

# Economic inclusion and being kept out of places (how can place-based indicators cope?)

- The city and spatial exclusion, inclusion and the compromises (from the hukou to favelas, with unaffordable formal housing thrown in)
- Public space, private space and exclusion/inclusion
- Markets, gentrification and exclusion
- The challenge of urbanisation and the urban transition
- Moving into the South African Metros: trajectories and house prices (Turok and Visagie)
- US cities: economists weighing in on the pricing issues (Chetty, Florida, Glaeser, Shiller, Krugman, etc)

# A “wicked” (complex) urban migration problem in danger of eliciting “wicked” (nasty) responses

- **A narrative:** **Cities** are being swamped by rural migrants. **Cities** cannot provide them with acceptable places to live and work. This is causing the rise of segregated low-income settlements, violence and deteriorating conditions for the poorest urban dwellers, and infecting the rest of the urban society and economy.
- **A first order response:** These poverty problems should be dealt with at source, in the **rural** sending areas. If migration is made easier or conditions for the most disadvantaged migrants in **urban** areas is improved, this will just attract more (note that this will especially affect those **cities** that are welcoming to migrants if others do not). Better to introduce regulations ensuring those who cannot get by in **cities** without assistance don't come to live in **cities**.

Is this trying to address the problem in its area of origin a common response to a “wicked” problem or a “wicked” response to a common problem? Or both?

# A “wicked” (complex) European migration problem in danger of eliciting “wicked” (nasty) responses

- **A narrative:** **Europe** is being swamped by foreign migrants. **Europe** cannot provide them with acceptable places to live and work. This is causing the rise of segregated low-income settlements, violence and deteriorating conditions for the poorest **European** dwellers, and infecting the rest of the urban society and economy.
- **A first order response:** These poverty problems should be dealt with at source, in the sending countries. If migration is made easier or conditions for the most disadvantaged migrants in **Europe** is improved, this will just attract more (note that this will especially affect those countries that are welcoming to migrants if others do not). Better to introduce regulations ensuring those who cannot get by in **Europe** without assistance don't come to live in **Europe**.

Is this trying to address the problem in its area of origin a common response to a “wicked” problem or a “wicked” response to a common problem? Or both?