Introduction

The writing of this article was triggered by an email received during the recording of the findings of a larger investigation entitled: *Luanda, Cidade (im)Previsível? Governação e Transformação Urbana e Habitacional: Paradigmas de Intervenção e Resistências no Novo Milénio* (Luanda, (un)Predictable City? Government and Urban and Housing Transformation: Paradigms of Intervention and Resistances in the New Millennium). As I was cross-checking the theoretical and empirical data and preparing the ground for original conclusions, sharing ideas with José Patrocínio (26 September 2013), leader of the Angolan non-governmental organisation (NGO) OMUNGA, forced me to deepen an unexplored aspect of my research, namely an unpredicted and paradoxical consequence of the emerging and growing grassroots resistance to the current neo-liberal dominant system. This questioning will be further developed in this chapter; as Patrocínio (ibid.) states:

> which victories and losses [truly exist] in the apparent victories (I need you to explore this subject). I mean, there were gains but not victories, is that it? What do these gains cause in terms of the loss of energy to fight? When will the energy to new claims be back? How do [small] gains become prisons? (Freely translated by author.)

The uncertainties of Patrocínio suggest that, by strategically recognising the cracks in the current neo-liberal facade, the Angolan government seeks to weaken the resistance of the activists and inhabitants that contest official urban and housing policies and practices, while defending everyday self-production of space so as to solve some socio-spatial problems caused both by market-driven interventions and the absence of governmental positioning aimed at improving living conditions for deprived communities. As such, this chapter addresses specifically the Angolan capital in the 21st century and seeks to encourage the discussion about (1) the top-down and bottom-up production and transformation of space; (2) the ‘in-between spaces co-induced’ amongst both forms of space production, with reference to current co-produced practices; (3) the dynamic forces created by the interaction of the government, in line with its urban and housing political agenda, and the militant resistance of some segments of organised civil society encouraged by impoverished social groups that contest official practices; and (4)
the socio-spatial consequences of these ever-changing and very unstable aspects regarding the quality of urban life, especially in Luanda, and the access of urban society to a complete form of citizenship.

Taking into account the scope of Part 1, Globalised neo-liberal urbanism: hegemony and opposition, my argument is basically built around two of Henri Lefebvre’s most distinguished books regarding cities and urban society, specifically *La Révolution Urbaine* (The Urban Revolution) ([1970] 2003) and *La Production de l’Espace* (The Production of Space) ([1974] 1991), although also being guided by other important texts of the author, namely the well-known *Le Droit à la Ville* (Right to the City) ([1968] 2009). Nonetheless, I also considered the work of scholars who have critically commented on Lefebvre’s thoughts, such as David Harvey, Neil Brenner, Christian Schmid and Andy Merrifield, so as to facilitate and reinforce a precise understanding of the reasoning. On the topic of the empirical framework of Angola, my comprehensive research about Luanda (Viegas 2015; 2016) sets the foundation for this theoretical-based discussion, whereas my previous theoretical-empirical discussions (ibid.) are used as a basis for a deeper exploration. All together, these reflections will carry the article to its conclusions and, hopefully, will pave the path for further questioning.

**Theoretical-methodological and empirical framework**

From its foundation, the Angolan capital always developed spatially in both ‘official and unofficial’ ways. All of the management models (colonial, 1576–1975; socialist, 1975–90; and neo-liberal, 1990 to the present) were unable to promote urban and housing instruments capable of predicting, regulating and controlling the large occupation of land and its use. Together, local groups sustained the self-production of their space in *mussequês* (i.e. un-official housing settlements) through what I call, in line with Lefebvre’s thought ([1968] 2009; [1974] 1991), the ‘unique appropriation of everydayness’. Given this, regarding the theoretical-methodological framework of this chapter, its structure follows central topic-analysis developed by Lefebvre (ibid.) in his writings *The Urban Revolution* and *The Production of Space* as referred to, among other relevant works. These selected key themes support the perspective that the ongoing urbanisation of the society is an uncompleted and uncertain process. This view takes into account conflicts between different modes of production of space and, regarding Luanda, will be analysed with reference to the guiding notion of the *Right to the City* (idem [1968] 2009).

Considering that Lefebvre addresses the problematic of neo-liberalism, including the theme of the ‘big state’ in line with the powerful and very engaged logics of the capitalist global system, the next section of empirical data refers to the urban and housing strategies, policies and practices of the Angolan regime in the present. Let us not forget that, according to the recent official national survey (INE 2016: 15), this African country has approximately 25.8 million inhabitants, and 6.9 million of its urban population lives in Luanda. In addition, the Angolan capital faces a growth rate of 1.9 per cent (United Nations 2014: 20), while 80 per cent of its population lives in self-produced settlements (Governo da República de Angola 2011: 1561). In such a challenging context, this section also introduces the perceived neo-liberal threats to urban space. In addition, the following section explains both (1) the procedures of the self-production of space, including those that are a consequence of current state interventions, and (2) the most recent processes of co-production of space within the framework of the capitalist mode of production where, according to Lefebvre ([1972] 2000), the participants of everyday life are reduced to their functionalist role as inhabitants.

The last two sections before the conclusions focus on the developing revolutionary contestation to the hegemonic nature of neo-liberalism and its consequences, although clarifying how
Lefebvre’s spatial ideas point to the opportunity (and urgent need) to take advantage of the flaws in the system in order to overcome it. But then again, my considerations go further. The section referring to what I designate ‘co-induced in-between spaces’ – to be precise, spaces resulting from actions of resistance – focuses on the materialisation of the attempt to surpass the ideological and institutional structure that, according to Lefebvre ([1970] 2003), needs to be overcome so as to promote the construction of another greater rationality, namely true urban democracy, as this author (ibid.) defends. Nevertheless, empirical research will also reveal the overwhelming power of global capitalism by presenting the indicators of its efforts to imprison current militant resistance within the framework of its own line of action, namely of how the system tolerates militant resistance only to succeed in absorbing it, whilst seeking to predict the tendencies of future gains and losses for the socio-spatial and economic development of urban society towards the process of forging complete urbanisation, as stressed by Lefebvre ([1968] 2009).

Top-down production of space

After the end of the civil war (1975–2002), during the ‘national reconstruction’, the Angolan administration decided to produce a new middle class by boosting economic growth. To accomplish this ambitious endeavour, the government encouraged the enlarging of the construction sector, with preference given to the real-estate market. As such, space is now frequently targeted for a more affluent society, mostly in Luanda. Some policymakers inclusively argued that, along with the export of hydrocarbon-based resources (e.g. oil), it was fundamental to adopt this strategy, as the Angolan state was profoundly engaged in promoting social welfare. Let us recall that, in general terms, in the early 70s, Lefebvre ([1970] 2003) had already identified up-and-coming forms of spatial conquest (including: land purchase and sale and real estate speculation) that led to the contemporary on-going reorganisation of urban and/or housing space. These restructurings are now, as they were before, largely subordinated to the centres of power and primarily aim to create surplus value. As recently underlined by Brenner (2008), the analytical lens provided by Lefebvre’s theory is a powerful and critical decoder of prevailing state productivism.

Presently, Angola is a presidential republic. Dos Santos, leader of the party in charge since 1975, concentrates power while being head of state and of the government, and commander in chief of the military as well. Furthermore, the long announced political-economic decentralisation has not been implemented. As indicated by Orre (2010), central administration has extended its authority to the entire country instead. In such a context, I would argue that alternative political and/or local solutions aimed at contesting the government’s neo-liberal strategy and effects (such as deprivation, social exclusion and spatial fragmentation, as identified by Viegas (2015)) are often discouraged. Regarding urban matters, official and/or ‘public’ (namely of alleged public interest) production of space in Luanda is often narrowed to the decisions of an elite harshly motivated by the capital’s broader urban renewal, expansion and internationalisation, as expressions of the economic rise of Angola in the contemporary global context. These private and/or governmental leading players act on behalf of the state, reinforcing its hegemony by means of implementing urban strategies and policies that follow the logics of class society, while seeking to control social practices, as Lefebvre ([1970] 2003) would surely argue. Harvey (1998: 55) refers to analogous dynamics in The Geography of Class Power, sustaining that ‘the geographical meaning of the bourgeoisie is the reproduction of class’.

The large number of political instruments (including: legislation, comprehensive and detailed plans and programmes) recently created by the Angolan government is in deep consonance with its determination to forge a bureaucratic and standardised urban society aimed at supporting its neocapitalist agenda, being what Lefebvre ([1974] 2000) would classify as official representations
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of space. As such, (1) the *Lei de Terras* (Land Law), *Lei do Ordenamento do Território e Urbanismo* (Law of Spatial Planning and Urbanism), *Lei de Fomento Habitacional* (Law of Housing Development) and their specific Regulations, approved between 2004 and 2009, alongside with the (2) *Planos Integrados de Expansão Urbana e Infraestruturas de Luanda-Bengo* (Integrated Plans for the Urban and Infrastructural Expansion of Luanda-Bengo) from 2011 and the (another) *Plano Director Geral Metropolitano de Luanda* (Metropolitan Masterplan for Luanda), in preparation, follow the major effort of the (3) *Programa Nacional de Urbanismo e Habitação* (Million Houses Programme), in progress since 2009, specifically the extinction of self-produced housing settlements and the weakening of deprived communities inhabiting these areas, including their urban and housing rights. Harvey (2001) criticises the monopoly of legality sustained by the neo-liberal state, in general terms, by means of denouncing its instrumentalisation for the promotion of violent processes.

Through the use of these ‘public’ instruments, among several others of lesser prominence, the Angolan government is leading a myriad of socio-spatial practices, while using (the discipline of) urbanism both as a mask and a tool of political power. As argued by Lefebvre ([1970] 2003), the spaces that are produced according to their (and the ruling regime’s) logics of representation, instead of responding to the particular logics (and needs) of the society which they claim to be working for, are eminently political spaces. As such, it is perceptible that, by claiming proprietorship over most of the country’s land, also by demarking state land reserves for forthcoming official urban and housing practices, the Angolan government is imposing maladjusted urban and housing models, especially on the deprived populations. These models are based on grid street plans and on acritical imported post-modern architectural typologies, even while being in harmony with the Angolan elite’s idealised image of an international city. Then again, the analysis of space and policies that support the Angolan state mode of production may well reveal tendencies and dangers related to the spacialisation of unrestrained capitalism and its escalation (Lefebvre [1972] 2000). Examples include neglecting access to appropriate urban infrastructures, basic services and employment.

**Bottom-up production of space**

At present, as stated for the political production of space in Angola, with greater expression in Luanda, the inhabitants of self-produced settlements also have no access to proper urban infrastructures. Additionally, these populations are deprived of most of the ‘benefits of urbanisation’, such as employment, health, education, formal trading and leisure. Together, these parameters somehow correspond to what Lefebvre ([1968] 2009) calls a ‘product’, specifically referring to the production of space as value, in line with the *Right to the City*. Yet, despite these limitations and with minor official assistance, these inhabitants transform urban reality through everyday practices of silent resistance, a performance that Lefebvre would recognise as production of (social) space by social agents (ibid.; *idem* [1974] 2000). As recently stressed by Merrifield (2006), for Lefebvre, the solutions for the contradictions of everyday life must inevitably be found in everyday life. As such, these communities renovate their way of living through the appropriation of space, while reinforcing the relations established with space. This occurs near the heavily saturated city centre, also due to the unceasing influx of residents flowing from peripheral areas for informal trading, and in the outskirts as well, where daily, and at times in conflict, the self-production of space takes place rapidly and massively, and in multiple and diverse ways.

Since the take-off of ‘national reconstruction’ in the early years of the 21st century, the impoverished social groups began to be reprimanded by the government, because of the materialisation of their daily practices. This tendency follows ‘the [current economic-based] development
drive that seeks to colonize space for the affluent’ (Harvey 2008: 39) and is aggravating land tenure insecurity while promoting several different urban conflicts, particularly in Luanda. In fact, the government proclaimed co-production of space through self-construction, either assisted or not, of housing, outbuildings and so on, within the unclear framework of the Million Houses Programme. But then again, the provision of state land for such flexible and permeable practices has been largely ignored, to say the least, by most government agents who prefer to encourage the participation of private entrepreneurs in the forging of urban space. Even so, the self-production of urban and housing space persists in central and peripheral areas. Given this, the real drawing of the city follows the occupation and experience of users-producers of space, embracing both ‘urbaniy’, a notion associated with production of urban culture, and rurality, as connected to rural life, and both rooted in the specificities of everyday life, as emphasised by Lefebvre ([1970] 2003).

Recently, when the Angolan administration decided to demolish self-produced areas within a context of urban renewal, tabula rasa and gentrification of the centre and its coastal districts (for instance Chicala), those who were being evicted sought to stay, whenever possible, in neighbouring areas. Similar routines of ‘accumulation by dispossession’, as labelled by Harvey (2001), arose in the 1990s and are at the moment being reinforced in peripheral areas, along with practices of mercantilist urban expansion (for instance Talatona and Kilamba, Cacuaco), some related to processes of clientelism. Concerning these actions, the perception of social space, in line with Lefebvre ([1974] 2000), as a theoretical-methodological research tool, also contributes to underline the costs of replacing the existing self-produced spaces by others resulting from the current capitalist mode of production; namely it helps to emphasise the space of losses. Given this, deprived social groups tend to occupy other lands close to the official housing projects, trying to obtain benefits from this proximity. Sometimes the urge becomes so great that it forces these needy populations to invade and occupy recently demarcated state land reserves. As emphasised by Lefebvre ([1970] 2003), everyday life also incorporates the exclusion of certain moments of life and of numerous activities.

Resettlement and/or rehousing interventions (for instance in Zango, Panguila and Sapu) are paradoxically accepting and even encouraging gradual occupation of delimited spaces through everyday practices. However, this executive change in action only occurs in peripheral areas, far from the ‘metropolis-to-be’ and its international brand image. Regarding the rehousing projects, the homogeneous space produced by the government (i.e. the housing) officially connects with many social spaces produced within the limits of the plots dispensed by the state (e.g. walls, carports, outbuildings). This overlapped co-existence sets up a mediation between quantitative and qualitative produced spaces, as Lefebvre ([1974] 1978) would describe, while permitting the strengthening of newly ‘co-produced’ areas, a concept explored by Melo (2015), specifically through official incentives. As such, in spite of all of the numerous constraints, such as proper access to urban infrastructures and resources, these housing projects (i.e. ‘neighbourhoods’, as Lefebvre [1970] 1978 would define them) persist beyond urban growth, along with the problems arising from their multiple social practices. Nevertheless, these interventions also mirror urban renewal and violent social exclusion practices in the centre, looking, to a certain extent, like a growing wound in a peripheral detached site.

Militant resistance and awareness

In Angola, the actions of a specifically organised civil society (e.g. non-governmental organisations, NGOs) are foremost related to the fight against the urban policies and practices of the government, especially the aggressive methods through which the administration takes over
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self-produced spaces. These NGOs, such as SOS HABITAT (started by Luiz Araújo in 2002), based in the capital, and OMUNGA (started by José Patrocínio in 2005), based in Lobito, are generally driven by the socio-spatial penalties of these ‘public’ activities, that occur above all (but not only) in Luanda. As pointed out by Lefebvre ([1968] 2009) in other contexts, the Right to the City is imprisoned by private or semi-private interests. Therefore, its formulation implies a democratic management of urban processes, hence it involves greater control over the production and distribution of capital surpluses, fuelled by the discontent and by the collective demand for power by (and for) the people. Lefebvre (ibid.) refers to this process as ‘revolutionary reform’, encouraging a permanent cultural and economic revolution with a policy of self-management consistent with social needs, and consequently with greater democratic control of the state apparatus. Accordingly, these NGOs insist on a major shift of power in Angola, in an attempt to formulate inclusive bottom-up paradigms of intervention.

The opposition between the Angolan state and these critical NGOs mirrors what Lefebvre ([1968] 2009) refers to as the (hidden or expressive) socio-spatial conflicts existing between the implosion of the old (or new) morphologies of the urbanised areas and some persistent islands of rurality. In such a context, some NGOs decide not to participate in the material production and transformation of housing spaces, although others chose, instead, to mediate housing conditions in self-produced areas and/or ‘co-produced neighbourhoods’ (such as Panguila), seeking to provide access to infrastructures and to the non-existing ‘benefits of urbanisation’ (ibid.). Unlike the former, these NGOs are trying to overcome flaws within the dominant system with regard to urban issues. Nonetheless, they similarly aim to contribute to the transformation of commonsense thought-frames opposed to the everyday self-production of space, a common sense shared by both the elite and leading political agents alike. Equally, their line of action, in some measure, points to ‘an alternative socialist project grounded upon anti-[state] productivism and radical grassroots democracy’ (Brenner 2008: 241). In this position of resistance, these NGOs encourage the active participation of the impoverished inhabitants in the production and/or transformation of their urban life, also as a viable path to build their own citizenship.

The distinction between the production of (social) space by social agents and the production of (political) space by the neo-liberal administration, in line with Lefebvre’s work ([1974] 2000), helps to present social movements as acting on behalf of a revolution aiming at the renovation of the dominant urban system, with reference to the consequences of one and another mode of production, within the demanding agenda of the Right to the City (Lefebvre [1968] 2009). On the one hand, everyday practices of self-production of space, without appropriate ‘official’ upgrading, cannot overcome much of the socio-spatial constraints. On the other hand, forced eviction, even those linked to resettlement or rehousing processes, strengthen the rising criticism and claims of these NGOs. In effect, the gigantic scale of interventions (for instance approximately 30,000 people dispossessed in the Iraque-Bagdad ‘neighbourhood’ and surroundings, in 2009), aroused the empathy of activists towards the victims of ‘public’ interventions, thereby exposing and leading to the ethical condemnation of these events, both nationally and internationally, so as to strengthen the elaboration of a worldwide anti-exclusion strategy. As pertinently asked by Merrifield (2006: 128): ‘what would be the point of any global politics if it… isn’t rooted in some particular context?’

The activities of these local organisations (aiming at the support of those evicted and mediation with the government as well) contributed to increase the growing voices of disapproval that rise up against the neo-liberal system in the Global North, with its hegemonic routines and consequences. Militant players seek to promote resistant and emancipatory movements, all the while enabling larger grassroots organisation and assistance from the deprived groups in a new wave of bottom-up urban policies and practices of (real) public interest. These include issues such as the
appropriation of power and space (as power) – not proprietorship – and, likewise, participation – not just consultation – in everyday decision-making, namely the ‘work’ as the motion that equals the ‘product’, concerning Lefebvre’s ([1968] 2009) *Right to the City*. Some forms of urban struggles, such as those encouraged by these Angolan NGOs, perhaps have the ability to effect transformations outside the capitalist mode of production (Lefebvre [1974] 2000). Others also occur, frequently motivated by the strongly critical manifestations against the regime by the famous rappers MCK and Ikonoklasta. In this context, urban space combines and mirrors the processes and conflicts that shape that space. Nonetheless, the reading, *per se*, of these heterogeneous spaces does not permit a complete understanding of the processes that are at the origin of its form.

**Spaces of resistance: ‘co-induced in-between spaces’?**

As identified, top-down political spaces are now being produced by the Angolan neo-liberal regime, particularly in Luanda. On the other hand, bottom-up social spaces are being self-produced by social agents, progressively. Moreover, the militant resistance of some NGOs supports everyday strategies and practices of survival as a prospective path to overcome the inequalities intrinsic to the capitalist mode of production as it leads to new ‘uneven geographies’ of class power (Harvey 2001). According to Lefebvre ([1968] 2009; [1974] 2000), the processes inherent to the global structure are permeable and influenced by the activities of local groups, including their existences and rhythms. As such, ‘in-between spaces’ are being ‘co-induced’ within these dynamics. These are naturally different from spaces co-produced by means of official incentive (such as Panguila) where changes in the forging of space are accepted or even introduced by the dominant system as a technique of co-opting opposing processes and practices. These tend to be spaces of micro-resistance instead, namely spaces produced within the struggles that emerge at the side-lines of the official context and that may be later enlarged, and thus are now being fought against by the regime.

The arena where the urban struggles occur is complex and challenging, therefore the process of eliminating any form of resistance is difficult to analyse since it has several permeable and overlapping layers. On the one hand, urban spaces are being co-produced through state initiatives, considering everyday processes and practices (such as Panguila). This corresponds to a first approach regarding the preservation of power by the dominant system. The space produced in this context is a variation of the capitalist mode of production. On the other hand, some public agents are responding positively, even though only occasionally, to a few of the demands of the militant resistance, while seeking to limit its strength. This routine corresponds to another attempt at preserving the existing structure. Nevertheless, the spaces ‘co-induced in-between’ these dynamics, i.e., the spatialisation of the regime’s positive response to the demands of NGOs that care for the self-production of space are, in fact, (micro-)spaces of resistance. These have the potential to induce a revolution to overcome the capitalist mode of production and the forging of a new urban model with specificities yet to be identified and explored. However, Schmid (2008) recalls that an essential aspect of Lefebvre’s approach consists in passing from theory to action.

Expressive examples of this two-stage process in defence of dominant structures are the supplying and/or the improvement of subsidised housing (such as in co-produced areas) without proper living conditions, as the government basically only invested in housing at the expense of urban and social infrastructures and resources. Similarly, when the regime temporarily suspends demolitions and evictions during the period of elections, just to restart them later on (for instance Chicala/Kilombo in Luanda – see Figure 10.1 – and the 27 de Março neighbourhood in Lobito). Given this, the ‘gains’ that Patrocínio (26 September 2013) mentioned are, on the one hand, an asset for the people who had almost no rights and occasionally enlarge their ‘right to place’. Then again, these ‘gains’ weaken the resistance of activists and inhabitants. In fact, in these
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circumstances, resistance tends to restrain further claims and, in so doing, reduces the room for manoeuvre of the most impoverished social groups regarding what was not properly taken into account by the government, such as full access to infrastructures, to the ‘benefits of urbanisation’ and, also, to a collective participation in the construction of a transformed urban life, namely full access to the Right to the City (Lefebvre [1968] 2009) both as process and goal. This is a fierce strategy of the government to sustain its hegemonic capitalist mode of production.

As a matter of fact, these ‘co-induced in-between spaces’ of resistance are being annulled for the very same reasons that self-produced spaces are being demolished. They are an effective threat to the Angolan regime in particular and, considering the growing international network of whistle-blowers, a global threat to the capitalist system itself. Brenner (2000: 376) mentioned that ‘politics of scale might have powerful implications… oriented towards… socially just forms of urban society’. So, in order to promote better socio-spatial conditions in Angola, one must continue to demand the Right to the City as a whole (Lefebvre [1968] 2009). This claim includes widespread access to: (1) housing with infrastructure, (2) urban resources, (3) appropriation of space, because each individual or family inhabits space in specific ways, and (4) participation in the political agenda. Then again, the analysis of the socio-spatial consequences arising from the latest ‘public’ interventions in such a ferocious neo-liberal context discloses the downgrading of social groups in need, often inhabiting precarious self-produced areas and reveals extensive spatial fragmentation, as lately identified by Viegas (2015). Altogether, these limitations tend to ground new urban struggles, with new participants and motivations.

**Conclusions: ‘gains and prisons’**

The opposing modes of production of urban and housing space existent in Angola, namely top-town and bottom-up, fall within the scope of the theoretical-methodological framework selected for this chapter, as they correspond to what Lefebvre ([1972] 2000) identified as official
production of political spaces and social production of social spaces in a neoliberal context. Regarding the current market-driven approach, state and/or private interventions, supported by a myriad of political instruments, are restructuring urban and housing space according to the old powerful logic of the accumulation and over-accumulation of capital, whilst aggravating pre-existent socio-spatial imbalances. Nevertheless, despite the aggressive nature of this dominant process or, paradoxically, because of it, the potentials of daily urban life – under conditions of neoliberalism – have persevered while complexifying the urban processes and/or experiences in Angola by means of grounding anti-capitalist struggles, particularly in Luanda. This occurs through two different, although complementary, ways: (1) the actions of a silent resistance inherent to everyday self-production of urban and housing space, as embraced by most inhabitants in need; and (2) the counter-actions of a particular militant resistance encouraged by daily experiences of production and transformation of space critical of, and thus opposed to, the government’s urban policies and practices with their socio-spatial consequences.

On the one hand, the administration inconsequently proclaimed political and administrative decentralisation, therefore local communities remained without local official representation, having a reduced capacity to negotiate with the government’s leading players, hence with limited opportunities to participate in the official urban scenario. On the other hand, the actions of some resistant NGOs are being blocked, because they are stimulating public criticism while encouraging urban society’s access to a complete form of citizenship. Until now, the Angolan regime has been, occasionally, acquiescent to some of the demands of the emerging resistance while appearing to be more flexible on the subject of accepting the self-production of urban and housing space. But then again, for the time being, the accomplishments are very modest (for instance, mostly related to the ‘right to place’) and they tend to become ‘prisons’ since they are likely to drain the energy of activists fighting for larger claims. As suggested by Patrocínio (26 September 2013), in Angola ‘there were gains but not [true] victories’. For that reason, regarding the post-war transition period (2002 to the present), I conclude that the forces in charge of the production of space are clashing, unbalanced and thus point to an extremely uncertain outcome.

Nevertheless, in such a context, further questioning is necessary: What must these NGOs do to stabilise and enhance the positive effects of their militant resistance? And how can they annul the negative consequences of the counter-resistance of the state? These and other questions must be asked so as to identify alternative paths, new innovative horizons, for the improvement of the quality of urban life in Angola. Concerning this subject, this chapter stresses an important theoretical contribution, namely regarding the ‘co-induced in-between spaces’ of resistance. This was possible due to recent empirical field work (Viegas 2015) in a context of very difficult access and poorly documented. Though the analysis of the Angolan data is context-specific and therefore cannot be transferred to other situations, the presentation of a precise socio-spatial context, together with a shift to the theoretical field, might be of interest for the reading of other sites, and vice versa, as together they enlarge the existent and growing voices against the capitalist mode of production and its uneven geographies. As such, I may also conclude that, by identifying and sharing examples of production of spaces of micro-resistance in Luanda, as opposed to examples of co-production of spaces (co-opted) through official incentive, this chapter may contribute to the drawing-out of a suggestion for a global alternative system resulting from the multiplication of many ‘co-induced in-between spaces’.
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