

TO FAVOUR UNDERPRIVILEGED NEIGHBOURHOODS!

The " millefeuille " (yarrow)

For almost 40 years, public policy has been trying to respond to the difficulty of underprivileged neighbourhoods. It was the arrival of the left in power that decided to take this problem into account in 1981 following the first tensions and violence with the creation of the CNDSQ.

Numerous reports, commissions, funds, organizations have been to try to reverse 30 years of "neighbourhood crisis" that will even go so far as to until a state of emergency is declared:

- 1982: OPE, summer prevention
- 1983: Dubedout- CLSPD report
- 1989: Suburban Report 89
- 1991: law of orientation of the city
- 1996: City Revival Pact
- 2000: SRU Act
- 2005: Riots and policy failures. State of Emergency
- 2010 : city contract (ANRU, ACSE, DIV, DATAR...)
- 2014: redesigning the zones
- 2017: Borloo report

The answers provided attempted to stem the issues of violence, delinquency, crime, trafficking of all kinds, parallel economy...

Over time, they were confronted with the question of communitarianism, the abandonment of territories by public authority, territories lost by the Republic.

All of them had as their objective social mix, intervention on the built, the fight against isolation, the attractiveness of companies, the fight against insecurity, the allocation of social housing...

In 1999, these neighborhoods had 25.5% of unemployed people under 25 years of age, and today this figure has risen to 47%, with 39% of young people without a diploma and 55% of inactive women.

Do we have to admit the failure of the mix when we see that the populations in these neighborhoods are mainly composed of families

single-parent families, three times as many foreign families, the most numerous, single fragile and economically precarious?

If we consider the consequences of the health crisis, which will reinforce these difficulties, how will these policies be effective?

At best, these measures have maintained the situation, limited the worsening of the situation, but isn't the worst still to come?

WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

In fact, the question is not whether these policies were necessary or not. The question is to understand for whom they were developed and whether and how they met the needs of its inhabitants.

With the desertification of businesses, segregation in hiring, dead squares, total obsolescence in favor of the city center, the ghettoization of the most modest populations, the absence of equipment and services, Only the single bakery or tobacco shop acting as a social link leads to a deep isolation of the individual, to the loss of contact between the inhabitants and to the abandonment of a bored youth, responsible for its non-success.

The populations of these so-called underprivileged neighborhoods live like "second-class citizens" with a status of "useless" in opposition to the idea of utility imposed in a meritocratic society like ours.

While today's inhabitants are judged on their usefulness in society, these populations accumulate all forms of uselessness: unemployment, school dropouts, isolation, poverty, lack of commitment, boredom, withdrawal from the neighborhood...

More than a simple class divide, it is a real urban segregation that we have been witnessing for decades. Are we once again on the verge of implosion?

In addition, the answers provided for nearly 40 years have been provided in a zoning logic: ZUP, ZEP, ZUS, free zones, REP...

These terms have found their way into everyday language over the years, but have taken on a very pejorative connotation, referring to the idea of underprivileged neighborhoods whenever they were uttered.

Thus, all the very positive words of our French language have been transformed into an amalgam of very negative ideas: suburbs, cities, neighborhoods, big cities, etc.

complexes, areas in difficulty, priority districts, sensitive neighbourhoods, priority areas, ghettos, young people in the suburbs, QPV, even "The Zone".

How can we not live differently when we live in these so-called neighborhoods?

How can we not feel injustice towards those who live in the city?

How can we not look for a common identity, a common culture of the neighborhood since it is connoted apart, outside the norm?

How can we not reassure ourselves by living differently, feel stronger by recognizing ourselves in other collective models, while rejecting the imposed norms of society?

How can you not break the rules when everything suggests that you are lives as if forgotten by the system?

These populations thus claim their belonging to their territory, to their neighborhood, identify with it by using codes, languages, customs, ways of life...

They are also developing strong solidarities which are expressed, as we have seen. during containment.

They also have legitimate demands for equal treatment and rights, which we must hear and support. From this recognition will be born future citizens involved in the life of the city.

WHAT TO DO?

Today, the overriding principle of all the policies implemented is the "Urban renewal", the environment with its procession of demolition of social housing, renovation

The issue of destruction or renovation is a matter of urban planners! Not a social issue.

So yes, of course this aspect of a greener, more enjoyable place to live, to human size is essential for a better quality of life.

But these achievements take time, take forever. At least 10 years are necessary for these achievements, one generation!

Residents do not see any change. What can be done in the meantime to improve daily life and fight against idleness?

The population, on the other hand, will not change. Is it necessary for each mandate to

ask to wait another 10 years?

Talking about diversity seems quite illusory when we measure the economic fragility of these populations to whom we will continue to offer housing in these neighborhoods.

The SRU law, interesting as it may be, has shown its limits with all those communes that refuse to accept this type of housing preferring to pay penalties.

Asking families to leave their neighborhood with the promise of a better world elsewhere is also lying to them somewhere, because their social situation will remain precarious and uprooting can once again generate grudges.

The solutions lie in enhancing the image of the neighborhood through immediate and short-term actions while waiting for urban renewal projects.

They can quickly go through :

- **The revision of all this superimposition of measures, by clarifying the political will to work for this cause.**
- **The increase of the State budget in this area: 1% of the budget at present.**
- **The revitalization of neighborhoods through commerce, mobility, transportation, public services, culture, animation...everything that has been slowly but surely disappearing from the landscape of these neighborhoods.**
- **The re-establishment of the school map, forcing children and young people from these neighbourhoods to be admitted to well-rated inner-city institutions rather than forced and coerced schooling in the establishment of the neighborhood.**
- **The creation of places to live for youth, youth services promoting citizenship, the values of the Republic, equal opportunities ...**

- The possibility for the cities that house these populations to avoid the triple penalty (exorbitant rental taxes, reduction of public services, large number of social housing units, etc.) by revising the tax bases.
- The priority is to give priority to the largely additional resources of the State and the local authorities in the cities concerned to support the elected representatives in this mission.
- The commitment of the companies to be helped in welcoming a young unemployed person from a neighborhood.
- Changing language, stigmatizing words. Let's go back to the LOCATIONS, to the FALLS, to the ARRONDISSEMENTS, to the ILOTS....
- The recognition and interest in these populations by the commitment, the place in the city, the participation in the taking of decisions...
- A genuine social and public health policy in favor of the most disadvantaged.

A FUNDAMENTALLY LEFT-WING CAUSE?

The left, rooted in its values of emancipation, social justice and the rule of law, must

It is imperative to get a grip on this question. It has a duty to do so.

As she initiated it in 1981, she is the only one able to have the courage to approach it without detour. She must not resign herself, she must take up this challenge and

must fight this scourge of the isolation of neighbourhoods that will eventually become the subject of further tensions if we do not react.

Socialists must carry this ambition for the future of children and young people. young people, for a fairer society, to reintroduce the social elevator.

The socialists must distance themselves from the right, which is quietly leading us towards an American model where the poor would be parked around the cities, responsible for their precariousness as an inevitability.

WITH THE SOCIALISTS LET'S FAVOR THE UNDERPRIVILEGED NEIGHBORHOODS!

Michèle EDERY

Deputy Mayor Delegate for Policy of the City of Saint-Fons Rhône

Metropolitan Councillor Portes du Sud. Metropolis of Lyon

SIGNATORIES :

Yann CROMBECQUE: ^{1st} Federal Minister of the Rhône, Deputy Mayor of Villeurbanne, Regional Councillor AURA

Michèle EDERY : Metropolitan Councilor Lyon. Deputy Mayor Delegate for Policy of the City of Saint-Fons. Rhône

Pascale CROZON: former Member of Parliament for Villeurbanne. Section Villeurbanne. Rhône

Christiane CONSTANT: Federal Secretary. Section Secretary Brignais. Regional Councillor AURA. Municipal Councilor Brignais. Rhône

Hadi MEBARKI: Deputy Mayor for Economic Development Saint-Fons. Rhône

Joëlle SECHAUD: Section Secretary of Oullins. Metropolitan Councilor of Lyon. City Councilor of Oullins. Rhône

Laura GANDOLFI: Federal Secretary. Deputy Mayor of Villeurbanne delegated to roads, cleanliness and living environment. Rhône

Malika BONNOT: Federal Secretary. Deputy Mayor Delegate for Politics and housing. Lyon 9th

Fabrice MATTEUCCI: Federal Secretary. City councillor of Caluire. Rhône

Dominique BOLLIET: Former mayor of Lyon 4th. Section ^{1st} and 4th Lyon

Anne REYMBAUT : section secretary Thizy Les Bourgs. Town councillor Thizy Les Bourgs. Rhône.

Thomas BONNEFOY: Federal Secretary responsible for current affairs and training

Djamel BOUABDALLAH: Federal Secretary. City Councilor of Bron. Rhône

Sezer ADANUR: Saint-Fons city councillor. Rhône Maryse

DEROUSSY : Saint-Fons city councillor. Rhône

Marc CAHARD: Federal Secretary for Communication. Section of Rillieux La Pape. Rhône

Dominique DESCHAMPS : Saint-Fons section

Mickaël DURIN : Saint-Fons section

Philippe BRUNON : Saint-Fons section

Annabel TALON : Saint-Fons section

Nora ABDOU : Saint-Fons section

Nabila HADJHAMAD: Saint-Fons section

Neila MEDJBRI: Saint-Fons section

Théobald RUTIHUNZA: Saint-Fons section

Selma KHELLAS: Saint-Fons section Inès

KHELLAS: Saint-Fons section Céline CAM:

Saint-Fons section

Céline GAUVIN: Saint-Fons section Antonin

VERCELLINO: Saint-Fons section Agnès

SENHADJI: Saint-Fons section Elisabeth

EDERY: Saint-Fons section Farida TLILI:

Saint-Fons section

