

SOCIAL HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

A Cross-National Perspective

This page intentionally left blank

SOCIAL HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

A Cross-National Perspective

EDITED BY

PAUL WATT

Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK

PEER SMETS

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2017

Copyright © 2017 Emerald Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78714-125-4 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-124-7 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-910-6 (Epub)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

<i>List of Contributors</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	ix
1. Social Housing and Urban Renewal: An Introduction <i>Paul Watt</i>	1
2. Holding on to HOPE: Assessing Redevelopment of Boston's Orchard Park Public Housing Project <i>Shomon Shamsuddin and Lawrence J. Vale</i>	37
3. 'The Blue Bit, that Was My Bedroom': Rubble, Displacement and Regeneration in Inner-City London <i>Luna Glucksberg</i>	69
4. Gentrification as Policy Goal or Unintended Outcome? Contested Meanings of Urban Renewal and Social Housing Reform in an Australian City <i>Lynda Cheshire</i>	105
5. Are Social Mix and Participation Compatible? Conflicts and Claims in Urban Renewal in France and England <i>Agnès Deboulet and Simone Abram</i>	141
6. Promoting Social Mix through Tenure Mix: Social Housing and Mega-Event Regeneration in Turin <i>Manuela Olagnero and Irene Ponzio</i>	179

7.	Tenure Mix against the Background of Social Polarization. Social Mixing of Moroccan-Dutch and Native-Born Dutch in Amsterdam East <i>Peer Smets</i>	215
8.	Phased Out, Demolished and Privatized: Social Housing in an East German 'Shrinking City' <i>Matthias Bernt</i>	253
9.	Social Housing and Urban Renewal in Tokyo: From Post-War Reconstruction to the 2020 Olympic Games <i>Chikako Mori</i>	277
10.	Territorial Stigmatization in Socially-Mixed Neighborhoods in Chicago and Santiago: A Comparison of Global-North and Global-South Urban Renewal Problems <i>Javier Ruiz-Tagle</i>	311
11.	Caught Between the Market and Transformation: Urban Regeneration and the Provision of Low-Income Housing in Inner-City Johannesburg <i>Aidan Mosselson</i>	351
12.	Social Housing, Urban Renewal and Shifting Meanings of 'Welfare State' in Turkey: A Study of the Karapınar Renewal Project, Eskişehir <i>Cansu Civelek</i>	391
13.	The Inbetweeners: Living with Abandonment, Gentrification and Endless Urban 'Renewal' in Salford, UK <i>Andrew Wallace</i>	431
14.	Social Housing and Urban Renewal: Conclusion <i>Peer Smets and Paul Watt</i>	459
	<i>About the Authors</i>	479
	<i>Index</i>	485

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- Simone Abram* Department of Anthropology, Durham University, Durham, UK
- Matthias Bernt* Leibniz-Institute for Research on Society and Space, Research Department 4 'Regeneration of Cities', Erkner, Germany
- Lynda Cheshire* School of Social Science, University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia
- Cansu Civelek* Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria
- Agnès Deboulet* Department of Sociology, University Paris 8, Nanterre Cedex, France
- Luna Glucksberg* International Inequalities Institute, London School of Economics, London, UK
- Chikako Mori* Graduate School of Law and International Relations, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan
- Aidan Mosselson* Gauteng City Region Observatory, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
- Manuela Olagnero* Department of Culture, Politics and Society, University of Turin, Torino, Italy
- Irene Ponzio* FIERI: Forum of International and European Research on Immigration, Torino, Italy
- Javier Ruiz-Tagle* Institute of Urban and Territorial Studies, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Santiago, Chile

- Shomon Shamsuddin* Department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA
- Peer Smets* Department of Sociology, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands
- Lawrence J. Vale* Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA, USA
- Andrew Wallace* School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
- Paul Watt* Department of Geography, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFHCO	Affordable Housing Company
AKP	Justice and Development Party
AMI	Area Median Income
ANRU	Agence Nationale de Rénovation Urbaine [National Urban Renovation Agency]
ANC	African National Congress
ASGISA	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa
AUM	Anxiety Uncertainty Management
BBP	Better Buildings Programme
CAB	Citizens Advice Bureau
CC	Conseil Citoyen [Citizens' Council]
CDS	City Development Strategy
CHALK	Charlestown and Lower Kersal
CHP	Community Housing Provider
CHP	Republican People's Party (Turkey)
CRESR	Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
Drs	Drucksache (printed paper)
DHPW	Department of Housing and Public Works
EAP	Estate Action Plan
GDR	German Democratic Republic (1949–1990)
GEAR	Growth Employment and Redistribution
GHLC	Government Housing Loan Corporation
GLC	Greater London Council
GPF	Gauteng Partnership Fund

GWG	GWG Gesellschaft für Wohn- und Gewerbeimmobilien Halle-Neustadt mbH (one of the two municipal housing companies in Halle (Saale))
HA	Housing Association
HMR	Housing Market Renewal
IOS	Informatie, Onderzoek en Statistiek (Department of Information, Research and Statistics of the Municipality of Amsterdam)
JHC	Johannesburg Housing Company
JNR	Japanese National Railways
JOSHCO	Johannesburg Social Housing Company
IMO	Chamber of Civil Engineers
KdU	Kosten der Unterkunft (“costs for accommodation” provided for welfare recipients)
LA	Local Authority
LBS	London Borough of Southwark
LCC	Logan City Council
LCCH	Logan City Community Housing
LRC	London Research Centre
LRI	Logan Renewal Initiative
MAAC	Minami Aoyama Apartment Corporation
MP	Member of Parliament
NASHO	National Association of Social Housing Organisations
NDC	New Deal for Communities
NFP	Not for Profit
NHFC	National Housing Finance Corporation
NHSS	National Housing Subsidy Scheme
NPNRU	Nouveau Programme National de Renouvellement Urbain [National Urban Renewal Programme]
PFI	Private Finance Initiative
PNRU	Programme National de Renouvellement Urbain [National Urban Renewal Programme]
PP	Peckham Partnership

PRU	Plan de Renouveau Urbain [Urban Renewal Plan]
PUCA	Plan, Urbanization, Construction, Architecture
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Program
SANCO	South African National Civics Organisation
SRB	Single Regeneration Budget
TARA	Tenants and Residents Association
TMG	Tokyo Metropolitan Government
TOKİ	Mass Housing Administration of Turkey
TUHF	Trust for Urban Housing Finance
UR	Urban Renaissance Agency
WG	Am Südpark: <i>Wohnungsgenossenschaft Am Südpark eG</i> (a cooperative housing company which went bankrupt in 2001)
WP	Welfare Party
WVB	Centuria GmbH (name of a private housing company, specialized in asset management)
ZUS	Zone Urbain Sensible [Sensitive Urban Zones]

This page intentionally left blank

SOCIAL HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL: AN INTRODUCTION

Paul Watt

FROM UTOPIA TO DYSTOPIA: THE DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE OF SOCIAL HOUSING ESTATES

Social housing estates — as developed either by local states (*viz.* public/municipal housing) or voluntary sector housing associations — became a prominent feature of the twentieth century urban landscape in many Northern European cities, and also to a lesser extent in North American and Australian cities.¹ Many of these estates were built as part of earlier urban renewal, “slum clearance” programs especially in the post–World War II heyday of the Keynesian welfare state. Old, overcrowded, slum areas of private rental housing were demolished to make way for new modernist housing blocks and estates which provided physically improved and affordable rental housing for workers and their families. In both Northern Europe and North America, the estates were created at a time of considerable optimism both in terms of town planning and modernist architecture, and also in the capacity of welfare states to build and manage mass housing projects (Campkin, 2013; Urban, 2012).

The heartlands of social housing in capitalist societies have been the large, industrial — now in many cases ex-industrial — cities of Northern Europe in

the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, France, the United Kingdom, and West Germany where there was extensive social housing provision, often, although not exclusively, in the form of monotenure estates. In some cities, these estates were largely located in inner-city areas, as for example in London and Amsterdam, whereas in other cases the estates were predominantly built in the suburban periphery, for example on the outskirts of the major Scottish cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, in the grand ensembles around Paris, Copenhagen, and West German cities such as Cologne and Dusseldorf (Power, 1997; Turkington & Watson, 2015; Urban, 2012; Whitehead & Scanlon, 2007).

In many Northern European societies, social housing took on a “mass” rather than a “residual” form (Harloe, 1995) in the sense that it did not house just the poorest and most vulnerable but instead catered for large tranches of the population, notably the industrial working class.² It was, in the words of the Swedish Social Democratic Party, “the people’s home” (*folkhemmet*; Harloe, 1995, p. 1), an example of welfare capitalism in action. This was also the case in postwar Britain where millions of people “considered council houses better than private accommodation, both in quality and in the security they offered” (Todd, 2014, pp. 179–180). This extensive provision did not, however, equate to the universalism that dominated other sectors of the postwar Keynesian welfare state such as health, education, and social security. Instead, housing has long been recognized as the “wobbly pillar under the welfare state” (Torgersen, 1987), even if that pillar has proved to be a good deal wobblier in some societies (and their cities) than others, notably England (Hodkinson, Watt, & Mooney, 2013; Watt & Minton, 2016; Chapters 3, 5, and 13 of this volume). In contrast to Northern Europe, social housing was far less prominent in US, Canadian, and Australian cities and tended to operate via an explicitly “residual” model of provision which primarily catered for the poor and notably for racialized minority groups (Darcy, 2010; Harloe, 1995; Hirsch, 1983; Wacquant, 2008).³

The widespread postwar optimism regarding social housing did not, however, last long. Despite the often utopian visions which lay behind social housing estates, in a relatively short time they came to be seen as problematic

both in design and social terms by politicians, the mass media, and academics. This was especially the case in relation to the large, modernist concrete “tower and slab” estates (Campkin, 2013; Coleman, 1990; Urban, 2012), for example, the “brutalist” about-to-be-demolished Robin Hood Gardens estate in East London (Mould, 2017). They were, and often still are, regarded as “sink estates” — stigmatized crucibles of urban poverty, misery, and lawlessness (Campkin, 2013) — even if residents’ lived reality was often at some remove from such stereotypical, stigmatizing images (Garbin & Millington, 2012; Watt, 2008), as discussed further in this chapter and several chapters of this volume.

Nowhere was this apparent systemic failure more pronounced than in the case of the public housing “projects” in the large US cities. Large postwar projects such as the Pruitt–Igoe tower blocks in St. Louis, and Cabrini-Green and Robert Taylor Homes in Chicago (now all demolished), rapidly became bywords for spatially concentrated poverty and crime. The sources of this decline were manifold but included, in various combinations, a significant underestimation of management and maintenance costs, systemic public underfunding, neglect and disinvestment, mounting unemployment coupled with demographic concentrations of poor families including many young people (see *inter alia* Bradford Hunt, 2009; Heathcott, 2012; Rainwater, 1970; Urban, 2012; Vale, 2013; Wacquant, 2008).

Furthermore, the spatial concentration of poverty had a profound racialized aspect to it since the new modernist housing projects by and large replicated the racialized injustices of the old “black ghetto.” The deliberate racialized siting of the new public housing projects in or near the old inner-city black ghettos, away from white neighborhoods, resulted in their becoming the “second ghetto,” as Hirsch (1983) famously described in the case of Chicago. The projects’ typically stark, towering appearance on the urban landscape only highlighted the symbolism of policy failures: “in many cities, public housing has simply become a more visible kind of slum, and by its very existence as a *public* programme highlights the failure of the federal response to poverty” (Rainwater, 1970, p. 524; original emphasis).

If the US inner-city projects were emerging as problematic by the mid-1960s, their subsequent decline was further exacerbated by a lethal cocktail of

deindustrialization and the flight of newly affluent blacks to the suburbs, as powerfully argued by the Chicago-based sociologist William Julius Wilson (1987, 1993). The “truly disadvantaged” — those poor African Americans left behind in the inner city including in the projects — not only lacked jobs but, unlike the ghettos of early- to mid-twentieth century US cities such as Harlem, they also had a dearth of “respectable” role models. The result, Wilson argued, was the spatial concentration of poverty and social dysfunctionality in the inner city and the production of spatial “neighborhood effects” which result in negative life chances for the poor and their children *over and above* any individual disadvantages they might face.

If concentrated urban poverty and social dysfunctionality were most severe in the US projects, they were also identified in Northern European inner-city and peripheral social housing estates (Beider, 2007; Musterd, Murie, & Kesteloot, 2006; Power, 1997; Turkington & Watson, 2015; van Kempen, Dekker, Hall, & Tosics, 2005). English council estates and the Parisian banlieues, for example, experienced large-scale urban disturbances — “riots” — during the 1990s and 2000s (Dikecs, 2007; Power & Tunstall, 1997). Furthermore, in academic terms, the “neighborhood effects” which Wilson identified arguably made their way from Chicago to the poorer areas of European and Australian cities including social housing estates. Those people growing up in such estates were said to be doubly disadvantaged — not only by their parents’ poverty, but also by the poverty and disadvantages of the place itself which magnified young people’s social exclusion (Friedrichs, Galster, & Musterd 2003; Jenks & Mayer, 1990; Manley, van Ham, Bailey, Simpson, & Maclennan, 2013). Estate residents were said to lack effective role models and connections to the world of work, since they were spatially isolated and lived with similar poor people to themselves.

Before turning to the preferred policy solution to the decline of social housing estates via their all-too-literal “fall” — demolition — it’s worth pausing at this point to add vital nuance to the above overarching narrative. For one thing, what seems to have happened is that certain iconic, infamous US projects — such as Pruitt–Igoe and Robert Taylor Homes — took on a symbolic significance that is way beyond their socio-spatial representativeness. Despite the specific problems faced by Pruitt–Igoe and the way its

decline was produced by macro-social and economic forces, this did not prevent it from assuming a symbolic, even mythical status in the eyes of politicians and those who were only too happy to see public housing interventions as inherently problematic (Freidrichs, 2011; Heathcott, 2012). In other words, these particular projects came to symbolize what Goetz (2013, p. 40) calls an “exaggerated discourse of disaster,” in which any policy successes from the projects in general were drowned out by a plethora of “bad news” stories. As we discuss later, residents of the projects, especially African-American women, were also at the forefront of concerted grass-roots mobilization attempts to combat the all-too frequent bureaucratic inertia and neglect they faced and in so doing demonstrated considerable attachment to their homes and neighborhoods (Feldman & Stall, 2004).

In relation to this, there is also disproportionate media and academic attention given to the Chicago Housing Authority project “failures,” while the far more extensive, well-funded, and generally positive projects run by the New York City Housing Authority receive relatively little attention (Hyra, 2008; Urban, 2012). As for the frequent design determinism which the policy analysts all too often employ to justify demolishing public housing units, Urban (2012, p. 32) points out how “many [NYC] areas that in the 1960s acquired a bad reputation – such as Harlem or the South Bronx – were neither high-rises nor public housing, but rather poor neighborhoods of three-story brownstone houses from the late nineteenth century.”

If US public housing is neither defined nor encapsulated by the Robert Taylor Homes or even the Chicago projects as a whole, it is even more questionable to try and make sweeping cross-national generalizations across from the US project experience to that of Northern European social housing estates (see *inter alia* Aalbers, van Gent, & Pinkster, 2011; Fenton, Lupton, Arrundale, & Tunstall, 2012; Stal & Zuberi, 2010; Wacquant, 2008). Not only were the latter far more extensive than the former, but in many European cities they were not equivalent to the racialized, hyper-marginalized enclaves of the US inner cities. As Wacquant (2008) and others have argued, the experiences of the black, inner-urban hyper-ghetto — in relation to racism, crime, poverty, and welfare state withdrawal — have no European equivalent, despite certain modernist architectural similarities (Urban, 2012). For one

thing, the US projects have had long-term strict income ceilings which mean they tend to cater for the poor and vulnerable far more than in Europe.

In comparison to the US projects, Northern European estates for much of their history did not cater for the very poor but instead for the manual working class and even sections of the middle classes (Harloe, 1995; Watt, 2005). More recently, however, many European countries have imposed formal income levels ceilings regarding who has access to social housing, while some continue to have no formal income restrictions (e.g., Austria, Denmark) (Scanlon et al., 2015). However, as Scanlon et al. (2015) identify, social tenants tend to have lower incomes than average in Europe. In addition, while the data are incomplete, they also found that ethnic minorities and immigrants tend to be overrepresented in social housing (31% in the Netherlands and 25% in Denmark), and even higher in large cities, for example Munich (Scanlon et al., 2015, p. 5), Paris and London (Urban, 2012), although not Berlin (Urban, 2012). Despite the concentration of low-income and ethnic minority groups in social housing in Europe, this is still far from the situation pertaining to the US inner-city projects, and especially to the most infamous projects such as Robert Taylor Homes and Pruitt-Igoe.

URBAN RENEWAL REDUX: DEMOLISHING SOCIAL HOUSING

Since the epochal demolition of the Pruitt–Igoe project tower blocks in St. Louis in 1972 (Heathcott, 2012) — the symbolic end of modernism according to Chris Jenks (cited in Harvey, 1989a) — social housing estates have been increasingly disappearing from the skylines of North American, Western European, and Australian cities. This eradication has occurred as a result of “new urban renewal” (Hyra, 2008) programs involving estates’ demolition and their replacement with mixed-tenure housing developments in order to solve problems of poverty concentration and social dysfunctionality. This “urban renewal redux” represents a rear-view mirror effect of how the old inner-city tenements were regarded as slums in the 1940s and 1950s and in need of demolition and replacement by the self-same modernist social housing estates that are now being torn down. As Vale (2013) has noted, in some cases this new renewal phase was even in the *same place* as

previous slum clearance schemes, giving rise to the phenomenon of what he terms “twice-cleared communities.” Another example of this can be seen in Chapter 9 of this volume where Chikako Mori shows how elderly residents of the Kasumigaoka Apartments experienced a double displacement as a result of Tokyo’s staging of the Olympics Games, first in 1964 and then again in preparation for the upcoming 2020 Games.

These renewal programs — which in practice often come under the rubric of “urban regeneration” — have the aim of radically altering the neighborhoods where social housing estates stand, away from their being (or at least *being seen as*), concentrated zones of poverty, crime, drugs, and other social problems, by literally obliterating the estates — a form of physical “cleansing” with resultant “social cleansing” effects. In the United States, various policies were devised to combat poverty concentration and neighborhood effects, notably the Hope VI program which began in the early 1990s (Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006; Goetz, 2013; Vale, 2013). Hope VI meant demolishing the projects and, because of increasingly limited public housing replacement units, moving the poor away from their previous neighborhoods, while the latter were redeveloped into mixed-tenure areas with large numbers of affluent, often white incoming homeowners. The appearance of the latter would promote social mixing between wealthy homeowners and the remaining tenants, in which the latter would gain valuable social connections as well as raised aspirations by living cheek-by-jowl with homeowners. Furthermore, rather than such estates being primarily state-developed, they would be developed as part of public-private partnerships. This “new urban renewal” set of programs became the policy orthodoxy and spread out from the United States to many European and Australian cities with social housing estates (Darcy, 2010, 2013; Imrie, Raco, & Lees, 2009; Jacobs, Marston, & Darcy, 2004).

Contemporary urban renewal is of crucial policy significance for cities and their denizens, not least those who live in the affected estates. It is also the subject of intense academic and policy debate regarding whether it promotes social mixing and spatial justice, as its proponents claim, or instead generates new socio-spatial injustices, inequalities, and insecurities, as its critics suggest. As the new urban renewal has spread geographically, so it has become increasingly

controversial with academics condemning its simplistic one-size-fits-all approach which has failed to take into account the successes, as well as failures, of social housing estates (Goetz, 2013; Urban, 2012). Critical urbanists in particular regard the new urban renewal as little more than an integral component of neoliberal urban policies which ultimately result in the displacement of the poor from inner-city areas. It is *de facto* “state-led gentrification” — in other words, the state aiding and assisting private capital to maximize profits in hitherto unprofitable urban locations via exploiting the creation and realization of rent gaps (Glynn, 2009; Hodkinson, 2011; Lees & Ferreri, 2016; Uitermark, Duyvendak, & Kleinhans, 2007; Watt, 2013a).

What has also happened is that the residents of targeted estates have challenged and even overtly *resisted* the renewal programs which were supposedly being undertaken for their benefit. This has taken several forms, including legal challenges as well as traditional mobilizations in the form of demonstrations and lobbying local politicians (see *inter alia* Cumbers, Helms, & Swanson, 2010; Douglas & Parkes, 2016; Flynn, 2016; Glynn, 2009; Lees & Ferreri, 2016; Pfeiffer, 2006; Watt, 2013a). Such opposition and resistance feature in Chapters 3, 5, and 9 of this volume. Resident opposition has even emerged in the archetypal “failed” US projects: “One of the more striking images of public housing transformation in Chicago was the sight of residents carrying signs protesting the demolition of Cabrini-Green project” (Goetz, 2013, p. 86). As Goetz and others highlight (Feldman & Stall, 2004; Pfeiffer, 2006), the Chicago projects were by no means as unidimensional as their detractors suggest. As Feldman and Stall (2004) detail, female African-American residents of the Wentworth Gardens project in Chicago mobilized and fought to improve their living conditions for decades in the face of official intransigence and neglect, while they latterly resisted the threatened demolition by the very same officials who had run their neighborhoods down. Such “place attachments” (Watt & Smets, 2014) to home and neighborhood are largely invisible to urban renewal professionals: “the satisfactions residents gained from living in these communities and the positive attachments they experienced remained opaque to outsiders, who saw only physical deterioration” (Feldman & Stall, 2004, p. 86). Feldman and Stall importantly raise the interrelated questions of perspective and power, questions which are all too frequently glossed over in the

technocratic world of urban policy — “whose voices count in renewal programmes?” As they argue, the voices which all too often *do not count*, and are not even heard, are those of low-income, public housing residents, and especially African-American women, who are also often those at the forefront of grassroots struggles to improve neighborhood services on estates (for the UK, see Gosling, 2008). Such grassroots struggles of social tenants have also been prominent outside the United States (Glynn, 2009; Lees & Ferreri, 2016; Watt, 2013a; Watt & Minton, 2016).

In academic circles, there is mounting debate and skepticism as to how far social housing renewal has met its goals of enhancing social mixing and social mobility (Arbaci & Rae, 2013; Bridge, Butler, & Lees, 2012; Graham, Manley, Hiscock, Boyle, & Doherty, 2009; Smets & Hellinga, 2014; Smets & Sneeep, 2017). To make matters worse, the intellectual foundation on which much social housing renewal policy is justified — neighborhood effects — is by no means as robust as its policy advocates recommend. Certainly, some scholars have produced state-of-the-art accounts of “enduring neighborhood effects” as in the case of Sampson’s (2013) magisterial overview of Chicago. Nevertheless, despite the growing mountain of research papers on neighborhood effects, there is little consensus regarding the size of such effects, their significance, or their causal pathways (Manley et al., 2013; van Ham, Manley, Bailey, Simpson, & MacLennan, 2012). There is even skepticism as to whether neighborhood effects even exist at all, a skepticism which comes from both individualistic (Cheshire, 2012) and structural (Slater, 2013) perspectives. Furthermore, as Slater (2013) and Davies and Imbroscio (2010) suggest, an exclusive focus on spatial inequalities and their all too visible manifestations (poor places/slums) and relatively easy and physically spectacular policy solutions (“knock them down”) can detract attention from mounting social inequalities and the much more entrenched and powerful forces which keep those inequalities in place.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, URBAN POLICY, AND SOCIAL HOUSING RENEWAL

The previous discussion suggests the existence of a polarized set of both political and academic positions on social housing estates and urban

renewal. One way of simultaneously summarizing and assessing this polarized debate is via discourse analysis. Using this, one can identify two distinct urban policy discourses regarding social housing renewal: first an official/mainstream discourse that dominates both policy approaches and mainstream urban social science; and second an oppositional/critical discourse that is prominent among housing and community activists who are opposed to renewal at their estates, as well as among academic critical urbanists (Watt, 2013b). These discourses are summarized in ideal typical form in **Tables 1 and 2**. Each discourse utilizes a set of key framing policy tropes, which encompass the identification of policy “problems” (**Table 1**), “solutions” and “effects” (**Table 2**). These ideal types represent an extrapolation not only from several academic sources (especially Darcy, 2010, 2013; Glasze, Pütz, Germes, Schirmel, & Brailich, 2012; Johnston & Mooney, 2007), but also from numerous policy and activist documents and websites, notably those derived from my own research on regeneration on London council estates (see *inter alia* Watt, 2008, 2009, 2013a; Watt & Minton, 2016). Like all ideal types, these are not meant to encompass all elements of both discourses, but instead to highlight their main constituent features and also to act as “models” against which social reality can be compared.

Before we examine these two discourses in detail, we will take a brief excursus into discourse analysis. This has proved to be a useful, albeit underutilized, tool in relation to urban policy (Jacobs, 2006), although it has featured in relation to social housing including regeneration and renewal (Darcy, 2010, 2013; Glasze et al., 2012; Marston, 2002; Watt & Jacobs, 2000; Watt, 2008). According to Levitas (1998, p. 3):

Discourse [...] means that sets of interrelated concepts act together as a matrix through which we understand the social world. As this matrix structures our understanding, so it in turn governs the paths of action which appear to be open to us. A discourse constitutes ways of acting in the world, as well as a description of it. It both opens up and closes down possibilities for actions for ourselves.

Not only do discourses provide perspectives on knowing the social world, but they are also, as Levitas highlights, conduits for social action. In the urban

policy context, discourses act as ways of understanding policy issues, and they invariably do so by highlighting certain attendant “problems” while ignoring or sidelining others as well as providing mobilizing frameworks for action to “solve” the focused-upon problems (Stenson & Watt, 1999). Thus discourses frame and mobilize action — in this case either “for” or “against” renewal (Watt, 2013b), as we discuss in detail below.

The main contribution toward examining social housing renewal from a discourse analysis perspective has come from Michael Darcy (2010, 2013) in two seminal papers. He examines how US, UK, and Australian housing authorities have fixed on a similar consensus around removing geographical concentrations of public housing and their replacement with “mixed income communities,” based on a congruence between “international policy transfer and apparent social scientific consensus” (Darcy, 2010, p. 1). Darcy insightfully notes how:

Despite the marked variations in the location and form of the housing being replaced, the urban structures in which it occurs, and even in the socio-cultural composition of the targeted residential communities [...] the stated rationale and aims of these policies and programs, and the premise on which they are designed, almost indistinguishable.

— Darcy (2010, p. 2)

As several chapters in this volume highlight, this general rationale has indeed formed the crux of social housing renewal policies and programs in the United States (Chapters 2 and 10), England (Chapters 3, 5, and 13), and Australia (Chapter 4). However, other chapters highlight how this rationale has extended well beyond the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia — all societies with prominent, albeit uneven liberal welfare state regimes — to encompass cities in societies with very different kinds of welfare state regimes and social housing trajectories, such as France (Chapter 5), Italy (Chapter 6), the Netherlands (Chapter 7), and Japan (Chapter 9). In other words, there seems to be some credence to the notion that we are witnessing what Darcy (2013, p. 365) calls a “globalised discourse

of deconcentration.” Demolishing social housing estates and deconcentrating their populations, who are frequently poor, is routinely espoused as a form of technocratic “common sense” by politicians, planners, consultants, and architects, as well as by many academics. In the United States, the latter constitute what Imbroscio (2008, p. 111) refers to as the “Dispersal Consensus” in that, “A large and influential group of American scholars studying urban and low-income housing policy have coalesced around the central idea that the best way to ameliorate the plague of urban poverty in the United States is to disperse (or deconcentrate) the urban poor into wealthier (usually outlying suburban) neighborhoods.”

Therefore, the demolition of social housing and the spatial deconcentration of its residents is *de facto* *hegemonic* within contemporary urban policy networks and organizations. In other words, the official/mainstream discourse functions as a “doxa” in Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, that is, “the treatment of concepts as self-evident and therefore taken-for-granted” (Allen, 2010, p. 142). It utilizes a set of key framing policy tropes, which encompasses the identification of policy “problems” (Table 1), “solutions” and “effects” (Table 2). Dominant policy tropes informing the official discourse include “neighborhood effects,” “social mixing,” “community participation,” “rehousing,” “urban renaissance,” and “poverty deconcentration.”

According to the official/mainstream discourse, the cause — or at least *one of the main causes* — of urban poverty and social exclusion is held to be the spatial concentration of social housing tenants onto monotenure estates, and hence social housing is itself considered inherently problematic (Table 1). The mechanism which brings this about is neighborhood effects, that is, the spatial clustering of poor tenants together in the same part of the city. Such clustering means that social housing estates are “ghettoes” of worklessness and crime and populated by a morally deficient, or at least socially disorganized and dysfunctional, “underclass” (Watt, 2008). In terms of social theory, the official/mainstream discourse is heavily reliant on social capital theory. Thus, tenants on social housing estates are characterized by weak social capital in the form of a spatialized form of classic anomie — normlessness, predicated on weak social ties. In some versions, a more subtle approach is taken, one which is informed by Putnam’s distinction between

Table 1: Official/Mainstream and Oppositional/Critical Urban Policy Discourses on Renewal *Vis-à-vis* Social Housing Estates — Problems.

Policy Problems	Official/Mainstream Discourse	Oppositional/Critical Discourse
Social rental housing	Inherently problematic	Meets housing needs
Causes of urban poverty and social exclusion (PSE)	Spatial concentration of social housing (SH)	Unequal resource distribution Reliance upon market housing
Neighborhood effects	Proven	Unproven
Existing SH tenants	Moral and economically flawed citizens — “underclass”	Deprived and marginalized citizens — “working class”/“urban poor”
Tenants’ social capital	Weak Or bonding surplus + bridging deficit	Medium–strong Mutually supportive networks
Physical quality of estates	Poor	Variable — according to investment and management
Territorial stigma	Strong and justified	Strong but stereotypical
Tenants’ place attachment to estates	Weak	Medium–strong
Tenants’ desire to leave estates	High	Low

bridging and bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). In the case of social housing estates, the problem in this variant is that it’s not so much that the tenants lack any form of social capital, it’s that they have the *wrong sort of social capital* — too much “bonding” (with their peers on the estate, classically in the form of youth neighborhood-based gangs) and not enough “bridging” with people not-like-them outside the estate. In addition, the estates are physically rundown and of poor quality, as well as being territorially stigmatized as “dangerous” and “rough” places. However, the dominant thrust of the official discourse is that such stigmatization is legitimate — in other words, estates *really are* hotbeds of crime and antisocial behavior. Unsurprisingly, when it comes to residents’ place attachment to the neighborhood, this is weak, while their concomitant desire to leave the estate is high.

The second “counter-hegemonic” oppositional/critical discourse is typically associated with housing/community activists who in various guises

(both individual and collective) challenge and contest specific regeneration projects (Douglas & Parkes, 2016; Elmer & Denning, 2016; Flynn, 2016), but also with radical/critical urban academics who both deconstruct and challenge the epistemological claims made by the official discourse (Brenner, 2009; Smith, 2002). Some of the key tropes of this critical discourse include “state-led gentrification,” “social cleansing,” and the “right to the city.” The counter-hegemonic oppositional discourse theoretically and politically challenges the parameters of the official renewal discourse. Rather than seeing urban renewal as a technocratic exercise in policy implementation and evaluation, the oppositional discourse regards such policy to be a key part of neoliberalizing, political-economic regimes that are qualitatively distinct from the postwar Keynesian welfare state regimes which developed the estates in the first place. As part of this, the oppositional discourse emphasizes how neighborhood effects are by no means proven, and that the official discourse replicates a stigmatizing set of stereotypes about social housing and its residents which ignore the often very real attachments that tenants have to their homes, neighbors, and neighborhoods. While acknowledging the power of territorial stigmatization, this oppositional discourse largely considers this to be stereotypical and unreflective of the sociological complexity and richness found in estates (see Foster, 1997; Smith, 2005 for illustrations based on research at London council estates).

The official discourse policy solutions/effects, as set out in Table 2, are poverty deconcentration, reduced territorial stigmatization, and promoting social mixing between existing poor tenants and wealthy homeowners through mixed-tenure housing redevelopments. The dominant organizational assemblage for enacting urban renewal is public-private partnerships. Given tenants’ lack of place attachment (Table 1), they are only too willing to be decanted and rehoused and to move out of their current home and their justly stigmatized neighborhood. Consultation by housing officials with residents is genuinely participative and bottom-up. The new incoming homeowners are aspirational role models and job brokers for the remaining tenants and in this way the latter’s social capital is enhanced — or transformed away from unhealthy bonding to healthy bridging with people “not like them.” Thus gentrification is “positive” (Davidson, 2008), and the new post-

Table 2: Official/Mainstream and Oppositional/Critical Urban Policy Discourses on Renewal *Vis-à-vis* Social Housing Estates — Solutions/Effects.

Policy Solutions/ Effects	Official/Mainstream Discourse	Oppositional/Critical Discourse
Policy framework	Social/tenure mixing	Roll-out neoliberalism
Organizational framework	Public-private partnerships	Entrepreneurial city
Solution to urban PSE	Spatial deconcentration of social housing (SH) tenants	Reduce social inequality Support and enhance SH
Tenants' mobility	Decant and rehouse Tenants want to move	Social cleansing Tenants want to stay
Consultation	Bottom-up Genuinely participative	Top-down Ideological
New homeowners in renewed estates	Aspirational: role models and job brokers for tenants	Gentrifiers: lead separate lives and antagonistic to tenants
Gentrification	Positive	State-led
New communities following renewal	Mixed and stable	Divided and unstable
City-scale	Urban renaissance	Reduced right to the city
National-scale	Heightened aspirations > increased social mobility	Entrenched but spatially reshuffled inequalities

renewal neighborhoods are mixed, stable, and sustainable. This upward neighborhood trajectory contributes to wider city-scale processes of urban renaissance, and to the heightening of national-scale social aspirations and upward social mobility.

By contrast, the oppositional/critical discourse views social housing renewal as enhancing the neoliberal privatization of urban space which promotes the entrepreneurial city (Harvey, 1989b). As such, it amounts to state-led gentrification that results in displacement and heightened insecurities. Rather than poor tenants being decanted and rehoused, they are socially cleansed from these new upcoming areas. Resident consultation is top-down and ideological in the sense that it's a box-ticking exercise which housing renewal officials have to undertake, but it has no real meaning since

the key decisions have already been taken by the major state-private stakeholders. The affluent incoming homeowners gentrifiers lead separate lives and are often antagonistic toward whatever remaining social housing tenants there are. Hence, post-renewal neighborhoods are socially divided, tense, and unstable. Rather than renewal promoting social mobility and spatial justice, it promotes the social cleansing of the inner city via the expulsion of poor denizens to the suburban outskirts and the loss of their “right to the city” (Harvey, 2008). Social inequalities are both entrenched and spatially reshuffled.

Both editors of this volume are sympathetic to the aims and values which guide the oppositional/critical discourse. This is not least on the basis of our own long-standing research which routinely demonstrates a profound gap between official renewal/regeneration aims and promises, and the on-the-ground, lived experiences of estate residents and others who are supposed to benefit (see *inter alia* Kennelly & Watt, 2012; Smets & Hellinga, 2014; Smets & Snee, 2017; Watt & Wallace, 2014; Watt, 2008, 2009, 2013a).

AIMS AND REMIT OF THE BOOK

This book provides a research-based perspective on the renewal of social housing estates in a variety of cities during the last two decades. Its overarching aim is to *put sociological — in some cases anthropological — flesh onto understanding the social processes and impacts of contemporary social housing renewal in a cross-national perspective*. In so doing, it addresses themes of neighborhood and community, poverty and social exclusion, social mixing, mixed-tenure developments, neighborhood effects, territorial stigmatization, demolition, displacement, urban governance, state-led gentrification, and neoliberal urbanism. It aims to understand how and why renewal occurs in a wide variety of urban spatial contexts, ranging from Northern European cities with long-established, extensive public and social housing provision, such as London and Amsterdam, to cities in the Global South, such as Santiago in Chile and the Turkish city of Eskişehir, for whom social housing is a far more recent development.

Throughout the book, there is an emphasis on foregrounding how the residents of social housing estates themselves view and experience urban renewal. What social processes are involved in this self-avowedly benign transformation, and how do the supposed beneficiaries of renewal understand what's happening to them, their homes and their areas? What effects does renewal have and to what extent do these effects mesh with the stated official renewal goals and aims? Again how do those most affected — social housing residents — view the postrenewal landscape, a landscape which may involve a loss of their existing homes and even neighborhoods? In addition to this resident emphasis, several chapters also consider the views of urban renewal officials and politicians, thus allowing for many points of comparison and contrast between “bottom-up” and “top-down” perspectives.

The book initially emerged out of a conference session “Public/Social Rental Housing and Urban Renewal: New Inequalities and Insecurities?” which the editors organized at the XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology, July 13–19, 2014, in Yokohama, Japan. Seven of the chapters are based on papers from this well-attended and well-received session, while the other five chapters are commissioned from researchers who the editors knew to be leading and upcoming scholars on social housing and urban renewal.

All the chapters draw upon original research, most of which is based on a single neighborhood-based case study, although two chapters (5 and 10) are comparative case studies. Each chapter draws upon mixed-methods research. While several chapters incorporate survey and other statistical data, there is a more general emphasis on qualitative research methods including ethnography, observation, and in-depth interviews. This qualitative emphasis is entirely apposite for the book's aims since the depth of the research findings facilitate an unraveling of the complexities, conundrums and blind spots of urban policy formulations, enactments and effects. The book is therefore distinguishable from existing cross-national studies of social housing renewal, such as [van Kempen et al. \(2005\)](#), and [Rowlands, Musterd, and van Kempen \(2009\)](#) which, while based on a single research project, tend to focus on quantitative renewal indicators. As such, these texts tend to underplay the lived experiences of residents undergoing the renewal of their homes and neighborhoods, as well as the dynamic changing nature of the renewal process itself. It is precisely these

aspects of social housing renewal which the chapters in this book capture. Indeed there is growing recognition of the value of qualitative research in relation to urban regeneration (O'Brien & Matthews, 2016), not least from urban scholars who espouse an explicit antigentrification perspective:

An ethnographic approach to the relationship between gentrification and social housing demolition is necessary to bring out the complex and interconnected processes through which the devaluation and displacement of communities and people, especially low income tenants and leaseholders, happen, as well as to analyse and understand the ways in which people's lives are affected by them over the long term.

— Ferreri and Glucksberg
(2016; section 4.2)

It is this volume's emphasis on providing rich, detailed case studies of the renewal process and its effects, notably as experienced by estate residents, which distinguishes it from existing cross-national overviews of social housing renewal (see *inter alia* Droste, Lelevrier, & Wassenberg, 2008; Glynn, 2009; Turkington & Watson, 2015). Whatever their analytical strengths, these existing studies sideline the voices of social housing residents. The more mainstream *Renewing Europe's Housing*, edited by Richard Turkington and Christopher Watson (2015), includes several case studies of particular renewal schemes across European cities, but its emphasis is examining renewal through the lenses of physical changes in the housing stock coupled with official statistics on housing units, population, income levels, etc. While the far more critical *Where the Other Half Lives* edited by Sarah Glynn (2009) broadens out beyond Europe to include North America, Australia, and New Zealand, many of its chapters focus on national-level policy and reactions to it.

By comparison to Glynn (2009) and Turkington and Watson (2015), this volume more consistently and fully engages with how national policies are implemented at the urban level in relation to *the lived experiences of the residents of social housing estates*. This includes residents' views of their homes and estates prer renewal, postrenewal, and also during the renewal process. While the spatial dimension of urban renewal is written into the ontology

and epistemology of specific initiatives with their explicit geographical demarcation *vis-à-vis* bounded and named estates, what is less recognized in the literature is the *temporal dimension* of renewal/regeneration (Davidson, McGuinness, Greenhalgh, & Robinson, 2013). Thus, one of the major epistemological omissions of much of the mainstream urban renewal literature is its misrecognition of how renewal is an *extended process in time*, as well as space. This is especially pertinent to residents who in many cases have a lifetime's experience of living on their estates, for good or ill, whereas official engagement is of necessity more time-bound. It is also this temporal dimension which can bring out the power dynamics of the renewal process whereby official time scales of start and finish can be elongated into decades of residents' lives. This temporal dimension can be identified in several chapters of this volume, but especially Andrew Wallace's analysis of "endless" urban renewal in Salford in Chapter 13 (see also Wallace, 2015; Watt & Wallace, 2014).

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

The chapters concentrate on social housing in several distinctive types of city. First, there are the historic heartlands of social rental provision, that is major Northern European cities with long-standing, extensive but now diminishing public/social housing estates: London (Chapter 3), Sheffield (Chapter 5), and Salford (Chapter 13) in England; Paris, France, (Chapter 5); Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Chapter 7); and Halle in Germany, part of the former GDR (Chapter 8). Second, there are those Western cities in which public housing has historically played a residual role: the US cities of Boston (Chapter 2) and Chicago (Chapter 10), Logan in Australia (Chapter 4), and Turin in Italy (Chapter 6). Third, is Tokyo, Japan (Chapter 9) as an example of an East Asian city. Fourth, there are three cities from the Global South where social housing has been developed as part of relatively recent urban renewal programs: Santiago in Chile (Chapter 10); Johannesburg in South Africa (Chapter 11); and Eskişehir in Turkey (Chapter 12).

Shomon Shamsuddin and Lawrence J. Vale in Chapter 2 examine one of the most researched and controversial social housing renewal programs, the US HOPE VI program (Goetz, 2013; Vale, 2013). As Shamsuddin and Vale note, the majority of published research on Hope VI has focused on those examples where public housing residents form a minority in their now-renewed neighborhood as a result of the influx of wealthy incomers. Their study goes against this trend by looking at the transformation of Boston's Orchard Park into the rebranded "Orchard Gardens." This redevelopment involved a Hope VI scheme where the majority of the units continued to be occupied by low-income households. Shamsuddin and Vale base their analysis on interviews with a sample of public housing residents *both before and after* HOPE VI redevelopment, and as such this is a unique study as far as the authors are aware. Interviews with housing authority staff, official documents, and archival materials are also used. Shamsuddin and Vale find increased residential satisfaction and significant declines in crime in Orchard Gardens following redevelopment, although concerns remain about safety and security. Their findings suggest that public housing renewal can accommodate a majority of poor, subsidized households with some degree of success. However, there was still a net loss of public housing units, as well as a clear process of filtering out "problem tenants" involving displacement, and such issues complicate notions of its being a wholly successful redevelopment.

One important issue raised by Shamsuddin and Vale is which, if any, social housing tenants have the "right to return" to the postrenewal neighborhood. This issue has been particularly problematic in many Hope VI schemes where such a right has not existed prompting claims of "negro removal" (Goetz, 2013). The right to return features prominently in Luna Glucksberg's Chapter 3, but in her case this was a right that residents had to struggle for as part of the renewal process. Glucksberg presents an ethnographic case study, involving participant observation, interviews, and archival research, of the regeneration of the "Five Estates" (council estates) in Peckham, an inner-city neighborhood located in south-east London. She considers the social implications of urban regeneration processes from an anthropological perspective centered on concepts of waste and value. In juxtaposing residents' voices and experiences alongside those of local politicians

and officials, the chapter highlights how the values and interests of those with more power tend to steer postregeneration outcomes in the direction of state-led gentrification. The chapter shows how processes of demolitions and displacement can deeply affect residents in that the homes and communities they value were “wasted” — erased from the landscape. Glucksberg’s approach allows for a reconsideration of regeneration processes in novel ways: through a micro-level understanding of how individuals attribute value to objects and social relationships; and at the macro-level in how inherent power dynamics resulted in one set of values being respected and ultimately acted upon, while others were silenced. In employing life histories and long quotations from interviewees, Glucksberg eschews constructing a singular, unilinear narrative of regeneration constituting either a “success” or “failure,” and instead offers a dense polysemic account of contrasting narratives, while paying full attention to inherent power imbalances in the lengthy and tortuous regeneration process. In disrupting linear narratives of urban renewal, Glucksberg also deconstructs the notion that there is a singular “official” account of the renewal process, let alone residents’ own often contradictory accounts.

In Chapter 4, Lynda Cheshire deepens our understanding of the complex nature of the official renewal account by focusing on the social construction of urban policy with reference to a case study of the Logan Renewal Initiative (LRI) in Queensland, Australia. Using a qualitative case study approach based on interviews and documentary analysis, Cheshire examines the competing aims of urban renewal programs and how different stakeholder groups advocate one element of the program while seeking to prevent another. Cheshire finds two competing agendas bound up within the LRI and with what she calls the “specter of gentrification” appearing in each. In focusing on social housing reform, the first agenda sees gentrification as an undesirable outcome that needs careful management. The second place improvement agenda, however, regards gentrification as an effective policy mechanism, albeit one that would be threatened by increases in the stock of social and affordable housing. The chapter demonstrates that renewal programs are rarely coherent policy tools, but are subject to change as stakeholders attempt to enact their own desired

outcomes. The potential danger in the case of the LRI is that both outcomes will result in the marginalization of low-income groups unless their needs are prioritized. The chapter effectively demonstrates the manner whereby local policy agendas and circumstances mean that the supposedly straightforward relationship between renewal and gentrification is far more complex than generally conceived in the urban studies literature.

The following three chapters focus on one particular aspect of urban renewal programs, that is, social mixing as enacted via tenure mixing. Agnès Deboulet and Simone Abram compare programs for urban housing regeneration in France and England in Chapter 5. They demonstrate how ideological similarities regarding policy ideas and programs played out differently in the different national contexts. Their chapter draws on results of several long-standing research programs, including fieldwork in several cities and regions in France and England which included participant observation in planning events, interviews, and neighborhood tours. In both countries, earlier promises for participation in housing renewal eventually gave way to demolition emphases, justified on technical grounds that were not shared with participants. The social mix and demolition linkage appeared contradictory, a contradiction that only a few residents could endorse. The chapter emphasizes the balance of power differences between France and England, and also looks at overlaps between policy objectives and similarities in housing renewal governance. It also highlights the frequent finding that residents' insider commitments to the value of their social housing differ from "outsider" perspectives which judge such housing to be "poor." The authors suggest that social housing renewal requires greater commitment and emphasis on residents' experiences and views.

In Chapter 6, Manuela Olagnero and Irene Ponzio also focus on social and tenure mixing based on a case study of the conversion of real estate complexes into public and subsidized housing built in Turin in relation to the 2006 Winter Olympic Games. As such, their chapter highlights the important role of sporting mega-events, such as the Olympic Games, in relation to urban regeneration *vis-à-vis* social housing, as also discussed by Chikako Mori in Chapter 9 with reference to the upcoming 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games (Kennelly, 2016; Watt & Bernstock, 2017; Watt, 2013a).

Olagnero and Ponzo explicitly compare policy goals aimed at producing social mix via the mixing of housing tenures, with outcomes. They employ survey data and semistructured interviews with residents, as well as interviews with key actors and observation in public places. Their findings suggest that regeneration policies *vis-à-vis* tenure mix are most effective in “area-based effects,” such as preventing neighborhood stigmatization and attracting private investments in local amenities, but less so for “people-based effects” such as mixed social interaction and positive role models. The chapter argues that achieving the latter people-based effects requires long-term interventions that extend beyond building and allocating new apartments. The chapter’s findings demonstrate how processes of social mix following on from regeneration require embedding in organizational and policy conditions.

Peer Smets in Chapter 7 also provides an analysis of social mixing and tenure mixing, in his case in the Transvaal neighborhood in Amsterdam, one which has gone through various rounds of urban renewal. He does so against a backdrop of widening social polarization which is occurring in The Netherlands at the national scale between the native-born Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch. The chapter is based on ethnographic research in the neighborhood. The chapter shows how Transvaal residents from different ethnic and income backgrounds interact together in the neighborhood. By highlighting the national Dutch context of interethnic polarization, Smets offers a new vantage point to the European literature on renewal and social mixing that tends to emphasize class issues, that is, mixing poor social housing tenants with richer owners. In policy terms, the chapter contributes to the formulation of evidence-based policies for the improvement of social cohesion and everyday livability in such ethnically mixed neighborhoods which have gone through renewal.

In Chapter 8, Matthias Bernt turns attention to the changing nature of social housing provision in a shrinking city in East Germany — Halle-Neustadt. He employs mixed methods including statistical analysis, documentary analysis, interviews, and fieldwork. Social housing is under pressure in East Germany due to three developments. First, and somewhat unusually in European terms, social housing has had a temporary status in Germany and therefore the number of such units is nationally decreasing rapidly. This trend is pronounced in East Germany where most cities have experienced

deindustrialization and extensive deprivation, and so lack the resources for new social housing subsidies. Second, privatization has reduced the municipally and cooperatively owned housing stock and increased the relevance of financial investors. Third, most East German cities have been demographically contracted; this has stimulated “rightsizing” policies and 350,000 housing units have been demolished since 2001. Combined, these three developments have resulted in concentrations of households living in poverty, plus the poor shifting to the least attractive parts of the city. Bernt shows how developments across several sectors have resulted in the marginalization of impoverished groups within the specific low-demand East German context, and in so doing he emphasizes how planning strategies, housing privatization, and changes in welfare provision interact.

Chikako Mori takes up the theme of megaevents in Chapter 9 by focusing on social housing and urban renewal in Tokyo in the run-up to the 2020 Olympic Games. As such, her chapter offers a counterpoint to Chapter 6 by Olagnero and Ponzo who are considering the post-Olympics’ period. Mori examines the nature and impacts of urban renewal as conducted by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government (TMG) in relation to social housing. She employs a qualitative case study approach based on participant observation and interviews. Her findings suggest that the TMG has promoted urban renewal of city government owned land in public-private partnerships by emphasizing these projects “win-win-win strategy among residents-business-city.” Nevertheless, such renewal has meant a deterioration of residents’ housing conditions as a result of either their displacement or a worsening of their housing environment. The chapter demonstrates a mismatch between the TMG’s rationale for renewal — the production of trickle-down effects and assisting existing residents — and the latter’s own experiences. The chapter offers insight into the “super-residualization” of social housing in Japan, characterized by the decrease in its size alongside urban renewal which benefits the middle and upper classes.

Historically, social housing has played a limited role in most societies in the Global South. However, contemporary urban renewal has in some cases involved the development of new social housing, albeit under conditions of globalization and neoliberalization. The following three chapters offer

accounts of such development in the Global South. First of all, Javier Ruiz-Tagle in Chapter 10 offers an explicit Global North/Global South comparison on urban renewal by focusing on territorial stigmatization with reference to local residents in socially-mixed neighborhoods in the Cabrini-Green–Near North area in Chicago, and the La Loma–La Florida area in Santiago in Chile. The study involved qualitative research, including interviews, observation, and “spatial inventories.” Unsurprisingly, there are differences in terms of social differentiation, types of social mix, and housing tenure. Nevertheless, Ruiz-Tagle identifies several shared stigmatization problems between the two areas, including how distrust against “the other” is spatially crystallized in relation to social housing.

In Chapter 11, Aidan Mosselson provides a critical examination of the urban renewal process in inner-city Johannesburg. He examines the effects of an approach to providing social housing which blends market-based practices with state intervention and regulation and discusses the implications these competing imperatives *vis-à-vis* urban renewal. His research involved interviews with property developers, officials, and tenants living in social and affordable housing developments. Mosselson highlights the contradictory and “overburdened” nature of the renewal process, given that the supply of social and affordable housing is expanding, while at the same time poor communities are being displaced. Mosselson’s chapter complicates and queries overarching neoliberalizing narratives in relation to urban renewal, by demonstrating how alternative developmental ambitions coexist with commercial practices.

Cansu Civelek in Chapter 12 discusses the social housing history and urban renewal experiences in Turkey while simultaneously pointing out long-term similarities and differences between these and urban policy trends in the Global North. The chapter focuses on the Karapınar Project in Eskişehir and is based on an anthropological case study and video documentary research that incorporates the views of local inhabitants, officials, and planners. In a similar manner to Glucksberg in Chapter 3, Civelek’s polysemic approach highlights the contesting claims and views regarding renewal and its consequences. The Karapınar Renewal Project is a Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ) project which claimed to turn *gecekondular* — squatter

settlements — into a healthy neighborhood. Civelek argues that such claims were chimerical and that the authorities' economic profits contrast with the economic burdens and dispossessions of the poor residents. For Civelek, the use of concepts of “social housing” and “welfare state,” which are normally associated with social democratic policies, by the Karapınar Project effectively distorted these concepts' meanings and utilized them in creating a space for legitimacy.

Chapter 13 by Andrew Wallace returns to the Global North, in his case to public housing in inner-city Salford, a deindustrialized British city and one ravaged, like many equivalent British cities, by postcrash, “austerity” cuts (Kennett, Jones, Meegan, & Croft, 2015; Mooney, McCall, & Paton, 2015). Two phases of qualitative fieldwork were conducted in an area of Salford subject to several regeneration schemes. The findings emphasize the challenges facing the residents of living in such spaces which are simultaneously partially gentrified and partially abandoned. Rather than a neat linear process of neoliberal urban transformation, the state has been rolled back, out and back again, and in the process Salford residents have been shunted from one logic of renewal and retrenchment to another. The chapter recognizes the “chaos” of urban renewal and welfare state retrenchment in this Global Northern urban periphery and in so doing offers a firmer platform for understanding the nuances of residents' responses and resistances.

In the concluding Chapter 14, Peer Smets and Paul Watt revisit the main themes, concepts, and approaches of the book. They also offer various suggestions for future research agendas, as well as a brief examination of the role of academics in relation to social housing and urban renewal.

NOTES

1. Despite its common usage, “social housing” has no single, universal definition. Even within the European Union states, social housing forms a complex web of different tenures, providers, financing models, demographics, rent levels, and subsidy schemes (Pittini, 2012; Scanlon, Fernandez Arrigoitia, & Whitehead, 2015). A suitable working definition is: “Social housing is allocated according to need rather than demand and price, and this concept of need is politically or administratively

defined and interpreted. Social housing is, explicitly, not allocated by market forces” (Haffner, Hoekstra, Oxley, & van der Heijden, 2009, pp. 4–5). Social housing, usually rental in form in the Global North, is distinguishable from the other two major housing tenures whose costs and prices are dominated by market mechanisms: owner occupation (either outright ownership or ownership based on a mortgage or loan) and private renting which is provided by landlords on a for-profit basis. Historically, social rental housing has mainly been provided by one of the following: either public/municipal housing provided by the state, usually local governments (“council housing” in the United Kingdom); or not-for-profit (or limited profits) voluntary organizations, typically called “housing associations” (Doling, 1997). The cross-national balance of housing providers — public or housing association — varies considerably even across Europe (Haffner et al., 2009; Pittini, 2012; Scanlon et al., 2015). In recent years, we have also witnessed greater private sector involvement in social housing provision in the European Union (Pittini, 2012). Internationally, social housing is largely rental, although public housing in some Asian societies, such as Singapore and Hong Kong, is provided for ownership (Gurstein, Patten, & Rao, 2015). In areas of the Global South, social housing is seen as “housing developed by the government (sometimes via the private sector) and sold or rented to low-income households (also under rent-to-buy schemes)” (Bredenoord & van Lindert, 2014, p. 62).

2. Recent overviews of social housing in Europe include Haffner et al. (2009), Pittini (2012), Scanlon et al. (2015), while useful earlier works include Balchin (1996) and Power (1993, 1997).
3. Studies of social housing, which cover a wider geographical area than Europe, include Glynn (2009), Groves, Murie, and Watson (2007), and Gurstein et al. (2015).

REFERENCES

- Aalbers, M. B., Wouter van Gent, P. C., & Pinkster, F. M. (2011). Comparing deconcentrating poverty policies in the United States and the Netherlands: A critical reply to Stal and Zuberi. *Cities*, 28, 260–264.
- Allen, C. (2010). Housing research, housing policy and the politics of dwelling. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 27(2), 136–143.
- Arbaci, S., & Rae, I. (2013). Mixed-tenure neighbourhoods in London: policy myth or effective device to alleviate deprivation? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 451–479.

- Balchin, P. (1996). *Housing policy in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Beider, H. (2007). *Neighbourhood renewal and housing markets: Community engagement in the US and UK*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bennett, L., Smith, J. L., & Wright, P. A. (2006). *Where are poor people to live? Transforming public housing communities*. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bradford Hunt, D. (2009). *Blueprint for disaster: The unravelling of Chicago public housing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bredenoord, J., & van Lindert, P. (2014). Backing the self-builders. Assisted self-help housing as a sustainable housing provision strategy. In J., Bredenoord, P., van Lindert, & P., Smets (Eds.), *Affordable housing in the urban global South. Seeking sustainable solutions*. London: Earthscan from Routledge.
- Brenner, N. (2009). What is critical urban theory? *City*, 13(2–3), 198–207.
- Bridge, G., Butler, T., & Lees, L. (2012). *Mixed communities, gentrification by stealth?* Bristol: Policy Press.
- Campkin, B. (2013). *Remaking London: Decline and regeneration in urban culture*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Coleman, A. (1990). *Utopia on trial* (2nd Ed.), London: Hilary Shipman.
- Cumbers, A., Helms, G., & Swanson, K. (2010). Class, agency and resistance in the old industrial city. *Antipode*, 42(1), 46–73.
- Darcy, M. (2010). De-concentration of disadvantage and mixed income housing: a critical discourse approach. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 27(1), 1–22.
- Darcy, M. (2013). From high-rise projects to suburban estates: Public tenants and the globalised discourse of deconcentration. *Cities*, 35, 365–372.
- Davidson, G., McGuinness, D., Greenhalgh, P., & Robinson, F. (2013). ‘It’ll get worse before it gets better’: local experiences of living in a regeneration area. *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal*, 7(1), 55–66.

- Davidson, M. (2008). Spoiled mixture: where does state-led 'positive' gentrification end? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2385–2405.
- Davies, J. S., & Imbroscio, D. L. (2010). *Critical urban studies, new directions*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Dikecs, M. (2007). *Badlands of the republic: Space, politics and urban policy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Doling, J. (1997). *Comparative housing policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Douglas, P., & Parkes, J. (2016). 'Regeneration' and 'consultation' at a Lambeth council estate. *City*, 20(2), 287–291.
- Droste, C., Lelevrier, C., & Wassenberg, F. (2008). Urban regeneration in European social housing areas. In K. Scanlon & C. Whitehead (Eds.), *Social housing in Europe II: A review of policies and outcomes*. London: London School of Economic and Political Science.
- Elmer, S., & Dening, G. (2016). The London clearances. *City*, 20(2), 271–277.
- Feldman, R. M., & Stall, S. (2004). *The dignity of resistance, Women residents' activism in Chicago public housing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenton, A., Lupton, R., Arrundale, R., & Tunstall, R. (2012). Public housing, commodification, and rights to the city: the US and England compared. *Cities*, 35, 373–378.
- Ferreri, M., & Glucksberg, L. (2016). Fighting gentrification and demolitions in the neoliberal university: displacing communities, researchers and the very possibility of radical critiques. *Sociological Research Online*, 21(3), 4. Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/21/3/4.html>
- Flynn, J. (2016). Complete control. *City*, 2(2), 278–286.
- Foster, J. (1997). Challenging perceptions: community and neighbourliness on a difficult-to-let estate. In N., Jewson & S., MacGregor (Eds.), *Transforming cities*. London: Routledge.

- Freidrichs, C. (2011). The Pruitt-Igoe myth [Documentary film].
- Friedrichs, J., Galster, G., & Musterd, S. (2003). Neighbourhood effects on social opportunities: The European and American research and policy context. *Housing Studies*, 18(6), 797–806.
- Garbin, D., & Millington, G. (2012). Territorial stigma and the politics of resistance in a Parisian banlieue: La Courneuve and beyond. *Urban Studies*, 49(10), 2067–2083.
- Glasze, G., Pütz, R., Germes, M., Schirmel, H., & Brailich, A. (2012). ‘The same but not the same’: The discursive constitution of large housing estates in Germany, France and Poland. *Urban Geography*, 33(8), 1192–1211.
- Glynn, S. (2009). *Where the other half lives: Lower income housing in a neo-liberal world*. London: Pluto Press.
- Goetz, E. G. (2013). *New deal ruins: Race, economic justice and public housing policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gosling, V. K. (2008). Regenerating communities: women’s experiences of urban regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 45(3), 607–626.
- Graham, E., Manley, D., Hiscock, R., Boyle, P., & Doherty, J. (2009). Mixing housing tenures: is it good for social well-being? *Urban Studies*, 46(1), 139–165.
- Groves, R., Murie, A., & Watson, C. (2007). *Housing and the new welfare state, Perspectives from East Asia and Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gurstein, P., Patten, K., & Rao, P. (2015). *The future of public housing: trends in public housing internationally*. Vancouver, BC: School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP), University of British Columbia.
- Haffner, M., Hoekstra, J., Oxley, M., & van der Heijden, H. (2009). *Bridging the gap between social and market rented housing in six European countries?* Amsterdam: IOS Press.

- Harloe, M. (1995). *The people's home? Social rented housing in Europe and America*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989a). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (1989b). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71B, 3–17.
- Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53, 23–40.
- Heathcott, J. (2012). Pruitt-Igoe and the critique of public housing. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 78(4), 450–451.
- Hirsch, A. R. (1983). *Making the second ghetto. Race and housing in Chicago, 1940–1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodkinson, S. (2011). Housing regeneration and the Private Finance Initiative in England: Unstitching the neoliberal urban straitjacket. *Antipode*, 43(2), 358–383.
- Hodkinson, S., Watt, P., & Mooney, G. (2013). Neoliberal housing policy – time for a critical re-appraisal. *Critical Social Policy*, 33(1), 3–16.
- Hyra, D. S. (2008). *The new urban renewal. The economic transformation of Harlem and Bronzeville*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Imbroscio, D. (2008). United and actuated by some common impulse of passion: Challenging the dispersal consensus in American housing policy research. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 30(2), 111–130.
- Imrie, R., Raco, M., & Lees, L. (2009). *Regenerating London*. London: Routledge.
- Jacobs, K. (2006). Discourse analysis and its utility for urban policy research. *Urban Policy and Research*, 24, 39–52.
- Jacobs, K., Marston, G., & Darcy, M. (2004). ‘Changing the mix’: contestation surrounding the public housing stock transfer process in Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(3), 249–263.

Jenks, C., & Mayer, S. (1990). The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. In L. Lynn & M. McGahey (Eds.) *Inner-city poverty in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Johnston, C., & Mooney, G. (2007). 'Problem' people, 'problem' places? New labour and council estates. In R. Atkinson & G. Helms (Eds.), *Securing an Urban Renaissance*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Kennelly, J. (2016). *Olympic exclusions: Youth, poverty and social legacies*. London: Routledge.

Kennelly, J., & Watt, P. (2012). Seeing Olympic effects through the eyes of marginally housed youth: Changing places and the gentrification of east London. *Visual Studies*, 27(2), 151–160.

Kennett, P., Jones, G., Meegan, R., & Croft, J. (2015). Recession, austerity and the 'great risk shift': Local government and household impacts and responses in Bristol and Liverpool. *Local Government Studies*, 41(4), 622–644.

Lees, L., & Ferreri, M. (2016). Resisting gentrification on its final frontiers: Learning from the Heygate Estate in London (1974–2013). *Cities*, 57, 14–24.

Levitas, R. (1998). *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and new labour*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Manley, D., van Ham, M., Bailey, N., Simpson, L., & Maclennan, D. (2013). *Neighbourhood effects or neighbourhood based problems? A policy context*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Marston, G. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and policy-orientated housing research. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19(2), 82–91.

Mooney, G., McCall, V., & Paton, K. (2015). Exploring the use of large sporting events in the post-crash, post-welfare city: A 'legacy' of increasing insecurity? *Local Economy*, 30(8), 910–924.

Mould, O. (2017). Brutalism redux: Relational monumentality and the urban politics of brutalist architecture. *Antipode*, 49(3), 701–720.

Musterd, S., Murie, A., & Kesteloot, C. (2006). *Neighbourhoods of poverty*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Brien, D., & Matthews, P. (2016). *After urban regeneration. Communities, policy and place*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Pfeiffer, D. (2006). Displacement through discourse: implementing and contesting public housing redevelopment in Cabrini Green. *Urban Anthropology*, 35(1), 39–74.

Pittini, A. (2012). *Social housing in the European Union*. *TECHNE – Journal of Technology for Architecture and Environment* (S.L.), October 2012, pp. 21–34. Retrieved from <<http://www.fupress.net/index.php/technel/article/view/11486>>. Accessed on December 4, 2016.

Power, A. (1993). *Hovels to high rise. State housing in Europe since 1850*. London: Routledge.

Power, A. (1997). *Estates on the edge: The social consequences of mass housing in Northern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Power, A., & Tunstall, R. (1997). *Dangerous disorder: Riots and violent disturbances in thirteen areas of Britain 1991–92*. York: York Publishing Services.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Rainwater, L. (1970). *Behind ghetto walls: Black families in a federal slum*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Rowlands, R., Musterd, S., & van Kempen, R. (2009). *Mass housing in Europe. Multiple faces of development, change and response*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sampson, R. J. (2013). *Great American city. Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Scanlon, K., Fernandez Arrigoitia, M., & Whitehead, C. (2015). Social housing in Europe. *European Policy Analysis*, 17, 1–12.

Slater, T. (2013). Your life chances affect where you live. A critique of the 'cottage industry' of neighbourhood effects research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 367–387.

Smets, P., & Hellinga, A. (2014). Belonging and micro-settings in a Rotterdam housing complex. In P. Watt & P. Smets (Eds.), *Mobilities and neighbourhood belonging in cities and suburbs*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smets, P., & Snee, K. (2017). Tenure mix: apart or together? Home-making practices and belonging in a Dutch street. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*. doi:10.1007/s10901-015-9493-y

Smith, D. M. (2005). *On the margins of inclusion: Changing labour markets and social exclusion in London*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Smith, N. (2002). New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 427–450.

Stal, G. Y., & Zuberi, D. M. (2010). Ending the cycle of poverty through socio-economic integration: A comparison of Moving to Opportunity (MTO) in the United States and the Bijlmermeer Revival Project in the Netherlands. *Cities*, 27, 3–12.

Stenson, K., & Watt, P. (1999). Governmentality and the death of the social? A discourse analysis of local government texts in South-east England. *Urban Studies*, 36, 189–202.

Todd, S. (2014). *The people: The rise and fall of the working class, 1910–2010*. London: John Murray.

Torgersen, U. (1987). Housing: the wobbly pillar under the welfare state. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research*, 4(S1), 116–126.

Turkington, R., & Watson, C. (2015). *Renewing Europe's housing*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Uitermark, J., Duyvendak, J. W., & Kleinhans, R. (2007). Gentrification as a governmental strategy: social control and social cohesion in Hoogvliet, Rotterdam. *Environment and Planning A*, 39(1), 125–141.

- Urban, F. (2012). *Tower and slab: Histories of global mass housing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vale, L. J. (2013). *Purging the poorest: Public housing and the design politics of twice-cleared communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- van Ham, M., Manley, D., Bailey, N., Simpson, L., & Maclennan, D. (2012). *Neighbourhood effects research: new perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- van Kempen, R., Dekker, K., Hall, S., & Tosics, I. (2005). *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wallace, A. (2015). Gentrification interrupted in Salford, UK: From new deal to “Limbo-Land” in a contemporary urban periphery. *Antipode*, 47(2), 517–538.
- Watt, P. (2005). Housing histories and fragmented middle-class careers: The case of marginal professionals in London council housing. *Housing Studies*, 20(3), 359–381.
- Watt, P. (2008). ‘Underclass’ and ‘ordinary people’ discourses: Representing/re-presenting council tenants in a housing campaign. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5(3), 345–357.
- Watt, P. (2009). Housing stock transfers, regeneration and state-led gentrification in London. *Urban Policy and Research*, 27(3), 229–242.
- Watt, P. (2013a). ‘It’s not for us’: Regeneration, the 2012 Olympics and the gentrification of East London. *City*, 17(1), 99–118.
- Watt, P. (2013b) Official and critical urbanist discourses on regeneration and social housing estates. Paper presented at RC21 Conference, Berlin, 29–31 August.
- Watt, P., & Bernstock, P. (2017). Legacy for whom? Housing in post-Olympics East London. In P. Cohen & P. Watt (Eds.), *London 2012 and the post-Olympics city: A hollow legacy?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watt, P., & Jacobs, K. (2000). Discourses of social exclusion: An analysis of bringing Britain together: A national strategy for neighbourhood renewal. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 17, 14–26.

Watt, P., & Minton, A. (2016). London's housing crisis and its activism. *City*, 20(2), 204–221.

Watt, P., & Smets, P. (2014). *Mobilities and neighbourhood belonging in cities and suburbs*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watt, P., & Wallace, A. (2014). Why can't we have them posh houses? Housing redevelopment and community tensions in London and Salford. In A. Deboulet & C. Lelévrier (Eds.), *Rénovations Urbaines en Europe*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Whitehead, C., & Scanlon, K. (2007). *Social housing in Europe*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1993). *The ghetto underclass*. London: Sage.