

Caren Levy, Andrea Rigon, Vanesa Castán Broto

1. Introduction

This book asks three sets of questions to examine community diversity and inclusive urban development (Box 1). These questions guide the intellectual project of the book, motivating each contributor's reflection on the collective argument. We conclude our journey with another reflection, a critique of the kind of answers that this book offers. This critique emerges from a discussion led by Caren Levy that revealed, first of all, that these questions are anything but independent: they relate to the multiple and overlapping layers of concern that shape inclusive urban development.

Box 1. Key research questions presented in Chapter 1

- How do urban development interventions affect different groups and individuals? How fairly are the benefits of the interventions distributed within urban communities? How are notions of homogeneous, static communities reproduced in urban planning and development practices, and with what consequences? 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? How can 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 practice emerge from critiques of community representation and intersectional analysis? Are there new methodologies that enable fairer forms of representation and meaningful participation of marginalized groups and individuals?

This book engages with the tensions inherent in any intervention to improve the lives and wellbeing of people. Many such interventions happen under the banner of overseas development assistance as projects of bi- or multilateral cooperation. Others follow different forms of state and spatial planning and, as such, are often part of the process of state consolidation and expansion in marginalized areas. Many such interventions also emerge within communities, activists, and self-organizing groups who seek to challenge the state of affairs to reclaim freedom, dignity, and autonomy. The identity paradox discussed in the Introduction (Chapter 1) follows an unresolvable tension in inclusive urban development between individual and collective identities. Such tension persists regardless of who sets the urban development process in motion, whether it is led by communities or by other actors.

The success of social mobilization often depends on the activation of collective identities as a means to counter threats of dispossession. A new sense of community emerges through collective action, as action serves to reimagine and reassemble existing identities. Marginalized people often find that taking part in collective action can improve their lives considerably. Many processes of collective identity formation are empowering. Collective identity becomes something valuable, a tool to prevent damage to community members and, sometimes, to deliver tangible improvements in their quality of life. For example, Afenah's and Butcher's accounts of community mobilization in Accra and Kathmandu explore the tension between collective identity and intra-settlement diversity. They show the success of the mobilization of a 'slum community' to deliver political goals. In these examples, settlements gained recognition through community mobilization, protecting people from eviction, and improving urban services. Mobilization led to instances of personal transformation through identity formation based on belonging to that settlement and participating in the process of political mobilization. However, these processes of mobilization did not include everyone. Those people whose interests did not fit the common political project saw themselves excluded – both from mobilization processes and their benefits.

Communities may project unidimensional expressions of collective identity as a means to gain external recognition within existing political systems. Local leaders shape community identities based

on their hopes, interests, and, of course, their own individual identity. While this strategy may be useful to achieve a given aim, unidimensional expressions of collective identity exclude some social groups and, over time, reduce the scope for collective action to address the concerns of all community members. Overlooking community diversity also leads to an unequal distribution of development benefits (see, for example, the contributions by Ramalho and Chant, Horn, Brown-Lusango, and Beebeejaun). There are, however, opportunities for communities to address internal diversity within the processes of mobilization. Several chapters in this book (Walker and Ossul, Rigon, Dabaj and Baumann, and Castan Broto and Robin) explore methodological approaches to do just that.

We argued in Chapter 1 that an intervention has an intent to improve a situation. The focus on such 'will to improve' evokes what Tania Murray Li (2007) has described as a gap between prescription and achievement in development projects. Drawing on her research in Indonesia, Li's analysis 'makes improvement strange' as it looks into how development projects translate the messy landscapes of rural life into a linear narrative that enables the characterization of a problem together with a portfolio of responses. Her research underscores that a project's capacity to deliver 'improvement' depends on political and economic structures that the project itself can hardly challenge. An emphasis on expert knowledge, procedures, and calculations distracts from the collective goals of emancipation and liberation. Inclusive urban planning requires a reflection on who should be at the helm when delivering such improvement projects.

We explore three themes to deepen our understanding. First, we propose a definition of community identity as a moving target, emphasizing both the fluidity of identity and the simultaneity of multiple identities. An intersectional approach is a means to engage with a dynamic understanding of identity, its constraints and potentials. Second, we outline the complex rendering of power within communities. Following the motto 'presence is not the same as voice,' we argue that inclusion in urban development requires opening arenas for people to influence and change decisions. Third, we examine the contributions in this book to extract examples of tactics that support inclusive urban development. These are, for all, tactics that help to build solidarity across difference.

2. Community identity as a moving target

The problem of community diversity is often reduced to a matter of composition, which inevitably leads to mapping multiple layers of otherness. Such mapping takes two forms:

- 1) Mapping to identify vulnerabilities targeted through the intervention and prevent further harm.
- 2) Mapping to analyze the synergies between different identity groups to deliver multi-layered interventions and promote structural change.

The focus on one specific form of vulnerability is common. For example, understanding the vulnerability of adolescent girls can lead to targeted interventions in water and sanitation (Ramalho and Chant). In Zimbabwe, nationals of foreign descent claim policy measures that address their systematic exclusion from land reform processes (Museveni and Chibvamushire). Indigenous women and young people in La Paz are both excluded from political systems of indigenous representation, creating opportunities for jointly challenging the current political process (Horn). Other actions focus on the synergies between different social groups, such as in the case of Lebanon, where work on a public street benefited people with physical disabilities, the elderly, and the carers of young children and their children (Rigon, Dabaj, and Baumann).

Nevertheless, this understanding of the composition of the community reflects a somewhat inadequate notion of identity that does not capture the processes and dynamics that shape communities. Identity is not a label pinned down to an individual alone. Instead, identities are relational. They are enacted, performed, and shared across communities. Thinking of the community's composition is also inadequate. The community cannot be simply divided into different parts. The idea of composition assumes that the community consists of a set of relatively homogeneous and bounded groups with different needs and responses. The notion of composition also does not explicitly recognize relations of power embedded in relationships within and between social categories of identity. Such ideas will prevent us from understanding community diversity.

Sociologist Stuart Hall (1992) spoke of the crisis of identity as a moment of destabilization of identity as the foundation of a sense of the self and society. The very assumption of stability was, in itself, the cause of the crisis. First, the subject is fragmented, never defined by a single identity. Instead, the subject consists of multiple, contradictory identities often ambiguous and unresolved. Second, whatever identity associations we live with, these are in constant flux. They rarely conform to a single, unified whole because they are in practice articulated as different expressions rarely amenable to analysis. Simultaneity and fluidity characterize community identity.

2.1. Simultaneity

Simultaneity refers to the coincidence of different events at a point in time. Identities are simultaneous because of their concurrent manifestation. Hence, identities cannot be delineated and dissected in isolation. Social groups need to act in consonance with the expectations of a given identity for it to be recognized, even where this identity is "constituted through contested practices" that may become visible in processes of social mobilization (Benhabib, 2002, p. 111). For example, urban indigenous communities in Bolivia have mobilized their indigenous identity "to co-produce an alternative city plan with indigenous civil society groups from across the city" (Horn). Horn notes that "(U)rban indigenous communities in La Paz are not only composed of different members with distinct interests and needs but also characterized by uneven power relations... In recent years, young indigenous women ... have indeed started raising their voice and confronted problems of sexism, domestic violence, and abuse within their own indigenous communities". Community organization processes depend on the identification of a common interest that enables groups to gel, organize themselves, develop institutions to support collective action, and identify strategic action. However, as Hall (1992) highlighted, such common interest cannot only build on a notion of a master identity, whether this to identify vulnerabilities or to enable mobilization.

Everybody experiences the simultaneity of identity as a routine, daily occurrence. However, thinking simultaneity in the context of urban development is very difficult. For example, citizens of Old Fadama in Accra mobilize gender, age, property ownership, and ethnicity simultaneously to access horizontal and vertical social networks (Afenah). Planning and delivering action will depend on managing such simultaneity because efforts to highlight certain aspects of identity are at best partial – and "run the risk of freezing existing group differences" (Benhabib, 2002, p. ix). While we can name the challenge and theorize it, in practice, simultaneity becomes something which clouds rather than illuminates judgment. Intersectionality draws attention to the specific experience of oppression beyond fixed labels and, in doing so, it works with rather than against simultaneity.

2.2. Fluidity

Identities are also fluid; they are ever-changing. As Butler (1993) argues, identities are enacted in performances. The chapters in this book emphasize the kinds of performance through collective action that enable claiming identities for political purposes, in the context of communities with large needs to improve their autonomy and wellbeing, for example, in Accra, Ghana (Afenah) or Kathmandu, Nepal (Butcher). Community diversity is not the outcome of diagnosis, even when such a diagnosis is participatory and led by communities themselves. The fluidity of identity forces us to look beyond simplistic understandings of intersectionality as an analysis of overlapping identity labels. Intersectionality calls for an analysis of the pre-existing social norms against which those labels are appropriated, performed, and attributed. For example, in Zambia, the government labeled farmworkers of foreign descent as foreigners, unproductive and not welcomed in resettlement programs. This policy led to farmworkers' impoverishment, and many ended up living in informal settlements with precarious livelihoods and limited access to services (Museveni and Chibvamushire).

When something is continually changing, being individually or collectively performed in each event (self-directed or in response to external events), it becomes a moving target. As a moving target, community diversity eludes characterization. People continuously reimagine themselves and build their identities within the messiness of life. Opportunities for adapting identities to changing circumstances abound. However, an overall emphasis on fluidity may overlook the sediments of identity as they manifest within systems of oppression. Intersectionality points to this challenge: identities are never entirely apprehended, nor are they entirely flexible. People may shift their

identities to fit a given position within existing structures of oppression or association. Still, those shifts depend on the given conditions within which those identities are expressed.

Collective action opens up opportunities to express individual identity, but it may also appropriate those aspects of identity that enable mobilization. Collective action is exposed to two different types of risks: one related to the organization of collective leadership (which influences what issues are prioritized) and one related to the potential omission of those who are in practice for various reasons excluded from the process. For example, Cawood and Rabby note that in the case of the provision of WASH infrastructure in Dhaka's Bostis, "(D)espite NGO efforts to target women and extreme poor households, all president, vice president and secretary positions in the WASH CBOs (with the exception of the UPPR CDCs which had a female-only mandate) were taken by local male leaders and house owners engaged in politics for the ruling party". Brown-Luthango highlights that given their invisibility "in the backyards of formal homes" in Cape Town, backyarders struggle to either create their own movement or join other forms of collective action in the city.

Expressing identity is akin to a process of discovery, not only the discovery of identity in oneself but rather the discovery of collective potential embedded in shared projects of conviviality. Inclusive urban development must go beyond recognizing identity markers of vulnerability: Inclusive urban development must acknowledge the fluidity of identity as a moving target and support people as they articulate their social life in response to a shifting sense of self.

3. Presence is not the same as voice

Reflecting on participation, Caren Levy always remarks that 'presence is not the same as voice' (Goetz & Gaventa, 2001). Communities can represent themselves, but representing themselves in the sense of being there is not the same as having voice. Having voice means having the capacity to contribute to and influence decisions that affect the community. For example, having women in the audience is not sufficient to hear their perspective, because they may not even speak, to begin with, let alone express their concerns freely. Safe spaces may help to voice concerns, although their scope may be limited. For example, some projects provide adolescent girls in Kenya's slums with safe spaces with peers to gain skills and knowledge (Ramalho & Chant). Carefully managed, sensitive research may also help to raise issues anonymously that otherwise would be invisible within urban development. These strategies, however careful, however sensitive, may be insufficient to address the profound inequities that condition actions and results.

Voice is often mediated through structures of representation, in which community leaders tend to overrepresent particular interests and end up amplifying some voices over others. Community leaders should give all community members a voice. Their legitimacy often depends on their ability to do so. However, the exclusion of certain groups or individuals is common, and, without power, those excluded may not find alternatives to gain a voice. Marginalized individuals often find that they lack the relationships, the access, the time, and capacity to express their voice in decision-making fora.

Addressing inequities may require more persistence and courage than any intervention would ever allow. Sarah Ahmed (2016) has discussed this in her analysis of 'diversity work' within higher education institutions in the UK. Institutional change, she says, requires pointing out the fundamental hierarchies and forms of abuse in everyday life. Ahmed explains that change towards more inclusive institutions is not effective until those concerned accept it and act upon it, regardless of whether those changes are 'officially' recognized and, for example, recorded in minutes. There is no institutional change if people's actions do not change. Ahmed explains how inclusive policy is delivered while institutions fail to accommodate demands for exclusion and their members make jokes that demean the very social groups who are excluded. Institutional inertia prevents change. For Ahmed, these experiences mean an encounter with a wall, as solid and as binding as a concrete one. Such 'walls,' however metaphorical they are, appear in many situations within and beyond research and urban development institutions. Museveni and Chibvamushure demonstrate the powerful barriers at work preventing the mobilizations of farmworkers of foreign descent in the peri-urban areas of Zimbabwe, as they encounter an historically racialized form of tied farm labor alongside current discriminatory government practices. This is echoed in the more than three decade experience of gender mainstreaming at global, national, and local levels, a practice that grew out of identifying those very

walls that worked against the inclusion and liberation of those experiencing oppression and discrimination (see for example, Levy, 1998).

The chapters contain many examples of how such walls emerge. Some cases relate to the encounter with those walls of ongoing discrimination in urban development in locations as diverse as La Paz (Horn), Kathmandu (Butcher), Niger Delta (Alozie), and Dhaka (Cawood & Rabby). Others reveal that those walls require maintenance, such as, for example, the constant intervention of the state as a discriminatory wall-maker in Hong Kong (Beebeejaun) or in Zimbabwe (Museveni & Chibvamushure).

3.1. Communities as active agents of change

Communities raise, once and again, against those walls. Communities have enormous energy to organize themselves and mobilize around identities, as shown, for example, in the thirty-year mobilization of the women's federation of the urban poor, *Mahila Ekata Samaj*, in Bansighat, Kathmandu, Nepal (Butcher) or among the Ghana Federation of the Urban Poor in Old Fadama, Accra, Ghana (Afenah).

The extent of change depends on how organized people are and to what extent they already mobilize around identities. The community is an active agent that shapes local capacities and future visions, even if the structures of community organizations are not visible or tangible. International development professionals often label social groups as a means to deliver a more nuanced analysis of the impacts of development interventions. For example, Cawood and Rabby (Chapter 8) examine the problems raised by the serial creation of CBOs to implement WASH interventions in Dhaka's bostis. This case shows that identity labels are often meaningless for those who bear them and sometimes hurt them. In fact, such labels may be already present in the structure of social relations, differentiating people and creating oppression and inequality, as shown in the cases of Zimbabwe (Chapter 7) and Hong Kong (Chapter 5). Many of these labeling practices need to be resisted and contested.

Nevertheless, as explained above, communities and activists often find that the same type of labeling advances their case, enabling and supporting actions that question and destabilize the political and economic structures at the root of inequity. Community organization can deliver for autonomy and dignity. The cases of Nepal (Butcher), Bolivia (Horn), and Ghana (Afenah) demonstrate this in meticulous detail, engaging with emerging contradictions in each case. Bonding on the basis of a given identity will exclude other people whose identities are not so prominent or not well organized. For example, Butcher shows that new settlers in the western part of Bansighat, Kathmandu, Nepal, were excluded in the women's federation of the urban poor, *Mahila Ekata Samaj*, which operates in the eastern part of Bansighat.

If the process of constructing an alliance based upon solidarity may produce exclusions, building solidarity requires making sure that there is a critical engagement with that process, that the process is kept in check. How communities come together must permanently be under examination. As bell hooks powerfully stated in her 1981 book, 'Ain't I a woman,' solidarity across social movements is likely to advance the fight against discrimination, furthering different agendas at the same time. Solidarity across movements may also be a means to identify instances of manipulation. For example, the identities of young men in Niger Delta were manipulated by local politicians and militants' leaders into using intimidation and violence to influence electoral results, demolishing their legitimacy within their communities (Alozie, Chapter 10). Community action should enable building solidarity across difference, with solidarity built around the conscious recognition of diversity.

Inclusive urban development should nurture community organization strategies as a vehicle for promoting change. Practices of urban development require, thus, mapping the conditions for mobilization against oppression alongside the walls to be faced in the expression of collective action. The web of social relations shaping the community must be mapped at different scapes. The formal and informal governance structures that operate within a community interact and depend on how the community interacts with other actors, such as governmental institutions or private investors.

Communities are part of social lives, networks, and forms of cultural exchange. Social relations are part of the gel that brings people together as much as they support the walls collective action aims to bring down. Social relations precede urban development. Communities are diverse, but their diversity is not passive. They express their identity in engagement with political organizations, action groups, and different forms of leadership. In the Hanna Nassif settlement in Dar es Salaam, residents joined a community development association to make direct contributions to the upgrade project, including land, labor, and 20% of their daily wage (Kombe, Kyessi, Lumbumba, Chapter 11). Whatever relations connect and disconnect people, they cannot be broken down into a composition analysis or an analysis of social norms without missing essential aspects of what it is to live in a given community. Shared experiences promote solidarity: The shared experience of living through hardship, for example, in an informal settlement. The recognition of shared drivers of oppression and exclusion. The connection via shared institutions and collective practices. All these experiences are part of the global experience of community diversity.

3.2. Power in communities

Power is inherent to life in communities. Community organizers may see themselves with a desire to neutralize those who hold power within the community to amplify other voices and recognize diversity. Hierarchies may result in the prioritization of some options over others within participatory processes. Social groups in control may stir the direction of interventions and direct action to address particular interests. Elite capture occurs whenever elites appropriate the benefits of community development or profit from its impacts. The contributions to this book acknowledge the complex and fundamental role of leaders of community governance structures (Kombe et al.) but also show processes of elite capture (Afenah; Butcher).

However, neutralizing power does not always benefit the processes of community mobilization. Powerful groups and individuals find different ways to legitimize their power, some of which may be more conducive to building solidarity than others. Elites often depend on markers of difference such as class, resources, hereditary power, caste, or ethnic group to establish their power. However, many people within communities may have other sources of power related to their competence and their ability to draw and maintain social networks. Recognizing the basis of people's power requires committing to reciprocal recognition (Levy, 2015).

At the other end of the spectrum, we need to understand why some social groups lack power. Focusing on the most marginalized may matter in terms of outcomes. Urban development that serves the needs of the most marginalized and vulnerable is likely to suit the needs of the majority of residents. In Lebanon, for example, focusing on the needs of people with disabilities served to deliver public spaces for everyone (Rigon et al). Feminist planners have long made this observation. When planning practices overlook women's needs, the outcome is urban environments that exclude women alongside children, the elderly, and the poor. Many communities know this and factor this approach in collective action.

At the same time, some of those social groups which are powerless and vulnerable may rely on practices that make them invisible as a means for protection. People may prefer to remain invisible instead if they think their needs clash with those addressed in a collective project of mobilization – or if they judge that expressing their needs could lead to some form of violence against them. Building *solidarity across difference* provides ample opportunities for a continuous revision of collective objectives, ensuring protection for those voices rarely heard.

For example, NGO models to deliver water services may tag on pre-existing identities to structure their models of delivery, generating a parallel process of exclusion (e.g. Cawood & Rabby, Butcher). NGOs judge such models less useful in more ethnically diverse areas, for example, to deliver water services to migrants. In Dar es Salaam, the urban development processes tended to exclude women (Kombe et al.). Women themselves demonstrated that they had their own agency and put pressure on the project to participate.

Robin and Castan Broto (Chapter 13) and Cawood and Rabby (Chapter 8) acknowledge that the process of building community governance structures is fundamentally political. A refusal to

recognise how the politics of mobilization and action unfold increases the risk of further exclusion and exacerbates intra-community inequities. Inclusive urban development calls for deliberately political engagements with the process of community mobilization.

4. Building solidarity across difference

Inclusive urban development depends on a collective negotiation of a common future in proximity, in line with the tradition of collaborative planning (Healey, 1997). Urban development practice can be a means for building voices along with each other, to enable a collective dialogue. Acknowledging multiple voices requires labour to acknowledge and assemble them, but representing those voices is not sufficient. Urban development practice also requires opening arenas for dialogue, engaging with a disconcerting chorus, and weaving it together into a shared account of development. Inclusive urban development is a craft, earned through openness, attention, and most of all, painstaking engagement with detailed stories of often frail presents and aspirations of better futures.

Nancy Fraser (2012) discusses Kazuo Ishiguro's novel 'Never let me go.' This dystopian novel follows the lives of clones that will be donors of organs. The novel never presents them as clones. As the book explores their lives, the reader shares in their experiences and bonds with them. Fraser argues that no discussion of the category of 'clone' is required to understand the fundamental injustice embedded in that system. The injustice is immediately apparent. It becomes a realization that cannot be swept aside, in the same way, that multi-criteria decision making and other multi-perspective tools cannot sweep aside the injustice embedded in a decision to sit an industrial facility or to implement an urban regeneration project. Rational arguments impose on and seek to distract attention away from the emotional and political aspects of urban development.

Intersectionality means bringing concerns with justice to the core of urban development. Intersectionality calls for two parallel strategies. On the one hand, intersectionality invokes a need to understand the community and, in particular, the collective mobilization strategies they have at their disposal. On the other hand, intersectionality calls for a deliberate engagement with the institutional frameworks and practices, along with the power structures that reproduce injustice and oppression. Inclusive urban development is a means to both mobilize communities and change the socio-economic conditions that oppress them.

4.1. Tactics to address intersectional identities

The collection of examples and case studies in this book brings to the fore that there are multiple tactics to incorporate an intersectionality perspective to deliver inclusive urban development. Table 1 provides an overview of the tactics explored in these contributions.

Table 1: an inventory of tactics for inclusive urban development

Examples of suggested tactic	Chapter examples	Limits and explorations
Make visible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collective research to make visible intersectional identities, concerning urban citizens experiences of urban problems (Ramalho & Chant, Chapter 2) • Collective research to make visible biases in policy and planning practices, including challenging basic assumptions and definition of variables/categories, for example, in planning (Beebeejaun, Chapter 5; Horn, Chapter 3; Museveni & Chibvamushire, Chapter 7; Robin & Castan Broto, Chapter 13) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of methodology, this requires going beyond additive approaches (Ossul & Walker; Chapter 12). Self-definition is increasingly an important aspect: how do people identify themselves?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collective research to make visible the discrimination in political practices (Horn, Chapter 3; Museveni & Chibvamushire, Chapter 7) 	
Support consciousness-raising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in research or consciousness-raising groups may change the way people see themselves and their situation (Ramalho & Chant, Chapter 2; Horn, Chapter 3; Ossul & Walker, Chapter 12; Rigon, Dabaj & Baumann, Chapter 14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This kind of research raises questions about what is consciousness-raising and from whom to whom such transfer of consciousness emerges. It may create either forms of solidarity or further inequalities.
Strengthen social mobilization	<p>Work within existing processes of collective organization to make claims focused on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interest-based issues (identity or ideology) (Horn, Chapter 3; Afenah, Chapter 9) • spatially-based issues (e.g. Geography/neighborhood) (Butcher, Chapter 6) * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinguish between different claims, how they are articulated within a community and how different claims strengthen or create tensions in mobilisation processes
Build both presence and voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite individuals and groups to be part of specific events • Create multiple arenas and forums for engagement • Enable public articulation of issues, bringing attention, for example, to contradictory issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider participants time and interests, and whether they are comfortable joining the urban development processes
Support advocacy of community interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some powerful community actors and external actors may deliver activities to lend public support to community causes, raising the profile of issues of their interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaining legitimacy to act in the collective interest, and sometimes as an external actor.
Deliver innovative or community-led demonstration projects/plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of an innovative project or a plan based on the interests and needs of particular identity groups as a demonstration and basis for negotiation with municipal planners and politicians (Horn, Chapter 3; Robin & Castan Broto, Chapter 13) • Key innovations may help to challenge the status quo and redefine 'the mainstream' • Such community projects can be delivered sometimes through participation in mainstream projects from external donors (e.g. Kombe et al, Chapter 11). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can often involve the use of participatory and related methodologies for knowledge-making such as citizen science and participatory design (Rigon et al, Chapter 14) • May raise practical issues and hence, may need at the outset protocols for conflict resolution (Robin & Castan Broto, Chapter 13).
Start by addressing needs of most marginalised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When conflicting interests at play, community members may find agreement on interventions for the most marginalized. These interventions also benefit other less marginalised groups and tend to have positive benefits for most (Rigon et al, Chapter 14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not work for major changes affecting most residents but can be a strategy for communities to experience negotiating and acting together, ahead of planning more substantial interventions.

Make conflict explicit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes where community members and other actors involved in urban development make explicit the conflicting interests and trade-offs, moving beyond narratives of shared interests (which often reflect the interests of the more powerful and hide interests of the most marginalized) (Rigon, Dabaj & Baumann, Chapter 14; Robin & Castan Broto, Chapter 13) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May require facilitators to represent the conflict, to ensure more disadvantaged groups maintain the structures of protection, and to open possibilities to address the conflict
Support visioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community processes that build a collective vision through dialogue, while respecting individual aspirations. Identify the shared collective direction for the future but also what isn't shared (Afenah, Chapter 9; Butcher, Chapter 6; Walker & Ossul, Chapter 12; Rigon, Dabaj & Baumann, Chapter 14). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May raise the need for protocols for inclusion of all voices and for conflict resolution (Robin & Castan Broto, Chapter 13).
Develop capacity and 'human infrastructure'	<p>Capacity building process must be reciprocal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing capacities of community practitioners and CBOs to engage with, take decisions and plan responsive to intersectional diversity in their communities (Rigon et al, Chapter 13) Developing capacities of practitioners in NGOs, the state and the private sector to engage with and plan responsive to intersectional diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collective decision making and community building (Rigon et al) are often thought of as outcomes of capacity building processes.
Ensure institutional recognition, including constitutional recognition of citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invoking international agreements as a basis for action eg CEDAW Invoking international agreements signed by governments (governments may not be signatures, or may be signature to some and not all clauses) Identities recognized in policy and planning documents and discourses Policy documents are backed up by budget allocations 	<p>This can be promoted by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> political constituencies to support their arguments, or donors to influence recipient government policies, or the state itself to show political commitment (real or not), to prioritize budget allocations and policy/planning decisions
Facilitate political representation and active participation in political processes at different scales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political representation in local and national government, and on related political committees ('Nothing about us, without us' (claim by disabled groups in Ossul & Walker, Chapter 12) Linked to active political constituency and reshaping of 'established polities' (Fraser, 2006, p. 305) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tactics need to engage with the possibilities of both direct and indirect representation Tactics need to engage with formal and informal political processes

*Squires (1999) makes the distinction between ideological, interest and geographical representation

In most cases, more than one tactic was used in the cases cited, in some cases, one leading to the other. For example, addressing the diverse needs of young women requires institutional recognition through global agreements like the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) alongside structured lobbying to deliver planned interventions (Ramalho

and Chant). Rather than a structured recipe for inclusive urban development, Table 1 presents a menu of ideas to be repurposed within a commitment to change through difference.

Caren Levy ended our discussion, quoting Ann Philipps in her insistence that "it has to be possible to be both different and equal." Inclusive urban development aims to balance both equality and difference, something that, in practice, results in negotiation between human rights and identity rights. Identity being a moving target is not amenable to ready-made proposals to define a sound practice of inclusive urban development. If the question is what does a sound practice of inclusive urban development look like, the answer is: 'it varies.' A range of different actions, depending on the context and the strength of collective agency and solidarity, can advance justice in urban environments. The answer can also be: 'not anything.' Well-intention interventions that do not challenge the root causes of deprivation and inequality can often worsen the conditions of living.

Following Wallace and Gilroy, interventions must incorporate diversity as a point of departure, for people to join the planning process as themselves. Whatever diversity work is and however difficult, diversity work is not enough.

Oppression requires the dehumanization of certain categories of people, and that is not something that can be politely discussed in terms of whether all the sides of the debate are represented. Challenging oppression requires asking fundamental questions, starting, for example, with the structure of the ODA industry and the urban planning tradition, and their embeddedness in systems of white privilege and colonialism.

Solidarity invokes the unity of agreement that may emerge around common interests or shared perceptions and practices. Community solidarity can support just urban futures if it can be built across difference. Solidarity necessarily requires an explicit acknowledgment of those differences. Sadly, even solidarity is often commodified. The feminist tradition has theorized solidarity as a terrain for the contestation of multiple identities. As many women movements working in projects in South America found in the 1980s when talking about solidarity, women are not just women: they are so many other things. That also applies to communities. When doing inclusive urban development, community dwellers are not only the people who live in a place: they are so many other things.

Building solidarity requires producing ideas that gel, those things that bring people together and help them click when they are apart. History shows that recognizing diversity propels social movements forward. Building solidarity across difference requires tactics that open the terrain to deliver urban justice.

References

Ahmed, Sarah (2016). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.

Benhabib, Seyla (2002). *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Butler, Judith (1993). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "sex"*. Psychology Press.

Fraser, Nancy (2012). On Justice. *New Left Review*, 74. March-April.

Goetz, Anne Marie, & Gaventa, John (2001). *From Consultation to Influence: Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery*, IDS Working Paper 138, Brighton: IDS.

Healey, Patsy (2005). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies, 2nd Edition*. Palgrave.

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

Hall, Stuart (1992). The Question of Cultural Identity. In Stuart Hall, David Held & Anthony G. McGrew (Eds.). *Modernity and its Futures*. (pp. 273–326). Oxford: Polity Press Open University.

Li, Tania Murray (2007). *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. Duke University Press.

Levy, Caren (2015). Routes to the just city: towards gender equality in transport planning. In Caroline Moser (Ed.) *Gender, Asset Accumulation and Just Cities: Pathways to Transformation* (pp. 135-149). London: Routledge.

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.

Levy, Caren (1998). Institutionalisation of Gender through Participatory Practice. In Guijt, Irene & Kaul Shah, Meera (Eds.), *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory*. (pp. 254-267). London: Intermediate Technology Publication.

Phillips, Anne (2002). Multiculturalism, universalism, and the claims of democracy. In Maxine Molyneux & Shahra Rasavi (eds), *Gender Justice, Development and Rights*. (pp. 115–138). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Squires, Judith (1999). *Gender in Political Theory*. Bristol: Polity Press.