

ISRM

W CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF WICKED PROBLEMS



GENTRIFICATION AS COMPATIBLE WITH SOCIAL JUSTICE, SOCIAL RESILIENCE AND DEVELOPMENT

by Uros Popadic M.A.

INTRODUCTION

Gentrification has been generally characterised as a process at odds with Social justice, and as something to be avoided in order to maintain the character of a neighbourhood. I argue that rather, this process is not only natural and inescapable, but can have a positive effect on society while not harming social justice, while its negative effects on lower income people can be easily alleviated by small scale local government intervention. At the same time this process builds social resilience by improving and revitalising neighbourhoods, while opening the opportunity for the improvement of infrastructure and reintegration of decaying areas. We put gentrification in the context of social resilience to review its effects and influence on making urban areas more stable. Therefore we should destigmatize the word and the processes behind it, as they are not abnormal nor to be abhorred. In the essay I review the arguments for and against gentrification to recontextualize it as not being in enmity with social justice, using the theoretical precepts that social justice originates in. I also examine the bad reputation that gentrification has in regards to social justice, where it is considered in a negative aspect, while in fact its negative effects can be alleviated without much hardship. In fact it can improve the city while not opposing social justice at the same time, and as such we should not characterise it as the spatial expression of economic inequality as some would.

We approach the question by a synthesis of the standpoints for and against gentrification, hoping to argue for a recovery of gentrification as a process that can assist us in achieving social justice by being reformed and reconceptualized. We try to see the process from both sides and to review the literature supporting various views, in order to have a fuller understanding of it and its real effects outside of discourse and bias, and we augment this approach by using the novel concepts of social resilience which are becoming more prominent in social science. Our main question therefore is if Gentrification can have a positive effect on social justice, and if so, how can it be adapted and used in this regard. By social justice in reference to gentrification we mean access to affordable housing, greater equality of people within the city to prevent class-conflict and negative emotions, and the prevention of forcible relocation as economically caused by gentrification directly.

SOCIAL JUSTICE IN RELATION TO GENTRIFICATION

The term social justice (SJ onwards) has multiple meanings and is not clearly defined, being understood differently by the general population than by theorists (Sen 2000). It has been mostly connected to ideas surrounding welfare and the economics of welfare, which were for a long time dominated by utilitarianism, focusing on the greatest good for the greatest number of people, however this has obvious shortcomings for the minority and neglects the importance of positive liberties (Sen 2000). This association has persisted to the present day as SJ politics are mostly aimed at wide groups and take a majority angle. The scarcity of resources and opportunities within a society increases justice concerns and social conflict, while judgments of group based deprivation are an antecedent of collective political action and unrest (Tyler and Smith 1995), leading us to expect a greater amount of social unrests and demands for social justice in poorer societies. SJ is a term broadly used in both normative and prescriptive ways, and as both guiding actions as a goal, especially for social policy, even so, the exact meaning of SJ is not strictly defined (Piachaud 2008). The British Labour party attempted to remedy this and has partly defined SJ as the equal worth of all citizens, equal right to be able to meet basic needs, the spreading of opportunities widely, and the reduction of unjustified inequalities. It has declared it a duty of the government to achieve it in the name of the rights of citizens. The goal then, is to create a society of equals under mutual respect, thereby overcoming hierarchical divisions, while lowering the disadvantages of people through government policy to make them more equal socio-economically (Wolff 2008).

Social justice can also be conceived of as a state of affairs in which benefits and burdens in society are dispersed in accordance with some allocation principle, while the norms that govern political life preserve the basic rights and liberties of individuals and groups, and all citizens are treated equally and with dignity. A Socially just social system avoids unnecessary suffering, or any abuse, exploitation and discrimination (Fiske, Gilbert and Gardner 2010), and at its basis such a system creates the fair division of advantages from social cooperation, where all have equal opportunity, focusing on personal liberty and distribution to those of lesser means for basic needs. Inequality can arise both out of choice and uncontrollable circumstances (Wolff 2008), yet governments are usually more concerned with altering outcomes with tax, instead of preventing their occurrence by greater equality of opportunity (Piachaud 2008). It is therefore accepted that to achieve SJ the government needs to be involved in order to right those wrongs which are perceived as occurring automatically in a complex society, in order to make sure that everyone is treated fairly. While basic equality is an accepted moral value, there are deep social injustices that can only be rectified institutionally, for the sake of those oppressed and their participation. SJ is also the degree to which a society supports the institutional conditions for the values of a good life, which include developing capacities, self-expression, and participation in the determining of the conditions of action (Young 1990), making SJ a democratic and egalitarian principle.

A core concept in SJ is relative deprivation, where a population feels dissatisfaction with what they consider an unjust division of social resources and opportunities, with these feelings being often subjective and based on exposure to those who have more.. Social action is mostly taken by the most advantaged part of the disadvantaged who compare themselves to a higher social strata and expect a constant improvement so that they could catch up to those above them (Tyler and Smith 1995). The process of Gentrification for example, displays disadvantages more directly by allowing a direct comparison in the living environment, and creating resentment, but this dissatisfaction is not due to a socio-economic change but a change of perspective in the disadvantaged. People who consider themselves relatively deprived will engage in collective action against the status quo, but this depends on their perceptions which aren't necessarily accurate. While unrest is more likely when a period of decline follows a long period of improvement as the population is used to wellbeing. Relative deprivation at a group level predicts prejudice and outgroup hostility (Fiske, Gilbert and Gardner 2010), as people tend to consider themselves disadvantaged rather than less able than others, demanding redress through justice claims. Individual subjective satisfaction is therefore not linked directly to the objective quality of their personal or group outcomes but depends on comparison of outcomes to others, with the main justice desires being based on fair treatment, procedural equality and adequate reward for effort (Tyler 2003). People not only wish to be treated fairly, but wish others to be treated in the same way, and want others to be roughly equal in outcome to them relative to effort.

We have mentioned that a socially just society needs to be perceived as being fair, and this idea is well exposed by Rawls who defined justice as fairness. In his conception, citizens are free and equal and demand access to primary goods, and he promotes the need for the least well off to be made as well off as possible while maintaining basic freedoms and promoting egalitarianism (Sen 2000). The position of Rawls was that justice is made up of an equal right of all citizens to basic liberty that is compatible with a similar liberty for all, while the socio-economic equalities should be to the greatest benefit to the least advantaged providing equal opportunity (Wolff 2008). In other words, he wants social goods to be distributed equally but in favour of the poor, a fair equality of opportunity, giving the poor a social minimum, increasing employment and distribution that adjusts income by taxes (Piachaud 2008). This further defines SJ as a system aimed at helping the poor alleviate their unenviable position, and allows for a greater role of government in the promotion of their wellbeing.

As for models of distributive justice, equity theory puts forth that satisfaction is not linked to objective outcome levels but to outcomes received relative to those judged to be equitable, equity being in the eye of the beholder and there is rarely agreement as to what is fair. SJ nowadays is more concerned with group relative deprivation instead of focusing on the individuals as social identity is more prevalent (Tyler and Smith 1995). It is also a property of social systems in which distributive justice is concerned with fairness in the distribution of resources and the relative deprivation felt by the members.

It is connected to procedural justice which addresses not only outcomes but the rules which determine the outcomes, and interpersonal justice that incorporates concerns about the treatment of others in everyday life (Fiske, Gilbert and Gardner 2010). In this view SJ is not concerned with the overall betterment and development of society, but of horizontal growth and equality, prioritising equality over overall growth of economic capabilities.

Utilitarianism is an important concept here, as it introduced well being as the public interest and the public good, creating support for the welfare state which reduces misery by redistributing valued resources to those who are worse off through extracting a small amount that doesn't cause suffering from those better off, being consequentialist in ethics (Fiske, Gilbert and Gardner 2010). With this we can connect the idea of equal opportunity for welfare, which is the best interpretation of the ideal of distributive equality, while the concept of resource equality would imply that meeting the basic needs of the disadvantaged would even the playing field to create the possibility for equality. Welfare equality would bring about such distribution of goods that each person enjoys the same basic welfare no matter their starting point (Arneson 1988), which can be considered an underlying goal of SJ. This is because economic inequality underlies the metaphorical walls that separate people, and social ethics with distributive justice can bridge these differences. We should also highlight the related concept of luck egalitarianism, which is a position in justice theory whereby how well-off people are should be determined by their responsible choices and not by differences in their unchosen circumstances (Kohn 2016), creating greater equity and evening out the starting positions in regards to privileges. These policies of social justice have wide support, for example the majority of US citizens believe that government spending on welfare should increase (Cortese 2003), showing that equality is highly sought after in contemporary societies.

Equality is the most used and accepted justice principle, with equal rights and equal treatment but accepting that with equal rights people won't be equally well off, as in a just system entitlements are based on merit which is compatible with social justice (Fiske, Gilbert and Gardner 2010). This concept is often combined with redistribution when considering SJ, with the goal of redistribution being an improved quality of life as being related to justice, so that all people have a right to function capably, which is not only connected to income (Sen 2000). Policies of SJ sometimes seem unfair at the microjustice level but at the macro justice level they are aimed at creating a balance between the resources and opportunities all groups receive and to achieve a smaller difference between the most well off and the least well-off.

People are more likely to make macro level judgements about issues which they believe are beyond the control of individuals (Tyler and Smith 1995), putting hope in public policy. As an example, the British government attempted to limit inequalities and considered an equal society to be one that promotes equal real freedom and opportunity to live in the ways people value and choose, so that everyone can flourish, such a society recognizing the different needs and situations of people and lowering the barriers for who they can be (Burchardt 2008).

Social issues do not affect everyone directly nor in the same way, with people of lower means being more vulnerable to economic shocks and market issues, but socio-economic problems have repercussions that harm all segments of society. This leads to the need for social interventions, which are acts that can occur both at macro and micro levels, and are usually ethically charged and designed to remove those deficiencies that disadvantaged groups of individuals have (Cortese 2003). The feeling of fairness makes social groups exhibit more solidarity and help others, especially in regards to procedural justice, while group membership is an important element in people's self-definitions. People of lesser means are most likely to regard their disadvantage as injustice and demand compensation, whereas the role of justice in this social setting is that of a mechanism that resolves social conflicts (Tyler 2003). We then expect more socially just societies to have more solidarity between citizens, and for those citizens to feel more taken care of due to the wide social nets which encompass them.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND URBANISATION

A society exists in a physical space, with the city being its best example, and for a society to be just, its spatial and urban relations must be just as well, creating a physical component for social justice. The public space is the arena in which society manifests, and in which its concerns can be demonstrated, meaning that for a city and its society to be socially just there must be public spaces which are used freely. For public space to be socially just it should not be homogenised and social differences within it should be respected, while development of that space should benefit all residents and not just the affluent ones, with a specific focus on supporting the disadvantaged. Likewise planning and policy practices should empower rather than deprive those who are oppressed (Harvey 1992), yet we have seen that in recent decades public spaces have been exposed to greater security in order to limit crime, but at the same time there was a negative effect on political freedoms such as protests in an effort to make these spaces public, safe and open to everyone (Mitchell 2003a). Creating security for citizens should not at the same time take away the function of public space in discourse and democratic behaviour, as the street is a site of interaction and the square a gathering place for the community.

Public space is an open area that is not directly controlled, free for people of all social classes (Mitchell 2003b), for social exclusion is not just about income or nominal equality but social networks and life chances, i.e. Social capital. While disadvantage is not a single dimensional concept but there are multiple causes of it, and it implies agency as it is something done to people (Harloe 2001), likewise loss of access to public space is an act against the welfare of its citizens. Public space and its democratic use are connected to calls for inclusion and participation, which would lead to a more deliberative democracy and open communication with a sensitivity to group identity and diversity (Fainstein 2014). Social justice is directly concerned with these issues and therefore must encompass spatial justice and the freedom of public spaces.

The cities of today are constantly changing and are very different than they were a mere half century ago. Most industrial production has been relocated offshore and this has led to deindustrialization and unemployment in cities, with remaining industries prioritising creativity instead of labour. This led to urban economic development policies focused on how to make urban areas grow dynamically in the context of the rise of a creative economy which has changed class structure (Leslie and Catungal 2012). The idea that urban planning should incorporate social justice and allow for the possibilities of citizens to shape their own lives has been discussed for decades, as contemporary economic and social processes tend to generate spatially unjust outcomes. (Fincher and Iveson 2012). We are witnessing the rise of a new creative class which is highly mobile, which is leading cities to focus on the quality of place to attract these people to deteriorating working class urban areas to use them to revitalise those areas. This is associated with gentrification and can entrench class differences and social polarisation within a city. (Leslie and Catungal 2012). These new challenges will define the cities of the future which are facing the challenges of remaining socially just while the societies that make up these cities change in structure.

The major concern over spatial and social justice is gentrification, which creates fears that neighbourhoods would be pacified into tamer and bland versions of themselves, with public spaces no longer being used politically. Democratic discourse can succeed only with certain order and rationality, and can be traced back to the Greek Agora, which was a place of citizenship and unmediated interaction (Mitchell 2003c), and for it to flourish public spaces must remain free and open. Justice is discussed in the field of human geography with respect to gentrification among other processes, which have social consequences such as inequality. We can conceive of a metric of justice that can be used spatially, where a person's capabilities depend on the space around them, capability being a person's freedom to lead the type of life they want, and they externally depend on the social and physical environment in which they are (Israel and Frenkel 2017). Gentrification creates direct changes to the physical environment and also to the social existence of populations, changing their capabilities and possibilities and challenging equal access to public space. We should also keep in mind that the free market leads to uneven spatial development, creating the possibility of oppression of communities systematically, as the living environment of a person can impair the equality of capabilities, and in a free market people of lower means could be confined to poorer areas (Israel and Frenkel 2017). These are not new problems as even fifty years ago there were urban protests due to inadequate services, government inflexibility, even urban renewal, leading to the concept of justice being added to urban studies and a critical view being taken with a view to give all citizens an equal right to public space (Fainstein 2014). Clearly these problems of justice and the just use of space are multidimensional and include social, economic, political and cultural complexities.

A key concept of social justice in a city is social cohesion, which facilitates urban economic development, while social exclusion erodes long run competitive capacity, meaning that urban economic growth and SJ should be compatible and synergistic. However while cohesion is the antonym of exclusion it is not equal to justice or equity, and social cohesion is harmed by urban competition and economic growth which is not equal, necessitating the use of social policy to redress this (Fainstein 2001). There are many ways to increase cohesion and to reduce inequality and inequity, such as increasing cultural capital among the worst off in society, (Israel and Frenkel 2017), or increasing social housing sufficiently for those of lower incomes (Fincher and Iveson 2012), while high levels of reciprocity in social networks increase social capital, levels of trust and shared norms (Harloe 2001), leaving policy makers with plenty of options to prevent emergent socio-spatial problems.

Likewise, emergent place-based policies and interventions can profoundly affect the location of economic activity as well as wages and employment. Income and living conditions vary considerably even between neighbourhoods and even in the most developed countries, and these policies try to redress this by being aimed not at social groups, but neighbourhoods and cities, revitalising them through tax cuts and subsidies, indirectly helping disadvantaged people (Kline and Moretti, 2014). On the other hand, cohesion is harmed by having high levels of income inequality in smaller areas, which can lead to social exclusion and urban failure (Harloe 2001), and social inclusion can be harmed by uneven urban development which can disrupt social relations. The worst problem of such development can be considered to be involuntary displacement, for which a good solution is housing development and subsidy aimed at helping those of lesser means, while allowing for boundaries between districts to remain porous (Fainstein 2014). The problems of urbanisation as related to SJ seem to be myriad, but to each of them policy solutions are being sought after, providing hope that even with the challenges of overpopulation and income inequality, cities could still be revitalised in a fair and inclusive way.

GENTRIFICATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The term gentrification originates from a left-wing critique in the mid sixties in relation to the east end of London being transformed by upper middle class expansion there. The major criticism of the left is that lower class people are displaced and their social relations suffer with a lack of affordable housing and a rise in community conflict (Atkinson 2002, Slater 2011). It has since become a word that electrified class and social debates and enabled a form of mobilisation in relation to the support for the bottom of the urban class structure (Slater 2011). Western cities have changed a lot in the past 50 years which was reflected in social changes in the urban space, with a move from rental to owner occupation and rejuvenation of urban areas. The social character of districts are changed as many previous tenants move away, while the social structure becomes more diverse (Shaw, 2008). Gentrification emerged out of deindustrialization after the 60s, and has since expanded in scope as formerly undesired neighbourhoods became desirable, whereas inner cities are re-urbanised and developed. Moving to other parts of the city is a form of elective belonging, and where people live is an important source of identity for individuals. The divides between classes and neighbourhoods are no longer as apparent or strong, making it hard to define gentrification in practice (Butler 2007). Gentrification occurs in urban areas where prior disinvestment creates opportunities for profitable redevelopment, for the benefit of the middle and upper class, especially in societies where working class industrial jobs are lost and where there is an expansion in middle class professions that require city living. There are various economic, social and cultural reasons for the emerging preference for inner city living by the middle class, and the availability of lower rent areas accommodates them (Slater 2011), and the process seems to have historical precedent, being neither unexpected nor unnatural.

Inner city gentrification is an international phenomenon which has evolved through many stages. A rent gap appeared between the used and potential value of property in the city centre which was dilapidated, motivating capitalist investors, while at the same time property value increase motivates owners to sell property rather than rent it out (Carpenter and Lees 1995). Due to suburbanization many areas were at first left with lower income populations that consumed less and paid less in tax, turning many inner cities into centres of social pathologies, leading to the question as to why the return of affluent citizens would not be welcomed (Vidgor 2002). Gentrification can be seen as a reversal of decline in many cities, but is controversial because of its perceived negative consequences, which are often not followed by evidence, as most residents remain in a gentrifying area and benefit from declining poverty and increased opportunity (Brummet and Reed, 2019). The conversion of working class areas into middle class residential areas is a movement of private market capital going into downtowns, and it led to clustering of new cultural amenities and architectural restoration, reversing the trends of suburbanization and inner city decline (Zukin 1987). With so many positives we could be surprised to find the concept so maligned without strong evidence, but on the other hand it can be considered a social problem due to displacement, as middle class people have limited housing possibilities and might choose to displace lower income ones (Marcuse 2016).

There is a debate over whether gentrification is temporary or the beginning of a long term restructuring of urban space and a part of a larger process of uneven development. It is either a localised small scale process which is symbolically important but dependent on temporary causes such as the price gap and changing lifestyles, or it's part of a larger revitalization of inner cities (Smith 1982). In either case the process is unavoidable and can at best be managed by public policy, yet for this to occur there must first be an understanding of what exactly the effects are, and if the popular opposition to it is warranted or misguided.

The strongest normative argument against gentrification is displacement, which is considered to be an involuntary movement of original inhabitants due to the inflow of new ones. This leads to a demand for it to be managed by policies that limit gentrification even if they are inconsistent with market allocations (Kohn 2016). However this view has been challenged by taking a wider utilitarian stance. Gentrification increases the economic value of the area, leading to public investment as well, but as the population becomes more upscale it leads to direct and indirect displacement (Marcuse 2016), yet through it the decline and disinvestment in inner city neighbourhoods is reversed. The displacement threat exists for the locals who could not afford to stay, however evidence shows that displacement is minimal, and that it's a much more gradual process than previously thought (Freeman 2005). Brummet and Reed found that the increase in out-migration is low and not to worse-off areas generally, while those that remain have direct benefits, and this is true even for the least well-off citizens. Such neighbourhoods are dynamic and diverse and have a higher migration rate in general due to people following opportunities, but the outflow of people of lower income is not lower than elsewhere (Brummet and Reed, 2019). The overall positive effects include renewal of decaying neighbourhoods, increased property values, improvement of local service and deconcentration of poverty. It improves the quality of life and social diversity, and there is mounting evidence that gentrifiers usually come from elsewhere in the city, freeing up space and not increasing the population (Atkinson 2002). The gentrified neighbourhoods have changed patterns of consumption and tastes, with increased business and commercial changes, while public spaces are usually privatised by the gentrifiers and businesses. There is a similarity in the process and results in multiple cities, even with local contextualities, where inner city devalorization and disinvestment are a prerequisite, and the final result is the exploitation of the profit potential by investors through middle class influx (Carpenter and Lees 1995). This would mean that many original inhabitants might find the changes unpleasant, but the majority should not.

After all, not all intra-city moving is displacement, as many people move voluntarily and are happier in their new neighbourhood and are not negatively affected, but as gentrification advances cheaper rent areas become harder to find. The middle class makes use of the rent gap and embraces urban living, putting gentrification on the continuum of urban change (Shaw, 2008) and not outside of it as an imposed process.

Evidence for mass displacement is lacking and often minimal as there are many vacant dwellings as well in gentrifying neighbourhoods, however low income residents are harmed by a higher percentage of their income going for rent. Low income people are actually less likely to be displaced from gentrifying neighbourhoods than other ones, and poor households are less likely to become less poor than be displaced by affluent people. (Byrne 2003). Findings show that displacement does not happen significantly more frequently in gentrifying areas than in general, but remaining tenants certainly had higher living costs, however an increase in employment opportunities and public services would offset that (Vidgor 2002). Provided that other areas of the city are available for lower rent, we can consider that as rent changes are inevitable this process is not unexpected or unnatural.

The link between gentrification and displacement is problematic and hard to track, and while the latter has been proven to occur as a result of the former the results are that the consequences are not that bad quantitatively, however low income people suffer the greater cost (Atkinson 2000). This undermines the main critique of Gentrification, and rather it de-concentrates poverty and provides for diverse neighbourhoods that aids democracy by creating informal social relationships between different classes of people. However it often leads to polarisation as the gentrifiers keep to themselves and do not intermingle with the locals. This transformation can therefore bring benefit or harm to the whole community and the city itself but its effects depend on the composition of the city as a whole (Kohn 2016). As such we can say that gentrification's harm has been exaggerated and does not have the wide effects proposed by critics, rather it highlights what is already there, and there are wider processes going on in cities besides. Without it the inner cities would be significantly poorer places, and it is occurring only in certain neighbourhoods. As a whole the levels of education and occupational attainment are increasing across all social strata when the process is introduced, and it is a useful means of restructuring urban spaces that improves housing quality and social services (Bourne 1993), opening up the possibility of such a change being used by city policy makers for the benefit of all citizens.

We should also consider the political context. Gentrification displaces locals but leads to greater tax yields for the local government, while creating the problem of the removal of low price rental housing from inner cities as stated before. However for the majority of the locals the situation is improved and decrepit areas become more beautiful and the area gains a better reputation (Zukin 1987), as more money is brought into the environment. The problem of displacement is a socially created one and as such it has to be addressed by social policy through a housing plan that's city citywide and creates adequate housing, with tools like mixed income housing and rent limitations. The UK government has already embraced gentrification as a solution for inner city problems and is supportive of it (Marcuse 2016), while experts recommend social policies to prevent displacement and produce affordable housing, and to limit capitalist exploitation of the rent gap, in order to limit social inequalities and displacement (Shaw, 2008). Policy makers should not allow limited displacement to discourage the process which brings so many benefits, especially as the problems it causes are solvable, and their solutions are more easily brought forth with increased funds that the process introduces.

An increase of affluent and well educated citizens is good for cities as those people pay taxes and purchase local goods, and the lack of affordable housing is not an issue of gentrification but of policy mistakes. Cities and areas that attract more affluent residents can finance affordable housing through tax earnings, and there is no sense opposing gentrification by artificially maintaining low quality low income housing in urban centres. The solution lies in the increase of the housing supply city wide (Byrne 2003), and we already saw state intervention involved in the process of gentrification, especially in the US, and this is because local governments want to revitalise decaying neighbourhoods and increase tax revenue. In New York however, policy had shifted away from social policy to more laissez faire approaches as affordable housing was becoming less funded, leading to the third wave of gentrification which is a combination of state and private support for it, with a decline of community opposition (Hackworth and Smith 2001). This lack of political opposition to the third wave should not preclude the continuation of social policies that can alleviate the negative effects.

The critique from the left states that the current economic paradigm serves the need of capital accumulation at the expense of the social needs of home and community, as cities are being regenerated to the detriment of the vulnerable inhabitants who are displaced. Yet even this critique considers gentrification unavoidable and best regulated by policy (Slater 2011). The process has effects beyond the neighbourhoods directly involved as they change the levels of demand in other areas, but it doesn't directly negatively impact the poor, at least not in a way that public policy cannot resolve by aiding the vulnerable. Thus the panic over gentrification is not warranted as the effect is not as large as public outcry shows (Vidgor 2002).

SOCIAL RESILIENCE AND GENTRIFICATION

Social Resilience (SR) has become a useful concept in social studies. It is connected to social coping capacities, which are the abilities of society to overcome adversity, adapt and learn from experience to adjust to the future, and to transform itself and its institutions to better support welfare and social robustness in preparation for crises. It is related to unexpected and rapid social change such as migration and economic transformation, and the ability of society to adapt to new circumstances (Keck and Sakdapolrak 2013). SR is multi-faceted, and includes the capacities of resistance, recovery and creativity, which differ in different segments of communities, with groups being differently resilient and resilient to different threats. Indicators of SR include trust, leadership, collective efficacy, social capital, social cohesion, community involvement, social values, communication and resource dependency (Maguire and Hagan 2007). SR is also considered to be the capacity of people to work together in any community or organisation and advance their wellbeing in response to challenge, and it is an essential characteristic of successful societies, being underpinned by institutional and cultural resources. It is not passive but an active process of response and the product of creative processes in which people cooperate to sustain their well being (Hall 2013). The concept has found wide usage in social research and has proven to be a useful way of conceiving social relations.

SR can be characterised as having key attributes: Knowledge and skill to respond to local needs, Social Capital, Community networks, Connectedness to the local environment, Community infrastructure, And a feeling of engagement and responsibility (Maclean, Cuthill, and Ross, 2014). It can be conceived of as having subdimensions such as: social structure, social capital, social mechanism, social equity and social belief. It can be increased by providing vulnerable communities with effective means of mitigation and strategies. While it is hard to measure SR, discourse surrounding it is an important tool for raising awareness of exposure to risk in order to aid preparedness (Saja et al, 2018). SR capabilities are improved by socio-cultural resources embedded in social networks, and by inclusive institutions. Social changes have an effect on society which is mediated by their cultural values, especially in regards to social shocks such as migration or economic crisis, and the vulnerability of marginalised groups depends on the institutional frameworks supporting them (Hall 2013).

Resilience and vulnerability are approaches to understanding the response of systems and actors to change and shocks, the first originating in ecology and the other in social sciences. These concepts have much convergence, whereas resilience also focuses on recovery and return time after sudden stress, preventing irreversible negative changes and regenerating after disturbance, and then not just persisting but transforming as a result (Miller et al 2010). Vulnerability is defined as the susceptibility to disasters, but they also depend on social structures, such as income distribution, social institutions, economic structures, and technological development (Voss 2008).

Vulnerability is unequally distributed and there is an evident social polarisation and residential segregation that produces negative effects for citizens as poor neighbourhoods lack the social ties for social mobility (Kruger, Seidelsohn and Voss 2015).

To this is connected the new concept of Urban social resilience, which has been gaining ground especially in relation to climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the paradigm is part of the attempt to assess the ability of cities to transform their socio political and economic structures in line with a more challenging future environment (Bouzarovski and M Gentile 2011). Vulnerability is not static but fluid and is agent-based, it's rooted in the actions of the actors and their knowledge, being driven by social networks. Due to the many stresses on a variety of people a bottom up approach is preferable here, while producing blueprints that can be widely applied based on experience and social learning (Miller et al 2010). The introduction of these concepts is both novel and useful as contemporary populations face a wide array of threats which are themselves new and complex.

Putting this in practice we should bear in mind that the limits to adaptation in society depend on the culture and knowledge of said society, as social values vary widely between societies and change significantly over time. Values frame how society develops rules and structures that govern risk and allocate resources, which creates socio-economical limits which are therefore mutable and socially constructed (Adger et al, 2009). Likewise, Social capital has a key role in building and maintaining social resilience, with social relations being an important component of transformation and resilience, especially in communities where there are unequally distributed vulnerabilities and potentials (Keck and Sakdapolrak 2013). Broad social inclusion therefore aids resilience by taking everyone's interests in account so that society as a whole can cope with disaster and adapt while reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience, especially for those most vulnerable (Voss 2008). The perception of risk depends on social values and the policy or lack thereof. Society and culture thereby limit adaptation, which also depends on the goals of adaptation and perception of risk that underline it (Adger et al, 2009), which puts a special emphasis on risk management policy. The distribution of social capital makes areas unequally resilient, and it is important for collective action in negotiating the effects of external stresses, whereas communities of place and action appear that can increase resilience. Trust in organisations and institutions increases the security citizens feel, and is a key component of SR (Kruger, Seidelsohn and Voss 2015), making SR a concept with direct bearing on policy and providing a new dimension of practice and understanding for policy makers.

The first task policy makers face is mitigation, which is a long term preparation of a community for possible shocks, and is the expansion of its capabilities. Societies deal with crises by first being prepared for them, then responding to them, and adapting to new circumstances while gaining new knowledge of the process. After a crisis is over society returns to the mitigation and preparedness phase, but is improved by the experience, making the process cyclical (Maguire and Hagan 2007). Society is a major factor of individual resilience, and with greater capacities social actors can cope with adverse conditions and create proactive responses, thus helping mitigate crises. The risks to which people are resilient include both hazards and vulnerabilities, and society must be able to anticipate and recover from a hazard while lowering overall vulnerability (Obrist, Pfeiffer and Henley 2010). The concept of SR is therefore a useful tool to aid risk assessment and preparedness in pre-disaster phases as well as to support the adaptive and transformative capacities in post-disaster phases. Communities can be engaged through political participation and active institutions which must be engaging and making sure the community plans for disaster mitigation are perceived as competent and adequate (Saja et al, 2018). Mitigation then depends on the whole of society and the political representatives working in unison, trusting each other, and is made or broken on the inclusion of the most vulnerable populations.

DISCUSSION: WEIGHING GENTRIFICATION'S EFFECTS

We consider in our analysis that Gentrification is not an a priori problem for social justice, but can rather be adapted to support its overall goals. The panic and fear of it seems unwarranted, and it appears to be a natural part of urban change, with many positive effects. We have provided some reference to good practice and to empirical support for the benefits and the alleviation of the negative effects of the process, and highlight the increased income brought by the process which local governments can use to solve the housing problems of those who are displaced. The role of the government is normatively supported as necessary, especially the powers associated with social policy, and we argue for policy intervention to straighten the problems which a completely free market leads to in open societies.

The negative effects are quite manageable, and the outcry is mostly based on socio-cultural dislikes as the new arrivals are seen with distrust and disgust by the less affluent locals. However, gentrification does not increase the inequality in the city, most of the arrivals come from elsewhere in the city and are fellow citizens partaking in the same local economy. They were always more affluent but are now more apparent in direct comparison, usually changing neighbourhoods for the better but making prices rise. There is no shame in moving to another part of the city where rents are lower, nor do people have an inherent claim to ownership of a neighbourhood, for people are highly mobile and there is generally a high turnover of people between neighbourhoods with or without gentrification. If housing prices rise, all owners of apartments in the working class neighbourhoods receive much greater income from selling it and moving away, giving a great benefit to those locals, putting the burden on those who rent, however they are already a mobile segment of the population.

Gentrification can improve local services and the local economy, actually improving long term social cohesion provide that polarisation is avoided, as over time the recovering of urban areas is a benefit to all citizens who remain, while those who dislike the change can move and with government help find adequate housing in the areas they find more appropriate. Social justice is concerned with people having equal rights and adequate social support, and as we have seen gentrification can support this by increasing the value of an area and the money available to local governments for social policies, and at the very least it does not harm social justice. This indirectly increases social resilience and makes urban environments more inhabitable, making the concept of gentrification compatible with both social justice and resilience. As such we should avoid a paradox by being so negative against such a tame process, and should take a deeper look before assigning so many negative connotations with it.

CONCLUSION

Gentrification is an unavoidable process, and is often the result of rising prices elsewhere and therefore a need of citizens, not a conscious displacement but a consequence. It seems to be a natural consequence of a post-industrial city as middle class people move back from the suburbs giving these people socio-cultural opportunities that they have a right to. No neighbourhood has its own culture that is frozen outside of the rest of the city, and they change their socio-cultural character constantly over time, and are not preferable to diverse ones. Besides, neighbourhoods are more attractive when they have a socio-cultural mix of people, but a homogeneity of affluent gentrifiers should also be avoided, and according to data, it is, as it mixes the social classes and prevents polarised neighbourhoods. It pushes some people out but not to worse areas, improves new parts of the city and frees up housing elsewhere, as after all gentrifiers come from somewhere else in the city such as the suburbs, and have a right to live in the inner cities as well. Likewise mixed neighbourhoods can increase the social capital of disadvantaged people, and social capital increases both social justice and social resilience. We have shown that the myriad benefits of the process outweigh the negative aspects, while the problems it causes can be solved with policy that is in harmony with the process.

REFERENCES:

- Adger et al. "Are there social limits to adaptation to climate change?" *Climate Change* 2009, 93.
- Arneson, R. "Equality and equal opportunity for welfare." 1988, in *Theories of Justice*, edited by T. Campbell and A. Mancilla, Routledge.
- Atkinson, R. "Does gentrification help or harm urban neighborhoods? An assessment of the evidence-base in the context of the new urban agenda." ESRC Centre for Neighborhood Research, 2002.
- Atkinson, R. "Measuring Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London." *Urban Studies*, 2000.
- Bourne, L. S. "The Myth and Reality of Gentrification: A Commentary on Emerging Urban Forms." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 1993.
- Brummet, Q., and D. Reed. "The effects of gentrification on the well-being and opportunity of original resident adults and children." FRB of Philadelphia Working Paper No. 19-30, 2019.
- Burchardt, T. "Monitoring inequality: putting the capability approach to work." in *Social Justice and Public Policy*, Bristol University Press, 2008.
- Butler, T. "For gentrification?" *Environment and Planning*, Vol. 39, 2007.
- Byrne, J. P. "Two cheers for gentrification." Georgetown University Law Center, 2003.
- Carpenter, J., and L. Lees. "Gentrification in New York, London and Paris: an international comparison." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 1995.
- Cortese, A. "Social ethics and implications for public policy." in *Walls and Bridges: Social Justice and Public Policy*, State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Fainstein, S. "Competitiveness, cohesion and governance: their implications for social justice."
- Fainstein, S. "The just city." *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2014.
- Fincher, R., and K. Iveson. "Justice and injustice in the city." *Geographical Research*, 2012, 50(3).
- Fiske, S., D. Gilbert, and L. Gardner. "Social justice, history, theory and research." J. Jost and A. Kay, *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2010, edited by S. Fiske, D. Gilbert, and L. Gardner.
- Freeman, L. "Displacement or succession: residential mobility in gentrifying neighborhoods." *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 40, No. 4, 2005.
- Hackworth, J., and N. Smith. "The changing state of gentrification." 2000, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 92, No. 4.
- Hall, P. "Introduction." in *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Harloe, M. "Social justice and the city: the new liberal formulation." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* VII, 2001.
- Harvey. "Social justice, postmodernism and the city." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 1992.
- Israel, E., and A. Frenkel. "Social justice and spatial inequality: toward a conceptual framework." *Progress in Human Geography*, 2017.
- Keck, M., and P. Sakdapolrak. "What is social resilience? Lessons learned and ways forward." *Edrkunde* (University of Bonn), 2013.
- Kline, P., and E. Moretti. "People, places and public policy: some simple welfare economics of local development programs." *Annual Review of Economics*, 2014, Vol. 6, Issue 1.

- Kohn, M. "What is wrong with gentrification." in *The Death and Life of the Urban Commonwealth*, 2016, Oxford Academic.
- Kruger, D., Seidelsohn, K., and Voss, M. "Contesting the resilient city: the unequal distribution of vulnerability and the role of social ties." Disaster Research Unit, Freie Universität Berlin, 2015.
- Leslie, D., and J. P. Catungal. "Social justice and the creative city: class gender and racial inequalities." *Geography Compass*, 2012, 6/3.
- Maclean, K., M. Cuthill, and H. Ross. "Six attributes of social resilience." *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, January 2014.
- Maguire, B., and P. Hagan. "Disasters and communities: Understanding social resilience." *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2007.
- Marcuse, P. "Gentrification, social justice and personal ethics." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 2016.
- Miller, F., et al. "Resilience and vulnerability: complementary or conflicting concepts." *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 2010.
- Mitchell, D. "The Right to the City: Social justice and the fight for public space." The Guilford Press, 2003.
- Mitchell, D. "To go again to Hyde Park: Public space, rights and social justice." in *The Right to the City: Social justice and the fight for public space*, The Guilford Press, 2003.
- Mitchell, D. "The end of public space? People's park, the public and the right to the city: Public space, rights and social justice." in *The Right to the City*.
- Obrist, B., C. Pfeiffer, and R. Henley. "Multi-layered social resilience: a new approach in mitigation research." *Progress in Development Studies*, 10, 4, 2010.
- Piachaud, D. "Social justice and public policy: a social policy perspective." in *Social Justice and Public Policy*, Bristol University Press, 2008.
- Sen, Amartya. "Social justice and the distribution of income." *Handbook of Income Distribution*, Vol. 1, 2000.
- Shaw, K. "Gentrification: what it is, why it is and what can be done about it." *Geography Compass* 2, 2008.
- Slater, T. "Gentrification of the city." in *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*, edited by G. Bridge and S. Watson, 2011.
- Tyler, T. "Social Justice." in *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*, edited by R. Brown and S. Gaertner, Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Tyler, T., and H. Smith. "Social justice and social movements." 1995, UC Berkley Institute of Industrial Relations Working Paper No. 61.
- Vigdor, J. L. "Does gentrification harm the poor?" *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 2002.
- Voss, M. "The vulnerable can't speak: An integrative vulnerability approach to disaster and climate change research." *Behemoth, A Journal on Civilization*, 2008, 3.
- Wolff, J. "Social justice and public policy: a view from political philosophy." in *Social Justice and Public Policy*, Bristol University Press, 2008.
- Young, I. M. "Justice and the politics of difference." Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Zukin, S. "Gentrification: culture and capital in the urban core." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 13, 1987.

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE OF STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT

The Institute of Strategic Risk Management (ISRM) is a leading global centre for the promotion and sharing of best-practice strategic risk and crisis management capabilities and thought leadership amongst practitioners, academics and policy makers. Across the Institute's global chapter network, our Members and Fellows help progress and promote the underlying understanding and capabilities associated with strategic risk and crisis management, alongside developing their own personal and professional networks.

The ISRM provides best-practice training, hosts leading events across its global and local networks, and provides strategic advice to support organisations' management of complex risks.

🌐 www.theismr.org

✉ info@theismr.org

ABOUT THE CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF WICKED PROBLEMS

The Centre for the Study of Wicked Problems (CSWP) is an international think-tank dedicated to facilitating effective research, analysis and solutions pertaining to the wicked problems faced by our organisations, governments and communities. The Centre brings together stakeholders, academics, policymakers and practitioners within one common platform to develop effective frameworks and strategies to address multifaceted challenges.

In creating a common global platform, the CSWP is a committed to facilitating a multi-disciplinary approach, recognizing that the complexity of wicked problems requires bringing multiple different perspectives and expertise to the table.

🌐 www.cswp.theismr.org

✉ info@cswp.theismr.org

