

## **União Nacional por Moradia Popular and Social Innovation in Housing Policies for the Poor in Brazil**

*Luciana Tatagiba  
& Ana Claudia Chaves Teixeira*

**Case Study N°21  
April 2016**

## Acknowledgements

The research for this Case Study has benefited from financial support by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2012-2016) under grant agreement n° 290613 (ImPRovE: Poverty Reduction in Europe: Social Policy and Innovation; <http://improve-research.eu>). The authors are solely responsible for any remaining shortcomings and errors.

April 2016

© Luciana Tatagiba and Ana Claudia Chaves Teixeira

## Bibliographic Information

Tatagiba, L. and A. C. C. Teixeira (2016), *União Nacional por Moradia Popular and Social Innovation in Housing Policies for the Poor in Brazil*, ImPRovE Case Study N°11/21. Antwerp: Herman Deleeck Centre for Social Policy, University of Antwerp.

Information may be quoted provided the source is stated accurately and clearly.

Reproduction for own/internal use is permitted.

This paper can be downloaded from our website: <http://improve-research.eu>



## Table of contents

1	The initiative and its organizers .....	4
2	Basic information on the (local) context and the emerging problems .....	5
3	Genesis of the initiative .....	6
4	The activities and organization .....	11
4.1	Occupation as a form of struggle.....	12
4.2	Institutional activities.....	12
4.3	The implementation of MCMV-E.....	13
5	The innovative dimension of the initiative .....	13
5.1	Content dimension .....	14
5.2	Process dimension .....	14
5.3	Empowerment dimension .....	15
6	Institutional mapping and governance relations .....	16
7	Governance challenges .....	17
7.1	Mainstreaming social innovation.....	17
7.2	Governing welfare mix – avoiding fragmentation .....	18
7.3	Governing welfare mix – developing a participatory governance style .....	19
7.4	Equality and diversity.....	19
7.5	Uneven access.....	19
7.6	Avoiding responsibility.....	20
7.7	Managing intra-organizational tensions.....	21
7.8	Enabling legal framework .....	21
	References.....	23
	Appendix.....	25

## 1 The initiative and its organizers

The case study focuses on the interaction of Brazil's biggest urban social movement União Nacional por Moradia Popular (UNMP, National Movement for Popular Housing) with national and sub-national governments within the framework of Minha Casa, Minha Vida – Entidades (MCMV-E; 'My House, My Life - Entities'), which is a new sub-program of the Brazilian national government's main housing initiative Minha Casa Minha Vida (MCMV; cf. the ImPRovE-country report on Brazil).

UNMP is among the biggest organized urban social movements in Brazil. Combining direct action and negotiations with national and sub-national governments, UNMP struggles for affordable housing for poor people. While UNMP has been engaged in direct action for a long time, it began to be involved in the execution of the national government programme Minha Casa, Minha Vida – Entidades (MCMV-E, engl. 'My House, My Life - Entities') in 2009.

MCMV has been established by the Brazilian Federal Government in 2009 in a counter-cyclical effort to fight the consequences of the international financial crisis and is among the most ambitious housing programs worldwide. A budget of 34 billion R\$ (approx. 15 bil. Euros in 2009) was liberated in the program's first phase, to construct one million houses until 2011. The program provides public resources for housing construction by means of subsidized credits for constructors and a combination of subsidized credits and subsidies for the benefitting low- to middle-income families, according to their level of income. 40% of the program's resources have been destined to low-income families, with a family income of up to R\$1.600 (1.600 Reais, approx. € 500), for whom the subsidy is 96% of the real estate value. This subsidy permits the access to housing for the low-income sectors, who have been historically largely excluded from Brazilian housing policies, hitherto absent or mainly benefitting middle-income families. Nevertheless, MCMV also benefits lower-middle income and middle-income families with a combination of lower subsidies and subsidized credit (cf. the ImPRovE-country study on Brazil).

MCMV-E is a sub-program which focuses on the active participation of homeless people's movements that contribute to implement the housing policies. It represents a bit less than 1% of the total resources invested via MCMV, showing the residual character of MCMV-E within MCMV, which has been strongly influenced by the commercial real-estate and construction sectors and designed by the Brazilian ministries linked to economic interests (finance, coordination of government). Nevertheless, MCMV-E is the first Brazilian housing program guaranteeing fixed resources to be managed by social movements. The housing movements take responsibility for all stages of the construction, the purchase of land, the elaboration of the project and the selection of the beneficiary families.

Thereby, MCMV-E has been providing an impressive participative form of governance in the policy field of social housing. The active participation of housing movements as key 'organizing entities' ('entidades organizadoras') is innovative, as it includes social movements with partly combative strategies of direct action (squatting). The case study will shed light on the complex governance dynamics of autonomous urban social movements taking an active role in the implementation of a national urban housing program.

## 2 Basic information on the (local) context and the emerging problems

According to official data, the housing deficit in Brazil in 2013 was 5.8 million housing unities and the estimates assume a further demand of 1.5 million housing units per year (Ministério das Cidades, 2013). The Brazilian housing policies reflect the interests of the construction firms and the real estate sector. The predominance of these market actors resulted in a form of production oriented towards the middle and upper classes and little or no incentives for the production for the low-income population. The government programs for poor people, with incomes from zero to three minimum incomes (in short: 0-3 SM, approx. € 500), are characterized by its discontinuity, low quality standards and the construction on sites that are distant from urban centers and with irregular access to urban and public infrastructure (Bonduki, 1994; Kowarick, 2009).

Brazilian social housing policies have been most actively introduced during the military dictatorship in the 1960s. Characteristic for this episode was a middle-class bias of social policies, which was also reflected in housing policies. The major tool since the 1960s, have been government-subsidized credits, enabling middle class families to finance home ownership. With the political focus on promoting home ownership, very little efforts were geared towards the promotion of affordable apartment dwellings. Being mostly ignored by public policies, the poor had to resort to irregular housing in slums (favelas) during the fast urbanization process of the 1960s and 1970s. This resulted in serious problems, as inequalities have been increasingly spatialized, with socially polarized and fragmented cities as a result. Furthermore, irregular housing also resulted in serious obstacles concerning sanitation and health, as public services such as sewage or waste collection were absent from the irregular settlements. The 1980s and 1990s were marked by severe economic crises and the retrenchment of the state from a vast number of areas. For the case of housing, this retrenchment was pronounced and resulted in low public investments in social housing. There were some experiences with federal resources, but they never constituted a proper program.

During the liberal-conservative government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002), the focus of UNMP was to intervene in Programa Arrendamento Residencial (PAR, engl. Residential Leasing Program), in the sense of opening space for the activities of the movement in its management (UNMP, Letter to Caixa Econômica Federal, 1999, apud Rodrigues, 2013, 63). The government refused the proposal of the movement, limiting the participation of the entities to voicing their demand. It defined that the contract has to be made with the construction firm.

The diminishing investments resulted in a serious lack of adequate housing. The so-called 'housing deficit', calculated by the Brazilian Fundação João Pinheiro, measures the percentage of housing which is constructed with inadequate construction material, excessive use of limited space, or when more than 30% of the monthly family income have to be used to pay for rent. After an increase during the 1980s, the housing deficit has been only slightly reduced throughout the economically more prosperous 1990s from 14.4% in 1991 to 12.3% in 1999 (Morais, 2005: 16). Until 2007, the housing deficit further dropped to 10.0% as a result of the combination of improving conditions of the economy and the labor market, despite the lack of financial efforts considering government spending. The poor are the most affected group of the housing deficit: In 2007, 70.7% of affected families only earned between 0 and 3 minimum wages (13.1% between 3 and 5 MW; 10.4% between 5 and 10 MW; 4.1% more than 10 MW; cf. Neto et al., 2013).

With the election of the Brazilian president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010; short: Lula) from the Workers Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores, PT), this situation changed and social housing policies began to be implemented in a more coordinated fashion. Nevertheless, public investments for housing were only slightly increased during the beginning 2000s (Krause and Balbim, 2010; cf. the ImPRovE country profile for Brazil). From 2009 onwards, the situation has been substantially altered, as the government introduced the program Minha Casa, Minha Vida (MCMV) as a countercyclical measure against the effects of the international economic crisis. Housing expenditure immediately rose from 1.1% of the GDP in 2005 to 1.8% in 2010 and the housing deficit further dropped to 8.53% in 2012 (cf. the ImPRovE country profile for Brazil). The following chapter will shed light on the processes underlying this change, with special emphasis on the main Brazilian housing movement UNMP.

### 3 Genesis of the initiative

It was in the preparations for the presidential campaign in 2002 that UNMP found space to re-initiate a more effective articulation at the national level. Between 1998 and 2000, *Instituto Cidadania*<sup>1</sup> united activists and intellectuals to formulate a proposal of intervention in the field of housing, known as *Projeto Moradia* (engl. Housing Project)<sup>2</sup>. Self-management constituted one of the guiding principles of the program, together with the support of the construction industry (Instituto Cidadania, 2000, 27, in Rodrigues, 2013; Bonduki, 2009). The victory of Lula in the presidential elections in 2002 opened a window of opportunities without precedence for the influence of the movement at the federal level. The whole field of housing was remodeled with the creation of a Ministry for Cities, a Council and a Conference of Cities and the entry of various activists and intellectuals from the field of urban reform in key positions in the Ministry (Serafim, 2013). The presence of PT in power opened once more space for UNMP, so that the multiple filiations of actors who occupied positions in the State could be translated into institutional innovations.

The first step was to utilize the spaces of participation, like the Council and the Conference of Cities – where UNMP had significant influence – to put the issue of self-management as a guiding principle on the agenda. The 1<sup>st</sup> National Conference of Cities, taking place in 2003, was an important step in this direction by defining self-management as a model in the final document of the conference. In the same year, UNMP wrote to the Ministry of Cities a letter in defense of self-management, which expresses the meanings constructed over its long trajectory:

*UNMP defends self-management as a form not only to construct homes, neighborhoods or social equipment, but as a form of constructing popular power (...). We construct alternatives for management where we are subjects of our history.* (UNMP, Letter to the Ministry of Cities, April 2003, in Rodrigues, 2013, 64)

At the end of April 2004 *Crédito Solidário* (engl. Solidarity Credit) was responding to the housing needs of low-income families, allowing the activities of cooperatives and/or associations of inhabitants, by means of giving direct financing to the prospective residents. A great part of the literature considers *Programa Crédito Solidário* (PCS, engl. Program of Solidarity Credit) a conquest of the movements (Lago, 2012). In the same direction, Mineiro and Rodrigues (2012) affirm that the proposal to create the program emerged after a series of protests and occupations in April 2004, which led to many

---

<sup>1</sup> A civil society organization led by the Lula, at that time only president of PT.

<sup>2</sup> Evaniza Rodrigues, from UNMP, participated in the coordination team of the project.

negotiations between CEF, the Ministry of Cities and the movements<sup>3</sup>. But there were a lot of difficulties which the movements and the governmental bodies in charge of its management had to face to operationalize the program. “During this period, many demonstrations, walks, camping, occupations and meetings demanding the “reduction of bureaucracy” of PCS took place” (Mineiro and Rodrigues, 2012).

In the following year, after intense pressure towards the federal government<sup>4</sup> the Law 11.124/2005 was approved which created the *Fundo Nacional de Habitação de Interesse Social* (FNHIS, engl.: National Housing Fund of Social Interest), after 13 years of being discussed in the Congress. The central questions for the movements were that the resources for housing in the social interest become part of the fund and remain under social control. But this was a demand that the government did not seem to be disposed to accept. In 2006, after the reelection of Lula, UNMP handed over to the president a document in which it reaffirmed that “FNHIS has to reunite all resources destined to the low-income population, not only the budgetary ones” (UNMP, 2006, Document for president Lula).

In the meantime, a juridical analysis of the law to create FNHIS defined that the resources of the fund must not be handed over to civil society organizations. Following Rodrigues and Mineiro (2012), this decision initiated a new round of pressure and negotiations between the movement and the government, by means of the organization by UMM (*União dos Movimentos de Moradia*, engl. Union of the Housing Movements, the section of UNMP in the State of São Paulo) of a mega-occupation in april 2007 (Neuhold 2009). In august 2007, a law like regulation (Medida Provisória 387/2007), which was afterwards converted into Law 11.578/2007, allowed to hand over resources directly to the movements and other civil society organizations (Rodrigues and Mineiro, 2012). At the 11<sup>th</sup> National Meeting for Popular Housing the law was applauded as a conquest of the movements:

*After our national tour of occupations in 2007 (...) president Lula, in a historical moment for the struggle of the movement, sanctioned Law 11.578/2007, which changed Law 11.124/2005, permitting direct access to the resources of Fundo Nacional de Habitação de Interesse Social (in Rodrigues, Pessino and Barbosa, 2008).*

In the sequence, the government launched the *Programa Produção Social da Moradia* (PPSM, engl.: Program for the Social Production of Housing), created in March 2008. One month later, there was a new round of mobilizations under the heading of “national tour in defense of housing and urban reform. While housing remains a privilege, occupying is a right”. In this period, there were occupations of various unused land owned by the federal government. In the document that justifies the tour, one can read together with various other demands:

*União Nacional por Moradia Popular - UNMP is once more in the streets to denounce and claim for the fulfillment of the right to housing in the city. (...) **WE ARE IN THE STRUGGLE** because big firms and corporations are privileged, instead of giving incentives to cooperatives and associations of the proper inhabitants in the implementation of housing policies.(...) **THAT IS WHY WE DEMAND:***

*- Construction of 1 million houses for the low-income population (...)*

---

<sup>3</sup> In Naime (2009) one can find interesting references to the dispute between the movements, Ministry of Cities and CEF about the parenthood of the program.

<sup>4</sup> Only in the city of São Paulo, there were 14 occupations realized in 2004, the mayor number of occupations since 1999 (Trindade, 2014).

- Increase of the resources of the Program *Crédito Solidário and Produção Social da Moradia*;
- Reduce bureaucracy of the federal Programs. (UNMP, April 2008)

PPSM had its first selection finished in March 2009, exactly at the same time as *Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida* (MCMV) was launched, which started to concentrate the resources in this field. The massive investments in housing production via MCMV were a response to the world economic crisis of 2008. According to the researchers (Serafim, 2013), the Ministry of Cities hardly participated in the creation of this program, even less the social movements. It was created by the presidential cabinet (*Casa Civil*) and the Ministry of Finance in dialogue with employers.

In the same period, the government launched *Minha Casa Minha Vida-Entidades* (MCMV-E), and regulated it five months later. This includes the participation of the movements and other civil society organizations in the implementation of the program. MCMV-E is today the main form by which the social movements participate in the implementation of public policies.

It was the world economic crisis of 2008 that led to the public acknowledgement of this situation. The government's decision to launch the program MCMV had an immediate impact on the construction sector. MCMV is an impressive program to produce housing and, for the first time, the Brazilian government started a broad initiative to combat the housing deficit. MCMV has been primarily designed by the ministries of government coordination and finance, with strong participation of the construction sector, while the ministry of cities and the housing movements have been largely absent from the planning phase. Despite its absence in the planning phase, the Brazilian housing movement has been recognized as the major pressure group behind the introduction of MCMV.

MCMV roughly follows the lines of housing programs between the 1960s and 1980s, as its main aim is to provide subsidized credit for residential property. Nevertheless, the fundamental difference to the hitherto existing programs is the consideration of the poor: A budget of 34 billion R\$ (approx. 15 bil. Euros in 2009) was liberated in the programs first phase, to construct one million houses until 2011 – of which 40 percent were destined to families earning up to 3 minimum wages (MW) (1600 R\$; approx. 500 Euros), another 40% to families earning between 3 and 6 MW and 20% to families earning between 6 and 10 MW (cf. the ImPRovE country profile for Brazil). While the housing deficit is centered on poor families (earning up to 3 MW), the 40% reserved for this group seem to be rather low. Despite this critique, the construction of “Housing for Social Interest” (HIS – *Habitação de interesse social*), focalizing the low-income population (earning up to 3 MW) is differing from the (lower) middle class support by MCMV: contrary to the subsidized credits, it comes along with substantial public subsidies, whereby the financial contribution of the recipient is 5% of her/his monthly income. Nevertheless, MCMV was elaborated in close cooperation with the construction firms, without incentives with respect to the quality of the construction and/or the localization of the sites. The market logic of MCMV reinforces the tendencies of urban segregation to the detriment of the poor, notwithstanding its contribution to reduce the housing deficit. According to the *Rede Cidade e Moradia* (engl. City and Housing Network), which studies the program,

*the municipalities, in general, limit themselves to approve the projects by flexibilizing its legislation to adapt it to the program. This permits constructing buildings in cheaper locations, as for example in old rural areas surrounding the city which are integrated into the urban agglomeration. With respect to the rules which require a minimum of social equipment in the neighborhood from the municipalities, these areas permit the real estate projects to remain financially viable, but they reproduce a form of segregated city and without urbanity, as they*

*are badly connected to public transport, infrastructure and access to urban services for economic and human development.*<sup>5</sup>

Despite this adverse context, UNMP, was able to influence public policy by bringing decision makers to take over programs and projects, which would not have been implemented without the movement's activities. The main result of the action of UNMP was the legal recognition of social movements – and not only the private construction sector – as a partner in the implementation of popular housing policies. MCMV-E was launched by the Brazilian national government and allowed social movements to decide upon one percent of the total investments carried out via MCMV. It is today the most important result of UNMPs efforts to influence housing policies.

Therefore, the Brazilian housing movement has been central to the development of the socially innovative features of the *Minha Casa, Minha Vida – Entidades* program. The Brazilian housing movement is quite diversified, composed of organisations with different political connections, organisational forms, demands and capacities of influencing public policies. Nevertheless, it is possible to link the origins of the movement to the urbanisation and industrialisation process and their effects on the working class (Kowarick, 2009). One factor which favoured the mobilisation was the economic crisis at the beginning of the 1980s. A lot of families, unable to pay their rents, joined the movement and participated in occupations (Bonduki, 1994). A remarkable actor in this diverse collectivity called housing movement is the *União Nacional por Moradia Popular* (from now on UNMP).

UNMP was created officially in 1993 to coordinate the struggle of the movement nationally, and today it is represented in 21 regional states. UNMP is a movement at the intersection of poor workers, the progressive part of the Catholic Church, volunteers giving professional advice and technical consultancy (*assessorias técnicas*)<sup>6</sup> and the Workers Party PT. The movement is not linked formally to any specific party, but many of its activists are active in PT too. PT emerged in the 1980s as the most important and innovative force of the national left. It gave a specific sense to the struggle for housing by linking it to the other struggles of all the movements for democracy and for the constitution of “popular power” (Doimo, 1995). In other words, UNMP is the result of the multiple membership of its members in popular organisations struggling for housing, of PT, the Christian base communities and the Catholic pastoral for housing. UNMP is the place where these different memberships converge, forming a net with a strong popular and religious base, which in the political field expresses the trust in democracy as a “form of life”.

UNMP has an organisational structure composed of the national meeting, state plenaries, national coordination, executive coordination and executive secretary ([www.unmp.org.br](http://www.unmp.org.br)). All affiliated regional organisations which participate in this structure follow common rules, but possess significant freedom of action by being constituted as autonomous organisations. UNMP has a rented main office where the executive secretary of the entity, responsible for the dissemination of the information, documentation and logistics. UNMP is financed by MISEREOR, a German development cooperation

---

<sup>5</sup><https://raquelrolnik.wordpress.com/2014/11/10/programa-minha-casa-minha-vida-precisa-ser-avaliado-nota-publica-da-rede-cidade-e-moradia/> - accessed 07/02/2015

<sup>6</sup> *Assessorias técnicas* in the field of housing are organisations of architects, engineers and sociologists involved in issues of social housing. In general, they are near to the housing movement, and offer services of consulting, technical project support and accompanying on construction site, and development projects in the field of social housing (habitação de interesse social - HSI).

agency. MISEREOR is part of the German Catholic Church, which shows once more the importance of this institution for UNMP. It is also financed by individual contributions of its members.

The structure of UNMP is based on so-called groups of origin, which are the entrance door to the movement. When a family gets in contact with the movement, it starts in an organisation of the movement in its neighborhood. There it is registered and starts to participate in the meetings. In these meetings, the family gets to know the history of the movement, its struggles and key demands. It is in the groups of origin where the educational process of what is called the “basis of the movement” takes place. The participation of the families in these meetings and in the activities promoted by the movement are the criteria for the movement to elaborate its lists of families which will be prospective residents, in case of the movement obtaining a victory with respect to new housing unities. What is valued with this form of organisation is the involvement of the families with “the *causa* of the movement”. By participating in the meetings and the activities, the individuals obtain capacities which permit them to link problems of housing to broader questions, as for example, real estate speculation. Furthermore, this points-based system permits UNMP (and other movements which adopt it) a significant capacity of mobilising its bases, via the distribution of selective incentives. This capacity is particularly important when the movement needs to show its strength in the streets.

Besides these current national activities, UNMP started its activities in Greater São Paulo, the metropolitan region of São Paulo which concentrates one of the biggest housing deficits in Brazil<sup>7</sup>. The main leaders of the national movement come from and act in the state of São Paulo via UMM-SP (*União dos Movimentos de Moradia da Grande São Paulo e interior*). Its strategies and forms of struggle, principally in the city of São Paulo, became references for the activities of the movement at the national level. And even more, the main offices of UNMP and UMM-SP are in the same building (in the city of São Paulo).

During the years, the strategies of the movement in the metropolitan region of São Paulo (Grande São Paulo) ranged from the occupation of unused buildings and land to self-help construction in the center of the city. One of its important characteristics has always been to struggle for public resources for the construction of housing, as can be seen in this journal of UNMP:

*For years, the movements started to articulate, occupying unused buildings, (...) constructing houses via self-help, negotiating endlessly with the State to deblock financial resources, organizing public events and demonstrations. (...) União Nacional por Moradia Popular emerged, and is consolidated in the struggle for self-help and self-management, which is our praxis. (...) By constructing our own houses, we diminish paternalism and clientelism of construction firms, save public money and construct housing of better quality for a lower price.*  
(Jornal da União, august 1993)

At the beginning, the State was only guaranteeing resources, and very often, the governments were considered as enemies who have to be convinced or combatted. In 1989, Luiza Erundina from PT was elected mayor of the city of São Paulo (1989-1992) and implemented important innovations in the field of popular housing by inviting activists from the movement to take part in government (Novy 1994). Leaders of UNMP started to work together with the State, which for the first time provided public

---

<sup>7</sup> The city of São Paulo has 10.886.518 habitantes and its metropolitan region 19.822,572. São Paulo is Brazil's major financial center.

resources to assist self-managed construction by UNMP. Thereby, this experience led to important learnings about the functioning of the State and budgetary issues.

The election of Luiza Erundina was an important inflection point in the trajectory of UNMP contributing to its organisation and the definition of its proposals for intervention in public policies. During this period, UNMP acquired a capacity of mobilization of its bases and to dialogue with public bodies which permitted them to become in the 1990s, one of the most recognized and prestigious organisations of the popular movements in the country. This experience also showed that the defense of public policies could be another form of relationship between State and movement, as is affirmed by an important leader of the movement, Benedito Barbosa:

*The movements in other governments were only demanding, they went to the door of the municipality to destabilize the State. (...) In the government of Luiza Erundina we learned to perceive the State in a different form, no longer as enemy, but as a partner of the movement in the sense of together constructing a public policy, which in this case was with respect to dignified housing for the workers of the city. (Interview in Cavalcanti, 2006, 72)*

In a setting in which the use of urban land is conditioned in such a significant form by market interests, it is interesting to observe how the movements perceive the State not only as an arena or an arbiter, but as an object in dispute. To influence the public housing policy, UNMP integrated direct action and institutional activities, always with the objective to guarantee the negotiation concerning their agenda. Given the erratic and discontinued trajectory of housing policies, it obtained know-how, learned to negotiate and showed a strong capacity of resilience which permitted it to maintain its organisation and activities, even at times of governments less inclined to the requests of the movement.

#### **4 The activities and organization**

UNMP demonstrated a great capacity of mobilization and pressure. One of the reasons explaining its strengths is its demonstrated capacity to learn from the experiences of the conflictive interaction with the State, diversifying its strategies of action and combining them in a creative form emanating from the opportunities and threats of the respective conjuncture.

During all the conflictive interactions with the State the housing movement developed a variety of practices and routines. These consist in a repertoire of action in which the following main, although not exclusive strategies have to be stressed: the occupation of buildings and public land, the participation in institutional spaces, like the council of public policies, beyond the construction of housings by means of self-management, as in the case of MCMV-E (Tatagiba, Paterniani and Trindade, 2011).

These strategies were tested over time, starting from a tradition which combines disruptive action with an intense experience to negotiate with public actors, principally on the urban periphery (Cardoso, 1983 e 1987). Around these practices and values, the housing movement structured itself, defined itself and presented itself to society as a collective actor, an actor who – despite of its internal heterogeneity – was characterized by sharing a broad political project centered in the defense of dignified housing for all, which meant beyond home-ownership the access and right to the city.

#### **4.1 Occupation as a form of struggle**

It was by occupying buildings and unused land that, at the beginning of 1997, the movement appeared more clearly in the public debate about the center of São Paulo. The strategy to occupy buildings and/or unused land, on the countryside as well as in the city, was no new phenomenon in terms of political action. The big innovation in the occupations which started in 1997 was that they were broadly coordinated and articulated, built around a pre-defined agenda of demands “and with a network of supporters which produced and consolidated ‘discourses’ about the right of the poor population to live in a consolidated area of the city” (Neuhold, 2009, 51; Trindade, 2014). Between 1997 and 2007, according to Neuhold (2009, 70), 72 occupations of unused buildings took place in the central area of São Paulo, 33 of them of public buildings and 31 of private ones. In 1999, UMM turned public its new strategy – simultaneous occupations – as an expression of its capacity of mobilization and coordination: in less than an hour UNMP occupied with 6.100 persons six unused buildings in the center of the city.

#### **4.2 Institutional activities**

Pressure went, as we said, hand in hand with negotiations. In the city of São Paulo, an important space for institutional action of the housing movement is the Municipal Housing Council (Conselho Municipal de Habitação - CMH). CMH was created in 2002, during the administration of the mayor Marta Suplicy from PT, after strong pressure from the movement and its allies in the field of institutional politics. CMH is a participative institution which uses different forms of representation. It is composed of 48 members and the same number of deputies. Public authorities have a third of the seats. The other two thirds are reserved to the councilors of civil society, being 16 representatives from popular community organizations linked to housing and 16 representatives from other entities of civil society linked to housing issues, like NGOs, universities, trade unions, etc. The representatives of public authorities are indicated by the local government. The representatives of the entities of civil society are elected by their respective segments in proper fora. The representatives of the popular entities linked to housing are chosen by means of elections in the sub-municipalities. The elections of the popular representatives have mobilized not only the housing movement, but also parties and government. In these elections, there was a growing participation by citizens from Sao Paulo: in the first election in 2003 participated over 31 thousand voters, in 2009 there were more than 47 million voters and for the election in 2012 there were more than 100 thousand voters registered (Tatagiba e Blikstad, 2011).

According to the Law nº 13.425 from 02/09/2002, CMH is a deliberative, fiscalizing and consulting organ, linked to the Municipal Department of Housing and Urban Development (port.: Secretaria Municipal de Habitação e Desenvolvimento Urbano), and has as its basic objective to establish, accompany, control and evaluate the municipal housing policies. This deliberative potential turns the Council into a potentially efficient instrument to intervene in powerful economic interests in the city, which are linked to real estate capital and construction firms. The main themes in dispute in the CMH are the production of housing for the low-income population and the right of popular classes to live in the center, central issues on the agenda of the movement.

### **4.3 The implementation of MCMV-E**

As indicated in chapter 3, the creation of MCMV was deeply intertwined with the combative and advocacy action by UNMP and other housing movements. MCMV has been organized in “modalities”, differentiating between a “construction firms” and “entities”. The latter module (MCMV-E) is a rather residual part of MCMV, containing a bit less than 1% of the program’s total resources.

MCMV-E is a national public housing policy with public subsidies for the construction of popular housing. It can be accessed by all entities of civil society (but not by construction firms) which fulfill the necessary prerequisites to be enabled to take part in the program. It is co-administered by the state-owned bank Caixa Economica Federal (CEF) and the Ministry of Cities. The participation in the program takes place at two levels: at the level of the families which are motivated to engage themselves in all stages of the undertaking; and the social organizations as direct responsible for the joint work of the public agencies. These two levels are profoundly intertwined as the quality of participation depends on the nature of the relationship which the movement achieves with the families during the whole process of producing housing. The very rules of the MCMV-E program impose the necessity for participation by the individual beneficiaries in collective decision making activities, organized by the social movements such as UNMP. Participating entities have to prove existence for at least three years prior to application with a mission statement focusing on housing, to avoid free riding and opportunism. The Ministry of Cities is responsible for their accreditation.

A characteristic of MCMV-E is that the organizations benefit their associates, i.e. the participating entities are selecting the beneficiaries themselves among their generally eligible members. The internal selection processes within the entities are diverse: Entities such as UNMP have more rigorous criteria of participation before and during the construction process, while others are less demanding; some stimulate debates among the future inhabitants to decide on who will live next to whom, while others use lottery systems, or rather reward the efforts of the members before and during the construction. Consequently, as a starting point, this modality of the program is not open to all citizens, but only to the associates of the entity. These associates must receive less than R\$ 1600 (approx. 500 euros) per month, per family which is a considerably low amount. Once the construction work is finished, they pay low monthly refunds, varying according to their income. The amount to be paid does most probably not correspond to the full total cost of the home, which is thereby subsidized with public resources, collected by federal taxes. CEF, a national public bank, treats these resources as social investment and all refunding by the new residents will be used for the construction of new housing.

## **5 The innovative dimension of the initiative**

To account for the innovative dimension of local governance, we link the three dimensions identified by Frank Moulaert et al. (2005; cf. Oosterlynck et al. 2013a) with Nancy Fraser’s ‘3 R’-conception to promote social justice (Fraser 1995, 2007; cf. Oosterlynck et al. 2013b: 7f.): (1) The content dimension refers to the satisfaction of basic social needs, or ‘redistribution’ in the terms of Fraser. (2) The process dimension touches on the transformation of social relations, or ‘recognition’ in Fraser’s words. (3) The empowerment dimension alludes to socio-political mobilisation, which can be understood as ‘representation’, re-interpreting Fraser’s original conception (Oosterlynck et al. 2013b: 7). The actions of UNMP have invoked all three dimensions, by promoting housing to people in need, while also raising individual and collective self-esteem of their constituencies. Political action and participation

promoted by the interplay of the UNMP with government actors has linked the first two dimensions to further promote empowerment.

### **5.1 Content dimension**

Interviews with members of the housing movement as well as the respective literature stress that MCMV-E emerged as a result of the pressure of the movement (Lago, 2012; Tatagiba and Teixeira, 2014). MCMV-E represents at least 1% of the total value invested in MCMV which shows its residual character in relation to the whole program. However, it is the first program of great scale which guarantees defined resources for housing construction. This can already be seen as a great advance. In the following, we will elaborate on the aspirations of the housing movement and in how far MCMV-E was able to cope with them.

Our research (Tatagiba, L. & Blikstad, K., 2011, Nepac, 2015, Tatagiba, L.; Paterniani, S. Z. & Trindade, T., 2012; Tatagiba, L. e Teixeira, A. C. 2014) shows, that with respect to the reasons for participating in the movement, the spontaneous response of 56,4% of the interviewed refers to quite immediate demands: obtaining housing. However, they insist in specifying: dignified housing. As was mentioned already, dignified housing is opposed to the reality lived by many: precarious housing in rented barracks, favelas, insecure housing dependent on rent or the help of parents and/or friends, housing without “paper”, waiting for planning regularization. The idea of dignity refers to a scenario to integrate the demands for housing with other demands, as housing permits access to other basic goods and services, such as employment, transport, health and education.

The results in the MCMV-E program have been rather mixed in this regard: The market logic inherent in the program does not permit acquisition of land in central urban locations, but forces the participating movements such as UNMP to buy land in more peripheral locations. Thereby, travelling distances can be substantial. Regarding urban infrastructure, results have also been mixed. These problems are part of the general setting of MCMV. Compared to the houses constructed in the general MCMV program, the dwelling developed within the confines of MCMV-E tended to be bigger in size and therefore offered a more dignified form of housing.

### **5.2 Process dimension**

MCMV-E is the first large scale housing program in which social movements are responsible for all stages, the planning, the acquisition of land, the project elaboration, up to the selection of the families of prospective residents.

First results (Nepac, 2015) show that there were great variations within the MCMV-E program. Therefore, the main reference here will be the work of UNMP and its linkages to MCMV-E. In 2009, a survey was conducted together with activists from UNMP which allowed to capture important dimensions of the profile of the activists and the reasons for their participation in the movement. Over half of the interviewed are women (57,8%), confirming studies which show the strong female participation in collective actions, principally with respect to demands for social policies. An interesting fact is that the women are not only the majority at the basis of the movement, but also occupying leadership positions in various organisations. With respect to age, there is a dominance of adults, age 40 to 59. With respect to the time of participation in the movement, the data shows an interesting equilibrium between persons with a long trajectory of activism and persons who just entered the movement.

“Dignified housing” is a symbolic reference which prioritizes the struggle and the conquest over a type of engagement which is focused solely on the concrete and urgent – for individual utility. This contains the potential to activate another awareness and motivations. From the responses given in the category “to conquer dignified housing” 27% insisted to mention the changes after entering in the movement, as a result of learning to participate. These responses described the process undertaken by somebody who entered in the housing movement to obtain a house and who, independently of whether s/he conquered it or not, widened her/his perception of this demand as a collective one, starting from the experiences that strengthen the relation between one’s individual identity and the participation in the movement. They remain in the movement now following the guiding principle to continue the struggle for housing not only for themselves, but “for the companheiros who need it, too”.

In the other categories, we see other reasons. For 15,6% of the interviewed, the reason to participate in the movement was the desire to struggle collectively for better living conditions. The obtained responses in this category express the objective to struggle for more social equality, before entering into the movement – sometimes resulting from a (personal or shared) experience of injustice, and legitimized by the constitutionality of social rights and by the perception of the collective character of this deficiency.

Beyond the motivations, we tried to better understand the structures which favour (or facilitate) the contact with the movement, linking aspirations and desires to a concrete form of collective engagement. The responses confirm the importance of personal networks in recruiting new activists. More than half of the interviewed (53,1%) affirm that they got to know about the movement by friends and relatives.

In a nutshell, the answers to the questionnaire clearly indicated transformations of social relations inspired by the activities of UNMP. As we will show below, these transformations are related to material improvement and governance processes. Therefore, social innovation also occurred in the empowerment dimension.

### **5.3 Empowerment dimension**

We further asked about evaluating participation in the movement and about its consequences for their lives. The most frequent response refers to political education resulting from the participation process in the movement: political consciousness, knowledge about rights, a new vision of the world and citizenship. In this category, sentences like “I learned that it is necessary to struggle”, “one has to organize”, “action is necessary”, “people have to unite to obtain an objective” were frequent. Furthermore, there were references to regaining identity by participating in the movement and to the experience of feeling oneself part of a collectivity. It is not only the knowledge about rights and political consciousness which are cited as decisive: also getting to know about technical questions and processes with respect to housing policies (as the legislation and legal processes of regularizing land, for example). The second most frequent category of answers (19,1%) stresses the recuperation of self-esteem, the personal growth, the self-confidence, major capacity to communicate (“I lost the fear to speak aloud”). Yet, the material benefits were less frequently cited, revealing the activists’ collective empowerment beyond material conquests – in this case housing. The emphasis of the interviewed with respect to the type of conquest is extremely rich: They emphasize the deepening of citizenship, reflect their being-in-the-city (political consciousness, knowledge of rights), and the impacts on their subjectivity like the recuperation of self-esteem and hope.

The political education and pressure for participation in policy-making finally led to the active participation of UNMP in MCMV-E. Research on the quality of participatory democracy in the MCMV-E program (Nepac, 2015) has revealed mixed results, especially in the phase after the conclusion of the construction, but also in the planning and construction phases. An important factor concerning the quality of participation has been identified as the internal organization of the participating movements, with UNMP's strategy of political education producing comparatively good results.

The importance of MCMV-E consists exactly in the possibility which it opens to do more than only constructing a house. In other words, the potential of the program rests on the support which it offers to a creative management of the undertaking. By giving space to participation, the program favours experiments which, although little disseminated if we look at the whole, are nevertheless relevant. MCMV-E permits the movements to show that it is possible "to do it differently" in popular housing policies, linking conquests of homes to the conquest of citizenship for the future home-owner.

## **6 Institutional mapping and governance relations**

MCMV-E has been set up as a program of collective self-management of housing for the beneficiaries, organized by social movements such as UNMP, on which this contribution puts its focus. On the side of the government, the central agent is the state-owned bank Caixa Economica Federal (CEF), being responsible for the financing and the operational side of projects. While CEF is responsible for the concrete management of projects – providing financing and monitoring the fulfilment of rules and norms – the National Ministry for Cities is responsible for setting guidelines, selecting the projects to be implemented and a constant re-evaluation of the program. Regional and municipal governments are responsible for assistance concerning issues of infrastructure, acquisition of land and concrete technical assistance for the benefitting social movements and associations.

The individual beneficiaries have to accord to the rules for the part of the program focused on poor households, i.e. have to earn less than 1,600 Reais (about 500 Euros), and be Brazilian citizens or have permanent Brazilian Visa. They are only selected by the recognized social movements running the program (Entidades Organizadoras – EOs) and have to take part in participatory activities by the movements and in the construction of the housing site. Furthermore, planners and social workers or scientists have to be present to act as 'technical officers' (Responsáveis Técnicos) to assist the central organizations for MCMV-E – the social movements running the program (EOs): Being the centrally involved agents, EOs are presenting housing projects to the government agencies and responsible for the full process of construction and the selection of individual beneficiaries, as well as for safeguarding structures and mechanisms of participation for the individual beneficiaries.

In this contribution, the focus concerning the EOs is on UNMP, an organization for the struggle for housing which over three decades has had as its explicit objective to influence the production of housing by means of an alternative proposal: the self-management with public financing. This demand is, in itself, the result of interactions between the movement and the State, consolidating itself as an alternative proposal of housing production during the local government of Luiza Erundina (1989-1992).

UNMP was able to influence public policies by bringing decision makers to adopt programs and projects which, without the action of the movement, they would not have adopted. MCMV-E is the most consistent expression of these conquests at the national level. The programs and rules which were created during its model-life expresses an alternative proposal to public policies which was

constructed in the interactions between movements, technical consulting, governments and communities based on practical learning in given conjunctures. They are not in a classical sense “demands of the movement which the state takes up”. As we saw during the whole story, the process is more complex, given that the proper demand in itself is the result of dynamic interactions between the state and the movement.

To stress that UNMP influences politics does not mean that it obtains “success” in the sense of a doubtless and definitive victory. The conquests were not definitive victories, they were small victories which opened the space of manoeuvre of UNMP for actions in the following rounds, to modify the context in which the interactions between the movement, its allies and opponents take place. In other words, UNMP has impacted on public policies under the form of incremental results in a context which is quite adverse given the supremacy of real estate interests in the production of Brazilian cities. Without power to invert the logic of housing production, one can say that UNMP was “advancing from the margins”, exploiting cracks and windows of opportunities, in an erratic and discontinuous development which characterizes the production of popular housing policies in Brazil.

Notwithstanding the presence of PT in government from 2003 onwards and the creation of the Ministry for Cities, the limits for the inclusion of the movement in the production system for popular housing continued, given the increasing dominance of market interests and construction firms. The federal government adopted anti-poverty policies – with an emphasis of combatting extreme poverty – and stimulated the internal market without confronting the big economic interests. This is called “Lulism” by André Singer (2012). It refers to a political strategy based on the electoral alliance of president Lula with a class fraction, the sub-proletariat, by means of programs like “Zero Hunger” and the improvement of living standards of the poorer half of the population - without confronting capital. It was a sufficiently soft reformism to avoid conflicts. It was in this complex context characterized by the high permeability of the State to movements and the low disposition of the Lula-government to produce radical changes in the system, that UNMP was able to obtain its main conquests.

## **7 Governance challenges**

### **7.1 *Mainstreaming social innovation***

UNMP’s involvement in MCMV-E is a remarkable example of multi-scalar social innovation. Collective organization has systematically linked political mobilization to the improvement of the living conditions of a vulnerable group of the population. Despite many factors being linked to the specific Brazilian institutional framework and political landscape, important lessons for mainstreaming social innovation can be drawn.

The UNMP began to organize in São Paulo on the municipal level and was successful in building up a network nationally in a country with an enormous size. Political lobbying has not been directed exclusively towards material gains for the homeless people represented by UNMP, but also put emphasis on participation in decision-making. The process described above points out the trajectory over the last decades, leading to the active inclusion in the public housing program MCMV-E. Even though it is difficult to compare Brazilian and European federalism, the inclusion of social movements and initiatives into participatory governance settings is of general interest. The linkages between the content, process and empowerment dimensions of social innovation involved individual and collective

processes of empowerment, promoting social innovation in the content, process and empowerment dimensions. The specific historical conjuncture of the international financial crisis coincided with a government trying to impose Keynesian-inspired anti-cyclical policies. Together with the pressure by UNMP, this resulted in the creation of MCMV with its sub-program MCMV-E. Political will to promote social inclusion, as in the case of the Workers Party PT, remains an important element in the setting up of participatory governance settings.

## **7.2 Governing welfare mix – avoiding fragmentation**

As pointed out in the country study on Brazil, the danger of fragmentation is considerably high, due to the size and the countries diversity and inequality, both between and within the different regions. Avoiding fragmentation of a national program designed to work on the local scale is therefore a serious challenge.

As pointed out in chapter 4, the Ministry of Cities and the state-owned bank CEF are the main responsables for running MCMV, reducing the role of regional and local political entities. States and municipalities, de facto, do not participate in the liberation of resources, as there is a more direct relation between the construction firms or the entities of civil society with CEF and the Ministry of Cities.

Due to the logic of MCMV-E being a rather residual part of the bigger MCMV program, another source of fragmentation are differences between MCMV-E and the other 99% of MCMV. The first results of our research (Nepac 2015) show that the dwellings built in the MCMV-E program tended to be both bigger and of better quality than their counterparts in the main MCMV program. Nevertheless, many other problems remain, as the market logic is inherent in all parts of the MCMV program. Construction sites have to be bought in the context of a real estate market with rising prices and further bureaucratic obstacles, leading to social movements witnessing a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis real estate capital (Nepac, 2015). Urbanists have hinted to the fact that urban planning remains secondary with the effect that popular housing sites are allocated in more distant locations of the city. In a note published in November 2014, Rede de Pesquisadores Cidade e Moradia (engl. Network of Researches on the City and Housing) warned:

*(...) a housing program which attends first to the interests of the private sector, without the necessary links to urban and land policies which backs it, stimulates, as an effect of its proper success, the increase in the real estate prices in the city and has led to a very bad urban insertion. This leads to the risk to solidify, in the breath-taking velocity of new contracts, new territories of ghettoization and social segregation.*

An important question for further research would involve the possible impacts of the co-existence of MCMV-E with the other parts of the program. Are there positive impacts on the size of the housing units in other programs? Is there a crowding-out of the smaller social entities involved in MCMV-E by the bigger construction and real estate development firms involved in the remaining 99% of MCMV? So far, these questions could not be answered.

### **7.3 Governing welfare mix – developing a participatory governance style**

MCMV-E permits, but does not oblige, to self-management, understood as participatory governance. In the case of UNMP, the entities manage the construction work, subcontract services, monitor expenses and the construction work in all its stages. Additionally, they share the decision making power with the prospective residents.

In the case of UNMP (which is not the case with all movements), the movement has activists who educate their respective basis that contributes monthly to the movement and that participate in all educational activities, marches, events, meetings of the groups of origin. This differentiates UNMP from many other movements participating in the MCMV-E program and has led to positive results considering the quality of participation of the individual beneficiaries. Furthermore, their undertakings include self-help building (*mutirão*), which means that the prospective residents work some hours per month on the construction site. And it also includes the participation in courses, education, meeting on site, and principally in construction commissions, as the commission for buying material, cleaning of the construction site, garden, etc. The participation in these commissions and assemblies permits the prospective residents to get to know and to reason over the construction project and to control/monitor all stages of the production process. The participants who most contribute in this process can first choose the house or apartment which they want to live in, once the construction work is ready. Thereby, the internal organization of UNMP benefited the establishment of a participatory governance style, while the results with other organizations were rather mixed (Nepac, 2015).

### **7.4 Equality and diversity**

The program does not envisage specific quota for black or indigenous people or women. It is oriented towards families that receive up to R\$ 1.600 (approx. € 500). There is pressure from parts of the movement to increase this value because they consider it very low. There are persons in the movement who receive more, but still are poor and without housing. The government, until now, did not increase this value. In other words, the program attends the most miserable and not the totality of those “without housing”.

### **7.5 Uneven access**

MCMV-E allots a quantity of spots to disabled persons with special needs and elderly. But again, the access is not open to all. As described in c), the program is oriented to those who organize themselves in entities, and are disposed (and achieve) to participate actively in all activities of the movement, in the construction work and outside. For example, a single mother with small children and little help from her family and friends will have difficulties in actively participating in such an intense process. The leaders from UNMP are aware of this, but there is no easy way to solve this problem of access. They assert that the value of this program is small in comparison with the module “construction firms” in MCMV. Persons who cannot or who do not want to actively participate in the movement can choose the other modality of MCMV.

## **7.6 Avoiding responsibility**

As mentioned before, MCMV-E was a demand from the housing movements which wanted to build homes. It is not the state which – in a neoliberal sense – is transferring its responsibilities. It is the movements which demand being the implementers of the policy. Evidently, this creates tensions between the UNMP entities and the respective authorities, notaries and CEF. In a first round, there was a mutual ignorance. The entities had to learn all the bureaucratic steps and struggled with this. The public authorities were not used to handle entities. In some cases, the local employees from CEF even had to be changed due to pressure from the movements. The latter complained that the employees either did not know the program or did everything possible to impede the start of the construction work, by pretending obstacles which did not exist legally. CEF and the Ministry of Cities have special bodies at the federal level to reduce bureaucracy and to launch the program effectively. But this remains a challenge.

With respect to the structure of mobilization and the strategies of action of UNMP, one has to stress the combination of insider and outsider strategies, both subordinated to the main objective which is the negotiation with the State. Internally, this emphasis of negotiation establishes limits to disruptive practices. As was said by an important leader of UNMP “our protests serve to establish negotiations, not to close the doors of access to the State. That is why we have to know the time to go to the street and the time to call the people back” (Interview with Benedito Barbosa, leader of UNMP). The multi-scalar agency has to be stressed, too. UNMP moves itself continuously from the local level to the national territory, with a remarkable capacity of articulation of actions in the interior of these different levels. At the local level, they organize occupations, demonstrations, self-help activities and the self-management of the construction works, political education and participation in the Municipal Council for Housing. At the national level, they pressure the Ministry of Cities, act in the National Council of Cities, organize demonstrations and meetings together with the Ministry of Cities and the Caixa Econômica Federal (CEF, engl. Federal Savings Bank), one of the main public banks owned by the federal government. CEF manages all transfers of resources for housing construction and the financing of the families. One person of the movement even obtained for two years a position in CEF to help to implement and finetune MCMV-E.

But what explains the conquests which the movement obtained? And what were the factors which influenced the results? Our research (Tatagiba, L. & Blikstad, K., 2011, Nepac, 2015, Tatagiba, L.; Paterniani, S. Z. & Trindade, T., 2012; Tatagiba, L. e Teixeira, A. C. 2014) shows that the capacity of mobilization of UNMP obtained better results with governments sympathetic to the movement. The presence of PT in the government opened the space for political experimentation by offering organizational and financial resources which permitted the involved actors to put in practice their ideas with respect to the alternative of self-management. The capacity of mobilization of UNMP, be it by means of protests or via activities within the government as members of the public bureaucracy, pushed the Workers Party governments to take over the agenda of the movement. In other words, in a more general sense one can affirm that UNMP influenced public policies and that this influence is the result of a combination of factors internal and external to the movement.

## **7.7 Managing intra-organizational tensions**

UNMP is a movement with many participatory levels, in its organizational structure as well as in the construction work. In these spaces, participation is promoted and conflicts are perceived as positive and its solution is seen as part of the democratic learning process.

An important conflict emerged concerning the issue of collective self-management. According to Benedito Barbosa (interview), UNMP was lobbying more than once for the viability of collective ownership of self-managed housing. Recently, a working group was created, consisting of members from the movements, CEF and the Ministry of Cities to enable this issue. According to Benedito Barbosa, another systematic criticism of UNMP refers to the possibility of a global service contract in MCMV-E. This would enable an entity to contract one construction firm which executes the whole construction work. Various entities and movements others than UNMP have used this modality available in the program. In its 13rd Meeting, UNMP made the proposal to the Ministry of Cities to end this possibility of construction by a global service contract, knowing that this displeases other movements. In the journal “Jornalzinho da União”, the justification is once again, the relationship between the type of housing construction and the conquest of popular power:

*Self-management is the counterpoint to global service contract, which penalizes the social movements which run behind land, run after municipalities and public authorities, suffer pressure from the community and then hand over everything in the hands of a construction firm. More than only a proposal to construct housing, self-management was defended as a form to strengthen the communities and to construct popular power. (Jornalzinho do 13º Encontro, 24/05/2014, p. 3, our accentuation)*

This vision of UNMP that MCMV-E should mainly be organized by self-management is not at all consensual within the universe of housing movements. For the majority, it is best to subcontract to a construction firm, or at the most, the movement manages the construction work, but with little participation of the future residents. The argument of the other movements is that participation which involves the prospective residents delays the construction work. Another argument is that there does not exist a culture of participation and to involve the prospective residents in the management and the self-help activities leads to resistance by a good part of the involved.

It is a fact that the program today, the way it is organized, allows self-management, but does not oblige to do it. It is possible to make a global service contract, which delegates nearly all the construction process to one building or construction firm. That is why UNMP has struggled to exclude the possibility of a global service contract from the available options in MCMV-E.

## **7.8 Enabling legal framework**

Since its foundation, MCMV-E has suffered from changes in its regulations. These changes reflect, on the one hand, operational problems of housing policies in a new context in which the implementation is under the responsibility of civil society, and on the other hand, reflect the capacity of the movement to experiment, to identify problems, to propose alternatives and to put pressure on governmental bodies (especially CEF) for changes. Our research about the implementation of MCMV-E in São Paulo shows this capacity of the movement to operate on various spatial scales. The know-how and legitimacy of UNMP obtained over its trajectory permitted it to exercise pressure to correct the track

of the program. An example in this respect is the indication of Evaniza Rodrigues, from UNMP as adviser of the president of CEF, a position which she held from 2010-2013, when she returned to União Nacional e à Zona Leste, its territory of activism.

One of the legislative changes of the program most celebrated by the movement was the modality of “acquisition of the land, project elaboration and legalization”, known as “advanced acquisition”, which guarantees resources for the acquisition of land before the process with respect to the viability of the construction work has been finished. The “advanced acquisition” is an attempt to minimize the problems which derive from the lack of disposable land for popular business ventures. Some months later, a new regulation extinguished the “real estate incorporation” (Resolução 190/2012), as a response to the request of UNMP allowing that the popular business ventures could be contracted directly, individualizing them only at the end of the construction. In May 2012, CEF realized a national seminary on MCMV-E, with participants from social movements, regional managers from CEF from the whole country and professional consultants (Rodrigues, 2013, 190). 138 proposals were approved in the seminary, which led, again, to changes in some of the rules.

*Within the changed operational rules, are the simplification of the documents for the modality, the establishment of deadlines for the analyses of the dissemination of material with the requirements of the program. There were, again created new resolutions to define the financeable items, taking away the cap of the value of the evaluation of the produced units, regularize the analysis of the framing of the participating families. (Resolution 190, 193 and 194 from 2012)*

Between 23 and 25 of May 2014, in Belém, UNMP organized its National Meeting which had self-management as its central topic. Furthermore, proposals for the advancement of MCMV-E were discussed, as is expressed in the bulletin of the meeting:

*The majority of interventions [of the participants on May 24] were about Minha Casa, Minha Vida-Entidades (...). All proposals were handed over personally to the representative of the Ministry of Cities, Marcos Aurélio, who was present at the debate. He made a summary of the program and recognized the necessity to enhance it. (Jornalzinho do 13th Meeting, 24/05/2014, 2)*

## References

- Bonduki, N. (2009), Do Projeto Moradia ao programa Minha Casa Minha Vida. São Paulo: Teoria e Debate, n. 82, maio/jun. [<http://www.teoriaedebate.org.br/materias/nacional/do-projeto-moradia-ao-programa-minha-casa-minha-vida>, acessado em 10 de julho de 2014].
- Bonduki, N. (1994), Crise de habitação e luta pela moradia no pós-guerra. In: L. Kowarick (org.), *As lutas sociais e a cidade*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, pp. 95-131.
- Cavalcanti, G. C. V. (2006), Uma concessão ao passado: trajetórias da União dos Movimentos de Moradia de São Paulo. Dissertação de Mestrado. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Doimo, A. M. (1995), A vez a voz do popular: Movimentos sociais e participação política no Brasil pós-70. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará/ANPOCS.
- Cardoso, R. (1983), Movimentos sociais: balanço crítico. In: Sorj, B. Almeida, M. H. T. (orgs.). *Sociedade e política no Brasil pós-64*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Cardoso, R. (1987), Movimentos sociais na América Latina, *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, São Paulo, vol. 1, n° 3, fev. 1987.
- Fraser, N. (1995), From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a "Postsocialist" Age, *New Left Review*, I (212).
- Fraser, N. (2007), Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. In: Held, David/Kaya, Ayse (eds.) *Global Inequality: Patterns and Explanations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 252-272.
- Kowarick, L. (2009), Viver em Risco. São Paulo: Editora 34.
- Krause, C. H. and Balbim, R. N. (2010), O Planejamento da Habitação de Interesse Social no Brasil e a sua Produção Social: desafios e perspectivas. In: Morais, Maria da Piedade/Costa, Marco Aurélio (eds.) *Infraestrutura Social e Urbana no Brasil: subsídios para uma agenda de pesquisa e formulação de políticas públicas - Volume 2*. Brasília: IPEA, pp. 365-403.
- Lago, L. C. (org.) (2012), Autogestão habitacional no Brasil: utopias e contradições. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital/ Observatório das Metrôpoles.
- Mineiro, E. H. and Rodrigues, E. (2012), Do Crédito Solidário ao MCMV Entidades: uma história em construção. In: L. Lago (ed.) *Autogestão habitacional no Brasil: utopias e contradições*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital/ Observatório das Metrôpoles, pp. 19-48.
- Ministério das Cidades (2013), [<http://www.cidades.gov.br/index.php/o-ministerio/noticias/2744-9minha-casa-minha-vida-e-tema-de-apresentacao-do-ministro-aguinaldo-ribeiro-em-barcelona.html>], last access: 30/10/2013]
- Morais, M. P. (2005), The Housing Conditions in Brazilian Urban Areas During the 1990s. In: IPEA. *Texto para discussão 1085*.  
<[http://ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/TDs/td\\_1085.pdf](http://ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/TDs/td_1085.pdf)>.
- Naime, J. (2009), Os interesses em torno da Política de Habitação Social no Brasil: a autogestão no Programa Crédito Solidário. Dissertação de Mestrado. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

- Nepac (2015), Relatório de Pesquisa. Avaliação do Minha Casa, Minha Vida Entidades: O desafio dos beneficiários.
- Neto, V. C. L., Furtado, B. A. and Krause, C. (2013), Estimativas do Déficit Habitacional brasileiro (PNAD 2007-2012). In: *IPEA. Nota Técnica 05*.  
<[http://ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/nota\\_tecnica/131125\\_notatecnicadirur05.pdf](http://ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/nota_tecnica/131125_notatecnicadirur05.pdf)>.
- Neuhold, R. (2009), Os movimentos de moradia e sem-teto e as ocupações de móveis ociosos: a luta por políticas públicas habitacionais na área central da cidade de São Paulo. Dissertação de Mestrado. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Novy, A. (1994), *Lokaler Widerstand und struktureller Wandel in Brasilien. Lokalinitiativen der Armen an der Peripherie von São Paulo*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Oosterlynck, S., Kazepov Y., Novy A., Cools P., Wukovitsch F., Saruis T., Barberis E. and Leubolt B. (2013a), The butterfly and the elephant: local social innovation, the welfare state and new poverty dynamics, ImPRovE Working Paper 13/03.
- Oosterlynck, S., Kazepov Y., Novy A., Cools P., Wukovitsch F., Saruis T., Barberis E. and Leubolt B. (2013b.), Exploring the multi-level governance of welfare provision and social innovation: welfare mix, welfare models and rescaling, ImPRovE Working Paper 13/12.
- Rodrigues, E. (2013), A estratégia fundiária dos movimentos populares na produção autogestionária da moradia. Dissertação de Mestrado. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Serafim, L. (2013), Participação no governo Lula: as pautas da reforma urbana no Ministério das Cidades (2003-2010). Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- Singer, A. (2012), Os sentidos do Lulismo: reforma gradual e pacto conservador. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Tatagiba, L. and Blikstad, K. (2011). Como se fosse uma eleição para vereador: dinâmicas participativas e disputas partidárias na cidade de São Paulo. *Lua Nova*, n. 84, pp. 353-364.
- Tatagiba, L., Paterniani, S. Z. and Trindade, T. (2012), Ocupar, reivindicar, participar: sobre o repertório de ação do movimento de moradia de São Paulo. *Opinião Pública*, vol. 18, nº 2, pp. 399 - 426. DOI: 10.1590/S0104-62762012000200007.
- Tatagiba, L. and Teixeira, A. C. (2014), Os efeitos do movimento de moradia sobre as políticas públicas. Apresentado no IX Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política.
- Trindade, T. (2014), Ampliando o debate sobre a participação política e a construção democrática: o movimento de moradia e as ocupações de imóveis ociosos no centro da cidade de São Paulo. Tese de Doutorado. Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

## Appendix

Coordination and translation of the article: Bernhard Leubolt and Andreas Novy.

The information for this ImPRovE case study benefitted from research carried out as part of the research project 'Avaliação do Programa Minha Casa, Minha Vida – Entidades. O desafio da participação dos beneficiários', Chamada MCTI/CNPq/MCIDADES Nº 11/2012.

The following interviews were used:

- Interview with Benedito Barbosa, UNMP, July 2014;
- Interview with Evaniza Rodrigues, UNMP and consultant of Caixa Econômica Federal during the period of research, October 2013;
- Interviews with 9 anonymized leaders of social organizations, acting as organizing entities of housing units constructed in the State of São Paulo for MCMV-E. Four of these persons were linked to UNMP and five of them were not. The interviews were carried out between June 2013 and June 2014, in the sites of the respective organizations and lasted on average an hour and a half with a semi-structured guideline.

## **ImPRovE: Poverty Reduction in Europe. Social Policy and Innovation**

Poverty Reduction in Europe: Social Policy and Innovation (ImPRovE) is an international research project that brings together ten outstanding research institutes and a broad network of researchers in a concerted effort to study poverty, social policy and social innovation in Europe. The ImPRovE project aims to improve the basis for evidence-based policy making in Europe, both in the short and in the long term. In the short term, this is done by carrying out research that is directly relevant for policymakers. At the same time however, ImPRovE invests in improving the long-term capacity for evidence-based policy making by upgrading the available research infrastructure, by combining both applied and fundamental research, and by optimising the information flow of research results to relevant policy makers and the civil society at large.

The two central questions driving the ImPRovE project are:

How can social cohesion be achieved in Europe?

How can social innovation complement, reinforce and modify macro-level policies and vice versa?

The project runs from March 2012 till February 2016 and receives EU research support to the amount of Euro 2.7 million under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme. The output of ImPRovE will include over 55 research papers, about 16 policy briefs and at least 3 scientific books. The ImPRovE Consortium will organise two international conferences (Spring 2014 and Winter 2015). In addition, ImPRovE will develop a new database of local projects of social innovation in Europe, cross-national comparable reference budgets for 6 countries (Belgium, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy and Spain) and will strongly expand the available policy scenarios in the European microsimulation model EUROMOD.

More detailed information is available on the website <http://improve-research.eu>.

Bea Cantillon (Coordinator)

E-mail: [bea.cantillon@uantwerpen.be](mailto:bea.cantillon@uantwerpen.be)

Phone: +32 3 265 53 98

Address: University of Antwerp – Sint-Jacobstraat 2 (M.177) – 2000 Antwerp - Belgium

Tim Goedemé (Manager)

E-mail: [tim.goedeme@uantwerpen.be](mailto:tim.goedeme@uantwerpen.be)

Phone: +32 3 265 55 55

Mobile: +32 494 82 36 27

Address: University of Antwerp – Sint-Jacobstraat 2 (M.185) – 2000 Antwerp - Belgium