Introduction

Andrea Rigon and Vanesa Castán Broto

> "At a first glance the community governance structure in charge of making important decision on the distribution of the public land of the informal settlement to its residents seemed to contain a diverse range of residents. Project implementers to ld me that the criteria ensured fairness in the representation of all residents. For each section of the settlement, two landlords, one tenant, one woman, one elder and one youth were elected. As I got to know the committee members, I was surprised to find out that almost all representatives were landlords, despite tenants making up over 80% of the residents. I suddenly realised that because people do not have a single identity, the woman, the elder and the youth were also landlords, and in some cases, even the tenant was part of a landlord family. That's when I realised that implementers' problematic assumptions about identity and failure to understand local power relations consolidated local inequalities" (extract from a personal ethnographic diary, Nairobi 2008).

Inclusive urban development is a concept that has shaped the United Nations Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development (especially the Sustainable Development Goal 11 of building sustainable, resilient, safe, inclusive urban communities) and the New Urban Agenda. This recent change of discourse, which ties inclusivity to inequality in global agendas for urban development, demonstrates the growing influence of critical analysis and theorisations of urban diversity following on decades of work on gender and intersectionality studies and the ever increasing recognition of feminist perspectives in urban development planning (as opposed to notions of urban development that emphasise efficiency, good governance, and entrepreneurship). However, as the quote above shows, that theoretical interest on diversity does not always translate into a recognition of the different conditions in which people live. Research projects and urban planning decisions are mired by assumptions that not only ignore the differentiated needs of a diverse urban community but also contribute to hide those differences in forms of research and planning that tend to exclude those who do not conform to those assumptions.

In practice, urban development interventions are, for the most part, based upon a particular homogenising perspective on urban development. Communities are rightly seen as a needed partner to provide legitimacy to interventions by state and other external actors. However, in fast-changing and diverse contexts such as informal settlements, the identification of community representatives and the creation of local government structures often invest local elites with power rather than ensuring marginalised voices are part of these processes, in a process that inevitably reinforces existing unequal power relations within communities (Guijt & Kaul Shah, 1998; Rose, 1999; Li, 2011; Rigon, 2014). The same interventions that seek to empower communities and their members to deliver sustainable and inclusive urban futures may reinforce the social structures that exclude some social groups and reinforce vulnerabilities.

The book *Inclusive Urban Development in the Global South: Intersectionality, Inequalities, and Community* puts a critical understanding of 'community' at the centre of international development practice in urban environments. The objective of the book is to outline how current thinking on diversity and intersectionality challenges existing practices of urban development, because they remain wedded to a particular concept of a homogeneous community, something that happens either through the use of generalising language or the articulation of development discourses (Howard, López Franco, & Shaw, 2019). Thus, the book argues for the recognition of the diverse needs and aspirations of different urban residents as an engine for just and inclusive urban development and explores innovative methodologies to achieve it.

This book aims to provide orientation for more just and inclusive urban development practice. The papers in this edited collection explore how diversity in terms of gender, class, race and ethnicity, citizenship status, age, ability, religion, and sexuality is taken (or not) into account and approached in the planning and implementation of development policy and interventions in lower-income urban areas. The book proposes an intersectionality approach as a means to account for the situated

experiences of diverse individuals and social groups, that experience the 'intersection' of different structural drivers of exclusion in unique and situated ways.

Moving towards inclusive urban development

The focus on the urban is not accidental. Parnell (2016) has pointed out that we are living through an era of 'urban optimism' in the way the urban is constructed as a sphere of intervention. The urban, nevertheless, remains a location for the delivery of techno-economic fixes that do little for advancing justice-oriented emancipatory agendas (Hodson & Marvin 2017). This book thus responds with a new conceptualisation of the treatment of communities in urban development that emphasises the potential for progressive actions that reach the most disadvantaged, by challenging the mechanisms of exclusion within communities themselves.

Since the neighbourhood remains the critical scale in urban development planning, this book aims at transforming current intervention practices that could benefit from a critical understanding of community. By *intervention* we mean any intentional action aimed at shaping urban development towards a more desirable direction. To intervene is to take active part in something to change the course of events. Interventions may be initiated by actors within the community or by external players, including government and NGOs.[1] The book reimagines the notion of community in a way that engages with current cutting-edge intersectional critiques, while also valuing existing social structures as mechanisms that enable the development of a collective project of urban futures.

The central argument of the book is developed in three parts: first, notions of 'community' remain central to international development practices in urban environments whose success depends on improving people's well-being and opportunity through neighbourhood-oriented interventions, often co-produced with and led by community members and their organisations; second, there is a consistent body of theoretical and empirical critique against static and homogeneous notions of urban communities, which often engages with practical examples about how this happens and that builds on an intersectionality perspective that begins any critique from the analysis of situated experiences of oppression and exclusion; third, while urban development practice has not yet engaged adequately with this critique, the debate opens opportunities for thinking new modes of urban development that put equality and justice at their centre.

Following this line of argumentation, the book seeks answers to three sets of questions:

● How do urban development interventions differently affect different groups and individuals? How fairly are the benefits of the interventions distributed within urban communities? How are notions of homogeneous, static community reproduced in urban planning and development practices, and with what consequence? What are the constraints and power relations that make it difficult for urban planning and development practice to achieve fairer outcomes through the adoption of an intersectional diversity approach?

● To what extent does urban development practice take into account the diversity of needs and aspirations of different groups and individuals? In what ways diversity and intersectionality theory contribute to understanding urban communities and the diversity of needs and aspirations of individuals and groups?

● What new alternatives for urban development practices emerge from critiques of community representation and intersectional analysis? Are there new methodologies emerging that enable fairer forms of representation and meaningful participation of marginalised groups and individuals?

A theme running through all contributions is that diversity matters. The impact of development interventions is shaped by local social contexts that need to be deeply understood in the planning and implementation because 'community' interventions can have "simultaneously emancipatory and

---

[1] We prefer the term intervention to terms such as project or programme which tend to exclude more organic self-initiated actions by communities.

repressive" outcomes (Butcher, this book) for different groups of people. The contributions will have a thread of common analysis, as they will engage with three key interlinked aspects of diversity that broadly correspond to the three dimensions of social justice in Nancy Fraser's framework (1998, 2000, 2005):

- *Recognition. Diversity of aspirations/needs requiring different interventions:* Poor urban residents are very diverse and live in unequal settlements. We seek to explore how diversity and intersectionality theory contribute to understanding their diverse needs/aspirations. Development interventions in these neighbourhoods (e.g. slum-upgrading, infrastructure improvements, housing, tenure regulations, social programmes) differ greatly in their capacity to recognise and address the diversity of residents' needs and aspirations.

- *Redistribution. The diversity of impact of interventions on different groups and individuals:* Urban development interventions have profoundly different impacts on different groups and individuals residing in the city. Analyses of existing interventions counter any narratives of win-win projects benefiting all community members and present a more complex and nuanced perspective on who gains from what intervention. Such analyses highlight the political choices about which individuals and groups to prioritise inherent in any interventions.

- *Participation. The diversity in participation to decision-making:* Local governance structures often reflect unequal power relations at settlement level, making it difficult to ensure that they adequately represent the diversity of interests, particularly of the most marginalised women, men and non-binary people.

The book is organised in three parts that outline its contribution.

The limitations of community-led and community based interventions: The idea that residents need to be involved in the planning and implementation of urban development interventions has gained traction in urban development planning, to become often the norm. However, in practice actors' understanding of the fact that residents are not a homogenous community expressing a single aspiration is still limited. These participatory efforts from government and development agencies often lead to specific elite interests be portrayed as community interest. Interventions are presented as being equally beneficial to all urban residents, but due to the diversity of needs they are benefiting only some and may even negatively affect other residents. Even when interventions such as infrastructures and services are supposedly provided for all, their access, use, and control are shaped by local power relations based on different dimensions of identity. Moreover, interventions in these settlements can activate market forces and, if the diverse conditions of residents are not taken into account, they can generate market-based displacement or the loss of residents' livelihoods.

Critical alternatives from the gender, intersectionality and diversity literature: For over 20 years, academics have raised the importance of diversity in development (Anderson 1996; Beall 1997), and the heterogeneity within groups such as women living in poor urban neighbourhoods has been highlighted, pointing out to the need for considering how gender intersects with other dimensions of identity (Khoshla 2009; Chant and McIlwaine 2016). More recently, a range of intersectional approaches to analyse development interventions have emphasised the need for a relational understanding of power (e.g. Walker, Frediani, & Trani, 2013). This work has emerged and continues to be nurtured by feminist scholars and their growing body of work on gender and development, which highlights the specific disadvantages of women, particularly in informal settlements, but also acknowledges the importance of other intersecting dimensions of identity (Chant and McIlwaine 2016).

However, in development practice, the complex identities on which persistent inequalities are based and reproduce – in short, the issue of diversity – is rarely put at the centre of urban interventions. When something is done, the approach to diversity is often based on the segregation of people into different groups based on a single dimension of their identity (Bastia 2014, p. 237). Indeed, many social interventions in these urban settings tend to prioritise specific "marginalised" groups and focus on one dimension of people's identity, thus failing to consider the complex identity and social reality of their "target groups". For example, it is common to see project consultations divided by groups such as the "disabled", "the youth", "the elderly" assuming an homogeneity of needs and aspirations within these

categories and failing to acknowledge the ways in which these dimensions of identity intersect with each other. Nevertheless, there are few attempts to put into practice an intersectional diversity approach in development policy and interventions.

Mapping the space of possibility for transformative, just and inclusive urban development: For those policy and interventions attempting to deal with diversity it is important to explore whether they are doing it strategically. Building on Molyneux's work (1984), Moser (1989) distinguishes between practical gender needs, addressing needs framed within existing gender relations, and strategic gender needs, which involve interventions able to change existing power relations, including division of labour. Similarly, this distinction can be deployed to analyse whether interventions are addressing practical or strategic needs of women, men and non-binary people across many axes of social identity. This is because there are *instrumental approaches* to diversity recognising difference without challenging unequal relations, and *transformational approaches* focusing on changing power relations and inequalities (Levy, 2009). After over 20 years of arguing for diversity in development, this collection aims to take stock of what has taken place in urban settings, whether or not interventions have been transformational, and to what extent urban interventions were able to challenge power relations. The collection also explores the contribution of intersectional approaches to analyse urban social processes and the potential for intersectional methodologies to inform urban development policy and practice.

Situating community

Community – a group of people sharing a common interest, history, or place – has long been central to urban development. Planners have long seen community as a scale of intervention, sometimes something that had to be created (Eichler & Kaplan, 1970).

Community development has always been approached as a political project involving radical reform (Greer & Minar, 1964). In the USA, for example, the alignment of ideas of community development and civil rights concerns supported in the 1960s a War on Poverty based on "Community Action Programs" (Cruikshank, 1999, pp. 72-73). However, community development also has deep colonial roots in the attempt to create a capitalist free market in developing countries by indoctrinating colonised people to voluntarily participate in capitalist economic development. This predominantly rural development approach became increasingly urban and closely associated with a neo-colonial attempt, led by USAID, to address urban marginality to prevent revolution from spreading in Latin America, following the Cuban revolution (Mayo, 1975 cited in Moser, 1989). Ideas of community and community development felt out of favour in urban planning in the 1970s and 1980s but prospered in the terrain of international development mainly associated with land and nature conservation approaches, such as community forestry, which generally overlooked the urban arena (but see Johnston, 1985). Community came back in the 1990s as a critical concept in urban development and opened the reinterpretation and inclusion of people within a broader philosophy of sustainable development (Paul, 1987). The concept of community merged well with the practices of participatory development that were becoming increasingly popular, although still often confined to rural areas through tools like Participatory Rural Appraisal (Chambers, 1990; see also Agarwal and Narain, 1989).

Community participation has a long history emerging from more radical ideas of empowerment and was associated with processes of self-organisation and collective action of communities. It was brought into development as a progressive shift to reverse top-down approaches and provide people with democratic control over their development. Within this shift, community participation approaches implied that communities were not merely the object of government intervention. Instead, communities were increasingly considered as a *subject* in development—the needed partner of governments and development agencies and an independent actor outside the spheres of the market and the state. On the one hand, involving communities offered a democratic *legitimacy* for intervention, as required by overarching participatory policy frameworks. On the other hand, community involvement was considered to be necessary to guarantee effective implementation, by securing the compliance and contributions of the intended beneficiaries. The result was that if 'the community' was not there, it had

to be created to fulfil the needs of development projects. In practice, this led to an increasing emphasis on the creation of community governance structures.

The influence of this history of community development and community participation continues to this day. Community is most often presented as having shared values of unity and homogeneity, which development policy should harness to foster collaboration, social capital, and conflict resolution. That unity, however, is constructed at the expense of other multiple forms of community expression. For Anderson (1991), communities are always socially constructed. Referring to the nation, Anderson argues that "regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (pp. 6-7). This conceptualisation is generally applied to communities at local and regional scales, without a reflection of the processes of distinction and separation that construct a community. As Anderson suggests, this notion of community is the starting point for nationalism.

Poor urban neighbourhoods in the global South are both diverse and unequal. Community development involves a transformation of heterogeneous groups of residents into a 'governable community'. Nikolas Rose argues that:

> "In the institution of community, a sector is brought into existence whose vectors and forces can be mobilized, enrolled, deployed, in novel programmes and techniques which encourage and harness active practices of self-management and identity construction, of personal ethics and collective allegiances" (Rose, 1999, p. 179).

Tania Li argues that governments mobilise a notion of community instrumentally as a means to regulate individual behaviour when other forms of coercion are not effective (Li, 2005, p. 3). The focus of this style of government through community is to optimise social relations to deliver improvements. She identifies a paradox at the centre of this style of governing, related to the need for technocratic calculations that enable intervention and that reveal that apparently 'natural' communities are built through the deployment of expertise (Li, 2005, p. 36). As Rose phrases it, "community is to be achieved, yet the achievement is nothing more than the birth-to-presence of a form of being which pre-exists" (Rose, 1999, p. 177). Or, concerning development projects, communities have "the secret to the good life […], yet experts must intervene to secure that goodness and enhance it" (Li, 2011, p. 59). The current mainstream development agenda assumes that a community is self-generating and capable of self-governing (Li, 2007, p. 234), and yet, it presents community as a site for technical interventions (Li, 2005).

The lack of satisfactory definition of community (Puddifoot, 1995) does not impede its instrumental use by a range of intervention actors, in the name of the state, the international community or the greater good of humanity. More recently, multiple attempts have emerged to document communities own collective action to lift themselves and, more generally, the urban poor (Appadurai 2001; Arputham, 2008). Much of this work reflects the philosophy and ethos of international umbrella organisations to facilitate the organisation of communities, particularly the network slum-dwellers international (SDI) (Mitlin, 2018; Chitekwe-Biti, 2018).

Communities are important. Community membership provides people with identity, meaning, and purpose, which contributes directly to their well-being (McNamara, Stevenson, & Muldoon, 2013). Community development practice is also empowering (Rubin & Rubin, 1992). Empowerment constitutes a process whereby "those who have been denied the ability to make choices acquire such an ability" (Kabeer, 1999, p. 437). Within communities, collective identification contributes to collective action and setting of political demands, which can improve the lives of community members and empower them. Moreover, communities build physical, human, social, financial, environmental, political, and cultural assets to generate positive change (Green and Haines, 2015).

At the same time, by focusing on the development of a shared, collective identity, community development approaches often nurture a divide between "us" and "them" that can exacerbate conflicts

with those not included in that particular identity-based definition. Community development approaches also tend to overlook differences within, rendering invisible the needs and aspirations of minorities and marginalised people, and failing to recognise individual identities. The forms of community participation deployed by development agencies are also rigidly designed to deliver a limited number of predefined outcomes responding to external priorities (Cook & Kothari, 2001). Moreover, these processes are mediated by local representatives who represent existing unequal power relations within the community. These inequalities are reinforced by development interventions, that tend to favour elite capture of project benefits.

Those who belong to a community face the dilemma that the very means that can be mobilised to promote empowerment and independence are those that can equally be harnessed to exclude certain social groups and promote the reproduction and encroachment of certain power hierarchies. Today, members of SDI and similar organizations are questioning critical scholars and practitioners demanding not only a recognition of difference but also the deployment of useful action that can ameliorate urban inequalities. Theoretical critiques of community may advance academic careers, but the question is whether they can also help to reimagine the principles of community development as an emancipatory practice. Those complex ethical challenges should not stop community-based work, but reinvigorate it. We propose bringing intersectionality at the core of community development practice, as a means to address its inherent contradictions.

The promises of intersectionality

The concept of intersectionality originated in black feminism. Crenshaw (1989), who discussed, from a legal perspective, the varied experiences of black women, is considered a foundational text to understand intersectionality. A key insight from this discussions is that intersectionality is not an analysis of the sum of different identity conditions, but rather, it is an approach that recognises the unique experience of multiple forms of oppression that specific individuals and groups face, and that are shaped by their unique simultaneous identities across multiple axes of difference.

Debates on intersectionality have painstakingly called against approaches that examine different characteristics of identity as layers that you can peel off the individual. Instead, intersectionality invites us to consider the structure of society and the multiple forms of oppression that it represents and that are experienced differently depending on the subject position (Bastia, 2014; Raza, 2017). In that sense, intersectionality is more accurately represented by the idea of understanding the multiple social locations in an imagined social map, rather than as a pile of identity blankets piled upon a single subject. Additional forms of disadvantage may exacerbate the experiences of oppression in particular settings (Kabeer, 2016).

For example, while black women may experience forms of discrimination from both racism and patriarchy, the experience of those forms of discrimination may vary depending on their social status, income, independence, and so on. First, the 'black woman' is not another fix, homogeneous category whose experience can be reduced to one narrative. Second, the experience of an individual is not about adding in additional layers of discrimination experiences, but about understanding the complexity of individual experiences. Third, considering intersectionality requires a sophisticated understanding of multiple and flexible social positions, in which certain characteristics vary from being empowering and disempowering depending on how they are articulated. As Crenshaw already explained, being subject to discrimination does not mean that a person is entirely devoid of agency. bell hooks (1981) explained in her classical book "Ain't I a woman," that forms of solidarity, mutual support, and empowerment emerge from collective association on the grounds of an identity characteristic (e.g., feminism, antiracism). However, those same associations also lead to forms of exclusion that may detract from the original radical intent of anti-discriminatory movements. Moreover, people who experience marginalisation in a way that does not match a general expression within that collective identity – or whose experiences are not even recognised – may see their concerns ignored, as it has happened through the history of social movements to black feminists who did not see themselves recognised in mainstream feminism because it was seen to cater to white females.

Some black feminist authors have criticised the use of "intersectionality beyond race, class and gender" which, in their view, erases "the intellectual labour and experiences of black women and other women of colour" (Muegge, Montoya, Emejulu, Weldon, 2018, p. 19). We believe that acknowledging its origins in black feminism and the unique experiences of oppression of black women, it is possible to use intersectionality in other contexts where power relations based on different axes of difference may be central to experiences of oppression.

In contexts of extreme deprivation in which collective organisation is often the only viable route for improving well-being, this challenge poses a terrible conundrum. On the one hand, bringing together a common community identity may help empower, mobilize the community, advance collective political aims, and develop a shared voice that can be heard beyond the community. On the other hand, the price to pay for that collective voice is to accept a certain level of homogenization so that a joint project can be developed. Intersectionality points towards the need to put this conundrum at the centre of community development practice both as a means of analysis and as a means to maintain a constant revision of the ways certain experiences may be constantly ignored or even eroded through those processes of community development. Intersectionality is not only a mode of analysis of community diversity, but it is also a critical praxis to deliver social justice in any kind of project that aims at improving the well-being of people (Collins, 2015). Intersectionality requires carefully examining the different stages of any project and the different ways in which forms of exclusion and oppression could be articulated within that project (Castán Broto & Neves Alves, 2018).

Intersectionality, first of all, invites us to consider inequality as a relational property. However, it is inaccurate to think of inequality as something that compares two separate communities that are different but homogeneous within themselves. Instead, intersectionality shows that for any slice of society we take, however, we take it, inequalities are certain to be there. And this is particularly important for marginalised communities that often depend on their leaders to address issues as important as putting across political demands or reporting the levels of access to different services. Intersectional analysis reminds us that we are all part of that society. Hence, we may be ourselves involved in projects, consultancies, or intersectional investigations that require a careful appraisal, from the composition of researcher groups to their impact on communities (Sawas, Castán Broto, Anwar, & Renham, 2019; Leach & Crichlow, 2020). Any such project of emancipation requires a system to make people, institutions and their relations accountable and to develop and maintain what Shaw et al. (2020) call an 'inclusivity reflex,' "both whilst building capacities for collective action within and across groups and also whilst navigating the challenges when marginalized groups mobilize to engage with decision-makers to seek justice" (Howard et al., 2019, p. 3).

Managing the identity paradox for inclusive urban development

Working with diversity and adopting an intersectional approach means dealing with several tensions. While there are some ways of intervening which are clearly problematic, there is no simple strategy that works in all cases. Rather we suggest some complex challenges and tensions that those urban planning interventions should consider in light of the specific urban contexts.

Identifying the community
Often, 'the community' understood as the residents of a spatially bounded place is in conflict with a complex reality. Identifying a community in space is generally a prerequisite for urban development interventions; however, it is difficult to define this spatial boundary. Planners adopt legal boundaries that may be very different from other spatial borders between communities that people experience. Moreover, there may be a plurality of administrative boundaries linked to different layers of governance. Boundaries are always contested and open for resignification. Constituency boundaries for national parliamentarians may be different from the ward boundaries of local government used to plan for the provision of some services. These are different from the jurisdictional boundaries of traditional local chiefs or other systems of governance which are not necessarily recorded in formal institutions. All these boundaries may not completely overlap with how people call or identify a specific settlement or part of the city. Even if a consensus on a bounded spatial area as the place for the community can be identified, those who happen to live there may identify stronger with other collective identities – based

on ethnicity, gender, disability, political party, religion, and so on – that, for them, are more relevant than the place of residence.

Collective identity vs intra-group diversity
There are tensions between collective identities and individual experiences that can hardly be understood through collective identities, given how different identities intersect to produce unique ways in which people live and interact in the urban arena. Local progress for the most marginalised is often linked to the political success of the mobilising capacity of collective identities. For example, the category of 'slum dwellers' and the self-presentation as a community supports the coalescence of political claims but can hide internal diversity. The intersectional critique deconstructs simplified collective approaches that deny a plurality of experiences, needs, and aspirations. On one side, there is the political potential of collective identities both in terms of mobilisation and in the ways the political system works in receiving aggregate demands. On the other, there is a need for people not to be predefined by categories based on a single dimension of identity, and for their reality to be understood and recognised in its complexity.

The challenge for practitioners and activists working both with grassroots groups and in government or other agencies intervening in poor urban neighbourhoods is to acknowledge this paradox and find workable approaches that enable engagement. Working in this context requires recognising how people frame their struggles strategically through collective political identities but at the same time acknowledging diversity *within* and that these social constructs are insufficient to understand urban development dynamics at the neighbourhood level.

Identity paradox: The identity paradox consists of the seemingly contradictory nature of community. On the one hand, engagement with collective identities enables political mobilisation. They are powerful in achieving progressive outcomes towards urban equality. However, those collective identities are fundamentally predicated on the control of people's wishes, their desires, and their actions and that amounts to forms of subject control that may serve to enrol actors into projects of subjectification and domination. Community identities are constructed and shaped by their members, but they require balancing the individual VS the collective in ways that may overlook their diversity leading to an unequal distribution of risks and benefits. We argue that this paradox cannot be wished away, it is part and parcel of development at the local level and that the purpose is to remain vigilant of the contradictions embedded in development practice.

Structure of the book

The contributions are grouped in three sections that shape the overall argument of the book:

- PART 1 focuses on *Explorations of the implications of diversity and intersectionality theory to understand urban communities and the diversity of needs and aspirations of individuals and groups and critique of existing approaches to identify community needs.* This part of the book contains contributions that reflect on internal dynamics of diverse urban communities. The contributions examine diversity empirically and explores different ways in which diversity shapes the needs and aspirations within a community. Part 1 also considers critical contributions on development practice that reproduce uncritical theorisations of homogeneous communities. Contributions also explores the interplay between intersectional identities and inequalities through the analysis of the complexity of everyday practice of different people affected by urban development.
- PART 2 delivers *Explorations of the diversity of impacts that an intervention can have on different individuals and groups.* This section of the book contains critical contributions that assess contemporary planning and development practice in terms of how new urban diversity concerns are applied in urban development and what are their distributional effects on different groups and individuals, challenging or reinforcing existing power relations. The implication is that well-meant interventions which aim to address communities without critically engaging with that idea of diversity may have detrimental consequences for people's well-being in terms of how interventions impact on people's lives. The contributions in this part provide a critical

insight into how existing policy and interventions address multiple sets of different needs and aspirations, or highlight how a specific group or set of identities are persistently marginalised.

- PART 3 presents contributions *Mapping out the spaces of possibility for just, inclusive urban development.* This part of the book will explore the methodologies and approaches to development and planning practices that emerge from current intersectionality theory and participation/representation critiques. For example, ways to make power relations and different interests explicit, the management of conflict, and the ways in which diversity contributes to identify alternative interventions and deliver thriving urban policies.

In the next chapter, Ramalho and Chant explore the intersectionality of gender and age and identify the critical need for prioritising research on, and action for adolescent females in poor urban neighbourhoods to create more gender-equitable urban futures. In Chapter 3, building on an account of two settlements in La Paz, Horn argues for the recognition of urban indigeneity and shows what it means to different people and how it is used to articulate different interests and claims shaped by age, gender, class and political position. In Chapter 4, Brown-Luthango examines backyarding as a growing housing type in South African cities and explores the link between community identity and spatial segregation and exposing how the complex tenant/landlord relation shape vulnerabilities of backyard dwellers. In Chapter 5, Beebeejaun argues that planning in Hong Kong relied on reducing diversity to simplified categories of Chinese immigrants or indigenous people. She problematises the narrative around the 'rational planning process' by revealing its implicit racial and ethnic hierarchies.

Part 2 starts with Butcher's account of power dynamics in community-based water management in an informal settlement of Kathmandu (Chapter 6). It reveals a complex politics of difference across gender, tenure, ethnicity, and the particular spatial and geographical conditions of the settlement, which is impacted by wider urban and ecological changes in Kathmandu. The articulation of these dynamics simultaneously opens and closes possibilities for different residents impacting on their access and control over services but also revealing broader power dynamics around identity, inclusion, and belonging in the city.

Musevenzi's and Chibvamushure's Chapter 7 demonstrates how residents of foreign descent were excluded from accessing land for housing and became slum-dwellers in the peri-urban settlements of Zimbabwe. The chapter explores the exclusion of former farm workers in peri-urban farms around major cities and towns in Zimbabwe throughout the implementation of the land reform programme. In Chapter 8, Cawood and Rabby show how NGOs transform residents into communities via newly created community-based organisations (CBOs) for the management of water infrastructure in Dhaka and how processes of building community governance structures are very political. Their intersectional analysis reveals that male leaders are also home-owners, affiliated to the ruling party, while women leaders are often their wives or members of powerful families. They found that adolescent girls and boys, short-term tenants, extreme poor families, single mothers, elderly widowers and residents with disabilities are often excluded by leadership and decision-making processes.

Afenah's analysis of everyday governance practices in Chapter 9 demonstrates how not all people participate and benefit equally from participatory development interventions and outlines the process of elite capture in a settlement in Accra, where residents have different access to horizontal and vertical social networks. The chapter acknowledges the role of community elites and collective processes in protecting the settlement from evictions and changing the narrative of external actors towards the settlement. In Chapter 10, Alozie brings young men's voices into the discussion about youth violence in the Niger Delta. She examines the role of hegemonic masculinity as well as structural injustices in the distribution of oil resources in the violence. In Chapter 11, Kombe, Kyessi, and Limbumba adopts an historical analysis of a housing co-production programme in Dar Es Salaam to demonstrate the importance of understanding the internal composition of communities and how community governance with a group of very heterogenous residents generates conflict which requires institutional mechanisms to be solved, and the involvement of external actors such as the municipality. They argue that failure to

unpack community diversity limits the impact of urban infrastructure on reducing urban inequalities and poverty.

Part 3 starts with Walker's and Ossul-Vermehren's reflection on the methodological tensions in the study of disability (Chapter 12). On one hand, the importance of using the category of disability recognising the empowering potential of a collective disability identity to frame political claims, foster collective action, and revealing persistent structural inequalities that disable people. On the other, using this category prevents people from being labelled in externally defined categories allowing them agency to express agency and present the complexity of their experience through the research process. In Chapter 13, Robin and Castán Broto analyse Community Energy Systems (CESs) as a means to build energy sovereignty, and deliver community control and autonomy. They argue that the notion of CESs needs to be read through an intersectionality lens to improve the justice outcomes of community-led initiatives. In Chapter 14, Rigon, Dabaj and Baumann argue that combining action-research, citizen science, participatory design and a diversity lens not only contributes to the design of infrastructures that respond to residents' needs but that it can transform social relations and build a human infrastructure able to negotiate and activate important change processes, while diffusing social tensions. They argue that such an approach can create an urban citizenship able to reduce social tensions and build new solidarities between different groups while constructively engaging with authorities.

References

Agarwal, Anial, & Narain, Sunita (1992). Towards Green Villages -a strategy for environmentally sound and participatory rural development in India. *Environment and Urbanization, 4*(1), 53-64.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, Mary B. (1996). 'Understanding Difference and Building Solidarity: a Challenge to Development Initiatives', in Deborah Eade (ed.), *Development and Social Diversity*, Oxfam (UK and Ireland), pp. 7-15

Appadurai, Arjun (2001). Deep democracy: urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2), 23-43.

Arputham, Jockin (2008). Developing new approaches for people-centred development. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(2) 319-337.

Bastia, Tanja (2014), Intersectionality, migration and development. *Progress in Development Studies* 14(3), 237–248.

Beall, Jo (1997). Valuing Difference and Working with Diversity. In Jo Beall (Ed.), *A City for All*, Zed Books, pp. 2-22

Castán Broto, Vanesa and Neves Alves, Susana (2018). Intersectionality challenges for the co-production of urban services: notes for a theoretical and methodological agenda. *Environment and Urbanization*, 30(2), 367-386.

Chambers, Robert (1990). Rapid and participatory rural appraisal, *Appropriate Technology,* 16(4), 14-16.

Chant, Sylvia & McIlwaine, Cathy (2016). *Cities, slums and gender in the global south: towards a feminised urban future*. London: Routledge.

Chitekwe-Biti, Beth (2018). Co-producing Windhoek: the contribution of the Shack Dwellers Federation of Namibia. *Environment and Urbanization*, 30(2), 387-406.

Collins, Patricia Hill (2015). Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1-20.

Cooke, Bill, & Kothari, Uma (Eds). (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?* London: Zed.

Crenshaw, Kimberle (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167.

Cruikshank, Barbara (1999). *The will to empower: democratic citizens and other subjects*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.

Eichler, Edward P. & Kaplan, Marshall (1970). *The community builders*. University of California Press.

Fraser, Nancy (1998). *Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, participation*. WZB Discussion Paper. No. FS I 98-108. Berlin.

Fraser, Nancy (2000). Rethinking Recognition. *New Left Review, 3*(May-June), 107-120.

Fraser, Nancy (2005). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World *New Left Review, 36*(November-December), 69-88.

Green, Gary Paul, & Haines, Anna (2015). *A Asset Building & Community Development*. Fourth Edition. Sage Publications.

Greer, Scott & Minar, David W. (1964). The political side of urban development and redevelopment. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 352(1), pp.62-73.

Guijt, Irene & Kaul Shah, Meera ((1998). *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory.* London: Intermediate Technology Publication.

Hodson, Mike, & Marvin Simon (2017). "Intensifying or transforming sustainable cities? Fragmented logics of urban environmentalism." *Local Environment* 22(sup1): 8-22.

hooks, bell (1981). *Ain't I a woman? Black women and feminism.* Pluto Press.

Howard, Jo, López Franco, Erika & Shaw, Jackie (2019). Intersecting inequalities and prospects for community development. *Community Development Journal,* 55(1): 1-6.

Johnston, Mark (1985). Community Forestry: a sociological approach to urban forestry. *Arboricultural Journal*, 9(2), 121-126.

Kabeer, Naila (1999). Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment. *Development and Change, 30*(3), 435-464.

Kabeer, Naila (2016). "Leaving no one behind": the challenge of intersecting inequalities." *ISSC, IDS and UNESCO, Challenging Inequalities: Pathways to a Just World, World Social Science Report*, pp. 55-58.

Khosla, Nidhi (2009). The Ready-Made Garments Industry in Bangladesh: A Means to Reducing Gender-Based Social Exclusion of Women? *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 11(1), 289-303.

Leach, Kirk A. & Crichlow, Wesley (2020). CRT intersectionality and non-profit collaboration: a critical reflection. *Community Development Journal,* 55(1): 121-138.

Levy, Caren (2009). Viewpoint: Gender justice in a diversity approach to development?: The challenges for development planning. *International Development Planning Review, 31*(4), i-xi.

Li, Tania Murray (2005). Government through Community: the World Bank in Indonesia. *Invited Paper for the Hauser Colloquium: Globalization and Its Discontent*.

Li, Tania Murray (2007). Development in the Age of Neoliberalism. In T. M. Li (Ed.), *The will to improve : governmentality, development, and the practice of politics* (pp. 230-269). Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press.

Li, Tania Murray (2011). Rendering Society Technical: Government through Community and the Ethnographic Turn at the World Bank in Indonesia. In D. Mosse (Ed.), *Adventures in Aidland: the anthropology of professionals in international development* (pp. 57-80). Oxford: Berghahn.

Mayo, Marjorie (1975). Community development: A radical alternative? In Bailey, Roy & Brake, Mike (Eds.) *Radical Social Work,* Edward Arnold, London.

McNamara, Niamh, Stevenson, Clifford, & Muldoon, Orla T. (2013). Community identity as resource and context: A mixed method investigation of coping and collective action in a disadvantaged community. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(5), 393-403.

Mitlin, Diana (2018). Beyond contention: urban social movements and their multiple approaches to secure transformation. *Environment and Urbanization, 30*(2), pp. 557-574.

Molyneux, Maxine (1984). Mobilisation without emancipation? Women's interests, state and revolution in Nicaragua. *Critical Social Policy, 4*(10), 59-71.

Moser, Caroline (1989). Gender planning in the third world: Meeting practical and strategic gender needs. *World Development, 17*(11), 1799-1825.

Muegge, Liza, Montoya, Celeste, Emejulu, Akwugo, & Weldon, Laurel S. (2018). Intersectionality and the Politics of Knowledge Production. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1(1-2), 17-36.

Parnell, Susan (2016). Defining a Global Urban Development Agenda. *World Development, 78*, 529-540.

Paul, Samuel, 1987. *Community participation in development projects*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Puddifoot, John E. (1995). Dimensions of community identity. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 5*(5), 357-370.

Raza, Hassan (2017). Using a mixed method approach to discuss the intersectionalities of class, education, and gender in natural disasters for rural vulnerable communities in Pakistan. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 12(1), 128–148.

Rigon, Andrea (2014). Building Local Governance: Participation and Elite Capture in Slum-upgrading in Kenya. *Development and Change, 45*(2), 257-283.

Rose, Nikolas S. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, Herbert J., & Rubin, Irene S. (1992). Community organizing and development (second edition). Columbus, OH: Macmillan.

Sawas, Amiera, Castán Broto, Vanesa, Anwar, Nausheen, H. & Rehman, Abdul (2019). Intersectional coproduction and infrastructural violence: experiences from Pakistan. *Community Development Journal*, 55(1), 83-101.

Shaw, Jackie, Howard, Jo, & Franco, Erika Lopez (2020). Building inclusive community activism and accountable relations through an intersecting inequalities approach. *Community Development Journal, 55*(1), 7-25.

Walker, Julian, Frediani, Alexandre Apsan, & Trani, Jean-François (2013). Gender, difference and urban change: implications for the promotion of well-being? *Environment and Urbanization, 25*(1), 111-124.