

Abstract

The world is in the middle of a global housing crisis. The number of people living in slums is rising every year and the goal of achieving adequate housing for all, as articulated in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 11), remains a distant dream. Proper means to counteract this system-inherent crisis through sound housing policies have not yet been found. The results are sprawling informal settlements that fit into the mosaic of an increasingly fragmented urban landscape as places of marginality and exclusion. Some countries, however, show a contrary trend, as for example Indonesia. In this country, the housing situation has improved for many residents over the last decades and innovative urban policies have emerged in several cities. Searching for the reasons for this success, the aspect of local governance has increasingly moved into focus in recent years. Often, it is assumed that specific modes of governance can be linked to success or failure of applied housing policies.

Against this background, this book aims to gain a better understanding of the relationship between modes of urban governance and emerging housing policies in order to achieve adequate housing for all. This goal is approached from different perspectives and by means of two case studies, the Indonesian cities of Surabaya and Surakarta, which have become known for their progressive policies. A first perspective puts the case studies into context and analyses previous housing strategies and associated paradigms at the international and national level. A second, theoretical perspective conceptualises the policy arrangement approach as an analytical framework for urban governance and develops a normative compass for 'adequate housing' and 'sound housing policies' based on Henri Lefebvre's right to the city. The third perspective is empirical and examines housing policies and modes of governance in the two cities, applying the policy arrangement approach and related qualitative methods (Interviews, surveys, Net-Map method). In the fourth comparative perspective, the two case studies are compared and evaluated with the help of the normative compass developed.

The four different perspectives each confirm in their own way the importance of urban governance for the possible emergence of sound housing policies. From a theoretical perspective, it is argued that both governance and housing policies should be oriented toward a normative goal, namely the right to the city. By applying this nor-

mative basis, it becomes possible to create the necessary foundation of governance that allows and promotes a societal transformation. The empirical research revealed that less hierarchical modes of governance with multiple actors involved in governance processes, shared power relations, and inclusive discourses are more likely to produce housing policies that are people-centred, participative, and actually benefit marginalised groups. However, the analysis also shows that the two cities studied still have a long way to go to ensure that all residents have equal access to urban resources, as the right to the city demands.

Keywords: Housing policy, adequate housing, governance, right to the city, policy arrangements, modes of governance, Indonesia, Surabaya, Surakarta

Zusammenfassung

Die Welt befindet sich in inmitten einer globalen Wohnungskrise. Die Zahl der Menschen in Marginalsiedlungen steigt kontinuierlich an und das Ziel angemessenen Wohnraum für alle zu erreichen, wie es in den Nachhaltigkeitszielen (SDG 11) artikuliert wird, ist nur eine ferne Illusion. Mittel und Wege dieser systemimmanenten Krise durch geeignete Wohnungspolitik zu begegnen sind bisher nicht oder nur in Ansätzen gefunden worden. Das Resultat ist eine weitere Ausbreitung von informellen Siedlungen, die sich als Orte der Marginalität und Exklusion in das Mosaik einer immer deutlicher fragmentierten Stadtlandschaft einfügen. In einigen Ländern lässt sich aber auch eine gegenläufige Tendenz beobachten, so zum Beispiel in Indonesien. Dort ist es gelungen die Wohnsituation für Viele zu verbessern und in mehreren Städten zeigen sich innovative Ansätze im Wohnbereich. Auf der Suche nach den Gründen für diese Erfolge rückte in den letzten Jahren immer mehr der Aspekt der lokalen Regierungsführung in den Fokus. Vielfach wird vermutet, dass bestimmte Formen von Governance eng mit dem Erfolg oder Misserfolg von angewandter Wohnungspolitik verbunden sind.

Vor diesen Hintergründen ist es das Ziel der vorliegenden Arbeit ein besseres Verständnis des Zusammenhangs zwischen Formen städtischer Governance und daraus hervorgehenden Wohnungspolitiken zu erlangen, um angemessenen Wohnraum für alle zu verwirklichen. Eine Annäherung an dieses Ziel erfolgt anhand von zwei Fallbeispielen, den indonesischen Städten Surabaya und Surakarta, die für ihre progressive Politik bekannt geworden sind, und aus verschiedenen Perspektiven. Eine erste Perspektive setzt die Fallbeispiele in den Kontext und analysiert bisherige Wohnbaustrategien und damit assoziierte Paradigmen auf internationaler und indonesischer Ebene. Eine zweite Perspektive ist theoretisch, adaptiert das Konzept der Policy Arrangements als Analysekonzept für städtische Governance und entwickelt basierend auf Henri Lefebvres Recht auf Stadt einen normativen Kompass für „angemessenes Wohnen“ und eine „inklusive Wohnungspolitik“. Die dritte Perspektive ist empirisch und operationalisiert das Analysekonzept zur Untersuchung von Wohnungspolitik und Formen der Governance in den beiden Fallstudien durch einen Mix aus vornehmlich qualitativen Methoden (Interviews, Befragungen, Net-Map Methode). In der vierten

vergleichenden Perspektive werden die beiden Fallstudien gegenübergestellt und mithilfe des entwickelten normativen Kompasses bewertet.

Die vier verschiedenen Perspektiven bestätigen jede auf ihre Weise die Wichtigkeit von städtischer Governance für das mögliche Entstehen einer inklusiven Wohnungspolitik. Aus theoretischer Perspektive wird argumentiert, dass sowohl Governance als auch Wohnungspolitiken auf ein normatives Ziel ausgerichtet werden sollten, nämlich auf das Recht auf Stadt. Erst diese normative Basis ermöglicht es die nötige Grundlage einer Governance zu schaffen, die eine gesellschaftliche Transformation zulässt und befördert. Die vergleichende empirische Forschung ergab, dass weniger hierarchische Formen der Regierungsführung mit vielen am Regierungsprozess beteiligten Akteuren, geteilten Machtverhältnissen und inkludierenden Diskursen eher zu einer Wohnungspolitik führen, die alle Bewohner der Stadt miteinbezieht, partizipativ ist und tatsächlich einen Nutzen für marginalisierte Bevölkerungsgruppen hat. Die Analyse machte allerdings auch deutlich, dass die beiden untersuchten Städte noch einen weiten Weg zu gehen haben, um allen StadtbewohnerInnen gleichermaßen den Zugang zu städtischen Ressourcen zu ermöglichen, wie es das Recht auf Stadt einfordert.

Keywords: Wohnpolitik, Angemessenes Wohnen, Governance, Recht auf Stadt, Policy Arrangement, Modes of Governance, Indonesien, Surabaya, Surakarta

1 Introduction

What is so interesting about housing policies? I have been asked this question many times over the last years, ever since I became interested in the topic of housing. I used to respond in a simple way, disregarding the complexity of the topic: ‘We cannot allow the existence of one billion people living in slums!’, ‘We live in the 21st century; there must be a way to improve the living conditions of the poorest’, or ‘We need a right to adequate and affordable housing for all!’. Such were my direct answers and they satisfied most people. Usually, they agreed, and recognised the importance of studying this topic. At the same time, however, they did not understand slogans such as ‘the right to the city’ or immediately judged them to be ideologically charged, and regarded the whole issue of housing the poor to be something from the past, an issue already overcome in advanced societies.

It was not until the financial crisis in 2008, when discussions on housing reappeared in the so-called ‘developed countries’¹ that slowly, people began to become aware of the fact that housing is not a given right in a capitalist world. In the precise moment when the employees of Lehman Brothers were leaving their offices carrying boxes with their belongings, the importance of housing markets as part of the circuits of capital accumulation with its inherent tendency to produce recurring crises (Harvey 1978) became evident. Loan defaults in the housing sector had induced a severe crisis in the financial sector, resulting not only in the near bankruptcy of whole countries but more concretely in the expulsion of thousands of families in North America and many countries of the European Union (Crump et al. 2008; Alexandri & Janoschka 2017). The crisis had shown quite plainly that a right to adequate housing does not exist, at least not everywhere and for everyone.

In most countries of the Global South the housing question has never left the table. While some industrialised countries only recently and only intermittently experienced serious housing backlogs, the housing challenge faced by developing countries is much

¹ In this work, the terms ‘industrialised countries’, ‘Global North’ and ‘developed countries’ are used synonymously just the same as ‘Global South’ and ‘developing countries’.

more serious. Here, rapid urbanisation processes, never before seen in their severity, result in fast-growing urban agglomerations and extensive urban landscapes. Usually, these urbanisation processes take place uncontrolled and produce an increasing housing shortage. Despite considerable economic growth, a significant part of society – the underprivileged – remain excluded and, due to the inherent logic of capitalism, formal markets have proven unable to provide sufficient amounts of adequate housing for the poor. Consequently, informal settlements in various stages of consolidation are sprawling in the cities of the Global South and informality as a way of life has long since become one of their characteristics (Roy & AlSayyad 2004).

The housing question is closely linked to two other debates: the discussions on the urban age and planetary urbanisation. The idea of the so-called *urban age* was born in 2007, when the United Nations, based on their demographic records, proclaimed that for the first time in human history more people lived in urban than in rural areas (UN-DESA 2014). In this perspective, cities are seen as the home to the majority of the population, as the places where the future of humanity will be decided.

Urbanisation is seen as a serious threat to the goal of sustainability, because urban fabrics produced today will shape our cities for decades to come (WBGU 2016a). Due to path dependency, structures cannot be changed easily in the short or medium term, having serious impacts on all dimensions of sustainability. Economically, cities are major drivers of globalisation processes, producing fragmented landscapes at all spatial scales, resulting in increased inequality and the exclusion of ‘the useless’ or ‘the underprivileged’ – those not needed in the global economy. Ecologically, these hubs of the global economy consume most of the produced energy and contribute with their emissions most significantly to climate change, ie 70 % of global CO₂ emissions are produced in cities (WBGU 2016b). Socially, cities have become the melting pot of a world characterised by increased inequality and social fragmentation. By denying equal opportunities for all, including such a basic right as ‘the right to adequate and affordable housing’, social cohesion in urban areas is threatened with serious challenges for political stability.

The debate on urbanisation can be linked further to a second discussion about *planetary urbanisation*. Perceiving urbanisation not only as a demographic process, some scholars argue that an ‘extended urbanisation’ is affecting every spot on our planet, no matter how peripheral (Brenner 2013; Brenner 2014a). Global cities – homes to transnational enterprises – push forward the commodification of their hinterland and expand and intensify their land grab to every spot on earth (Leon 2015). There, the logics of capital accumulation destroy and transform the ‘old’ landscapes, expelling original residents. Those dispossessed are then pushed to the gates of the cities, contributing significantly to the uncontrolled dynamics of spatial and demographic urban growth. Adopting this perspective, urbanisation becomes more than a process describing the growth of urban areas or the proliferation of lifestyles, but a process affecting and transforming all places on earth, incorporating them into the circuits of capital accumulation and producing fragmented landscapes characterised by poverty and inequality.

The highest dynamic of urbanisation can be witnessed in developing countries. On the African and Asian continents alone, 1.4 million people are added to the ranks of the world's citizens every week (UN-DESA 2018a). Of course, the demographics these statistics are based on as well as the perspective on 'the urban' and 'urbanisation' must be questioned critically (Brenner & Schmid 2015). It can be agreed that it is the Global South which will have to cope with an estimated 95 % of global urban growth by 2050 (Davis 2006). Whole urban areas, including housing units and services, must be planned, financed, and constructed in a sustainable way for an estimated number of 2.5 to 3 billion new urban residents by 2050 (UN-DESA 2018a). Identified as a second wave of urbanisation after industrialisation, the consequences of urbanisation have clearly become one of the most serious challenges in the 21st century (OECD 2015: 27–28).

1.1 The housing question and the challenge of slums

Increased urgency characterises the debate on urbanisation and its most serious consequence: the lack of affordable and adequate housing. Different actors are responsible for housing production: private developers, individuals, and the government. These groups have generally distinct and sometimes opposing interests: in the case of private individuals it is mostly to satisfy their housing need; developers seek the highest possible returns on their investments; and governments might act to make profits or for the public good. Developers and the government usually work in the formal housing sector while individuals produce housing for both the formal and informal markets. Due to the priority of the logics of profit-seeking over the logics of satisfying housing needs – in other words, the dominance of exchange value over use value (cf. box 2), most housing stock is produced only for medium- or high-income households. This leaves a lack of adequate housing for the poor (an affordability crisis) who must rely on informal housing markets to satisfy their housing need.

Strong urbanisation processes reinforce this lack of adequate housing, causing a skyrocketing demand in many cities of the Global South. In 2014 an estimated one billion people, or one third of the world's urban population, lived in slums (UN-Habitat 2016: 203), a term used to describe various kinds of marginal settlements (cf. box 1). Even if relative numbers are decreasing in most parts of the world, forecasts predict the world's slum population to grow by up to two billion by 2050 (UN-DESA 2013: 10). Consequently, some scholars draw an apocalyptic picture for our future world, picturing a 'planet of slums' (Davis 2006).

This proliferation of slums raises some important questions: Why are the numbers of slum dwellers still increasing? Is this tendency deeply rooted in our capitalist mode of production? Is the international community unable or unwilling to address this challenge? What strategies, measures, and initiatives have been introduced?