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A.1 Research question and hypotheses

This research investigates criminal territorial dynamics in contexts where the state is available (i.e., when the state has both the capacity and the will to respond to citizen complaints), focusing on Montevideo, Uruguay. It aims to understand how drug gangs establish commitments of silence (CS) within communities, examining variations and contributing factors.

Montevideo is selected for being a case where the state is available to receive citizens’ crime reports and act accordingly (i.e., the police force is both capable and not colluded with the criminal organization committing the crime). The police force has consistently maintained high legitimacy among Uruguayans, with trust steadily increasing in recent years (Figure A.1). This trust level surpasses even esteemed institutions such as Parliament, political parties, the government, and the Electoral Court, as indicated in Figure A.2. Uruguay outperforms other countries in the region in this indicator, as highlighted in Figure A.3.

Figure A.1 Trust in the Uruguayan National Police.

Source: Latinobarómetro 2021.

Responses to question: “Please look at this card and tell me, for each of the groups/institutions or persons mentioned in the list, how much confidence do you have in them: A lot, Some, Little or No confidence in ...?”[[1]](#footnote-1)

[Here: “A lot of confidence” and “Some confidence”].

Figure A.2 Trust in Uruguayan National Institutions



Source: Latinobarometro 2021

Responses to question: “Please look at this card and tell me, for each of the groups/institutions or persons mentioned in the list, how much confidence do you have in them: A lot, Some, Little or No confidence in ...?”[[2]](#footnote-2)

[Here: “A lot of confidence” and “Some confidence”]

Figure A.3 Trust in the Police institution



Source: Latinobarometro 2021

Responses to question: “Please look at this card and tell me, for each of the groups/institutions or persons mentioned in the list, how much confidence do you have in them: A lot, Some, Little or No confidence in .... [the police]?”[[3]](#footnote-3)

[Here: “A lot of confidence” and “Some confidence”].

State availability alters criminal dynamics, offering communities an exit option (breaking CS) and posing a credible threat to gangs. Gangs secure silence commitments to prevent exits, using varied means such as forced (i.e., violence, blocking exit) or negotiated commitments.

CS are informal agreements where communities stay silent about gang operations, providing a shield. This silence is exchanged for tranquility, creating a tacit relationship between the community and the gang, maintaining stability by keeping operations unnoticed. The goal is to prevent reporting of illicit activities.

This study focus is on explaining such variation in CS. The main argument is that the resulting negotiated or forced CSs are explained by the structure of local reciprocity networks of the community. Long-term exchange ties in these networks, involving daily assistance, influence CS nature. CS becomes embedded in the community's reciprocity network, affecting their ability to regulate gang violence and maintain silence. The structure of the network is crucial, especially when gang members are homegrown and part of the community's reciprocity network.

This appendix details the evidence for the descriptive and causal inferences, and their probatory nature, for each stage of the hypothesized process. Bellow I outline the hypotheses that guided the process-tracing analysis.

H1. The outcome: in communities with extended reciprocity networks the CS established between the community and the gang will be negotiated. (Descriptive).

H2. The outcome: in communities with fragmented reciprocity networks the CS established between the community and the gang will be forced (Descriptive).

H3. The independent variable: in communities with extended reciprocity networks relationships of exchange among neighbors are widespread among all community members. (Descriptive)

H4. The independent variable: in communities with fragmented reciprocity networks relationships of exchange among neighbors are restricted to family groups. (Descriptive).

H5. The mechanism: the reciprocity network structure in each case determines the type of CS established by influencing the community's ability to regulate the gang’s use of violence (Causal).

A.2 Process-Tracing

In this study, I use a process-tracing design to describe the causal mechanism that connects the structure of reciprocity networks at the community level with the type of CS established with local drug gangs. To test the hypotheses described previously, I relied on different sources of information: systematic press review, in-depth interviews with a variety of local actors –such as neighborhood residents, community leaders (ranging from NGO workers to teachers and social workers), and government officials–,[[4]](#footnote-4) public opinion data, and historical records.

To test whether the CS established between the Amal gang and Paths community is *negotiated*, I searched for evidence showing that community members offer silence in exchange for the gang providing “peace of mind”. Furthermore, I sought evidence of explicit references made by community members indicating that the gang members provide benefits to neighbors to receive their silence in return. Conversely, to test whether the CS established between the Inga gang, and the Pigeons community is *forced*, I also searched for evidence showing that community members offer silence in exchange for the gang providing “peace of mind”. However, in this case I sought evidence of explicit references made by community members indicating that the gang members somehow force neighbors to keep their silence which manifests mainly through violent actions. Table A.1 contains the detailed evidence and its relevance for these hypotheses.

To test whether the structure of reciprocity network is extended among community members in the Paths and fragmented in the Pigeons, I sought evidence showing instances of exchange between members of the community, including information on who is involved in such exchanges. Regarding the extended reciprocity network of Paths community, I sought evidence indicating that all members of the community participate in exchange relationships with each other. Conversely, regarding the fragmented structure in Pigeons community, I sought evidence suggesting that exchange occurs within small groups and not at the community level. Furthermore, I also searched for evidence showing that reciprocity structures preceded the establishment of the CS in each case. Specifically, I looked for evidence that indicated that the reciprocity structures were forged even before the emergence of gangs, at the origins of each community. To gather pieces of evidence or causal process observations (CPOs) for these hypotheses, I primarily relied on the memories of neighbors regarding interpersonal and community relations at the origins of each neighborhood, as well as historical records related to the community formation process in each case. Table A.1 contains the detailed evidence and its relevance for this hypothesis.

Finally, to test the causal mechanism I looked for evidence showing how community members rely on the reciprocity structure to calibrate their relationship with the gang. For this I relied mainly on in-depth interviews with varying actors in each community (from neighbors to local politicians, and state agents). In the case of Paths community, I sought evidence indicating that community members can leverage their connections within the extended network to influence the gang’s behavior. Conversely, in the case of Pigeons community I searched evidence suggesting that belonging to the community has no impact on how neighbors relate with the gang.

Table A.1. Causal relationship, evidence, and sources of information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hypothesis** | **Evidence** | **Grouped CPOs (pieces of evidence)** | **Test type** |
| H1. The CS established between the Amal gang and the Paths community is negotiated (Descriptive). | Community members offer silence | Community members acknowledge that they keep silent  | Hoop test (necessary but not sufficient evidence) |
| Community members say that they rather prefer not to talk about the gang operations to avoid messing up with them |
| Basis for silence is the exchange relationship | Neighbors say that they do not report the gang because they are very good to the people in the neighborhood | Hoop test (necessary but not sufficient evidence) |
| The Amal uses mainly non-violent actions towards neighbors (help neighbors or neighborhood, buying gift for children, donating food, paying neighbors` electricity bills) | Straw in the wind (hint: evidence neither necessary nor sufficient) |
| H2. The CS established between the Inga gang and the Pigeons community is forced (Descriptive). | Community members offer silence | Community members acknowledge that they keep silent  | Hoop test |
| Community members say that they rather prefer not to talk about the gang operations to avoid messing up with them |
| Basis for silence is fear of retaliation | Neighbors say that they do not report the gang because they are afraid of retaliation | Hoop test  |
| The Amal uses mainly violent actions towards neighbors (evictions, threats, control of movement within the neighborhood) | Straw in the wind |
| H3. The structure of the Paths’ reciprocity network is extended among community members (Descriptive). | Members of community have long-term relationships of exchange with each other | Interviewees express that neighbors exchange help in solving everyday problems associated with welfare and care needs | Smoking gun (sufficient but not necessary evidence) |
| Interviewees acknowledge that solidarity among neighbors is long-standing. |
| Interviewees express that they know they can count on their neighbors to meet welfare and care needs | Straw in the wind  |
| Solidarity among neighbors is widespread (not associated to specific social groups) | Interviewees claim that there are relations of solidarity among all the community members | Smoking gun |
| Community reacts colectively to solve needs of members | Straw in the wind |
| Paths Community Hall was originally run by neighborhs and is oriented to serve needs of both children and their families |
| H4. The structure of the Pigeons’ reciprocity network is fragmented among community members (Descriptive). | Family members have relationships of exchange with each other | Interviewees express that neighbors exchange help in solving everyday problems associated with welfare and care needs among family members | Smoking gun |
| Solidarity among neighbors is fragmented (associated to family groups) | Interviewees state that non-family neighbors do not maintain personal relationships with each other. | Smoking gun |
| Interviewees express an absence of a sense of community among Pigeons residents | Straw in the wind |
| Interviewees state that there are deep coexistence problems among members |
| H5. The reciprocity network structure in each case determines the type of CS established by influencing the community's ability to regulate the gang’s use of violence (Causal). | Fragmented Reciprocity Networks: the community has no leverage over the gang actions | Community members are seen as potential “enemies” by gang members | Smoking gun |
| Community cannot regulate gang’s violence |
| Community members that do not pertain to the gang cluster do not have social ties that bind them | Straw in the wind |
| Extended Reciprocity Networks: the community has leverage over the gang actions | Community members regulate gang`s violence | Smoking gun |
| Gang members are protected by neighbors for being part of the community |
| Gang members are considered part of the community | Straw in the wind |

H1. The CS established between the Amal gang and Paths community is *negotiated* (Descriptive).

**CPO1:**During a personal interview, a neighbor explained: “The thing is like this: if you don’t mess with them, they won’t mess with you”.[[5]](#footnote-5)

**CPO2:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said that “everyone here knows what to talk about and what not to talk about.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

**CPO3:** During a personal interview, a community leader stated that they often prefer to “pretend we don’t know what’s going on.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

**CPO4:** During a personal interview, a neighbor explains, “The gang members are very good with the neighbors, they help them (...) so the truth is that there is no interest in reporting them, they are good people, they are excellent people.” [[8]](#footnote-8)

**CPO5:** A community worker who has been working in the neighborhood since 1995 said during a personal interview that “If there were ever episodes of high violence, I missed them.” [[9]](#footnote-9)

**CPO6:** During a personal interview, a neighborhood councilman explained: “The Amal have a very effective strategy for avoiding denunciations. If you need something, Amal will provide it for you. Would you denounce me? No. Tomorrow you need a plate of food and I give it to you, are you going to denounce me? Tomorrow, you need to pay the electricity, I give you the money without any commitment because you are not going to pay me back. Are you going to report me?”[[10]](#footnote-10)

**CPO7:** During a personal interview, a community member said: “The Amal made a huge meal in the soup kitchen; they fed about 300 people during the pandemic.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

**CPO8:** A community leader said during a personal interview: “They give money to the neighbors, when they must go to the doctor, they give them money for the cab.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

**CPO9:** A community leader said during a personal interview: “They give children’s day gifts in the Cancha del Rosario [the Soccer Club of the neighborhood].”

**CPO10:** During a personal interview, a community leader said: “"The Amal were more about going out and offering money to people in large amounts.”

**CPO11:** A neighbor said, during a personal interview, that “the Amal had a soup kitchen; it was well-known, and they would feed all the kids, you know...”[[13]](#footnote-13)

**CPO12:** During a personal interview a neighbor said that “the Amal gang provides loans to neighbors so they can access housing.”

H2. The CS established between the Inga gang and the Pigeons community is *forced* (Descriptive).

**CPO13:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said: “One shouldn't mess with the members of the gang, and that way, they won't mess with you.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

**CPO14:** During a personal interview, a neighbor stated: “If you see something, you must be blind, deaf, and dumb. That’s how it works here. Out of respect and fear of the reprisals they can take against your family (...) Most of us want to leave, but that’s the reality we must live with. We are hostages.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

**CPO15:** During a personal interview, a community leader stated:“They have areas in the neighborhood, they occupy houses, they take people out of their homes, and they take over those places.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

**CPO16:** During a personal interview, a community leader said: “Gangs occupied houses, violently removing people who were not related to them, they were marking their territory.”[[17]](#footnote-17)

**CPO17:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said: “They threatened a neighbor because they thought he had reported them to the police.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

**CPO18:** During a personal interview, a community leader said: “They intimidate or do not allow certain people to pass or walk in their neighborhood.”[[19]](#footnote-19)

**CPO19:** During a personal interview, a community leader said: **“**What they do is displace the families, they arrive and take them out of their homes in half an hour.” [[20]](#footnote-20)

**CPO20:** During a personal interview, a community leader said: “Families are displaced because the location is convenient for them or because the neighbor does not "affiliate" or is suspected to be whistleblower.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

**CPO21:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said: “They forcibly evict people from their homes, and if you report them, they retaliate against you with reprisals.”[[22]](#footnote-22)

**CPO22:** During a personal interview, a state official said: “They don't evict through sweeping; instead, they strategically choose those who are unwilling to collaborate, gradually taking over the territory.”[[23]](#footnote-23)

**CPO23:**  During a personal interview, a community leader said that “some neighbors are subjected to threats and persecution because it is presumed that they reported the occupation of a residence.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

**CPO24:** Criminal gangs employ both violent and nonviolent strategies to ensure community members’ participation in the CS. Through the analysis of 68 interviews, 50 references to these actions were identified, and Table A.2 summarizes the frequency of these strategies by gang. It is important to note that the table is not exhaustive, but it provides an overview of the differences between the two gangs.

Table A.2 Variation in references to gang actions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | **Type of actions** |  |
|  |   | Non-violent | Violent | Total |
| **Gang** | Amal | 34% (N=17) | 2% (N=1) | 36% (N=18) |
| Inga | 4% (N=2) | 60% (N=30) | 64% (N=32) |
|  | Total | 38% (N=19) | 62% (N=31) | 100% (N=50) |

According to the table, nonviolent actions are more prevalent among the Amal, with 34% (N=17) of references to nonviolent strategies and only 2% (N=1) of references to violent strategies, totaling 36% (N=18) of total references to gang actions. On the other hand, the Inga primarily use violent strategies, with only 4% (N=2) of references to nonviolent actions and 60% (N=30) of references to violent actions, totaling 64% (N=32) of total references to gang actions.

Taken together, the presented evidence for H1 and H2 suggests a negotiated CS in Paths community and a forced CS in Pigeons community. As Table A.1 indicates, most of the evidence in both cases constitutes Straw in the Wind tests, which means that they are not necessary nor sufficient, but they do support the respective descriptive inferences. It is worth noting that an accumulation of this kind of evidence could confirm a hypothesis, even though straw in the wind CPOs are not sufficient to do so (Mahoney, 2012). Additionally, both cases have CPOs that constitute Hoop Tests (necessary but not sufficient) for the inference regarding the exchange relationship and the fear of retaliation as the basis for silence.

H3. The structure of Paths’ reciprocity network is extended among community members (Descriptive).

**CPO25:** In 1956, the Montevideo Departmental Council commissioned a study for the urban planning of the city, which proposed the decentralization of Montevideo through the division of the city into zones. These zones were then subdivided into successive partitions, each with services at the scale of the human conglomerate. These partitions included sectors (120,000 inhabitants), districts (30,000 inhabitants), and neighborhood units (10,000 inhabitants) (Carmona & Gómez, 2002). This Master Plan, known as the “Plan Director,” modified the previous urban structure and played a key role in promoting the formation of communities like Paths (Carmona & Gómez, 2002).

**CPO25:** The Master Plan for the urban planning of Montevideo proposed the creation of local communities in the city’s outskirts as one of its main goals. To achieve this, the Plan suggested urban projects for the immediate redevelopment of specific areas into neighborhood units, which were viewed as the “primary element of the modern city” where not only living spaces were built but also a series of services that were linked to the daily life of a small community (Concejo Departamental de Montevideo, 1959).

**CPO26:** The housing complexes were planned to “foster neighborhood life linked to a common center” (Sociedad de Arquitectos del Uruguay, 1958, p. 18). Within this framework, the Unidad Casavalle housing complex, which hosts Paths community, was built between 1957 and 1958.

**CPO27:** The Master Plan aimed to address the fundamental problems that plagued the city, including its excessive territorial extension, the lack of large central roads, the disorder of traffic, the lack or decay of neighborhood life in the neighborhoods, and the shortage of healthy and affordable housing in accordance with modern housing techniques, as stated in the document Memoria del Plan Director (Master Plan’s Memoir) (Concejo Departamental de Montevideo 1959, 23). One of the key objectives of the Master Plan was to reverse the decay of community life at the neighborhood level.

**CPO28:** The construction of Paths was conceived as part of a “progressive plan for social recovery” centered on the development of a new neighborhood (Concejo Departamental de Montevideo, 1959).

**CPO29:** The project included not only housing construction but also the provision of social services such as a health-care center, school, and kindergarten (Filardo, 2005, p. 18).

**CPO30:** A resident of Paths neighborhood said “From a social point of view, each place is very different, here you cross a street, and the communities are very defined, because in general they have a different past (...) The Casavalle Unit is much older, it dates to the late fifties. When the Casavalle Unit was built, a health and educational complex was also built, consisting of schools, a nursery, a kindergarten, and a polyclinic*. This already gives you a certain profile, a different perspective of the neighborhood*.” (Interview by Filardo 2005, 19; emphasis added).

**CPO31:** The political impetus for the construction of Paths came from Alba Roballo, then a legislator for the Colorado Party and president of the Departmental Council of Montevideo. A few years later, Roballo would become one of the founders of the main leftist political party, Frente Amplio (Broad Front, FA). Throughout her career, Roballo was known for her social activism and working alongside vulnerable populations. On the day of the inauguration of Paths, the community remembers Roballo’s presence and involvement: “… the one who inaugurated it was Alba Roballo, with the drums, with everyone” (Álvarez Pedrosian, 2013, p. 229).

**CPO32:** In the years following the inauguration of Paths, local authorities and politicians organized cultural activities with the aim of promoting the formation of a strong community. As noted in the Report of the Departmental Council of Montevideo: “(…) cultural activities were planned, such as neighborhood days, traveling exhibitions, and the relocation of libraries, recognizing the formation of local communities, with their own life, which must necessarily exist within the city for its effective decentralization” (Concejo Departamental de Montevideo, 1959, p. 31).

**CPO33:** Many of the neighbors who later formed the Paths community already lived in the area in precarious housing. After years of struggling for access to housing, the construction of Unidad Casavalle was finally included in Montevideo’s Master Plan. In this regard, a neighbor notes:

“Unidad Casavalle was inaugurated around 1958, but historically, neighbors say they started fighting for their housing as early as the late 1940s. They fought to build housing and eradicate their precarious living conditions. I cannot tell you exactly when the law was enacted, [[25]](#footnote-25) but I can tell you that the neighbors started developing this concern to stop living in shacks and have the possibility of living in decent housing.”[[26]](#footnote-26)

**CPO34:** The new housing complex was constructed on the same land where the neighbors’ precarious housing was located, as one resident recalls: “Our family has lived in this neighborhood for about 70 years. In 1958, the houses were built and given to people, but before that, it was all countryside and people lived here.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

**CPO35:** The process of populating Unidad Casavalle was established in Montevideo’s Master Plan. First, the precarious dwellings were gradually demolished, and the families were moved to temporary social housing. Then, they were installed again “in a suitable environment to reintegrate into the active life of the community” (Concejo Departamental de Montevideo, 1959, p. 52).

**CPO36:** As the Paths community was formed, the already established relationships between the neighbors were mainly strengthened through collective activities. It is worth noting that the accounts of how neighborhood relationships were at that time refer to extended relationships at the community level. As Álvarez Pedrosian put it, “In the 1960s, as the housing complex became more populated, neighborhood institutions began to take shape, collective celebrations were held, and there was a tacit knowledge among all the inhabitants” (Álvarez Pedrosian, 2013, p. 233).

**CPO37:** Dwellers also recall several examples of how collective activities brought the community together. For instance:

“We all decorated the streets and made the party for Children’s Day. Each mother would contribute a cake and some cookies, and a table would be set up in the middle of the street for the children to dance. Everyone would join in the celebration and dance together. On December 24th and 25th, they would also gather to play music and dance.”[[28]](#footnote-28)

**CPO38:** “The neighborhood carnival parades were highly successful in bringing the Paths community together, with children, adults, and teenagers all participating. The parades involved several days of rehearsals, during which the community members practiced together. On the day of the parade, people would come out into the streets and celebrate together. The parade took place in Casavalle and community members also participated in other parades.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

**CPO39:** An interviewee describes how people take care of each other, including picking up children from school and caring for them as if they were their own. She explains, “They call someone an aunt who is not the aunt (...)” to highlight the close relationships between neighbors. [[30]](#footnote-30) She further added: “One day, a girl who was often abandoned came with a neighbor who was not a direct relative and announced that she would start taking care of her. There was no legal process involved, but the neighbor had a long-standing relationship with the family that spanned generations. As a result, she was essentially adopting the child”.[[31]](#footnote-31)

**CPO40:** A worker from a state organization in the neighborhood remarked, “One must be present to realize how much time they lend to each other, the places they lend, the ways in which they help at times when one would really shoot the other way. Solidarity is very impressive.” [[32]](#footnote-32)

**CPO41:** A community worker testified similarly, stating, “It is a beautiful neighborhood, with very supportive people. When things are bad, you always have people who come to lend a hand. And that seems to me to be a culture that comes from the 60s; there is a very rich solidarity culture here.”[[33]](#footnote-33)

**CPO42:** A community healthcare worker stated: “We are talking about people who come from generations in processes of neighborhood construction, even processes of how they organized themselves to distribute the land, how they organized themselves to build their community, and these processes generate certain bonds that are seen in a circulation of favors among them.” [[34]](#footnote-34)

**CPO43:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said: “We have been neighbors for years since I was a little girl, and you know you can count on them for anything. You can call house to house, and there will always be an older person or someone who has lived in Paths for forty-something years to help out.” [[35]](#footnote-35)

**CPO44:** A former principal of a local high school stated that “as soon as someone is going through a difficulty, the neighborhood immediately looks for a solution.”[[36]](#footnote-36) To illustrate this point, she recalls an incident where the house of a wheelchair user was flooded, and the community members gathered to discuss how to help her: “They first found a place where the person could stay until the situation was fixed, and they also got her a better wheelchair.”[[37]](#footnote-37)

**CPO45:** Paths boasts its own neighborhood community hall, which was initially established by a group of neighbors led by Teresa, a community leader. For several years, this group of neighbors met at Teresa’s house, and each parent would take care of something, such as creating a daycare center or a place to leave the children outside the house. Later, they managed to obtain a piece of land in Paths from the Local Government of Montevideo, gathered the necessary materials, and constructed the community hall. In 1994, they entered into an agreement with the “Centers for Child and Family Care” plan (Centros de Atención a la Infancia y la Familia, CAIF), an intersectoral public policy that fosters alliances between civil society organizations, the state, and local governments, and “that is when the situation began to become a little more professional.”[[38]](#footnote-38) Today, the community hall continues to operate under an agreement with the CAIF plan, serving almost two hundred children and their families, especially their mothers.

**CPO46:** Data from a survey conducted by the Municipality of Montevideo in 2011 in Casavalle[[39]](#footnote-39) reveals that 45% of those interviewed (n=95) “agreed or strongly agreed” with the following statements: “Most of the people in this neighborhood can be trusted” and “Most people in this neighborhood are willing to help when needed”. Conversely, 15% and 18% of those surveyed responded that they “disagree or strongly disagree” with the statements, respectively.

Figure A.4Agreement with the following statements among Paths community members.

Responses to question: “In every community, some people get together with others and trust each other, while others do not. Now, I would like to talk about trust and solidarity in your community. Using the following scale (SHOW CARD), how much do you agree with the following statements?”[[40]](#footnote-40)

Taken together, these pieces of evidence suggest that the structure of reciprocity networks in the Paths is not limited to a small group but rather encompasses a significant portion of the community, indicating an extensive structure. As Table A.1 shows, some pieces of evidence are Smoking Gun tests as they are sufficient to validate the descriptive inference of widespread long-term relationships of exchange among community members. Other pieces of evidence, such as community members expressing their trust in their neighbors to meet welfare and care needs or the existence of a communal hall, provide empirical hints that support the descriptive inference.

H4. The structure of Pigeons’ reciprocity network is fragmented among community members (Descriptive).

**CPO47:** Pigeons was created as part of a housing policy intended to relocate squatters from downtown Montevideo without any interest in fostering community life. This policy was initiated under a democratic government in 1972, but the major implementation took place during the dictatorship from 1973 to 1985. The political restrictions on community life during the dictatorship and the fact that the first settlers came from different social nuclei due to the resettlements are key elements that contribute to the fragmented structure characterizing exchange relationships in Pigeons.

**CPO48:** The objective of the housing policy was to make the most of the land by building the largest number of houses at the lowest possible cost, “without any concern from the urbanistic point of view” (Risso & Boronat, 1992). The absence of common spaces in Pigeons is a testament to this fact (Bolaña, 2018).

**CPO49:** The 540 dwellings that comprise Pigeons were built to provide temporary housing solutions for populations occupying dwellings in downtown areas of Montevideo and for the eradication of cantegriles, or informal settlements, and relocation of its population in these complexes (Filardo, 2005, p. 18).

**CPO50:** The Honorary Commission for the Coordination and Promotion of Social Action Housing, led by the wife of then President Juan María Bordaberry, oversaw the construction of these emergency housing complexes in the outskirts of Montevideo to which the re-housed population was transferred. The relocation criterion was based on the population’s socio-economic profile, further accentuating the socio-territorial segregation of the city.

**CPO51:** The settlement process of Pigeons occurred during the coup period, which resulted in a political context with severe restrictions on community life (Ibarra, 2009). This is evident in the purchase commitment document for the Unidad Misiones (i.e., Pigeons) housing units dating from 1974. A section of the document refers to the “Regulations for Use, Operation, and Administration” where residents were prohibited from holding public meetings or gatherings of any kind that might disturb the tranquility of the people living in the building. They were also not allowed to use loudspeakers or play musical instruments during the hours set aside for rest (from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m). Additionally, the document states that the inhabitants of the building must maintain a discreet silence to achieve the aforementioned purpose. Moreover, the document establishes that children’s games are not allowed in corridors and stairways, among other obligations for the inhabitants (Álvarez Pedrosian, 2013, pp. 245–247).

**CPO52:** Unlike Paths, Pigeons was built to host rehoused populations from diverse origins, not just from the adjacent areas. One interviewee explains this difference by saying,

“[The neighborhoods are different] according to the people who settled (...) in Paths it was the ‘old families’, the ones that were there beforehand, because they [the houses of the new housing complex] were built for a housing plan of the Municipality and, well, those families that have been there for years settled there. In Pigeons they brought people from the remains of the *Ciudad Vieja* who came and settled there, and they were not from the neighborhood. So that is the difference.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

**CPO53:** The initial residents of Pigeons were individuals who had illegally occupied the backyards of houses in the neighboring community of Paths. Subsequently, as part of the urban planning policy, individuals residing in central areas of Montevideo were also relocated to Pigeons. A current resident of the neighborhood notes that, initially, preference was given to those who had already been living in Pigeons and knew each other. [[42]](#footnote-42) However, difficulties arose when new settlers, who were relocated from the poorest neighborhoods in Montevideo, began to arrive. The resident remarks, “We had to fight with the other. It was difficult from the beginning...I know that they came from the worst neighborhoods of Montevideo, and they put them in there [in Pigeons].”

**CPO54:** A neighbor of Pigeons explains that “it was poorly planned from the beginning. Very poor people from very different places were rehoused in a very small place.” [[43]](#footnote-43) According to this neighbor, there was no long-term project that contemplated the “social consequences of the amalgamation of so many people from such different social backgrounds (...) Many people came to live there who were not from there.”[[44]](#footnote-44)

**CPO55:** A neighbor who lived there since 1983 said: “It was already problematic, since I arrived there, it was already a conglomerate of neighbors with unsatisfied basic needs, high degree of amalgamation and families that were relatively numerous but did not know each other (...) That gave rise to a very complicated coexistence.”[[45]](#footnote-45)

**CPO56:** The fragmentation between family groups was evident in Pigeons, as neighbors constructed walls or wire fences to separate their houses and those of their relatives. This contrasted with the more open layout of Paths, which had Paths and a street in the middle.[[46]](#footnote-46) However, in Pigeons, neighbors extended their houses to accommodate relatives or family friends, exacerbating problems of overcrowding and coexistence. A resident who moved in when Pigeons was inaugurated described the situation as a disaster, saying that there was no selection process for the inhabitants and that people were taken from different places without any consideration. [[47]](#footnote-47) This led to neighbors making extensions to their houses and closing off their properties with fences or blocks, resulting in a deterioration of the living conditions and coexistence in the community.

**CPO57:** A resident who has lived in Pigeons since its inception stated: “This neighborhood, as they say, was doomed from the start... the coexistence of unrelated people is what has made Pigeons what it is today. There is no sense of community, and people are not interested in it. At the beginning, we tried to work together as a community to address certain issues, such as regularizing the electrical connection, but unfortunately, nobody was interested in participating.”[[48]](#footnote-48)

**CPO58:** During a personal interview, a former principal of a local high school expressed: “In Pigeons, there is solidarity and complicity, but mostly among those of the same family. Generally, family members take care of each other, they keep things within the family and generate a kind of community life, but only among themselves... It is a more segregated feeling, so to speak.” [[49]](#footnote-49)

**CPO59:** During a personal interview, a resident said, “Of course, I know the neighbors of Pigeons, I know them all by name, but not personally in the sense of having a relationship with them.”[[50]](#footnote-50)

**CPO60:** A community member, during a personal interview, said: “There is no sense of community, and the lack of solidarity leads to a certain way of things happening. It’s like that story by Bertolt Brecht: Yesterday they went to the neighborhood and took away the communists, but since I wasn’t a communist, I didn’t worry or get involved. Then they took the Jews, but since I wasn’t a Jew, I didn’t worry or get involved. And so on and so forth. Until one day they came looking for me, and there was no one left who cared about me. That’s the problem in Pigeons; people say ‘as long as something happens to the neighbor over there but not to me.”[[51]](#footnote-51)

**CPO61:** During a personal interview, a community member said: “People see when there are others who need help and act like little monkeys: ‘I don’t see, I don’t hear, I don’t talk’.” [[52]](#footnote-52)

**CPO62:** Neighbors expanded their homes to accommodate relatives or friends, leading to the streets becoming increasingly narrow and resulting in disputes over land boundaries between family groups. These coexistence problems are so deeply ingrained that, according to one neighbor interviewed, the only way to solve them is by getting rid of the neighborhood altogether: “We would have to throw a bomb at the Misiones Unit and eliminate it. There is no way to fix that.”[[53]](#footnote-53)

**CPO63:** Data from a survey conducted by the Municipality of Montevideo in 2012 in Casavalle reveals that in Pigeons, a considerable percentage of respondents expressed a lack of trust and willingness to help among their neighbors. Specifically, 44% and 31% of the 89 respondents “disagreed or strongly disagreed” with the statements “Most of the people in this neighborhood can be trusted” and “Most people in this neighborhood are willing to help when needed”, respectively. In contrast, 28% and 26% of the respondents “agreed or strongly agreed” with the same statements, respectively.

Figure A.5 Agreement with the following statements among Pigeons community members.

Responses to question: “In every community, some people get together with others and trust each other, while others do not. Now, I would like to talk about trust and solidarity in your community. Using the following scale (SHOW CARD), how much do you agree with the following statements?”[[54]](#footnote-54)

Taken together, the evidence presented reveals a fragmented reciprocity network within Paths community. As Table A.1 illustrates, some pieces of evidence constitute Smoking Gun tests, as they are sufficient to validate the descriptive inference of fragmented relationships of exchange among community members without being necessary. Other pieces of evidence, such as community members expressing a lack of a sense of community and the existence of deep coexistence problems, provide empirical hints that align with the descriptive inference. However, they constitute Straw in the Wind tests as they are neither necessary nor sufficient to prove the inference.

H5. The reciprocity network structure in each case determines the type of CS established by influencing the community's ability to regulate the gang’s use of violence (Causal).

**CPO64:** A community leader in Paths stated during a personal interview: “Here we all help each other. This is how things work in this neighborhood, and they [the Amal] know it: if they don’t collaborate with the neighborhood, they will lose the respect they have earned.”[[55]](#footnote-55)

**CPO65:** A community leader in Paths stated during a personal interview: “They [the Amal] do things that benefit the neighborhood, such as cleaning up garbage dumps and helping neighbors when they need money or to solve a specific problem. They are positive leaders and are legitimized in this way in the neighborhood.”

**CPO66:** A former teacher at the local school said: “There’s a veteran woman who’s about 60 years old. She sits at the school gate every day... She knows all the families in the neighborhood. She sits at the school gate to take care of the workers and the children because the gang [Amal] respects her.”[[56]](#footnote-56)

**CPO67:** A former director of a local high school said during a personal interview that: “In Paths, you can feel the intangible. When I walk through the neighborhood, I feel like I am being looked after. There is a sense of solidarity within the community. For instance, people in the houses greet me loudly as I walk past, as if to announce that I am part of their community... and I feel that way. It’s a matter of ‘I know you, you belong to this community, and therefore I will take care of you.”[[57]](#footnote-57)

**CPO68:** During a personal interview, a neighbor from Paths stated: “They [gang members] are part of our community: we live together and share our daily lives. We have known each other since we were very young.”[[58]](#footnote-58)

**CPO69:** A Paths community worker said: “There is protection from the gang towards the people and from the people towards the gang. If not, look at when a patrol car goes somewhere, the neighbors throw stones at it, even though they have nothing to do with it. They protect each other, the neighbors, and the gang, who are also neighbors. If the police come to so-and-so’s house, the neighbors stone him. Why do the patrol cars drive around with broken windows? Because the neighbors themselves protect the gangs.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

**CPO70:** A resident of Pigeons said: “They don’t care about anything, even if you’re from the neighborhood. To pass through certain streets, which are theirs, they have a guy who asks you where you’re going and what you’re doing, and then he picks up the phone and tells the others to let you pass or not.”[[60]](#footnote-60)

**CPO71:** A neighbor stated that: “If you observe anything, it’s as if you’re blind, deaf, and mute. That’s how things are here. We stay silent out of fear and respect for the retaliation they could inflict on our families (...). Most of us would like to leave, but this is the harsh reality we face. We are powerless, essentially held hostage by the gangs.” [[61]](#footnote-61)

**CPO72:** In a personal interview, a community leader described how “Gangs forcibly took over houses, violently evicting those not connected to them. To avoid retaliation, everyone remains silent, as the gang marks their territory.”[[62]](#footnote-62)

**CPO73:** During a personal interview, a neighbor said: “They forcibly remove people from their homes, and if you report them, they respond with retaliation. That’s how it operates, and there’s nothing you can do about it.”[[63]](#footnote-63)

**CPO74:** A community worker in Pigeons stated that “there is a division among the neighbors between those who collaborate with them [gang], favoring their actions, and those who do not and are therefore considered enemies, who are the vast majority of the neighbors.”[[64]](#footnote-64)

**CPO75:** During a personal interview a community worker in Pigeons said: “Evictions generally occur because you are not affiliated with them, so to speak. Here, we all know each other and see what they do and where they are. The gang sees you as able to denounce them.”[[65]](#footnote-65)

When considered collectively, the evidence presented provides support for the causal inference that the community’s leverage acts as the mechanism connecting the structure of local reciprocity networks and the resulting CS. As Table A.1 shows, some pieces of evidence serve as Smoking Gun tests, meaning they are not only necessary but also sufficient to validate the causal inference. Other pieces of evidence, such as those revealing information about social ties among community members, provide empirical hints that align with the causal inference. However, they are Straw in the Wind tests, meaning they are neither necessary nor sufficient to prove the inference.

A.5 List of interviewees and informed consent forms

Table A.3 List of interviewees

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date of interview | Interviewee | Number of interviewee | Wave of interviews |
| June 13, 2019 | Scholar | 1 | 1 |
| June 13, 2019 | Neighbor | 2 | 1 |
| June 13, 2019 | Neighbor | 3 | 1 |
| June 17, 2019 | Community leader | 4 | 1 |
| June 17, 2019 | Community leader | 5 | 1 |
| June 17, 2019 | Community leader | 6 | 1 |
| June 18, 2019 | Community leader | 7 | 1 |
| June 18, 2019 | Community leader | 8 | 1 |
| June 18, 2019 | Neighbor | 9 | 1 |
| June 18, 2019 | Community leader | 10 | 1 |
| June 18, 2019 | Neighbor | 11 | 1 |
| July 4, 2019 | State official | 12 | 1 |
| July 23, 2019 | Community leader | 13 | 1 |
| February 19, 2020 | Scholar | 14 | 1 |
| February 20, 2020 | Neighbor | 15 | 1 |
| March 2, 2020 | State official | 16 | 1 |
| March 2, 2020 | Neighbor | 17 | 1 |
| March 5, 2020 | Neighbor | 18 | 1 |
| May 6, 2020 | Community leader | 19 | 1 |
| May 6, 2020 | Community leader | 20 | 1 |
| May 6, 2020 | Community leader | 21 | 1 |
| May 6, 2020 | Community leader | 22 | 1 |
| May 10, 2020 | Community leader | 23 | 1 |
| May 17, 2020 | Neighbor | 24 | 1 |
| May 17, 2020 | Neighbor | 25 | 1 |
| July 25, 2020 | Neighbor | 26 | 1 |
| September 1, 2020 | Neighbor | 27 | 1 |
| September 8, 2020 | Community leader | 28 | 1 |
| November 17, 2020 | State official | 29 | 1 |
| June 15, 2021 | Community leader | 1 | 2 |
| June 15, 2021 | Community leader | 2 | 2 |
| November 16, 2021 | Community leader | 3 | 2 |
| November 16, 2021 | Community leader | 4 | 2 |
| November 16, 2021 | Community leader | 5 | 2 |
| November 16, 2021 | Community leader | 6 | 2 |
| November 16, 2021 | Community leader | 7 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Community leader | 8 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Community leader | 9 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Community leader | 10 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Community leader | 11 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Neighbor | 12 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Neihgbor | 13 | 2 |
| November 18, 2021 | Neihgbor | 14 | 2 |
| November 22, 2021 | Community leader | 15 | 2 |
| November 23, 2021 | Community leader | 16 | 2 |
| November 23, 2021 | Community leader | 17 | 2 |
| November 23, 2021 | Community leader | 18 | 2 |
| November 23, 2021 | Neighbor | 19 | 2 |
| November 24, 2021 | Neighbor | 20 | 2 |
| November 24, 2021 | Neighbor | 21 | 2 |
| November 25, 2021 | Community leader | 22 | 2 |
| November 25, 2021 | Community leader | 23 | 2 |
| November 30, 2021 | Neighbor | 24 | 2 |
| November 30, 2021 | Neighbor | 25 | 2 |
| November 30, 2021 | Neighbor | 26 | 2 |
| November 30, 2021 | Neighbor | 27 | 2 |
| November 30, 2021 | Neighbor | 28 | 2 |
| December 6, 2021 | State official | 29 | 2 |
| December 6, 2021 | Community leader | 30 | 2 |
| December 7, 2021 | Community leader | 31 | 2 |
| December 9, 2021 | Community leader | 32 | 2 |
| December 9, 2021 | State official | 33 | 2 |
| December 9, 2021 | Community leader | 34 | 2 |
| December 9, 2021 | Neighbor | 35 | 2 |
| March 3, 2022 | Community leader | 36 | 2 |
| March 3, 2022 | Neighbor | 37 | 2 |
| March 18, 2022 | Scholar | 38 | 2 |
| March 18, 2022 | Neighbor | 39 | 2 |
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1. Por favor, mire esta tarjeta y dígame, para cada uno de los grupos/instituciones o personas mencionadas en la lista, ¿Cuánta confianza tiene usted en ellas: Mucha, Algo, Poca o Ninguna confianza en ... [la policía]? [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Por favor, mire esta tarjeta y dígame, para cada uno de los grupos/instituciones o personas mencionadas en la lista, ¿Cuánta confianza tiene usted en ellas: Mucha, Algo, Poca o Ninguna confianza en ... [la policía]? [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Por favor, mire esta tarjeta y dígame, para cada uno de los grupos/instituciones o personas mencionadas en la lista, ¿Cuánta confianza tiene usted en ellas: Mucha, Algo, Poca o Ninguna confianza en ... [la policía]? [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Table A1 of this Appendix for a detailed list of the interviewees. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Interviewee 17. March 2, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Interviewee 26. July 25, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Interviewee 5. November 16, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Interviewee 24. May 17, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Interviewee 1. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Interviewee 18. March 20, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Interviewee 24. June 17, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Interviewee 18. November 23, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Interviewee 26. November 30, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Interviewee 24. May 17, 2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Interviewee 37. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Interviewee 16. November 23, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Interviewee 10. November 18, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Interviewee 39. March 18, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Interviewee 19. May 6, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Interviewee 4. June 17, 2019. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Interviewee 36. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Interviewee 2. June 13, 2019. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Interviewee 29. November 17, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Interviewee 23. November 25, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. The Law of Populated Centers, enacted in May 1946, assumed that the Neighborhood Unit was a central instrument in urban planning. Montevideo’s Master Plan is based on this Law to organize the peripheral areas of the city with the objective of restoring community life (Cajade, 2018). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Interviewee 27. September 1, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Interviewee 9. June 18, 2019. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Interviewee 9. June 18, 2019. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Interviewee 18. March 5, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Interviewee 39. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Interviewee 2. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Interviewee 1. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Interviewee 4. June 17, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Interviewee 30. December 6, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Interviewee 19. November 23, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Interviewee 1. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Interviewee 19. May 6, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Bervejillo (2012). Special thanks to Ignacio Zuasnabar and Maria Julia Acosta of Equipos Consultores and to the Municipality of Montevideo for kindly providing the database of the survey conducted in 2011. The study involved a survey of 600 residents of the Casavalle neighborhood during the month of June 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. En toda comunidad, algunas personas se reúnen con otras y se tienen confianza mutua, mientras que otras no. Ahora, me gustaría conversar acerca de la confianza y la solidaridad en su comunidad. Utilizando la siguiente escala (MOSTRAR TARJETA), ¿qué tan de acuerdo está con las siguientes afirmaciones? [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Interviewee 14. November 18, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Interviewee 12. November 18, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Interviewee 27. September 1, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Interviewee 37. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Interviewee 14. November 18, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Interviewee 37. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Interviewee 27. September 1, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Interviewee 36. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Interviewee 24. November 30, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Interviewee 20. March 18, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Interviewee 27. September 1, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Interviewee 35. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. En toda comunidad, algunas personas se reúnen con otras y se tienen confianza mutua, mientras que otras no. Ahora, me gustaría conversar acerca de la confianza y la solidaridad en su comunidad. Utilizando la siguiente escala (MOSTRAR TARJETA), ¿qué tan de acuerdo está con las siguientes afirmaciones? [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Interviewee 22. November 25, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Interviewee 1. June 15, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Interviewee 19. November 23, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Interviewee 24. May 17, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Interviewee 37. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Interviewee 37. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Interviewee 10. November 18, 2021. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Interviewee 2. June 13, 2019. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Interviewee 26. July 25, 2020. First wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Interviewee 36. March 3, 2022. Second wave of interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)