

editorial
editorial

entrevista
interview

ágora
agora

tapete
carpet

artigo nomads
nomads paper

projetos
projects

expediente
credits

próxima v!rus
next v!rus

V!19

issn 2175-974x | ano 2019 year
semestre 02 semester



BAUGRUPPEN: O MODELO BAUGRUPPEN: THE GERMAN
ALEMÃO DE COHOUSING E SUAS MODEL OF COHOUSING AND ITS
VARIÁVEIS CONSTITUTIVAS CONSTITUTIVE VARIABLES

ANIE FIGUEIRA
RICARDO TREVISAN

PT | EN

Anie Figueira is an Architect and Urbanist, holds a Master's degree in Building Planning Design, and is a Specialist in Urban and Sustainable Architectural Rehabilitation. She is a researcher of the research group "Design, Planning and Landscape" of the National University of Brasilia, connected to the Labeurbe group of the same university, and the "Chronology of Urban Thinking" research group of the Federal University of Bahia, Brazil.

Ricardo Trevisan is an Architect and Urbanist and Ph.D. in Architecture and Urbanism, with postdoctoral studies at Columbia University. He is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism at the National University of Brasilia, and a researcher at the research groups "Landscape, Design, and Planning - Labeurbe" and "Architecture and Urbanism of the Brasilia Region". He is the local director of the "Chronology of Urban Planning Project", with the "New Cities: Thinking for Atlas Project".

How to quote this text: Figueira, A. C. and Trevisan, R., 2019. Baugruppen: the German model of cohousing and its constitutive variables. Translated from Portuguese by Dick Farney Pimentel Rocha. *Virus*, Sao Carlos, 19. [e-journal] [online] Available at: <http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/_virus19/?sec=4&item=14&lang=en>. [Accessed: 13 December 2019].

ARTICLE SUBMITTED ON AUGUST 28, 2018

Abstract

This article aims to discuss what are the constitutive variables that make up the housing mobilization entitled *Baugruppen* (in English, Building Groups), in Germany. The idea is to analyze three fundamental variables that are present in *Baugruppen*, including social, financial and organizational - through websites, and the state, in the light of the understanding of neoliberalism that commodifies and generates the financialization of dwelling, logic that generates crises and feeds on them. The aim of the *Baugruppen* is to suppress the existence of an agent that profits from housing construction, as is the case of homebuilders and developers, and thus reduce the price of housing by 25% to 35% of the value of the traditional market. However, it is extremely important to understand that this is a housing mobilization that only develops and can spread through specialized websites and the construction of information on the Internet. The expectation is to be able to better understand how the stakeholders of this mobilization work and what are the future perspectives for this housing and city thinking.

Keywords: *Baugruppen*, Germany, Neoliberalism, Co-housing, Information construction

1 Introduction

In the age of information condensation, with the massive use of the Internet, how is it possible to update the struggle for housing under the neoliberal perspective, which, in turn, destroys housing as an acquired right? The pressing idea in this article is to understand the variables present in the organization of housing mobilization in Germany, entitled *Baugruppen* (in English, Building Groups) or co-housing. The variables consist of: 1) social aspects; 2) financial aspects and organization through specialized websites; and 3) the role played by the State to encourage or restrain certain singularities arising from the process of claiming the right to housing and the city.

The main objective of the idea that permeates the *Baugruppen*, or *co-housing*, is to exclude agents who profit from the financialization of housing, as builders and developers, through a collaborative process of collective construction of organized civil society. Thus, future residents are responsible for the entire process of housing conquest and can reduce the price of housing by 25% to 35% compared to traditional market prices (Tostes, 2015).

A *Baugruppe* can take place in two different ways: the first is called informal and occurs when a *Baugruppe* shows interest in land that has been publicly announced by the government for site improvement; the second way is named formal and happens when the City Council shows interest in a previously formed and cataloged *Baugruppe* (Little, 2006).

Thus, by participating in a construction group, each family is responsible for not attending in other groups of the same gender. If this happens, the family has a compromised name in the market and may even be fined. As a result of these measures, it was found that only 40% of the apartments are rented, while the other 60% are occupied by the owners themselves (Little, 2006).

However, there is divergence of information about the existing sizes of *Baugruppen*. There are sources that state that the size varies from 3 to 43 families (Moura, 2010), while others indicate that it can change between 5 to 50 families (Little, 2006). Therefore, it is likely that even in disagreement, these numbers do not change so much from one case to the other.

It is important to note that much of this process was and is established through experiences that are considered "successful", cataloged and made available on websites. Such experiences are exponentially multiplied, not only by German states, but also by several other European countries, which have experienced and still undergo through similar crises of weakening the welfare state.

Understanding the scenario in which the *Baugruppen* were inserted and the current economic logic was essential for mobilization to become possible. And this is the logic of neoliberalism, which transforms any and every aspect of human experiences into commodities to be bought and sold indiscriminately by the financial market, including the right to dwell (Rolnik, 2009).

Neoliberalism establishes itself as a world system of single political reason, which traps any debate of power alternation, depending on what aspect local government is in, makes the housing market deregulation more or less flexible. The problem, then, would be structural in nature, and for that reason would alternate the narratives in the power games. But that would not change the fact that neoliberalism is a pendulum-like system, which acquires means of governability through successive crises, across a significant resilience that is renewed and improved in the course of each new crisis caused by it (Dardot and Laval, 2017).

It is exactly in the interstice between crises that the *Baugruppen* arose, and it was mainly developed in Germany. Its first copy dates from mid-1994 in the Rieselfeld district of Freiburg. Called the Blue House, this first *Baugruppe* became the driving force for the creation of a housing mindset, which gave rise to a later neighborhood called Vauban, where the *Baugruppen* emerged in mid-1996, also in the city of Freiburg. The purpose of the article is to understand some of the constitutive variables that made this mobilization possible, and which, although they may act in different ways, depending on the context in which they are inserted, they are common to all states and countries, since all of them depend on society, banks, Internet access and state mediation.

Moreover, it must be said that *Baugruppen* themselves would not exist without the variables mentioned (social, financial and organizational, and state). Those variables' respective needs and interests will promote

and enable this new approach to the issue of housing and land occupation. The variables in question were selected not only as a cutout of the analysis, but as an important milestone for thinking about *Baugruppen* as a method.

2 Social variable

In order to understand what motivated people to mobilize in the *Baugruppen* construction, it was firstly necessary to understand who were they, their profiles, their age group, and what types of absences had encouraged this resolution of collective actions. For this, we used researches about Urbanism (Ache and Fedrowitz, 2012; Droste 2015; Ring, 2016); Sociology (Bresson and Denèfle, 2015; Göschel, 2010); and Anthropology (Hede, 2016).

A *Baugruppe* always starts from its residents. Comprehending this variable and who are the stakeholders is essential to recognize such a mobilization, especially from the understanding of what are the age groups, what is the income and what is the family profile of the people involved.

It is from their interests, their demands and the absence of meeting these same demands that mobilization will gain strength to drive other stakeholders. All of these parts exist and will exist regardless of any factor, but without the community and its claims, there is no *Baugruppen* at any time - not before, not during, not after.

Not only in Germany, but in many industrialized societies, there is a real change in demographics, caused by two different trends: declining birth rates and increasing life expectancy. These trends have a considerable bias that simultaneously affects health and social security systems.

In Germany, for almost 40 years, the birth rate has been lower than 1.4 children, which means that with each new generation there is a 30% shortage of young people to fill the gap. Besides, it is important to consider that the people are getting older and older, improving their physical and mental health and increasing life expectancy beyond 60 years old. If on the one hand this datum is positive, on the other hand it results in a large older population and a smaller younger population that cannot be compensated even through immigration (Göschel, 2010).

This fact has consequences on social security system, because the way this system is conceived reaffirms, in a way, the support to families low birth rate. Since there is no indication of a future change in the reproductive pattern, as the population over 60 will represent 40% of the population by 2030, and about 15% of the population will be composed of people over 80 by 2050, there is a natural movement of cooperation between young and old people. Older people who are not isolated in generational ghettos, but integrating and acting in society that, due to their own demographic reduction, will need all possible social help. Considering that the number of elderly people is greater than the number of members that a family can support, the elderly will become a collective social responsibility.

In addition, immigration is also a controversial topic of discussion in Germany, as it requires a process for integrating immigrant families into the German context, which is very costly for public coffers as it does not generate taxes only for the family in question, but also for the entire population in which this family will be inserted. The families are accompanied by social welfare institutions until their integration is completed.

Baugruppen in Germany can be seen as an alternative way of providing personal services that are presumably already deficient.

Thus, many people live together to provide care to one another, as well as companionship, attention and task division. These tasks would be expected from their respective families. However, for several reasons, they are not provided by them and are not provided by public welfare institutions or the services market, as the individual income of society has decreased, and the service prices have risen. This way, such services are now considered luxury goods that can no longer be bought in the service market. It is emphasized that this is only a brief and superficial description of a much broader structural problem (Göschel, 2010).

By producing within the *Baugruppen* an alternative to these personal tasks that were traditionally provided by each individual's private family system or the public system through welfare state entities, an option is created that doesn't fit into any of the other categories mentioned above.

While *Baugruppen* can't be considered completely private, as would be the case of the family, they can't be considered public as well, once they don't depend either on a government institution or on a part of the traditional service market. They establish themselves as something innovative that is between the public and the private (community sense), which does not entirely embraces both fields.

Above rational and stable public contracts, blood-bonded associations or the love that usually binds a family together, the *Baugruppen* are, above all, a relationship of trust, while seeking to establish a similar level of stability found in a family or public institution. This does not mean that there is, in fact, a social vacuum that the *Baugruppen* are filling, as their residents still have their own families and are often assisted by public institutions.

What the *Baugruppen* create in practice is a link between the public and private domains, linking poles that have been separated throughout modern and industrial life (Göschel, 2010).

Until 2007, the German Senate had evidence that more than 200,000 Berliners over the age of 50 would rather have an independent life directed toward community living than living in a nursing home. Thus, in the absence of the necessary subsidies to fill this demand, in 2008 a network agency was created to distribute information, form groups and establish the necessary frameworks for new projects. This agency is funded by the Senate Department for Urban Development and the Environment Berlin (SenStadtUm) and organized by *Stadtbau*, a private planning and consulting agency (Droste, 2015).

If we have such demands at the top of the age pyramid, other needs appear at its base. After many years of devising a life beyond the big urban centers, young Germans began to want their space again in the centralized regions of the city. These young people are not restricted to the profiles of young urban professionals, new bohemians or childless hedonists - known in Germany as DINKS (Double-Income-No-Kids).

There are many young families with children who, when faced with appropriate offers and spacious and affordable apartments, prefer to settle in city centers. Although the societal ideal remains that of a large suburb house, for young people, the attributes glimpsed in urban centers life are becoming increasingly attractive, due to the short distances to be traveled, the present cultural infrastructure and the opportunity and options varieties within urbanity (Ring, 2016).

At the beginning of the 21st century, there was a range of assertive impacts on mixed-group housing. Therefore, multigenerational *co-housing* projects have been increasingly built. In recent decades this has been revealed by supplementing and expanding this type of project in the country, as there are all sorts of different *Baugruppen* communities across Germany (Ache and Fedrowitz, 2012). There is a recognized claim among residents that the chance of trusting a neighbor to the point of leaving their child with them is one of the most important aspects of cohabiting in this type of community (Hede, 2016).

Sociological studies state that the resident profile of *co-housing* projects is of well-educated people with middle-income families (Bresson and Denèfle, 2015). Although there are aspirations from both the government and residents that there is a mixed income structure, projects like this are at risk of social segregation (Ache and Fedrowitz, 2012).

Coupled with the meager urban housing supply, and given that Germany has mostly tenants, the issue has begun to seriously affect social groups more strongly embedded in the middle class - albeit with a lower income - to some extent they had been spared from the housing crisis. At the same time, these groups were deeply engaged in environmental protection and the preservation of natural resources (Bresson and Denèfle, 2015).

It is this middle class, in general, that the *Baugruppen* encompass - people whose education is relatively high, but who have a low income because of the overall employment situation in the country. This housing options limitation have spurred the *Baugruppen* creation by people who were neither poor enough to get government subsidies nor rich enough to buy the few housing available.

The socioeconomic difficulties, job instability, job insecurity, lack of opportunities for housing improvement in the middle and lower middle classes were experienced by these well-educated young adults and gave rise to projects for alternative management of the sustainable consumption of products and services. These projects have revolutionized the way we meet demands in the continuing attempt to avoid waste in all sectors, ranging from transportation, energy, natural resources, money and housing.

Within these younger age groups, activism, sometimes formal, sometimes informal, has fostered a sense of collectivity, sociability, and mutual help. Elective democratic actions became almost a duty within communities, largely due to the support of public authorities, but also based on a common sense that they were good for the community and the social-urban community in general (Bresson and Denèfle, 2015).

Thus, from the understanding of these two main interest groups, the elderly and the young with financial gain and interest in having children, there are demands and needs that hold within themselves a deeply basal

essence in almost all Western societies - older people who will need care and assistance as time goes by, and young people with young children who need a support and trust network in case of any unforeseen circumstances.

While older people generally have the financial stability that young people are still seeking to achieve, young people have easy access to the tools of the contemporary digital world, as well as the understanding of their mechanisms. Moreover, young people also understand creative economic actions, in which it is possible to frame the *Baugruppen*.

In addition to the usual residents profile, which was addressed in this part of the paper, there is another important point regarding the way these future residents will get financing, credit and legalization of their properties. And it is about this aspect that the second variable of the article is devoted, approaching which are the agents responsible for the economic and legal bias of the cohabitation process, and their organization through specialized websites.

3 Financial and organizational variable by websites

In the construction of information, the organizational variable systematically goes through the way new people will join the *Baugruppen* mobilization. The analysis takes place through surveys conducted on the Internet and on specialized websites, as well as through research on financing methods. After all, there is no state subsidy, only concessions on land value. The research used to approach this variable occurred through the dissertations of Sudiyono (2013) and Moura (2010), also in the consultations carried out on their websites.

All urban and housing processes involve explaining essential elements in the development of their contexts. A building endowed with architectural and urbanistic qualities develops not from the desire of a minority, but from many characters, which may or may not make such a challenge possible. These essential elements are probably potentiators or barriers, depending on how your interference will act, especially within scenarios that suit them or not. It is precisely in relation to these actors, which simultaneously promote, profit and facilitate the existence of the *Baugruppen*, that this part of the study will turn.

In order to be able to explain what are the usual procedures for entering a *Baugruppe*, the initial step should be to reveal certain standard behaviors of those interested in participating in such cohabitation. Initially, prospective residents should gather information to learn more about mobilization and how it works, which can be done through research on cohabitation concepts on the following Internet portals: *id22.net*; *baugemeinschaften.de*; *wohnen-im-eigentum*; *cohousing-berlin.de*; and *Netzwerkagentur GenerationenWohnen*. To view presentations, workshops and exhibitions, it is possible to visit the *Experimentdays.de* website, where meetings and debates are combined between past, present and future residents, as well as stakeholders in the *Baugruppen* process (Sudiyono, 2013).

If the purpose is in order to see examples of projects already done, it is possible to visit the *Wohnportal.de* portal and, if organizational help is needed for the project, the *Netzwerkagentur GenerationenWohnen* also assists in this process. As for financing, there is a major bank that gives credit to the *Baugruppen*, the GLS-Bank, which exists since the 1970s, when the Vauban district in Germany emerged, meaning: Fur Gemeinschaftsbank Leihen und Schenken - (Community Bank for Loans and Donations). This bank was created in 1974, and until 2010 it had already funded around 6,500 projects and actions in the areas of culture, ecology and society. Its specialty is in supporting alternative urban projects by providing credit to schools, kindergartens, therapeutic institutions, organic greengrocers, healthy eating projects, companies linked to environmental sustainability, as well as assisting unemployed and community store projects (Moura, 2010).

GLS Bank's motto is "money for the people", with a guarantee to be the first universal bank for social and ecological issues, therefore, with investments that try to grant human needs and sustainable development for future generations through preserving natural resources. In this way, the bank has been making a reasonable return on its investments, along with opportunities for future economic development. GLS Bank also supports housing projects such as the *Baugruppen* through financial assistance and soft loans (Sudiyono, 2013).

Currently, there is a proliferation of banks willing to provide credit and financing, such as the foundation of the large IKEA Corporation, the Atrias foundation, the *Banco Ambiente*, DBK Bank, Triodos Bank, among others. A few years ago, a direct connection was made with primary *Baugruppen* values, with the aim of barring agents who profited indiscriminately from housing and giving residents a constructive autonomy of their own living space.

This action mobilized several stakeholders, such as architects' cooperatives, organized civil society, companies interested in environmentally friendly housing, the German Senate and Parliament, virtual media

communication, etc.

Over the years, the *Baugruppen* have no longer been the product of one active principal actor – the organized civil society – but of several actors. However, those who succeed in being hegemonic in the process of collective construction are those that best fit the systematic demands of this form of construction, such as those best educated and imbued with a greater sense of collectivity.

In relation to legal procedures and their respective organizations, what exists are differences in how the *Baugruppen* articulate to become their housing developments recognized by the state and the legal environment. Even the manner in which the *Baugruppen* begin may not be the same, depending on who actors are involved in the initiation process.

For example, some *Baugruppen* projects may begin to be developed directly by future residents; others may come from the decision of an architect or even a cooperative of architects. Some may be undertaken by non-profit non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or even by cooperative models not necessarily owned by architects; and there may still be other stakeholders, such as future residents themselves acting in the form of a cooperative, as well as construction agents, the elderly, urban collectives, groups interested in cohabitation with a focus on respect for animals, among other urban profiles that may be predisposed to build collaboratively.

From these possible choices, the German Senate created the “Senate Urban Development Department” and commissioned the “City Development Company,” *Stattbau Stadtentwicklungsgesellschaft*, to produce the “Intergenerational Life Counseling Center”, materialized on the quoted website, *netzwerkgeneration.de*. This support network agency has been in existence since 2008 and has helped from then on to articulate stakeholders in transgenerational housing. In this network, it is possible to find project ideas; consultants to help with intergenerational life issues; supporters in the development and implementation of project ideas; mediators for understanding the housing industry; housing cooperatives; and private owners.

Other services provided by the support network agency, free of charge, are initial advice for those interested in project ideas, project planning and project visualizations already undertaken.

In addition, the agency is not only virtual, but also has a regional office with a physical headquarters in central Berlin. This is the *Gemeinschaftliches Wohnen e.V Bundesvereinigung* Forum, which is a supraregional association of organizations and individuals for the implementation of new life arrangements and self-organized communities.

The multiple interests of other stakeholders in the dispute over urban space, such as architects, the State, financial institutions, among other characters that assisted in the demands of organized civil society, are no longer restricted to this society.

There is a systematization and solidification of the economic, financial and legal devices, driven by digital media and websites, which outline a *Baugruppen* growth scenario across Germany, and which they are trying to take a certain role in their agenda. The process, which began with organized civil society and became a public policy with active State participation, will be best explained sequentially.

4 State variable

What we propose to analyze in the state variable concerns the role played by the German State in the dissemination of information about the *Baugruppen* and their performance in the urban scenario. The state variable is based on assessing the failures caused by the State's omission to provide access to housing, as well as analyzing the state's ability to regulate, promote and protect this mobilization. The studies of state attributions in order of guaranteeing access to housing were based on the urban studies by Droste (2015), Ache and Fedrowitz (2012).

One of the variables of the State is to promote knowledge about what is being produced in the country, in general. Until 2015, there was a lack of research on *Baugruppen* consequences for land use policy and the market regulations that promote it, besides studies on the governance policy frameworks that the State has to encourage or curb certain urban initiatives (Sudyono, 2013). In addition, there is little material about the social setbacks that the *Baugruppen* will face in the long run until they can stabilize or not.

The eventual demand for research tends to grow, and with this, its assessments should include analytical aspects that need to be incorporated to meet the housing agenda, such as the creation of special institutional structures within government. These structures will serve to regulate the housing market so that the

Baugruppen become, in fact, socially inclusive, not a mobilization with a series of half-open parentheses that may eventually result in segregation.

Questions remain as to what state-created legal frameworks could facilitate or hinder urban and housing policies for the *Baugruppen* to help groups with specific and sometimes special needs to make it easier for them to access to cohabitation. Therefore, what cannot be vague in these surveys is the critical analysis about the projects and their results, so that researchers are not dazzled or just interested in doing favors for a particular population sector, which would be another lobby than a scientific investigation in fact.

Another topic that the *Baugruppen* may come to favor with their potential is the struggle for gender equality as they seek to promote greater gender equality within the European and German context.

As for the early *Baugruppen* communities, these are social and political elements with an emphasis on collectivity, everyday life and inclusion. Their character is not speculative, since they removed the investments of the productive process directly from the state in housing. While some projects are willing to build "just" housing, others within their sense of urban collectivity go beyond and integrate. This usually happens on the ground floor, work facilities and neighborhood services such as yoga classes, day care centers, support centers for the elderly, community classes, living centers or public classes, among others.

It should be clarified that while the city has gained with the building constructions, the *Baugruppen* were born out of system failures, such as the German state's lack of public policies to provide housing rights, inability to read the birth. new lifestyles, or even trying to resonate and apply housing policy experiences from other countries.

The *Baugruppen* are, therefore, the result of a real absence of the State, although they cannot exist in its total absence. It is important to clarify that, from the moment the state accepted its spontaneous emergence, it has also validated the initiative and has been continuously supporting it. And even though the *Baugruppen* are still a considerably small niche, the political interest in them on the part of the state is also growing, which notes them carefully because of their contribution to the dynamics and resilience of cities.

This has increasingly made the *Baugruppen* a housing public policy strategy implemented by municipalities, including lessening the responsibility created by some burdens on certain sectors of the population, especially social security.

If partnerships between the *Baugruppen* and municipalities are sufficiently regulated and skillful, there is a possibility of legitimate improvement in social land use and progress related to neighborhood quality. From this fruitful relationship between both parties, there would be the likelihood of simultaneous gains (Droste, 2015).

What is not sustained in the long run is the state's ability to guarantee access rights to housing for socially weaker groups as long as there is in fact no state regulation about the *Baugruppen*. It is even risky to determine whether the mobilization will effectively become a more universalizing public policy or whether will remain restricted to a specific middle class niche within society.

While there is an interest on the part of municipalities to make the *Baugruppen* more blatant alternatives, there is also doubt about the true efficiency of the state in contributing to a spatially fairer city. This is not restricted to Germany only: while the *Baugruppen* have very own characteristics in the country, in other geographically close places, such as the Czech Republic and Austria, the concept is also intended to be applied. The issue of cohabitation itself has spread to several parts of Europe, having in each country its own attributes and particularities.

The German government, the Berlin government and the governments of other municipalities, or even the German Senate, are not the main actors in the struggle for the *Baugruppen*. They play supporting roles, although their support is important, it is not crucial as it does not take direct action on the organization, even if it seeks to influence it. As stated earlier, one of the state's main actions was the creation of the network agency *Netzwerkagentur GenerationenWohnen*, which helps to establish early contacts with the concept of cohabitation.

Whatever the state scale, the activities developed by the State are mainly established as information and communication. There are virtual announcements, regular newsletters and face-to-face meetings, such as roundtables, exhibition fairs and the complete collection of a database with details and information from all *Baugruppen* ever held.

The most instructive way, indicated by some scholars, is perhaps the holding of fairs where professionals can expose their work, portfolios and experiences, bringing together a range of experts with complex knowledge that consists the civil construction industry (Ache and Fedrowitz, 2012).

Such fairs are understood as a good way to promote the private sector without necessarily letting it dominate housing mobilization. This type of promotional event strengthens model offices and offices with an emphasis on collectivity, ecology, and social and environmental responsibility. There are also all sorts of professionals and activities that help foster the creative economy. In addition, they favor the dissemination and distribution of skilled labor at a fair and conscientious price to a population that also wants to become more aware of what it consumes and to whom its capital power will favor, besides on what kind of work will help foster it.

But, regardless of the means, what remains is the awareness that the *Baugruppen* are an action that, fortunately or unfortunately, don't fit just a single actor, in this case, the state. There is the understanding that stakeholders from organized civil society and from communities involved play a major role in ensuring that the parent idea and current values in the *Baugruppen* design are guaranteed and maintained.

5 Final considerations

Therefore, what can be understood through the variables presented is that they are common to many European countries. The population is, in fact, gradually aging, while the existing young population is no longer sufficient to supply the demands of the labor market. This market has been, at the same time, dismantled and precarious because of neoliberal reason. Regardless of how each country will react and organize, the logic is almost always the same.

Although many of these achievements are restricted to the European scene, the fragmentation and weakening of the welfare state affects the elderly and young people just as much as it affects their social security.

That is why the *Baugruppen* are a promising alternative: in an economy based on the right to private property, once it is guaranteed, even if other social rights are suppressed, people in a community built on trust have a kind of material comfort they might not otherwise find.

The other point regarding these variables concerns the banks that finance the *Baugruppen*. While at first there was only GLS-Bank linked to *Baugruppen*, as many banks are attracted to this kind of mobilization, which is considered an auspicious investment, the credibility of *Baugruppen*'s ability to remain a solution taken as of popular initiative, from bottom up,. On the other hand, the capacity of the market to absorb this initiative and change capital from one hand starts to grow, as is common in the neoliberal reality, which appropriates and liquefies daily every alleged conquest.

As for websites, it can be argued that the *Baugruppen* would hardly have an considerable reach if it were not for the dissemination and construction of information through the Internet, which could demonstrate the scope for mobilization both for German states and for other countries that were willing to reproduce the idea in their respective scenarios, such as Austria and the Czech Republic.

As for the last variable, the state, it is significant to remember, firstly, that Germany is, in fact, a federative state, which means, it has governmental autonomy to give the *Baugruppen* the character that best suits their local government. Another key point concerns the change in leadership of the German Federal Government, which had been, from 2005 to the present (when the *Baugruppen* spread most), led by Chancellor Angela Merkel, ending her term in 2020, which may mean a change in the way *Baugruppen* is understood and done in Germany.

It must be said that, in addition to the variables analyzed, there are others of paramount importance that help in understanding this mobilization, such as existing regulations and the role of cooperatives in resisting neoliberal oppression. Account should also be taken of the responsibilities of architects and experts in designing and articulating different stakeholders and analyzing how the city and urban environment respond to these stimuli from the *Baugruppen*.

What can be understood from the analysis of the variables (social, financial and organizational and state) in promoting the *Baugruppen* conception is that each one of them is fundamental for the mobilization, not only in the conception of the narrative presented, but mainly in the construction of the collective action that enabled many new homes all over Germany.

However, for the *Baugruppen* to continue to exist faithfully to its initial purposes, there must be an awareness on the part of its future residents to demand from the state to safeguard its right on not to being exploited by

intermediaries, such as by construction companies and developers, or even new mechanisms that may arise to profit from their right to housing.

Although capitalism is a social fact and there is always a financial benefit from the acts undertaken by civil construction, the *Baugruppen*'s goal is to suppress the intermediary, the agent who profits and speculates with dwelling. This means, it is necessary that, the stakeholders regarding the inhabitants remain aware that inhabiting the city is a right that the state needs to guarantee, and that its population must never fail to claim.

Finally, in the age of massive information, there are plenty of examples on the Internet of how to collectively build a new way of inhabiting homes and cities. Therefore, more critical analysis is still needed on how this can be done to primarily benefit the local community. At present, perhaps the aspect that should receive the most attention in the context of the *Baugruppen* is the meaning of the word *Baugruppen* itself, and whether it remains in keeping with what it proposed from the outset, namely the groups that build together.

References

Ache, P., and Fedrowitz, M., 2012, *The development of co-housing initiatives in Germany*. *Built Environment*, 38(3), pp. 395-412.

Bresson, S., and Deneffe, S., 2015. *Diversity of self-managed co-housing initiatives in France*. *Urban Research and Practice*, pp. 8(1), 5-16.

Dardot, P. and Laval, C., 2017. *La pesadilla que no acaba nunca: el neoliberalismo contra la democracia* (Vol. 891037). Editorial GEDISA.

Droste, C., 2015. German co-housing: an opportunity for municipalities to foster socially inclusive urban development? *Urban Research and Practice*, 8(1), pp. 79-92.

Göschel, A., 2010. Collaborative Housing in Germany, *In Living together – Cohousing Ideas and Realities around the World. Proceedings from the international collaborative housing conference in Stockholm*, May 5–9, edited by Dick Urban Vestbro, pp.71–78.

Hede, H., 2017. *In search of 'a chosen community': A study on self-initiated co-housing projects in Berlin*. Master Thesis, Lund University.

Little, J., 2006. Lessons from Freiburg on Creating a Sustainable Urban Community. *Hentet d*, 10(10), 2013.

Moura, R. L. S. D. M., 2010. *Estudo do eco-bairro de Vauban, em Freiburg, Alemanha- Contributos para a definição de um modelo participativo com vista à disseminação de eco-bairros em Portugal* (Master Thesis, Faculdade de Arquitectura de Lisboa).

Ring, K., 2019. *The self-made city. Urban living and alternative development models*, in The Palgrave Handbook of Bottom-Up Urbanism, Springer.

Rolnik, R., 2015. *Guerra dos Lugares: a colonização da terra e da moradia na era das finanças*. São Paulo: Boitempo..

Sudiyono, G., 2013. *Learning from the management and development of current self-organised and community-oriented co-housing projects in Berlin: Making recommendations for the IBA Berlin 2020* (Unpublished master's thesis). Berlin University of Technology, Berlin.

Tostes, L., 2015. *Junto e Separado: o novo jeito de morar em Berlim*. [online] Available at: www.laberlina.com/2015/06/junto-e-separado-o-novo-jeito-de-morar-em-berlin/. [Accessed 21 October 2019].
