5 Gendering justice, building alternative futures

Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Sarah Miraglia

> We want guaranteed access to basic services such as telecommunications, energy, health and water. Moreover, we want to live in a world without war, with social justice, with equity, where men don't dominate women, where children don't have to work in cane fields or in factories, where children don't roam the streets without hope. With this desire, when our various organisations come together, we know this movement has a bright future. America is destined to be the continent of hope and life. And our struggles will show that, though we might not experience it in our lifetime, we will have added a grain of sand to the pile. (Reyes 2009, 18)

Erasto Reyes reminds us of a vision for social and economic justice that fuels continuing struggles for liberation in the 21st century. While neoliberal cultures inevitably place capitalist interests above the needs and hopes of people, it is people's movements (anti-colonial/anti-imperial, peasant, ecological, labour, women's, peace and justice, anti-globalisation, etc.) that have exposed the fault lines of neoliberal capitalism and placed questions of democracy, equity, and justice at the centre of struggles for emancipation. A decade into the 21st century, we face an unprecedented consolidation (and crisis) of social, economic, and political power fuelled by the conjuncture of relentless neoliberalism, masculinist religious fundamentalisms, rampant militarisms, resurgent racisms, and the criminalisation of minoritised populations in many countries. This chapter argues that gender equity and women's agency are core components of envisioning anti-capitalist struggles for social and economic justice, in general, and for enacting alternatives to privatisation, in particular.

The first section interrogates the politics of economic restructuring, arguing that neoliberal reforms have effectively worked to reprivatise women through "empowerment" projects that entail the commodification of public services and participatory projects. The next section takes us *beyond* a critique of neoliberalism, developing an argument that counters the disempowering effects of commodified public services, suggesting that

rather than seeking to "empower" women, alternatives need to focus on women's agency in struggles for social and economic justice. Our review of gender equity in "alternatives to privatisation" highlights the complex nature of working in and through established governance structures and within institutional settings and argues for models of action that work to create the infrastructure necessary for women's strategic interests. Finally, we introduce an analytical framework that allows us to see women's agency through their struggles around the body, the environment, and diverse economies – through place-based struggles that originate in the lived experiences of women struggling against neoliberal reforms.

Feminist scholarship and activism in the last several decades has shown conclusively that gender is constitutive of economic and political structures of governance, that gender ideologies and representations consolidate hierarchical relations of rule globally, and that peoples' subjectivities and identities are profoundly gendered. Thus, any project that seeks to confront the hierarchical and unjust relations of rule embedded in processes of privatisation and commercialisation must engage with the everyday politics of gender. Fundamentally, a gendered analysis assumes attentiveness to unequal male/female power relations and a commitment to gender justice – i.e. strategies to eliminate the subordination and impoverishment of women. Gendered analysis does not assume that women are uniformly or universally subordinated or that women in different places, spaces, and cultures face identical challenges (Anzaldua and Moraga 1981, Davis 1985, Mohanty 1986, Jayawardena 1995). Class, caste, sexuality, religion, culture, ability, and race/ethnicity/indigeneity all intervene to position women in different *and* similar relationships to power and inequality. In addition, patriarchal histories of colonialism, racism, and capitalist exploitation position communities of women in the global South and North in different, yet comparable, relationships to each other, to the state, and to transnational governance structures. Women in the global South bear the brunt of the current economic order.

Speaking of the Americas, Beckman suggests that, while "'Old' forms of domination such as patriarchy, capitalism and racism remained in place... neoliberal economic and political arrangements have exacerbated the feminization of poverty across the region" (2001, 32). In other words, neoliberal economic policies further cheapen women's labour in the workplace, simultaneously increasing their labour in the home via the dismantling of social services in particular, and the welfare state in general. Privatisation and commercialisation constitute key aspects of neoliberal restructuring in the global South. Privatisation recasts the principles of democratic governance, leading to the abdication of responsibility and shift in power and accountability from governments to private corporations, transforming the "structures of entitlements" (Elson 1995) in ways that are most injurious for the poor, especially poor women who subsidise the environmental costs of overconsumption. Power relations of gender, class, and race/ethnicity are

reconfigured through the mechanism of feminisation as devaluation. What many analysts refer to as the "feminisation of labour" operates through a devalorisation of the labour and skill involved in performing tasks, simultaneously reducing wages for jobs considered "feminised". The feminisation of labour has led to the marginalisation of men in the workforce, and this loss of a male income leaves households with very few resources for survival, pushing more families into poverty. Thus, gender analysis and questions of women's rights and agency remain central to envisioning and enacting alternatives to privatisation in the global South.

This chapter suggests a relational, complex understanding of gender. We speak of gender as (i) a theoretical lens and an epistemological project (gender in relation to meaning systems – ideologies, theories, paradigms), (ii) an apparatus of governance embedded in institutions of rule (gendered structures, practices and forms of social reproduction), and (iii) as lived cultures – gendered subjectivities, self and collective identities (Marchand and Runyan 2000, Nagar and Writers 2006, Ahlers and Zwarteveen 2009). Our analysis is anchored in an anti-racist, materialist feminist framework that links everyday life and local gendered histories and ideologies to larger, transnational/global structures and ideologies of capitalism through a gendered "place-based" framework (Harcourt and Escobar 2005). This particular framework draws on historical materialism and centralises a differentiated notion of gendered struggles anchored in the bodies, environments, and economies of the most marginalised communities of women – poor and indigenous women in affluent and neocolonial nations and women from the global South (Mohanty 2003). We suggest that an experiential and analytic grounding in the lives and struggles of marginalised communities of women (urban poor, working class, peasant, indigenous, etc.) provides the most inclusive paradigm for advocating gender justice in the creation of alternatives to privatisation.

We agree with Fine and Hall (see Chapter 3, this volume) in their call for public sector systems of provision that utilise an "approach that needs to be contextually driven rather than as a...universal theory". However, our call for a particularised framing is coupled with a vision of gender justice that is both expansive and universal. We envision a world that values and promotes gender justice within households and the larger polity; a world in which legacies of colonialism, violence, poverty, and deprivation are acknowledged and actively resisted. We work and struggle for a post-capitalist world, for what many people refer to as a "solidarity economy" – one that values cooperation and interdependency above profit and greed. Our work is dedicated to the feminist struggle for gender justice – to an expansive and universal vision, anchored in the differences and specificities of women's lives. In our discussion of alternatives to privatisation, gender justice (the elimination of hierarchies and unequal power based on gender) is central to socio-economic practices and structural arrangements that value equity in access to resources, participation, leadership, and the politics of knowledge.

Some of the questions pertaining to a gendered analysis of privatisation and commercialisation include a *gendering* of the left critique of neoliberalism in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, a critique of global restructuring in terms of the gendered impact of policies/practices and implications for gender equity, and, finally, a focus on the ways in which women cope, adjust, resist, and advocate for their communities and on their own behalf (i.e. women's agency). In concrete terms, this gendering of the left critique includes a shift away from treating "the poor", "the worker", or "the peasant" as homogeneous identity groups, to being attentive to the ways in which gender, race, ethnicity, and nation inflect and constitute each identity in ways that shape the opportunities and constraints faced by women and men positioned differentially in hierarchies of power, privilege, and exclusion utilising an intersectional approach. For example, the particularities of poor, indigenous women's lives in Latin America are different from (and similar to) the lives and struggles of poor male peasants in South Asia. While each group may be "poor", the challenges faced by the different communities can only be understood if gender, race, and ethnic particularities are taken into account. These are some of the questions we address in what follows.

GENDERING NEOLIBERALISM

Colonial legacies, neoliberal frameworks

Colonial legacies and patriarchal structures, as well as ideologies and practices of masculinist, class, and race/caste supremacy, underlie social relations and institutions that constitute neoliberal economic and political orders. Legacies of colonialism include capitalist processes of recolonisation that consolidate and exacerbate relations of domination and exploitation by making use of existing social divisions to further the goal of profit maximisation (Alexander and Mohanty 1997). As Sen suggests, "Faced with intransigent social structures and rigid hierarchies such as those based on gender, race, or caste, the expansion of commerce builds on these hierarchies, altering and reshaping them in the process, and transforming the life experiences of those involved" (1996, 821). In fact it is colonial legacies of racialised patriarchies that underlie the division of labour in contemporary capitalist cultures. Maria Mies (1984) theorises colonisation and "housewifization" as linked processes of racialised gender that were instituted by colonial powers during the 18th and 19th centuries to extract maximum profit from women's labour in the colonies and at "home". Thus, while slave women's "productive" labour was valorised, and reproductive labour controlled because it led to loss of profit, bourgeois women in the metropole were subjected to a process of housewifization that valorised their reproductive roles, withdrawing them from the public sphere, and

simultaneously constructing gender regimes of public/private spheres. It is these very processes of race, class, and gender differentiation in the service of capital exploitation that traffic in the present. Since the 1970s, US feminist economists have critiqued the notion of "hegemonic economic man" (a self-made man: narrowly self-interested, competitive, individualistic, and motivated by greed) that developed historically in 19th-century Europe and the US. The "economic woman" required by this hegemonic notion of masculine personhood tended to be the full-time homemaker-wife, a racialised, class-specific, and heteronormative notion of womanhood (Matthaei 1982). However, while public/private distinctions have been the basis of gendered regimes since post-15th-century colonialism, an intersectional approach that is attentive to race and class particularities suggests that women in the global South, and poor, immigrant and women of colour in the global North do not fall neatly into the homemaker-wife or "economic woman" designations.

Neoliberalised global restructuring has drawn on these colonial legacies to consolidate the current regime of international debt, development aid, and the so-called structural adjustment of the economies and governance structures of developing countries. Marchand and Runyan (2000) argue that global restructuring reworks practices and meanings of masculinity/femininity by shifting the boundaries and meanings of public/private, domestic/international, and local/global. Feminist scholars of global restructuring claim that the relations of domination and the economic and political hierarchies instituted by neoliberal cultures are profoundly gendered and could not be sustained without the gendered symbolism and metaphors that serve to "naturalise" the gendered division of labour that underlies processes of economic restructuring. The withdrawal of government responsibility for social welfare has resulted in the transfer of these obligations to women, a process that Babb (1996) refers to as women "absorbing the shocks" of adjusting economies. In essence, women subsidise processes of economic liberalisation, both through unpaid labour in the home and paid labour in formal and informal work (Beneria 1999). It is erroneous, however, to construe public and private spaces as discrete spaces. As Pitkin and Bedoya suggest, "Production and reproduction overlap and often occupy the same space in women's lives" (1997, 47). Women's work in the home is increased in a number of ways that are often directly related to changes in the public sphere. They have to work harder to collect water, provide food, ensure health, and supplement household incomes due to cuts in health, education, and food subsidies and the privatisation of water, which often has detrimental effects on the poorest women.

Over three decades of feminist activism and scholarship in the global South, from the early critiques of the impact of economic development on poor "Third World" women by DAWN (Sen and Grown 1987), to more recent analysis by the Feminist Initiative of Cartagena (2003), point to the profoundly negative effects of mainstream development policies, and SAPs

(structural adjustment programmes) anchored in neoliberal paradigms. The 1980s to early 1990s witnessed the sustained engagement of development discourse by feminists via the United Nations (UN) world conferences on women and the entry of women's movement activists into international governing bodies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) focusing on women's issues. Harcourt (2006) argues that this engagement of international governance structures by women's rights advocates resulted in a "professionalisation" of development and a proliferation of NGOs on women's issues leading to a depoliticisation of radical gender justice projects and the creation of a management apparatus of development. It is this particular development discourse, backed up by UN statistics, texts, case studies, and reports. that partially fuelled the managerial and bureaucratised neoliberal policies, in turn discursively producing a generic, gendered female body with a particular set of needs and rights, thus potentially erasing differences among women. The radical feminist critiques of SAPs and privatisation thus resulted at this time in an organisational focus on "gender mainstreaming" (as evidenced through static measures of gender parity in development plans and projects and/or women's participation in the private sphere), not gender justice (an analysis of gendered power hierarchies that unearth and destabilise the roots of gendered forms of inequality; a project often regarded as meddling in the "cultural" affairs of "other" nations).

From gender mainstreaming to women's empowerment: Reprivatising women through health, water and electricity projects

Gender mainstreaming was agreed upon as the "global strategy for the promotion of gender equality" (Manase et al., 2003, Panda 2007) in the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action (the Fourth World Conference on Women). In some ways, gender mainstreaming represents the gains made through the persistence and struggle of thousands of women around the world whose activism and advocacy persuaded international organisations to rectify gendered silences and omissions in international policies. But it also represents ongoing negotiations and contestations between women-based/feminist groups and the members of the UN system and ostensibly the larger development industry (Mukhopadhyay 2004). While the goal of gender mainstreaming was to bring women's issues to the centre of development agendas and to move away from "the earlier 'add women and stir approach'" (Subrahmanian 2004, 89), it has fallen short of actually transforming gendered inequalities in development plans. As Mukhopadhyay argues, "feminist concerns with the political project of equality are being normalised in the development business as an ahistorical, apolitical, decontextualised and technical project that leaves the prevailing and unequal power relations intact" (2004, 100). Despite – and partly because of – the attempts to make gender politically viable within international organisations and NGOs, gender mainstreaming has more often than not failed

to rectify gender inequalities, though it has spurred debates on methods and strategies. This policy dialectic – the relationship between activists, advocates, and planners – has generated a new/old paradigm emphasis on "women's empowerment" as a strategy for gendering development.

The empowerment approach, we argue, is gender mainstreaming adapted to a neoliberal ideological agenda. On the surface, women's empowerment is concerned with promoting equality of access to resources, and power in decision making for women, but in practice it works to conceal deep-seated social, political, and economic inequalities that need to be addressed to make real, meaningful change. Empowerment approaches tend to individualise gender equity, subject gendered interests to tests of market efficiency, and essentially *reprivatise* women through a marriage of "efficiency, productivity and empowerment" (Cleaver 1998, 294). This marriage of objectives is enacted on the ground through the commodification of resources and the decentralisation of resource management, which also is a process of commodification as it relies on the "free labour" of community members to enact the project (Aguilar 2005; what Elson [1995] refers to as the "cash and committee" approach). The introduction of commodified public services, it was argued, would increase access for millions. On the whole, this prediction has not played out in practice. Billions continue to lack access to safe drinking water, sanitation, electricity, and health care. Worse yet, not only have women not gained access to these vital services, but also in many cases they have lost government subsidies for them and/or the total provision of them. The gap between what can be paid and what commodified services cost, and/or the loss of the service altogether, is filled in by women's labour. In very concrete ways, neoliberal policies have "privatised social reproduction" by reprivatising women's labour (Roberts 2008). In the following, we highlight some of the problematics of this approach to gender and service delivery.

The costs of commodified public services

One means of commodification is the introduction of user fees and "full cost recovery" programmes into systems of public service delivery. Katz (2001, cited in Roberts 2008) identifies this process of commodification as one that moved from pricing schemes that valued "social equity" (paying what one could afford) to "economic equity" (users must pay for the full costs of the resource). Proponents of this system argue that user fees compel consumers to make judicious choices in their use of the good. What are not accounted for in these models are the consequences of an inability to pay. In the field of health care, for example, Nanda (2002) found that women's rates of utilisation of health care decreased dramatically in several African nations after the introduction of user fees, thus jeopardising women's health. Nanda similarly shows that maternal death rates increased by 56% in the Zaria region of Nigeria as a result of an inability to pay user fees.

In this case, women could not afford maternity care and thus suffered the consequences of unattended births. Commodified services have multiplicative effects as well. Brown's (2010) study of water privatisation in Tanzania shows how an inability to pay for water makes HIV/AIDS care increasingly difficult, particularly in Tanzania, where home-based care for HIV/AIDS patients is policy. In this case, an inability to pay for water jeopardises women's safety as at-home caregivers. Thus, not only is the patient's health put at risk, but so too is the health of the caregiver.

In the electricity sector, neoliberal reforms have had similarly detrimental effects because planners have tended to focus on supply-side concerns that value profit over equity and prioritise industrial consumption (Clancy 2000, UNESCAP 2003). The supply-side focus has marginalised the energy needs of women through a lack of policy attention to biomass fuels, which are largely used by the poor in both rural and urban settings (Clancy 2000, Batliwala and Reddy 2003). Women's health is put at risk by the lack of attention to biomass fuels; they are tasked with the responsibility of collecting biomass fuels and also with cooking responsibilities that have particularly adverse though well-known health effects (Holdren and Smith 2000, Reddy 2000). The World Bank, for example, "classed indoor air pollution in LDCs [least developed countries] among the four most critical global environmental problems" (Cecelski 2000, 18). Beyond indoor pollution, the use of biomass fuels puts women at risk of injuries related to collecting firewood and inhibits school participation by young girls who often work alongside their mothers to collect biomass energy sources. In these ways, women's labour becomes a subsidy for supply-side electricity reforms.

The costs of supply-side reforms are often compounded by the rising costs of energy, and by the loss of government fuel subsidies (Clancy 2002). Taken together, these reforms work to further marginalise rural populations in poverty where electrification requires costly infrastructure that investors are unwilling to take on given low expectations for a return of profit (Zomers 2003). The gap between rural and urban electricity access is the greatest in sub-Saharan Africa, where Hall (2007) shows that 54% of households in urban areas have access, versus 8.3% access in rural areas. Though significant, the gap between rural and urban access is crosscut by race, class, and gender inequalities. For example, Annecke's research on the South African electricity sector notes that "[t]he 46% of households that are not yet electrified are usually those housing poor, black women in rural areas, further marginalized as a result of their lack of access to electric power" (2009, 291). Additionally, McDonald (2009) argues that although connections to the grid have been made possible, millions of South Africans continue to live without electricity because they are unable to afford the service under cost-reflexive pricing schemes. These findings suggest that increasing connections may work to bridge the rural/urban gap in service, but poor communities will continue to lack adequate access when economic efficiency is valued over social equity.

One of the primary arguments for the commodification and/or privatisation of public services is that it will allow governments to save money. However, actual savings have been the exception rather than the rule. Such was the case in Buenos Aires when the International Finance Corporation (IFC) provided funding to distribution companies to reduce electricity theft by terminating "illegal" connections. The terminations resulted in lawsuits being brought against corporate distributors, which argued that privatisation deprived people of basic services. The lawsuit ended with the government subsidising the costs of hook-ups for the unserved populations (World Resources Institute 2002). As such, while the urban poor received electricity in Buenos Aires, it was the actions of the government – not the corporation – that ensured such access. As this case illustrates, government spending on energy has often increased rather than decreased, leaving fewer resources available for the provision of basic welfare services (Bayliss 2001). In another example from the health sector, Bernal et al. (1999) show that budget cuts resulting from economic restructuring work to inhibit the provision of legalised access to abortion. Though Mexican political leaders have signed on to statements that call for greater access to reproductive health care, they are able to sidestep this controversial issue by arguing that they lack adequate funding to materialise that mandate.

Gender and politics of "community" participation

The participatory approach to resource management co-constitutes a process of donor-driven decentralisation of governance and has become *sine qua non* for development agencies. Participation, it is argued, creates commitment to a project, ensures efficiency, accountability, and transparency, democratise decision making through bottom-up processes, and enables empowerment for women and marginalised groups (Resurreccion et al., 2004, Beall 2005). The focus on decentralising management, feminists hoped, would open the door for women to gain measures of control over natural resource management and, ostensibly, access to natural resources (Zwarteveen and Meinzen-Dick 2001). However, these hopes have not been filled in practice. Instead, feminist advocates and activists point out that women's relationships to water are essentialised according to a gendered division of labour, communities are conceptualised as homogeneous in their interests, and households are treated as a congruent unit of interests. Finally, there are also critiques of the meaningfulness of participation, which can vary greatly from "nominal" to "empowering" (Agarwal 2001) with direct consequences for how a project is structured and to what degree it meets the needs of all community members.

Much of the development work on gender and water tends towards an essentialisation of women's relationships to water and fails to problematise the socially constructed division of labour informing these roles (Meinzen-Dick and Zwarteveen 1998, Sultana 2009). In mainstream policy literature,

women's uses of water are typically limited to their uses in the domestic sphere, including washing, cleaning, and reproductive work. The essentialisation of women's uses of water casts their activities as predominately rooted in their "natural" role as caretakers (Cleaver 2000). Taking for granted the idea that women primarily use water for domestic purposes fails to question the socially constructed division of labour. Zwarteveen and Meinzen-Dick (2001) provide a useful corrective, arguing that women's uses of water should not be seen as a product of their natural gender roles but as produced by a naturalisation of gender inequality. They ask if policy makers would observe different uses of water for women if there were structures in place that allowed such uses. The essentialisation of women's uses of water is representative of narrowly construed resource management schemes. These abstractions make it easier to design a universalised approach, but the flattening out of difference forecloses the potential for these projects to produce meaningful changes in women's lives.

Treating the community as a homogeneous entity has serious consequences for the structure of a community-based group and the distribution of benefits. Without a nuanced approach to the community, privileged community members are more likely to become the primary contacts (referred to as "elite capture") for participatory projects (van Koppen 1998, Sultana 2009), perpetuating and/or exacerbating "naturalised" inequalities (Resurreccion et al., 2004, Boelens and Zwarteveen 2005, Karim 2006). For instance, in the Chhattis Mauja irrigation scheme in Nepal, a local woman leader volunteered to act as a village leader, called a *muktiyar*. Though she was given the position, she was forced to resign after five months because the villagers would not accept a woman in this position (IFAD 2006). In this example, the leadership position was made available to women, but the project planners did not account for male resistance to a woman in a leadership position. Beyond male/female gender inequalities, an intersectional approach further compels a consideration of relations between women. For example, Singh's (2006) study of village-level water management committees in rural India found that although the majority of women were vastly under-represented at the meetings, upper-caste women were more likely to have their needs met because, unlike lower-caste women, their interests were represented by male family members. The result was that in two different instances, hand pumps were located in places considered to be the province of upper-caste members. The lack of accountability for the poorest members means that the benefits of community-based projects tend to accrue to more powerful members in a given community with gender being mediated by race/caste/class.

As with the water sector, energy sector projects treat communities and households as unitary in their goals and interests. As a UNESCAP report argues, "technologies and innovations that are actually targeted for women are based on perceptions and preferences of men" (2003, 21). Similarly, Annecke (2009) reports that even when the benefits of energy interventions

are meant to accrue to women, the unequal status of women permits male community and household members to reap the benefits of those projects. Cecelski (2000) and Skutsch (2005) add an intersectional dimension to this discussion by arguing that within groups of women, it is also necessary to give attention to the energy uses of various classes of women or women from different castes. As Cecelski (2000) notes, the benefits of rural electrification programmes tend to accrue to wealthier families, including, of course, women. In these ways, to homogenise groups of women, as mainstream development projects often do, is to miss opportunities to provide equitable services to those who need them most.

Community-based projects also operate at the household level where, similar to homogenisation at the community level, an assumed "congruency of interests" (Upadhyay 2005) between men and women means that women's interests are not adequately represented in the project. Project planners are more likely to meet with male members of the household and are sometimes apt to not speak with women at all (Clancy 2000, Udas and Zwarteveen 2010). This model also assumes there is a male breadwinner in each family, which conceals a number of realities faced by women. In the agricultural sector, access to water is often dependent on ownership of property. However, many women are prohibited from land ownership, which by extension prohibits them from owning the water sources (natural or constructed) on that land. This, in turn, effectively erases the fact that women – as well as men – are also farmers, either by themselves or alongside husbands or children. Women are further marginalised when land ownership determines the selection of participants in community-based agricultural groups, as was the case in a project designed to optimise the scarce water supply in Llullucha, Peru (Delgado 2005). The project was organised by the *Instituto de Manejo de Agua y Medio Ambiente* (IMA; a government entity), which chose a participatory approach that engaged the local *comuneros*. The *comuneros* form a group of registered landowners and an all-male group. Through this focus, the IMA effectively excluded women from participation. The result was that women protested the irrigation system that did not allow water to flow into the waterholes that they used to care for livestock. As a consequence of women's protests, project planners were forced to alter their plans (Delgado 2005). Similarly, in the energy sector, the disenfranchisement of women at the household level has contributed to the devaluation of women's labour expenditures and the neglect of women's energy needs (Reddy 2000). For example, Clancy (2002) finds that male control over household funds often means that investments are not made in technologies that would make women's tasks easier or safer. As these examples make clear, energy policies are not gender neutral, as is assumed by energy experts. The failure of these experts to include gendered analyses reverberates in the reprivatisation of women's labour.

Finally, participation can also be problematically construed solely as economic exchange. This approach to participation reprivatises women

(and men) in the form of consumer-citizens whose participation consists of market transactions rather than meaningful democratic participation. For example, in the water sector in Mexico, Castro argues that "[t]he prevailing notion of user participation is mostly limited in practice to the expectation that users would become obedient customers who pay their water bills punctually" (2007, 764). O'Reilly similarly highlights the role that gender plays in the making of a modernised citizen-consumer by focusing on a water project that invoked modernisation as a justification for women's empowerment through the commodification of water in Rajasthan, India: "the promotion of modern water by project staff ran parallel to a marketing of modern womanhood and consumerism coded as 'women's participation'" (2006, 962). In these examples, the rhetoric of participation operates as a thin disguise for the imposition of commodified service delivery.

In each of these sectors – water, electricity, and health – the imbrications between gender and neoliberalism have produced perverse consequences that pay lip service to gender equality while advancing projects that undermine that goal. Women's workloads have increased through the removal of government subsidies, and they are reprivatised through participatory projects that fail to meet their needs but require their participation. Empowerment through participation is often a pretence that furthers project goals, but conceals the fact that women actively negotiate access to resources in their everyday lives. An alternative approach to gendering resource management would be attentive to the practices that women already employ to gain access to resources. As argued by Pradhan, alternative models should work to "find out how or in what ways women influence decisions even under conditions of structural subordination" (2003, 54). Rather than impose an empowerment agenda, we argue that alternative models would do well to seek out what Miraftab calls "invented spaces of participation", or those spaces "characterized by defiance that directly challenges the status quo" (2004, 4). Like Miraftab, we argue for attention to women's agency in the context of gender justice and imagining alternative futures – not in defending a patriarchal status quo or in the service of conservative social movements. Starting with women's transformative agential practices is a "bottom-up process" that builds on and broadens the agency that women already express. In the following sections, we review projects that recognise and build on women's agency, as opposed to projects that seek to *give* empowerment.

GENDER EQUITY: IMAGINING ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

The previous sections briefly reviewed feminist scholarship on neoliberalism and global restructuring, and privatisation and commercialisation in the water, health, and electricity sectors in the global South. The remainder of this chapter focuses on "alternatives", taking up the question of

envisioning and enacting alternatives to privatisation (and commercialisation) that centralise gender equity and gender justice.

Struggles against private incursions are galvanising new social movements that join together the efforts of diverse communities. These movements draw on and build up processes of participatory democracy that compel state actors to take seriously their mandate to govern in a manner consistent with the needs of the people. In this way, processes of privatisation and commercialisation should also be regarded as processes of politicisation (Naples 2002). Thus, as suggested earlier, engaging the perspectives and experiences of those most marginalised by capital provides a fuller understanding of how capital operates and points towards strategies of resistance that can fundamentally transform social inequalities from the ground up.

We have sought a variety of sources to inform our analysis of gendered alternatives, but locating sources that systematically review gendered alternatives has not been easy. While there is a growing body of literature that documents the rise of social movements against commercialisation (most notably in regard to water and sanitation), there are far fewer resources that explicitly address the role of gender, particularly as it relates to race, nation, ethnicity, class, and/or caste. Many of the reports and articles we found give gendered concerns only a passing mention, noting that women are deeply affected by neoliberal policies but fail to explicate how they might become agents in the process of constructing alternatives. Many of the feminist analyses of gender in relation to the restructuring of health, water, and electricity centre on critiques of processes associated with commercialisation, not necessarily on creating alternatives. In most cases we do not see women presented as agents and change makers. Our work here pieces together the stories of resource management projects that include partnerships between community-based groups, NGOs, governments, and international organisations that have made specific efforts to confront inequalities based on gender, race/ethnicity, class/caste, and/or indigenous identities.

Writing about Empire in the neoliberal age, Roy (2004, 66) argues passionately that no act that confronts Empire is too small. She urges us to resist by identifying "its working parts, and dismantle them one by one. No target is too small. No victory is insignificant." It is in this spirit that we craft our vision of gender justice in the context of neoliberalism, global restructuring, and privatisation. Fundamental to this vision is the recognition that women have been key to late 20th-century social movements – indigenous, feminist, anti-racist, anti-colonial, environmental, labour, peasant, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transexual (LGBT), and anti-globalisation, creating and cross-pollinating more just, democratic, and sustainable economic values, practices, and institutions that many see as the basis of a new "solidarity economy". Feminist economists have long argued that the values of a solidarity economy – cooperation, equity in all its dimensions, economic democracy, local and community control, and sustainability

– are commensurate with global struggles for gender justice (Nelson 2006, Allard and Matthaei 2008). While place-based struggles and contextual approaches to women's resistance to privatisation and commercialisation are key to understanding larger struggles for gendered economic justice, it is the universal principles embodied in the right to equity and dignity in varied economic practices, the right to clean, sanitary and sustainable living arrangements, the right to develop relationships and households based on autonomous sexual choices, the right to bear children or not, and even the right to leisure for working-class/poor women that constitute the broad parameters of our vision of gender justice. Thus, documenting forms of resistance and evidence of alternative visions in the terms we have laid out in this chapter is itself an important contribution. Our hope is that activists, scholars, advocates, and practitioners will take up the tactics and strategies outlined below in pursuit of this vision of gender equity and more just and democratic systems of governance.

Governance practice, institutional settings, and women's agency

From the Chipko Movement to protect the forests in northern India to *Las Madres de la Plaza de Mayo* in Argentina (Safa 1990) to the Cochabamba "Water War", women have been a formidable source of power and protest, but women have also seen their victories usurped as protest movements take on formalised structures. Molyneux's (1985) analysis of "women's emancipation" as it was taken up by the Sandinista government after the Nicaraguan Revolution provides insight into the processes that give rise to the subordination of women's interests. Molyneux distinguishes between "practical gender interests" and "strategic gender interests". Practical gender interests ease the hardships for women struggling under conditions of poverty but do not subvert the systems of inequality that perpetuate their subordination. Challenging those systems requires the development of strategic gender interests, those based on an "analysis of women's subordination and from the formulation of an alternative, more satisfactory set of arrangements to those which exist" (Molyneux 1985, 232). Thus, strategic gender interests work towards undoing gendered divisions of labour, male violence, and unequal political representation.

In many ways commitments to gender and participation have been used as a charitable front for profitable endeavours. The necessary focus on women's experiences has been overlooked in the process of developing "toolboxes" of gender mainstreaming techniques designed to expedite and streamline the process of creating new markets for commercialised water, sanitation, health, and electricity services, and although there are clear critiques of the role of international financial institutions, the analysis is a bit murkier in regard to the work of the UN bodies and the international NGOs that have taken shape around issues of gender inequality. Speaking of the gendered health initiatives emerging through global platforms, such

as the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), Harcourt notes the complexities of women's engagement with international bodies: "While such global processes open up new spaces for women's solidarity and network building with the new communication technologies and new economic resources, it is also pushing women into new forms of poverty" (2003, 6–7). Broad policy commitments do not easily lend themselves to concrete, practical actions and are made more tenuous by the predictable tensions between stated interests in gender equality, programmatic commitments to a market-based system of service provision, and (in the case of health care in particular) the rising power of fundamentalist religious authorities (Shiva 2005). Harcourt's observation suggests that meaningful change does not begin at the top, but must be generated from the ground up, at local levels of experience and organising.

Beyond protest and critique, people's movements are beginning to construct alternative practices and paradigms for access to and management of resources. The struggles over access to water, health, and electricity are also struggles for creating inclusive models of democratic governance that empower people (Balanyá et al., 2005). The question for us is how and to what extent women and/or women-based groups have been or can be part of the process of imagining and creating alternatives. Though it is certainly the case that community-managed resources are more accountable to the needs of people, it is also the case that gender, class/caste, religious, and racial/ethnic relations inform processes at the community level. Laurie's (2011) analysis of the roles of women in the Cochabamba "Water War" illustrates the contradictory gender relations embedded in this iconic struggle. Laurie found that while women were active members of the Cochabamba protests, they were also solely responsible for the reproductive work that was necessary to maintain the protests – cooking, providing water, and attending to families. Thus, while women were centrally involved in the "Water War", gendered ideologies and expectations may remain unchanged.

Opening doors: Rethinking women's participation and decision making

> The challenge is how to open doors, doors and not windows, doors and hopefully big doors so we can take over decision-making spaces. That doesn't mean just being present; I am tired of that kind of tokenism in which women leaders are delegated to the same domestic role within the board of directors in the water organization as in the homes. It's not enough to say that women hold a leadership position. We must ask: what is the quality of this post or what kinds of decisions are they allowed to make? (Gomez 2009, 15)

Gomez calls attention to the necessity of an approach to gendering alternative movements that goes beyond formal statements and participatory

quotas, beyond visibility to the power to make decisions. The larger question here is how to move from the politics of representation to a politics of equity and justice. We have argued that gendered assumptions are embedded in systems and institutions, naturalised into discourses, practices, and policies that structure access and resource management, and give shape to the presumed roles and alleged capabilities of women that are deeply ingrained in local, state, national, and international contexts. Because gender is so integral to these processes, gender inequalities cannot be undone by simply ensuring that women gain numerical parity with men. Instead, a feminist approach is one that challenges gender inequalities in a way that builds on and develops women's agency (Ahlers and Zwarteveen 2009). The examples we review take steps to not merely bring women to the table but to enhance the power they have over decisions that affect their lives.

Bringing women to the table in meaningful ways has been a major challenge for women-based groups and gender advocates. A particularly trenchant issue has been the resistance of male community members to the increased public presence of women. There are, however, examples of women's groups and project teams that have effectively stifled male resistance and even induced male appreciation for women's active roles in resource management. The work of SEWA, the Self-Employed Women's Association (India), has been invaluable in this respect. The struggles over women's meaningful participation were brought into sharp relief through SEWA's "Women, Water and Work" campaign, which later became the "Millennium Water Campaign". The campaign covers 11 districts in 500 villages and seeks to bring women into water projects as active participants in the locally operated water boards and committees. Women were initially hesitant to serve on these boards, and male villagers were even more resistant: "[Men] were critical of women entering the public domain on this issue, and several went so far as to say they would not drink water from a source created by women. Many threatened not to work on water harvesting structures that would be managed by women. Some men openly said women would make financial blunders and force them to mortgage their lands (as all land titles are in men's names) to repay their debts" (Panda 2005, 8). Regarding itself as a "militant" organisation, SEWA continued to facilitate the inclusion of women on water user committees despite this resistance. SEWA's persistence worked to increase women's agency in the water project but also within communities and homes. As Panda (2005) reports, the spheres of activities that women engage in have broadened to include new women-based institutions with strong links to governance structures.

Male resistance to women's roles in public spaces is not unique to SEWA's experience, but in some cases it has been so strong as to require alternative sites for women's participation. Such was the case in a community-based water management committee in the Ghogha Region of Gujarat, India, where a women's "self-help group" (SHG) was created. Ahmed (2005)

looks at one example of a SHG in the Ghogha Region that was formed by *Utthan*, a local NGO that facilitates the participation of local communities in the construction and maintenance of water supply systems. The *Utthan* project facilitators explicitly sought to increase the role of women in decision-making realms but found that male resistance was quite formidable. In the village of Neswad, women reported that male attendees would complain to husbands about their wives' participation, thus acting as a form of social control on women's participation. *Utthan* opted to form a SHG to "provide a 'safe' place for women to voice their priorities and articulate their opinions" (Ahmed 2005, 79). In this case, the SHG operated as a site for women to voice their concerns and a stage from which to launch concerted actions that benefited women in particular and the community in general.

A Rural Energy Development Programme (REDP) in Nepal, a joint effort between the Nepalese government and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), also wanted to increase the role of women but recognised that specific efforts would need to be made to sensitise men to women's increased presence in the public arena. The project focused on creating community organisations (COs) that formed the basis for the functional groups, which are the decision-making bodies in regard to community energy needs. The REDP project considered it important to organise gender-differentiated COs in order to provide a space for women to voice their concerns, noting that "in mixed groups women only tend to nod their heads in unison rather than genuinely participate in discussions and decisions" (Winrock, n.d.). Women-only COs are drawn into decision-making processes through the functional groups, which require membership of both male and female COs. The results of this project suggest that women have made gains beyond greater access to energy sources. In several districts, women manage the microhydro schemes, and, in some cases, husbands watched the children while their wives participated in the training to become managers. While gains appear to have been made through this project, the focus on gender is not met with a necessary focus on the role of caste in the villages where, as the report notes, caste hierarchies exist. It is not clear how or if the project conceptualised gender in relation to class/caste.

In some cases, women have organised themselves in attempts to fill the gaps in service left by unresponsive governments. In northeast Brazil, a group of women began to notice that the Olho d'Agua River, located in Santa Cruz da Baixa Verde, was drying up, largely due to the effects of large-scale irrigation projects. The river was a lifeline to the women who made their homes along its banks. The Rural Women Workers Movement of Sertao Central (MMTR) and the Rural Workers Labour Union (STR), a municipal-level union, began to organise themselves and the community in order to save the river from "dying" (Branco and Almeida 2002). At the time of Branco's writing about the project, it was in its initial stages but included plans to contact each of the families affected as a mobilisation

strategy, conduct workshops with all members of the community with the assistance of gender and environment experts, and involve local authorities in the project once a broad-based coalition had been formed. Though the project began through the efforts of women, men also became involved in the activities, believing that saving the river will contribute to the sustainability of the community. In 2002, the project planners also began to make alliances with the Federation of Agricultural Workers (FETAPE), a state-level union. This project illustrates the process of women forming activist groups at the community level, while also making strides to connect to broader political goals and organisations. This strategy allows community groups to make connections to large-scale political processes through a bottom-up process of collective action.

While beginning with women's everyday experiences is necessary to the process of creating alternatives that are accountable to women, the continued marginalisation of women's interests compels partnerships with groups and organisations outside of the local context in order to obtain funding, access to media and technical assistance. Gender budgeting advocates, for example, take this approach to organising for women's interests. Gender budgeting initiatives (GBI) draw from the contestatory framework of Latin American public budgeting (PB) programmes but build on them by denaturalising the assumed gender neutrality of the budgeting process. PB is a model of economic governance that devolves power over financial decision making to local levels of governance, where communities and civic groups engage in setting budget priorities and overseeing expenditures. PB experiments began at the municipal level through the work of community leaders and the Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB) in São Paulo and Santa Catarina within the context of an authoritarian Brazilian government (Souza 2001). In this context, facilitating the participation of the people served to put pressure on an unresponsive government and worked to create systems of governance that were responsive to the needs of people. PB thus emerged as a challenge to the absolute power of strong, centralised governments, and these early examples set the stage for future attempts at redressing unequal and unaccountable government budgets. While the value of PB has surely been demonstrated in the Latin American context, the assumption that budgets are gender-neutral instruments has largely remained in place in those initiatives (UNIFEM 2009).

Since the mid-1980s, a series of budget initiatives have been launched in over 60 countries that extend the critical and participatory elements of PB beyond the assumed gender neutrality of conventional budgeting practices (Budlender and Hewitt 2003). These initiatives are models of collective action that include the efforts of international organisations, national, state, and local governments and NGOs working at the grassroots level. Gender budgeting facilitates an analysis of budgets at multiple levels of governance but can also be used to analyse the spending priorities of non-governmental entities (Villagomez 2004). The implementation of gender-budgeting initiatives

at local levels of governance has particular relevance because decentralisation has meant that public services are often provided at these local levels (Budlender and Hewitt 2003). With regard to creating alternatives, gender budgeting can be used to pressure local governments to be accountable to agreements that have been made at the international level. For example, Khosla (2003) notes that feminist organisations in Mexico have made use of gender budgeting to illustrate the gaps created by unfunded mandates made by Mexican authorities through the ICPD. In this way, gender budgets deal "directly with the responsibility of governments to international commitments to women, namely equality in the distribution, access and funding of public resources" (Villagomez 2004, 4). The application of gender-budgeting processes to groups and organisations working to create alternatives can work to ensure that women's needs are met and that women's labour is properly accounted for by alternative systems.

What seems evident from the above review is the gap between international agreements on women's equality and national action on these agreements. However, gender justice activists continue to utilise these agreements in their work. The new (as of 2010) UN entity, UN Women, was created to address this precise gap, to pressure nation states to address questions of gender equity in economic, political, social, and cultural arenas. What is also obvious is the existence of male resistance and patriarchal cultures at all levels in women's struggles for democratic and just alternatives. These structural issues and institutional cultures need to be addressed directly in imagining and enacting alternatives. Alternatives that are gender sensitive, that centralise women's experiences in the origin of the project, that define women's roles as leaders and decision makers, and that defend this position through the life of the project are likely to be more effective than projects that are not attentive to these issues. Additionally, alternatives that provide women with economic assistance and security (as SEWA does) and those that provide women with skills, knowledge, and political education to mobilise their strategic interests are likely to have the most lasting impact in terms of gender justice.

Democratising knowledge: Critical literacy and alternative pedagogies

At the heart of creating alternatives that are responsive to issues of equity and access for women is the question of knowledge production. How do we come to know what the best arrangements are for all women? Given that neoliberal policies assume a "generic and oppressed" Third World woman, the task for feminist research is to excavate the ideological basis of these assumptions and privilege the lived realities that are concealed by them. A productive and sustainable approach to gendering alternatives compels us to recognise that "knowledge *is* produced by activist and community-based political work – that some knowledge can *only emerge within these*

contexts and locations" (Alexander and Mohanty 2010, 27; emphasis added). This approach thus addresses the question of what gets to count as knowledge and who counts as knowledgeable and suggests a reprioritisation of subaltern knowledges and experiences.

Mainstream development projects have focused their efforts on training communities and groups in the methods of resource management developed by academics and practitioners situated in the global North. This approach often valorises Northern-centric models of resource management, obscures the biases with which development practice operates, "evades the question of whether 'modernity' is desirable...[and] neglects the issue of local, subjugated knowledges" (Wieringa 1994, 841). Whereas mainstream development projects assume an approach that is "universally rational and efficient" (Boelens and Zwarteveen 2005, 753), indigenous approaches are sensitive to local environmental conditions and have created complex modes of distribution that can accommodate the needs of diverse constituents (Adams et al., 1997). Trawick argues a similar point in his analysis of the problems associated with the privatisation of water systems in Peru where water laws were based on "rational" use models that "failed to achieve an equitable and efficient distribution of the resource" (2003, 985). By contrast, he argues, the models that have been employed in the Andean region since precolonial times are models that are attentive to the local geographical terrain and the equity concerns that exist in the region. While we need to be careful to not romanticise the "equitable community", learning about indigenous methods of resource management provides a means of acquiring cultural competence in structuring alternatives.

Practitioners working in the health care field have similarly critiqued the top-down approach to knowledge production. Alternative approaches to health care have, in some cases, sought to remedy this situation in order to build sustainable systems of delivery that make sense for the communities in which they work. The Zimbabwean coalition Community Working Group on Health (CWGH) is an example of a health research, education, and advocacy project that works to undo the "one-way transfer of knowledge from technocrats to the community" in order to make health education more relevant to the local context (Chigudu 2007, 256). Their work takes on the gender neutrality of "traditional" (meaning technocratic, top-down) information, education, and communication approaches to HIV/AIDS education and awareness that do not address the "unequal gender power relations, and notions of masculinity and femininity that shape expectations [and]...erode women's and girls' ability to negotiate safe sex, make informed choices regarding reproduction, and enjoy control over their bodies" (Chigudu 2007, 263). By contrast, CWGH works extensively with men and women to bring issues of sex and sexuality to the fore in order to adequately address issues of power and inequality between men and women that endanger women's sexual health, freedom, and choice.

The CWGH also trains community members in the process of collecting local data that can then be used to advocate for themselves in the policy arena. It is the belief of CWGH that information generated by the community is more likely to be credible to the community, and this facilitates the advocacy efforts of the communities they work with. This is similar to the goal of the AMANITARE coalition in Africa, which works to "create a knowledgeable constituency that would act as a pressure group to influence health and legal professionals, political institutions and society at large" (Ochieng 2003, 41). The CWGH takes the research process one step further to include "report-back sessions". During these sessions, the results of the research are discussed with community members, and resolutions may be made to address the concerns that arise in the project. For example, after hearing the stories of several women who made use of dangerous methods for abortion and listening to the reasons why they would seek an abortion, one community opted to campaign for the full legalisation of abortion. These examples of efforts anchored in women's everyday lives and struggles provide models for the development of alternatives that embody women's strategic interests, focusing as they do on education, accountability, and women's leadership.

Similar efforts have been made by gender budget advocates who call attention and create resistance to the gendered impacts of macroeconomic policies related to trade, investment debt repayments, and market liberalisation – policies largely regarded as gender neutral and/or policies that have been depoliticised by neoliberalism (Cagatay 2003). One such initiative is the Gender and Economic Reforms in Africa (GERA) programme. GERA began in 1996 and consists of African women researchers, advocates, and activists who are particularly concerned with extending gendered analyses of budgets beyond national budgetary processes. GERA is also concerned, however, with the process of knowledge production and thus works towards bringing women into the research process with the understanding that "research is an important means of empowering women and marginalised groups" (Randriamaro 2003, 45). Importantly, GERA's work moves beyond empowerment as the appropriation of women's experiences to coordinating women's voices and experiences into a cohesive source of opposition. "GERA advocates for African gender researchers and activists to re-claim the concept of gender mainstreaming, so that it plays the role of a political tool for women's empowerment, instead of a technical device for legitimising inequitable trade and economic policies" (Randriamaro 2003, 48). The GERA approach to reclaiming gender mainstreaming is to organise a pan-African network of active and engaged activists, researchers, policy makers, and scholars who can work together to transform economic policies and processes.

Gendering alternative, democratic structures of governance and resource management demand that alternative methods of presenting and sharing information also be developed. In an innovative example, a Handpump

Technology project in rural Costa Rica produced educational materials that explicitly strove to destabilise gender binaries (Aguilar 2005). The educational materials consisted of manuals that illustrated the process of building and maintaining hand pumps. In the manuals, women and men were each pictured in non-traditional gender roles (i.e. women were installing hand pumps, and men were caring for children), there was equal male/female representation throughout the manual, and gender-neutral language was also used. In addition to the strategic use of gendered images, the manuals were also created in a manner that allowed people who could not read to follow the steps necessary for building and repairing the hand pumps (Aguilar 2005). In this way, the relatively simple task of producing educational materials becomes an important route to destabilising gender binaries and educational hierarchies. Similarly, the South African Women's Budget Initiative (WBI) has employed strategies to democratise participation in gender budgeting exercises. What these examples show is that while resource and budget management has been construed as the realm of educated bureaucrats, these modes of management have worked to exclude laypersons from active participation in the legal and economic structures that affect their lives. But activist groups are deconstructing the mantle of bureaucratic authority that has stifled the participation of citizens. Such is the case in Ecuador where a coalition group of activists are in the process of drafting a new constitution: "What's been really important is that this new constitution has been created by a group of citizens, environmentalists, women, economists, architects, farmers, and social leaders. We've broken with the notion that the constitution is only for lawyers, only for constitutionalists" (Martines 2009, 27). For those groups that have sought to democratise resource management, knowledge has to be created by all and extended to all.

In all sectors a lack of gender-disaggregated data has been perhaps the greatest barrier to designing policies that are responsive to women's needs. This is true at both the macro and micro levels of policy making. As such, feminist researchers have sought new methods of data collection that work towards illuminating women's contributions. At the micro level, GBI worked to make visible women's unpaid labour in the home and in the community, to enumerate the extent to which their unpaid labour bolsters economies, and to quantify the impacts on women of the reductions in public services (Khosla 2003). Budlender et al. (2006) have identified an approach to gender budgeting that allows for data collection at the micro level in order to fill the gaps created by the neglect of women's work in national indicators called the Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS). The CBMS approach facilitates the collection of disaggregated data at the level of the community and household and is conducted at the lowest administrative level of governance in order to provide the most detailed information to local-level government planners. The value of this approach is that it covers a relatively small area but captures data and information that is

neglected by state and national surveys. In regard to gender budgeting, the CBMS approach facilitates a data-backed discussion of the productive and economic value of women's unpaid labour.

Whereas the CBMS approach does not appear to directly draw women into the process of negotiating budgetary priorities, a method identified as the "interpretive focus group" (IFG) may assist in that process. The IFG was developed by Dodson et al. (2007) as a means of bridging the "interpretive" gap between researchers and participants of differing social locations and is a model of practice drawn from feminist participatory action research. Although the CBMS approach strives to make visible the economic contributions of women's unpaid labour, the gap between researcher and participant may work against the process. The IFG provides a means of overcoming this distance by involving participants in the analysis of their responses. Dodson et al. (2007) argue that IFGs have two central purposes: first, they include participants in the research process through the final stage; and second, they ensure the accuracy and appropriateness of the researchers' evaluation of the data. Thus, the CBMS approach in tandem with the IFG provides a methodological approach to acquiring gender-sensitive data that is also accountable to the differences between women. To further the relationships between women, the findings from the CBMS as analysed through the IFG may also be shared amongst various groups of women in a process of knowledge sharing. These methods of research provide a model for building alternatives that are grounded in the needs of those groups that are marginalised by neoliberal development policy and discourse. They also work to train these groups in the process of advocating for what they want and need. In this way, alternative research practices create alternative models of citizenship and action that are necessary for building accountability into alternative models of resource management.

The value of knowledge sharing for the creation of alternatives is that it works to make connections across communities whether those communities are geographical or social. These knowledge-sharing exercises permit the cross-fertilisation of understanding, both in terms of similarities of struggle but also in terms of strategies for resistance. SEWA's "Women, Water and Work" campaign, again, serves an instructive purpose here. The campaign included groups and organisations from 11 districts and 500 villages, and the vastness of the project meant that information sharing was an important part of the overall success of the programme. To facilitate this part of the project, SEWA organised monthly information meetings that were held in selected villages where the successful initiatives had occurred. As noted by Panda:

> This is essentially a lateral learning process between members providing them with opportunity to learn from each other as well as visit different parts of the state to get a first-hand knowledge of how water problems have been tackled by other women. Thus, this is not only an

> exposure visit meant to build capacities of women, but also an empowering experience. (2005, 7)

We suggest that projects that frame gender equity as an epistemological project, in terms of the transformation of practices and institutions, and as lived culture are the most successful in addressing women's strategic interests. It is this framework of envisioning alternatives that emerges in the conceptualisation of place-based struggles in the discussion that follows.

GENDER JUSTICE AND PLACE-BASED STRUGGLES

> Our objective, even if it is unconscious, is to reactivate the processes of participation, to re-appropriate in our own hands our own resources of our own communities, contexts, territories: From the little, without the big. Related to 'the big', related to the general themes, to grand values, grand issues, universal struggles, but, within the dynamics of the small, of the quotidian. (interview, Porte Alegre 2003, cited in Osterweil 2005, 184)

The critique of the managerial and bureaucratised development apparatus, and of the NGOisation of the women's movement, as discussed earlier, led to a distancing by some women's rights scholars and activists from the UN establishment. As many feminist activists have become disillusioned with the UN system, they have moved to a more effective, transformative gender justice strategy of place-based politics (Harcourt and Escobar 2005). This strategy grows organically out of women's struggles as they materialise in and through particular sites. In an effort to bring together these collective struggles under a framework that allows for cross-comparison and analysis, Harcourt and Escobar (2005) developed a "Women and the Politics of Place" (WPP) framework. The WPP framework argues that the place-based practices of women involved in social justice struggles invoke related transformations around the body (e.g. women's movements that involve sexual, productive, and reproductive rights), the environment (ecological and environmental justice movements), and the economy (social and economic justice movements). In other words, the WPP framework makes capacious use of "place". It refers not only to place as territorially based but also to place as a site of struggle for gender justice, particularly in relation to women's bodies, their environments, and their economic activities. Importantly, place is also attentive to difference, diversity, and specificity in relation to these struggles as well as to larger, global processes. It is to the imbrications between global processes and the politics of place that we now turn.

Place-based movements and activism should not be regarded as place-bound (Harcourt and Escobar 2005). Instead, the framework suggests that places act as prisms that refract global economic and governance structures,

bending and shaping them in ways that make sense within the politics of particular sites and in different communities: what Michal Osterweil calls a "place-based globalism" (2005). This is not to suggest that global processes exact a determined force on the ground. Rather, it is a recognition that global processes become part of the terrain upon which women struggle and this perspective compels us to see the ways that women are politicised and act through these changes. The defence of one's right to survive in the face of the overwhelming valorisation of markets compels new strategies and modes of resistance that challenge left political organising, as well as hegemonic development discourses and practices, and create new modes of globalised struggle. Recognising the power of place privileges local and translocal modes of resistance to totalising theories of global processes, and seeks to valorise those movements. As sites where global processes are materialised, the analytical value of a place-based framework lies in thinking through place as a unit of analysis.

The pertinence of a place-based framework is borne out by the scholarship on anti-privatisation water movements and the creation of alternatives to privatisation, which can be read as place-based, economic justice struggles – what others have called "territory based" (Spronk 2007) or livelihood struggles. For instance, Danilo Urea, a Colombian, says that water struggles lead not just to a reappropriation of water sources but also their territories:

> We are told that "territory" means the land, but really territory means the construction of a life profoundly rooted in our natural heritage. The river, the watershed, the mountain, all this forms part of what we mean by territory, and all of it is profoundly linked to culture. So for our communities, organisations, and movements in Latin America, the defence of territory is fundamental; protecting territory is protecting culture, and water runs through both. (2009, 7)

Similarly, Spronk (2007) discusses territorially based organisations versus class-based organisations in anti-privatisation struggles in Bolivia, where membership is based on participation in daily struggles and the focus is on living conditions and neighbourhood issues, not just workers' rights. All of the above are examples of struggles that grow out of lived realities that draw on indigenous knowledge and participatory decision making in the context of larger struggles for equity and democracy.

As *Changing the Flow: Report on Water Movements in Latin America* (Bell et al., 2009) illustrates, the recent water wars engaged place-based local and regional movements, leading to a new vision of water democracy based on principles of equity and access in resource management, exchange technical and indigenous knowledge across linguistic, cultural, and national borders, ecological and environmental sustainability, and community participation founded on reciprocity and collective and inclusive

recognition. Women are centrally involved in these struggles, although they tend to not be visible in leadership positions. As Marcela Olivera from Red Vida (Bolivia) states:

> It is true that the role of women is more invisible but that doesn't signify that it is less important in the element of water. Red Vida is a network propelled by women. It's a network where there's a diversity of organizations, everything from unions to non-profit organizations to grassroots organizations, but women are the driving force. I think it's rich that women have appropriated the defence of water. On our continent, at least, the face of the movement is the face of a woman. (2009, 34–35)

Envisioning alternatives to privatisation that address questions of gender equity necessitates attentiveness to the ways in which women have organised around their own practical and strategic gender interests.

This model contrasts sharply with the formal leadership structure and official platforms generated by older forms of internationalism that required a centralised strategy of action detached from the specificities of place and gendered realities and suggests the need to shift to a model of organisation embedded in what Rocheleau describes as "rooted networks" (2005, 84) of people involved in place-based politics anchored in vertical (class/race/gender hierarchies) and horizontal (cross-national/cultural/linguistic borders) resistance networks. These rooted networks signify a place-based globalism that Osterweil argues "is not simply a tactical or technological perspective for effectively reaching the global scale; it also constitutes an ethico-political vision, a basis for revisioning political practice at a global scale without succumbing to a totalizing or universalizing approach that ignores or negates difference and specificity" (2005, 186). Using the WPP framework of place-based globalism or the notion of rooted networks of people involved in anti-privatisation struggles allows us to be attentive to gender in all the ways that we argued earlier constitute a materialist project: as knowledge/ideological frames, as institutional practices, and as lived culture. This feminist framing reorients our theoretical and methodological lenses, allowing us to *see* women and to centralise their/our everyday lives so that the prisms through which we understand global economic processes are gendered.

What these cases illustrate is a move away from coalitions based on homogenised identity politics to coalitions rooted in place-based struggles that kaleidoscope difference and diversity into powerful social justice movements. This is illustrated by Brazil's National Environmental Sanitation Front, which brought together unions, public municipal sanitation workers, neighbourhood committees and peasants: an entire cross-class/gender/race coalition in defence of water (Melo 2009). Similarly, in Ecuador, the constitutional "Human Right to Water" was written by a group of "citizens,

environmentalists, women, economists, architects, farmers, and social leaders" (Martines 2009, 27). When we look specifically at the gendered aspects of place-based organising, we can see a critique of the domestication of women in stereotypically gendered ways through the commodification of water, electricity, and health and the reconstitution of a public/private divide. In contrast, we argue that the politics of place offers a way to rethink and reconfigure alternatives that are accountable to women's struggles in access to and control over municipal services. Our approach centralises the agency that women express in their everyday lives, which are not usually lived through the public/private binary that is assumed in neoliberal policies and practices. The structure of alternatives that we argue for would recognise and build on the agency that women enact through practices of survival and resistance and that often occur in places that are neither wholly public nor wholly private. Countering the reprivatisation of women, then, calls for an imagining of new publics that work against the neoliberal model of atomising resource management along the lines of a public/private divide, and through which women are able to exert autonomy and influence. Alternatives cannot be just technical projects; they must also be projects aimed at creating transformative publics.

POSTSCRIPT: TOWARDS GENDER EQUITY PROJECTS IN ALTERNATIVES TO PRIVATISATION

As privatised and commercialised systems of service delivery fail to deliver on their promise of increased access, a new moment is opening up that is ripe for anti-privatisation activists. The crisis of global capital is a moment of opportunity for its critics. Imagining and enacting alternatives that do not recreate race/class/caste/gender/indigenous inequalities means that women from marginalised groups must be at the centre of analysis. This approach is one that makes use of the framework of WPP to understand women's livelihood strategies. This is an epistemological project that seeks a nuanced understanding of women's practices of accessing health, water, and electricity services. This approach is open to traditional research methods so long as feminist methodological concerns shape the research process. In a very general sense, feminist researchers engage strategies that "excavate" women's experiences. This process of excavation is one that strives to "elicit accounts and produce descriptions...of practice and thought that are part of female consciousness but left out of dominant interpretive frames" (DeVault 1999, 65). Thus, it requires an approach that moves away from generalisations to specific accounts of the social divisions that mediate structures of access and distribution.

Concretely, there must be a commitment to including women in numbers that are either equal to or greater than men. Beyond numerical parity, however, there must be a commitment to advancing women's agency within

these groups. We suggest the inclusion of a gender justice advocate as part of the project team who can mediate discussions in favour of women's active participation, someone who is willing to do the difficult work of redistributing power within male-dominated groups. There is also a need to accurately account for women's labour contributions in the health, water, and electricity sectors. One means of accounting for women's unaccounted activities is to employ a time-use study that is attentive to women's work in the household as well as their income-generating activities. In a similar approach, Elson (1995) argues for analyses of "waterpoints" that can illuminate the patterns of water usage by particular women. Time-use or waterpoint studies can work to illustrate the analytical value of a place-based approach by employing these methods in multiple settings in order to empirically understand the similarities and differences of women's lives in different contexts. More generally, seeking alternatives that are accountable to gendered inequalities requires coalitions with women's groups – the "invented spaces" of participation that emerge organically in response to threats to women's lives. Engaging with women and women's groups at multiple levels of social hierarchies entails a commitment to producing empirical studies of their activities, their goals, and their modes of resource use and management. We are advocating for a bottom-up process that recognises and seeks to augment women's agency in order to create alternatives that are accountable to multiple constituencies. These are only a handful of options that may be employed for those seeking to document or conduct new studies on gendered alternatives to privatisation. Given the lack of attention to women in resource management, the possibilities are virtually endless.

To conclude, this chapter suggests that women's experiences, specifically the experiences of women who have been reprivatised through the commodification of municipal services, should be the most basic unit of analysis when thinking through questions of equity and access with regard to alternatives. This involves a commitment of energy and resources to gain a deep understanding of the community that is intended to benefit from the alternative service, including attention to the relevant identity categories such as class/caste composition, wealth distribution (measured in local terms, i.e. land, income, etc.), educational levels and disparities (by wealth and gender), gender composition, religious orientations, and race/ethnic divisions. We have argued that in terms of gender justice, alternatives to privatisation and commercialisation cannot be narrowly circumscribed but must be envisioned as part of a larger struggle for women's rights and economic and social justice. Women cannot be treated as a "special interest" group – economic gender justice and non-private service delivery systems are core aspects of a larger anti-capitalist struggle and of a universal vision for equity and freedom. Taking women's interests as central to building alternatives requires us to move beyond the liberal frame of "gender mainstreaming" and the neoliberal frame of "women's empowerment" to an

approach that recognises and builds on women's agency. This shift begins in the lives of women, learns from their perspective, and formulates policies that are attentive to local, place-based struggles as they exist within structures of privilege, power, and inequality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Amanda Wilson for getting us started with an initial bibliography on gender and alternatives to privatisation.

REFERENCES

Adams, W.M., Warren, E.E. and Mutiso, S.K. 1997. Water, rules and gender: Water rights in an indigenous irrigation system, Marakwet, Kenya. *Development and Change* 28: 707–730.

Agarwal, B. 2001. Participatory exclusions, community forestry, and gender: An analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework. *World Development* 29(10): 1623–1648.

Aguilar, L. 2005. Water as a source of equity and empowerment in Costs Rica. In Bennett, V., Dávila-Pobelete, S. and Nieves Rico, M. (Eds), *Opposing currents: The politics of water and gender in Latin America*, pp. 123–134. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Ahlers, R. and Zwarteveen, M. 2009. The water question in feminism: Water control and gender inequities in a neo-liberal era. *Gender, Place and Culture* 16(4): 409–426.

Ahmed, S. 2005. Negotiating gender equity through decentralised water management in coastal Gujarat: The case of UTTHAN. In Ahmed, S. (Ed.), *Flowing upstream: Empowering women through water management initiatives in India,* pp. 51–92. Ahmedabad: Foundation Books Pvt. Ltd.

Alexander, J.M. and Mohanty, C.T. (Eds). 1997. *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*. London: Routledge.

———. 2010. Cartographies of knowledge and power: Transnational feminism as radical praxis. In Lock Swarr, A. and Nagar, R. (Eds), *Critical transnational feminist praxis,* pp. 23–45. Albany: SUNY Press.

Allard, J. and Matthaei, J. 2008. Introduction. In Allard, J., Davidson, C. and Matthaei, J. (Eds), *Solidarity economy: Building alternatives for people and the planet,* pp. 1–18. Chicago: ChangeMaker Publications.

Annecke, W. 2009. Still in the shadows: Women and gender relations in the electricity sector in South Africa. In McDonald, D.A. (Ed.), *Electric capitalism: Recolonizing Africa on the power grid*, pp. 288–320. London: Earthscan.

Anzaldua, G. and Moraga, C. 1981. *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of colour.* San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press.

Babb, F. 1996. After the revolution: Neoliberal policy and gender in Nicaragua. *Latin American Perspectives* 23(1): 27–48.

Balanyá, B., Brennan, B., Huedeman, O., Kiguamoto, S. and Terharst, P. (Eds). 2005. *Reclaiming public water: Achievements, struggles and visions from around the world.* Porto Alegre, Brazil: Transnational Institute and Corporate Europe Observatory.

Batliwala, S. and Reddy, A.K.N. 2003. Energy for women and women for energy (engendering energy and empowering women). *Energy for Sustainable Development* 7(3): 33–43.

Bayliss, K. 2001. Privatisation of electricity distribution: Some economic, social and political perspectives. London: Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU). www.psiru.org/publicationsindex.asp.

Beall, J. 2005. Decentralizing government and decentering gender: Lessons from local government reform in South Africa. *Politics and Society* 33: 253–276.

Beckman, E. 2001. The Eighth Encuentro. *NACLA Report on the Americas* 34(5): 32–33.

Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds). 2009. *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America*. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red VIDA, and Transnational Institute.

Beneria, L. 1999. Structural adjustment policies. In Peterson, J. and Lewis, M. (Eds), *The Elgar companion to feminist economics,* pp. 687–694. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Bernal, G.E., Bissell, S. and Cortes, A. 1999. Effects of globalization on the efforts to decriminalize abortion in Mexico. *Development and Change* (42)4: 130–133.

Boelens, R. and Zwarteveen, M. 2005. Prices and politics in Andean water reforms. *Development and Change* 36(4): 735–758.

Branco, A. and Almeida, V. 2002. Women, mobilization and the revitalization of water resources: The case of Northeastern Brazil. Paper prepared for the Forum for Water in the Americas in the 21st Century, Mexico City, DF, February.

Brown, R. 2010. Unequal burden: Water privatisation and women's human rights in Tanzania. *Gender and Development* 18(1): 59–67.

Budlender, D. and Hewitt, G. 2003. *Engendering budgets: A practitioner's guide to understanding and implementing gender-responsive budgets*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Budlender, D., Reyes, C. and Melesse, M. 2006. *Gender-responsive budgeting through the CBMS lens*. Discussion Paper Series No. 2006–17, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS). www.dirp4.pids.gov.ph/ris/dps/pidsdps0617.pdf.

Cagatay, N. 2003. Gender budgets and beyond: Feminist fiscal policy in the context of globalization. *Gender and Development* 11(1): 15–24.

Castro, J.E. 2007. Poverty and citizenship: Sociological perspectives on water services and public-private participation. *Geoforum* 38: 756–771.

Cecelski, E. 2000. Enabling equitable access to rural electrification: Current thinking and major activities in energy, poverty and gender. Briefing Paper prepared for Asia Alternative Energy Policy and Project Development Support: Emphasis on Poverty Alleviation and Women. The World Bank, January 2000. www.sarpn.org.za/genderenergy/resources/cecelski/energypovertygender.pdf.

Chigudu, H. 2007. Deepening our understanding of community-based participatory research: Lessons from work around reproductive rights in Zimbabwe. *Gender and Development* 15(2): 259–270.

Clancy, J. 2000. *Policies, projects and the market empowering women? Some initial reactions to developments in the energy sector.* Working Paper Series Technology and Development Group No. 105. Enschede: University of Twente, Technology and Development Group.

———. 2002. *The gender-energy-poverty nexus: Finding the energy to address gender concerns in development*. DFID Project CNTR998521. London: DFID.

Cleaver, F. 1998. Choice, complexity, and change: Gendered livelihoods and the management of water. *Agriculture and Human Values* (15): 293–299.

———. 2000. Analyzing gender roles in community natural resource management. *IDS Bulletin* 31(2): 60–67.

Davis, A.Y. 1985. *Violence against women and the ongoing challenge to racism*. Latham: Kitchen Table Press.

Delgado, J.R.V. 2005. Irrigation management, the participatory approach, and equity in an Andean community. In Bennett, V., Dávila-Pobelete, S. and Nieves Rico, M. (Eds), *Opposing currents: The politics of water and gender in Latin America,* pp. 109–122. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

DeVault, M. 1999. *Liberating method: Feminism and social research*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Dodson, L., Piatelli, D. and Schmalzbauer, L. 2007. Researching inequality through interpretive collaborations: Shifting power and the unspoken contract. *Qualitative Inquiry* 13: 821–843.

Elson, D. 1995. Gender awareness in modelling structural adjustment. *World Development* 23(11): 1851–1868.

Feminist Initiative of Cartagena. 2003. In search of an alternative development paradigm: Feminist proposals from Latin America. *Gender and Development* 11(1): 52–58.

Gomez, A.E. 2009. A new definition of hope. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America,* pp. 13–15. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.

Hall, D. 2007. *Energy privatization and reform in East Africa*. London: Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU). www.publications.marsgroupkenya.org/GAP_Report4_KPLC/PDFs/Energy_Privatisation_and_Reform_in_East_Africa.pdf.

Harcourt, W. 2003. Building alliances for women's empowerment, reproductive rights and health. *Development* 46(2): 6–12.

———. 2006. *The global women's rights movement: Power politics around the United Nations and the World Social Forum*. Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper Number 25. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Harcourt, W. and Escobar, A. (Eds). 2005. *Women and the politics of place*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Holdren, J.P. and Smith, K.R. 2000. Energy, the environment, and health. In Goldemberg, J. (Ed.), *The world energy assessment: Energy and the challenge of sustainability*, pp. 61–110. New York: UNDP.

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development). 2006. *Gender and water: Securing water for improved rural livelihoods. The multiple-uses system approach*. Rome: IFAD. Mimeo.

Jayawardena, K. 1995. *The white woman's other burden: Western women and South Asia during British rule*. London: Routledge.

Karim, R.K.M. 2006. Gendered social institutions and the management of underground irrigation water resources in a Bangladeshi village. *Gender Technology and Development* 10(1): 13–36.

Khosla, P. 2003. Water, equity and money: The need for gender-responsive budgeting in water and sanitation. The Netherlands Council for Women. Mimeo.

Laurie, N. 2011. Gender water networks: Femininity and masculinity in water politics in Bolivia. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(1): 172–188.

Manase, G., Ndamba, J. and Makoni, F. 2003. Mainstreaming gender in integrated water resources management: The case of Zimbabwe. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth* 28: 967–971.

Marchand, M. and Runyan, A. (Eds). 2000. *Gender and global restructuring: Sightings, sites and resistances*. New York: Routledge.

Martines, J.P. 2009. Keepers of water. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin*

America, pp. 27–28. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.
Matthaei, J. 1982. *An economic history of women in America: Women's work, the sexual division of labour, and the development of capitalism*. New York: Schocken Books.
McDonald, D.A. 2009. Electric capitalism: Conceptualising electricity and capital accumulation in (South) Africa. In McDonald, D.A. (Ed.), *Electric capitalism: Recolonizing Africa on the power grid,* pp. 1–49. London: Earthscan.
Meinzen-Dick, R. and Zwarteveen, M. 1998. Gendered participation in water management: Issues and illustrations from water users' associations in South Asia. *Agriculture and Human Values* 15: 337–345.
Melo, M. 2009. Alternatives for another, possible world. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America,* pp. 29–30. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.
Mies, M. 1984. *Patriarchy and accumulation on a world scale: Women in the international division of labour.* New York and London: Zed Books, Ltd.
Miraftab, F. 2004. Invited and invented spaces of participation: Neoliberal citizenship and feminists' expanded notion of politics. *Wagadu* 1: 1–7.
Mohanty, C.T. 1986. Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review* 30: 61–88.
———. 2003. *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Molyneux, M. 1985. Mobilisation without emancipation? Women's interests, the state, and revolution in Nicaragua. *Feminist Studies* 11(2): 227–254.
Mukhopadhyay, M. 2004. Mainstreaming gender or "streaming" gender away: Feminists marooned in the development business. *IDS Bulletin* 35(4): 95–103.
Nagar, R. and Writers, S. 2006. *Playing with fire: Feminist thought and activism through seven lives in India*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Nanda, P. 2002. Gender dimensions of user fees: Implications for women's utilisation of health care. *Reproductive Health Matters* 10(20): 127–134.
Naples, N. 2002. Changing the terms: Community activism, globalisation, and the dilemmas of transnational feminist praxis. In Naples, N.A. and Desai, M. (Eds), *Women's activism and globalisation: Linking local struggles and transnational politics*, pp. 3–14. New York: Routledge.
Nelson, J. 2006. *Economics for humans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ochieng, R.O. 2003. Supporting women and girls' sexual and reproductive health and rights: The Ugandan experience. *Development* 46(2): 38–44.
Olivera, M. 2009. A struggle for life. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America,* pp. 33–35. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.
O'Reilly, K. 2006. "Traditional" women, "modern" water: Linking gender and commodification in Rajasthan, India. *Geoforum* 37: 958–972.
Osterweil, M. 2005. Place-based globalism: Locating women in the alternative globalization movement. In Harcourt, W. and Escobar, A. (Eds), *Women and the politics of place*, pp. 174–189. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
Panda, S.M. 2005. Women's role in local water management: Insights from SEWA's Millenium Water Campaign in Gujarat (India). EMPOWERS Regional Symposium: End-Users Ownership and Involvement in IWRM. Cairo, Egypt, 13–17 November.
———. 2007. Mainstreaming gender in water management: A critical view. *Gender Technology and Development* 11(3): 321–338.

Pitkin, K. and Bedoya, R. 1997. Women's multiple roles in economic crisis: Constraints and adaptation. *Latin American Perspectives* 24(4): 34–49.
Pradhan, B. 2003. Measuring empowerment: A methodological approach. *Development* 46(2): 51–57.
Randriamaro, Z. 2003. African women challenging neo-liberal economic orthodoxy: The conception and mission of the GERA Programme. *Gender and Development* 11(1): 44–51.
Reddy, A.K.N. 2000. Energy and social issues. In Goldenberg, J. (Ed.), *The World energy assessment: Energy and the challenge of sustainability*, pp. 39–60. New York: UNDP.
Resurreccion, B., Real, M.J. and Pantana, P. 2004. Officialising strategies: Participatory processes and gender in Thailand's water resources sector. *Development and Practice* 14(4): 521–533.
Reyes, E. 2009. The power that makes pitchers overflow and rivers flood their banks. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America,* pp. 16–19. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.
Roberts, A. 2008. Privatizing social reproduction: The primitive accumulation of water in an era of neoliberalism. *Antipode* 40(4): 535–560.
Rocheleau, D. 2005. Political landscapes and ecologies of Zambrana-Chacuey: The legacy of Mama Tingo. In Harcourt, W. and Escobar, A. (Eds), *Women and the Politics of Place*, pp. 72–85. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
Roy, A. 2004. *An ordinary person's guide to empire*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Safa, H. 1990. Women's social movements in Latin America. *Gender and Society* 4(3): 354–369.
Sen, G. 1996. Gender, markets and states: A selective review and research agenda. *World Development* 24(5): 821–829.
Sen, G. and Grown, C. 1987. *Development, crises, and alternative visions*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
Shiva, V. 2005. *Earth democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Singh, N. 2006. Women's participation in local water governance: Understanding institutional contradictions. *Gender Technology and Development* 10(1): 61–76.
Skutsch, M.M. 2005. Gender analysis for energy projects and programmes. *Energy for Sustainable Development* 9(1): 37–52.
Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in Brazilian cities: Limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions. *Environment and Urbanization* 13(1): 159–184.
Spronk, S. 2007. Roots of resistance to urban water privatization in Bolivia: The "new working class", the crisis of neoliberalism, and public services. *International Labour and Working-Class History* 71: 8–28.
Subrahmanian, R. 2004. Making sense of gender in shifting institutional contexts: Some reflections on gender mainstreaming. *IDS Bulletin* 35(4): 89–94.
Sultana, F. 2009. Community and participation in water resources management: Gendering and naturing development debates from Bangladesh. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34(3): 346–363.
Trawick, P. 2003. Against the privatization of water: An indigenous model for improving existing laws and successfully governing the commons. *World Development* 31(6): 977–996.
Udas, P.B. and Zwarteveen, M. 2010. Can water professionals meet gender goals? A case study of the Department of Irrigation in Nepal. *Gender and Development* 18(1): 87–97.

UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific). 2003. Mainstreaming gender in energy and planning policies. Background paper for expert group meeting. UNESCAP Project on Capacity Building on Integration of Energy and Rural Development Planning. www.unescap.org/esd/energy/cap_building/integration/egm/documents/Soma_D_paper.pdf.

UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2009. Gender responsive budgeting. Newsletter, Issue 3. New York: UNIFEM.

Upadhyay, B. 2005. Gendered livelihoods and multiple water use in North Gujarat. *Agriculture and Human Values* 22: 411–420.

Urea, D. 2009. Protecting territory, protecting culture. In Bell, B., Conant, J., Olivera, M., Pinkstaff, C. and Terhorst, P. (Eds), *Changing the flow: Water movements in Latin America,* 27–28. Food and Water Watch, Other Worlds, Reclaiming Public Water, Red Vida, and Transnational Institute.

van Koppen, B. 1998. Water rights, gender, and poverty alleviation: Inclusion and exclusion of women and men smallholders in public irrigation infrastructure development. *Agriculture and Human Values* 15: 361–374.

Villagomez, E. 2004. Gender responsive budgets: Issues, good practices and policy options. Paper presented at the Regional Symposium on Mainstreaming Gender into Economic Policies. Geneva, Switzerland, United Nations, 28–30 January. www.gender-budgets.org/uploads/user-S/Gender%20budgets%20-%20UNECE%20web%20draft.pdf.

Wieringa, S. 1994. Women's interests and empowerment: Gender planning reconsidered. *Development and Change* 25: 829–848.

Winrock International. n.d. Report on assessment of rural energy development program (REDP): Impacts and its contribution in achieving MDGs. Nepal: Winrock International. www.redp.org.np/phase2/pdf/impactsandcontricution.pdf.

Zomers, A. 2003. The challenge of rural electrification. *Energy for Sustainable Development* 7(1): 69–76.

Zwarteveen, M. and Meinzen-Dick, R.S. 2001. Gender and property rights in the commons: Examples of water rights in South Asia. *Agriculture and Human Values* 18(1): 11–25.