

## Introduction

In 2009, in Rio de Janeiro, the city government served notice to over five hundred families in the community of Vila Autódromo that they would be evicted to make room for a new stadium for the 2016 Olympic Games. A few years later, government officials advised the residents of the community of Buraco Quente in the city of São Paulo that they would be removed as an economic boom spurred construction and renovation (Buraco Quente Community Residents 2013). Thousands of miles away, in Washington, D.C., low-income residents of Chinatown's Museum Square apartment building faced displacement as the building went up for sale and residents feared they would be unable to find affordable housing elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> In Atlanta, too, low-income residents displaced by the demolition of public housing and rapid gentrification faced increasing difficulty in finding affordable housing, particularly in the historically black Old Fourth Ward neighborhood. These individual cases simply exemplify larger global trends. In all of these cities and many more around the world, the tenure of low-income residents is in peril, and rising housing costs prevent those at the bottom of the income ladder from attaining secure and decent housing in central urban neighborhoods.

The confluence of housing challenges in cities with diverse economic and political histories is certainly not coincidental. As cities strive to achieve “world city” status and attract international invest-

ment, the push for urban development tests the ability of cities to provide opportunities for all and to exhibit the ideal of “inclusive cities.” As an ever-greater share of the world’s population lives in cities, questions of inclusion increasingly matter for stability and sustainable development, and future trends to incorporate people of all income levels are critical for the practice of democracy and the legitimacy of the state.

In this environment, civil society plays a pivotal role in demanding accountability of the state to address the needs of low-income residents and support the goals of an inclusive city. But questions remain about how civil society organizations (CSOs) go about this task, the challenges they face, and the outcomes their efforts produce. We expect that the institutions of democracy dictate the avenues available to CSOs to influence public policies and programs, but we know less about why particular organizations seek to engage with various institutions or pursue alternate strategies at specific points in time. As much as democratic institutions define the possibilities for CSOs to engage in the political process, the activities of CSOs also indicate the extent to which these institutions are able to work in practice to incorporate diverse voices and interests. If institutions are not perceived as viable paths for reform, CSOs will instead seek other opportunities to achieve their goals. The locus of civil society engagement matters in that the actors who control decision making within institutions concerned with urban development likely shape the direction of policies and programs.

I argue that if cities are to be more inclusive, CSOs representing the interests of low-income residents need to be present at the decision-making table. But what we see is that the strategies CSOs undertake, constrained by their own agency and the environment in which they operate, largely determine the extent to which their role is transformational in democratizing urban development. The cases in this book provide evidence of how CSOs on the ground seek to influence official decision making through various means and the impact that ensues from these strategic choices. Through the lens of housing, the book details how and why CSOs engage in various strategies and how these strategies lead to achievements in housing policies, programs, and institutions. In particular, the book presents efforts by community organizations to secure housing for low-income residents across Rio de Ja-

neiro; São Paulo; Washington, D.C.; and Atlanta. The physical location of a home is a primary determinant of whether residents are incorporated into the opportunities of the city, but the process by which affordable housing is preserved or achieved represents a broader indicator of how the needs of low-income residents as a group or class are integrated into urban governance.

Throughout the book, I assess how organizations representing the interests of low-income residents influence the direction of policies and programs to ensure access to affordable housing and the ability to stay put in the face of displacement. I use the term “community organization” rather than the broader term “civil society organization,” to indicate that these are collective actors specifically focused on the preservation and promotion of inclusion at the community level. Across cities these types of organizations are diverse, ranging from social movement organizations, neighborhood associations, and nonprofit professional organizations.

Specifically, I address these main questions:

*1. How do community organizations working to preserve and promote affordable housing seek to be empowered through the strategies in which they engage?*

Given similarities in housing challenges across cities, we might also expect to see similarities in the strategies undertaken by community organizations concerned with these issues. Further, the global focus on inclusion and participatory governance among scholars, development practitioners, and global social movements should encourage community organizations to demand new forms of influence. However, many types of collective action exist in which organizations seek influence not only from the inside, through governmental institutions, but also from the outside, by persuading public officials, by electing allies to office, or by appealing to actors outside the local environment, such as international governmental organizations or philanthropic donors. This book serves to first document the strategies in which community organizations concerned with low-income housing engage. Though, as detailed in Chapter 2, previous literature on collective action tends to categorize the tactics of actors as either contentious or cooperative, I build on the classic “exit, voice, or loyalty” framework conceived of by Albert Hirschman to identify the source of empowerment that defines

the strategy of contemporary community organizations (1970). I categorize strategies as “inclusionary,” “indirect,” “overhaul,” or “exit-oriented.”

*2. What leads groups to take on certain strategies?*

The factors behind why community organizations develop certain strategies are not well defined either through literature on collective action or participatory governance. This study seeks to remedy this gap by proposing two primary factors that should motivate the choice of strategies. In Chapter 2, I argue that the ideology of community organizations fighting for housing combined with the organization’s relationship with the state strongly influences the choice of strategies. The ideology of an organization and its members shapes the goals and perception of the appropriateness of certain actions, while the relationship with the state establishes trust and expectations regarding responsiveness and accountability. This argument responds to the classic divide attributing the nature of collective action either to the agency of collective actors or to the structure of the environment in which they operate. What I argue is that both agency and structure matter for strategic decisions within organizations, but we need to know how these two elements combine to enable community organizations to shape public policies and programs. While I do find that the variables of political opportunities and resources also matter for shaping the strategies of community organizations, ideology and the relationship with the state play a particularly critical role in establishing an environment that is either conducive or detrimental to inclusion of civil society in decision making.

*3. What are the outcomes of these strategies, both for ensuring housing for low-income residents and for democratic governance?*

Finally, I ask what the outcomes of the efforts of community organizations are and whether the type of strategy they employ makes a difference in the outcomes we see. Literature on urban politics from the United States and Latin America has long warned that the power of the private sector in urban development drowns out the interests of community organizations seeking to preserve and expand property for social purposes. Recently, however, scholars including Clarence Stone (2015) find governments and private-sector interests more amenable to

working with community organizations, recognizing equality and diversity as valuable tools to increase the benefits of urban development. I argue that strategies in which organizations seek influence within governmental institutions should promote housing outcomes that increase inclusion in the city and hold promise for transformation in the democratic governance of urban development through increased participation, accountability, and respect for diversity.

### The Problem: Global Challenges to Housing and Inclusive Urban Development

Across the world, the United Nations warns that by 2030, 2 billion people will be in need of housing in cities (United Nations Preparatory Committee 2016). This includes the estimated 880 million people who currently live in inadequate housing in cities and the 1.8 billion projected population increase. The United Nations estimates \$929 billion in investment is needed to improve housing for just the 880 million residents currently living in inadequate housing in cities.<sup>2</sup> The demand for secure and decent housing is only growing, even as the current supply and investment in affordable housing remains insufficient.

The confluence of low supply and increasing demand predictably leads to rising costs. The McKinsey Global Institute finds that an estimated 330 million households are currently financially stretched by housing costs, and they forecast that number to increase to 440 million by 2025 (Woetzel et al. 2014). In a study of two hundred cities around the world, a team of researchers from the Lincoln Institute, United Nations Habitat, and New York University found that the median house price to income ratio was 4.9, well above the 3.0 ratio generally considered affordable.<sup>3</sup> The study showed that affordability levels were not significantly different across developing and more developed countries. In fact, Beijing and Shanghai were two of the most unaffordable cities in the world. The team also found that rental prices were largely unaffordable, with the average renters across both developing and developed countries paying 31 percent of their income to housing.

Given rising costs and growing need, questions arise about what governments can and will do to address this gap and the difference

interventions in housing will make for creating inclusive cities. Not only is affordable housing important for the physical comfort and security it provides to residents; it is also a key component of how low-income residents are perceived in the city and the opportunities for advancement that are available to them. As Peter Marcuse and David Madden write, “No other modern commodity is as important for organizing citizenship, work, identities, solidarities, and politics” (2016, 167). The effect of housing on well-being and participation in the life of the city cannot be understated. For example, Janice Perlman argues that despite increasing access to consumption goods and infrastructural upgrades, residents of Rio de Janeiro’s favelas still lack respect from higher-income residents in the city, who view them as squatters or criminals who do not belong to the formal city rather than as citizens to be treated with dignity (Perlman 2010). Without this respect for people across class and across neighborhoods, Perlman argues, we can never have inclusive cities. In the United States, former president Obama argued that where one is born should not determine the limit of opportunities. During the Obama administration, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Julian Castro reiterated this message at the 2016 United Nations Habitat III Conference in Quito and spoke about the need for “housing as a powerful platform to spark opportunities in people’s lives” (Castro 2016). As Castro stated, housing is one link in a chain of social issues, including schools, food access, transit access, and employment opportunities, and should be prioritized as such.

The fact is, though, that the increasing cost of housing across cities removes the possibility for many to secure a decent place to live within the urban environment. Rising prices prevent new residents from finding affordable housing and also spur displacement, as long-time residents cannot afford increases in rent or property taxes. New construction for residential and commercial buildings as well as infrastructural development can bring new job opportunities and better provision of services to all residents. But the challenges to development are clear when low-income residents are either forced out or priced out of their existing communities in the process. Gentrification, in which new investment brings in middle- and upper-class residents to neighborhoods previously occupied by low-income households (Smith 1996), often means increasing revenue for the city, reduction in crime, new retail, and expanded options for entertainment, but

frequently at the expense of existing residents. Empirically, there is still an ongoing debate about whether gentrification leads to displacement,<sup>4</sup> but as the case studies in this book demonstrate, many urban residents around the world do face upheaval related to development and gentrification, even if that is not always the rule. In addition, as neighborhoods gentrify and prices increase, evidence shows that first-time buyers and minorities in the United States and other developed countries are disproportionately affected by the challenges of attaining financing for homeownership (United Nations Habitat 2016, 13).

In response to these growing trends in inequality, the idea of creating more inclusive cities permeates current global discussions on housing and urban development. For instance, the New Urban Agenda, agreed upon in 2016 by United Nations member countries around the world, states:

We share a vision of cities for all, referring to the equal use and enjoyment of cities and human settlements, seeking to promote inclusivity and ensure that all inhabitants, of present and future generations, without discrimination of any kind, are able to inhabit and produce just, safe, healthy, accessible, affordable, resilient, and sustainable cities and human settlements, to foster prosperity and quality of life for all. (United Nations Habitat 2016)

“Inclusive cities” are not simply achieved through the availability of affordable housing; rather the idea encompasses the broader goal of ensuring diversity. Nonetheless, officials from the United Nations call for housing to be at the center of the global urban agenda, suggesting that current patterns of housing production create cities of exclusion, through segregation and fragmentation of residents (Clos 2016). United Nations Sustainable Development Goal, Target 11.1, also calls for signatory nations to ensure access to adequate housing for all by 2030.

While the neoliberal approach to development suggests that governments should remove support from housing provision in favor of market incentives, continued gaps in adequate and affordable housing renew the call for government intervention. Though United Nations Habitat, the World Bank, and other international institutions once

suggested that policies and programs should work toward “a world without slums,” in which the primary goal was for the poor to have access to formal-sector housing, these institutions have now moved toward a world that integrates slum dwellers and low-income residents into the fabric of the city. This vision is encompassed by a number of policies and programs, including cooperative solutions, incremental housing, self-build schemes, upgrading of informal settlements, and new financing models (United Nations Habitat 2016, 14). The shift recognizes that neither the government nor the market can adequately generate formal-sector housing for all and that informality represents a necessary source of affordable housing. This new model promotes building on existing community strengths rather than disrupting social networks.

Further, current urban discourse acknowledges that housing interventions themselves are not the only key to the inclusive city; the means by which decisions are made also define inclusion. The New Urban Agenda calls for states to commit to broadening “inclusive platforms” that “allow meaningful participation in decision making, planning, and follow-up processes for all, as well as an enhanced civil engagement and co-provision and co-production” (United Nations Habitat 2016, 7).

At the global level, numerous initiatives increase the capacity of civil society to promote inclusive urban governance. For example, the Inclusive Cities Project, led by the global nongovernmental organization (NGO) WIEGO, argues that inclusive cities “ensure all residents . . . have a representative voice in governance, planning, and budgeting processes,” as well as “access to secure and dignified livelihoods, affordable housing, and basic services,” and its goal is to increase organizational capacity of CSOs for this purpose (WIEGO 2016). The World Bank views “spatial inclusion” as being the access to land, housing, and services, while “social inclusion” involves improving the terms of individuals and groups to participate in society, including participatory processes and rights-based approaches (Shah et al. 2015). In addition, for over a decade, United Nations Habitat has promoted inclusive cities as both a means and an end, in which the inclusive city is the outcome of good urban governance and inclusive decision-making processes are an essential means to achieving good urban governance (United Nations Habitat 2012). Inclusiveness in this regard can be achieved



through a variety of policies and programs, including approaches that promote welfare, human development, the environment, institutions, and the right to development. For the purposes of this book, inclusion is defined by both the incorporation of community organizations in official decision making and the outcome of ensuring access to secure and decent housing for all residents. Access to government decision making is both the goal and the definition of inclusive cities. Enhancing the capacity and commitment of community organizations to participate in governance institutions—thereby democratizing urban development—is critical to this agenda.

### The Role of Urban Mobilization

If we accept that civil society must play a significant role in creating inclusive cities, we then need to understand the incentives for civil society to participate in and demand new modes of governance rather than assuming the part these actors should want to play. We know community organizations fighting for low-income housing want spatial inclusion in the city, but the cases in this book also serve to elucidate the motivations and limitations of community organizations in working toward more inclusive governance.

In the 1980s and 1990s, mobilization around housing dissipated in cities around the world. In the developing world, and particularly in Latin America, scholars noted a number of challenges to widespread popular mobilization. First, neoliberal reforms limited the ability of cities to provide broad social benefits, which led demands for low-income housing to become more localized and less oriented toward reform of urban social policy (Roberts and Portes 2006). Second, popular movements faced co-optation by newly elected democratic regimes that could now claim to legitimately represent popular needs (Eckstein and Merino 2001; Foweraker 2005; Roberts 1997, 2002; Roberts and Portes 2006). And, third, regularization, urbanization, and state housing subsidy programs in cities such as Lima, Mexico City, Rio, and Santiago decreased the perceived need for widespread mobilization for housing (Roberts and Portes 2006). In the United States, the move toward privatization of services and investment in market mechanisms to provide housing across income levels reduced the funding provided directly by federal, state, and city governments. The move to

dismantle public housing from the 1970s forward stirred little protest, in part because the federal one-for-one replacement rule limited numerical reduction of existing housing units and little changed quickly. It was not until the 1990s that housing authorities promised new mixed-income communities with greater amenities to residents and demolished public housing units in earnest.

Today, however, across cities low-income residents express a growing frustration with existing programs, policies, and institutions that do not adequately address their need for affordable, secure, and decent housing. In Latin America, low-income residents have found that democratic institutions are not enough to protect and promote the rights of citizens. In particular, regularization of titles to provide secure property rights and “urbanization projects” to improve the basic infrastructure of communities, including paved streets, sanitation systems, and electricity, among other amenities, have failed to guarantee inclusion and integration of the poor into the “formal” economy and politics of cities (McCann 2014; Perlman 2010). Across developing and developed nations, residents also increasingly decry close ties between the state and the private sector. Frustration over lack of consultation in development projects and protection of individual rights has motivated residents to again collectively mobilize. In the United States, the Occupy and Black Lives Matter movements distill the frustrations with inequality and discrimination that permeate cities. Following the financial crisis in 2008, Occupy protested the foreclosure of homes purchased with subprime loans and called on governments and private banks to assist rather than discard homeowners in trouble. Protesters called for the accountability of Wall Street to prevent deepening inequality, particularly based on homeownership. The Black Lives Matter movement has also taken to the streets to advocate for greater transparency and accountability of law enforcement, but more broadly members seek economic justice and structural change to combat discrimination against African Americans.

Mobilization of citizens around the world appears to be on the rise, and much of what we hear about in the news involves protest against gentrification and displacement. For instance, in 2015 a London group called Class War, organized through social media, vandalized a café they perceived to be a symbol of gentrification. One protestor interviewed stated, “We don’t want luxury flats that no one can afford[;] we

want genuinely affordable housing. We don't want pop-up gin bars or brioche buns[;] we want community" (Khomami and Halliday 2015). Several years earlier and across the hemisphere, in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, resident-organized groups, referred to as "crisis committees," protested residential displacement and threats to established neighborhoods over land title conflicts (Harsch 2009). After shutting down the protest, the government eventually made promises for more compensation and assistance for those being relocated. In Port-au-Prince, when the Haitian government threatened to clear slums in 2012, protestors erected flaming barricades and clashed with police in an effort to remain in place (*The Telegraph* 2012). In San Francisco, a group called the San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition (SFADC) is engaged in an ongoing fight against the consequences of gentrification, specifically a wave of evictions and landlord harassment forcing residents from their neighborhoods (Colomb and Novy 2016). The SFADC seeks to change city policy by proposing resolutions in the city council and ballot initiatives for voters, in addition to staging protests in public places.

These cities vary tremendously by socioeconomic characteristics and institutions, yet they all face backlash from residents frustrated that their interests and their physical place in the city are in jeopardy. In each of these cases reported by news outlets, residents took to the streets to influence government policies and programs that directly affected their lives. In fact, the most typical way that we view civil society impact is through its influence on public officials, either through disruptive protest, direct negotiation, or public advocacy campaigns. And yet, as the discussion of inclusive cities indicates, the expectation of activists, scholars, and global leaders is that civil society should also increasingly demand new opportunities for change from the *inside* of governmental institutions. Participatory governance institutions, including opportunities for managing official budgets, policies, programs, and planning processes, *could* provide civil society with a route for direct influence. These types of institutions are the means toward inclusive cities as well as the outcomes of demands for political inclusion.

In addition, the judicial system *could* provide an important outlet for housing conflicts and a direct voice in shaping housing outcomes for residents. Courts adjudicate the rights of residents as governments attempt to control land use. The extent to which community organiza-

tions access the court system to mediate conflicts and trust in the fairness of the courts demonstrates the viability of legal redress as an effective strategy. If organizations view the current administration or governmental system as inalterably controlled by real estate or other corporate interests, however, inside influence through participatory institutions or the justice system may not be viable options for redress. Instead, civil society may choose to replace public officials, seek influence from outside actors, or work autonomously to provide housing solutions.

## Research Design

This study relies on a comparative case study approach to address the primary questions regarding strategies and outcomes of community organizations. The comparative case study approach allows for careful process tracing within individual cases as well as comparison across cases. By analyzing cities across the “developed-developing” divide, I show the similarities and differences that exist across diverse urban contexts. For years, comparative urban research has been limited by the assumption that the experiences of richer and poorer cities are not comparable. But the experiences we see in practice related to increasing costs and decreasing socioeconomic diversity in cities motivates the study across this divide. While clear differences exist across the United States and Brazil, we do not know how these differences matter until we conduct comparative research.

I selected the cases for this study primarily on the basis of similarities in the challenges of displacement and access to affordable housing. The United States and Brazil have some of the highest rates of urbanization in the world in addition to long-standing issues of inequality within cities. The cases under examination in this study exemplify the challenges of displacement and affordable housing while also demonstrating the variation in the approaches to respond to these challenges. The selection of cases across two countries allows for cross-national comparisons as well as cross-city comparisons.

More specifically, initially I selected Rio de Janeiro and Atlanta because both cities experienced significant displacement around preparation for Olympic Games. Rio de Janeiro hosted the Summer Olympic Games in 2016, the construction for which involved state-led removals

of thousands of residents from informal settlements. In Atlanta, preparation for the Summer Olympic Games of 1996 also accelerated the demolition of downtown public housing buildings and the dispersal of low-income residents. In both cases, though the state initiated processes of removal, increasing real estate prices also provided the impetus for new developments that exacerbated the problems for newly displaced residents. During this time and well after, Atlanta experienced significant demographic change across neighborhoods long neglected for investment (U.S. Census Bureau 2011). In Rio, low-income residents traditionally crowd into centrally located favelas on steep hillsides, the wealthy preferring to live directly along the city's coastline. Leading up to the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympic Games, these favelas underwent drastic change as police interventions reduced the threat of violence and urbanization projects improved basic services in many of the favelas with the most desirable ocean views and central locations. In a sign of the changing times, both David Beckham and Madonna were rumored to have purchased homes in the city's central favelas (Williamson 2015a). True or not, the perception that favelas are now hot real estate reshapes the city's market. Locally, people refer to these forces of gentrification as "white removal" or "market removal" as opposed to forced evictions carried out by the municipal government.

I also initially selected the cases of São Paulo and Washington, D.C., because both cities had significant plans for city-center redevelopment that spurred rising prices and dislocation of residents. In São Paulo, the municipal government and then the state government made plans to revitalize the degraded city center, which threatened low-income residents who would be removed or priced out of the area. At the same time, the plans presented an opportunity to secure government-supported low-income housing in the city center. The city of São Paulo also experienced an increase in forced evictions in the 2010s. By 2012, 177 communities in the metropolitan region had either been removed or were notified of potential removal by the municipal government (Observatório das Remoções 2012). The justification for the vast majority of these cases was construction of public works projects, including upgrades to the subway system and a new highway (the "beltway") around the city. Many residents claimed that the city government largely ignored their rights to compensation and that many had no choice but to move far out of the city, removed from

employment opportunities and the communities they had once enjoyed.

In Washington, D.C., redevelopment of the Gallery Place/Chinatown neighborhoods brought in new retail, dining, and entertainment, in addition to luxury condominiums and apartments. Tearing down public housing and rising prices appear to have pushed low-income residents out of the area, even as advocates in the city mounted protests to what they viewed as an affordable housing crisis (Sturtevant 2014). Redevelopment and gentrification have now touched all areas of the city, and evidence of the threat of displacement is also seen in the increasing number of landlord-tenant disputes in the remaining low-income apartment rental buildings within and outside of the downtown area.<sup>5</sup> Further, public housing residents face displacement as their buildings are torn down and promises of replacement units from the D.C. Housing Authority are not kept.

In each of the four case studies, fieldwork formed the basis of the research. In each city, I met with leaders from a variety of community organizations, other NGOs, the media, private-sector associations, and government agencies related to housing and asked the same three main questions regarding strategies and outcomes. These discussions led me to focus more narrowly on specific organizations in each city that were actively pursuing the goals of preserving or generating housing for low-income residents and had made a significant impact during the time period under study (2012–2016). Focusing on these specific cases allowed me to isolate how the strategies undertaken by organizations led to certain outcomes. To understand the activities and motivations of these organizations, I conducted interviews with leaders and attended pertinent community and citywide meetings. In each city, I also spoke with government officials regarding the effects of an organization's strategies.

In Atlanta and Rio de Janeiro I selected the Historic District Development Corporation (HDDC) and the Residents' Association of Vila Autódromo, respectively, as organizations that were both fighting to preserve low-income housing in specific communities symbolic to the future of inclusion in each city. In Washington, D.C., I chose the Housing for All Campaign, led by the Coalition for Nonprofit Housing and Economic Development (CNHED), and in São Paulo, I selected the União dos Movimentos de Moradia (Union of Housing Movements—

UMM) and the Frente de Luta por Moradia (Front for the Housing Struggle—FLM). These groups serve as umbrella organizations, mobilizing smaller organizations and residents for collective action while maintaining strong relationships with city government officials and institutions. The choice of different types of organizations across the cities—neighborhood-based versus citywide—allows for comparison of how each type of organization operates in different contexts.

To analyze the data for the case studies I used qualitative software to categorize thematic issues and key words. This process allowed me to note similarities and differences in the strategies undertaken by groups across cities and to link the demands and outcomes elicited by these strategies. The relatively long time frame from beginning to end of this study, from 2011 to 2017, meant that I needed to maintain continuous contact with key sources in each of the cities, make multiple site visits, and follow events as they unfolded through social media and news reports to ensure I captured the timeline of strategies and outcomes of these organizations' efforts.

## Outline

The book begins with a comparative chapter on civil society, urban development, and housing across the United States and Brazil, the purpose of which is to orient the reader to the similarities and differences in the environment facing urban organizations across these two countries. In Chapter 2 I then present the main theoretical arguments regarding the typology of strategies, the factors behind the choices of strategies among community organizations, and the outcomes these strategies produce. I build on the variables behind strategic choices discussed by social movement and governance literature to explain both the factors internal and external to organizations that generate actions. Here I argue that ideology, the organization's relationship with the state, political opportunities, and resources shape the choice of inclusionary, indirect, overhaul, or exit strategies. Further, I argue that inclusionary strategies should lead to the most transformational changes in policies, programs, and institutions, but internal characteristics of the organization, the capacity of the city government, political shifts, and existing laws either enhance or limit the ability of community organizations to effect change.

In Chapter 3 I describe the resistance of Vila Autódromo in Rio, demonstrating that a radical ideology combined with a weak relationship with the state led to an exit strategy in which the community sought the support of international actors to pressure the city government to allow residents to remain in place. While the strategy produced limited victories for the community, the impact of their resistance on long-term structural change may be in providing a model rather than direct reform for those facing removal.<sup>6</sup> In Atlanta, a conservative ideology, a mixed relationship with the state, and limited resources produced the HHDC's indirect strategies for incremental change. New political leadership and increasing awareness of the growing crisis of affordability produced limited citywide reform, but little resolution to the challenge of long-term inclusion in the historic neighborhood.

In São Paulo, the UMM and the FLM wage a continuous struggle to hold the city government accountable for promises of investment in housing for low-income residents, often termed "social housing," and enforcement of zoning regulations. Of the four case studies, the housing movements in São Paulo are the only groups to have engaged in truly inclusionary strategies, but the existing participatory and legal institutions are far from sufficient as mechanisms of accountability. Influence of officials through disruptive tactics and bilateral negotiations also served to elicit promises and motivate implementation of programs. Government capacity in times of economic and political crisis, however, ultimately limited the movements' progress. Finally, in Washington, D.C., a relatively conservative ideology and a close relationship with the state encouraged indirect strategies to boost investment in a range of existing housing programs. Here, economic growth enabled the city government to increase investment, responding favorably to the Housing for All Campaign's long-term strategy. The campaign achieved their goal of increasing the budget for housing, though they did not prompt further institutional reforms that might provide for greater inclusion within policy making.

Though issues of tenure in the informal settlements of Brazil would seem to differentiate these two countries, the cases show that across cities residents struggle for the state to recognize their right to occupy space increasingly out of financial reach. Without organization, housing remains an individual challenge, but at the community level, residents realize their cases are strengthened by collectivizing the issue.



The cases reflect the importance of access to the legal system, direct negotiation with officials, and public consciousness of the residents' experiences. In addition, even though the victories for these communities are incomplete, they demonstrate a willingness from city governments to work with low-income residents collectively. Across cases, collective action pays off, but in different ways. At the heart of these conflicts is the desire of low-income residents to be recognized and treated as an integral part of the city. The cases demonstrate the similarities in insecurity facing low-income residents in cities experiencing rapid development and increasing costs of living, but they also show the importance of strategies for producing more favorable outcomes for residents.

### Implications

How can the city be more inclusive and preserve existing diversity while improving the quality of life and promoting economic development? Often it may seem like development, as defined by increasing prosperity, services, profits, and revenues, is incompatible with development as defined by improving quality of life and increasing human capital. But every day we see community organizations around the world seeking to limit the power of profit to shape cities, insisting on a greater voice in urban development.

In the United States and Brazil, urban investment is reshaping cities at rapid speed. Though at first glance the issues across cities in the United States and Brazil differ significantly because of contrasting histories of urban development and the presence or absence of informal settlements, similarities exist in the processes by which gentrification, displacement, and the reduction of affordable housing take place. Community organizations across the world engage in various strategies to combat displacement and secure affordable housing, but we still have much to learn about why and when organizations choose the strategies they do to promote housing and the effect of these choices across diverse contexts.

This research suggests that today community organizations across the United States and Brazil still largely seek to influence policies and programs for housing from the *outside* rather than seeking opportunities for decision-making power from *within* government institu-

tions. Their strategies demonstrate the traditional notion of separation between the state and civil society, but this indirect means of influence will not further the global agenda for inclusive cities. Community organizations face enormous challenges in garnering resources, mobilizing support, and counteracting the power of the private sector, but if we all desire more inclusive cities, community organizations may need to reflect on their own strategies and how they might change to achieve outcomes that promote incorporation, both spatially and politically. As the case studies demonstrate, organizations in the United States are more hesitant than those in Brazil to call for formal inclusion of civil society actors in government institutions if these representatives would be unelected by the people. But even in Brazil, where there is a longer tradition of incorporation of civil society into the state, newly created participatory institutions and legal instruments meant to protect the poor often fail to provide power to civil society and resolution to the significant challenges of housing. Of course, those who hold power in the environment in which civil society operates—including public-sector institutions and private-sector interests—also must see the value in including civil society in decision making and work toward that goal. The cases illustrate the long road ahead for civil society and government to fulfill the promise of inclusive cities, but the achievements of these organizations, regardless of their strategies, provide signs of hope for collective action as a means of preventing displacement and ensuring access to affordable housing.