

The lives of the excluded matter!  
The centrality of the peripheries in the 2020 municipal  
elections

**A new Network for Inclusion and Right to the City**

The study conducted by the Centro Socio-Pastoral Nossa Senhora da Conceição of Mãe Luiza in Natal (CSPNSC), a member entity of the BR Cidades articulation, based on three more decades of operation in this popular neighborhood of Natal, demonstrates that the Network proposal is sustainable from a budgetary point of view and proposes a four-point commitment for candidates in the 2020 municipal elections.

The Inclusion Network and Right to the City (Inclusion Network) is the instrument to reach the Favelas, Peripheries and rural areas of Brazil, submitted to the chronic abandonment of the Public Power, the access to inclusive public policies and collective equipment for sports, culture, leisure and dignity, materializing a new city experience for the people and making their emancipation possible.

The *Peripheries* concept used is comprehensive and not geographic, including street dwellers and other vulnerable populations.

One of the strategic outcomes of the implementation of the idea of a Network platform is the strengthening and multiplication of citizenship on a population scale, contributing to the stabilization and expansion of the democratic rule of democracy.

The proposal is based, from the theoretical point of view, on the contributions of Paulo Freire and Caio Prado Júnior, for the understanding of the dynamics of social exclusion and inequality; of Henri Lefebvre, for the considerations related to the Right to the City, and of Olívio Dutra, for what is inspired by the Participatory Budget. The elaboration was also influenced by successful experiences such as the Integrated Centers for Public Education (CIEP) of the Leonel Brizola and Darcy Ribeiro government in Rio de Janeiro or the FUNAPS Community Program of the Luiza Erundina and Erminia Maricato government in São Paulo. This theoretical and practical collection was crucial for the construction of the Inclusion Network proposal as a new totality, which is essentially due to

the understanding of the itinerary of more than 30 years of struggles of the community of Mãe Luiza.

**The Network of Inclusion and Right to the City is justified:**

1. For the validity of an unjust State Policy, with a slave-like matrix, organic with it and invisible (for the normality resulting from the consensus) whose purpose is the reproduction of the Brazilian society as it is - marked by inequality from the origin - and which is characterized by:
  - a. a state that excludes;
  - b. a state that abandons;
  - c. a chronic historical and sociologically purposeful underdevelopment for the poorest, oppressing and continually generating more social exclusion, insurmountable difficulties and suffering for our people.



Passo da Pátria is located 2Km from the headquarters of the City Hall of Natal, 2018



Chácara Santa Luzia is a 40-year-old occupation located 10 km from the government center in Brasília/DF, 2019

## 2. For the need of a turn

Towards a new State policy, which breaks with the current State policy, to be built by participatory dialogue with each community for the construction of the future society, and which is able to promote:

- a. participatory territorial development for social inclusion rather than abandonment;
- b. opportunities, self-confidence, emancipation, social participation and citizenship on a population scale



Mãe Luiza's Philharmonic Concert in a neighborhood street, 2019



Arena do Morro Gymnasium in Mãe Luiza, outdoor view, 2019

### **What does this Network incorporate?**

The Network is composed of equipment, policies, actions and infrastructures that will be the object of the construction of each community in a democratic process of **Participatory Territorial Planning** that will have to state the priority needs and demands for each community and its solutions. This planning must be the joint initiative of a Public Power (today municipal) that is committed to this cause and of the associative and collective entities of each neighborhood, resulting in the agreement of a calendar for the implementation of collective equipment and policies resulting from this Planning.

Without prejudice to other ideas coming from the communities themselves in the democratic process of **Participatory Territorial Planning**, the following equipment and its public policies should be presented as examples of what can be done with available public resources:

**Collective equipment, actions and policies to be agreed upon by the Public Power with the communities in a feasible timetable**

1) Land access considerations

The implementation of the Network proposed here will not take place in

an environment of political or administrative neutrality, since the urban - being the privileged place for the meeting of differences - shows conflicts of interest that guide the production of space. Therefore, it is necessary to underline the discussion of the guarantee and security of access to land, as well as the permanence of the communities in the post-planning territories and insertion of the equipment proposed here, which will certainly gain market value, to the detriment of their previous *status*.

In addition, with the expectation that groups not necessarily linked to specific territories, such as the street population, will be attended to, it is necessary to guide their settlement - when appropriate - in central areas and provided with infrastructure. In this sense, being the Network an articulation between organized civil society and the Municipal Public Power, we underline the importance of its articulation with the policies of land regularization and land use and occupation, markedly the Master Plan of the municipality, when there is one.

## 2) Public Infrastructure

- Sustainable urban drainage devices: permeable pavements, open vegetating channels, accumulation reservoirs, infiltration ponds, vegetating strips and rain gardens;
- public stairwell;
- paving of footpaths and vehicles;
- containment of slopes (slopes, cliffs etc.);
- basic sanitation;
- street lighting;
- Interventions in unhealthy or risky homes.

## 3) Possible Social and Urban Equipment

### 3.1) Cultural and leisure

buildings

- community libraries (located in their own building in neighborhoods, schools or prisons);
- sports center;
- public pools;

- cultural centers;
- event halls, celebrations and family gatherings, with community cuisine;
- rooms for association meetings equipped with the necessary furniture and equipment
- rooms for the presentation of school events, for cultural, theatre and film shows;
- museum of community memory;
- day care center for senior citizens;
- community toys.

### 3.2) Free public spaces

- amphitheatres;
- pedestrian boulevards;
- acoustic shells;
- leisure areas for families;
- playgrounds;
- lookouts;
- sidewalks;
- multifunctional open spaces

### 3.3) Utility (or income generating) equipment

- Public sinks and laundries for residents including supplies for street people;
- wake centers;
- community gardens;
- community kitchens;
- workshops for handicrafts and plastic arts;
- sewing workshops;
- Support for the acquisition and maintenance of working tools for informal workers
- Public markets (agroecology, fishing, family farming, handicrafts and other local products);
- Fairs support units.

## 4) Equipment and actions of environmental interest

- parks in areas of environmental interest;
- squares and spaces with scenic-landscape potential;
- public afforestation;
- urban landscaping;
- depollution of water bodies;
- ecopost of environmental education;
- ecological museum

### **Parallel to other existing networks**

The Inclusion Network could be assimilated to the Education Network, which is made up of Pre-Schools, Elementary, Secondary, Technical and Higher Education, as well as its educational policies, or to the Health Network, which is made up of Basic Health Units, Polyclinics, Laboratories, Hospitals and Maternity Hospitals and its public policies. The SUS (Brazilian Health System) Network also owes its existence to the struggles for Sanitary Reform.

In the Inclusion Network, the collective equipment is aimed at guaranteeing the quality of life and the development of Citizenship. It presupposes the implementation and articulation of public policies and initiatives to address environmental risks and the problem of homelessness and unhealthy and unsafe housing.

### **How was this equipment sized?**

It was considered for sizing purposes:

- a target population corresponding to the poorest third of the total population of the municipality;
- a collective equipment, public policy implemented or environmental risk confrontation carried out for each group of 20,000 inhabitants each year;
- a cost estimate of the constructed square meter of high commercial standard or, for calculation purposes, the average value of R\$2,000.00 ensuring good design and execution standards;
- sufficient budgets for the construction of a collective equipment with 750 square meters, or for the implementation of a specific public policy, in values



that are equivalent, in 2020, to at least 1.5 million Brazilian Reais per year per community;

- a list of collective and political equipment in a range that goes from the public swimming pool to the elderly day care centre, through the diagnosis of environmental risks and open to other ideas and needs that can be enunciated by each community in the Participatory Territorial Planning process;
- a participatory methodology for defining this agenda for collective equipment or public policies, including
  - a) Participatory planning processes that result in short, medium and long term territorial development projects;
  - b) public competitions for architectural and urbanism projects;
  - c) employability of local labor to strengthen the bond and identity of the community with local labor and income generation;
  - d) shared and bipartite management between the Public Power and Associations and local community organisations for the management of collective equipment when in operation
  - e) Connection to Technical Assistance in Housing of Social Interest (ATHIS)

### **Physical costs of implementing the Network considering municipal budgets: the example of Natal RN**

- Natal has, according to IBGE, a population of 817,590 inhabitants.
- In its poorest third are therefore 272,530 people or, for the purposes of the proposed sizing, about 14 groupings of 20,000 inhabitants.
- Applying 1.5 million Brazilian Reals per year in each of these clusters, the municipality would invest 21 million Brazilian Reals per year or 0.63% of its budget for 2020. This amount is equivalent, on average, to 0.58% of the budget of Brazilian capital cities.



Brazilian states capitals	Population (2012)	Poorest third target of the policy	Poorest third by groupings of twenty thousand inhabitants	Cost per municipality considering 1.5 million reais per	Municipal budgets (2019/2020) incomes	Percentage of costs in municipal budgets
Porto Velho	442701	147567	7	R\$ 11.067.525	R\$ 1.558.036.080	0,71%
Rio Branco	348354	116118	6	R\$ 8.708.850	R\$ 829.051.331	1,05%
Manaus	1861838	620613	31	R\$ 46.545.950	R\$ 5.149.837.000	0,90%
Boa Vista	296959	98986	5	R\$ 7.423.975	R\$ 1.344.914.737	0,55%
Belém	1410430	470143	24	R\$ 35.260.750	R\$ 3.725.147.000	0,95%
Macapá	415554	138518	7	R\$ 10.388.850	R\$ 840.068.000	1,24%
Palmas	242070	80690	4	R\$ 6.051.750	R\$ 1.364.000.000	0,44%
São Luís	1039610	346537	17	R\$ 25.990.250	R\$ 3.390.370.000	0,77%
Teresina	830231	276744	14	R\$ 20.755.775	R\$ 3.590.015.000	0,58%
Fortaleza	2500194	833398	42	R\$ 62.504.850	R\$ 8.541.489.019	0,73%
Natal	817590	272530	14	R\$ 20.439.750	R\$ 3.226.694.000	0,63%
João Pessoa	742478	247493	12	R\$ 18.561.950	R\$ 2.322.071.000	0,80%
Recife	1555039	518346	26	R\$ 38.875.975	R\$ 6.375.627.000	0,61%
Maceió	953393	317798	16	R\$ 23.834.825	R\$ 2.600.000.000	0,92%
Aracaju	587701	195900	10	R\$ 14.692.525	R\$ 2.382.000.000	0,62%
Salvador	2710968	903656	45	R\$ 67.774.200	R\$ 8.022.875.000	0,84%
Belo Horizonte	2395785	798595	40	R\$ 59.894.625	R\$ 12.106.581.000	0,49%
Vitória	333162	111054	6	R\$ 8.329.050	R\$ 1.659.981.077	0,50%
Rio de Janeiro	6390290	2130097	107	R\$ 159.757.250	R\$ 31.001.430.204	0,52%
São Paulo	11376685	3792228	190	R\$ 284.417.125	R\$ 65.662.001.878	0,43%
Curitiba	1776761	592254	30	R\$ 44.419.025	R\$ 9.400.000.000	0,47%
Florianópolis	433158	144386	7	R\$ 10.828.950	R\$ 2.048.266.161	0,53%
Porto Alegre	1416714	472238	24	R\$ 35.417.850	R\$ 7.723.000.000	0,46%
Campo Grande	805397	268466	13	R\$ 20.134.925	R\$ 4.307.329.000	0,47%
Cuiabá	561329	187110	9	R\$ 14.033.225	R\$ 2.663.916.427	0,53%
Goiânia	1333767	444589	22	R\$ 33.344.175	R\$ 5.756.298.170	0,58%
Total	46226690	15408897	770	R\$ 1.155.667.250	R\$ 197.590.999.084	0,58%

Sources: Municipal LDOs 2019 and 2020 and Municipal Powers Media Information

## The physical costs of setting up the Network, taking into account the federal budget

- We are 210 million inhabitants who could, for cost dimensioning purposes, be divided into 10,500 groups of 20,000 inhabitants;
- The poorest or most socially vulnerable 30% of these 10,500 groups correspond to 3,500 groups with 20,000 inhabitants;
- By investing, definitively, as a State Policy, R\$1,500,000.00 (2020 values) per year for each of these 3,500 communities, in collective equipment and other planned initiatives and policies, R\$5,250,000,000 (five billion two hundred and fifty million reais per year) would be needed;
- These 5.25 billion corresponded to 0.16% of the 2019 Union budget, which was R\$3.26 trillion. If we add 10% of this amount for expenses of funding and Human Resources, we will reach 0.2% of the budget or 6.2 billion reais per year.

By way of comparison, the Brazilian prison system consumes 15.8 billion per year. The investments planned for the Inclusion Network are likely to progressively reduce a large part of the costs in Public Security.

## Human Resources, funding, management and land expenses

### *Human Resources*

The initiatives in the Inclusion Network, unlike the Health Network or the

Education Network, require a relatively low number of people employed. A community library, a public swimming pool, a multi-sport gymnasium or a presentation room can operate with a minimum number of professionals who should be concentrated, above all, on ensuring that the spaces are available for continuous use.

Partnerships with Universities and the Education Network will allow even more qualified use of the available collective equipment, when it will be supplementary to that of the school or when it will be used for sports or cultural activities, for example.

Other initiatives, such as the planned Public Spaces, should, to ensure their proper functioning, be the object of public hygiene and cleaning actions, normally already ensured by the municipality and, eventually, Public Security. With costs in the order of 0.5% of the capital budgets, it is estimated that the Inclusion Network will produce a maximum of 5% to 10% of that 0.5%, or 0.025% to 0.05% of the cost of the investment in physical works specifically in the area of People Management. This suggests that there will be a vegetative growth of expenditures within the limits of sustainability and indicating that until the amounts spent in the first year double, (from 0.5% to 1.0% of the municipal budget) will have elapsed ten to twenty years.

If we include the other Federation entities in the effort to finance the Network, which should be sought, we will see that the costs with human resources for the maintenance of equipment for public use are sustainable.

### *Funding*

The cost of the initiatives can be met, in part, using various materials already planned for other networks. Education, for example, receives sports materials for Physical Education that can be used by the student in school activities in sports environments provided by the Inclusion Network. Furthermore, it is estimated that not all initiatives will require large expenses in funding, as is the case of the Public Spaces planned, in which the cost of cleaning and security activities is already sized by the municipal governments. On the other hand, collective equipment that focuses essentially on providing space for community, associative, or family activities will have part of the funding expenses shared

with these users. Therefore, it is considered that the funding does not represent an increase in expenses that threatens the sustainability of the Inclusion Network.

### *Management*

The Inclusion Network provides for the management of initiatives to be carried out in a bipartite manner between the Public Power, represented by their related Secretariats, and the Communities, represented by their community entities.

There shall be a bipartite board of directors for all the initiatives in the territorial area, and the members external to the Public Power, chosen by the communities, shall be remunerated for the exercise of the management position of the Inclusion Network in the territory. In order to dimension costs, it is admitted that this minimum local territorial directorate may be remunerated in the amounts received by the directors of the Basic Care Units or of the local Schools. They will be the target of a policy of continuous training in the context of the Network.

### *Land*

The collective equipment and interventions foreseen in the Inclusion Network should be, as a priority, deployed on public land. However, not all territories will have public lands available for the inclusive local development agenda and, in these cases, the lands will have to be acquired by the Public Power to materialize the agenda. This may slow down the process, because what could be built with the budget of one year will require the budget possibly of two, the first year will be conditioned by the previous acquisition of the land and the second by the execution of the project. The extension of the execution of the agenda, however, does not make it impossible, it will only condition its implementation to the reality of each case. It will be faster where there is availability of public land and slower where there is not. Another possibility of intervention concerns the requalification of existing buildings that can be adapted to comply with the function defined in participatory territorial planning. This strategy can cheapen the intervention and revitalize structures with

historical, architectural or cultural value.

### **What commitments should candidates make for the 2020 municipal elections?**

A four-point agenda:

1. The commitment of the candidates and parties in the democratic and popular field to allocate at least 0.5% of the municipal budget to this infrastructure and public policy agenda in an organic and definitive way, with a view to its sustainability as a State Policy for the long term.
2. The commitment that the investment is made through a Participatory Territorial Planning process with short, medium and long term clippings, involving each community in the design of its own territorial development project.
3. The commitment that each community, respecting the participatory methodology, will be presented with a list of public and political facilities as an example of what can be done with the available resources, because it is difficult in social exclusion to dream and fight for what is not known or that seems secondary or unreachable.
4. The commitment that this Collective Action has priority in the context of the municipality as a Public Policy.

Such commitments are feasible, converge with the principles of the various parties in the progressive field, and must be enrolled in the programs of their mayoral and alderman candidates.

It is a prerequisite for the implementation of the proposed Inclusion Network that candidates, candidates and parties commit to this agenda by adding these four points to their government programs or electoral platforms.

The four commitments make the Inclusion and Right to the City Network viable and point to viable ways out of overcoming poverty and social exclusion strengthen that of democracy and contribute to multiplying citizenship in quantity and quality, on a national scale and in the context of each city.

**Collaborated with the systematization of this document**

**Cesar Sanson**, Prof. Dept. of Social Sciences, UFRN; **Edilsa Gadelha**, Pedagogue, Escola Espaço Livre CSPNSC; **Elisânia Alves**, Architect, PhD student in Architecture, Dept. of Architecture, UFRN, **Heitor Andrade**, Prof. Dept. of Architecture, UFRN, **Josélia Silva**, Professor and coordinator of Escola Casa Crescer, CSPNSC; **Maria Aparecida da S. Fernandes**, Professor of Portuguese Language and Literature, IFRN, **Pedro Henrique Oliveira**, Public Policy Manager, Master in Urban and Regional Studies - UFRN; **Sarah Andrade**, Architect, PhD Student in Architecture, Dept. of Architecture, UFRN; **Ion de Andrade**, Epidemiologist SESAP/RN and CSPNSC