RIGHT TO HOUSING ON A LIVABLE PLANET

Tactics and Intersections of the Climate and the Housing Movements

EUROPEAN ACTION COALITION
FOR THE RIGHT TO HOUSING

EUROPEAN ACTION COALITION
FOR THE RIGHT TO HOUSING AND TO THE CITY

Right to housing on a livable planet

Tactics and intersections of the climate and the housing movements

2026

Editors
Ana Krstic
Ivana Andelkovic
Merlin Becskey
Teresa Mamede
Tim de Boer

Title
Right to housing on a livable planet: Tactics and Intersections of the Climate and the Housing Movements

Publisher
Coalición Europea de Acción por el Derecho a la Vivienda y la Ciudad
c/Leiva 44 bis
08014 Barcelona
España

www.housingnotprofit.org
info@housingnotprofit.org

Layout and Design
Ivana Anđelković

This publication was funded/co-funded by the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Coalición Europea de Acción por el Derecho a la Vivienda y la Ciudad and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

Co-funded by the European Union

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Is an alliance between the climate movement[1] and the movement for the right to housing necessary or possible? Where do the two movements converge, and how can they complement each other? This booklet arises from the practical need to stimulate discussion and advance these questions within social movements. For years, activists from both movements have been exploring ways of bringing these struggles together, and we believe it is necessary to share these experiences and strategic reflections they have inspired. Our first objective is to help climate activists draw inspiration from the organising tactics of the housing movement, and vice versa, while also presenting examples of successful initiatives that have put the intersection between the two movements into practice. The second objective is to invite you to participate in a collaborative process to further explore these complementarities and implement them.

With this intention, the first section, "Tactics from the climate and housing movements", presents a series of methodologies that are particularly characteristic of each movement, such as Climate Strikes and Rent Strikes. We then examine examples in which different groups have successfully developed campaigns that combine housing issues with climate or energy concerns in the section "Case studies of intersections between climate and housing". Thirdly, we consider experiences of international coordination and examples of collaboration at that level but addressing the two movements se-

1 In this booklet, we have limited our focus to the climate movement, although we recognise that it represents only one part of the broader environmental movement. The first reason is that there are concrete examples of its successful intersection with the housing movement; one example is the thermal renovation of homes. Secondly, the climate movement stands out for having developed highly complex and stable structures of international coordination. This contrasts with the housing movement and with other environmental movements that operate more locally.

parately. Finally, in the conclusions, we develop a series of reflections and, drawing on the case studies, seek to articulate answers to questions such as: What are the strengths and weaknesses of each movement? How could the two movements collaborate and complement each other? What unique contribution does each make to the ecosystem of social movements?

We are writing this introduction in the context of the war launched by the United States and Israel against Iran in February 2026. The consequences of this war have once again demonstrated the vulnerability of an energy system based on fossil fuels to geopolitical tensions. They have also shown that our dependence on gas, oil and coal exposes us to increasingly high and volatile energy prices and, consequently, higher inflation. Another recent example was the energy crisis that followed the COVID 19 pandemic and coincided with the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

In this context, part of the climate movement that emerged in 2019 around the Fridays for Future and Extinction Rebellion protests recognised that the struggle to reduce CO2 emissions and prevent the climate crisis was connected to a broader movement concerned with people's immediate needs. Renewable energy not only reduced the price of electricity, but also opened up the possibility of a more democratic energy system, for example through cooperatives or energy communities. The housing movement, meanwhile, witnessed how the energy crisis forced many families to reduce their use of heating, hot water and cooking facilities, live in cold, damp or unsafe homes, accumulate debt and experience supply disconnections.[2] As food prices, rents and mortgage payments also increased, so did evictions and overcrowding. Tenants and people facing housing insecurity are the same people who suffer the harshest consequences of a system dependent on fossil fuels.

2 EAC has run an extensive analysis on the reaction of the housing movement to the energy crisis during 2021-2023: https://housingnotprofit.org/prices-rice-people-arise/#1

One of the weaknesses of the economic system in which we live is the permanent state of polycrisis to which it subjects us. This forces social movements working on one of its dimensions, for example feminism, antiracism, housing or environmentalism, to work together. If these different movements could find an effective way to collaborate and coordinate, they could increase their capacity for political influence and social transformation needed to move beyond an economic system that turns fundamental needs into sources of profit and is driving us towards the collapse of the ecosystems we depend on.

Under what circumstances can the climate and housing movements join forces? Can activists from both movements collaborate in their everyday work? Can they jointly advance alternative economic models? Will this alliance mainly work during energy crises as we have described above, when it becomes clear that those affected by rising rents are also those who cannot afford higher energy bills? Or are there other moments when this alliance can also work?

These questions go beyond the scope of this text, but it can help explore some possibilities, anticipate certain limitations and stimulate debate, particularly by identifying the main points of intersection. These are diverse and extend beyond the energy crises already mentioned. Some of the connections are outlined below.

Climate risks and housing

Global warming increases the frequency or scale of disasters such as floods and fires. As Flooded People UK[3] has shown a shared priority for both movements is to guarantee climate adaptation, comprehensive compensation for affected communities, and the right to return and rebuild, while raising awareness that these extreme events are not accidental but are caused by the climate crisis. At the same time, growing climate risks increase the cost of insurance, mortgages and rents, or leave homes without coverage.

3 https://www.floodedpeople.org.uk/

Touristification, aviation and the housing crisis

All, but especially low cost, air travel increases the number of visitors and tourist flats, reduces the supply of residential housing and drives up rents. At the same time, aviation is one of the largest sources of CO_2 emissions. The two movements can connect demands to reduce flights and regulate tourism with limits on temporary accommodation, protection for local residents and the recovery of homes for permanent use, something that has been explored extensively by Stay Grounded.[4]

Climate crisis, housing renovation and energy efficiency

The climate crisis intensifies energy poverty during the summer, as extreme heat disproportionately affects vulnerable households. Both movements can converge around demands for the thermal renovation of homes and the creation of climate shelters[5] in cities to combat the urban heat island effect during the summer, which implies demanding a different kind of urban planning than the profit-making oriented one. In winter, phasing out gas and coal boilers can reduce emissions and energy bills if they are replaced with renewable energy. Improving thermal insulation through housing renovation is equally important. This is the approach adopted by Locataires Ensemble[6] in France.

Tensions

On the one hand, the two movements share common concerns, which facilitates the creation of alliances, but on the other it can generate friction. One of the clearest examples is green gentrification. Parks, green corridors and adaptation projects can improve health and reduce climate risks, but they can also increase property values

4 https://stay-grounded.org/

5 A climate shelter is a public indoor or outdoor space offering protection from extreme heat or cold through shade, safe temperatures, water and seating. Examples include cooling centres for residents or areas with trees or parks.

6 https://www.locataires ensemble.org/

and displace residents. A similar effect occurs when the cost of improving energy efficiency of homes is unfairly passed onto tenants instead of being covered by landlords or governments. A third example concerns the apparent tension between increasing the housing supply to reduce prices according to market logic and restricting construction in protected natural areas. These contradictions are the consequences of the injustices produced by a green transition planned by those who concentrate power and sometimes they produce a false impression that the two movements have different or even opposite goals to one another, which can generate tension.

Since they do not emerge from the movements themselves, but from the solutions offered by those in power, these potential tensions should encourage closer relations between the housing and climate movements, as well as the incorporation of each other's analysis and demands. This process can help housing activists better understand the actual demands of the climate movement without associating them with the same "green capitalism" promoted by corporations and governments. In the same way, the climate movement can gain a deeper understanding of the implications of the ecological transition on different sections of the society and incorporate demands such as rent controls, local community ownership of land, safeguards against passing costs onto tenants and measures against gentrification.

Complementarity through difference

Another difference that can open the door to complementarity, but also to tensions, is the social class composition of the two movements. The urban climate movement, at least in the Global North, is characterised by a stronger presence of middle class people with university education among its ranks. Ultimately, they are those who can afford to think about future existential risks. The housing movement, meanwhile, genuinely appeals to working class people overwhelmed by immediate pressures. This may suggest that the two movements are irreconcilable and that they mobilise people with different needs, interests and opportunities who ask for different solutions. However, it also shows that people from different social backgrounds become socially aware for different reasons. "Socially aware" here means un-

derstanding that the underlying causes of both housing inequalities and environmental risks lie in the logic of the economic system that must be changed.

Nothing prevents activists from different social backgrounds from collaborating despite these differences, provided that they share a common analysis of the root causes of the problem. This collaboration can create strengths of which many movements are already aware. Keeping people in precarious economic situations involved in grassroots movements is extremely difficult. People with a certain degree of economic stability are usually those who can afford long term involvement and sustain the structural activities of a collective, thereby removing the risks and burdens from those who are in a more precarious position.

Sectoral struggles and fragmentation

It should be noted that the contributions in this booklet can also be used to develop connections between different sectorial struggles, for example feminism, housing, environmentalism and antiracism. This leads to a broader reflection on why the current ecosystem of social movements displays such a high degree of diversity. What has been the strategic value of this diversity, given that the common problem is a fundamentally unjust economic system?

Each social movement has addressed one of the contradictions of the economic system, but none has been able to articulate a mass political identity capable of communicating two messages: a) Firstly, the economic system must be replaced as soon as possible because of the existential threat of ecological collapse; b) Secondly, an alternative is possible. There are at least three factors that limit this in practice.

It is difficult to organise a community around an issue as abstract as the economic system without referring to one of its specific contradictions, which has the capacity to appeal to a particular section of the population. It is much easier to create a political subject around an identity, as feminism or antiracist movements have done. Secondly, we live in a hypermediated society in which attention is

increasingly fragmented. It is difficult to communicate the systemic issues without referring to one of its parts. Thirdly, it is difficult to keep a social movement alive without achieving concrete victories that strengthen confidence, reinforce activists' sense of effectiveness and help improve the material conditions of communities engaged in struggle. This usually creates the need to focus on specific problems in order to achieve effective political influence.

That said, under what conditions can an effective alliance between different movements be put into practice? This is a difficult question and we want to contribute to its answer. In this booklet, we present some experiences, highlighting some of these opportunities and challenges. In the conclusions, we offer several reflections that attempt to answer this question. However, this is undoubtedly a collective effort that must extend beyond this text. What is shared here is an invitation to begin a process through which we can identify together when and how this form of coordination can take place.

Protests announcing rent strikes (Madrid 2025)

TACTICS FROM THE CLIMATE AND HOUSING MOVEMENTS

"We Need to Be Smart" — Organising Barcelona's Rent Strikes

An interview with Marta Il-Raga from Barcelona Tenants' Union on rent strikes, collective organising, and the struggle over housing in Spain

B: Can you walk me through the Rent Strike campaign? How was it initiated?

R: To understand the rent strike campaign you first need to understand what came before it. For years, the main tactic of the tenants' union was what we called the "Stay Put" campaign. This emerged around seven or eight years ago, when the union was founded. At that time, the biggest problem tenants faced was insecurity: landlords could terminate contracts without cause, and whenever a lease expired they could raise rents however much they wanted. So our analysis was: how do we organise tenants before the eviction happens?

Unlike mortgage holders, tenants often disappear from the political picture once they're evicted. Mortgage holders carry debt and therefore remain trapped in conflict with the bank. But tenants are simply displaced. We realised we needed a strategy that intervened earlier. The idea behind "Stay Put" was essentially civil disobedience. We encouraged tenants to remain in their homes after the lease expired and negotiate new terms collectively, instead of simply accepting huge rent increases. At least conceptually, we didn't consider this a rent strike. Some people did, because tenants were refusing to pay the increased rent. But our position was: we are willing to pay rent — just not these abusive increases. At that time, before COVID, this made political sense. Inflation wasn't exploding yet, wages were stagnant, and rent levels, although already difficult, were not as catastrophic as today.

From rent freeze to lowering the rent

Over time, the Stay Put strategy spread widely. The union grew rapidly, and many tenants won concrete victories using it. Even today, it remains one of our core organising tools. But after COVID, we realised something important: demanding rent freezes was no longer enough.

People needed rents to actually go down. That's when we launched the campaign "Abaixem els lloguers" — "Lower the Rent." The campaign lasted roughly a year and a half and culminated in a massive demonstration in Barcelona last November. At that point, we started asking ourselves seriously: If we really want lower rents, what tools do we have? And the answer increasingly pointed toward rent strikes.

So we created a working group inside the tenants' union dedicated specifically to studying rent strikes, legally, politically, and organisationally. We analysed recent examples from the US and Canada. We looked at legal grey zones. Obviously rent strikes are not formally legal but they're not exactly illegal either. So we explored what protections tenants might have and how existing laws could be strategically used. The goal was to slowly build the legal, social, and organisational infrastructure necessary to sustain real strikes building by building.

Choosing "the perfect enemy"

One key decision was choosing a strategic target. And this was a very smart move. We decided to focus on La Caixa, one of the largest banks in Spain and a hugely important institution in Catalonia. It has enormous public visibility, and crucially, it is also one of the largest landlords in the region. La Caixa had developed large amounts of what in Spain is called publicly protected housing, a kind of semi-social housing built through public-private partnerships. These buildings were constructed using public subsidies and often public land, but they remained privately owned for a fixed number of years. The contradiction was obvious: public money was funding housing that would eventually become fully privatised. And the tenants living there were exactly the kinds of people likely to organise: lower-middle-class households who couldn't afford private market rents but

also couldn't buy homes. At the same time, La Caixa was exploiting loopholes. They increased costs through parking fees that technically fell outside rent caps. Maintenance was neglected. Buildings deteriorated. Tenants were angry. So La Caixa became, politically speaking, the "perfect enemy."

Why rent strikes changed the dynamic

At first, the plan was not necessarily to launch a full strike immediately. The initial aim was simply to organise tenants building by building. But tenants themselves began to realise that the rent strike created a different kind of solidarity. The limitation of the Stay Put strategy was that only tenants whose leases were expiring could take action. If your contract still had three years left, you couldn't really participate.

A rent strike changes that. People can decide collectively to take risks together, even if their leases expire at different times. That creates a much stronger sense of shared struggle and of course it creates more financial pressure on landlords. Initially, some groups experimented with partial strikes, refusing only to pay certain illegal charges like the real estate property tax, which landlords were improperly passing onto tenants. But eventually tenants decided if the legal risk is essentially the same whether you withhold one euro or the full rent, then you might as well go all the way. Importantly, tenants are not simply "keeping" the money. The unpaid rent is placed into collective deposits so that, if agreements are reached or people need to withdraw from the strike, the funds are still there.

"The time of the landlord is over"

B: What conditions made this the right moment for a rent strike?

R: Housing has become the central social issue in Spain. But this didn't happen automatically, the tenants' unions worked very hard to make it visible politically and in the media. The Madrid tenants' union especially became very effective at using more confrontational rhetoric. They openly framed the conflict as tenants versus landlords. Mass demonstrations followed first in Madrid in October, then Barcelona in

November, and then demonstrations again across the whole territory in April. The political atmosphere shifted. Suddenly slogans like: "The time of the landlords is over" started resonating widely.

The idea behind the rhetoric was simple: If we stop paying, they collapse. They need our rents. That's an extremely powerful political idea. But at the same time, we were careful. A general rent strike is extraordinarily difficult to organise. So in Barcelona we insisted on something more specific, focused rent strikes against specific landlords. That's the strategy we're trying to develop.

B: How do you actually organise a strike building by building?

R: The process is slow and extremely methodical. First comes canvassing, really intensive door-knocking. And the key is listening. Many tenants have never been politically organised before. Some are conservative. Some distrust collective action entirely. Some are migrants. Some are squatters. The work consists of slowly helping people recognise that their problems are shared. Then assemblies are organised inside the building. At first these meetings are actually somewhat top-down. Organisers explain the broader strategy, present examples from other buildings, and ask tenants whether they want to participate. From there, we identify internal leaders and assign concrete tasks.

One method we use is surprisingly low-tech. We literally make paper maps of the building. Green dots for supportive flats, red for hostile ones, yellow for undecided. The visual process helps people realise they are not isolated. Over time, buildings hold specific meetings about the possibility of striking. Tenants collectively decide what percentage of participation would be necessary before launching the strike. Sometimes we even rehearse non-payment collectively before formally beginning.

B: How do you deal with people's fears — eviction, legal action, retaliation?

R: You cannot lie to people about the risks. An eviction is possible. That has to be openly discussed from the beginning. But our argument is also very clear: "You already are at risk. Your lease will eventually end. The question is whether you face that alone or collectively." Part of the work is emotional preparation. We discuss what people will do when eviction notices arrive. Lawyers explain possible legal scenarios. We have psychologists in the union helping support discouraged strikers. We also produce solidarity videos, public events, demonstrations, all of this helps tenants feel they are part of something larger. Because once a strike begins, the entire union has to reorganise itself around supporting it. And legal infrastructure is absolutely essential. People need to know there are lawyers behind them, that there are legal strategies in place, that they won't simply be abandoned.

Media, Messaging, and Political Framing

B: How are you framing the strike politically and publicly?

R: One problem we encountered was that the public misunderstood what a rent strike actually is. People imagined it like a one-day labour strike: "Okay, what day does the rent strike begin?" But rent strikes don't work like that. They require long-term organisation. So we had to constantly clarify that these were specific strikes against specific landlords, not some spontaneous general refusal. In Catalonia, much of the political framing became tied to the La Caixa case. The argument was: the real defenders of public housing are the tenants themselves. That framing became especially powerful because the regional government constantly promises to build more social housing, while the existing publicly protected housing is quietly being privatised at the same time. So we argue that strikers are effectively defending housing for future generations.

B: How has the media reacted?

R: Honestly, it's been difficult. Housing is constantly discussed in Spain, and normally the tenants' union has a strong media presence because journalists always want stories about the housing crisis.

But this case is different because La Caixa is extremely powerful. You have one of the first real rent strikes happening, and major media still don't really want to touch it. It's not even necessarily the journalists themselves. It's the broader structure of the media. Nobody wants to confront a bank like La Caixa directly. Maybe international media attention will help break that silence.

Abolishing rent as a political horizon

B: What strategies are you using to sustain momentum?

R: We basically work on three levels. First, there are the tenants actually living in the buildings and participating in the strike. Second, there are union organisers supporting them. We call them "enlaces" (eng. links). People like me who coordinate between the building and the larger union structure. And third, we're trying to build a broader solidarity movement around the strikes. That includes neighbourhood associations, reading groups, local organisations, cultural associations; anyone willing to support the struggle. But honestly, this part is still difficult. Sometimes I think we create events that mainly appeal to young middle-class activists in the union, not necessarily to the strikers themselves. Maybe what people really want is a barbecue. So I think we still need to learn how to build forms of solidarity culture that genuinely belong to the tenants themselves.

B: How would you define a successful strike?

R: Of course, ideally nobody would be evicted, tenants would remain in their homes, and the buildings would become fully public. In the case of La Caixa, one major goal of the Catalan government is to buy the buildings outright. But I also think success can take different forms.

If tenants remain in their homes paying lower rents, that's already a victory. And beyond material outcomes, something else matters deeply to me, even if people lose, I want them to feel they did something meaningful, something useful for future generations.

I think political transformation matters. One example is Casa Orsola in Barcelona. That struggle became symbolic because tenants organised collectively, resisted eviction, mobilised huge solidarity, and ultimately pressured the city council into buying the building. But the most important result wasn't only the purchase itself. It was that many of the tenants became long-term organisers afterwards. They stayed involved in the movement. That's a real victory too.

B: Why stop at lowering rents? Why not go further and talk about abolishing rent entirely?

R: I actually agree with the ambition behind that idea. But first we need to clarify what abolishing rent really means in practical terms. Would it mean public ownership? Cooperative ownership? Permanently decommodified housing? These are specific questions. We've actually started discussions with housing cooperatives in Catalonia to explore whether rental buildings could eventually be transformed into tenant-owned cooperatives. Because honestly, one problem with our current demands is that they're still relatively modest. You win five more years of affordable rent, but after those five years, the same problem returns. So yes, ultimately we need to think about how to remove the landlord entirely.

Assembly culture and democracy

B: Could you describe your assembly culture? How are meetings run?

R: We have different kinds of assemblies, but generally speaking they're very well organised. The largest ones are the weekly tenant assemblies held every Friday in different territorial branches of the union. People come there with their housing problems, and collectively we try to solve cases together. There's a strong effort to rotate roles; facilitation, note-taking, speaking, because we don't want expertise to become concentrated. The idea is that assemblies are spaces of collective intelligence.

At the same time, I don't think we should romanticise total horizontality. Sometimes people actually prefer having recognised organi-

sers or leadership structures. Not everybody wants the same level of involvement. So for me democracy is less about pretending everyone has identical roles, and more about transparency, accountability, participation, and collective decision-making. And honestly, I think the union is also a school for democracy. People don't only come to defend their housing rights. They also learn what collective self-organisation means.

Lessons for smaller tenant unions
B: What lessons would you share with smaller tenants' unions?

R: Patience. That's probably the biggest lesson. Sometimes a strategy fails at first not because it's wrong, but because conditions are not ready yet. We started experimenting with organising entire buildings almost immediately after the union was founded, and the first attempts were disastrous. But we still felt there was something strategically important there.

Now, years later, we can see that it was the correct direction. Movements are built through accumulated victories, step by step. Sometimes you need modest victories first. Sometimes you need to fail before something finally works. But for me the key thing is this, it is always the right moment to organise a tenants' union.

Fridays for Future and the Climate Strike

The common market, the Treaty of Rome's (1958) main objective, was achieved through the 1968 customs union, the abolition of quotas, the free movement of citizens and workers, and a degree of tax har-Fridays for Future developed from an individual act into one of the largest transnational waves of youth protest in recent history. On 20 August 2018, fifteen year old Greta Thunberg began sitting outside the Swedish Parliament instead of attending school, holding a sign that read "School strike for climate". She protested every school day until the Swedish elections in September and then continued her action on Fridays. Images circulated through social media, while students in other places reproduced the format under the hashtags

#FridaysForFuture and #SchoolStrike4Climate. By 15 March 2019, coordinated strikes had taken place in more than 120 countries, involving an estimated 1.6 million participants. The September 2019 Global Climate Strike expanded the mobilisation further, bringing millions of school and university students, parents, scientists and civil society organisations into demonstrations across the world.

Fridays For Future Global Strike (2019)

The innovation did not simply lie in young people demonstrating against climate change. The movement transformed absence from school (strike) into a recognisable form of political disruption. Students lacked the industrial power of employees who could stop production, and many were too young to vote. Their withdrawal from education therefore operated mainly through moral, cultural and communicative pressure. By refusing to attend lessons, they exposed a contradiction: governments insisted that children should prepare responsibly for the future while failing to protect the climatic conditions on which that future depended. The strike turned young people's limited institutional power into public legitimacy and placed their age at the centre of a claim about intergenerational injustice. In this sense, missing school was not merely a means of attracting attention, but a political message in itself.

As a mobilisation tactic, the climate strike combined a simple form of action with a powerful public narrative. Its basic method could be explained in one sentence: leave school on Friday and gather in a visible public place to demand climate action. This made the tactic modular and easy to reproduce. A new group did not require a large organisation, substantial funding or specialist equipment. A small number of pupils could choose a date, prepare placards, announce a meeting point and register the action on an international map. Fridays for Future provided tools for registering strikes, alongside logos, chants, communication guidance and suggestions for organising assemblies and discussions in schools. Since the same action could be undertaken by five pupils outside a town hall or by thousands marching through a capital city, it offered a low threshold for beginning while leaving considerable space for growth.

The recurring Friday rhythm was equally significant. Instead of depending exclusively on exceptional demonstrations, the tactic created a regular and predictable opportunity for participation. Weekly strikes allowed local activists to meet, distribute responsibilities, develop confidence and establish a recognisable public presence in their town or city. In practice, many groups combined smaller weekly gatherings with larger national or global days of action. The weekly protest maintained continuity, while the global strike generated concentration, scale and media attention. Shared dates enabled thousands of locally organised actions to appear as a single international event. This produced the image of a coordinated global constituency without requiring a central organisation to direct every participating group.

Local groups formed the operational core of this model. They recruited participants, selected meeting points, planned marches, contacted local authorities where prior notification was required, prepared banners and speeches, approached journalists and arranged sound systems, stewards and social media coverage. Depending on their size, groups were able to distribute tasks among teams responsible for logistics, communications, political demands, outreach or coordination with other organisations. Meetings often took place af-

ter school or online, enabling young people to combine activism with their education. Decentralisation gave local organisers substantial freedom to adapt the common strike format to different political and cultural contexts.

Schools were not only places from which students withdrew. They also operated as important mobilisation networks. Organisers spoke with classmates, distributed leaflets, created messaging groups and encouraged friends to participate together. These relationships reduced the social and practical costs of joining a protest for the first time. Young people knew where to meet, who they would travel with and what was likely to happen during the action. Teachers and school administrations were able to obstruct involvement through disciplinary measures, but they were also able to facilitate it by discussing the climate crisis, tolerating absences, organising assemblies or inviting scientists and activists to speak.

The original audience for mobilisation consisted of school age young people, particularly secondary school pupils, but the organisational strategy soon expanded. University students created campus groups and connected lectures, public discussions and educational events to street demonstrations. Parents formed groups such as Parents for Future, providing assistance with transport, safeguarding, fundraising, legal questions and relations with schools, while publicly supporting youth leadership. Scientists established Scientists for Future networks, signed declarations endorsing the concerns of the strikers and participated in assemblies and public events. Their involvement strengthened the movement's claim that its demands were based on established climate science rather than merely on youthful emotion. Environmental organisations also contributed meeting spaces, communication infrastructure, legal advice and campaigning experience.

These relationships required careful management. Established NGOs possessed professional staff, funding and access to political decision makers, but their involvement risked weakening the perception that the strikes were genuinely organised by young peo-

ple. Many local groups therefore accepted practical support while attempting to retain control over political messages, speakers and decision making. This distribution of roles became part of the public identity of the tactic: children and young people occupied its moral and political centre, while parents, teachers, scientists and non-governmental organisations provided resources and legitimacy through the wider movement infrastructure.

The mobilisation of September 2019 represented a deliberate expansion from a school strike towards a broader social strike. Youth organisers invited adults to leave their workplaces and join the demonstrations. Trade unions, businesses, professional associations, human rights organisations and religious groups endorsed or facilitated participation in different countries.
The tactic was also reinforced by an accessible political framing. "Listen to the science" offered a common language for participants from different political backgrounds, while the Paris Agreement provided a widely recognised institutional reference. The claim that young people had "no future" without urgent action condensed a complex political issue into an emotionally direct message. As the movement expanded, many groups connected the strikes with climate justice, antiracism, Indigenous rights, public transport, fossil fuel divestment, loss and damage and opposition to specific extraction projects. This localisation enabled activists to connect the global climate crisis with tangible conflicts affecting their communities. It also generated internal debates between those seeking broad unity around demands based on climate science and those advocating a more explicit critique of the economic system, colonialism and social inequality.

The mobilisation brought many first time protesters into collective action, trained young organisers and placed climate change higher on political and media agendas. Fridays for Future increased climate related communication by politicians, greater media attention and changes in electoral behaviour. However, repetition also created strategic difficulties. A strike may lose pressure when political authorities can anticipate it, participation declines or the action becomes a familiar ritual that imposes few material costs on decision

makers. At the same time, media coverage frequently personalised the mobilisation around Thunberg rather than examining its decentralised grassroots organisation or its broader structural demands.

Fridays for Future consequently began combining strikes with political education, electoral interventions, petitions, litigation, campaigns against fossil fuel projects and alliances with workers. For example, the collaboration between Fridays for Future Germany and the Verdi public transport union represented a significant development. Youth activists supported demands for better wages and working conditions for transport workers, while the union connected these claims with the investment required for climate friendly public transport. Such alliances go beyond inviting adults to join a youth demonstration. They identify shared material interests around which climate activists and organised labour can construct longer-term forms of collective power.

The historical importance of Fridays for Future therefore lies in its transformation of the school strike into an internationally reproducible mobilisation infrastructure. Its strength emerged from the interaction between moral disruption, accessible local organising, regular repetition, decentralised coordination, digital communication and alliances that gradually expanded the participating public. The tactic alone could not force governments to decarbonise, and mass attendance did not automatically create lasting political power. Nevertheless, it altered the scale and social composition of climate protest, gave a generation practical organising experience and demonstrated how thousands of autonomous grassroots actions could be synchronised into a recognisable global political event.

Extinction Rebellion and Non Violent Direct Actions (NVDA)

Extinction Rebellion, commonly known as XR, emerged in the United Kingdom in 2018 with the explicit aim of moving climate campaigning beyond petitions, lobbying and conventional marches. On 31 October, activists gathered in Parliament Square to issue a Declaration of Rebellion against the British Government. The movement

combined three central demands: that governments tell the truth about the climate and ecological emergency, act with the necessary urgency and establish a citizens' assembly to guide the transition. Its distinctive contribution was not simply a more urgent message, but a mobilisation model centred on publicly announced, non violent breaches of the law.

XR understood disruption as a means of turning a widely recognised problem into an unavoidable political crisis. Demonstrations confined to designated areas could be heard and ignored, while occupations and blockades interrupted traffic, commerce and official activity. The movement expected disruption to attract media attention, recruit sympathisers and force institutions to respond. Arrest was therefore not regarded solely as an unfortunate risk. Publicly accepting it could demonstrate commitment and create a moral contrast between peaceful campaigners and an unresponsive state. The tactic sought to transform passive concern into a public dilemma: continue with normal life during an emergency, or support those refusing to accept normality.

This model became visible when XR blockaded five London bridges in November 2018 and reached its defining form during the April 2019 Rebellion. Thousands of people occupied Waterloo Bridge, Oxford Circus, Marble Arch and Parliament Square for several days. A pink boat named after the murdered Honduran environmental defender Berta Cáceres became a stage at Oxford Circus, while Waterloo Bridge was transformed through the presence of trees, food, music and public talks. More than 1,000 people were arrested. The duration of the action was as important as the road closures. Maintaining the occupied sites created a continuing political and media event rather than a march that disappeared after a single afternoon.

At grassroots level, mobilisation generally began before the occupation through public meetings and introductory talks. Presentations such as "Heading for Extinction" framed climate breakdown as an immediate emergency and argued that established institutions had failed to respond. They created a path from concern to action: parti-

cipants could join a local group, attend training in non violent direct action and decide what degree of legal risk they were prepared to accept. The purpose was not only to provide information about climate science, but to move people from anxiety or frustration towards participation in organised collective action.

Local groups provided the basic recruitment infrastructure. They organised meetings, distributed leaflets, approached community organisations, arranged transport and ran stalls, talks and training sessions. During national rebellions, groups often travelled together and assumed responsibility for particular sites, days or functions. A mass action could therefore be assembled through existing relationships rather than from an anonymous crowd responding to central instructions. The same model supported decentralised actions outside London, including road occupations, die-ins, performances and interventions at council buildings, banks or fossil fuel companies, all connected through common symbols, demands and communication channels.

Extinction Rebellion Die-in on the campus of the UVA in Amsterdam (2019)

Affinity groups formed smaller units of trust and action, often composed of people who had trained together or already knew one another. They were able to plan autonomous interventions, join a larger blockade or support members who chose roles involving the possibility of arrest. Not everyone was expected to face this risk. Participants were able to contribute through stewarding, media work, food provision, transport, first aid, accessibility, wellbeing, legal information, photography, art, music or support following arrest. This differentiation was central to mass participation. Civil disobedience was presented not as an activity reserved for fearless militants, but as an ecosystem in which people with different capacities, responsibilities and levels of risk could take part.

Preparation was intended to ensure that disruption remained disciplined rather than aggressive. XR's Action Consensus required participants to remain non violent in their conduct and communication, avoid endangering others, understand the possible legal consequences and consider emergency access when planning blockades. Training addressed the purpose of non violent action, behaviour during confrontations, group communication and arrest. The commitment to public and accountable action distinguished XR's approach from clandestine sabotage. Participants generally explained their motives and accepted that the authorities might remove or prosecute them, using the encounter itself to communicate the urgency of the climate crisis.

Large occupations required a second layer of infrastructure. Action teams selected locations of political or economic significance and attempted to hold them through numbers and physical presence. Other groups managed communications, finance, legal support, food, sanitation, transport, sound equipment and welfare. Occupied roads became temporary social spaces containing kitchens, assemblies, children's activities, performances and scientific talks. This festival atmosphere served a strategic purpose. It sustained participation over long periods, invited passers by into conversation and demonstrated an alternative use of urban space. The combination of blockade and community distinguished XR's rebellions from actions based exclusively on interruption.

XR coordinated these activities through a Self Organising System rather than a conventional chain of command. Work was distributed among circles, teams and defined roles operating within agreed mandates. Local and affinity groups retained substantial autonomy, while national structures supported actions, media, training, finance, citizens' assemblies and legal or digital infrastructure. In principle, authority belonged to roles and processes rather than permanent leaders, allowing groups aligned with XR's principles to act without waiting for permission.

The movement also developed what it called regenerative culture. Civil disobedience exposes participants to exhaustion, conflict, arrest, court proceedings and emotional pressure. Wellbeing teams, check ins, debriefing sessions and support for arrested activists helped people prepare for and recover from these experiences. Affinity groups were encouraged to discuss what had happened, what their members needed and what lessons could be drawn. These practices were not simply therapeutic additions. They formed part of the mobilisation infrastructure by seeking to reduce burnout, preserve relationships and enable repeated participation. Care work, although less visible than a blockade, sustained the people whose bodies were used to hold public space.

XR addressed a broader audience than the predominantly young constituency of the school climate strikes. Recruitment targeted parents, grandparents, scientists, health workers, teachers, artists, lawyers, faith communities and people who had never regarded themselves as activists. Surveys of the 2019 London rebellions found many first time protesters and participants with little experience of actions involving arrest. XR was particularly effective at mobilising older, highly educated and middle class citizens who already accepted the seriousness of climate change but had lost confidence in individual lifestyle changes and institutional politics. This increased the number of people prepared to participate in environmental direct action, while also revealing continued difficulties in reaching working class and racially diverse communities.

Art and performance connected these audiences and made the disruption visually understandable. The hourglass symbol, brightly coloured banners, choirs, drums, funeral processions, die-ins and the red robed Red Rebel Brigade produced images that circulated through newspapers and social media. Spectacle softened the appearance of confrontation while preserving the interruption, communicating grief, danger and collective creativity at the same time. Digital channels circulated meeting points and images, but local meetings and interpersonal recruitment remained decisive. Media exposure expanded the number of potential supporters, while grassroots relationships transformed part of that attention into sustained participation.

Red Rebel Brigade holding their hands out to police in Westminster

The tactic also created serious tensions. Road blockades inconvenienced workers and passengers who had little direct control over climate policy, while attempts to disrupt public transport proved especially controversial. An autonomous action targeting the London Underground in October 2019 provoked anger among commuters and exposed the limits of decentralisation. An action that appeared

compatible with an abstract disruption could undermine the environmental message and damage relationships with the public. Legal risk was also distributed unequally. People with secure employment, citizenship, housing and family support were generally able to handle arrest more easily than migrants, racialised communities, precarious workers or carers.

The results were mixed. The April 2019 rebellion placed climate change at the centre of political debate in Britain, and Parliament declared a climate emergency shortly afterwards, although this did not represent acceptance of XR's programme. Disruption strengthened general environmental attitudes but did not produce decisive policy change or an equivalent increase in sustained mobilisation. Repetition reduced the element of surprise as the police and media narratives adapted. At the beginning of 2023, XR UK therefore announced that it would temporarily prioritise attendance over arrest and relationships over roadblocks.

XR has not formally abandoned non violent civil disobedience. Its strategy for 2025 and 2026 recognises that the tactics used in 2019 no longer produce the same effects and places greater emphasis on community bases of power, alliances and pressure directed at those responsible for climate and ecological injustice. The historical importance of the movement lies in its construction of a mass pathway into civil disobedience. Recruitment talks, local groups, training, affinity groups, differentiated roles, regenerative care and dramatic occupations enabled people who had never imagined breaking the law to participate in disruptive action. Its experience demonstrates that disruption can generate urgency and commitment, but only when attention is transformed into organisation, alliances and lasting collective power.

CASE STUDIES OF INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN CLIMATE AND HOUSING

The Confluence of Struggles in Madrid

Luis Rico – Ecologistas en Acción

The Confluence of Struggles is a recently established meeting space that brings together sectoral social movements working on housing, antiracism, labour rights and environmental issues across the Madrid region. The initiative began in 2023 in the form of collaboration of five grassroots organisations belonging to Madrid's autonomous left, which had already shared several temporary spaces for mobilisation. Although these groups differ considerably in their objectives, membership, size and organisational cultures, they agree on three basic premises.

- The first is that unity creates strength and that, at a time marked by multiple crises and the advance of the far right, grassroots organisation from below and from the left is more necessary than ever.

- The second is that, although their struggles may appear different, they share common causes, primarily the economic model whose need for accumulation and continuous growth places it in conflict with life itself.

- The third is that they have many more points of convergence than differences.

Five organisations currently form the Confluence.

- The Madrid Street Vendors' Union emerged approximately two decades ago and is composed of migrant workers who promote mutual aid and defend the rights of migrants without residential or working permits.

- The Madrid Tenants' Union was established in 2017 by residents organising against the housing crisis and the rental bubble in

the Madrid region. Although the union has branches in the main cities of Spain, only its Madrid organisation participates in the Confluence of Struggles.

- The General Confederation of Labour, known as CGT, is a trade union operating throughout Spain, although only its federation for Madrid, Castilla La Mancha and Extremadura participates in the Confluence. It is the third largest trade union in the country by membership and has a history of struggle extending over more than a century.

- CNT Comarcal Sur is also a trade union with the same historical roots as CGT. Although it has a presence across Spain, a group based in Madrid participates in the initiative.

- Ecologistas en Acción is an environmental organisation created in 1998. Its work is based on social environmentalism, which understands environmental and social problems as consequences of the economic system of production and consumption. Although it has groups throughout Spain, the organisations from the Madrid region participate in the Confluence.

For the time being, the Confluence of Struggles has limited its work to the Region of Madrid, as its members considered it necessary to establish the process within a specific territory in the initial phase. However, if the experience proves successful in Madrid, the possibility of reproducing it in other places has not been excluded. Although five organisations currently form the Confluence, it remains open to the participation of additional groups.

Its principal objective is to strengthen intersectoral social mobilisation and achieve change across the main challenging areas of our lives, including the ecological crisis, racism, labour precarity, the lack of access to housing and sexism. The experience of the 15M mobilisations in 2011 remains an important reference. At that time, a significant part of the Spanish population took to the streets against the abuses of the economic system. The Confluence of Struggles believes that, during

the present crisis, it is both possible and necessary to reactivate public mobilisation, although this will require different approaches.

The initiative therefore seeks cooperation among the social sectors suffering the consequences of the current crisis, including migrants, people without access to housing and the working class. Its work attempts to overcome familiar social tensions that have become embedded in public opinion but are, in fact, consequences of contradictions within the prevailing model of production and consumption. One example is the apparent conflict between employment and environmentalism, since closing polluting factories can lead to job losses. A similar tension exists between housing and environmental protection, as expanding the amount of land available for construction and destroying areas of high ecological value have oftentimes been presented as a solution to the housing crisis by the government. Another example is the confrontation promoted by the far right between migrant workers and workers born in Spain. To challenge these narratives, the Confluence emphasises that such problems share common origins and cannot be addressed in isolation.

The environmental crisis, for example, cannot be understood without recognising the unequal responsibility for its creation. This inequality exists on multiple levels – some countries have contributed to the crisis more than others, namely in the Global North; the same goes for businesses and companies, such as heavy industry and multinational corporations in general, and the wealthiest people all over the world have profited from appropriating global resources unlike others. Neither can the crisis be addressed without examining who suffers its most severe effects, including populations displaced from their territories by droughts and conflicts over resources and, on a smaller scale, people whose work takes place in the street.

Any environmental solution that fails to address existing social problems and does not involve solidarity between classes and countries will consequently exclude large parts of the population. Highlighting the systemic origin of these problems makes it possible to develop shared solutions and overcome apparent tensions.

The industrial system could, for example, be transformed as part of an ecological transition that also reduces working hours and improves employment conditions for everyone, regardless of their place of origin. Access to housing could be expanded without building new urban developments by limiting rental prices, discouraging empty properties, substantially taxing large property owners and promoting public housing or housing under right of use arrangements.

Through these approaches, the Confluence of Struggles seeks to create an inclusive and intersectional narrative that places people, the planet and life itself at the centre. Its ultimate aim is to construct lasting counterpower capable of bringing social movements together and creating an active civil society. This would enable movements to move beyond their traditional defensive positions and develop more emancipatory strategies capable of imagining paths towards ecological utopias.

Building the Confluence

Considerable attention has been given to the process through which the participating organisations have come together. One important element has been the pace of work. The process was not accelerated or overloaded with content. Moving gradually was considered more important, as this gave each organisation the opportunity to become comfortable within the space and to discuss its commitments, doubts and reservations internally.

A second element involved creating spaces of trust in every meeting so that the people involved could get to know one another and establish positive relationships. The third consisted of identifying the elements that united the organisations' political analysis and forms of action rather than initially concentrating on their differences. These choices contributed to a process that, although it lasted almost three years, was received positively by all the organisations and generated growing enthusiasm.

The organisations decided that a useful starting point would be to hold a joint training space every six months for members of all five groups. Three training meetings have taken place, drawing on the

knowledge of people close to the Confluence of Struggles organisations. Their titles were "A diagnosis for political action. Towards a common framework for understanding the crisis?", "Constructing our own power. Autonomy, popular power and the construction of a multiple political subject", and "Towards a postcapitalist transition".

Another way of building the initiative collectively has been to support the sectoral struggles led by each organisation. This support has taken different forms, including attending mobilisations called by other participating groups, endorsing them publicly and producing joint statements. Examples include support for housing protests organised by the Tenants' Union, mobilisations by teachers promoted by CNT and CGT, and actions organised by the Street Vendors' Union.

A further step involved creating common blocs within major mobilisations in Madrid. During demonstrations in solidarity with the Palestinian population, the five organisations not only attended together but also collaborated in civil disobedience actions denouncing the genocide in Gaza.

The Confluence of Struggles also created the School of Struggles, a training space for new activists that offers weekly sessions led by members of the five organisations. Its most recent shared milestone was the Spring Festival, held in May 2026 in a Madrid neighbourhood. This public presentation of the Confluence included discussions, a shared meal and concerts. During the three year process, the organisations also developed the Confluence of Struggles shared identity, name and visual image.

Organisational structure

The coordination of the initiative has been carried out by activists from the participating organisations. The process initially relied on a small group composed of between one and three members from each organisation, who coordinated the first meetings and communication between the groups.

Two additional working groups were subsequently created. One was responsible for organising the training sessions, while the other considered possible joint campaigns involving all five organisations. The latter also gradually developed the identity and visual image of the Confluence of Struggles.

During the second year, two other groups were established. One organised the School of Struggles, while the other prepared the Spring Festival. Almost all this work was undertaken by activists from the organisations. From the third year onwards, however, some groups decided to strengthen the process by allocating part of the working hours of their paid staff to the Confluence.

Managing diversity and unequal capacities

The initial difficulties were mainly related to the diversity of the participating organisations. Some members were not fully convinced by the process, as they feared that it would add a considerable amount of work to already demanding agendas without producing significant progress. This was one of the reasons why the organisations decided to proceed slowly and respect the internal discussions of each group.

A second challenge was finding time to dedicate to the Confluence when mobilisation agendas were already full. The training sessions were therefore initially held every six months, since greater frequency could have placed additional pressure on the participating organisations.

A further difficulty arose from the different rhythms and capacities of each group. Not every organisation was able to contribute the same amount of work at every stage. Those able to take on a greater share of the tasks nevertheless showed willingness to do so.

This created another potential risk. Organisations contributing more time could have taken control of the space and its decisions. The Confluence of Struggles attempted to prevent this by slowing down decision making until every organisation had an opportunity to express its position on each proposed step. In general, difficulties

were approached according to the same principle: avoiding forced timetables and maintaining channels of trust.

Results and lessons

The process remains open and continues to develop. Its public presentation only took place in May 2026, and the organisations expect to continue increasing cooperation and expanding the number of groups involved.

The main result so far has been the development of increasingly fluid joint work. This has been demonstrated through internal and public training sessions, common mobilisations, texts written collectively and the organisation of the Spring Festival. The most important achievement, however, has been the growth of trust and enthusiasm for continuing to work together and strengthening the Confluence. Respecting a gradual timetable has been central to this progress. It allowed the process to advance without placing pressure on any organisation, while maintaining a constant rhythm of work. This was possible because the Confluence of Struggles avoided directly assuming responsibility for every urgent issue within Madrid's mobilisation calendar. Instead, it drew on the work already carried out by each organisation within its own area. The Tenants' Union continued addressing housing, the Street Vendors' Union focused on antiracist struggles, the trade unions worked on employment and labour rights, and Ecologistas en Acción concentrated on environmental issues. The other organisations supported each of these struggles. Concentrating on what united the groups, while avoiding an initial debate about their differences, was also highly important. The training sessions were particularly successful because they enabled participants to explore the shared causes of the problems they confronted. They also created spaces for mutual understanding and helped generate a positive atmosphere.

Finally, open and generous attitude of the people and organisations involved has been decisive. Contributions were unequal at certain moments, which is normal among groups with very different characteristics and capacities. Each organisation nevertheless offered what it

could in a spirit of solidarity, and the differences in their levels of participation did not generate conflict. This has allowed the Confluence of Struggles to preserve enthusiasm throughout the process.

Flyers form the first Spring Festival of Confluence of Struggles (2026, Madrid)

Public housing tenants are vital low carbon protagonists

Fiadh Tubridy

Towards the end of November last year the Just Housing research team organised a workshop in collaboration with the Community Action Tenants Union focusing on campaigns to improve conditions in public housing. For the past three years one of CATU's main national campaigns has been focused on public housing, with the key demands being that much more public housing needs to be built, that investment is required to improve conditions in the existing stock and that income caps should be abolished so that public housing is accessible to anyone who wants it. The workshop was an opportunity to reflect and share information on all the work that

has been done on this campaign and to build links between local and national issues in order to build a more united island-wide campaign. The event involved presentations about campaigns in Southill in Limerick, Mayfield in Cork, Davitt House in Drimnagh, Rathmines Avenue, Ballymun and our own organising and survey work in Cromcastle Court in Kilmore. Author and campaigner John Bissett gave an insightful presentation on the fight for regeneration of St Michael's Estate in Inchicore and there was another talk about mass campaigns in public and privately rented housing being undertaken by international tenants' unions.

Retrofitting and public housing conditions

An obvious question to be addressed at this point: what is the connection between, on the one hand, campaigns to improve conditions in public housing and, on the other, the issues of retrofitting and climate action that are the focus of our research project. As was apparent throughout the workshop, questions related to damp, mould and heating costs are central to contemporary campaigns around public housing and are typically some of the primary grievances driving organising in this area. We have previously provided an overview of some of the maintenance problems in public housing, but the workshop gave critical, on the ground perspectives based on conversations and direct experience, describing and showing photos of chronic mould, problems with ventilation, lack of insulation, exorbitant energy costs and non-functional heating systems, alongside a whole array of other maintenance issues.

While retrofitting is a technocratic term more associated with climate policy and emissions calculations, at a basic level the works involved in a retrofit, new windows, doors, insulation, and upgraded heating systems, are amongst those most urgently needed in many publicly-owned homes. Looking back at earlier campaigns about public housing conditions, one key example was that in Dolphin House after the collapse of the public private partnership regeneration plan following the financial crisis and property market crash, which left tenants on the estate living in atrocious conditions. The campaign adopted a 'Human Rights Based Approach' and involved an in-

ternational legal case which found that the Irish government was in breach of the European Social Charter. In the immediate term it forced DCC to upgrade 40 of the homes left in the estate by installing double glazed windows and additional insulation.

Thus, while the tenants' concerns were about their immediate health and wellbeing rather than BER ratings and emissions, their efforts led to works which we would now recognise as retrofits and energy efficiency improvements (and may well have ended up being counted towards DCC's retrofit targets). It is further notable that this investment was only secured in the face of determined state resistance, which shows the hollowness of official discourses about the need for education and 'behavioural change' to promote uptake of retrofits.

In some cases, and perhaps increasingly, tenants' demands have been framed in terms of retrofits and the links to climate change have been made explicit. One notable example was a protest organised by CATU Crumlin/Drimnagh outside a DCC climate committee meeting in 2023 highlighting the council's lack of action on retrofitting in Davitt House. The tenant's full list of demands include replacement of all windows and doors and full insulation for all homes in the estate, alongside other improvements.

This situation, where tenants are fighting for combined social and environmental improvements, has clear parallels with Daniel Aldana Cohen's analysis of housing activists in Brazil. He describes them as key "low carbon protagonists" because they have been fighting for high quality inner city public housing and public transport, often conflicting with the neoliberal forms of urban greening and gentrification promoted by 'green policy elites'.

We should recognise the environmental and climate significance of public housing organising in Ireland. In fact, public housing tenants and those involved in organising these campaigns are one of the most important and (potentially) well-organised and cohesive forces for climate justice in Ireland.

The significance and scope of public housing organising

We have already highlighted the importance of these campaigns from a climate perspective. However, important as these issues are, the scope and potential of this movement exceeds issues limited to the immediate fabric of the home, energy efficiency and maintenance.

The issues raised by attendees at the workshop included many related to the local environment and community, such as access to public transport and the use and control of green spaces - "there's nothing for the kids" being one of the most commonly heard complaints on the doors. This illustrates how the concerns being raised by public housing residents have implications for fundamental issues of democratisation and control over one's living environment.
Speaking about recent regeneration schemes, John Bissett highlighted that quality of life on public housing estates relates to a much wider range of issues than simply the physical condition of the homes themselves: "We need to think organically and about what's going to happen when people move in. One of the key things obviously is that people have decent jobs and decent healthcare. They're the keys. Let's deliver them as well as the housing."

Beyond the immediate issues being raised on the doors, attendees also pointed to the critical importance of these campaigns to combatting the far right. The hope is that "providing a clear target", in other words pointing out that ultimate responsibility for many of the problems facing working class communities lies with councils and central government rather than migrants, and putting people into struggles where they will directly experience this antagonism, will help to undercut the growth of racist ideas and movements.

Tactics and successes

Returning to the basic features of these campaigns, the presentations highlighted common tactics and organising tools, including doorknocking, mapping, leafletting, gathering complaints forms, housing support groups and various forms of protests and actions. It is worth highlighting that there is ongoing discussion on the balance between more disruptive, and potentially effective, actions and the

need to build relationships with trade unions and avoid alienating local authority workers.

There have been notable successes including securing a very significant amount of investment and repairs across different councils, such as the replacement of all windows in Davitt House. In Mayfield, the CATU branch has won the right to represent tenants in meetings and negotiations with Cork City Council.

It was noted, however, that where councils carry out works in response to pressure from this is typically in an ad hoc manner that makes it difficult to keep track of and publicise successes. Further, organisers feel that work carried out by councils is often carefully targeted to, as one CATU member described it, "neutralise" the most vocal and effective tenants and demobilise campaigns.

It's also the case that repairs and refurbishment programmes carried out by councils are done to a very poor standard and don't properly fix the issues (or can even make them worse). This applies even in the case of those won through tenant organising, such as the disastrous retrofitting programme in Cromcastle Court in the mid 2010s. As such we need to build tenant power for long term control and management of estates rather than simply securing once-off victories.

Challenges and future prospects

These campaigns are, unsurprisingly, not without their challenges. A key issue is the fragmentation and divisions within working class communities, with growing support for the far right being just one example of this.

Within the housing movement, the emphasis on public housing organising has been linked to an analysis that this is a key constituency because public housing tenants have a shared landlord and relatively stable, cohesive communities compared with the fragmentation and alienation of the private rental sector. In theory, this provides more fertile ground for organising. In practice, however, the experience of recent (and historic campaigns) shows that this is not entirely accurate.

One issue that was apparent from the workshop attendance was that there is continued division between 'organisers', mostly younger, active CATU members who are private renters or mortgage-holders (who made up the majority of attendees) and public housing tenants themselves. So far, these campaigns have not translated into public housing tenants leading campaigns themselves or becoming active union members in large numbers.

Further, it was noted that once problems are fixed there is a tendency for tenants to drop away, which reflects a widespread tendency to treat organisations such as CATU 'as a service' which can be relied upon in times of crisis. In response one attendee highlighted that "we need to keep reinforcing what CATU is about. We need to get the message out there about what a union is".

These issues relate to the context of residualisation of public housing, referring to the fact that it has becoming progressively a smaller and more stigmatised section of the housing system reserved only for what are seen as the most desperate and deserving cases. Related to this many tenants face additional inequalities related to access to healthcare, employment and caring responsibilities that make it difficult to become politically active. As described by Hearne and Kenna (2014) "the deteriorating conditions across estates in Dublin in the 2000s made successful cross-city organization very difficult to achieve."

Likewise, something we have found though the survey work we have been carrying out for the Just Housing research project is how the residualisation of public housing and the failure of councils to maintain their properties contributes to further stratification within estates, between tenants who can afford to invest in improving their own homes, compared with those who can't and are left living in desperate conditions.

Another related issue is the difficulty of cohering the local organising into a unified, island-wide campaign for public housing. As it stands,

most of the work that has been done so far has been in the context of relatively isolated and highly localised campaigns loosely connected through the union structure. As noted in a recent analysis, CATU has faced "challenges to connecting local and national issues – for instance, linking the union's national campaign for public housing with the specific problems and demands of local members".

While this is partly linked to the union's local branch structure, it is also connected to the fact that the burden of sustaining local campaigns continues to fall primarily on a small number of active members and organisers rather than being taken up by tenants themselves, leaving little capacity for a more coordinated national campaign. Despite this, there is clearly scope for a more coherent and unified campaign as well as the intensification and massification of local struggles, that would contribute to climate justice alongside other forms of social transformation. There is, as one attendee put it "a will for change".

Limitations in collaboration between the housing and the climate movement

The following interview with a housing activist from the Czech Republic shows that there are also limitations when it comes to close collaboration between the two movements, especially when they want to work on the same or similar campaigns long term. It is an experience of two groups, a housing and a climate justice oriented group, that started an organisation together with the aim to build an encompassing movement instead focusing on single issues only. Eventually they decided to part ways and grow their organisations independently. We could say that what this experience points to is the necessity to converge and diverge at different times and to experiment with different forms of collaboration that would have a meaningful impact on society.

A: How did your organisation come into being?

M: We founded the organisation in 2021. At the beginning we were people doing climate justice and tenants' rights. And the aim of this

organisation was to bring structure to the Czech movement where people would be able to do activism, but get paid for their work. The idea was to do resilient activism.

A: Why did you decide to work together and what did it look like?

M: Us from the housing group wanted to organise a mass movement. We were using this structure to get grants, which was really important because we were not able to get them on our own. People from the climate movement had already gone further than us. The housing movement didn't have an organisation, have any structure or a clear idea about what to do. We just came to this field with zero experience while the climate justice movement already had a fight behind them, a fight against coal. And we were in very different positions in terms of where our movements were.

A: What were the differences in your work?

M: People from the climate justice movement do not organise mass movement. They talk a lot about organising, but they mainly do education projects and campaigns. We also tried to do a campaign on housing, DIY housing isolation in winter for tenants. It was thought to be part of the struggle against energetic poverty. Energetic poverty in the Czech Republic is a problem, but not as big as rents that are really high. So I couldn't say that this campaign was successful because only our friends participated in it. It was a fun activity, but that's it. We didn't manage to attract many people, because I think not many actually struggle with this in comparison with high rents and short-term rental contracts. So we decided to split. At the beginning, we were doing a lot of strategic planning together, but finally it seemed to us that we work in different ways and with different people. As I said, the housing movement had no money and no chance to get grants, but now we have some money because we have membership fees. So we can be legally and financially independent, which is better for us because we can write grants in our own name.

A: What is the climate movement doing at this moment?

M: They're focusing on community energy and this may be another reason why we are not working together anymore. We have different visions. From our perspective, this project is attractive for a very small number of people. Community energy is fine, but we can't tell people that if they want cheap energy, they have to put solar panels on their houses, connect to a network and organise a communal energy project. At this point I don't see how it is possible to scale up these projects. We don't want to have such cool looking projects, we just want lower rent, that's all.

A: Why is the climate movement focused on these kinds of projects? Are they involved in them or do you think that they are just easier to attract funding?

M: A lot of them also live in cooperative housing, which is a great initiative, but we can't scale it up at this point. I think this might be the reason they are focused on these particular projects, and they of course are themselves involved in them. It is a sort of an incubator of ecological and economic alternatives. But as I said, not everybody wants to live in communal housing and have communal energy. The majority of people just want to live in their flats and have low rent.

A: Have there been any successful projects that you worked on together?

M: Yes, the climate movement wanted to create a new, more eco-friendly economy. They're working on different projects that are related. Now it is mainly energy, but there were other initiatives. One was collaboration with food cooperatives. So when you become a member of our organisation, you also become a member of the food cooperative. It buys food directly from farmers, and because it is a cooperative, they don't make any profit. They sell food for the prices that they get from farmers and they're financed through membership fees. They go to the farms, they check how this food is produced, if it is really ecological. They also check working conditions in the farms, making sure there is no migrant slave labour, for example. There is also a community that one can visit, go there, have food

and drinks together. So there is also this kind of community spirit behind it. In general, I think that it is a very tangible connection between the housing group and food cooperatives, which are part of the alternative economy.

A: Why do you think this has been the most successful example of collaboration between housing and climate movements?

M: Because getting food is very tangible, people can actually go there and buy something. There is an additional benefit of membership in our organisation. The food there is really good, always fresh, local. So one can support local farmers by buying food from them. This way it touches upon the topic of a multifaceted social change, while it is also accessible for everybody. Everybody can just go there and buy something. It's not hard, it's a low-key activity, unlike organising an energy cooperative, which is really hard. It is not something most people would like to do in their free time.

A: Can you tell me a little bit more about the members of your organisation, who are they?

M: Members of our union are, of course, renters, but there are also people who are in solidarity with renters. They can even be ethical landlords who, for example, went abroad and rented their flat to a refugee for a lower price. In general, members of our organisations are middle-class people who think that the housing situation in Prague is unjust. Some renters are not middle-class, they're working-class people from the outskirts of big cities, living in blocks of flats that are owned by the same landlord. But I would say that the majority of our members in the big cities are middle-class people who have social and cultural capital and who have time to organise, because not everybody has time to go to meetings and help solve problems of other people.

We are really trying to get out of this middle-class bubble, and little by little it is happening. The housing crisis helps us a lot with that, there are so many people who are so angry, and they're trying to

find a way to channel their anger. I think this might be a little bit different with the climate justice movement. It's not like I pay 500 euros every month because of the climate crisis. I pay 500 euros for my rent because my landlord is greedy and they can get away with that. For the climate justice movement it is very hard to find these tangible life experiences that would make people so angry. I saw that from the very beginning when we wanted to make these movements together. So eventually we split and other initiatives, just like the energy cooperative, are emerging from it. I guess what we created was an incubator for different ideas that later on have to find their own ways.

INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION EXPERIENCES

If major corporations, financial flows and the far-right operate across borders, social movements cannot afford to remain confined within them. Internationalism is therefore not an optional aspiration, but a necessary condition for effectively challenging transnational concentrations of power. It is essential for coordinating action, facilitating mutual learning and building international solidarity, while also enabling movements to understand political, economic and ecological crises systemically and involve the broad public, for example through global days of actions or internationally coordinated protests.

Likewise, we cannot assume that the economic and political transformations required to move beyond the current economic model can succeed in isolation within individual countries. For such changes to take root, and to prevent reactionary forces from dismantling the progress achieved, they must be pursued in a coordinated and broadly synchronised manner, at least at the regional level. International coordination therefore provides movements not only with solidarity across borders, but also with the scale, resilience and collective power needed to make structural change sustainable.

In this section we show two examples of international structures and campaigns from both the climate and the housing movement that can showcase some success on this scale of organising.

Housing Action Days — from a decentralised international campaign to an infrastructure for movement building

Housing Action Days is an example of a lasting international campaign for the right to housing that we will use to demonstrate both the importance of international organising within the housing movement and its possibilities to involve people and cross national borders.

It started in Germany in 2020 and was adopted by the EAC, which has since regularly run it in springtime every year. The arrival of

spring in many European countries means the end of the winter moratorium on evictions and increased stress for many households. It started symbolically as a Housing Action Day, which marked the beginning of increased activity for many housing collectives, but since it quickly started growing in popularity across Europe, it expanded to a whole week to encompass different events and local dynamics. Since 2021 the EAC has taken the role of an informal coordinator and facilitator of the campaign that helps spread the call, gather all the news about actions on social media and on an interactive map on the website, as well as to spread the information to local and international media. The purpose of such coordination is not only to increase numbers of organised actions and attendance figures, which have been impressive for the Housing Action Days — in 2026 the number of local actions surpassed 200 and reached communities outside of Europe. Rather, such immense interest of local collectives to participate in it is a clear sign that the campaign is undoubtedly relevant for the housing movement as a whole.

Housing Action Days did not emerge simply as another European campaign. They emerged from a growing understanding among housing organisers that what appeared to be local crises were in fact expressions of the same global system. Whether fighting evictions in Athens, rent increases in Berlin, touristification in Lisbon, speculation in Cluj-Napoca, or the privatisation of public housing in Dublin, communities across Europe were confronting remarkably similar forces. What was often experienced as an isolated local struggle was increasingly understood as part of a shared political conflict over who cities are for and who has the right to remain in them. This insight was not only significant for organisers, but for affected people as well. People facing eviction by their landlord or court, living in substandard housing that is due to be demolished to make way for profitable urban renovation projects often feel isolated and guilty for their personal situations. In some cases, the only ones they can rely on in these situations are their immediate communities and housing groups. International campaigns such as Housing Action Days raise awareness among them that the issues they are facing are not the consequences of their own lack of capacity and inability. When they unite in international

campaigns for housing and when they understand that the issues are not individual or local, but systemic, they get more determined to persist in their struggle and support each other.

However, even though housing problems across borders have the same root, systemic causes, their manifestations are manifold and context dependent. Rather than creating a centralised campaign with a single agenda, Housing Action Days thus became a space where autonomous groups are able to act together while maintaining their own priorities, tactics and political cultures. Tenant unions, anti-eviction networks, neighbourhood assemblies, migrant justice groups, housing cooperatives, squatters' movements, climate activists and homeless people's organisations found a common framework through which to connect struggles that had previously seemed too specific, too local or even only relevant in a particular national context. Under the umbrella of a request for "Housing for people, not for profit" and the call to organise locally while acting globally, communities confronted the shared realities of housing commodification, land grabbing, displacement, climate injustice and urban inequality. As well as being able to stress different issues and their aspects, they have had the liberty to choose methods that are most suitable for their struggles and that have the greatest impact on their communities.

Over the years, mobilisations have included mass demonstrations, neighbourhood assemblies, rent strikes, building occupations, anti-eviction blockades, community festivals, public tribunals, direct actions targeting landlords and investors, collective mapping of vacant housing, solidarity kitchens, educational workshops and creative interventions in public space. Some actions have mobilised thousands of people in city centres, while others have focused on strengthening local organising capacities in neighbourhoods facing displacement and housing insecurity. One of the reasons we believe Housing Action Days have been so successful is their flexibility and inclusivity — every collective has been able to adapt them to their own needs, capacities and goals, while also reflecting the movement itself: there is no single way to fight for housing justice.

We will briefly mention some examples for the sake of inspiring new collectives to join the Housing Action Days and to encourage them to take part no matter how big or small they feel, because every kind of action equally contributes to the campaign. One of the most impressive examples of mass mobilising may have been the demonstration in Lisbon in 2023 that took more than 3000 people to the streets of the city.

Housing Action Days (Lisbon 2023)

A group of collectives united around housing and urban issues organised a march against housing injustice and called people to a referendum on limiting short-term rentals in the city. Some have incorporated artistic and satirical elements, such as Stop Auctions Athens. Other collectives have used Housing Action Days as an opportunity to remind their communities of their work and involve them in their work. Such examples are numerous festivals, picnics, film screenings or joint vacant buildings mappings in the neighbourhoods in Germany and the Czech Republic.

Housing Action Days (Athens 2023)

Finally, Housing Action Days have been a cause for attracting more media attention to local direct actions, such as in the cases of successful anti-eviction actions in Belgrade in 2023 or in Barcelona in 2026.

Over time, Housing Action Days evolved from a decentralised campaign into an infrastructure for movement-building. What began as a coordinated European mobilisation expanded year after year, connecting struggles across dozens of cities and countries. By 2023, more than 120 decentralised actions took place in over 60 cities in Europe. In other words, the growth of Housing Action Days has mirrored the growing strength of the housing movement. Organisers began visiting one another's cities, sharing tactics, supporting campaigns across borders and developing common analyses of financialisation, speculation, displacement and urban inequality. The annual mobilisations became both a public expression of resistance and a mechanism through which the movement itself was growing stronger. Its most important achievement may have been the creation of lasting relationships between organisations, the exchange of organi-

sing strategies, and the development of a shared political language capable of linking local experiences to wider structural processes.

A significant milestone in this process was reached in 2025. Following discussions and strategic exchanges among organisers, including those held in Barcelona in 2024, Housing Action Days took a decisive step beyond its European origins. Recognising that the forces shaping housing injustice operate on a global scale, participants embraced a more explicitly international horizon. The next year's Housing Action Days became the largest edition to date, bringing together more than 200 actions not only across Europe but also through connections with struggles in other parts of the world. In Manila, leaders from various communities, including the urban poor, fisherfolk and workers met to share their experiences of facing demolition threats and other housing issues. They signed a manifesto calling for the promotion of the right to adequate public housing.

Housing Action Days (Manila 2025)

Even though the numbers are indeed impressive and encouraging, the impact of Housing Action Days is not best measured by attendance figures alone. Its real achievement lies in helping transform scattered local struggles into a transnational — and increasingly global — movement capable of acting collectively while remaining rooted in local realities. In a time when housing is increasingly tre-

ated as a financial asset rather than a social good, Housing Action Days have demonstrated that resistance can be organised across borders, that solidarity can be built between very different struggles, and that housing justice is a common cause linking communities around the world.

Climate Action Network: From a Loose Coalition to a Global Advocacy Infrastructure

Climate Action Network International is an organising infrastructure for a highly diverse climate movement. Commonly known as CAN, it currently connects more than 2,500 civil society organisations in over 130 countries, ranging from international environmental and development NGOs to national coalitions, research institutes and community organisations. Its importance lies less in directing these bodies than in enabling them to exchange information, develop common positions and act together across national, regional and international arenas. This combination of scale, expertise and decentralised coordination has made CAN one of the most institutionally developed networks within global climate civil society.

CAN emerged before climate change acquired the permanent diplomatic machinery that exists today. In 1989, organisations mainly from Europe and the United States created a loose but official network to coordinate their work on climate negotiations and domestic policy. The initiative developed between the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere in 1988 and the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and before the United Nations began formal negotiations for a climate convention in 1990. Its original structure included Climate Network Europe, the United States Climate Action Network and CAN UK, followed by a Canadian network. Its purpose was practical: organisations following the emerging negotiations needed to share intelligence, divide responsibilities and avoid contradictory advocacy.

The network expanded alongside the international climate regime. By 1993, after the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change had opened for signature, several dozen organisations were participating through seven regional networks. CAN had defined three functions that would remain central to its work: exchanging information about climate policy; producing common policy proposals; and coordinating NGO involvement in efforts to prevent global warming. By the first Conference of the Parties in Berlin in 1995, membership had grown to almost 150 organisations. Members met beforehand to establish shared "Goals for Berlin", anticipating the strategy sessions that would later precede major negotiations.

The annual cycle of United Nations climate diplomacy gave CAN a regular organisational rhythm. Conferences of the Parties created deadlines around which members could prepare research, negotiate positions and coordinate communications. These recurrent processes transformed technical monitoring into shared storytelling and gave hundreds of organisations a recognisable collective voice.

The current structure of CAN developed through national and regional nodes. The network has 11 regional nodes across all continents. Organisations normally join through their regional node. Each one has its own governance, membership procedures and advocacy priorities, allowing it to respond to local political conditions rather than implement instructions issued by an international headquarters.

This federal structure is central to the durability of CAN. Member organisations remain autonomous, while the nodes provide spaces in which groups with different political and thematic priorities can cooperate. A national node may coordinate responses to legislation, connect grassroots campaigns with policy specialists, organise meetings with ministers or prepare a shared intervention before an international summit. Regional structures bring together priorities from different countries and connect them with global debates. The network can therefore operate at several levels. Local organisations document climate impacts, national coalitions translate these experiences into demands, regional nodes identify common patterns, and CAN International brings these priorities into multilateral forums.

CAN International, the overarching structure, operates as the legally and financially independent secretariat rather than as the owner of the network. Its staff coordinate political strategy, movement building, communications, fundraising, operations and network development. Governance is provided by an international Board of Directors elected by the membership during the General Assembly. This structure creates institutional accountability without replacing the autonomy of members.

Thematic working groups form the second major axis of coordination. Their areas include adaptation and loss and damage, agriculture, national climate plans, communications, ecosystems, energy, finance, carbon markets, the G20, health, science, technology and transparency. These groups bring together members with relevant expertise, monitor negotiations, compare national experiences and draft positions on behalf of the network. They divide complex agendas into manageable fields while allowing these different areas to be reunited within a common political strategy.

These transnational advocacy networks do more than circulate information. They also influence how organisations evaluate tactics and political opportunities. NGOs are more likely to adopt protest tactics when organisations with which they have direct relationships have already used them. Repeated meetings, working groups and joint campaigns create these relationships among CAN members. Organisations learn how to lobby, communicate, mobilise and cooperate by being part of such a network.

The network has increasingly developed alliances beyond conventional environmental NGOs. Recent strategies have involved youth organisations, women and gender groups, trade unions, Indigenous representatives, development organisations and campaigns for the phase out of fossil fuels. This broadens its knowledge and legitimacy and approaches climate policy not simply as a question of reducing emissions, but as a struggle involving livelihoods, public finance, historical responsibility, human rights and access to energy.

CAN became one of the world's best-organised international climate networks not through rigid centralisation, but through several interconnected layers of coordination. This combination of decentralised action and organisational continuity has enabled it to address important gaps in the coordination of international climate mobilisations. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, Fridays for Future struggled to maintain the international structures and levels of participation that had sustained the Global Climate Strikes of 2019. CAN's established regional, national and international networks have increasingly helped preserve the practice of coordinating global days and weeks of climate action, particularly in September and during the UN climate summits towards the end of the year. This development has gradually broadened CAN's function: originally structured primarily as a policy advocacy and lobbying network, it has also become an important infrastructure for coordinating public mobilisation and street protest across different regions.

Global Day of Action during COP30 in Belem (Brazil 15th November, 2025)

CONCLUSIONS

The housing and climate movements should not be treated as homogeneous actors. Each contains different political traditions, organisational forms and tactical cultures. Nevertheless, the cases described above show a recurring contrast. The climate movement has put emphasis on the urgency of a planetary existential threat and synchronising action across territories at the international level. Housing movements are generally stronger at building durable organisations around immediate material needs, developing local leadership. These differences can generate tensions, but they also create the basis for complementarity. We would like to close this booklet by revisiting some of the main differences and limitations of each movement, in order to formulate ways to understand their complementarity.

Strengths and limitations of the two movements

The principal strength of **the climate movement** is its capacity to scale. Fridays for Future transformed leaving school on Friday into a modular tactic reproducible by a few pupils outside a town hall or by millions in globally coordinated demonstrations. Its recurring rhythm, shared symbols and digital infrastructure enabled autonomous groups to appear as one international movement. It also converted young people's limited institutional power into moral legitimacy by exposing the contradiction between preparing children for the future and failing to protect that future.

Extinction Rebellion demonstrated another strength: creating disruptive urgency. Through occupations, blockades, affinity groups, training and differentiated roles, XR built a mass pathway into non-violent civil disobedience. Its London occupations showed that disruption could be combined with community spaces, public education, art, care and legal support. Climate Action Network illustrates even greater capacity: durable international coordination. Its nodes, working groups, secretariat and diplomatic timetable allow diverse

organisations to exchange information, formulate positions and intervene across national and global institutions.

These strengths also reveal limitations. Climate strikes can generate visibility without building lasting local membership or sufficient material leverage. Repetition may turn disruption into ritual, while media coverage can personalise decentralised movements. XR's blockades sometimes alienated commuters and exposed unequal access to arrest-based tactics: secure participants were able to assume risks unavailable to migrants, precarious workers or carers. CAN's institutional access creates continuity and expertise, but consensus-building may privilege well-resourced organisations and translate systemic demands into reformist diplomatic language.

The housing movement's greatest strength is its connection to immediate experience. The Barcelona Tenants' Union organises around rent increases, insecure contracts, neglected maintenance and displacement. Its "Stay Put" campaign encouraged tenants to remain after contracts expired and to negotiate collectively. The later rent-strike campaign against La Caixa organised whole buildings, mapped support door by door, identified internal leaders and prepared tenants legally and emotionally. This created solidarity and direct economic pressure. Casa Orsola similarly shows how resistance to eviction can win institutional intervention while transforming affected residents into long-term organisers.

CATU's public-housing campaigns in Ireland show how everyday grievances can produce climate-relevant victories. Demands concerning mould, poor insulation, defective heating and energy bills led to campaigns for windows, doors, repairs and retrofits. In Dolphin House and Davitt House, tenants secured improvements addressing health, housing quality, energy poverty and emissions.

Housing organising is nevertheless slow, labour-intensive and dependent on trust. Rent strikes carry legal and eviction risks. Local victories may remain isolated, while councils can neutralise campaigns through selective repairs or concessions. CATU's experience

shows that residents may treat a union as a temporary service and withdraw once a problem is solved, while organisers become overburdened.

Main differences between the movements

The first difference is temporal. Climate mobilisation often speaks in the language of future catastrophe, ecological thresholds and intergenerational responsibility. Housing organising begins with rent due this month, an eviction notice, mould in a child's bedroom or a heating system that does not work.

The second difference concerns leverage. Fridays for Future mainly exercises communicative, electoral and moral pressure, because pupils cannot stop production like organised workers. XR adds physical disruption, but road occupations do not necessarily impose costs on those most responsible for emissions. Moreover, individual incentives for activists to keep such a risky tactic is not accompanied by the improvement of short term material conditions as in the case of a rent strike. Tenants possess different leverage: landlords depend on rent, authorities depend on legitimacy and buildings can be collectively defended. Rent strikes, staying put and preventing evictions can directly interrupt the mechanisms through which housing income and displacement are produced. Additionally the motivation of housing activists is not only driven by moral concerns but also by personal and communitary gains, such as better housing conditions or lower rents.

Thirdly, their organising spaces differ. Climate campaigns often begin in universities and digital international networks. Housing movements organise in the neighbourhoods. The former can expand quickly across borders; the latter develops through repeated face-to-face contact. This influences social composition. Climate activism in the Global North has often mobilised young, university-educated and middle-class people. Housing struggles can reach working-class households and migrants facing immediate insecurity, although

both the Czech case and CATU show that organisers may still come disproportionately from the educated middle-class, too.

Finally, they differ in how success is measured. Climate movements often seek agenda change, public recognition, commitments and regulation. Housing movements can measure an eviction stopped, a rent reduced, a building purchased, repairs completed or tenants recognised in negotiations. These victories strengthen collective efficacy, although they may narrow activity to casework and defensive demands.

Summary of differences, strengths and limitations

Dimension	*Climate movement*	*Housing movement*
Time horizon	Future-oriented and existential, although impacts are increasingly immediate	Immediate economic grievances
Primary scale	Transnational / International	Local
Main constituency	Educated middle-class	Working-class
Main leverage	Moral authority, visibility, public disruption, expertise and institutional advocacy	Rent flows, possession, collective defence, negotiation
Organising rhythm	International conferences, Global action days and campaigns	Door knocking and long communitary conflicts
Typical victory	Agenda change, commitments or regulation	Lower rents, prevented evictions, repairs, public acquisition or stronger rights
Main strengths	Rapid scaling, strong and stable international coordination, moral urgency, institutional coordination	Territorial roots, mutual aid and direct pressure on rent flows or public authorities
Main limitations	Episodic participation, limited material leverage	Slow organising, local fragmentation, difficulty sustaining members after victories

What could this alliance look like?

The cases presented throughout this booklet, together with the differences, limitations and strengths identified, can help define several areas of complementarity. The reality of the climate crisis requires us to accelerate the pace of change and recover a sense of agency. The transformation of the economic system must take place within our generation. We cannot delegate this responsibility to future generations. At the same time, this reality requires us to think systemically and move beyond the niche to which we have become accustomed, characterised by a landscape of sectoral struggles and diverse social movements that appeal to only one section of the population.

The ecological transition affects multiple dimensions of social and economic life and requires us to overcome many aspects of the economic system. This perspective encourages us to accelerate alliances between different social movements and adopt a systemic approach. In this regard, further research could examine the role of the property sector within the global financial system and how real estate values underpin financial assets. This reflection could lead us to identify housing as a key battleground from an systemic perspective.

The housing movement can also learn from the climate movement about how to expand international coordination structures without reproducing the same mistakes. Additionally, Housing Action Days could provide an existing framework for actions connecting climate and housing, while international climate networks could offer a means of accelerating the expansion of these initiatives across continents. Conversely, climate movements can learn from housing collectives that organisation is not the same as mobilisation. People remain involved when collective structures help them confront concrete problems and achieve material improvements. In the same way, this alliance can enable climate activists to engage with the narratives and organising practices of working class communities.

Another source of complementarity lies in the types of tactics used by both movements. Each has experience in organising lawful pro-

tests and even coordinating them internationally. The housing movement has also developed this approach through Housing Action Days. However, the climate movement has acquired greater expertise in organising civil disobedience actions designed to attract media attention and disrupt everyday life, while the housing movement is particularly effective at community building and practising economic civil disobedience, for example through rent strikes. These tactics can complement one another, and each movement can learn from the other.

This mutual learning could take place, for example, through national or international spaces inspired by the Confluence of Struggles in Madrid. This space of convergence helped participating organisations retain their identities while gradually building trust through shared training, mutual support, common demonstration blocs, political education and public events. It enabled environmentalists, tenants, migrant workers and trade unionists to develop a common analysis while respecting their different capacities and rhythms.

Joint campaigns could also provide opportunities to put these forms of convergence into practice. For example, improving thermal insulation can reduce emissions and energy bills, but only when accompanied by rent controls, protection against eviction, tenant participation and guarantees that costs will not be transferred to residents. CATU's campaigns demonstrate that public housing tenants are not merely beneficiaries of climate policy. They can become organised protagonists of a low carbon transition. Similar alliances can address overheating, flood protection, transport, green spaces and reconstruction while defending the right to remain.

Both movements can also share common targets. Banks, investment funds, corporate landlords, energy companies and public authorities frequently shape both housing and environmental outcomes. The European Union provides a clear example through the role of the European Commissioner for Energy and Housing, Dan Jørgensen. Joint power mapping could identify who owns buildings, finances fossil fuel infrastructure, controls renovation funds and influences decisi-

on making. Campaigns could combine the communications capacity and international coordination of the climate movement with the door to door recruitment, collective bargaining and sustained local pressure developed by tenants' unions.

Both movements confront the transformation of the basic conditions of life into sources of accumulation. The climate movement challenges the organisation of production and energy around fossil fuels, while the housing movement opposes the treatment of homes and land as financial assets. Together, they can connect planetary urgency with everyday survival. The climate movement can place housing struggles within a global systemic narrative, while the housing movement can provide climate politics with lasting community roots, concrete demands and forms of power capable of enforcing a just transition. If, after reading these lines, you feel called to continue reflecting on these alliances and putting them into practice, we invite you to become part of this collective process.