WORLD URBAN FORUM 7, MEDELLIN, APRIL 2014
AITEC DECLARATION
FOR AN ALTERNATIVE PROCESS

15-02-2014 Version

AITEC
Association Internationale de Techniciens, Experts et Chercheurs
contact.aitec@reseau-ipam.org

1. The seventh World Urban Forum (WUF) will be held in Medellin, Columbia from the 5th to the 11th of April, 2014. This WUF will be an important step toward the United Nations conference Habitat 3 on the theme "Future Cities".

Habitat 1 (Vancouver, June 1976) was a milestone of international debate on housing and cities and helped to launch the concept of Sustainable Development. Habitat 2 (Istanbul, June 1996) extended the 1992 Rio Conference on Environment and Development.

2. World Urban Forums gives the tempo for international discussions on cities and housing. WUF 1 and 2, held in Nairobi in 2002 and 2004, focused on urban sprawl and urban poverty. WUF 3, held in Vancouver in 2006, focused on sustainable urban development and urban planning for integrated cities. FUM 4, held in Nanjing in 2008, affirmed that social harmony is impossible when populations are refused access to basic needs while a minority lives in luxury. WUF 5, held in Rio in 2010, declared the Right to the City and defined both its foundations and the obstacles to its achievement. WUF 6, held in Naples in 2012, linked the question of equity with that of prosperity and highlighted distributive policies for education and health. FUM 7, to be held in Medellin in 2014, will focus on integrating equity into the United Nations agenda after Rio+20 and the Post 2015 Development Agenda.

3. AITEC (International Association of Technicians, Experts, and Researchers) participated actively in the civil society meetings and events in Istanbul in 1996. To explain our point, we propose to review the conclusions, still relevant today, of the AITEC statement prepared for the United Nation General Assembly, Habitat 2+5, held in March 2001:

"Since Habitat II, held in Istanbul in 1996, the situation of the urban poor has significantly deteriorated. Despite the enthusiastic statements and commitments by governments and international institutions, urban precariousness has increased. More and more determined movements are rising up against this situation and advancing viable solutions. However, the real political will of the majority of States and of the international community runs counter to the implementation of those solutions…"

4. In the same vein, AITEC asserted in 2001 that "an appraisal of these official international conferences justifies a certain pessimism regarding States' capacity to build a democratic international system. Participating States make commitments only on the basis of minimal declarations, which in turn they rarely apply unless they are compelled by social movements. Nevertheless, these conferences provide the occasion for exchange, debate, and for parallel meetings between new actors on the international scene. They reinforce social movements in the affirmation of their demands. They contribute to the construction of world opinion. They have progressively established the increasingly important position of others actors alongside States, particularly associations and municipalities. … In addition, these conferences play an important role in reaffirming the position of United Nations institutions, founded on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights instead of the Bretton Woods Agreement."

www.globenet.org/aitec/chantiers/urbain/habitat2/habitatII.htm

5. AITEC's declaration for the WUF 7 in Medellin proposes a new agenda to be discussed by social, urban and international solidarity movements, elected representatives of local authorities in perspective of founding a common position to be submitted during Habitat 3 in 2016. It aims both to define alternatives that stem from existing social movements and to produce a new basis for analysis and prospection. This statement proceed from the "concept paper" of WUF 7, "Urban Equity in Development - Cities for Life."
http://worldurbanforum7.org/Media/Default/News/Urban%20Equity%20in %20Development-Cities%20for%20Life_English%20(2).pdf

6. This declaration is addressed to the leaders of social movements, to national political leaders, to local officials, to scientists, and to housing and urban planning professionals. It is a call to promote alternative policies and practices wherever possible.

This declaration consists of three sections: an analysis of the world urban situation; a critical response to the WUF 7 concept paper; and an alternative approach grounded in existing social movements.

The urban situation

7. The contemporary situation is characterized by what is commonly described as a crisis. It takes the form of a financial crisis, the crisis of financialization that characterizes the current phase of capitalist globalization. In fact this crisis emerges at the intersection of several dimensions: social and economic dimensions, particularly social inequalities and corruption; geopolitical and military dimensions, characterized by the end of western geopolitical hegemony and the rise of new powers; ideological and cultural dimensions marked by new calls for democracy and outbursts of racism and xenophobia; and ecological and civilizational dimensions, particularly the endangerment of the planetary ecosystem.

2

8. Questions of housing, of the city, and of space are central to each of these dimensions. The financial crisis that struck with subprimes mortgages and the burst of the real estate bubble is far from over. Whole neighborhoods of American cities are mined by overwhelming debt burdens. In Spain, suicides follow evictions. Today's urban management practices engender spatial and social segregation. Securitarian ideology dominates urban governance and reemerges in rising discrimination, xenophobia and racism.

9. The analysis of the global urban situation advanced in the concept paper focuses on the inequalities lived by the world urban population. From this point of view the report is not without interest. It is a devastating indictment of unequal cities and of the situation of the urban poor. It emphasizes the new forms of poverty and ever-deepening inequalities. The current analytical framework advances past conceptions of urban poverty inasmuch as we recognize today that inequalities endanger sustainable growth and that the results of growth do not automatically benefit the poor. Inequalities weaken demand. Inhabitants know that inequality affects living and security conditions. This analysis is thus relevant in several respects, but remains over-general and presents this evolution as a foregone conclusion without questioning its causes.

10. Inequalities can rightly be seen as a primary factor. The growth of inequalities is a logical consequence of modes of production of the city dominated by financialization and marketization. Several open questions demonstrate a schism within urban planning, as the answers they provoke are radically different depending on whether the goal of the urban process in question is capital accumulation or solidarity with inhabitants. Some examples include: land management, employment, housing, access to services, transportation and mobility, environment, urban security, democracy and citizenship. Inequalities have weight on all questions characterizing the urban situation, as a whole and in its specific aspects, and tend to make cities unlivable, including for those who profit from them. They cannot be by way of default accepted if we want to respond to an economic, cultural and democratic vision of cities and their transformation.

11. Urban planning focuses on an integrated, stable, and non-precarious population. Urban planning, as a rule, has become the art of hiding the poor and of ignoring the precarious, who in fact fill a significant portion of the jobs that allow the city to function and yet cannot find housing. They occupy the interstices of the city or are forced ever farther into the peripheries. The transformation of city centers and historical neighborhoods is dominated by gentrification and urban design in the service of tourism, benefitting the upper-middle class and the commercial service sector.

12. These dynamics significantly destabilize urban populations. The question of housing for the working classes, nearly everywhere unanswered, augments this fragility, particularly for youth and women. In many cities the increasing precariousness of whole neighborhoods entails a corresponding increase in single motherhood, and provokes

ever-greater gender inequalities. Young, qualified populations, open to the world but unemployed — as in the figure of the unemployed degree-holder seeking rapid change — live in difficult urban conditions: no jobs, no housing, and no tangible possibilities to establish a household. The increasing insecurity of employment translates into complete housing insecurity; nearly all the low-income groups live in fear of eviction.

13. The urbanization is spreading blindly, as the footprint of cities increases everywhere, doubling in 20 years in the cities of the South. Land tenure becomes even more decisive and largely impossible. Privately owned land had become the rule and the reference. Land speculation determines prices, and the vast majority of the urban population has no access to recognized land rights. Land occupancy by so-called informal housing continues to proliferate. The management of urban development is delegated to municipalities without the financial means and land resources to effectively accomplish their task. The concern for environment remains declarative, serving primarily to promote the image of the clean city for the upper-middle classes rather than promoting new ways of thinking urban development. The creation of peripheral urban employment clusters does not fundamentally change the determinant role of mobility in urban organization. On the contrary, multidirectional travel renders transportation unmanageable.

14. An appreciation of the response of social movements provides a point of departure from which to understand this situation. A number of occupation movements since 2011 have revealed a new generation imposing its right to public space. What is at work is a culturally distinct generation, anchored in a situation that it in turn transforms. It highlights the deep social transformations provoked by increased levels of education, which manifest themselves on the one hand as a brain drain and on the other as unemployed graduates. Migrations link this generation to the world and to its deep contradictions in consumption, culture, and values. The results are certainly contradictory, but tend to reduce isolation and seclusion. The phenomenon of unemployed graduates is building a new alliance between the children of the working- and middle classes. This new generation is inventing a new political culture informed by its demands and creativity, creating new organizational forms through its mastery of digital and social networks, and affirming its autonomous organization.

15. Housing is at the core of the crisis. Privatization and the dismantling of the social state have radically undermined the production of social housing. Housing is a worldwide critical issue for the working classes and the poors, in the Maghreb and Mashreq, it represents a real source of suffering. In Spain, a movement against evictions developed rapidly following the end of the Puerta del Sol occupation. The "Network of Mortgage Victims" holds the banks accountable for "indebting people for life". It states: "This is not a crisis, it is a fraud" and "no home, no job, no retirement, no fear."

16. The urban issue is not limited to housing. Insurrections condemn neoliberal urban development and restore meaning to the city. Some social movements have succeeded in defeating the permanent injunction to move along and the forced mobility that characterize neoliberal cities. Concomitantly with this evolution, a number of networks

4

make propositions to facilitate encounters and solidarity, to seek greater connection rather than increased consumption, to slow down the city, and to increase resilience through relocations. By occupying the squares, these social movements have returned to the city centers. They are reclaiming squares and settling in the public spaces. The movement in Istanbul emerged out of resistance to the decision to replace a public space, the Gezi parc, with a privately owned shopping mall.

The World Urban Forum 7 Concept Paper: Analysis

17. The report's orientation toward inequalities and unequal cities is clear. To work against inequalities, it is necessary to promote equity. The title of the concept paper itself confirms this: "Urban Equity in Development — Cities for Life". Framing the question in terms of equity is not itself novel, but World Urban Forum 7 sought to make it a priority. The concept paper proposes to reread the six preceding WUFs for their references to equity, identifying the concept as their common thread. In WUF 1 and 2, equity would respond to the poverty that characterizes urbanization. In WUF 3, equity would be the basis of inclusive cities and the foundation of sustainable urbanization. In WUF 4, equity would be the response to the exclusion of a large part of the population. In WUF 5, equity would reappear in the right to the city. In WUF 6, equity would take the form of redistributive policies. In WUF 7, equity would characterize the Millennium Development Goals in the Post 2015 Development Agenda and in the Rio+20 framework.

18. The concept paper calls for the recognition of the importance of urban equity and recalls that this concept may have several facets and meanings. Many of its proposals are quite interesting. To place equity at the center of development, one must accept that no individual may be disadvantaged and reject all discrimination. Urban space must not reproduce, create, or reinforce inequalities. Public goods and basic services must be accessible to all according to their needs. Urban equity is an issue concerning justice and articulates justice with human rights. It promotes redistribution and social protection, reminding us of the role of law, of mechanisms of inclusion, and of affirmative action.

The concept paper underlines the contingency of equitable development, which does not arise spontaneously. A great many treaties and conventions refer to equality and to fundamental rights rather than to equity per se. Equality may usher in another agenda for development organized around participation, transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, empowerment, and social inclusion. The paper cites, for example, universal access to water, to energy, and to essential public goods, guaranteed revenue, the respect of commons, and the right to the city.

19. A preference for equity and ejection of equality characterize the concept paper and the assessment that follows from it. This approach presents itself as a neo-humanist perspective, basis of a new social and citizens' contract, but in fact privileges individual development and makes of individual progress the principal driver for collective

evolutions. Such an approach leads to an underestimation of the political and economic mechanisms that produce inequalities and, above all, the growth of those inequalities. No real analysis attempts to characterize today's social and economic inequalities. The unequal aspects of contemporary modes of production and their consequences for the organization of urban space and for territorial development are not addressed. In general, there is no analysis of the spatial organizations generated by the dominant logic and by the creation of competition between regions: the commodification of the city and the predominance of the capitalist private sector, the metropolises and megalopolises, the destruction of rural space, anarchic consumption of certain natural resources, etc.

Despite references to the 'sustainable city', the concept paper relegates the environmental question to the margins, reducing it to the 'green economy' and environmental equity, while it ignores the strong structural linkages between the social question and the environmental question. The question of human rights in the city, already raised in previous summits, is neither reviewed nor continued.

20. The concept paper discusses the link between equality and equity from the outset, taking a clear position for equity rather than equality. This position is somewhat surprising, since the developments that follow consider equity as much as equality, particularly when mention is made of international texts referring to fundamental rights. The end result of this treatment is not a differentiation between egalitarianism and equality, but rather a devaluation of equality on the basis of a distinction between equality and equity, a distinction made all the more opaque by the different meanings that it takes on in the different languages of the report. Beyond quarrels over definition, we question the reasons for this ideological position. Two such reasons are particularly troubling: one concerns the struggle against inequalities, the other the translation of concepts into urban policy.

21. The first reason refers to the pretense of working against inequalities without acknowledging equality. One explanation for this tendency may be found in the debates that accompanied the Millennium Development Goals and the post 2015 Agenda, in which we would find a consensus on the necessity to work against poverty. From this point of view, the United Nations highlihts the declining global poverty rate while admitting that the change from $1 per day to $1.25 per day does not fundamentally change the situation. To diminish poverty, we are urged to trust in growth without questioning its nature or the ecological limits of growth in general. Of still graver importance, however, this diminution in the poverty rate does not translate to a reduction of inequalities; on the contrary, they multiply. If we hope to diminish inequality, we might envision limiting the range of revenues through appropriate fiscal and regulatory measures: that is where the problem lies. Consensus exists neither on the necessity to limit large revenues and stockholder profits, nor on the distortions of consumption in cities, particularly linked to property values. Any reference to equality and to public action to promote it is considered dangerous. In the wake of the Washington consensus, the concept paper concentrates on equity following the recognition of growing inequalities. Equity, 'conception of a universal natural justice not inspired by legal definitions', is assigned to the domain of regulation whereas equality emerges in the legal domain, where it is often the hard-won fruit of social struggles. The advancement of equality is diametrically opposed to the ever-growing power of the dominant neoliberalism. To choose to pursue equity is to choose to

reward each according to his contribution, which by definition is greater in proportion to an individual's wealth. To choose to pursue equity is to choose to pursue the accumulation of wealth and of benefits for the same populations and individuals, ensuring only that the poor are not too visibly harmed, not too much more impoverished: they are not further impoverished in absolute terms, but in relative terms they are.

22. The main positive point that can be recognized for the concept paper is the undeniable recognition of the central appreciation of inequalities and their consequences. The principal criticism that one can level at it is that it does not question the causes of this situation and of these inequalities. In not seeking out the root of these problems, in not investigating their causes, this approach cuts itself off from answers adequate to the situation.

23. To justify its approach, the concept paper calls on ostensibly respectable institutions. It cites references from the IMF and World Bank recognizing the scale of these inequalities and their nefarious consequences. But it neglects to recall the previous declarations by these same institutions and, more importantly, the direct responsibility of structural adjustment policies and the broader program of the Washington consensus in the production of this situation. This amnesia has grave consequences, as it prevents illustration of the necessity of a rupture with these policies, which are still in effect. In support of its position, the report cites two Nobel prizewinners, Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman. But it forgets their analyses of the underlying causes of this situation. Joseph Stiglitz notably states, "Inequality is a choice." Inequalities are not only a consequence, they are a choice, they are a policy.

24. Urban policies and urban planning are significant preoccupations of the report. The annexes give a comprehensive list of approaches. The approach that refers to equality, noted above, is found in general terms in diagram 1 of table 2. The column corresponding to this goal contains items on which one could rely to develop relevant action plans even if the relation between public actions and the construction of a new urban social pact is not considered. What is remarkable, on the other hand, is that no consideration is made of the nature of current public policies. The report remains most discreet regarding the orientation of the general social and economic policies that determine urban policies. It presents a model as ideal, Cities for All, but one must admit that the execution of this model in urban policies remains vague.

25. The report neglects to propose any analysis of the range of possible urban policies. Does this imply that they are all equivalent? The report refers to Rio+20, which would have defined an approach to a socially and ecologically just society that would orient the United Nation's efforts for the development agenda known as the Post 2015 Development Agenda. The social and citizens' movements present at Rio+20 do not share the vision of a green economy that was selected by the official Conference. They elaborated their positions in the debates of the Peoples' Summit, organized by a group of social movements in counterpoint to the Rio+20 Conference of Heads of State in June 2012. They begin from the hypothesis that neoliberalism's exhaustion opens new perspectives

and deep changes in the dominant globalization. Three horizons, three conceptual pathways emerged: the reinforcement of finance capital in other forms and its extension to nature; a reformulation of capitalism founded on public regulation and social modernization; and a rupture opening onto an ecological, social, and democratic transition. The question is not to know which will carry the day with respect to the others. The three are and will remain present. The question is which will predominate over the others. Concrete situations will be characterized by specific articulations between these three logics.

26. The first vision refers to the development of a capitalistic financialized green economy. In this paradigm, ending crisis implies an enlargement of the world market, the 'unlimited market' necessary to perpetual growth. It proposes to enlarge the world market, now qualified as a green market, by a financialization of nature, the commodification of life itself and generalized privatization of the ecosphere. Nature produces 'services' (it captures carbon, purifies water, etc.). In the dominant vision, these services are necessarily of little value because they are free. To improve them, it suffices to give them a price, a price defined by the market. They must be commoditized, privatized, financialized. The shift from a nature considered as a common good to a private property would also permit a 'good management' of nature. It should be left to the large, multinational corporations, which will know how to manage it and overcome its weaknesses. Any reference to fundamental rights is called into question because it weakens the preeminence of the market. In this logic, international law and nature alike must submit to the rules of business.

27. The urban models corresponding to this vision prolong the model of structural adjustment and of the liberal-global city brought into stark relief by recent violent responses to popular resistance. In this perspective, housing and habitat remain deeply marked by the characteristics of the current conjuncture. Unbearable debt burdens accentuate the precariousness of households. Privatization of social housing and of public space remains the rule. Securitarian urbanism grows unabated. Property investment remains a safe haven for capital. Giant profits concentrated in capital markets nourish money laundering and narco-architecture.

28. The second paradigm is a Green New Deal, supported by eminent mainstream economists like Joseph Stiglitz, Paul Krugman, and Amartya Sen, often described as neo-Keynesians. This program amounts to a profound reshaping of capitalism, including public regulation and redistribution of revenues. It remains marginal today, as it implies a confrontation with the dominant logic of the global capital market, which refuses Keynesian references and refuses to accept that any inflation diminish the revalorization of profits. The concept paper seems tempted by this approach but does not dare consider it too closely, for fear no doubt of appearing to break with the dominant neoliberalism. This situation brings to mind the New Deal, adopted in 1933 but not successfully applied until 1945, after the Second World War.

29. The urban models corresponding to this exit from crisis will return to certain policies of the Fordist and Keynesian period. From this perspective, housing and habitat recover certain aspects of Fordist/Keynesian solutions. Housing, along with health and education, is an extension of the social protections provided by the welfare state, in which income redistribution takes the form of conditional cash transfers to households and significant support for adequate housing. Income and employment stabilization supplement salaries through work-sharing. Public space is preserved and reinforced by public transportation systems. Prevention again finds its place in the management of social, ecological and civic insecurities. These urban policies could go farther should advocates for social modernization draw support from the working classes and respond to urban social movements. Conversely, they would meet their limits in the contradiction between the productivism of green capitalism and the constraints of the ecosphere.

30. The third way forward builds on the framework elaborated by social and citizens' movements that emerged through the World Social Forum process. Social movements are not indifferent to the improvements in employment and purchasing power promised by the Green New Deal, but they recognize the impossibility of their realization in the current balance of power. They consider that productivist growth in a capitalist mode, even when regulated, cannot escape the limits of the planetary ecosystem and therefore is not viable.

They call for a substantial rupture in social, ecological, and democratic development, advancing a new paradigm, new ways of producing and consuming: common goods and new forms of property, strict control of finance capital, 'buen-vivir' and prosperity without growth, reinvention of democracy, shared and differentiated responsibilities, and public services based on rights and free access. The challenge is to found the organization of societies, and of the world as a whole, on the principle of access to rights for all.

31. In this understanding, housing and habitat would be at the center of relocation policies and territorial planning at the local scale and beyond. Challenges to urban planning practices based on traffic and acceleration would support counter-proposals for 'slow cities' and 'transitional cities'. Municipalities would experiment with new forms of local democracy at the intersection between populations, territories, activities, and the environment. This rupture is already visible in acts of resistance and concrete emancipatory practices that herald alternatives, from local to global scales. The urban models that correspond to this path remain to be invented. Some possibilities are already emerging in particular movements' and a few local authorities' search for new forms.

An alternative approach

32. To define and to support an alternative process, we propose to build on social and citizens' movements, on all movements at work in the city on the basis of access to fundamental rights and equal rights for all, and more generally to build on all counter-

9

proposals and instances of resistance to current processes. Among these, the urban social movements directly concerned with the use of the city, its development, and its production will play a pivotal role.

Urban social movements are today establishing themselves as new and important actors in urban transformation. To resist and to improve their situation, inhabitants organize to struggle together (unions, renters' associations, etc.), to experiment and to act (organizations for solidarity, integration, and development), and to gain political power (parties, citizens' associations). This situation is neither novel nor unique to urban movements, but urban social movements are growing and changing rapidly. They combine the demands for rights in cities with the demand for the right to the city, innovating and disseminating new practices.

33. Social movements express fundamental transformations in urban societies. If they are the apparently marginalized actors of this ongoing production, society as a whole is its primary (if often forgotten) actor. As opposed to the social movements that seek to express its needs and desires, society as a whole is of the same scale as the State and the economic actors that arrogate the decisions that seek to reshape it, against which the society often opposes its inertia and sometimes its rage. The concept paper recognizes the role of governments and of citizens in constructing a more equitable, socially inclusive, and secure world in the long term. It points out the importance of civil societies in the search for a fair city. The space for actors of urban transformation is in flux. Between the State, contested but always present, and inhabitants, considered as subjects, clients, consumers, users, or citizens, depending on the context, other actors seek out their roles. Municipalities are gaining increasing autonomy; they link the local and the territory; and they affirm their representativity as local and proximate institutions. Associations present themselves as the organized form of civil society; they relay inhabitants' interests and their demand for participation in democratic process. Businesses impose themselves on public space; they emphasize the importance of production and appropriate a monopoly on 'good governance'; they incarnate the rationality of network and service management; and yet they correspond to several logics, as emerging forms of actors in the social and solidarity economies demonstrate. The alternative approach stems from inhabitants' proposals, made explicit by social movements, to build a strategic alliance between inhabitants' movements and local governments capable of weighing in the balance of the State's urban policies and of orienting the action of economic powers.

34. Many movements sustained the two principal objectives set forth by the United Nations for Habitat 2: appropriate housing for all and viable human settlements. These principles allowed movements to establish their specific analysis of situations and contexts, to define their positions with respect to national policies and international institutions, and to ground their proposals and methods of intervention. The movements defined five principles in the course of meetings with the international community. These are the principles of liberty, equality, citizenship, solidarity, and sustainability. At Habitat 2, a number of themes emerged: sustainable development, the right to housing, plurality in approaches to property rights, financing for urbanization, modes of urban management, the importance of associations, and the recognition of municipalities as strategic actors.

New possibilities exist for the definition of urban policies. They depend in large part on the scope and force of urban social movements.

35. Since Habitat 2, visible results have not been forthcoming, leading to widespread disappointment. Have the recommendations of Habitat 2 led to significant decisions and/or advances in housing and urban issues? One can say with confidence that apart from a few rare cases they have not. Over the last five years, the situation has not improved for the poorest populations; on the contrary, the growth of poverty and inequality have continued unabated. The reasons for this tendency are not hard to imagine. First of all, it is clear that the political will to address these problems in a meaningful way is lacking. Housing and the city are not leaders' priorities! As a result, for many States, what decisions have been taken are superficial and were never intended to produce action. Moreover, the adopted action plan is contradictory: while prioritizing action against poverty it reaffirms the legitimacy of liberalization, which is one of the primary causes for the growth of inequality and poverty.

36. To identify the major propositions capable of founding new urban policies, techniques, and practices, we must begin from concrete struggles, movements, and alternative practices.

For example, the inhabitants of several neighborhoods have succeeded, following struggles and negotiations, in imposing their right to land tenure security and in preventing their eviction. The establishment of land tenure security consistently leads to a phase of neighborhood improvement. Associations and forms of local production take on an important role in this process, led by inhabitants capable of undertaking improvements in housing and in the neighborhood in general.

New forms of local democracy also appear in these neighborhoods, sometimes extended through local leaders' promotion to posts of municipal responsibility. Urban social movements bear new projects of social transformation, renewed through their participation in global activist movements and their convergence of social- and citizens' movements around a common orientation: access to basic rights, peace, and democracy for all.

37. Among the propositions advanced by urban social movements, we adopt the following ten proposals, all of which emerge out of alternative practices and permit to conjoin urban policy and basic rights:

- The search for alternatives to eviction; no eviction without rehousing; prioritize the possibility to remain in place; the right to housing as legal procedural basis; access to decent housing for the homeless; cancellation of undue housing debts;

- Production of cost-controlled and social housing according to the needs of each territory; rents compatible with revenues; protection and reinforcement of existing social housing; housing and employment cooperatives;

- Security of land tenure for inhabitants; community land trusts, municipalization of real estate;

11

- Respect for ecosystems; an urbanism respectful of the environment and of ecological equilibriums;

- No privatization of public space; challenge the urbanism of major sporting and cultural events; challenge the imposition of large, useless projects;

- Access to basic urban services for all; free access to urban transports and drinking water; access for all to healthcare, education, and culture;

- Minimum wage; social protection; social insurance;

- Local development: support for economic activity; promotion of local production for local consumption; employment programs; local currencies;

- Local democracy; participation and control by and for the inhabitants; participatory budgeting; empowerment of inhabitants; struggle against discrimination and spatial segregation;

- Articulation of urban and rural territories; urban and periurban agriculture; right to food self-sufficiency.

38. This declaration seeks to draw attention to the political consequences of campaigns in favor of equal rights: such campaigns are rarely simple extensions of the rights of the most vulnerable, without significant effects on the rest of society. Take, for example, campaigns to regularize the property rights of informal occupants who inhabit the abandoned spaces of their city. Over time, these neighborhoods are taken up by ongoing urbanization processes and can occupy desirable sites. The regularization of their land rights tends, among other effects, to remove these neighborhoods from the spaces supposedly easily appropriable by the upper-middle class for its own housing. A campaign to regularize squatters presented as evident and a purely technical challenge can in fact require the production of a large electoral and municipal consensus, considering that an amelioration of effective property rights for one group diminishes the other's privileged access to urban space. The city must be analyzed as a common space. This commonality, which is properly 'political', cannot be reduced to the division that the law operates.

39. The question of the effectiveness of local urbanism largely depends on the ability of technicians and activists to establish and to maintain the autonomy of local development, setting the organization of things and of people in space apart from the structures imposed by a global order. While such autonomy may be limited, it exists if and when it can be organized around the activation of an economic activity and a society anchored in a particular context. This articulation contributes greatly to daily life as the organization of a local autonomy. Only under this condition can the right to the city be thought as the collective right to work toward local autonomy and to construct certain parts of the city according to collective goals and efforts.

40. By this declaration we aim:

- To call on the leaders of social movements, on scientists, professionals, local representatives, and on all citizens to create alternative practices that demonstrate that other paths to realize urban policies respecting fundamental rights, the right to housing, and the right to the city are possible.

- To call on the leaders of social movements, on scientists, professionals, local representatives, and on all citizens to develop, on the basis of urban struggles and critical analyses of public policy, alternative practices, a new urbanism, and new urban policies.

- To invite international networks of urban social movements, and particularly those united in the World Assembly of Inhabitants, to mobilize to prepare Habitat III (for 2016) on the basis of their platforms.

- To demand that international institutions be obligated to respect international agreements, most particularly protocols establishing rights, a cornerstone of international law, and further to demand that an international authority oversee the acts of these institutions and their members, guaranteeing citizens' movements access should they deem that international law has not been respected.