

*Please note*

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in URBAN GEOGRAPHY, 2015, <http://www.tandfonline.com/>. Doi: 10.1080/02723638.2015.1056605.

*Full reference:*

Tulumello S. (2015), Reconsidering neoliberal urban planning in times of crisis: urban regeneration policy in a “dense” space in Lisbon. *Urban Geography*. Doi: [10.1080/02723638.2015.1056605](https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2015.1056605).

**Reconsidering neoliberal urban planning in times of crisis: urban regeneration policy in a “dense” space in Lisbon**

Simone Tulumello

*Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal*

Address: c/o Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Av. Prof. Anibal de Bettencourt, 9, 1600-189, Lisboa, Portugal.

Mail: [simone.tulumello@ics.ulisboa.pt](mailto:simone.tulumello@ics.ulisboa.pt)

Phone: +351-961379236

**Funding**

This work was supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia under Grants SFRH/BPD/86394/2012 and PEst-OE/SADG/LA0013/2013.

**Disclosure statement**

The author has no commercial or financial involvements that might present an appearance of conflict of interest related to the research.

# **Reconsidering neoliberal urban planning in times of crisis: urban regeneration policy in a “dense” space in Lisbon**

## **Abstract**

The article furthers recent debates about the concept of neoliberalism and its use as an explanatory concept, through the analysis of urban planning and regeneration policy in Lisbon in times of crisis and austerity. Suggesting a look at neoliberalization from a three-fold perspective – the project, governmentalities and policy-making – the article debates to what degree current responses to the European economic crisis, i.e. austerity policy, can be understood as a renewed and coherent deployment of neoliberal stances. The article presents implications for urban planning in Lisbon and thus suggests an exploration of the negotiations and clashes of hegemonic neoliberal governmentalities and policies with the local social and spatial fabric. A “deviant” case, Mouraria neighborhood, is chosen for this exploration, a “dense” space in which the outputs of policies are different from what was expected. In conclusion, it is suggested that neoliberalization (in times of crisis) shall be understood as a coherent project and a set of ambiguous governmentalities, which bring about contradictory policy-making at the local level.

## **Keywords**

Urban planning; Planning policy; Crisis; Urban regeneration; Neoliberalization; Gentrification.

## **Introduction**

Geographical and urban studies have recently questioned how (mainstream) urban theories tend to produce universal understandings – often based on an analysis of only a few cases in global cities – and force their use for explaining phenomena onto different contexts and environments (Amin and Graham, 1997; Meagher, 2010; Robinson, 2011). In planning research, explorations of planning cultures (Sanyal, 2005; Knieling and Othengrafen, 2009) and the methodological approach of phronetic research (Flyvbjerg, 2004) have stressed the importance of local contextual characterizations for the production of theory. These approaches share an underlying concern with the risk that the use of concepts generated by a global outlook may force or distort the very understanding of local processes and trends. From a critical perspective, this also entails the risk of not producing knowledge useful for changing the status quo.

From this perspective, some scholars have recently been claiming for a need to go beyond neoliberalism as a theoretical explanatory concept – i.e. a concept which “seeks to explain observed ‘real world’ referents” (Baptista, 2013, 591). Critical geographers have suggested that neoliberalism has seen adaptation over time and space (Brenner et al., 2010a; Theodore and Peck, 2011; Peck, 2013). The existence of “variegated neoliberalization[s]” (Brenner et al., 2010b), that is, adaptations of the neoliberal project to the landscape of institutional, economic, and political contexts, has been the ground for critiques about the usefulness of neoliberalism as an explanatory concept. Parnell and Robinson (2012) suggest shifting the theoretical epicenter of urban studies towards the Global South in order to look beyond neoliberalism.

Baptista (2013) suggests that critiques of neoliberalism have been limited by the fact that they have been concerned with places in the capitalistic core (especially the United States and United Kingdom) or places which have been directly influenced by the actions of dominant capitalism expressed by global institutions – see, e.g., Miraftab’s (2004; 2009) work about post-apartheid Southern Africa under the influence of International Monetary Fund and ONGs. Going beyond a West/South divide, Baptista uses a case at the “borderlands” of urban theory (i.e. in Portugal) and suggests that “current efforts at epistemological renewal within urban studies would benefit from taking up these European cities as relevant cases in their own right because their urban condition is dissimilar (but not exceptional) to that reported in the ‘heartlands’ of urban theory” (2013, 592).

The present article furthers this debate, focusing on urban planning policy, which is a good “way in” for an exploration of variegated neoliberalism because it “provides insights into variable practices, manifestations, and spaces of resistance as well as allowing identification of distinct eras or paradigms” (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2013, 24).

The article explores a case in Portugal, not only because it is in the borderlands of urban theory, but because the economic crisis, the deployment of a European and national austerity policy, and the implementation of anti-crisis policies at the local scale make it an interesting field for a renovated exploration of neoliberal trends from a critical stance. The aim is that of re-building theory in-between two kinds of approach: those which claim a dismissal of the concept of neoliberalism; and those, especially political-economic critiques, that, focusing on the hegemonic dimension of neoliberal policy-making, tend to neglect bottom-up processes of production of urban space. Having in mind Flyvbjerg’s suggestion (2004, 299-300) to critically link macro-level

(structural) and micro-level (contextual) explanations, the article explores multi-scalar relations between austerity policies implemented on a European and national scale and urban regeneration policy in Lisbon.

A review of theoretical critiques of neoliberalization and debates about the emergence of neoliberal trends in urban planning in Portugal and Lisbon opens the article. Then, the article introduces the context of crisis, debating austerity as a renovated deployment of the neoliberal project and its implications for local governmentalities and urban planning in Lisbon. It is thus suggested going beyond an analysis of neoliberal policies *per se* with an exploration of their clashes and negotiations with the spatial and social fabric of urban space. The case of the Mouraria neighborhood in Lisbon is presented and debated with this purpose. The conclusions of the article suggest that neoliberalism is a useful concept for understanding policy-making for urban planning on the condition that it be employed around three different, and interlinked, dimensions: a coherent (global) project, a set of ambiguous governmentalities, and contradictory policy-making at the local scale.

### **Critiques of neoliberalism: project, governmentalities, and urban policy**

Baptista (2013) categorizes two strands of critical literature about neoliberalism: structuralist critiques of neoliberal political-economy and governmentality critiques, which use a Foucauldian approach in order to explore the dynamics of state reconstruction. This article debates the former approach, which has emerged as the dominant critique of neoliberalism in urban studies, while still making use of insights from governmentality critiques.<sup>1</sup>

Neoliberalism, in structural critique, is a project which emerged in the late 1970s for restructuring international capitalism and restoring conditions for capital accumulation (Harvey, 2005). The acknowledgment that the state should not be reduced – as in classical liberal conceptions – but rather reshaped and re-engineered in order to enable generalized competition is at the core of the neoliberal project (Waquant, 2012). State regulation is the key to guarantee market deregulation: “neoliberalization represents an historically specific, unevenly developed, hybrid, patterned tendency of market-disciplinary regulatory restructuring” (Brenner et al., 2010a, 330).

Neoliberalism is understood as “an authoritarian reconfiguration of liberalism [...] specifically designed to meet the challenge of mass democracy and the welfarist demand that came with it” (Seymour, 2014, 7; cf. Blyth, 2013; Blokker, 2014). From a critical perspective, the neoliberal project is incompatible with democracy, but it has to come to terms with it in order to be deployed, hence a set of governmentalities that aim at reshaping people at the same time as the state. On the one hand, the neoliberal capitalist order is presented as inevitable and necessary: there is no alternative (the Thatcherian TINA). Blokker (2014) stresses the resulting depoliticization – i.e. the neglect of political and conflictual dimensions – of the economy and politics. Depoliticization is accompanied, and made possible, by scientization and technocratization, as evident in rhetorical calls for evidence-based policy-making (Torriti, 2010; Sanderson, 2011). On the other hand, consensus is pursued through discursive conventions that, especially at the local scale, emphasize partnerships and networks, participation and empowerment (Jessop, 2002). Miraftab (2004) suggests that, within this frame, hegemonic power shifts from coercion to the use of symbolic and ideological power.

Neoliberal policies have spatial consequences (Sager, 2011). Production of, and consumption over, urban and metropolitan territories are debated as a coherent and long term strategy stemming from neoliberal stances (Theodore and Peck, 2011). On the one hand, land revenue and real-estate assets, crucial for financial speculation, interlink urbanization with capital accumulation. On the other hand, urban policy is considered central in the wider implementation of neoliberal governmentalities, as in housing policy: the Thatcherian “right to buy” was capable of promoting capital accumulation – through mortgages and leverage – while, at the same time, “unscrew[ing] individual and system-level social protection” (Schwartz, 2012, 53), hence commodifying housing.

Sager (2011) evidences common trends and practices in neoliberal urban planning: marketing and city-branding, public-private partnerships, privatization, gentrification, liberalization of formerly public regulated services and sectors. Critiques have shown the deployment of neoliberal governmentalities in urban planning policy and how they are used to favor private interests: democratic deficits (Swyngedouw et al., 2002); depoliticization and neglect of politico-conflictual dimensions (Gualini, 2008; Deas, 2013). As a result, in actual practices, even public participation may not bring about a democratization of planning processes (Afasi, 2003).

As far as the effects of neoliberal urban planning are concerned, Sager (2011) stresses how preferential treatment given to private investors may bring about a worsening of services for people who cannot afford market costs. Planning studies in the United Kingdom debate localism and decentralization\_for the increased social and economic polarization they entail (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2013; Davoudi and Madanipour, 2013; Deas, 2013). Critical geographers debate neoliberal revitalization and regeneration policies for their effects in terms of displacement and social exclusion (see, among others, Smith, 1996; Kern, 2010). Further scholars, addressing dimensions



of security policies, suggest that neoliberal governance has driven the emergence of an urban geopolitics made up of fortification and control (see, among others, Rossi and Vanolo, 2010; Graham, 2010).

### **Critiques of neoliberalism applied to Portugal and Lisbon**

The case of Portugal allows a study of neoliberalization in urban planning policy within a context of turbulent transformations. Similarly to most Southern European countries, the late economic development of Portugal has brought about, during the last two decades, turbulent trends in urbanization, governance, and spatial planning (Malheiros, 2002; Seixas and Albet, 2012): urban territories have been restructured by late suburbanization and reurbanization, whereas the trends that have been reshaping European urban governance have been delayed and made especially complex. In particular, Portuguese recent history has been marked by two crucial moments for the deployment of neoliberal policy: the end, in 1974, of a fifty-year-long authoritarian regime and the adhesion, in 1986, to the European Community, which was followed by a boom of international investment, especially in the retail and real-estate industries (Salgueiro, 1994).

Some scholars have argued that a neoliberal political context is important in order to understand recent Portuguese territorial and urban governance. Fernandes and Chamusca (2014) depict a field dominated by the lack of regional planning, municipal competition, public-private partnerships for urban regeneration, and the prevalence of market-driven urban policies. Mendes provides a critique of the national program for the regeneration of “critical neighborhoods”, concluding that the participatory processes were instrumentally used to “legitimise the State’s capitalist power to regulate” and

favor real-estate stakeholders, strengthening “the power over and the domination of the urban space” (Mendes L., 2010, 1184).

Lisbon, the main metropolitan area of Portugal, is coherent with this context: it lies between an introverted past and recent efforts to emerge as a global-level metropolis, and shows contradictions and delays in the evolution of urban policy towards decentralization and public participation in decision-making (Ferrão, 2003; Seixas and Albet, 2012). Lisbon city is a complex terrain, whose strong symbolic and cultural capital have been put in crisis by thirty years of demographic contraction caused by suburbanization, socio-economic polarization, and weaknesses in urban governance (Oliveira and Pinho, 2010). Some scholars have depicted the emergence, during the 1990s, of neoliberal trends in urban planning in Lisbon. Lund Hansen (2003) highlights a turn towards market oriented planning and asymmetry of governance for the benefit of private capital. Swyngedouw et al. (2002) include the case of the Expo 1998 district in examples of neoliberal urban planning because of the role of the state in covering deficits with advantages for real-estate promoters, the creation of a discretionary planning agency, and the failed connection with other planning tools.

Still assessing the case of a state-led program for urban regeneration addressed by political and academic critiques such as a neoliberal policy, Baptista claims that the program be understood around political aspirations for “a European welfare state apparatus”, “democratization”, and “modernization” (2013, 605). These findings, although relying on evidence from a single case, have a wider theoretical utility because, according to Flyvbjerg’s insights about case-study research (2006), they are capable of problematizing a theory, that is, that neoliberalism *per se* can explain recent evolutions of urban planning. According to these findings, Baptista suggests reducing neoliberalism to the status of one concept among several others – also Hilgers claimed,

on the grounds of the study of governmentalities in Africa, that “neoliberalism is a major element, but just an element, that helps determine the configuration of the state” (2012, 90).

### **New neoliberal governmentalities? From the economic crisis to urban regeneration in Lisbon**

Baptista’s data were gathered before the economic crisis, which is being accompanied by renewed relations between the dimensions of neoliberalism as a hegemonic project, a set of governmentalities, and urban policy-making. This section builds a multi-scalar analysis, which interlinks the local scale – focusing on urban planning and regeneration policy in Lisbon – and the (Southern) European one, for two reasons. Firstly, many see the European crisis, and especially the crisis of Southern European countries, as the culmination of long-term uneven development paths driven by neoclassical economic governance (Hadjimichalis, 2011; Blyth, 2013). Secondly, austerity policies are seen as a full-scale deployment of neoliberal economic and political stances (Blyth, 2013; Seymour, 2014) – and austerity policies have been implemented to a greater extent in those countries that have undergone external bailout by the Troika made up of the International Monetary Fund, European Commission, and European Central Bank, most of them in Southern Europe (Greece, Portugal, and partially Spain).

Housing policy exemplifies the connections between neoliberal ideas, crisis, austerity, and public policy at the urban scale. The erosion of welfare and public housing provision “forced people in the United States and elsewhere to rely ever more on homeownership as a substitute for social risk-sharing mechanisms. Individual efforts

to replace public cash and public services with homeownership pushed home prices up to clearly unsustainable levels” (Schwartz, 2012, 53). The resulting housing bubble allowed enormous leverage in financial markets, hence triggering the financial burst; then, the bailouts of financial institutions transferred the costs of the burst from private to public hands (Blyth, 2013). Austerity, further reducing welfare provision, rather than fixing the causes of the crisis, transferred the costs to the poor and working classes: from a critical perspective, austerity is a neoliberal “class strategy” (Seymour, 2014, 29).

This seems to be the case for Portugal. Long term causes of the economic crisis are found in an economic model that had been betting on low wages and high inequality (Reis and Rodrigues, 2011). A limited provision of affordable housing, together with state-subsidized credit systems, had been encouraging homeownership over three decades (Santos, 2013). Austerity policies were launched by the Portuguese government in 2010 and have then been deployed in full scale since 2011 after the external bailout by the Troika. In the metropolitan area of Lisbon, a correlation between austerity policies and its effect on the social fabric is evident (Seixas et al., 2015): until 2010, the crisis impacted mainly the economic dimension (cf. Ferrão, 2013), whereas since 2011 tax increases as well as social transfers and welfare cuts have strongly affected not only the poorer classes, but also middle-class households, public employees and the elderly.

Within this scenario, the center-left government (Partido Socialista) in charge of Lisbon city since 2007, has been active in re-shaping municipal policy-making in the context of the economic crisis – and the curtailing of national transferences.<sup>2</sup> Examples of this activism are the municipal reform (2012), which reduced the number of parishes and decentralized several competences, and the first participatory budgeting (2007)

launched at the municipal scale in a European capital city. As far as strategies for economic recovery are concerned, special emphasis has been given to urban entrepreneurship support schemes, attraction of global flows of mass tourism, and big events. Seixas et al. (2015) highlight the coexistence of innovation and contradictions in the set of anti-crisis policies deployed.

Political guidance for planning policy has been in the hands of town councilor Manuel Salgado since 2007. Under his guidance, urban regeneration has been at the core of the efforts for, and discourses about, planning policy. The following remarks are grounded on the analysis of original relevant documents (see Appendix) and some interviews and work-meetings with key-informants in municipal departments.<sup>3</sup>

Urban regeneration shapes the strategy of the town master plan, launched in 2008 and approved in 2012, which is called the “3 Rs plan”: reuse, refurbish, regenerate (*reutilizar, reabilitar, regenerar*). At the same time, the new drive for detailed planning was almost exclusively focused on urban regeneration.<sup>4</sup> The discourse on regeneration is connected with the need to attract inhabitants back to the city – Lisbon has lost around one third of its inhabitants between the 1980s and 2000s because of suburbanization – and (re)creating a “vibrant” urban environment. The chief planner responsible for detailed planning describes Lisbon’s urban policy as aimed at “making a cosmopolitan city, a compact city where life is vibrant [*burbulhante*], [where] a multiplicity of uses, activities, an enormous variety of situations [happen]” (interview, my translation).

Three policies are at the core of regeneration strategy: a drive for real-estate refurbishment, municipal housing management, and the BIP/ZIP program (Bairros e Zonas de Intervenção Prioritaria, Priority Intervention Neighborhoods and Areas). A debate about these policies would be useful to question whether and to what degree

neoliberal governmentalities and ideas have permeated urban regeneration policy. The following remarks are grounded on a mix of qualitative analysis and text analysis of the policy documents – the text analysis<sup>5</sup> (Figure 1) was used to highlight clusters of frequent words recurring together and thus to emphasize the core “discourses” (see Farrelly, 2010) of the documents.

#### FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

An excerpt from a newspaper interview with Manuel Salgado clarifies the approach to real-estate refurbishment and council housing management:

Real-estate refurbishment [*reabilitação*] is not a competence of the municipality. The municipality must create tools for private stakeholders to do refurbishment. The municipality must support and give licenses quickly. It must negotiate fiscal incentives with the state and take care of re-housing. The municipality must refurbish its own assets in partnership with financial stakeholders.<sup>6</sup>

The new town master plan extended the eligibility for fiscal incentives for refurbishment to the whole of the urbanized areas. A strategic charter of schemes for stimulating private intervention was thus approved. The strategy is grounded on several typologies of public intervention as a way to stimulate private investment: text analysis emphasizes public works and investments in public spaces and services, leasehold subsidies, and the role of the municipality in speeding up building permission procedures.

The general discourse of the strategic vision for municipal housing stock (around 30,000 units) envisages two different sets of strategies, as emphasized by text

analysis: regeneration and intervention programs in council housing neighborhoods; a set of different strategies (leaseholds; subsidy schemes for young households; sales) for dispersed dwellings. However, the medium-term goal of the vision is the divestiture of the stock, to be reduced by two thirds in ten years, as a way to create revenues for municipal debt reduction and reinvestment in refurbishment (UrbanGuru, 2011, 56). The council housing strategic management program is thus designed around the political decision to go towards the “gradual selling of dwellings to tenants, on a voluntary basis” (ibidem, 54; my translation).

The BIP/ZIP program, launched in 2011, is designed for promoting local partnerships for regeneration in deprived neighborhoods.<sup>7</sup> The scheme aims at “fostering partnerships and small-scale interventions for the improvement of local ‘habitats’”.<sup>8</sup> The program funds, through yearly competitive processes, micro-actions carried out by partnerships of grass-roots organizations. The municipality intervention is limited to expenditure monitoring as a way to promote bottom-up organization. Text analysis emphasizes how the discourse of the charter (2013 version) is grounded on concepts such as entrepreneurship, community making, partnerships, self-organization, and capacity building. Nevertheless, the scarce and sprawled funding allocation<sup>9</sup> may hardly impact the general aim of regenerating 67 neighborhoods, and the competition among neighborhoods has boosted yearly rushes to submit dozens of projects of every kind – from micro public services to cultural events and feasts. On these grounds, the emphasis on empowerment may be interpreted as a way to gloss over the political decision to allocate to the regeneration of deprived areas risible funding, when compared, for instance, to the expenditure for big events or city marketing<sup>10</sup> – something that reminds Miraftab’s critique of the neoliberal instrumental use of empowerment discourses (2004).

To sum up, urban regeneration policy in Lisbon in times of crisis shows a predominance of governmentalities numbered among typical neoliberal ones: public sector activism in favor of private investment; divestiture of council housing stock under a twofold discourse of rationalization of the municipal budget and the right to buy for tenants; emphasis on empowerment, partnerships, and entrepreneurship, which tend to replace public intervention for urban cohesion. Current and potential effects have been debated. Firstly, regeneration policies and refurbishment incentives are driving gentrification in central districts like Chiado, Bairro Alto, and Cais do Sodré (Mendes L., 2013; Nofre, 2013). Secondly, the credit crunch affecting middle-class families and their housing strategies is expected to further shift real-estate refurbishment towards big investors and the tourism industry (Seixas et al., 2015). These two points have been at the core of political critiques by the left-wing parties.

### **Reconsidering neoliberalism in a dense urban space**

Within the crisis context, the study of interconnections between the deployment of austerity – understood, from a critical perspective, as an expression of the neoliberal project – and local transformations in urban governance is capable of building critical links between macro-level (structural) and micro-level (contextual) explanations (cf. Flyvbjerg, 2004, 299–300). The case of Lisbon during the crisis has thus put in crisis the claims for the dismissal of neoliberalism as an explanatory concept. The next step will thus be a (re)building of theory in-between the extremes of neoliberalism as *the explanatory concept* and neoliberalism as *a concept within/like several others*.

In order to do so, the set of governmentalities described in the previous section should be further debated to understand their capacity or not to produce the effects



numbered among those typical of neoliberal urban policy. This is because (neoliberal) policies on urban space are “qualitatively different from a simple straightforward exercise of sociospatial engineering” (Allegra, 2013, 594), inasmuch as they are not deployed on a *tabula rasa*, that is, a neutral ground for top-down modification (cf. Corboz, 1993). On the contrary, according to Lefebvre (1974), (urban) space is a dynamic entity, which unfolds around three dimensions: “spatial practices”, the dimension in which a society shapes its own space; “representations of space”, the space of dominance as conceptualized and planned by scientists, urbanists, and technocrats; and “representational space” lived through images and symbols. From this perspective, governmentalities and policy-making – i.e. the space of technocratic dominance – have to face, and negotiate with, local socio-spatial fabrics and representations.<sup>11</sup> This is especially relevant for governmentalities, such as the neoliberal ones, which are characterized by a search for hegemonic status through consensus-building.

From this perspective, the analysis of neoliberal governmentalities needs to be complemented by an assessment of the clashes and negotiations between the policies stemming from these governmentalities and the urban spaces they are deployed in. From a critical stance, I am interested in exploring how a given urban space is capable of resisting hegemonic neoliberal trends and their effects. And, in this article, I shall explore the case of what I call a “dense” urban space. Density of a substance is a characteristic property that expresses the relation between the mass and how much space it takes up. Accordingly, the density of urban space can be defined as the relation between its public and civic “mass” and the space it takes up: a space is dense, within this perspective, because of the concentration of (different) social groups, activities, understandings, wills, desires, instances, interests, and values.

A dense urban space has two characterizations, one social and one spatial. As for the social dimension, density will refer to the coexistence of social capital and social diversity, as is the case in “super-diverse” contexts, that is, social fabrics characterized by a multiplicity of ethnic and national backgrounds and the “dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants” (Vertovec, 2006, abstract). A corollary of this dimension is the presence of articulated networks of local organizations. As for the spatial dimension, density will refer to a compact urban fabric – as opposed to the geographic isolation brought about by spatial dispersion (cf. Harvey, 1993) – where appropriated public space exists that constitutes the tangible and symbolic space in which civic and political action takes place (cf. Bonafede and Lo Piccolo, 2010).

The next sections build an in-depth analysis, through a case-study approach, of urban regeneration policy in the neighborhood of Mouraria in Lisbon, chosen as a “deviant” case (cf. Flyvbjerg, 2006), that is, one which shows different outputs to others in similar conditions. Deviant cases are useful for theory building inasmuch as they are able to reveal “more information” and clarify deeper causes behind an issue (ibidem). Mouraria, a central historic neighborhood, has recently been characterized by strong transformations linked with urban regeneration policies. Mouraria will be shown to be an especially dense urban space that shows different outputs compared to similar districts undergoing similar policies (i.e. the aforementioned and gentrified Chiado, Bairro Alto, and Cais Do Sodré).

## Urban regeneration policies and local practices in Mouraria

Mouraria (Figure 2) lies in the historic center of Lisbon, on the western slopes of the hills of Castelo and Graça, north-east of Baixa (downtown Lisbon). Mouraria is historically a place of residence for immigrants – Mouraria comes from *Mouros*, Arabs. During the 20th century, it has been a “backdoor to the city” (Malheiros, 2010) for a variety of populations mainly from the Iberian rural regions, former African Portuguese colonies (since the 1970s), and Eastern Asia (since the 1990s). During the decade 2001-2011 Mouraria became a fully multi-ethnic neighborhood with around a third of non-Portuguese residents, from more than 25 nations (Table 1). Nowadays, the characterization of a traditional *bairro* (neighborhood) and a “super-diverse” nature coexist in the identity of Mouraria (Mendes M.M., 2012; Oliveira and Padilla, 2012).

Mouraria is also characterized by a dense fabric of local grass-roots organizations, a mix of historic neighborhood associations and recently founded cultural associations. Some associations grouped together in 2008 under the umbrella group Renovar a Mouraria, whose objectives are “social inclusion, inter-generational cohabitation, a neighborhood more open to the outside population and the revitalization of cultural popular traditions”.<sup>12</sup> The magazine Rosa Maria. Jornal da Mouraria<sup>13</sup>, founded in 2010 by the association, is a good source for following the activities of local groups. An analysis of the eight numbers published so far shows three typologies of articles: reports about ongoing projects and news about cultural events; articles that detail the different cultural traditions and historical heritage in the neighborhood, with special emphasis on the presence of numerous ethnic groups; articles detailing activities carried out by local actors (social work with the homeless, sex-workers, and drug

addicts; fighting against analphabetism; support for the elderly, particularly those living alone).

#### TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

As for the spatial dimension, Mouraria is an example of Arab urbanism, a maze of narrow alleys on the steep slopes of two hills. Its main public spaces, Almirante Reis Avenue and Martim Moniz Square, are located on its western fringe. This spatial duality between generous public spaces and the compact medieval urban fabric is reinforced by a duality between the vitality of the densely appropriated avenue and square – where there are shops, cafes, and services – and the introverted residential streets. In recent decades, Martim Moniz became the center of the neighborhoods’ public life, being characterized by the activities of a plurality of individuals and groups from different economic, social and cultural backgrounds. The square was ideally divided into sectors shaped by spatial references and the practices of different groups (Menezes, 2009): young Africans, gypsy families and young Bengalis. The Chinese community traded informally and, in a marginal corner, the sex trade was practiced.

#### FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Mouraria was, still recently, a “marginal” place within the inner urban core, something typical of Southern European cities (cf. Capursi and Giambalvo, 2006). On the one hand, a relatively deprived social fabric characterized the area, when compared with Lisbon (Table 1). On the other hand, the concentration of immigrants, the visible presence of drug-dealing and prostitution, and a latent conflictuality between different

groups have been consolidating historical narratives of *malandragem* (roguery) associated with the Fado singers of Mouraria (Mendes M.M., 2012). During the 1990s and early 2000s, images spread by the local media insisted on emphasizing social marginality, crime, and danger.<sup>14</sup> As a result, although the area did not show higher crime rates than other parts of the city, Lisboners considered Mouraria as one of the most dangerous areas in town (Esteves, 1999). Mouraria was perceived as a frontier-land, in-between the main touristic districts of the city – Baixa, Castelo and Graça. This was especially true for Martim Moniz square, which marks the frontier with the Baixa – and where tourists have to go to catch the “famous” tram 28. The municipal department responsible for urban security thus decided in 2010 to include Martim Moniz in a project for a CCTV system, which was, however, rejected by the national authority for data protection because of low crime rates (Tulumello, 2013). Nevertheless, the department is working on a renewed version of the project that is expected to be implemented in the near future thanks to a legislative change that made the authority’s opinion not binding.

Mouraria has been, since 2008, at the core of municipal efforts for urban regeneration and the mayor moved his office into the neighborhood in 2011 as a way to symbolize this renovated interest. The policies implemented stem from the municipal strategy previously debated. The detailed land-use plan has been updated in order to simplify real-estate refurbishment, in relation to indications of the strategic charter.<sup>15</sup> Several dwellings have been, and are being, sold within the management strategy of the municipal housing stock: flats in dwellings refurbished by the municipal real-estate company have been sold to young families, and dilapidated dwellings have been sold to be refurbished by private investors.<sup>16</sup>

Numerous regeneration actions (see Appendix) have been coordinated since 2008 under a unique strategy – in fact, the chief planners interviewed talk about a unique regeneration program funded through different sources. Ten actions have been funded by the BIP/ZIP program – Mouraria has been the most successful among the 67 eligible areas in gathering funds, with more than 10% of all available funding (2011–2013 editions). The program Mouraria, *Cidades dentro da Cidade* (Cities within the City) was funded under the “social cohesion” axis of the Lisbon framework program for structural funds (2007–2013) and afterward, through a successful bid by local grass-roots organizations at the municipal participatory budget (2011).<sup>17</sup> Twenty-three projects have been carried out under a community development plan.<sup>18</sup>

The all-round strategy aims at increasing social cohesion and local development through a mix of actions (see Appendix), under three pillars: public space refurbishment; a drive for entrepreneurship and tourism in relation to traditional handicrafts and local heritage; improving services with special attention to vulnerable groups. The investment in public services has been rather limited, amounting to less than 10% of total expenditure. This is because the general discourse, as evident from documents and interviews, stresses partnerships, entrepreneurship, and capacity-building as the means for achieving social cohesion. The “values” underlying the community development plan, for instance, are defined as: capacity building, bottom-up participation, mobilization, diversity, partnership, entrepreneurship, and social innovation. Another dimension, highlighted by Ferro (2012, 78–91), was the “opening” of the neighborhood towards adjacent areas, through the integration of interventions within and outside the historical boundaries of Mouraria, with the aim of overcoming the introversion and social marginalization of the neighborhood.

These efforts have produced effective outputs: public spaces have been renovated, some public services have been activated, and new economic activities pinpoint Mouraria. The planners in charge talk about an “emblematic” program, capable of fostering local socio-economic development and a radical change to the common perception of the area through the engagement of local actors. This last point is a key to understanding the uniqueness of the case. Processes of partnership and participation have been characterized by the existent fabric of local grass-roots – thirteen local associations<sup>19</sup> participated in the regeneration programs, around fifty entities participated in total.

Some studies agree on the fact that recent institutional practices for regeneration in Mouraria have been accompanied, and their effects multiplied, by the effective participation of a multiplicity and diversity of local practices. Ferro (2012) details how the community development program was developed through an actual horizontal and collaborative process, and the central role of claims by local groups for integration, active citizenship, freedom of expression, openness of public spaces and diversity. Ferro highlights that local populations have thus felt like active agents, and perceptions of safety have been improved, especially among the elderly. As far as cultural policies are concerned, Oliveira and Padilla (2012) highlight the mobilization of the different cultural traditions of Mouraria and the appropriation of cultural events by different ethnic groups; Mendes and Padilla (2013) stress how collaboration between institutional and local actors has encouraged grass-roots organizations to engage and interact with different audiences and groups.

The magazine Rosa Maria has been covering the regeneration programs, emphasizing how local associations have been active in protecting weak actors in the process – especially the elderly living in buildings appointed for private refurbishment –

and, more generally, working to prevent displacement.<sup>20</sup> The editorial from n. 2 (2011) sums up the perspective of the association Renovar a Mouraria with respect to the regeneration programs. It evaluates positively that “never have so many refurbishment and social action projects been carried out in our neighborhood, never has such a synergy happened” (my translation) and highlights the open issues (social problems, some feelings of insecurity, isolated elderly people).

The coexistence of a mix of complex, even contradictory, trends characterizes the transformation of public space, as evident in Martim Moniz square, where, in 2012, a cultural promoter created the Mercado de Fusão (Fusion Market). The pedestrian zone was occupied by kiosks and esplanades, a dozen “ethnic” bars as homage to the “multi-culturality” of the place. The public space was partially privatized and a privately managed CCTV system installed. Martim Moniz, becoming a space for a variety of activities related to the cultural market (Figure 3), has assumed a new role in the city’s mainstream representations. Diversity became an attraction, and Martim Moniz has become a “cool” place and a mandatory stop on the itineraries of Lisboners and tourists.<sup>21</sup> New media representations depict a culturally dynamic space for conviviality and sociability (Tulumello and Ferro, 2013). This has brought about new practices and once exogenous users, together with the reshaping of frames of sociability and spatial appropriation: individuals linked to the sex trade and drug dealing had to move towards the outside of the square, other groups had to continuously rework the shapes, times, and places of their living space. The “new” Martim Moniz is at the same time a place shaped by endogenous images, concepts, and meanings and a meeting point for new urban subjects who introduce exogenous values and practices: a heterogeneous urban setting where different actors and social practices interact and mingle around syncretic forms of production of space.<sup>22</sup>



FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

### **Discussion: neoliberal urban planning within a “dense” space**

Is neoliberalism a central explanatory concept for understanding urban planning and regeneration policies around Mouraria? Indeed, in the context of municipal anti-crisis and crisis-driven policies, urban regeneration strategy is designed around a set of governmentalities that can be numbered among those highlighted by critiques of neoliberalization. In Mouraria, under the umbrella of these governmentalities, the analysis of policy-making shows a bulk of contradictions: one could think of planners talking about local development as the key to overcoming feelings of insecurity at the same time as another department works on implementing a CCTV system in a low-crime area; one could think of a strategy funded by both a direct intervention of the municipality (a community development plan) and bids by the grass-roots organizations to be evaluated on a competitive scheme by the municipality itself (BIP/ZIP program).

What is characteristic of Mouraria is that the deployment of neoliberal governmentalities does not seem to be capable of bringing about the de-politicization and technocratization of policy-making for urban planning. Evidence confirms the hypothesis about the “density” of this urban space. On the one hand, an heterogeneity of already existing practices (cf. Mendes M.M., 2012) has been capable of taking advantage of the space of consensus-building entailed by neoliberal governmentalities – also confirmed by the capacity of local actors to be successful in fund-raising through competitive bids and participatory tools. On the other hand, the existence of densely appropriated public spaces has guaranteed a stage where local voices can be represented: it is easier for institutional actors to actively listen to local aspirations in a

context where local actors find a stage for their claims and are active in the production of space.

These specificities influenced the effects of regeneration strategies, when compared to those described by political-economic critiques of neoliberal urban planning, as evident in two dimensions. Firstly, Mouraria has been represented for a long time as an urban “frontier” by discourses that resonates with those depicted in narratives of revanchist urbanism (see Smith, 1996). Yet, in most cases of urban stigmatization (see, amongst others, Young, 1990; Sibley, 1995), once rhetoric about danger and degradation has settled, the discourse crystallizes and becomes the justification for repressive and exclusionary policies. Representations of Martim Moniz, instead, got rapidly re-framed and the discourse about urban difference, once framing the category of danger, suddenly became a category of both a “cool” and politically active place. From the perspective of policy-making, thus, regeneration was not accompanied by the well-known set of urban security policies. Rather than patrols, Mouraria had the mayor settling his office within the neighborhood: imagine, as a comparison, the mayor of New York’s office being moved to the Lower East Side during the 1980s (cf. Smith, 1996). Even now, it is possible to see prostitutes in some streets along with municipal police officers,<sup>23</sup> while police violence seems to be related to a past of seclusion of the neighborhood.<sup>24</sup> The only exception is the attempted implementation of the CCTV system, but political discourses about control systems in Lisbon are much more concerned with “modernization” than “security-making” (Tulumello, 2013).

Secondly, although the concept of gentrification has been used as a buzzword in political critiques of the municipal government, preliminary evidence shows distinctiveness in Mouraria. Real-estate trends (Table 2) excluded, until 2011, localized

increases in rents and values. This may also be explained by the high, but because of population growth, decreasing rate of unoccupied dwellings, which allowed newcomers not to compete with long-term residents. Although census data are not available for evaluating more recent housing trends, an analysis of real-estate websites shows how values per square meter remain around 65–80% of municipal averages.<sup>25</sup> Rent costs have reached Lisbon averages, but they are well below those of other historical neighborhoods.

#### TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Malheiros et al. (2013) depict incoming fluxes of young individuals with relatively low economic and relatively high cultural capital. Nevertheless, these fluxes are not connected with displacement or social polarization. In the first phase (census data available until 2011), demographic data show contradictory trends (Table 1): population growth, the settling of younger and skilled households have been accompanied by ethnicization and the permanence of vulnerable groups – see, for instance, the accelerated growth of unemployment in the first phase of the crisis when compared to Lisbon city. The growth of professional-managerial employees, classic indicator of gentrification (cf. Ley and Dobson, 2008), is not significantly faster than in Lisbon and the total rate in 2011 is still a third of Lisbon average. Malheiros et al. (2013) qualify the ongoing processes as “marginal gentrification”, emphasizing how newcomers tend to establish relationships with individuals “holding a different educational level and, more prominently, with those with a different ethnic background” – also Ferro (2012), Oliveira and Padilla (2012) insist on this last point.

Gentrification processes described in the literature bring about a housing value boom in a matter of years, but this is not the case in Mouraria after six years of regeneration policies. Still, the question of whether such trends will turn towards classic gentrification processes in forthcoming years is still open, as is worth debating using Ley and Dobson's (2008) systematization of factors capable of stopping or freezing gentrification. As for the spatial characteristics and the supply of property acceptable for gentrification, although located in a perfect location (near noble districts, near the amenities and cultural facilities of the historic center), the spatial features of Mouraria make it an unlikely target for affluent newcomers, especially in the highest parts of the hills, because of the steep and narrow alleys, which do not allow for parking spaces, and the fabric of small buildings, which would hardly allow the kind of lifestyle expected by affluent gentrifiers. As for the social composition and the capacity of mobilization, the poverty and high number of immigrants may have been one of the causes of slow gentrification. Ley and Obson (2008, 2474) reminds us that early gentrifiers tend to appreciate cultural diversity, whereas later – and wealthier – gentrifiers are more protective of their investments and tend to be more social exclusionary. However, the specificity of the case of Mouraria is that the regeneration processes are bringing about local development, as well as social cohesion, which may furnish the local population with the capacity to cope with further gentrification trends in the future – and we have seen how local grass-roots organizations are already engaged in preventing localized cases of displacement. As for the policy responses, the municipality is not planning to reinforce the stock of affordable housing, which is an impediment to gentrification. At the national level, the liberalization of the leasehold market brought about by a national law approved at the time of austerity in 2012 may lead to further increases in rents and, eventually, the displacement of vulnerable groups, especially elderly tenants.<sup>26</sup>

To sum up, the question about whether current trends will consolidate in local development, increased diversity, and social cohesion, or they will turn towards advanced stages of gentrification is still open and could be influenced by processes at different levels. An article in the magazine *Rosa Maria* (n. 5, 2013, pp. 24-25), about the aforementioned liberalization of the rent market, highlighting how Mouraria has been one of the neighborhoods least affected by rent growth in Lisbon, questions “for how long?”. The question is indeed open, and the history of Mouraria so far suggests that this will depend a lot on the capacity of this dense space to keep engaging with institutional action and to keep taking advantage of it.

## **Conclusions**

The article explored neoliberalism as an explanatory concept for contemporary urban planning from a double perspective, at the same time structural and contextual, through the study of urban regeneration policy in Lisbon in times of crisis. This has brought about the exploration of three interlinked dimensions: neoliberalism as a project, its governmentalities, and the micro-processes of policy-making. Lisbon has proven to be a useful context for this exploration because of its (and Portugal's) peculiar recent history. In times of crisis, the enforcement of austerity provides a connection between the macro- and micro-scale: from a critical perspective, austerity can be understood as the renovated deployment of a coherent neoliberal project in an urban space. This seems to have brought about, in the local arena, a specific set of governmentalities, which, although deployed under a coherent discourse, appear ambiguous in nature. This ambiguity has resulted in urban policies that show contradictions in their implementation.

I thus suggested looking at governmentalities and urban policies that aspire to a hegemonic state from a dynamic perspective, considering the bottom-up dynamics of production of space as well. The study engaged with theory building through the exploration of neoliberal policies in an urban context showing unexpected outputs when compared to others in similar conditions. The case of the Mouraria neighborhood has shown how, in a “dense” context characterized by distinctive spatial features, appropriated public spaces, social super-diversity and bottom-up organization, local aspirations and wishes can take advantage of the ambiguity and contradictions of neoliberal governmentalities and policy-making. Although the instrumental use of the discursive concepts of participation and empowerment is capable of foreclosing spaces for debate in most contexts, it may open it elsewhere. Put in other words, local empowerment emerges “despite” neoliberalism in some contexts (Miraftab, 2004; 2009), but, in dense urban spaces, it may emerge “within” neoliberal policy. The debate on the density of urban space thus resonates with those on the role of (economic, social, cultural, symbolic) local capitals in the production of urban space (cf. Garbin & Millington, 2012) and complements them with a focus on the spatial dimension. This suggests, from a critical stance – i.e., from a perspective aspiring at progressive or radical change – that working towards “dense” urban spaces is a crucial step in the aim to challenge depoliticization and effects boosted by neoliberal governmentalities. This is especially relevant when looking at the dimension of the timing of transformations and potential drivers of future changes.

I shall thus recall Baptista’s (2013, 605) admonishment that:

[S]cholarly critiques [...] of neoliberalism in urban studies [...] have an intellectual place of origin. [...] They also travel elsewhere [...] [and] may come to exert a form of hegemonic power that can prevent other concepts, analytical frameworks, and forms of

critique play a role in their own right; and, as a result, they may overlook or even distort the understanding of local conditions.

Evidence from Lisbon suggests that the limits of the critiques, at least in some contexts, should not be found in the use itself of neoliberalism as a crucial explanatory concept, but in the way the concept is used: in the approaches to, and methodologies for, critique. A mix of the political-economic and governmentality perspectives has been shown as useful in order to overcome some of these limits.

In conclusion, the connections between top-down austerity pressures and local effects and responses in a Southern European city have been shown to be an appropriate field for the exploration of relations between local processes and global concepts, that is, for furthering the debate on the “sites of epistemological production” (Baptista, 2013, 591) of urban theory. Two points for this research agenda stem from this article. Firstly, preliminary data from Lisbon suggest that in-depth and comparative studies of the specific housing and real-estate trends in cities at the borderlands of urban theory could produce an assessment of the usefulness of the concept of gentrification outside the contexts where it originated – in the sense that different theoretical frameworks may be more appropriate to the understanding of localized processes of land value increase and social recomposition in absence of displacement and/or with peculiar temporal patterns. Secondly, evidence showed a need to go further beyond the, although necessary, recognition of space as shaped by unequal relations of power (cf. Bourdieu, 1993). In order to do so, I suggest that more nuanced understandings of relations between hegemonic processes, grass-roots actions, and urban policy be grounded on the analysis of conflictual and dialogical patterns of production of urban space from the perspective of its variable density, as preliminarily defined here.

## **Acknowledgements**

A preliminary version of the article has been presented at the IX conference of the AESOP Young Academics network in Gothenburg (March 2014). The author would like to thank: Giacomo Ferro for the collaboration in the conference version of the article, Eduardo Ascensão for insightful remarks about the case of Mouraria, three anonymous referees and the editor for critical and constructive commentaries.



## References

- Alfasi, Nurit (2003). Is Public Participation Making Urban Planning More Democratic? The Israeli Experience. *Planning Theory & Practice* 4 (2), 185-202.
- Allegra, Marco (2013). The Politics of Suburbia. Israel's Settlement Policy and the Production of Space in the Metropolitan Area of Jerusalem. *Environment and Planning A* 45 (3), 497-516.
- Allmendinger, Phil & Haughton, Graham (2013). The Evolution and Trajectories of English Spatial Governance: "Neoliberal" Episodes in Planning. *Planning Practice & Research* 28 (1), 6-26.
- Amin, Ash & Graham, Stephen (1997). The Ordinary City. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22 (4), 411-429.
- Baptista, Idalina (2013). The Travels of Critiques of Neoliberalism: Urban Experiences from the "Borderlands". *Urban Geography* 34 (5), 590-611.
- Blokker, Paul (2014). The European Crisis and a Political Critique of Capitalism. *European Journal of Social Theory* 17 (3), 258-274.
- Blyth, Mark (2013). *Austerity. The History of a Dangerous Idea*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bonafede, Giulia & Lo Piccolo, Francesco (2010). Participative Planning Processes in the Absence of the (Public) Space of Democracy. *Planning Practice and Research* 25 (3), 353-375.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, editor (1993). *La Misère du Monde*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Brenner, Neil, Peck, Jamie & Theodore, Nik (2010a). After Neoliberalization? *Globalizations* 7 (3), 327-345.

- Brenner, Neil, Peck, Jamie & Theodore, Nik (2010b). Variegated Neoliberalization: Geographies, Modalities, Pathways. *Global Networks* 10 (2), 182-222.
- Capursi, Vincenza & Giambalvo, Ornella, editors (2006). *Al Centro del Margine. Standard di Vita in un Quartiere del Centro Storico di Palermo*. Milano: FrancoAngel
- Corboz, André (1993). Avete Detto “Spazio”? *Casabella* 597/598, 20-23.
- Davoudi, Simin & Madanipour, Ali (2013). Localism and Neo-Liberal Governmentality. *Town Planning Review* 84 (5), 551-561.
- Deas, Iain (2013). Towards Post-Political Consensus in Urban Policy? Localism and the Emerging Agenda for Regeneration Under the Cameron Government. *Planning Practice & Research* 28 (1), 65-82.
- Esteves, Alina (1999). *A Criminalidade na Cidade de Lisboa. Uma Geografia da Insegurança*, Lisboa: Colibri.
- Falanga, Roberto (2013). *Developing Change: A Psychosociological Action Research with Civil Servants Engaged in Participatory Processes* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Coimbra). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10316/24148> (Accessed March 15, 2015).
- Farrelly, Michael (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis in Political Studies: An Illustrative Analysis of the “Empowerment” Agenda. *Politics* 30 (2), 98-104.
- Feldman, Gregory (2013). The Specific Intellectual’s Pivotal Position: Action, Compassion and Thinking in Administrative Society, an Arendtian View. *Social Antropology* 21 (2), 135-154.
- Fernandes, José R. & Chamusca, Pedro (2014). Urban Policies, Planning and Retail Resilience. *Cities* 36, 170-177.

- Ferrão, João (2003). Para uma Área Metropolitana de Lisboa Cosmopolita e Responsável. In José A. Tenedório, editor, *Atlas da Área Metropolitana de Lisboa*. Lisboa: Área Metropolitana de Lisboa, 317-321.
- Ferrão, João (2013). Território. In José L. Cardoso, Pedro Magalhães & José M. Pais, editors, *Portugal Social de A a Z. Temas em Aberto*. Lisboa: Expresso, 244-257.
- Ferro, Giacomo (2012). *Re-Inventar um Bairro: Análise de uma Reforma Sócio-Urbanística no Bairro da Mouraria* (Master thesis, Universidade Nova de Lisboa). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10362/8714> (Accessed March 15, 2015).
- Flyvbjerg, Bent (2004). Phronetic Planning Research: Theoretical and Methodological Reflections. *Planning Theory & Practice* 5 (3), 283-306.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2), 219-245.
- Garbin, David & Millington, Gareth (2012). Territorial Stigma and the Politics of Resistance in a Parisian *Banlieue*: La Courneuve and Beyond. *Urban Studies* 49 (10), 2067-2083.
- Graham, Stephen (2010). *Cities under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. NY: Verso.
- Gualini, Enrico (2008). "Territorial Cohesion" as a Category of Agency: The Missing Dimension in the EU Spatial Policy Debate. *European Journal of Spatial Development*, refereed paper n. 28.
- Hadjimichalis, Costis (2011). Uneven Geographical Development and Socio-Spatial Justice and Solidarity: European Regions after the 2009 Financial Crisis. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 18 (3), 254-274.
- Harvey, David (1993). Class Relations, Social Justice and the Politics of Difference. In M. Keith & S. Pile, editors, *Place and the Politics of Identity*. London: Routledge, 41-66.

- Harvey, David (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hilgers, Mathieu (2012). The Historicity of the Neoliberal State. *Social Anthropology* 20 (1), 80-94.
- Jessop, Bob (2002). Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective. *Antipode* 34 (3), 452-472.
- Kern, Leslie (2010) Selling the “Scary City”: Gendering Freedom, Fear and Condominium Development in the Neoliberal City. *Social & Cultural Geography* 11 (3), 209-230.
- Knieling, Jörg & Othengrafen, Frank editors (2009). *Planning Cultures in Europe. Decoding Cultural Phenomena in Urban and Regional Planning*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Lefebvre, Henri (1974). *La Production de l'Espace*. Paris, Anthropos.
- Ley, David & Dobson, Cory (2008). Are There Limits to Gentrification? The Context of Impeded Gentrification in Vancouver. *Urban Studies* 45 (12), 2471-2498.
- Lund Hansen, Anders (2003). Rescaling of the Commercial Property Market and Changing Urban Governance in Lisbon. *Géocarrefour* 78 (4), 301-312.
- Malheiros, Jorge (2002). Ethni-Cities: Residential Patterns in Northern European and Mediterranean Metropolises – Implications for Policy Design. *International Journal of Population Geography* 8 (2), 107-134.
- Malheiros, Jorge (2010). Comunidades Indias en Lisboa. ¿Creatividad Aplicada a las Estrategias Empresariales y Sociales? *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals* 92, 119-137.
- Malheiros, Jorge, Carvalho, Rui & Mendes, Luís (2013). Gentrification, Residential Ethnicization and the Social Production of Fragmented Space in Two Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhoods of Lisbon and Bilbao. *Finisterra* 96, 109-135.

- Meagher, Sharon M. (2010). Critical Thinking about the Right to the City. *City* 14 (4), 427-433.
- Mendes, Luís (2010). Neoliberalism and Public Participation in Urban Regeneration in Portugal. In Manfred Schrenk, Vasily V. Popovich & Peter Zeile, editors. *15th International Conference on Urban Planning, Regional Development and Information Society*. Wien: Competence Center for Urban and Regional Development, 1177-1185.
- Mendes, Luís (2013). Public Policies on Urban Rehabilitation and their Effects on Gentrification in Lisbon. *AGIR – Revista Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais e Humanas* 1 (5), 200-218.
- Mendes, Maria M. (2012). Bairro da Mouraria, Território de Diversidade: Entre a Tradição e o Cosmopolitismo. *Sociologia, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto*, thematic issue 1, 15-41.
- Mendes, Maria M. & Padilla, Beatriz (2013). Bairro da Mouraria em Lisboa. *Estudo Prévio* [online]. Retrieved from [www.estudoprevio.net/artigos/22/maria-manuela-mendes-beatriz-padilla-.-bairro-da-mouraria-em-lisboa](http://www.estudoprevio.net/artigos/22/maria-manuela-mendes-beatriz-padilla-.-bairro-da-mouraria-em-lisboa) (Accessed March 15, 2015).
- Menezes, Marluci (2009). A Praça do Martim Moniz: Etnografando Lógicas Socioculturais de Inscrição da Praça no Mapa Social de Lisboa. *Horizontes Antropológicos* 32, 301-328.
- Mirafatab, Faranak (2004). Making Neo-Liberal Governance: The Disempowering Work of Empowerment. *International Planning Studies* 9 (4), 239-259.
- Mirafatab, Faranak (2009). Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South. *Planning Theory* 8 (1), 32-50.
- Nofre, Jordi (2013). “Vintage Nightlife”: Gentrifying Lisbon downtown. *Fennia* 191 (2), 106-121.

- Oliveira, Vítor. & Pinho, Paulo (2010). Lisbon. City Profile. *Cities* 27 (5), 405-419.
- Oliveira, Nuno & Padilla, Beatriz (2012). A Diversidade como Elemento de Desenvolvimento/Atração nas Políticas Locais Urbanas: Contrastes e Semelhanças nos Eventos de Celebração Intercultural. *Sociologia, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto*, thematic issue 1, 129-162.
- Parnell, Susan & Robinson, Jennifer (2012). (Re)theorizing Cities from the Global South: Looking Beyond Neoliberalism. *Urban Geography* 33 (4), 593-617.
- Peck, Jamie (2013). Explaining (with) Neoliberalism. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 1 (2), 132-157.
- Reis, José & Rodrigues, João, editors (2011). *Portugal e a Europa em Crise. Para Acabar com a Economia de Austeridade*. Lisboa: Actual.
- Robinson, Jennifer (2011). Cities in a World of Cities: The Comparative Gesture. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35 (1), 1-23.
- Rossi, Ugo & Vanolo, Alberto (2010). *Geografia Política Urbana*. Roma: Laterza.
- Sager, Tore (2011). Neo-Liberal Urban Planning Policies: A Literature Survey 1990–2010. *Progress in Planning* 76 (4), 147-199.
- Salgueiro, Teresa B. (1994). Novos Produtos Imobiliários e Reestruturação Urbana. *Finisterra* 57, 79-101.
- Sanderson, Ian (2011). Evidence-Based Policy or Policy-Based Evidence? Reflections on Scottish Experience. *Evidence & Policy* 7 (1), 59-76.
- Sanyal, Bishwapriya, editor (2005). *Comparative Planning Cultures*. NY: Routledge.
- Santos, Ana C. (2013). Temos Vivido acima das Nossas Possibilidades?. In José Soeiro, Miguel Cardina & Nuno Serra, editors. *Não Acredite em Tudo o Que Pensa. Mitos do Senso Comum na Era da Austeridade*. Lisboa: Tinta da China, 17-30.

- Schwartz Herman (2012). Housing, the Welfare State, and the Global Financial Crisis: What is the Connection? *Politics & Society* 40 (1), 35-58.
- Seixas, João & Albet, Abel, editors (2012). *Urban Governance in Southern Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Seixas, João, Tulumello, Simone, Drago, Ana & Corvelo, Susana (2016). Potentials and Restrictions on the Changing Dynamics of the Political Spaces in Lisbon. In Jörg Knieling & Frank Othengrafen, editors. *Cities in Crisis. Reflections on the Socio-spatial Impacts of the Economic Crisis and the Strategies and Approaches Applied by Southern European Cities*. London, Routledge (in press).
- Seymour, Richard (2014). *Against Austerity. How We Can Fix the Crisis They Made*. London: Pluto Press.
- Sibley, David (1995). *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Neil (1996). *The New Urban Frontier. Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.
- Swyngedouw, Erik, Moulaert, Frank & Rodriguez, Arantxa (2002). Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large-Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy. *Antipode* 34 (3), 542-577.
- Theodore, Nik & Peck, Jamie (2011). Framing Neoliberal Urbanism: Translating “Commonsense” Urban Policy across the OECD Zone. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 19 (1), 20-41.
- Torriti, Jacopo (2010). Impact Assessment and the Liberalization of the EU Energy Markets: Evidence-Based Policy-Making or Policy-Based Evidence-Making? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48 (4), 1065-1081.

- Tulumello, Simone (2013). Panopticon Sud-Europeo: (Video)sorveglianza, Spazio Pubblico e Politiche Urbane. *Archivio di Studi Urbani e Regionali* 107, 30-51.
- Tulumello, Simone & Ferro, Giacomo (2013). Le volatili rappresentazioni di piazza Martim Moniz a Lisbona, *Quaderni U3*, 1 (3), 13-19.
- UrbanGuru (2011). Programa de Intervenção Estratégica no Património Habitacional Municipal e nos Devolutos Municipais. Relatório final. Lisboa: CML. Retrieved from <http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1323729521D4qVS7sl3Eu87LY5.pdf>. (Accessed March 15, 2015).
- Vertovec, Steven (2006). *The emergence of super-diversity in Britain.*, WP 06-25. Oxford: Compas.
- Wacquant, Loïc (2012). Three Steps to a Historical Anthropology of Actually Existing Neoliberalism. *Social Anthropology* 20 (1), 66-79.
- Young, Iris M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---

1 Although some scholars see the reconciliation between the two strands of critiques as problematic or impossible (Brenner et al., 2010b), the article will show that a mixed conceptual approach is helpful in order to explore the inherent contradictions of some micro-dynamics of neoliberal urban policy.

2 Although historically a left-wing party, the Partido Socialista can nowadays be numbered among the tradition of “new lefts”, like the British Labour, and it is mentioned, in the national debate, as part of the *bloco central* (central bloc), together with the center-right parties. A socialist government, in 2010, approved the first austerity budget and started negotiations for an external bailout.



---

3 Chief planner, Department of Planning and Urban Regeneration (June 2013); chief planner, Urban Planning Division (October 2013); assistant to councillor responsible for Civil Protection and Security (July 2013); person in charge, Traffic Management Division (responsible for CCTV systems) (October 2013).

4 Sixteen plans were launched in the first two years of government, whereas not one had been launched during the two previous years. Of the 30 plans launched (2007–2013), 24 belong to urban regeneration, restructuring, or reconversion typologies.

5 Text analysis with KH Coder (open source, available at <http://khc.sourceforge.net/en/>). See Figure 1 for further details.

6 My translation. Available at: [http://www.dn.pt/inicio/interior.aspx?content\\_id=985824&page=1](http://www.dn.pt/inicio/interior.aspx?content_id=985824&page=1) (Accessed March 15, 2015).

7 For an in-depth analysis of the program, see Falanga (2013).

8 My translation. From the charter (2013 version), available at <http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1359469405A8tLB8be2Mp39YG1.pdf> (Accessed March 15, 2015).

9 €1 m a year, around 0.25% of municipal budget. In three years (2011–2013), 159 projects have been funded in 56 of 67 eligible neighborhoods and an average of €60,000 has been received by each area funded (elaboration of author).

10 As a telling example, the municipality has conceded a €3 million – roughly the amount allocated to BIP/ZIP during three years – tax dispensation to the organizers of the 2014 edition of the Rock in Rio festival.

11 According to Falanga (2013), the municipality has not established a specific

---

was mentioned 12 times: 9 reported crimes (mainly thefts and drug-dealing), 2 mentions in news about drug-related crimes in other parts of the city, and 1 story of social decay.

15 The two versions of the plan are available at [www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes/plano-de-urbanizacao-do-nucleo-historico-da-mouraria](http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes/plano-de-urbanizacao-do-nucleo-historico-da-mouraria) (Accessed March 15, 2015).

16 At the time of writing (October 2014), the municipal enterprise is selling flats in two dwellings (see [www.epul.pt](http://www.epul.pt)), and two dwellings are being sold at public auction (see <http://rehabitarlisboa.cm-lisboa.pt/inicio.html>) within the Rehabilita Primeiro, Paga Depois (Refurbish, Then Pay) program.

17 In 2011, a project for actions for around €1 million became the most voted for ever, and the one which gathered most funds, in the history of Lisbon's participatory budget.

18 See [www.aimouraria.cm-lisboa.pt/](http://www.aimouraria.cm-lisboa.pt/) for details about the second and third program.

19 Associação Conversas de Rua; Associação Crescer na Maior; Associação Renovar a Mouraria; Associação SOU; ConTacto Cultural; Casa da Achada; Casa da Covilha; Casa dos Amigos do Minho; Casa de Lafões; Grupo Gente Nova; Grupo Desportivo da Mouraria; Sport Clube do Intendente; Movimentos de Amigos de São Cristovão.

20 Cf. an article on number 8 (2015), p. 20, titled "Gentrificação: perigosa renovação" (Gentrification: dangerous regeneration).

21 The facebook page of Mercado de Fusão ([www.facebook.com/MercadoFusao?fref=ts](https://www.facebook.com/MercadoFusao?fref=ts)) asserts: "it is the time for Martim Moniz to be the spot of the moment. You have probably already heard about it, and it is pure truth: Martim Moniz is about to become the place to be in Lisbon" (my translation).

22 These remarks are strongly informed by the work carried out by Giacomo Ferro (2012) and the conversations we had during long afternoons in Martim Moniz.

23 The Catholic group Obra Social das Irmãs Oblatas gives social support to sex-workers in the neighborhood and debates about the possibility to create a safe house are ongoing (see Rosa Maria magazine, n. 4, 2012).

---

24 A local activist told me that, when she asked to a drug dealer what he thought of the “new” Mouraria, he answered “at least, policemen aren’t beating us, now!”.

25 Application of Público newspaper (<http://imobiliario.publico.pt/>), which makes use of data gathered by Confidencial Imobiliário ([www.confidencialimobiliario.com/](http://www.confidencialimobiliario.com/)) from the main Portuguese real-estate promoters; websites Imovirtual ([www.imovirtual.com](http://www.imovirtual.com)) and Remax Portugal ([www.remax.pt](http://www.remax.pt)).

26 Law 31/2012, Nova Lei do Arrendamento Urbano (New Law about Leasehold in Urban Areas).

## Appendix

### Documents analyzed

Document	Date	Website
Town master plan	2012 (approved)	<a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/plano-diretor-municipal">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/plano-diretor-municipal</a>
Detailed land-use plans (planos de urbanização)	2007-2013	<a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes</a> <a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-com-termos-de-referencia-aprovados">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-com-termos-de-referencia-aprovados</a>
Detailed non-statutory plans (planos de pormenores)	2007-2013	<a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-eficazes</a> <a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-com-termos-de-referencia-aprovados">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/urbanismo/planeamento-urbano/planos-com-termos-de-referencia-aprovados</a>
Strategic charter 2011-2024 for real-estate refurbishment	2010 (approved)	<a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/VIVER/Urbanismo/urbanismo/Reabilitacao/estrat.pdf">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/VIVER/Urbanismo/urbanismo/Reabilitacao/estrat.pdf</a>
Priority intervention neighborhoods and areas program (BIP/ZIP)	2010 (launched)	<a href="http://bipzip.cm-lisboa.pt/">http://bipzip.cm-lisboa.pt/</a> <a href="http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/?no=271000100460,050">http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/?no=271000100460,050</a>
“10 years vision for the Municipal Housing Stock” and management programme	2011 (approved)	<a href="http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1323729521D4qVS7sl3Eu87LY5.pdf">http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1323729521D4qVS7sl3Eu87LY5.pdf</a>

## Regeneration actions in Mouraria

	Date	Funded by	Partners	Objectives/actions
10 actions funded by priority intervention urban areas programme (BIP/ZIP)	2011-2013 (funded)	Lisbon municipality (0.35 M€)	Lisbon municipality (funding and monitoring) Local grass-root organizations	Building of a community canteen Building of a community center Public services improvement or access facilitation Cultural events
Mouraria, as Cidades dentro da Cidade (Mouraria, the Cities within the City) program	2009 (launched)	QREN (Portuguese Framework Strategy for EU Structural Funds) (7,5 M€) 2011 municipal participatory budgeting (1 M€)	Lisbon municipality and interested parishes Association Renovar a Mouraria Association Casa da Achada EPUL (municipal urban development company)	Public space refurbishment Building of a center for innovation and support of start-ups Building of a center for neighborhood social services. Building of a center for valorization and communication about Fado music. Communication plan, heritage and tourism
Mouraria community development plan	2012 (funded)	Lisbon municipality (1 M€)	Lisbon municipality and interested parishes 39 local and national grass-root associations and groups	Creating opportunities of training and employment Empowering social capital Improving public space usability Better access to health care Improving the image of Mouraria Capacitation of local grass-roots

## Tables

Table 1. Selected demographic census data, 2001-2011.

		2001	2011	Var. 2001/2011
Resident population	Lisboa	564,657	547,631	-3.0%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>2,675</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>14.6%</b>
Non Portuguese residents (%)	Lisboa	3.4	6.3	85.3%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>354.5%</b>
Average age	Lisboa	44.1	44.4	0.7%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>45.5</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>-4.0%</b>
One person households (%)	Lisboa	30.5	34.9	14.4%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>43.4</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
Illiteracy rate	Lisboa	6.0	3.2	-46.6%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>-26.2%</b>
Unemployment rate	Lisboa	7.3	11.8	62.2%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>111.0%</b>
Professional-managerial employees* (%)	Lisboa	30.8	42.4	37.6%
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>43.2%</b>

Elaboration of author on census data, Instituto Nacional de Estatística ([www.ine.pt](http://www.ine.pt)). Data for Mouraria refer to Socorro parish, although few dwellings in Graça, Santa Justa and Anjos parishes pertain to Mouraria as well.

\* Rate of civil officers, managers, executives and specialized professionals (technical and scientific charges) over the employed population.

Table 2. Selected real-estate data, 2001-2011.

		2001	2011	<i>Var. 2001/2011</i>
Unoccupied dwellings (%)	Lisboa	13.9	15.5	<i>11.5%</i>
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>-29.5%</b>
Overcrowded dwellings (%)	Lisboa	15.2	12.1	<i>-20.3%</i>
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>
Average monthly charge for mortgages (€)	Lisboa	425*	475	<i>11.7%</i>
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>336*</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>
Average monthly rent charge (€)	Lisboa	150*	269	<i>78.7%</i>
	<b>Mouraria</b>	<b>130*</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>72.8%</b>

Elaboration of author on census data, Instituto Nacional de Estatística ([www.ine.pt](http://www.ine.pt)).  
Data for Mouraria refer to Socorro parish, although few dwellings in Graça, Santa Justa and Anjos parishes pertain to Mouraria as well.

\* Adjusted to 2011 prices.

## Figure titles and captions

### *Figure 1*

#### Title

Text analysis: main documents for urban regeneration policy in Lisbon

#### Caption

Graphic representation of “co-occurrence networks” of terms into sentences (darker has more connections). The analysis highlighted high-frequency words occurring together, creating content communities (see <http://sourceforge.net/p/khc/discussion/222396/thread/2da0ff02/> for details on methods). Highlights of clusters added by the author.

### *Figure 2*

#### Title

Aerial image of Mouraria in the context of the historic center of Lisbon.

#### Caption

At the Western margin of the neighborhood, the main public spaces, Almirante Reis Avenue and Martim Moniz Square. Map: Google; images: DigitalGlobe, IGP/DGRF.

### *Figure 3*

#### Title

A music event at Martim Moniz square, May 2014.

#### Caption

Photo: author.