participation

The SPARC Alliance, a coalition of an NGO and two slum-based groups, is arguably the most influential housing and development organization operating in Mumbai's slums. The Alliance defies simple categorization; it is at once a transnational development NGO, a grassroots coalition of slum-based self-help groups, a government-contracted social service provider, a housing developer, and an urban political lobbyist. The group's work is regularly hailed as a model of best practice in transnational urban development circles and exchanges. Alliance leaders, including the charismatic former slum dweller Arputham Jockin, have won many prestigious international honors. In the early 1980s, the NGO component of the SPARC Alliance began working on the busy sidewalks of south-central Mumbai with "pavement dwelling" women struggling with everyday police harassment and repeated demolition of their homes. It was here, among the poorest and most vulnerable populations, that the group developed its famed model of participatory development and non-confrontational negotiation. SPARC leaders recall their strategies emerged in response not only to government negligence of the poor but also to housing movements in the city. They criticized middle-class activists, arguing that their rights-based protest approach did not adequately engage the participation of evictees themselves.

SPARC leaders claimed that the poor—especially women—were more concerned with partnerships and practical solutions than conflicts with state officials (D’Cruz undated). Instead, the group engaged women in activities that aimed to make visible both the capacities and needs of the urban poor. These included savings mobilization, alternative housing and sanitation design demonstrations, and community surveying. By the mid 1980s these activities led to the development of a slum-based women’s collective called Mahila Milan. SPARC and Mahila Milan subsequently began collaborating with a large grassroots movement established during the mass eviction sweeps of the 1970s: the National Slum Dwellers Federation. Since then the SPARC Alliance has spearheaded a broad range of neighborhood development interventions focusing on environmental improvements, multi-stakeholder partnerships, and the participation of communities, especially slum-dwelling women. Its grassroots base and non-confrontational collaborations with local state and international development agencies has made SPARC a powerful player in Mumbai’s redevelopment.

A number of development practitioners and academics have hailed the SPARC Alliance as a model for empowering the urban poor (Appadurai 2002; Mitlin and Patel 2005). Most famously, Appadurai has posited that the social mobilization practices of the Alliance advance a “deep democracy”. He argues that SPARC has produced long-lasting and substantive changes through its “politics of patience”, in which women occupy a “moral core” through non-confrontational participation. Yet the practice of accommodation has also allowed for a deeper penetration of market forces as cooperative partnerships in slum clearance and redevelopment have yielded substantially to the interests of developers and financiers. SPARC’s market-friendly stance is evidenced by the fact that it was the only NGO invited to meetings with government officials and real estate developers to negotiate the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme in the 1990s. More recently several critiques of SPARC have arisen from diverse quarters (Benjamin 2008; McFarlane 2004, 2008; Mukhija 2003; Roy 2009). Significantly, McFarlane has shown how SPARC sanitation projects have shaped political processes and everyday life in slums in contradictory ways (McFarlane 2008). He argues that while the group has carved out progressive spaces of citizenship and political engagement through “new geographical imaginaries”, it has done so through a conception of social change that “generally works with the symptoms of poverty rather than the causes” (McFarlane 2004:907).

These geographical imaginaries and political modalities can only be fully understood through a gender analysis of processes of social mobilization and subject formation. Examination of resettlement projects in particular reveals that housing and sanitation are not merely distractions from a more authentic class politics. Rather, they draw on the differentiated experiences of slum residents and the fracturing of subjectivities. Slum dwellers have mobilized around feminized and ostensibly non-political social-reproductive needs and aspirations for housing and domesticity. At the same time the privileging of domesticated gendered subjectivities has silenced other experiences of women and men. Drawing on secondary literature and ethnographic data on Alliance resettlement interventions collected between 2006 and 2007, I examine deeply gendered subject formation processes and resultant spatial transformations in Mankhurd.

Domesticity through Resettlement

The relocation of the pavement dwellers of South Mumbai marked the beginning of SPARC's involvement in resettlement in Mankhurd. After a 20-year-long process in 2006, SPARC resettled about 80 families organized by the original women of Mahila Milan from slums on the sidewalks of downtown South Mumbai. Although several women said that they had tried to negotiate a more central location, Mankhurd emerged as the compromise relocation site because of its low-cost land. The Alliance's involvement in resettlement in the area expanded exponentially when it was contracted as the primary NGO to implement community-based resettlement activities for over 20,000 families affected by the World Bank-financed Mumbai Urban Transport Project (MUTP). With its cheap, easily accessible, and large tracts of land, Mankhurd was again chosen for the largest MUTP resettlement colonies built under the market-oriented SRS policy. The MUTP resettlement has been lauded in international development circles as a best practice model because of its participatory implementation design involving a large number of women. The project reveals how ideals and discourses of gendered domesticity and participation in and desires for improvement in housing and sanitation were central to the cooperation of many residents.

SPARC Alliance leaders and literature on the MUTP consistently highlight women slum dwellers as both desirable participants and beneficiaries of resettlement. As one SPARC Alliance staff member writes, "With their experience of running households on inadequate budgets, poor women take easily to managing [resettlement] projects when given exposure, training, and opportunity . . . a significant women's presence not only makes the representation more even but more effective as well" (Burra 1999:10–11). In a speech given in Mumbai to planning students visiting from the UK, Alliance leader Arputham Jockin historicized slum dwellers' housing needs in gendered terms. He argued that early in urbanization processes male migrant workers had no need for housing because they could bathe and sleep in the open, whereas women who joined them later needed shelter for privacy and bodily integrity. In a well-circulated article, women slum dwellers involved with SPARC Alliance neighborhoods were interviewed about the difficulties and harassment that they faced in accessing water and relieving themselves in the absence of toilets and regular water supplies (Bapat and Agarwal 2003). In the Alliance's discursive framing, women were ideal stewards and beneficiaries of resettlement due to their knowledge of the home, water provision duties, and special sanitation needs.

This gendering did not remain in the realm of discourse alone; it was made material through the educative mobilization practices of MUTP's participatory resettlement. For instance, assembly meetings and new participant trainings held by Alliance leaders during various stages of resettlement constituted an important space for the spread of Alliance ideals of domesticity and participation in project-affected areas. At such events Jockin and top Alliance leaders commonly gave speeches to motivate slum dwellers and (majority women) new members to change their lives and the lives of those around them. A familiar phrase that Jockin and other leaders used was *aage badho*, a call to evicted slum dwellers to "advance forward" or "progress". For Jockin and Alliance leaders, progress consisted of moving away from the unhygienic and vulnerable life that slum dwellers were

used to living. They emphasized the benefits of resettlement amenities like toilets and piped water for all slum dwellers, especially women. Formalized resettlement housing was posited as the most promising path out of the ills of the slum toward a more comfortable and legitimate existence. One interviewee recounted that when residents confronted the Alliance with complaints of resettlement difficulties, Jockin and other leaders would explain that “it was wrong for us to be living near the railways, that it was government land, and that we needed to progress and move into a better, permanent place”. Newly recruited members echoed and agreed with Jockin: “It was not right, the way we used to live near the railway track. Filthy water kept entering our homes . . . There was always a long line for public toilets. So many people died by getting hit by train cars.” Besides health, hygiene, and safety, leaders and members eschewed other aspects of informal housing. One member described it as theft: “The light and water we had was stolen. We paid 300 or 400 rupees, still it was stolen. Jockinsir showed us the correct path . . . We have improved so much here [with resettlement].”

Trainings and meetings took on an especially important role in facilitating solidarity, morale, and communication in Mankhurd transit camps, where thousands of displaced slum dwellers lived for 3–5 years before moving into buildings. Many of these high-density camps lacked water and sanitation and were prone to monsoon flooding and increased incidences of illness and death due to clean water shortages, pests, adjacent garbage dumps, and toxic fumes from a nearby chemical plant: a far cry from the discourse of safe and hygienic resettlement. Not surprising, then, transit camps served as critical sites for the Alliance’s ethico-political and crisis management work during the MUTP resettlement. Alliance events recruited new participants and leaders into the Mahila Milan women’s collective who helped circulate information and foster collectivity to address dire material and social needs in the camps. Women became involved in the crucial work of organizing residents to devise systems of communal environmental concerns such as accessing sources of water and implementing camp clean-ups. These new roles thus relied on quite traditional ones.

Fracturing and Reworking Womanhood

The transit camp experience yielded a reworking of the Alliance’s earlier feminized non-confrontational and cooperative mode of negotiation with the state. Under MUTP resettlement processes, Mahila Milan women worked with Alliance leaders towards reshaping desires and softening the sting of eviction and transition difficulties that may otherwise have been interpreted as a raw deal (Doshi 2012). The ethos of patience and participation relied on familiar South Asian cultural narratives positing women as naturally more understanding and tolerant of difficult situations. In these tropes of womanhood, it is precisely their quiet suffering and self-sacrifice that make women not only instrumental for capitalist (and non-capitalist) exploitation (Spivak 1988) but also the ideal vehicle for advancing moral and cultural values. They echo the global development discourses and representations of the altruistic and entrepreneurial “Third World Woman” undergirding neoliberal policies and practices that assign poor women responsibility for resolving the problem of poverty (Chant 2008). Gendered participation may ultimately have

helped facilitate community cooperation with slum clearance. This is not to deny the fact that many women (and men) welcomed the amenities of resettlement when and if they finally arrived.⁴ However, not all women valued resettlement to the same degree, a fact that was silenced in SPARC Alliance discourses. Many women emphasized the increased economic and physical strain of commuting to their former neighborhoods for domestic service work. For women unable to commute, lack of employment opportunities in Mankhurd has reduced overall household incomes and intensified financial insecurity (Tata Institute of Social Sciences 2007). As one resident commented caustically, “what good are toilets when we can no longer feed ourselves?”

Thus slum subjectivities were constructed through gendered discourses that elevated women’s participation as both a development solution and as a benefit to the poor. In a context in which the poor are violently targeted for their seemingly incorrigible informal lifestyles, this reframing of slum women as practical solution-seeking agents of urban improvement has provided a powerful counter-narrative to denigrating elite discourses. The feminization of participation has been characterized, however, by an inherently divided subjectivity, one that has privileged women’s domestic social-reproductive roles as “housewives” to the exclusion of those with working lives outside of the home.⁵ While women who could afford the time to stay at home and participate as volunteers generally cited more benefits, women who needed to continue working in their former neighborhoods were either less involved or expressed increased hardships resulting from resettlement. Thus gendered subject formation processes have facilitated socio-spatial transformations necessary for urban capital accumulation while also deepening inequalities. In response to the increasingly evident difficulties of off-site resettlement, some slum residents have recently opposed displacement. However, struggles of evictees excluded from resettlement have taken a different trajectory as the following case demonstrates.

Frontier Enclosures: Eviction and Citizenship Struggles in Mandala

Vision Mumbai and Ethnicized Evictions

While MUTP transit camp residents in Mankhurd eagerly anticipated resettlement into flats, adjacent slum settlements in the area and across the city faced a shock. Over the span of a few weeks in the winter of 2004–2005, Mumbai witnessed its largest slum demolition sweep in 20 years. Between 45,000 and 90,000 informal structures⁶ deemed illegal by the state were rapidly and violently razed, leaving over 300,000 people homeless. Some in the media called the demolition drive Mumbai’s “tsunami” for displacing as many people as that well known international natural disaster occurring in the same month. The newly elected Congress Party government in the state of Maharashtra proudly proclaimed the demolitions as the first step in launching the Vision Mumbai redevelopment plan. The Vision Mumbai demolitions were a cruel betrayal to evictees; prior to the elections the party had promised to legalize and resettle all slums settled before 2000. Enforcing “cut-off

date” laws of the Slum Rehabilitation Act, the demolition sweep targeted “illegal” slums settled after 1995. The largest among these was a settlement called Mandala located on Mankhurd’s eastern fringe, housing 3000–5000 families.

Since the Vision Mumbai sweep, Mandala evictees are among the most militant and active participants in anti-displacement movements in the city, engaging in ongoing negotiations to reclaim their land and counter the exclusions of redevelopment. Mandala’s eviction struggles have been characterized by a more outward critique of neoliberal redevelopment than the gendered participatory resettlement experiments discussed in the previous case study. Among the influential differences were evictee exclusion from resettlement, the location of Mandala in the Mankhurd resettlement hub, ethnic discrimination, and the mediation of an ideologically eco-socialist movement, the National Alliance of People’s Movements (NAPM). NAPM activists and Mandala evictees—whose land was demarcated for the resettlement of “legal” slum dwellers displaced from the city center—have countered dispossession through modes of struggle inflected by discourses of sustainability, citizenship, and inclusion in the city and nation. To illustrate the political contours of subaltern subjectivity in this case, I draw on media and secondary literature about the Vision Mumbai demolitions as well as ethnographic and other qualitative data collected among Mandala evictees and activists since 2006.

The role of ethnic discrimination in eviction politics is evidenced by the fact that the demolitions targeted not only “illegal” slums settled after the 1995 cut-off date but also areas where the majority of residents’ ethno-religious backgrounds have made them vulnerable to the xenophobic campaigns of the Shiv Sena. According to housing rights activists and my own field observations, most Vision Mumbai evictees were ethnically North Indian or Muslim. Ethnic discrimination was also corroborated in the everyday lived experiences of evictees facing systematic discrimination from the state. As one frustrated resident of Mandala slum expressed, “this would not have happened to us if we were Maharashtrians”. Elected officials also often invoked the rhetoric of ethnic cleansing and security against illegal migrants. For instance, the Maharashtra chief minister defended the demolitions by asserting that the city had no choice but to “take action against illegal Bangladeshis” and other migrants. Contrary to this popular discursive framing of newly settled slums as bastions of recent rural migrants, research in Mandala revealed that most residents were either born in Mumbai or had been living in other parts of the city for significant periods of time prior to moving to the area. Nonetheless, the denigration of migrants was highly effective in Mumbai given the influence of the Shiv Sena. In a rare cross-party alliance, opposition Shiv Sena leaders praised their political rivals’ zero tolerance stance against encroachers (Times News Network 2005). Ethnic targeting thus may have aided in the political facilitation of eviction *en masse* (D’Souza et al 2005).

In response to discursive practices demarcating rightful belonging in the city in terms of class and ethno-religious identity, Vision Mumbai evictees have undertaken multiple and sometimes contradictory strategies for reclaiming their land. Although many neighborhood leaders initially engaged in vocal protest, original inhabitants shifted towards an “occupancy urbanism” (Benjamin 2008) stealthily re-occupying several areas soon after demolition by leveraging contacts in the local state.

However, the trajectory of enclosure in Mandala was marked by more severe repression and conflict. Understanding how and why Mandala residents were positioned differently from other Vision Mumbai evictees and resettled groups requires analysis of the spatial politics of recent demolition drives and the close involvement of a new social movement, NAPM, in anti-eviction struggles.

NAPM and the Reworking of Citizenship, Rights, and Legitimacy

The SPARC Alliance and other well established slum resettlement NGOs failed to consolidate a direct response to the Vision Mumbai demolitions despite many leaders' publicly expressed outrage. In this vacuum of firm leadership, NAPM emerged as an organizing lynchpin of the anti-evictions movement. NAPM's world renowned leader, Medha Patkar, brought new political vigor to the Mumbai anti-evictions struggle by building alliances with rural anti-displacement movements including the famed Narmada Bachao Andolan (Save the Narmada River anti-dam movement). The NAPM immediately launched a series of Gandhian-style marches and sit-ins and a court case against the state agencies involved in the Vision Mumbai evictions. These actions helped to consolidate and mobilize formerly dispersed neighborhood groups and housing activists in the city.

NAPM's organizing and protest tactics drew on familiar idioms of resistance developed during the Narmada struggles. These included an eco-socialist critique of large-scale infrastructure and development projects entailing the displacement of the most marginalized citizens of the nation. Chiding state-led neoliberal redevelopment as a form of neo-colonialism, NAPM rallies—held at symbolic urban spaces like Azaad Maidan (a park dedicated to the martyrs of Indian independence struggles)—have invoked powerful symbols of earlier anti-colonial struggles. Here urban evictees delivered poignant and emotionally charged speeches on global city development as violation of the rights of the poor and ethno-religious minorities. For instance, one Mandala evictee exclaimed, "We can't feed ourselves in the village, we are kicked out of the city. Where must we go? Pakistan? Bangladesh? We are from this country, we have a right to stay in Mumbai."

In these and other spaces, NAPM activists' condemnation of both Hindu Nationalist politics and evictions as exclusions of poor Indians from the spaces of the nation has emphasized both class and identity-based dispossession. Through these idioms NAPM has vociferously protested the elite biases of redevelopment and argued for more local and democratically deliberated in situ slum improvement strategies and low-rise, mixed-use working class neighborhoods. In this manner NAPM differed (initially) from NGOs like the SPARC Alliance that have supported high-rise resettlement and public-private partnerships with developers and transnational financiers. Similar to the SPARC Alliance, NAPM leadership encouraged women's participation and leadership in mobilizations. But the group's discursive practices around poor women's participation highlighted women's working class experience (gendered as it may be) rather than their social reproductive roles as housewives and mothers.

These symbolic protests soon led to more direct action in Mandala 6 months after its residents were evicted in the Vision Mumbai sweep. The state of emergency

caused by the infamous Mumbai floods of July 2005 galvanized the Mandala movement into reclaiming and rebuilding the demolished plot. The re-occupation was far from smooth, however; bulldozers descended on Mandala again in the following year when the area was designated as the location for resettling slum structures from the banks of the Mithi River that government officials blamed for the flooding. The political economic geography of Mandala and the broader Mankhurd area is also significant for understanding its designation as a resettlement site. I have already addressed how city plans have long targeted Mankhurd as central resettlement hub, a process precipitated by the massive MUTP resettlement. The Mandala plot is well situated in terms of access to the Mankhurd train station. It is also located near the Vashi Market, a major depot for agricultural produce from the city's hinterland, where many Mandala residents worked in day laboring and food-processing jobs. The combined effects of the political vulnerability of residents and the desirability of the plot fueled a second eviction characterized by more violent clashes between residents and police, including several cases of police brutality and arson (Bhide 2009). In a macabre political ecology, Mandala homes were burned and demolished, and debris from the Mithi River basin was transplanted across the city to the Mandala site in truckloads to both "clean up" the river and to solidify land for a commercial resettlement center. Resettlement was thwarted by Mithi River occupants who were ultimately able to negotiate to remain on-site at the river or to relocate to a closer, more desirable site (Doshi forthcoming; Faleiro 2006). Mandala evictees have continued negotiations with officials to re-occupy their land since the second eviction.

In the meantime NAPM and Mandala leaders have taken up new strategies harnessing the discourse of citizenship to advance a broader critique of urban development and juridical charges of state corruption as an infringement of the rights of the poor. One example of juridical strategy use was NAPM's support of a World Bank investigation petition made by a group of residents affected by an MUTP project. NAPM also launched a media and action campaign indicting the "real encroachers of Mumbai", whom they identified as "the nexus of builders-politicians-bureaucrats" working for the elite. NAPM exposed corrupt practices of the state through press releases and public actions at elite developments like the luxury Hiranandani complex built on 240 acres of land purchased from the government at the absurdly low price of 1 US cent per acre on the (unfulfilled) condition that developers construct affordable housing for lower income groups. NAPM also organized events—including "people's hearings" and "panels" with evictees—where state officials and agencies faced accusations of malpractice and injustice. Such events did not produce legally binding agreements but the act of turning the table on the state by putting it on trial for anti-poor and "illegal" practices has served to enact rights claims and publicize the hypocrisies of redevelopment.

Recently, these practices of contention have been supplemented by other citizenship-based strategies and idioms aimed at negotiating resettlement with national rather than state agencies. The juridified modes of appeal are reflected in the Mandala leaders' decision to proceed with their claims "legally". Compounded violence and exclusion has led to a different set of political engagements. As one Mandala resident exclaimed, "We are tired of the police beatings. We now

should do things the proper way and get back this land so no one can take it away again." Evictee leaders and NAPM activists have drawn up a compromise proposal for the 50-acre Mandala plot that is still under negotiation. In the proposal Mandala evictees have agreed to resettlement in buildings on 15 acres of the site while the remaining 35 acres would be placed under the mandate of a new central government program. The compromise falls short of the movement's ideal of small-scale, low-rise forms of slum rehabilitation. However, in negotiating with the national urban development ministry, activists have been able to bypass Maharashtra state's exclusionary cutoff-date laws, thereby giving Mandala evictees access to some form of compensation. The juridical and rights-based modality and national state target of these strategies mark a significant contrast with the thesis offered by Chatterjee on "the politics of the governed", which posits the actions and moral ideologies of the urban poor as wholly distinct from the citizens' rights discourses deployed by property-owning bourgeoisie (2004).

Although NAPM's idioms and strategies of mobilization address the violent disposessions faced by evictees of slums like Mandala, it has been impossible to address all slum residents' desires. While neighborhood leaders publicly expressed solidarity with the NAPM's ideological stance, my ethnographic observations among evictees and leaders revealed more complex perspectives. The Mandala slum evictees with whom I spoke during research in 2007 and 2011 expressed conflicted views on how to proceed with land reclamations. For instance, several neighborhood leaders disagreed with eschewal of the developer-led, high-rise resettlement model. As one NAPM activist admitted, "some of the people do not always agree with the movement's core principles, though they always maintain the necessary image of solidarity". Furthermore, some neighborhood leaders and residents wanted to extra-legally reoccupy the land while others believed that since the first re-occupation ended in a second demolition, the group should follow a more procedurally correct course of action. Residents ultimately chose the latter approach though many worry that pursuing official government channels will mean sustaining a wait that not everyone can afford to bear equally. Nonetheless, the decision has remained to not reoccupy the land without undergoing the authorized procedures. In this way Mandala residents have claimed legitimacy as unjustly excluded citizens of the city and nation. Delay and uncertainty may be the price evictees pay for asserting their rights as citizens through official and "legal" means rather than the informal channels of "political society" (Chatterjee 2004) or the "porous state" (Benjamin 2000).

Conclusion

This paper explores the complex and contradictory politics of urban transformation in Mumbai by focusing on the agency of slum residents displaced by redevelopment projects. Ethnographic analysis of two cases of social mobilization on the urban periphery reveals that differentiated subaltern subject formation processes are crucial to whether and how global city transformations and capital accumulation advance in the city. Redevelopment is experienced through changing class, gender, and ethnic relations and ideologies to constitute the "fatal couplings of power and difference" (Gilmore 2002) that shape dispossession as well the political practices

of countering it. In one case, gendered negotiations, participation, and ideals of domesticity influenced residents' engagement with redevelopment in ways that enabled slum clearance and resettlement but also exacerbated inequalities. In the second, articulations of class and ethno-religious marginalization prompted alliance with other displaced groups and resistance to evictions expressed through idioms of citizenship. In both cases, NGOs and social movements mediated and partially altered desires and modes of engagement with state agencies and other social actors. Historically sedimented development practices, inequalities, and discourses shaped the capacities and resources through which displaced groups staked claims to the city.

The political geography of Mankhurd appears to offer an extreme or exceptional case in which eviction and resettlement are intimate partners, juxtaposed and overlapping with each other. I argue, however, that this frontier space offers a lens into how processes of accumulation and dispossession are taking place throughout Mumbai. Neoliberal policies, state agents, non-governmental groups, and discourses of improvement, legitimacy, and belonging have engaged and excluded residents in urban redevelopment in different ways throughout the neighborhoods of the city. At the same time, the politics of the evicted are constantly pushing and reworking redevelopment state practice. For instance, protests and negotiations have led to governmental promises of extending resettlement eligibility to a greater number of Mumbai's citizens. New national policies such as the Rajiv Awaaz Yojana offer the possibility of public housing without reliance on market mechanisms or the participation of developers and market incentives. Mediating groups and slum residents have also altered their tactics. For instance, the SPARC Alliance and slum-based leaders have recently undertaken a more critical approach to state redevelopment (Arputham and Patel 2010). NAPM has been involved in negotiations and compromises with local and national state agents around new resettlement options. Political strategies are thus never fixed but constantly changing depending on circumstances. As the city grows and infrastructure and accessibility improve, expansion into currently devalued frontier neighborhoods like Mankhurd may again threaten residents with displacement (Bhide 2009). It remains to be seen how future configurations of force—including subaltern political engagement—will influence development trajectories.

In this paper, I take seriously Harvey's assertion that "the right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city" (2008). However, I argue that radical scholarship must pay more rigorous attention to the often-overlooked, differentiated embodiments, meanings, and experiences of urban change that are at the heart of such deep social transformations. In this regard, Mumbai's redevelopment politics offer more than a Third World case affirming established theories of global urbanization and accumulation by dispossession. It demonstrates that just as primitive accumulation produces "an accumulation of differences and divisions within the proletariat" that fundamentally molds class power through racialized and gendered labor practices (Federici 2004:63), so too does redevelopment in relation to land. Redevelopment produces difference and reworks class relations through ethnicized and gendered displacement practices and experiences that in turn fuel

varied and unpredictable political movements. Similarities are evident in other global struggles over dispossession ranging from the property-ownership desires and racialized predatory lending practices underpinning the US foreclosure crisis to eviction politics of multiply dispossessed groups in the global South. In-depth examination of these interconnected but distinct political processes “denaturalizes” dispossession (Hart 2006), illuminating greater and hopefully more inclusive and promising avenues for social justice.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by funding from the Social Science Research Council and the Society of Women Geographers. An earlier version of this paper was presented in 2010 in Hong Kong with the Urban Ecologies in Asia research cluster; members provided valuable input, and I thank Anne Rademacher and K. Sivaramakrishan for the invitation. I am also grateful to Jennifer Casolo, Tracey Osborne, Michael Watts, and the three anonymous reviewers for their insightful and useful comments. Special thanks also go to Vinay Gidwani for his editorial support and patience. Finally, I am most indebted to the residents and activists in Mumbai who so generously shared their lives and struggles with me.

Endnotes

¹ Slum is the term used in development regulation codes of Indian cities for a broad range of substandard, informal structures and neighborhoods.

² I am thankful to Simpreet Singh of NAPM for sharing data gathered through a Right to Information Act petition.

³ Slum establishment consists of a complex political ecology of labor and investment from swamp reclamation to payments made to local brokers and police. For examples of similar processes, see Sharma (2000).

⁴ Notable resettlement problems include weak construction, density, and water supply shortages; see Modi (2009).

⁵ See Wright (2007) for examples of similar gendered politics in Mexico.

⁶ Official and activist estimates vary.

References

- Adarkar N and Menon M (2004) *One Hundred Years, One Hundred Voices: The Millworkers of Girangaon: An Oral History*. Calcutta: Seagull Books
- Anand N and Rademacher A (2011) Housing in the urban age: Inequality and aspiration in Mumbai. *Antipode* 43(5):1748–1772
- Appadurai A (2000) Spectral housing and urban cleansing: Notes on millennial Mumbai. *Public Culture* 12(3):627–651
- Appadurai A (2002) Deep democracy: Urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Public Culture* 14(1):23–43
- Arputham J and Patel S (2010) Recent developments in plans for Dharavi and for the airport slums in Mumbai. *Environment and Urbanization* 22(2):501–504
- Banerjee-Guha S (1995) Urban development process in Bombay: Planning for whom? In S Patel and Thorner(eds) *Bombay: Metaphor for Modern India* (pp 100–120). New Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Bannerjee-Guha S (ed) (2010) *Accumulation by Dispossession: Transformative Cities in the New Global Order*. New Delhi: Sage
- Bapat M and Agarwal I (2003) Our needs, our priorities; women and men from the slums in Mumbai and Pune talk about their needs for water and sanitation. *Environment and Urbanization* 15(2):71
- Baviskar A (2003) Between violence and desire: Space, power and identity in the making of modern Delhi. *International Social Science Journal* 55(175):89–98

- Benjamin S (2000) Governance, economic settings and poverty in Bangalore. *Environment and Urbanization* 12(1):35–56
- Benjamin S (2008) Occupancy urbanism: Radicalizing politics and economy beyond policy and programs. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(3):719–729
- Bhide A (2009) “Struggling for foothold: The experience of Mandala.” Paper presented at the Workshop on Shelter Security and Social Protection for the Urban Poor and the Migrants in Asia 11–13 February, Ahmedabad, India
- Brenner N and Theodore N (2002) Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’. *Antipode* 34(3):349–379
- Burra S (1999) *Resettlement and Rehabilitation of the Urban Poor: The Story of Kanjur Marg*. Mumbai: Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centers
- Chant S (2008) The “feminisation of poverty” and the “feminisation” of anti-poverty programmes: Room for revision? *Journal of Development Studies* 44(2):165–197
- Chatterjee P (2004) *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Chatterji R and Mehta D (2007) *Living with Violence: An Anthropology of Events and Everyday Life*. New Delhi: Routledge
- D’Cruz C (undated) Demolitions to dialogue. <http://www.sparcindia.org/docs/dtod.html> (last accessed 1 March 2012)
- D’Monte D (2005) *Ripping the Fabric: The Decline of Mumbai and Its Mills*. New Delhi: Oxford India
- D’Souza D, Josson P, Nair M and More D (2005) *Bulldozing Rights: A Report on the Forced Evictions and Housing Policies for the Poor in Mumbai*. Mumbai: Indian People’s Tribunal on Environment and Human Rights
- Davis M (2006) *Planet of Slums*. New York: Verso
- Doshi S (2012) The politics of persuasion: Gendered slum citizenship in neoliberal Mumbai. In R Desai and R Sanyal (eds) *Urbanizing Citizenship: Contested Spaces in Indian Cities* (pp 82–108). New Delhi: Sage
- Doshi S (forthcoming) Resettlement ecologies: Environmental subjectivity and graduated citizenship in Mumbai. In Rademacher A and Sivaramakrishnan K (eds) *Ecologies of Urbanism in India Hong Kong*: Hong Kong University Press
- Faleiro S (2006) A river runs through upturned lives. *Tehelka* 24 June
- Federici S (2004) *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia
- Fernandes L (2006) *India’s New Middle Class: Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Gidwani V (2006) Subaltern cosmopolitanism as politics. *Antipode* 38(1):7–21
- Gilmore R W (2002) Fatal couplings of power and difference: Notes on racism and geography. *The Professional Geographer* 54(1):15–24
- Guha R (1982) On some aspects of the historiography of colonial India. In R Guha (ed) *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (pp 1–8). New Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Hansen T B (2001) *Wages of Violence: Naming and Identity in Postcolonial Bombay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Hart G (2006) Denaturalizing dispossession: Critical ethnography in the age of resurgent imperialism. *Antipode* 28(5):977–1004
- Harvey D (2003) *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Harvey D (2008) The right to the city. *New Left Review* 53:23–40
- Holston J (2008) *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Leitner H, Peck J and Sheppard E S (eds) (2007) *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*. New York: Guilford Press
- Mahmud T (2010) “Surplus humanity” and the margins of legality: Slums, slumdogs, and accumulation by dispossession *Chapman Law Review* 14(1):1–82
- McFarlane C (2004) Geographical imaginations and spaces of political engagement: Examples from the Indian Alliance. *Antipode* 36(5):890–916

- McFarlane C (2008) Sanitation in Mumbai's informal settlements: State, "slum", and infrastructure. *Environment and Planning A* 40(1):88–107
- McKinsey and Company (2003) *Vision Mumbai: Transforming Mumbai into a World-Class City*. Mumbai: McKinsey and Company
- Mitlin D and Patel S (2005) *Re-interpreting the Rights-Based Approach: A Grassroots Perspective on Rights and Development*. London: Global Poverty Research Group, Economic and Social Research Council
- Modi R (2009) Resettlement and rehabilitation in urban centres. *Economic and Political Weekly* 44(6):20–23
- Moore D (2005) *Suffering for Territory: Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*. Durham: Duke University Press
- Mukhija V (2003) *Squatters as Developers? Slum Redevelopment in Mumbai*. Burlington: Ashgate
- Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (2009) *Mumbai Human Development Report*. New Delhi: Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai
- Narayanan H (2003) In search of shelter: The politics of the implementation of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act of 1976 in Greater Mumbai. In S Patel and J Masselos (eds) *Bombay and Mumbai: The City in Transition* (pp 183–206). New Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Nijman J (2000) Mumbai's real estate market in the 1990s: Deregulation, global money, and casino capitalism. *Economic and Political Weekly* 35:175–182
- Nijman J (2008) Against the odds: Slum rehabilitation in neoliberal Mumbai. *Cities* 25(2):73–85
- O' Hare G, Abbot A and Barke M (1998) A review of slum housing policies in Mumbai. *Cities* 15(4):269–283
- Ong A (2007) *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press
- Patel S and Thorner A (eds) (1995) *Bombay: A Metaphor for Modern India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Roy A (2009) Civic governmentality: The politics of inclusion in Beirut and Mumbai. *Antipode* 41(1):159–179
- Roy A (2011) Slumdog cities: Rethinking subaltern urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(2):223–238
- Sharma K (2000) *Rediscovering Dharavi: Stories from Asia's Largest Slum*. New Delhi: Penguin
- Smith N (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge
- Smith N (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy. *Antipode* 34(3):427–450
- Spivak G C (1988) Can the subaltern speak? In C Nelson and L Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp 271–313) Chicago: University of Illinois Press
- Spivak G C (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Tata Institute of Social Sciences (2007) *Impact Assessment and Evaluation of Phase II of the Mumbai Urban Transport Project*. Mumbai: Tata Institute of Social Sciences
- Times News Network (2005) Demolition of slums has Sonia's nod, says CM. *Times of India* 17 April
- Tripathi A (2011) Raj Thackeray blames migrants for terror strikes, BSP calls him 'terrorist'. *The Times of India* 15 July
- Vasudevan A, McFarlane C and Jeffrey A (2008) Spaces of enclosure. *Geoforum* 39(5):1641–1646
- Weinstein L (2008) Mumbai's development mafias: Globalization, organized crime and land development. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1):22–39
- Whitehead J and More N (2007) Revanchism in Mumbai? Political economy of rent gaps and urban restructuring in a global city. *Economic & Political Weekly* 42(25):2428–2434
- Wright M W (2007) Femicide, mother-activism, and the geography of protest in northern Mexico. *Urban Geography* 28(5):401–425