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Cities are now front and centre of many community-led radical urban transition and transformation initiatives. They are breeding grounds for multidimensional societal problems spanning environmental degradation, massive greenhouse gas emissions, dispossession and exclusion. As nests of development and crises, they function as arenas of contestation over neoliberal policies that commodify and privatise space and life which in turn reproduce marginality and injustice. Yet at the same time, cities invite a radical openness to transformation (see Yiftachel 2015).

This chapter offers a survey of existing transnational initiatives promoting urban transformation. Drawing mostly from the Transformative Cities Atlas of Utopias (henceforth TC Atlas) and Fearless Cities, we present cases of community action across the world and consider different praxes that emerge from local movements. In what follows, we highlight that these growing transnational initiatives and trans-solidarity platforms are deeply rooted in local and national movements, and share a fundamental desire to envisage and create people-centred places. Hence, we regard the ‘urban commons’ and transformative cities as praxes of radical urban transformation. But rather than underlining the prospects of replicability and upscaling, we choose instead to unravel parallels between and draw lessons from these praxes. We anchor our analysis of radical urban transformations and alternatives in a critique of capitalism, patriarchy and growth-centred economy.

NEOLIBERAL NARRATIVES

At the 2016 World Cities Summit in Singapore, the World Bank claimed that the “single most crucial component in rejuvenating decaying urban areas around the world is private sector participation” (World Bank 2016). For the Bank, private sector participation pertains to the mobilisation of big money and the involvement of for-profit entities such as national and transnational companies (TNCs), investors, regional and corporate banks and other financial institutions. Ede Ijjasz-Vasquez, Senior Director for the World Bank’s Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice, stressed that “participation [of] the private sector is a critical factor in determining whether a regeneration program is successful” in creating areas “where citizens can live, work, and thrive” (ibid.). Large urban renewal projects, also known as “revitali[s]ation, renaissance, regeneration, renewal, redevelopment, rejuvenation, restructuring, reurbani[s]ation, and residentiali[s]ation” (Slater 2008: 219; see also Tickell / Peck 2003), aim to physically upgrade sections of a city and bring in a more affluent demographic (Koch et al. 2017) by reconfiguring blighted areas and neighbourhoods in decline as well as the built environment as a whole (Slater 2008). Yet across the Global North and South,
such improvements have entailed dispossession on a massive scale (see Lees et al. 2017). Low-income communities are evicted and forcibly relocated; owners of small businesses and hawkers displaced; and communal spaces privatised to make way for more profitable land uses. Revitalisation projects mobilised to institute neoliberal systems in under-provisioned urban areas (Koch et al. 2017) bear a resemblance to structural adjustment programmes that restructure and reorganise cities as investment hubs and engines of economic growth. Such initiatives are accompanied by changes in laws and policies that weaken local institutions, corporatise municipal bodies and facilitate the outsourcing of public services to third-party contractors, thereby rendering these entities similar to private-sector organisations which are often devoid of public ethos.

From Lagos to Singapore, the corporate private sector continues to shape everyday urban life through their dominance in retail and food distribution, banking and finance, land and housing, as well as basic services provision. Their hegemony is attested by recent figures showing that 69 of the 100 largest economies are transnational corporations, and the ten biggest corporations in the world generate a cumulative revenue of more than the combined income of 180 countries (Global Justice Now 2016). Using income-based metrics for measuring the size of an economy has elicited criticism and ignited debate, particularly within the Global Working Group Beyond Development (GWGBD). Nonetheless, it is a powerful method for demonstrating the scope of corporate power.

TRANSFORMATIVE CITIES: CHALLENGING THE POWER OF CAPITAL

As new inequalities emerge and existing ones are amplified by projects of neoliberal urbanism, a groundswell of resistance originating from the margins of society has edged its way into the foreground. Opposition to water privatisation, citizen-led campaigns for energy democracy, anti-eviction and cooperative housing movements and electoral victories of progressive political parties have gained ground in response to capital’s consolidation of power. Since 2000, at least 835 cases of (re)municipalisation of public services, involving more than 1,600 municipalities in 45 countries, have been recorded around the world (Kishimoto / Petitjean 2017). The motivations behind these projects often include aspirational and politically-strategic goals such as regaining control over local resources and the local economy, decentring the power of TNCs, ending private-sector violations of labour and human rights, providing more affordable and democratic public services and implementing ambitious climate strate-
gies (ibid.). In other parts of the world, these agendas have been complemented by the recent rise of radical municipalism articulated in citizen-led platforms, such as Barcelona en Comú in Catalonia (Spain), Demosisto in Hong Kong and Reclaim the City in Cape Town (South Africa). These alternatives demonstrate that another world is possible and is in fact already being envisaged and enacted.

The Transformative Cities Atlas of Utopias came into being as part of efforts to contribute to the global debate on radical urban transformations (see box below). Initiated by six regional and international organisations,¹ it aims to “build an atlas of real utopias, make these experiences viral and share the learning that comes from implementing these experiments” (Buxton / Trumbo Villa 2018). Their objectives spring from recognising the potential of cities to “break with the dichotomy of despair” and offer possibilities for practicing transformative ways of living, thereby providing the rudiments of radical transformation (Buxton / Trumbo Villa 2017). Conceived as a translocal learning and sharing platform of transformative practices at the city/municipal level, the Atlas aims to amplify real-world practices that demonstrate how cities are working on radical solutions to the multiple crises brought about by entrenched and uneven power structures.

¹ Led by the Transnational Institute, the TC Atlas is a collaboration between Habitat International Coalition, European Network for Community-led Initiatives on Climate Change and Sustainability, Red Intercontinental de Promoción de la Economía Social Solidaria, Global Platform for the Right to the City and Friends of the Earth International.
The Transformative Cities (TC) award adopts a methodology that combines public policy literature with the ontological and political vision of Ernesto Laclau. It uses ‘demands’ rather than identities (e.g., workers, women) as starting points or units of analysis. Dr Erick Gonzalo Palomares Rodriguez, the main architect of this methodology, credits the political significance of using demands to “its ability to represent the indignation and frustration of different sectors of societies”, as well as to its power “as a political strategy [for] creat[ing] a social majority”. Inspired by this view, the TC award focuses on the novel political strategies used by communities, social movements and city/municipal bodies in instigating policy reform in housing, water and energy. As a hermeneutic tool, it also underlines the translation of these experiences to other contexts, rather than replication which global awards celebrating best practices are known for.

Source: Skype interview with Dr Erick Gonzalo Palomares, 14 June 2019

The TC Atlas may be used to explore the constellation of global transformative practices, many of which remain under the radar. The strategic focus on basic rights to housing, energy and water stems from years of advocacy and campaigning by the Transnational Institute and its partners. It serves as a specific lever and an entry point for understanding how transformative processes led by communities, social movements and progressive parties are implemented at the city/municipal level. In 2018, using participatory online tools, the initiative made its first open call for contributions of community-led transformative practices in the energy, water and housing sectors. In total, 32 cases from 19 countries were collected, spanning small villages and global cities (see Table). Of this sample, nine were chosen as finalists by a team of evaluators representing activists, scholars and changemakers in the corresponding fields. Three People’s Choice award winners were determined by a public vote, namely the women of Solapur (India) who built thousands of homes, the community-owned and -built water treatment plant in Cochabamba (Bolivia), and the new municipalist platform for energy transition in Cádiz (Spain) called the Plan of Action Against Energy Poverty. Following the success of the initial round, a second call was announced in early 2019, garnering 34 submissions of transformative practices from around the world.
### SUMMARY OF TRANSFORMATIVE CITIES ATLAS OF UTOPIAS CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR/ PUBLIC SERVICE</th>
<th>IMPETUS</th>
<th>KEY ACTORS</th>
<th>POLITICAL STRATEGIES</th>
<th>LOGICS OF SOCIAL CHANGE²</th>
<th>CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Struggles for the right to the city, particularly housing rights, i.e., access to dignified and affordable housing, and resistance to mass evictions and commercialisation of urban space</td>
<td>Urban poor and informal settler communities; housing cooperatives; trade unions; women workers</td>
<td>Sustained campaigning demanding housing rights and opposing gentrification and commercialisation of urban space; policy reform; media work; popular mobilisation; vertical and horizontal alliance work</td>
<td>Social movements; social movement unionism; radical municipalism</td>
<td>Policy reform; public investments in dignified and affordable housing; participatory mechanisms in planning and implementing housing projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Struggles for energy democracy/sovereignty; resistance to energy poverty, fracking and fossil fuels; campaigns for renewable energy transition and climate justice; opposition to private electricity companies; demands for grassroots solutions to energy problems; calls for remunicipalisation</td>
<td>Cooperatives; multi-constituent platforms; progressive political parties</td>
<td>Platform-/discourse-building and awareness-raising initiatives regarding energy democracy; cooperative-building efforts; lobbying and campaigning for energy policy reform</td>
<td>Prefigurative politics; social movements; radical municipalism</td>
<td>Energy policy reform; defeat of fossil-fuel and coal-fired power plant giants; new democratic municipal energy companies; community-led and economically-regenerative alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Community responses to ‘glocal’ (global/local) problems, i.e., pollution, privatisation of water services, climate change; demands for right to water, democratic control of public water and remunicipalisation</td>
<td>Local governments (city councils/mayors); grassroots-led movements; civil society coalitions with local roots but global networks</td>
<td>Self-organising; multiple performative strategies; city-level reclamation of control over water</td>
<td>Prefigurative politics; everyday politics; social movements; radical municipalism</td>
<td>Temporary to permanent halt to water privatisation and outsourcing; introduction of prepaid water meters; de-privatisation and remunicipalisation of water services; creation of new public water companies; community-led alternatives; broad community-labour alliances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ rendering.

2 This is based on the Global Working Group Beyond Development’s typology.
Whilst the initiative does not offer a definition of transformation or transformative practices, many of the cases featured in this chapter trace their roots to popular struggles and demonstrate diverse ways of reimagining cities, reclaiming living spaces and resisting corporate control of shelter, energy and water. The TC Atlas highlights the ability of local people to chart new pathways for their communities and reclaim their individual and collective autonomy, with the principles of cooperation and solidarity as bases. A number of cases are incomplete insofar as they are ongoing processes of transition and transformation: from issue-based campaigns to abolish prepaid water metering, to ‘systems thinking’ for building solidarity economies. The common thread weaving these cases together is the emphasis on claiming vital rights, namely water, food, energy, housing and mobility. Though fundamental to human survival and a dignified life, these rights have been reduced to ‘sectors’ subject to neoliberal policies. Nonetheless, their commodification has shaped them to become the very tools for organising transgressive social mobilisations and popular uprisings. One such example is the pushback against coal power in Mauritius. In 2013, social organisations publicly released documents regarding the license that was secretly awarded by the government to CT Power, a Malaysian TNC, to operate a new coal-fired power plant. The movement’s bold move, alongside its advocacy for the establishment of a National Audit Commission tasked to review the country’s energy policy and lead the transition to renewable energy, resulted in the shelving of the power plant project and spurred the launch of another campaign for cooperative-led alternatives to fossil fuels.

In taking stock of these radical changes, we note that one process of transformation may not necessarily lead to the transformation of other aspects of urban life. Victories and gains need to be protected from corporate and State backlash. Successes in reclaiming public services may co-exist with regressive social and public policies such as opening up urban land to commercial interests, as in Jakarta and Mumbai. This is usually the case for issue-based social movements’ campaigns to end privatisation, provide basic services and democratise governance. However, these objectives often evolve into comprehensive agendas, particularly when relevant groups become involved in local/national or regional/international networks and campaigns, or when the situation requires building unity platforms (e.g., challenging the dominance of cross-border TNCs and capital).

We also note that the TC Atlas cases go beyond the ‘small is beautiful’ view of alternatives. Instead, they emphasise the geographic and thematic context, alongside the importance of transnational solidarity. Many of the cases presented here
have strong regional and international links, inspired by transformative practices and lessons from cities that share similar challenges. For example, the water school in Mexico, led by a volunteer-based organisation comprising professionals, organisers and educators, was based on a Freire-inspired initiative on water education in Colombia. Similarly, Eau de Paris, which remunicipalised its privatised water system in 2010, adopted environmental management practices promoting agroecological farming practices that improve water quality and help smallholders. The same model was also implemented in the last two decades in the Catskill Mountains, New York City’s main water source.

**CONTENTIOUS POLITICS**

The local cases cited in this chapter illustrate contentious politics, a concept described by political scientists Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly as “interactions in which actors make claims bearing on someone else’s interests, leading to coordinated efforts on behalf of shared interests or programmes, in which governments are involved as targets, initiators of claims, or third parties” (2007: 4). It refers to collective political struggles of claimants (or the groups they represent), which depend in part on non-institutional forms of interaction with the State or with opponents such as corporations. Contentious politics covers policymaking and elections, social movement campaigns, democratisation processes and experiments, as well as riots and revolutions (Tilly / Tarrow 2007). The concept offers a practical way of understanding the diversity of transformative practices in the TC initiative, as it deals with three aspects of social life, namely contention, collective action and politics. In essence, contentious politics concerns political questions about who does what, why, where, at whose expense and how.

Each site of contention has its own peculiarities. For instance, there are marked differences between the water pollution and sanitation crises faced by the water cooperative in San Pedro Magisterio in Cochabamba, and the electricity-market deregulation confronted by residents of Schönau in Germany. Whilst the conditions that spawned local organising and collectivisation vary, parallels and similarities exist in the mechanisms and processes that operate across different sites because they relate to basic rights.

Parallels include established repertoires and political strategies used by social movements, communities and citizen-based political parties such as demonstrations, petitions, lobbying, statements and media campaigns, public meetings and assemblies and other performative actions. The success of these repertoires often
depends on the strategic identification of political opportunities and key targets, as well as the kind and quality of organisations, networks, traditions and solidarities that sustain them.

The transformative cases discussed in the TC Atlas mostly involve well-focused and politically-engaged approaches which aim to reclaim space and civic participation, build horizontal and vertical alliances and forge translocal solidarity. Some strategies also prioritise collaboration with progressive political parties and State towards the achievement of shared goals. The experience of Valladolid Toma la Palabra, a Spanish municipalist movement that runs the environment department of the city council, illuminates this point. Inspired by electoral pledges of the new three-party coalition government to remunicipalise public water management, the movement campaigned to organise open debates and roundtables. These conversations eventually resulted in the establishment of the Public Water Management Platform composed of neighbourhood associations, ecologists and socially-engaged residents. The city subsequently announced its commitment to invest €178 million over the next 15 years for upgrading infrastructure and keeping water prices affordable.3

The TC Atlas cases also tackle common problems that mobilise collective actions in diverse contexts. The "think global, act local" slogan of alter-globalist movements articulate four of these common issues. It proceeds from widespread discontent firstly, with neoliberal policies and laws in growth-centred economies; secondly, with corporate and financial control of water, energy and housing; thirdly, with the involvement of international financial institutions (IFIs) and development finance in the design and implementation of privatisation policies and programmes; and lastly, with the reproduction of social inequalities.

These frustrations coalesce in the World Bank and regional development banks’ active production of water crises, which resulted in the handover of State-owned water utilities to the private sector from the late 1990s up to the 2000s, as in the experience of Jakarta and Paris in the years preceding remunicipalisation. Fortunately, the intersection of these sites of discontent has often prompted powerful mobilisations such as the gathering in 2016 of 20,000 people on the streets of Belgrade in protest of a large-scale waterfront project (Pantovic 2016).

3 For more information, see: www.waternewseurope.com/spain-remunicipalisation-of-drinking-water-valladolid.
Another thread that runs through these cases is the collective motivation and action to pursue alternatives. Collective action refers to the organisation of coordinated efforts or activities involving shared interests, slogans and programmes (Tilly / Tarrow 2007). The success of these outcomes relies largely on the active, dynamic and meaningful participation of communities and citizens throughout the transformation process. People’s assemblies are a common feature of these cases – whether it is the community-led production of hydroelectric energy in El Cua, Nicaragua, or the equitable model of local energy provision established by Community Power, a movement of marginalised people in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Democratic decision making, direct participation in community affairs, self-organisation, resource pooling and reliance on local knowledge demonstrate that transformation-related decisions, motivations, interests and behaviours are shaped and experienced in the intimacies of everyday life.

Practices of plural and radical democracy articulate people’s resistance to neoliberal notions of democracy which in turn triggers socio-political change. This involves exposing, challenging and altering oppressive power structures and relations, as in the case of Sistema de Agua Potable de Tecámac (SAPTEMAC), a volunteer-based organisation of professionals that runs water schools in Mexico. The group identifies laws and policies supporting water privatisation as a source of oppression, and through the water schools, equip citizens with political tools for defending rights. Such initiatives illustrate that exploitative relations stem from the neoliberal State and capital’s control of the city; at the same time, they illuminate why municipalist movements emerged in the last six years (2014-2020) (see section on fearless towns and cities).

Reclaiming power as a community figures prominently in the TC Atlas cases. For instance, the Las Peñas neighbourhood in the outskirts of Cochabamba practiced ayllus, which is the traditional form of indigenous local governance in the Andes. It encompasses collective mechanisms of land control and management, as well as ayni, a concept embracing mutualism and reciprocity in communal work and as a way of life. This self-organised community used both practices in asserting housing rights, autonomy and self-determination.
FROM DECONSTRUCTION TO RECONSTRUCTION

Radical urban transformations are part of the growing global resistance against privatisation and commodification of urban life. Underpinned by principles of social justice and solidarity, many of the popular struggles have not only produced counter-narratives, but also proposed alternatives to the neoliberal order. In this section, we identify three key alternative praxes emanating from the TC Atlas: de-privatisation, rise of the urban commons and social movement unionism.

DE-PRIVATISATION

The first praxis pertains to campaigns for de-privatisation. Two approaches are particularly noteworthy. The first involves launching a counter-narrative and counter-offensive against Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)\(^4\) by promoting the practice of Public-Public, Public-Community and Community-Community partnerships (collectively known as PuPs) in the water sector. The failure of PPPs, alongside the deterioration of outsourced public services, has inspired a renewed appreciation for the role of the public and the State, particularly in the context of these novel forms of partnerships. PuPs are concrete, practical and innovative tools that link up various actors\(^5\) to share experiences, expertise and local knowledge, with a view to improving democratic public services and building public support for non-profit, mutually cooperative and solidarity partnerships. Unlike PPPs, PuPs are rooted in serving the common good and do not seek to profit from cooperative development projects. One example is Sintracuavalle, the trade union in the Jamundí and Cauca Valley in Colombia that led a campaign defending local water supply. In 2009, unions helped set up four community water systems in Latin America based on the principles of the Plataforma de Acuerdos Públicos Comunitarios de Las Américas (the Platform for Public-Community Partnerships of the Americas), an America-wide platform establishing community-led water alternatives and promoting horizontalism and solidarity.

---

\(^4\) PPPs are long-term contracts underwritten by government guarantees that have been used as mechanisms for introducing corporate private sector participation into energy, housing, water, transport and infrastructure, which are traditionally run or provided by the State. Supporters of PPPs, which include the State, IFIs and donor governments, argue that the private sector brings in monies, expertise, technologies and skills the public sector lacks. One of the main advocates of this view is the Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility (PPIAF), which was created in 1999 as a multi-donor technical assistance facility, financed by 11 multilateral and bilateral donors and housed inside the World Bank Group. The PPIAF is designed to promote and strengthen policies, regulations and institutions that allow private sector investment in infrastructure in emerging markets and developing countries. For more information, see: https://ppiaf.org.

\(^5\) PuPs actors include Northern and Southern countries, trade unions, activists and public resource managers.
The trade unions, activists and social movements participating in this platform, whose work originated in the Cochabamba water wars in 2000, have fiercely defended water as commons and successfully blocked the rollout of PPPs in the region.

The emphasis on community partnerships emerged from the Global South, where ‘public’ is misconstrued for the State (i.e., municipal or central authorities) and where there is general distrust of government. As social participation has expanded, it has also taken on new forms. For example, the municipalist movements in Cádiz, community organisations in Minneapolis and Jackson and urban poor neighbourhood associations in Dar es Salaam and Mumbai have systematically organised around crafting community-based solutions to water, energy and housing problems. They have also built new forms of partnerships wherein women play a vital role as leaders and changemakers. Such initiatives demonstrate the power of organisation and participation in forging an ethic of active labour towards the improvement and democratisation of public service provision.

The second approach to de-privatisation involves the remunicipalisation of public services, which disputes the necessity, superiority and inevitability of privatisation and corporate control. Kishimoto and Petitjean (2017) refer to remunicipalisation as “the process of bringing previously private or privatised services under local public control and management” (ibid.: 159). The growing list of cities and municipalities taking back control of their public services indicates the appeal and promise of remunicipalisation as one of the most significant policy shifts in public service governance in the past decade (McDonald / Swyngedouw 2019). This global paradigm shift echoes widespread citizen dissatisfaction amidst the failure of the private sector to provide adequate basic services. The ills of privatisation and austerity measures pushed by IFIs and adopted by central and supra-regional governments are palpable in cities and towns. They materialise in various forms, ranging from unnecessary public costs (e.g., bailing out a bankrupt private water company operating in the western part of Metro Manila) to deteriorating public services, both of which exacerbate existing inequalities. In contrast, remunicipalisation creates a “credible, realistic, and attractive option” (Hoedeman et. al. 2012: 106) for delivering more equitable public services. Furthermore, it stresses a shift in public operation and management, specifically from the corrupt and unreliable provision of basic services to a new generation of public companies rooted in principles of social justice.

Remunicipalisation is particularly vibrant in Europe, notably in the water and energy sectors. The return of Paris’s water services to the city’s control in January 2010 threatened the dominance of French multinationals Suez and Veolia in the water
market. Regarded as a pioneer in public water management, Paris previously operated an unbundled water system, with distribution, infrastructure and water safety assigned to different companies. Eventually, it established a single and fully-integrated public operator (from source to tap) called Eau de Paris (Transformative Cities 2018). This new entity succeeded in restructuring water provision, instituting important reforms, reclaiming public interest and providing clean and affordable water to three million consumers. By reinvigorating the public sector, the city was able to generate significant annual structural savings of €30 million. More importantly, it was able to reduce the price of water by 8% and continue the free supply of water to public fountains. This shift likewise allowed the local government to establish cooperation with organisations supporting refugees and the homeless, as well as employ strategies supporting agroecological farming practices of farmers whose lands are home to the city’s water sources.

Whilst Paris’s remunicipalisation of water services was primarily initiated by the city itself, Berlin’s was championed by a small group of activists that uncovered a PPP deal between Veolia, RWE and the city government. From 2006 to 2011, a citizens’ campaign urged local officials to hold a referendum on disclosing the secret contract. The campaign gathered massive support from big NGOs, residents, trade unions, political parties and the media, and eventually forced local authorities to buy back their shares and remunicipalise the city’s water supply. Similar initiatives are happening elsewhere. From 2012 to 2017, a series of court victories in favour of citizens and labour groups compelled the city of Jakarta to terminate the 1997 privatisation contract due to the poor performance of PT PAM Lyonnaise Jaya (Suez’s subsidiary) and PT Thames Pam Jaya. This accomplishment was the result of decades of intense campaigning and sustained transnational mobilisation to remunicipalise Jakarta’s private water system.

In the energy sector, the struggles for sovereignty and democracy consist of three common aspects. The first is the fight against fossil-fuel reliance and the push for renewable energy transition. The second involves the collective goal of energy self-sufficiency, improved and democratised energy services, as well as citizen participation in ownership, management, operation and policymaking. The third concerns the effort to roll back corporate power by enabling cooperative-run systems and instituting policy reform allowing citizen re-appropriation and control. In Mauritius, the People’s Cooperative Renewable Energy Coalition, devised a plan which ensures shifting to solar energy whilst simultaneously addressing the question of food sovereignty. The coalition traces its roots to Power Shift Campaign
which mobilised for energy policy reform. Supported by young people, trade unions, social movements and a progressive political party, it entered into a partnership agreement with the island’s sugar farmers to acquire uncultivated lands for use in generating renewable energy whilst providing assistance in food production. In post-Chernobyl Schönau, a citizens’ initiative campaigned for clean electricity and successfully acquired the power grid despite opposition from the private operator. Today, the cooperative supplies clean and sustainable electricity to their small town and to 170,000 households across Germany. The remunicipalisation of energy production was made possible by significant changes in State policies (e.g., government incentives such as feed-in tariffs that allowed the renewable energy sector to grow in the 1990s) and more recently, by the ambitious *Energiewende* (energy revolution) policy which is Germany’s low-carbon, nuclear-free transition plan.6 In neighbouring Spain, a number of citizen-led campaigns aim to democratise, decentralise and devolve energy production. The Catalonia-based Xarxa per la Sobirania Energètica mobilises against fracking and corporate hydropower dams, and campaigns for regional energy policy reform whilst collaborating transnationally. In the Spanish city of Girona, Som Energia, a cooperative which began as a student assignment in 2011, has grown to 44,600 members nationwide and now supplies 100% renewable energy to thousands of households.

These cases of remunicipalisation show the possibilities of reclaiming power and experimenting with democratic ownership and collective management. Under this model, citizens exercise a central role.

**RISE OF THE URBAN COMMONS**

The second praxis we draw from the TC Atlas involves the rise of the urban commons. This pertains to creating, expanding and caring for the commons, which are resources, spaces, public goods and wealth that belong to the public and must therefore be actively protected, managed and shared for the good and benefit of all (Guttal / Manahan 2011). The TC cases show diverse forms of shared access and governance of the urban commons, as well as bottom-up reclamation of the commons.

The experience of Cooperation Jackson in Mississippi, United States (see Chapter 5) illustrates this praxis. The organisation is a network of cooperatives and worker-owned, democratically self-managed enterprises that aims to build a solidarity

---

6 The book Reclaiming Public Services (Kishimoto/Petitjean 2017) documented 234 cases of remunicipalised energy systems in Germany. The country accounts for 90% of remunicipalisation cases in this sector.
economy in the city (Transformative Cities 2018). It employs ‘systems thinking’, which combines a radical vision and plan with long-term processes of socio-economic transition and political change. Launched on International Labour Day in 2014, Cooperation Jackson’s long-term vision is to create four interconnected and interdependent institutions, comprising a federation of local worker cooperatives, cooperative incubator, cooperative education and training centre and cooperative bank or financial institution (Cooperation Jackson N.d.). Inspired by the Jackson-Kush Plan7 initiated in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, these efforts centre on organising unemployed and underemployed working-class people from black and Latino communities, and building worker-organised/-owned cooperatives. Among their key activities is the creation of the Sustainable Communities Initiative which seeks to (co-)shape place, space, culture, institutions and businesses in ways that sustain the community socio-culturally, ecologically and economically. This involves helping stabilise rent; providing affordable, green housing; as well as creating living-wage jobs. Through this work, Cooperation Jackson hopes to establish a Community Land Trust, Housing Cooperatives and Eco-Village model, made possible by voluntarism, community production and collaboration with the municipal government (ibid.).

The commons are also generated and kept alive by continuous acts of commoning or bottom-up social governance, which bypass markets and States and radically reconceptualise relations with these institutions. Latin America offers rich examples of community-led self-organising and of defending and reclaiming the commons. Prompted by a severe water pollution crisis, the community of San Pedro Magisterio in Cochabamba formed a cooperative responsible for treating domestic wastewater and managing the neighbourhood’s entire water cycle (Transformative Cities 2019). Residents convened assemblies where collective decisions were made about the technical design of the water treatment plant, the improvements to the sewerage system, as well as the introduction of a new tariff structure that would sustain the new system (ibid.). The community’s determination to manage water and sanitation quashed municipal authorities’ opposition. Since then, the cooperative has created alliances with other neighbourhoods and public officials to fight against political intimidation (ibid.).

Autonomous organising in defence of the commons is likewise strong among dispossessed urban communities. In Dar es Salaam, displaced residents self-organised

---

7 The Jackson-Kush Plan was designed to address the economic and social impacts caused by the disaster. For more information, see: https://cooperationjackson.org for more information.
against government-led demolitions in favour of Tanzania’s port expansion. They created the Chamazi Community Based Housing Scheme to provide a relocation site within the city, improve access to water and sanitation, as well as finance community needs. Residents also launched a collective initiative to secure around 12 hectares of land purchased through community-pooled resources amounting to US$ 24,000, and mobilised broad-based civil-society and government support for the provision of affordable and dignified housing.

In Washington D.C., tenants have been organising limited-equity cooperatives (LECs) since the late 1970s (Huron 2018) in response to widespread evictions. The LEC model provides affordable and secure housing to tenants through the collective purchase of the residential complex from private landlords (ibid.). This practice has scaled up beyond D.C. through knowledge sharing by groups such as the Aspen Cooperative, which hosts delegations of tenant organisations seeking to learn from their experience (ibid.: 15). This control over housing is described by Huron (2018) as a reclamation of urban commons. Anti-eviction movements are mobilised based on “the right to stay put” (Hartman 1984; see also Weinstein 2014), which resists the displacement and “re-placement” (Rademacher 2009) of communities.

Although the practice of urban commoning may involve acquiescing to capitalist processes and seeking assistance from city authorities (Huron 2018: 86), it also adopts a more defensive and confrontational approach that opposes, rejects and bypasses landlords and the State. Squatter movements and tenant takeovers of idle or abandoned housing are typical examples of “seizing and maintaining the commons” (Huron 2018: 60). Such tactics have spread among cities across the world following the 2008 subprime mortgage crisis which has escalated the financialisation of land, housing and real estate (see Aalbers 2019), as well as the emergence of “austerity urbanism” (Peck 2012).

One of these tactics is the establishment of homeless encampments in cities. In the United States, temporary camps have proliferated in the aftermath of the global financial crisis. As of 2017, five tent cities existed in Seattle, a city covering 217 square kilometres (Sparks 2017). Whilst camps emerge as a “spatial tactic of resistance” (ibid.: 90), subsequent legalisation and regulation potentially undermine their radical politics, as encampments are normalised and become an “official state strategy of poverty management” (Herring 2014: 299). Yet despite the political limitations brought about by institutionalisation, homeless camps retain radical possibilities. For example, Tent City 3 in Seattle has been able to foster collectivism marked by a shared commit-
ment to contributing to the daily operations of the camp such as taking on security, tent maintenance, donation management and kitchen duties (Sparks 2017: 94). In this semi-autonomous and self-governed space, residents exercise political agency and citizenship (Sparks 2017: 100)

Another transgressive practice of urban commoning is the takeover of idle, disused and abandoned public, residential, commercial and industrial properties. Squats and occupations emerged in Western European cities and municipalities as early as the 1950s (see Mudu 2004). Whilst known to be used as residences, collectives also reconfigured these spaces into hubs of social and political activity, as in Milan, Rome, Turin, Bologna as well as the Italian municipality of Sesto San Giovanni where social centres function simultaneously as sites of community organising, venues for social and cultural events, bastions of autonomous activism (ibid.; see also Andretta et al. 2002) and hotbeds of transcontinental solidarity movement building (Mudu, 2004). Between 1985 and 2003, 262 social centres were active across Italy (ibid.: 929). In the late 2000s, urban austerity and the global financial crisis ignited an expansion in squats and occupations across the world. In the United States, coordinated actions were launched in December 2011 as part of the decentralised Occupy Our Homes Movement (Christie 2011). Years later, in the Philippines, members of Kadamay, a homeless and urban poor group, took over some 5,300 deteriorating socialised housing units and relocation villages in the province of Bulacan, north of the capital region of Metro Manila (Dizon 2019). This radical reclamation of space can be read as a tipping point for what Oldfield and Greyling (2015) term “waiting for the state”, which pertains to the housing precariat’s “practices of quiet encroachment” (ibid.: 1100). In protesting the sluggish response of governments to the active production of housing crises (Ferreri / Vasudevan 2019), occupations and takeovers transform neglected spaces and, in the process, create new social and spatial relations through self-management and self-production (ibid.).

Beyond practices of reclamation, the rise of the urban commons likewise manifests in cooperativism. In Budapest (Hungary), the Cargonomia collective was set up in 2015 as a sustainable urban centre offering a local and organic food distribution point, featuring a cargo-bike messenger service, family-scale organic vegetable farm, organic bakery, wine distribution and bicycle-building cooperative responsible for delivering more than 3,000 food boxes annually (Transformative Cities 2018). These efforts directly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from food production and distribution, whilst providing multiple benefits to the community such as offering logistics support and community space (ibid.). The local network underpins an
approach grounded on ‘systems thinking’ and solidarity economy building, similar to that of Cooperation Jackson. At the same time, it underlines the importance of social centres as the backbone of community life, as incubators for commons-based initiatives and as the birthplace of urban social movements. Another example is the work of a community organisation in Amsterdam, Netherlands called Stichting Building. The group transformed a derelict church into a social centre, with the aim of fostering community life and local activism. This helped build bridges between community members by gathering excluded groups and wealthy individuals, young and elderly people, as well as minority groups in a space that encourages the exchange of ideas. The community the organisation nurtures serves as a collective force in fighting against gentrification, particularly the threat of church demolition and construction of new commercial buildings.

Cooperative movements likewise attempt to reclaim information and technology in a world where big corporations control data, and panopticon-like State surveillance has become an everyday reality. Juegos del Común (Commons Games), a Barcelona-based digital association, stresses the importance of open data to transparency and democracy. It experiments with using game dynamics to challenge corporate-controlled technology whilst promoting open data and encouraging citizen participation. The group has developed four game prototypes as well as an online service providing public access to city council datasets about the consequences of tourism for housing.

**SOCIAL MOVEMENT UNIONISM**

The third praxis derived from the TC Atlas is worker-led/-owned transformative practices. Social movement unionism, which is rooted in the political struggles in developing countries, has grown over the last three decades despite criticism of trade unions’ parochial concerns. This approach is distinct from traditional unionism on at least three fronts. Firstly, it adopts broad aims concerning social justice, human rights and democracy; secondly, it advocates active labour-community alliances; lastly, it reframes trade unions as social movements that mobilise their members not only against workplace injustice and other forms of social oppression (Alliance of Progressive Labor 2001).

---

8 An iconic example of social movement unionism (SMU) is the alliance between South Africa’s Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the anti-apartheid struggle in the 1980s. It is also practised by trade unions in Brazil and the Philippines in their campaigns and industrial relations. More recently, global unions such as Public Services International have reinvigorated SMU through their campaigns for de-privatisation, remunicipalisation, PuPs and energy democracy.

9 Traditional unionism mainly focuses on work and workplace issues.
Trade unions under Public Services International (PSI), one of the largest international federations of public sector unions with millions of members around the world, assert the importance of unions in ensuring quality service and defending rights alongside other groups, citizens and actors. The challenge lies in building real participatory mechanisms which bring together various stakeholders. A concrete case of labour’s transformative role in public service provision is the experience of a workers’ association in Dhaka, Bangladesh in fighting against the outsourcing of parts of the water supply distribution system. Through collective persistence, it succeeded in introducing revenue collection managed by labour cooperatives, and in creating a broad-based community-labour alliance in the 1990s. The Dhaka Water Supply and Sewerage Authority (DWASA) encountered major challenges in meeting community demands due to poor levels of revenue collection and substantial water losses. The utility company proposed building a surface-water treatment plant to be financed by the World Bank on condition that DWASA privatise sections of its water supply distribution and revenue collection. The unions strongly opposed this plan and developed grounded solutions with the communities they serve. They proposed that one zone be managed by the worker cooperative in partnership with the community, and the other by a private operator for a one-year period (Hoque 2003; Hall 2010). When this was implemented, revenue collection improved and water losses decreased in the cooperative zone (Hall 2010). Payment of living wages likewise eliminated bribe seeking (ibid.). As a result, the water union successfully blocked the World Bank plan; and in doing so, it demonstrated the viability of worker-operated cooperatives and strengthened their relations with the communities they serve (Transformative Cities 2018).

Dynamic traditions of strong unionism are likewise present in the housing sector. For nearly two decades, textile mill workers in Mumbai, India have consistently campaigned for their rights to land and housing. In particular, they demanded that a portion of the land belonging to textile mill companies be earmarked for shelter needs. This strong campaign, alongside social movement unionism, produced legislation committing 100,000 to 150,000 housing units for workers. According to the TC Atlas case brief (2018), around 8,000 apartments have been constructed, with 18,000 units under way. In Solapur, 396 kilometres from Mumbai, women cigarette (beedi) workers were at the forefront of the struggle for dignified housing. In 1992, around 65,000 women workers launched an extensive campaign headed by the Centre of Indian Trade Unions to secure affordable housing for their members as well as to textile and informal sector workers employed by the government. The women likewise played a central role in the design, planning and implementation of three housing
schemes. The Comrade Godutai Parulekar Housing Scheme, regarded as the largest cooperative housing project for workers in Asia, involved the construction of some 10,000 housing units from 2001 to 2006. This was followed by the Comrade Meenakshi Sane Housing Scheme in 2015, which aims to build 1,600 houses for women beedi workers. The largest project, sanctioned a year later, involves the construction of 30,000 affordable homes, including key infrastructure such as roads, water and electric facilities, hospital, tertiary school, market and places of worship (Transformative Cities 2018).

In both the textile mill and beedi worker examples, people supported broader demands for dignified housing and emphasised shelter as a working-class issue. They used cooperatives as a training ground for running parts of the economy such as public services. New forms of partnership like labour-community alliances (see the case of Colombia above) required the rethinking of roles, relationships and attitudes based on principles of equity, mutual respect and genuine solidarity.

FEARLESS TOWNS AND CITIES AS MULTIPLE NODES OF CHANGE

Transformative Cities underscores the praxis of Fearless Cities through its focus on radical municipalism (i.e., self-government by towns, municipalities, cities and city regions) as a means of creating and expanding solidarity, inclusion and the commons. The logic of social change it espouses is transformative political power, wherein the transformation or appropriation of certain parts of the State happens through greater collective activity from below. Fearless Cities is a newly formed international platform built on translocal solidarity, particularly a translocal alliance for the growing municipalist movements around the world. To date, there are more than 80 cities and municipalities with active platforms and people’s political parties advancing a radical municipalist agenda in defence of human rights, democracy and the common good (see Figure 1). As the movement is defined not only by its goals but also by how it enacts its politics (Baird 2017), it shows a commitment to doing things differently (i.e., from traditional left politics). The first gathering hosted in Barcelona from 9-11 June 2017, sought to build an “ecosystem of organizations working within and beyond electoral politics at local level” (ibid.).

This practice differs in three ways from the wave of municipalist strategies in the 1990s and early 2000s which focused on decentralisation and disregarded devolution of powers and people’s direct participation in shaping urban life. Firstly, a radical municipal strategy acknowledges the municipal scale, where people’s lives are organised and governed by institutions, as a site of contestation, resistance and trans-
formation (Plan C / Russell 2017). Secondly, radical municipalist movements are often deeply rooted in popular struggles for just shelter, public water, energy democracy, dignified labour and urban justice. A number of movements have occupied streets and halls of power to reclaim urban space and life from the claws of capital. Remunicipalisation struggles echo the demands to dismantle corporate power and other structures of oppression (see Chapter 5). Thirdly, this new radical municipalist agenda undergirds the more encompassing and transformative objective of building social justice. It counters the politics of the far right, emphasises the politics of everyday life and changes the way politics is practiced. Its aim is to “build global networks of solidarity and hope from the bottom up” (Fearless Cities N.d.).

This model of people-centred governance espouses both an understanding and a way of doing politics that go beyond electoral strategies and large-scale actions and initiatives such as mass uprisings. Radical municipalism stresses the importance of day-to-day community organisation, which deals with the “quiet, mundane, and subtle expressions and acts” (Kerkvliet 2009: 232; see also Hobson / Seabrooke 2007) of collaboration, negotiation, and dialogue to determine “who gets what, when [and] how” (Lasswell, 1936). It therefore concerns the control, production, allocation, and use of public resources (Kerkvliet 2009: 227). The remunicipalisation of public services serves as a good example, as it is a response to people’s demand for genuine democracy and meaningful participation in governance and political life beyond the ballot box. Moreover, radical municipalism seeks to foster creative and cultural spaces that embrace diversity and address isolation and othering (Wright / Jenkinson 2019). A number of European cities have rolled out identification schemes for undocumented immigrants (Baird 2017) in an effort to make an otherwise invisible population visible. Multiple initiatives have also been initiated in solidarity with refugees and asylum seekers in their struggle for political change (Wright / Jenkinson 2019). In this way, radical municipalism reconfigures social relations based on principles of social justice.
In what follows, we enumerate examples of radical municipalist platforms across the globe:

> Barcelona en Comú is an electoral multi-constituent/citizen-led movement with roots in the housing rights movement. It won the city elections in 2015 and subsequently instituted progressive policies promoting direct citizen involvement in policymaking and participatory budgeting systems towards the redistribution of wealth and power. Inspired by Barcelona, other Spanish cities created their own municipalist movements including Valladolid Toma la Palabra, which runs the environment department of the new city council. It held open debates leading to the remunicipalisation of its water system, which drew opposition from the private sector. This resulted in the democratisation of the Board membership, renewed public investment and the suspension of water rate increases. In the Andalucía region of Spain, citizen-movement candidates from the Por Cádiz Sí Se Puede (For Cádiz, Yes We Can) and Ganar Cádiz en Común (Winning Cádiz in Common) coalitions were elected to the municipal government with a platform advocating renewable energy, promoting democratic energy transition, addressing energy poverty/inequality and supporting the creation of energy-related employment. These efforts subsequently rebuilt and reshaped the city’s social and productive life, as well as introduced a general strategy for roundtables (mesas) as open space platforms for debates on the city’s energy issues.

> The Richmond Progressive Alliance (RPA) transformed the region from being the “armpit of the [San Francisco] Bay area” (Hashe 2018) to an environmentally- and labour-progressive city. It raised the local minimum wage, led grassroots mobilisation around social and environmental issues and supported community policing which led to a decrease in overall crime rates. From 2006 to 2014, Green mayor and RPA co-founder Gayle McLaughlin introduced a number of progressive policies. Notably, under her leadership, the city sued Chevron and won US$ 90 million in environmental damages.

> Kurdish women in the self-governing region of Rojava in Northern Syria are building “feminist, assembly-based models of stateless democracy” (Baird 2017), amidst an economic embargo, limited access to food and water, an inhospitable climate of conflict and a refusal to recognise the Kurds. Women have been organising not only to dismantle entrenched power structures, but also to implement alternatives to the oppressive system. One such example is the creation of women’s communes in Jinwar (free women’s space/women’s land) which provide a free and safe space for victims of violence and patriarchy, as well as those who have lost their husbands and
relatives in the war. The communes include schools, medical centres, museums and houses; and community life is built and shaped based on ideals of freedom, equality and non-violence. In 2012, the Kurds declared self-determination and introduced “Democratic Confederalism” which promotes “a non-state system of grassroots democracy, decentralisation, gender equality, and environmental sustainability” (Ocalan 2011).

Pro-democracy and youth-led opposition parties in Hong Kong such as Demosisto and Youngspiration organise and challenge Chinese government-elected city councillors, amidst State repression and persecution.

Electoral victories of progressive candidates in Latin America signal hope and change despite the rise of right-wing politics and the crises of socialist governments in the region. A candidate fielded by Cidade que Queremos, a citizens’ platform in Belo Horizonte in Brazil, won more than the number of votes combined for other candidates in the city council elections. Similarly, in Chile, a former student activist running on a people-led platform was elected mayor of Valparaiso.

These cases illustrate practices that generate progressive municipal and urban movements and therefore create people-centred and anti-capitalist alternatives. At the same time, they show how the internationalist dimension of Fearless Cities is crucial to developing a common identity, deepening global collaboration and confronting common issues collectively (Plan C/Russell 2017).

Yet despite these gains, the future of fearless towns and cities is under threat. Taking the experience of Spain as an example, the May 2019 municipal election results highlight some hard lessons on the municipalist movement’s sustainability and future collective work. Whilst the defeat of Spain’s Fearless Cities in Madrid, Barcelona, Zaragoza, A Coruña, Santiago de Compostela and other key cities may be attributed in part to rekindled nationalism, sociologist Carlos Delclós (2019) points to the incommensurability between the movement’s campaign and its discursive focus. Speaking specifically about Barcelona en Comú’s recent electoral defeat, he notes that though it had previously won on a platform challenging global capitalism, patriarchy and climate change, its rhetoric has nonetheless foregrounded accomplishments of governance centred on municipal programmes (ibid.).

---

10 See this powerful article written by the women of Jinwar: https://internationalistcommune.com/jinwar (07.06.2019).
Thus, whilst the future of radical municipalism rests in part on its ability to counter right-wing politics and political manoeuvring, its success lies in how it is conceptualised and enacted as a political strategy. As a starting point, it is productive to consider the place of rural dwellers in a movement focused on the municipal; to think critically about the fundamental difference between municipal institutions and the nation-state; to evaluate the prospects of developing tactics that bypass legal and financial obstacles imposed by governments, and generating strategies that encompass or surpass the State; to deliberate the political significance of seizing institutions; and to probe the possibilities of surviving after seriously transgressing the State (Plan C/Russell 2017). Answers to some of these questions are tackled in chapters of this book. But overall, they are in the making: they emerge in the very practice of radical municipalism.

Map of fearless cities, a global municipalist movement
Source: Barcelona en Comú
WHAT DO THESE PRAXES MEAN?

The transformative practices featured in the Transformative Cities Atlas of Utopia and Fearless Cities initiatives underline locally-embedded and globally-networked practices of radical urban alternatives. Most of these practices cover multi-constituent approaches including alliance work with the traditional left and established political parties. They stress transparency, radical democracy, citizen participation and the progressive realisation of human rights to housing, water and energy. In this section, we enumerate lessons drawn from these praxes of radical urban transformation:

> **Scope and scale:** The TC Atlas and Fearless Cities underscore the city/municipality as the locus of radical urban transformation. Most of the initiatives pose a direct challenge to capitalism, exclusion, and other forms of structural oppression. The alternatives they build either upset the balance of power or demolish the structures that undergird them. For these efforts to succeed and flourish, sustained repertoires and socio-political capital must be built. Whilst some of these initiatives are substantial in scale and may even be replicated, this anthology nonetheless troubles the prospects of upscaling and replicability as the lone measure of evaluating promise and success. It may be just as beneficial to draw lessons and inspiration from victories and determine which aspects can be adopted or reworked in diverse contexts.

> **People’s agency:** The cases presented here testify to the capacity of the poor and the marginalised to re/write their own her/histories, reject existing conditions and reconfigure structures and possibilities (Long 2001). Many of these community- and worker-led alternatives demonstrate citizens’ ability to transform power and social relations, and effectively generate a commons-based, participatory and democratic politics.

> **Crucial differences between public and private:** The nature and objectives of public and private actors are vastly different. Though the public sector is not necessarily inherently ‘good’, the alternatives featured in the Atlas of Utopias indicate a renewed appreciation of its potentials and promise. This is supported by the proliferation of global initiatives to reclaim, redefine and reshape the notions of ‘public’ and ‘publicness’.

> **New public ethos and commitment to public service:** Engendering a new public ethos entails involvement in public service provision. Engaged citizenry and everyday forms of radical democracy are crucial to radical and transformative initiatives.
Decentring urban expertise: The cases suggest a critical questioning of expertise and a necessary shift in such expertise. This is particularly salient in the issue of housing wherein the homeless, precarious and dispossessed inhabit the fringes of housing politics despite being at the centre of the crisis. It is imperative to decentre the production and implementation of solutions from planners, developers and economists, to citizens and shelter justice movements (Madden / Marcuse 2016: 4). Such a shift reflects an understanding of the housing crisis as a political and economic problem rather than a technical and technocratic one (ibid.).

From citizen participation to self-governance: Recognising the expertise of end users of public services draws attention to the inadequacy of liberal notions and practices of citizen participation, as well as of ‘inclusive’ new urban governance regimes which nonetheless do not fundamentally reconfigure power relations (Alvarez 2019). A critical examination of such initiatives recognises the need for a corresponding shift to self-governance and citizen control of programmes claiming to benefit the public (ibid.).

Challenges: These lessons we enumerate here likewise present challenges. These include legal barriers and obstacles to remunicipalisation such as the inclusion of Investor-State Dispute Settlements in trade and investment agreements and contracts, as well as the pushback by right-wing and pro-capitalist forces advocating for novel forms of PPPs. Whilst the sustained success of anti-privatisation movements is the result of a number of factors, the importance of strong citizen campaigns urging central governments to reject neoliberal policies and the influence of IFIs is indisputable.

The rise of the commons is firmly situated in the context of claiming “the right to the city” (Lefebvre 1996), which is both a slogan and a political ideal that far exceeds the right to live in the city, insofar as it fundamentally extends to “the right to change ourselves by changing the city” (Harvey 2008: 23). As a collective right, it is centred on the power of collective action to simultaneously transform urban space, urban life and urban relations. The cases outlined in our discussion of the Transformative Cities Atlas of Utopia and Fearless Cities demonstrate how radical and people-initiated actions reconfigure lived experience and inhabited spaces. In striving for a life of dignity, communities transform the political subjectivities of the marginalised, thereby re-politicising urban citizenship and reconstituting the city. As interventions and moments of rupture that shape and are shaped by urban politics, radical praxes reveal the transformative possibilities of towns and cities enmeshed in systems of inequality.
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