Own Nothing and Be Happy: Ethical Implications of Private Equity Led Urban Gentrification

Maxwell Vinciguerra

Boston University

December 3, 2024

The concept of “own nothing and be happy”,[1] popularized by the World Economic Forum (WEF), has sparked significant debate about its implications for economic stability, personal autonomy, and societal ethics.[2] Rooted in an idea of access replacing ownership, the ideology envisions a future where material goods are shared rather than possessed. This seemingly utopian vision is deeply contested when applied to private equity driven urban gentrification. In this context, the practice often exacerbates economic inequality, disrupts communities, and chips away at long-term residents’ rights to stability and autonomy.

At its core, "own nothing and be happy" presents an appealing alternative to the consumerism that has dominated much of modern economic life. Proponents of this ideology suggest that relinquishing personal ownership in favor of access to shared and improved community resources could reduce waste, promote sustainability, and foster a sense of community. By removing the burdens of ownership, individuals may experience fewer financial pressures and enjoy increased flexibility. For example, in urban centers, shared electric vehicles could alleviate the need for car ownership, reducing congestion and emissions, while communal workspaces might offer opportunities for collaboration and innovation.[3] Subscription-based access to household goods and services could ensure that people have access to high-quality items without significant upfront costs, making lifestyles more adaptable and efficient with changing needs. These models could, in theory, create urban environments that are efficient, inclusive, and environmentally friendly. However, this approach becomes problematic when implemented in a context where power dynamics are heavily skewed, such as in private equity led gentrification. In such cases, access is often controlled by profit-driven entities that prioritize

[1] World Economic Forum, "You'll Own Nothing and You'll Be Happy," YouTube video, 1:00, posted by World Economic Forum, January 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVIy3rjuKGY.
[2] Stewart, Richard, Michael B. Charles, and John Page. "A Future with No Individual Ownership Is Not a Happy One: Property Theory Shows Why." *Futures* 152 (2023): 103209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103209.
[3] Ibid

financial returns over community welfare. As a result, the promise of shared access can quickly morph into a mechanism for exclusion, exacerbating inequality and undermining the potential benefits of this ideology.

Urban gentrification, the process by which lower-income neighborhoods are transformed by an influx of wealthier residents and capital, is a double-edged sword. On one hand, it can bring much-needed investment to areas suffering from neglect, revitalizing infrastructure, enhancing public spaces, and attracting businesses that stimulate the local economy. Improved amenities and services, such as parks, schools, and transportation, can also raise the overall quality of life for new residents.[4] On the other hand, this process often displaces long-term residents who can no longer afford the rising costs associated with such transformations, including higher rents, property taxes, and living expenses. This displacement not only uproots individuals and families but also fragments social networks and community cohesion built over generations. In the hands of private equity firms, gentrification frequently prioritizes profitability over the welfare of the existing community. The focus on maximizing returns often accelerates these changes, as entire neighborhoods are reshaped to cater to higher-income populations.[5] This creates stark ethical dilemmas, as the benefits of redevelopment are rarely shared equitably, leaving long-standing residents to bear the brunt of the changes.

Urban gentrification is not a new phenomenon; it has been a recurring trend in cities undergoing economic transformation. Historically, waves of gentrification have followed periods of industrial decline, urban neglect, or post-war redevelopment. While the economic drivers differ, the outcomes are strikingly similar: working-class communities are displaced, and the

[4] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4

[5] Demir, Firat. "The Rise of Rentier Capitalism and the Financialization of Real Sectors in Developing Countries." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/048661340730528

socio-economic fabric of neighborhoods is irreparably altered. Today, private equity involvement accelerates this process, transforming it from a gradual evolution to a rapid, profit-driven upheaval. Unlike organic gentrification led by small-scale investments, private equity's role introduces a systemic imbalance.[6] With vast financial resources, these firms can outbid local buyers, acquire entire blocks, and initiate large-scale projects that leave no room for existing residents to adapt. Making the modern gentrification model more aggressive, stripping neighborhoods of their identity at an unprecedented pace.

Private equity firms have become central players in this process, acquiring undervalued properties and implementing redevelopment strategies that emphasize financial returns. This model is driven by the principle of maximizing shareholder value, often at the expense of residents. For instance, a firm might purchase a block of affordable rental housing, renovate it into luxury apartments, and significantly increase rents.[7] While this increases the firm's profits and attracts higher-income tenants, the original residents, many of whom were already economically vulnerable, are forced to leave. The result is not only the physical displacement of people, but also the destruction of social networks, cultural continuity, and community identity.

Critics argue that this commodification of urban spaces erodes the very character that made these areas desirable in the first place. Take Boston's Jamaica Plain neighborhood as an example: once a vibrant, working-class community, it has seen significant gentrification in recent decades.[8] While property values and local amenities have improved, many long-term residents,

---

[6] Gemson, Josephine, and Thillai Rajan A. *Private Equity Financing in Infrastructure and Real Estate: Impact, Strategies, and Value Addition.* Singapore: Springer, 2023.
[7] Keel, Andrew. "The Future of Mobile Home Park Investing: Three Big Names." Forbes, April 6, 2022. https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2022/04/06/the-future-of-mobile-home-park-investing-three-big-names/
[8] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4

particularly those from minority groups, have been priced out. James Jennings, a scholar from Tufts University, has highlighted how gentrification driven by economic incentives can resegregate cities along racial and class lines, perpetuating systemic inequalities. Displacement, he notes, isn't just a byproduct of gentrification; it is most often an outcome of maximizing returns for investors.[9]

The ethical challenges of private equity's role in gentrification are significant. By prioritizing profit over people, these firms destabilize communities, displacing those who have contributed to the fabric of these neighborhoods for generations. This is particularly troubling in cities like Boston, where housing affordability is a major issue. According to a 2022 report by the Massachusetts Housing Partnership, over half of renter households in the state are cost-burdened, spending more than 30% of their income on housing.[10] The aggressive acquisition strategies of private equity firms not only drive-up housing costs but also frequently result in the conversion of affordable units into luxury accommodations, making it increasingly difficult for low- and middle-income families to find stable housing. Private equity driven gentrification exacerbates this problem by further reducing the stock of affordable housing and deepening inequality based on affordability of living in the area after the gentrification.

This phenomenon is particularly acute in cities with historically marginalized populations. In Washington, D.C., for example, gentrification has led to the displacement of thousands of African American families, fundamentally altering the city's cultural identity. Once referred to as "Chocolate City," a term rooted in both cultural pride and the racial segregation of

[9] Ibid
[10] Gemson, Josephine, and Thillai Rajan A. *Private Equity Financing in Infrastructure and Real Estate: Impact, Strategies, and Value Addition*. Singapore: Springer, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-1634-1.

its time, D.C. has seen its black population decline by over 30% in some neighborhoods since 2000. Studies show that much of this displacement is tied to rising rents and property taxes fueled by private equity acquisitions. The process often begins subtly, with small developments and infrastructure upgrades, but quickly escalates as investment firms identify the area as profitable. Residents who cannot afford the new costs are forced out, often to distant suburbs where public transit and job opportunities are less accessible, perpetuating cycles of economic disadvantage.[11]

The "own nothing, be happy" ideology intersects uncomfortably with these dynamics. Proponents argue that shared access to resources reduces barriers to consumption and promotes sustainability. By replacing ownership with access, this model could theoretically reduce waste, encourage more efficient use of resources, and create a more environmentally friendly urban lifestyle. In theory, this model could foster greater inclusivity, allowing more people to enjoy urban amenities without the financial burdens of ownership. Imagine a city where shared electric vehicles replace individual car ownership, reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions, or where public housing provides access to clean, well-maintained spaces for all, enabling residents of diverse income levels to live with dignity. Additionally, communal workspaces could enhance collaboration and innovation, creating vibrant hubs of community activity. These ideas have undeniable merit but are difficult to reconcile with the realities of gentrification, where shared access often becomes a euphemism for exclusionary practices that prioritize profitability over inclusivity. In practice, access is frequently controlled by entities whose goals may not align with community needs, making the ideals of sustainability and equity harder to achieve.

[11] Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Katherine O'Regan. "Gentrification: Perspectives of Economists and Planners." In *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Economics and Planning*, edited by Nancy Brooks, Kieran Donaghy, and Gerrit-Jan Knaap. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195380620.013.0017.

When private equity led redevelopment strips long-term residents of their economic foothold, the promise of shared access becomes hollow. Property ownership has long been tied to financial stability and generational wealth, particularly for marginalized communities. A 2019 study by the Urban Institute found that homeownership rates among black Americans lag far behind those of white Americans, contributing to a persistent racial wealth gap.[12] In urban areas, where real estate is often a family's most valuable asset, the loss of ownership represents not just a loss of stability, but also a diminished capacity to build wealth for future generations.

Beyond economic implications, the psychological toll of displacement is immense. For many families, losing a home is more than just a logistical challenge; it represents a loss of stability, security, and identity. Children are forced to change schools, adults lose proximity to their workplaces, and communities are fractured. Research shows that displacement often leads to higher rates of mental health issues, including anxiety and depression, particularly among vulnerable populations such as seniors and low-income families. Furthermore, displaced residents lose access to the social support systems that are critical for resilience, such as neighbors who provide childcare or emotional support. This invisible cost of gentrification rarely factors into profit-driven decision-making but significantly impacts the long-term well-being of individuals and communities.

The argument for "own nothing" rests on the assumption that people will find contentment in access rather than possession. Yet research by Richard Stewart and his colleagues suggests otherwise. They argue that ownership is deeply embedded in the human experience, supporting personal identity and agency. In urban settings, ownership represents more than just

[12] Choi, Jung Hyun, Laurie Goodman, and Jun Zhu. Explaining the Black-White Homeownership Gap: A Closer Look at Disparities across Local Markets. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, November 2019. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/explaining-black-white-homeownership-gap.

material possession, it is a foundation for self-determination and community stability. When private equity firms acquire and redevelop neighborhoods, those foundations are disrupted, creating an environment where long-term residents lose both their homes and their voices.

Consider the case of Detroit, where private equity has played a significant role in reshaping the city's real estate landscape. While some neighborhoods have benefited from new investment, others have experienced widespread displacement. Families who had lived in the same home for decades found themselves unable to afford rising property taxes and utility costs. As economist Firat Demir has noted, financialization, the shift from productive investment to speculative financial gains, diverts resources away from sustainable, long-term development. In Detroit and other cities, this has meant prioritizing high-yield projects over equitable development, creating a cycle of displacement and exclusion.[13]

The financialization of real estate exacerbates this dynamic by treating housing as a commodity rather than a human necessity. Private equity firms often bundle housing assets into real estate investment trusts (REITs) or securitized products, making them tradable on financial markets.[14] While this practice generates significant returns for investors, it disconnects property ownership from the lived experience of tenants. Decisions about rent increases, maintenance, and redevelopment are made in boardrooms far removed from the affected communities. This commodification prioritizes market performance over the basic human need for shelter, amplifying inequality and fostering resentment among displaced populations.[15] As Firat Demir

---

[13] Demir, Firat. "The Rise of Rentier Capitalism and the Financialization of Real Sectors in Developing Countries." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613407305283
[14] Strömberg, Per. *The Economic and Social Impact of Private Equity in Europe: Summary of Research Findings*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics, 2009. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429322.
[15] Demir, Firat. "The Rise of Rentier Capitalism and the Financialization of Real Sectors in Developing Countries." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613407305283

points out, this speculative approach to investment fundamentally undermines the social contract that housing represents in a civilized society.

While the private sector's interest and adoption of the "own nothing and be happy" ideology is often justified through market efficiencies and profit-driven innovation, a remarkable contradiction emerges when considering the government's role in implementing a similar framework. If the perspective from a centralized government were to mandate collective ownership of housing, transportation, and consumer goods, critics would immediately label it as a move towards communism. The thought of individuals relinquishing private property in exchange for access to state-controlled resources aligns with historical communist policies that attempted to abolish private ownership in favor of collective welfare.[16] Throughout history, attempts at government-enforced communal living have been met with resistance, and then resulting in inefficiencies, stagnation, and a loss of individual economic agency.[17] For example, in Soviet-era housing policies, large communal apartments (*kommunalkas*) were established to maximize limited resources, but they ultimately led to overcrowding, lack of individual autonomy and choice, and widespread dissatisfaction (Aalbers, 2016).[18] The primary difference between state-led developments and private equity-driven gentrification is that the latter is justified under the guise of free-market principles, even when outcomes—such as stripping individuals of ownership and agency—resemble the very systems that capitalist economies have historically opposed.[19]

The hypocrisy of market-driven development versus state-imposed redistribution raises fundamental questions about economic ideology and power structures. If the government were to

[16] Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1848. *The Communist Manifesto.* London: Penguin Classics
[17] Hayek, Friedrich A. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
[18] Aalbers, Manuel B. 2016. *The Financialization of Housing: A Political Economy Approach.* London: Routledge.
[19] Friedman, Milton. 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

nationalize housing and dictate who could access which resources, the backlash would be immediate, with critics arguing that such policies undermine personal freedom and economic mobility.[20] However, when private equity firms implement similar strategies—buying out neighborhoods, converting affordable housing into high-rent developments, and forcing long-term residents into a renter-for-life model—the response is often muted, and framed within the natural evolution of urban progress and development.[21] A contradiction is clear: when private corporations control access, it is considered innovation, but when the government attempts to ensure equitable distribution, it is declared as government overreach.[22] This contradiction highlights the power dynamics at play, where a concentration of wealth in the hands of private entities is tolerated, and even celebrated, while state interventions aimed at mitigating inequality are labeled as an affront to economic freedom. In reality, both approaches result in similar limitations on personal ownership, but the key difference is in who benefits—private investors or the broader public.

To justify the "own nothing, be happy" ideology as an ethical framework, it must be implemented in a way that protects residents' rights and promotes equity. Advocates often point to the potential for shared urban spaces and flexible rental models to democratize access. For example, new amenities introduced by private equity investments can attract businesses and improve infrastructure, theoretically benefiting all residents. However, these benefits are frequently unevenly distributed. As Per Strömberg's research shows, the profit motives of private

[20] Strömberg, Per. *The Economic and Social Impact of Private Equity in Europe: Summary of Research Findings*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics, 2009. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429322.
[21] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4
[22] Aalbers, Manuel B. 2016. *The Financialization of Housing: A Political Economy Approach.* London: Routledge

equity firms rarely align with the needs of vulnerable communities. Long-term residents often cannot afford to stay and enjoy these new amenities, further entrenching inequality.[23]

The path forward requires rethinking how urban redevelopment is approached. Policies like rent control, affordable housing mandates, and community land trusts can help mitigate the negative effects of gentrification.[24] These measures ensure that existing residents can remain in their neighborhoods, sharing in the benefits of revitalization without being priced out. Participatory planning processes are equally critical, allowing communities to have a voice in shaping the future of their neighborhoods. As Jennings argues, development must prioritize the needs of people over profits, fostering collaboration between investors, policymakers, and residents.

Cities like Vienna, Austria, present a compelling alternative model, where nearly two-thirds of the population resides in social housing or subsidized apartments, ensuring affordability even in the most high-demand areas. Their approach demonstrates that it is possible to balance modernization with preservation, providing a blueprint for equitable urban development.[25] While such models may not fully align with the "own nothing" ideology, they highlight the importance of prioritizing community welfare over market forces.[26]

The promise of a future where people “own nothing and are happy” is seductive in its simplicity, but its ethical implications are complex. In the context of private equity led urban

---

[23] Strömberg, Per. *The Economic and Social Impact of Private Equity in Europe: Summary of Research Findings*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics, 2009. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429322.
[24] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4
[25] Strömberg, Per. *The Economic and Social Impact of Private Equity in Europe: Summary of Research Findings*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics, 2009. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429322.
[26] Stewart, Richard, Michael B. Charles, and John Page. "A Future with No Individual Ownership Is Not a Happy One: Property Theory Shows Why." *Futures* 152 (2023): 103209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103209.

gentrification, this ideology often leads to exclusion rather than inclusion, displacement rather than empowerment.[27] If the goal is to create sustainable, equitable cities, then the focus must shift from profit-driven models to community-centered approaches. Urban development should not come at the expense of the very people who make neighborhoods vibrant and resilient. Instead, it should strive to balance modernization with preservation, ensuring that progress benefits everyone, not just a privileged few.[28]

Looking forward, it is imperative to explore innovative models that balance the benefits of development with the preservation of community rights. Community land trusts (CLTs) offer a compelling alternative by placing land ownership in the hands of nonprofit organizations that prioritize affordability and community control. CLTs have been successfully implemented in cities like Burlington, Vermont, where they have preserved affordable housing for decades while fostering community engagement.[29] Another promising model is the use of public-private partnerships to fund mixed-income developments that include affordable units. These approaches demonstrate that it is possible to attract investment without sacrificing the rights of long-term residents. Policymakers must prioritize these solutions, ensuring that urban redevelopment serves as a bridge to shared prosperity rather than a mechanism of exclusion.

In conclusion, the "own nothing, be happy" ideology offers an intriguing vision for urban living, but its application to private equity led urban gentrification reveals profound ethical challenges. Without adequate safeguards, this framework risks amplifying the inequalities it aims to alleviate, displacing long-term residents, and eroding the rights and stability of vulnerable

---

[27] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4.
[28] Demir, Firat. "The Rise of Rentier Capitalism and the Financialization of Real Sectors in Developing Countries." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613407305283
[29] Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4.

communities. The promise of access over ownership, while theoretically compelling, often prioritizes profitability over the well-being of those directly affected, raising critical questions about its alignment with ethical urban development. Returning to the central question, whether "own nothing, be happy" can serve as an ethical stance in private equity led gentrification depends on its ability to protect the rights and economic security of long-term urban residents. To align with these ideals, redevelopment must prioritize inclusivity, safeguard community stability, and ensure that progress benefits all residents equitably. By balancing modernization with the preservation of local identity and addressing systemic inequalities, it may be possible to adapt this ideology to foster cities that are not only economically vibrant but also socially just.

Bibliography

Aalbers, Manuel B. 2016. *The Financialization of Housing: A Political Economy Approach.* London: Routledge.

Choi, Jung Hyun, Laurie Goodman, and Jun Zhu. *Explaining the Black-White Homeownership Gap: A Closer Look at Disparities across Local Markets.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute, November 2019. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/explaining-black-white-homeownership-gap.

Demir, Firat. "The Rise of Rentier Capitalism and the Financialization of Real Sectors in Developing Countries." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 39, no. 3 (2007): 351–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613407305283

Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Katherine O'Regan. "Gentrification: Perspectives of Economists and Planners." In *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Economics and Planning*, edited by Nancy Brooks, Kieran Donaghy, and Gerrit-Jan Knaap. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195380620.013.0017.

Friedman, Milton. 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gemson, Josephine, and Thillai Rajan A. *Private Equity Financing in Infrastructure and Real Estate: Impact, Strategies, and Value Addition*. Singapore: Springer, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-1634-1.

Hayek, Friedrich A. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Keel, Andrew. "The Future of Mobile Home Park Investing: Three Big Names." *Forbes*, April 6, 2022. https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2022/04/06/the-future-of-mobile-home-park-investing-three-big-names/.

Jennings, James. "Gentrification as Anti-Local Economic Development: The Case of Boston, Massachusetts." *Trotter Review* 23, no. 1 (2016): Article 4. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/trotter_review/vol23/iss1/4.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1848. *The Communist Manifesto.* London: Penguin Classics.

Stewart, Richard, Michael B. Charles, and John Page. "A Future with No Individual Ownership Is Not a Happy One: Property Theory Shows Why." *Futures* 152 (2023): 103209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103209.

Strömberg, Per. *The Economic and Social Impact of Private Equity in Europe: Summary of Research Findings*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics, 2009. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1429322.

World Economic Forum. "You'll Own Nothing and You'll Be Happy." YouTube video, 1:00. Posted January 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVIy3rjuKGY.